UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU-230052

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

A NEW VARIORUM EDITION

OF

SHAKESPEARE

THE LIFE AND DEATH

KING JOHN

EDITED BY

HORACE HOWARD FURNESS, JR., A. B.; LITT. D.

PHILADELPHIA & LONDON

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

1919

Copyright, 1919, by H. H. FURNESS, JR.

TO

L. B. W. F.

Yet be most proud of that which I compile
Whose influence is thine and born of thee.

PREFACE

THE earliest text of *King John* is that contained in the Folio of 1623. As far as the mere text is concerned the task of the editor is comparatively light, and those passages requiring typographic deciphering are pleasurably few. It is become so much the custom to speak derogatively of the editorship and the printing of the Folio that it is pleasant to speak in commendation of any part of that work. *King John*, in the Folio, contains a little over two thousand seven hundred lines. In the Cambridge text there are but fourteen examples wherein the Folio reading has been abandoned as corrupt and an emendation by a modern editor adopted. A table showing these will be found in the *Appendix* to this volume. A further evidence of the excellent state of the text may be seen in the list of CRUCES, prepared by F. A. LEO, for all the plays (*Jahrbuch*, xx, p. 158); therein *King John* provides twenty-four passages, but this does not, by any means, imply that these are all due to corruptions of the text; in the majority of passages given by LEO the crux consists in the fact that a word, or expression, has given rise to a discussion as to a particular meaning or interpretation, such, for example, as 'Alcides shooes upon an Asse'; 'greefe is proud and makes his owner stoope'; 'a new untrimmed bride,' etc. Upon passages such as these the editors and commentators have expended their labor and ingenuity; in fact, an examination of the Notes will show that passages which have been fruitful of discussion are, in number, greater than in almost any other Play in this series, but, as has been already said, this does not mean that the Text itself is come down to us imperfect or corrupted. This is, however, not the case as far as the Act and Scene divisions are concerned, and modern editors have not hesitated to alter the headings where necessary, a source of great confusion to the student using a modern text and with the Folio text before him, as in the present volume. For example, Act I, sc. ii. of the Folio is in all modern editions Act II, sc. i.; Act II. in the Folio is but

77 lines, and, accordingly, modern editors, following THEOBALD, have made this Act III, Sc. i, and the Folio's Act III, sc. i. a continuation of the scene where Constance awaits the return of the wedding procession with the two Kings. And here at once a difficulty confronts us. If we retain the Folio divisions completely, the modern line numbers are utterly useless for reference; if we adopt the modern division completely, the line numbers in Act III, sc. i. (the Folio's Act II.) up to line 77 will be repeated in the Folio's actual Act III, sc. i, which in the modern text is made a continuation of the preceding scene. In disentangling this I fear I have been only partly successful. It seemed too drastic a treatment of the Folio text to suppress entirely the heading Act III, sc. i. and all the line numbers. I have, therefore, retained the Folio heading Act III, scena prima, and its line numbers, placing in brackets the line numbers as in the Cambridge text. This will enable the student with a modern text before him to locate any passage, which otherwise would be a matter of some difficulty and consequent loss of time.

The question of the exact year—even the month—wherein each of SHAKESPEARE'S plays was written was, for the earliest editors, one of singular interest. Any passage which might be supposed to refer, even remotely, to an event of the historic days of SHAKESPEARE'S life in London was eagerly seized upon as a means to settle the question once for all. This is termed internal evidence; again, manifest allusions to the play, or parts of it, by contemporary writers are taken as external evidence. In later years much time has been expended in classifying the plays according to the structure of the verse; this belongs also to the class of internal evidence.

King John is included in MERES' list in the *Palladis Tamia*, 1598, and, although there are several commentators who have adopted an earlier date of composition, this same year has been accepted by the majority. The dates range, however, between 1592 as the earliest and 1611 as the latest; this last having but one proposer and supporter. Beyond its inclusion in MERES' list, we have no other piece of external evidence for a date of composition of *King John*, and it is not, moreover, given in the list entered by JAGGARD and BLOUNT when applying for license to print the First Folio in 1623. The Applicants then gave the titles of all those other plays of SHAKESPEARE the licenses for

which had not been assigned to other men. The reason for this complete omission from the *Stationers' Registers* is now impossible of explanation. HALLIWELL suggests that, either it was a mere oversight on the part of the printers, JAGGARD and BLOUNT, or that the license to print SHAKESPEARE'S play had already been assigned to another; if this latter, where then is the entry of that other license in the *Registers?*

As to internal evidence, WARBURTON decided that King John's berating Hubert for a too zealous following out of a hint to put Arthur to death was suggested by Elizabeth's anger at Davison for like behavior towards Mary Queen of Scots, who was executed in 1587; but, as was quickly demonstrated, this was far too early a date, and it was hardly probable that an audience would recognise and apply an occurrence of several years before, granting even that knowledge of the Queen's action was widely and publicly known. Constance's heart-rending grief and passionate words on the loss of Arthur was accepted by MALONE as the outpouring of SHAKESPEARE'S sorrow and personal loss of his little son Hamnet in 1596, and this date with MALONE receives corroboration from the description by Chatillon (Act I, sc. ii.) of the expedition accompanying King John against France, being like to the expedition of Raleigh and Essex against Spain at this same period, but for this last suggestion MALONE acknowledges his indebtedness to a remark on this similarity by DR. JOHNSON. MALONE'S theory of Shakespeare's method of composition, to me at least, does not commend itself. Are the jealous pangs of Othello; Cleopatra's infinite variety; Falstaff's buffoon jests; King John's despicable villainy, but reflections of some exterior impulse on SHAKESPEARE, or due solely to a passing mood? Such a supposition, instead of enhancing, detracts from our awe at the power of that mind which could so project itself into the innermost thoughts of any and all types of mankind.

Metrical, and other verse-tests, are corroborative of the conclusion that *King John* belongs to SHAKESPEARE'S early period, and we cannot, therefore, be far wrong in assigning it to a date somewhere between 1596 and 1598, which, for all practical purposes, is quite close enough.

For the main conduct of his drama SHAKESPEARE did not, as with several others of the Histories, have recourse directly to the

Chronicles. The basis of *King John* is an older play, *The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England,* in two parts, first issued anonymously in 1591; it was re-issued in 1611 with the superscription 'by W. Sh.' on the title-page, evidently for the purpose of deceiving the public, that this was SHAKESPEARE'S play, which had appeared in the interim. A third edition was printed in 1622 and the letters 'W. Sh.' on the title-page were changed to 'W. Shakespeare.' The proximity of this last date to that of the First Folio might possibly be a reason for the omission of SHAKESPEARE'S play from the list given by JAGGARD and BLOUNT, as before mentioned; there is, unfortunately, no entry of *The Troublesome Raigne* to be found in the *Stationers' Registers* for the year 1622, but the play was printed in that year, and its re-issue shows that it was well known.

The complete lack of cumulative interest and absence of character development are inconsistent with the assumption that SHAKESPEARE was wholly responsible for this examplar of the two-part tragedy or historical play. Nevertheless, so astute a critic as CAPELL declared in favor of SHAKESPEARE'S authorship, and saw in the later *King John* but a rewriting of one of SHAKESPEARE'S own juvenile productions. STEEVENS likewise included *The Troublesome Raigne* among the twenty Shakespearian plays published in quarto during the life of SHAKESPEARE, but later admitted that he recanted from this opinion and was content to allow the Author his anonymity. The most steadfast opponent of those who refused to accept SHAKESPEARE as the author of the older play was LUDWIG TIECK, who discerned in *The Troublesome Raigne* a power and beauty which has curiously been invisible to the English Commentators; he declared that, had this play but been the acknowledged work of one of SHAKESPEARE'S lesser brethren, the opinion as to its position among the works of that age would have been far different. Unlike STEEVENS, TIECK maintained his opinion to the last, and, in spite of the adverse views and criticism bestowed upon him by his own countrymen, declared that further examination but confirmed his first decision. COLERIDGE, in his first tentative chronological order of the plays, placed *The Troublesome Raigne* in the earliest or prentice period of SHAKESPEARE'S work, characterizing the work as 'not his but of him'; in later attempts COLERIDGE rightly rejected the older play, but hesitated as to assigning its true authorship. This last question is fully discussed in the *Ap-*

pendix to this volume, and therefore need not be repeated here.

The anonymous author drew the main incidents of his plot from HOLINSHED'S *Chronicle*, and therefore SHAKESPEARE, as he closely followed his predecessor, was indirectly indebted to the early historian. Although the general order of *The Troublesome Raigne* is followed, there is substantially not a scene or speech which is not entirely recast; in but one or two instances has SHAKESPEARE reproduced even so much as an entire line, and has compressed the two parts of five acts each into one drama of five. A careful study of SHAKESPEARE'S procedure in the present instance will be, for those interested in either the theory or practice of play-writing, a task both pleasant and certainly profitable. His keen intuition as to the dramatic value of any incident; the equally clear perception as to what was retarding the progress of his drama with its consequent omission, and, over and above all, his marvellous use of every means to develop and make real each and every character—all these are excellent object-lessons in the art of dramatic construction.

There was an older play than *The Troublesome Raigne* on the subject of King John's contest with the Pope, written by JOHN BALE, Bishop of Ossory, entitled *Kynge Johan*. From its general style and what is known of BALE its probable date of composition lies between the accession of Elizabeth and the year 1563, the date of BALE'S death. Beyond the fact that both the anonymous author and BALE used the historical material furnished by the *Chronicles*, there is no evidence to show that the author of *The Troublesome Raigne* had any recourse to the work of his predecessor; still less that SHAKESPEARE even knew of its existence. BALE'S work is now chiefly interesting to students of the development of dramatic forms. It is the earliest known example of a drama in English wherein personages connected with public affairs in England are represented; and since abstract impersonations, such as Civil Order, Verity, Sedition, are also introduced, it bears a certain relation to the older moralities, occupying an intermediate place between these and the later historical plays. It is the only example of this form which now exists. An analysis of *Kynge Johan*, with copious extracts, is included in the *Appendix* to this volume.

Coming down to more modern times, in 1745 we find COLLEY CIBBER, doubtless incited by the alarming attempts of Charles

Edward Stuart, backed by the Church of Rome, using SHAKESPEARE'S *King John* as political fuel for the flames. His alteration bore the clumsy title *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John;* it was produced at Drury Lane in 1745, CIBBER himself playing the rôle of Pandulph. It was not received with favor either by the critics or public, and after ten performances was withdrawn, CIBBER retiring from the stage with its last presentation.

In the dedication to the Earl of Chesterfield CIBBER declares that he endeavored to make his version 'more of a play than he found it in SHAKESPEARE'; possibly he thought he had, but the wilful public preferred SHAKESPEARE'S tragedy as produced at the rival house, Covent Garden, and *Papal Tyranny* sank into dramatic oblivion, where it still deservedly remains. Needless to say it did not have the political effect intended by its author.

Nearly sixty years later, in 1800, R. VALPY, Head-Master of Reading School, produced an alteration of *King John* even more drastic than CIBBER'S. As had CIBBER, VALPY omitted the whole of the First Act, beginning his play with the scene before Angiers, leading to that between Philip and John. But VALPY apparently was not satisfied with any speech or series of speeches as written by SHAKESPEARE, and, with fool-hardy presumption, therefore rewrote and recast all to conform to a style, which he strangely imagined, was more forceful and impressive. As adaptations go, VALPY'S may take its place with DAVENANT'S perversion of *Macbeth;* TAIT'S desecration of *King Lear;* and DRYDEN'S travesty of *The Tempest.* It was prepared for the use of his scholars, and for such a purpose it should have had but a very limited audience, but VALPY was ambitious, and shortly after its performance at Reading School it was produced in London; like *Papal Tyranny*, it had but a brief career, and has never since been revived.

SHAKESPEARE'S *King John* has, of course, survived both of these attempts upon its dramatic life; but among his English Histories it has never been one of the favorite or stock-plays, such as *Henry IV.* or *Richard III.* Various are the reasons assigned for this, but chiefly that the titular hero is not the protagonist.

Faulconbridge carries all before him from his first scene, where he at once captivates the King and Queen Elinor, to the final words of the play put in his mouth as the one best typifying the

rugged warrior Englishman of the time. Critics have not been slow to note the gradual change in his character. The braggart of the early scenes is drawn on the same plan as that of the Faulconbridge of *The Troublesome Raigne*, and in the older play he maintains practically the same character throughout. It was the intuitive perception of SHAKESPEARE that grasped the dramatic possibilities of such a character and showed how a man of Faulconbridge's temperament attains to full strength and fineness by responsibility placed upon him, and by the confidence of one who trusts him implicitly. 'Have thou the ordering of the present time' are almost the last conscious words addressed to Faulconbridge by the King, as he hands over to him the conduct of the campaign against the Dauphin's invasion, and this after Faulconbridge's scathing comment on the King's announcement that Pandulph has offered to make a compromise with the invaders. Once only can we detect a slight wavering in his allegiance. The dead body of Arthur, found under such suspicious circumstances, almost shakes his faith, and wrings from him the admission that he begins to lose his way amid the thorns and dangers of this world; and that Heaven itself frowns upon the land where such deeds can be committed. His righteous indignation is forgotten as he stands beside the dead body of the King; his last words breathed in the dead ears are, that he but stays to avenge the murder, and then his soul shall wait on his benefactor to heaven as it has been but his servant upon earth. In adapting the older play it must have been at once apparent to the Playwright that King John's was not a character which lent itself to dramatic treatment. He was utterly perfidious, a poltroon, and a moral coward without one redeeming feature. Richard, Duke of Gloucester, ruthless and cruel though he was, had at least the saving grace of a grim humor; and his resourcefulness on all occasions excites a dreadful interest in his fate. But John was without even these signs of strength; his defiance of the Pope is mere bluster, he cringes abjectly when he is made actually to realize the power of the Church, and accedes to all the conditions, forcing himself to believe that all this was done not on compulsion, but as a voluntary act on his part.

That the full title of this Play in the Folio is misleading cannot be gainsaid. The action, in fact, deals with but a small number of the vicissitudes of John's stormy career as King; and that incident which in later ages was regarded as the bul-

wark of the people against the despotic acts of the crown—Magna Charta—is entirely omitted. SHAKESPEARE'S reasons for ignoring an episode of such historic interest has been the source of varied speculation and comment. The anonymous author of *The Troublesome Raigne* had before him in the *Chronicles* a full account of the signing at Runnymede. It evidently did not appeal to him as a matter of importance politically, and quite unnecessary dramatically, as his main object was to make hateful to his hearers the acts of the Pope, and with such the Great Charter had had no connection whatever. What more natural, then, that what his predecessor had cast aside as extraneous SHAKESPEARE should likewise neglect? It is more than doubtful that Magna Charta, in the days of Elizabeth, was regarded as of any import, and equally certain that the people of that period actually preferred a monarch uncurbed by conditions, who should rule absolutely without recourse to appeals to Church or state. Had SHAKESPEARE accepted the incident of John's signing the Charter for a subject of a part of his drama, it is impossible to believe that we should not have had a scene equally as fine as many in his other historical plays, for example, the scene of Richard's renunciation of the crown to Bolingbroke. I, for one, wish that he had attempted it.

The words put by SHAKESPEARE into the mouth of John when defying the Pope are thought to indicate that SHAKESPEARE was merely using King John as a mouthpiece to voice his own opinions as to Papal authority; such sentiments also render doubtful the question whether JOHN SHAKESPEARE was a Romanist or had conformed to the acts first issued by Elizabeth. That there is quite as much to be said in favor of one as the other will be seen by a reference to the notes on III, i, 78, and to the views of various commentators in the article *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism* in the *Appendix* to this volume. I cannot reconcile myself to the opinion that SHAKESPEARE ever made use of his dramatic art for the purpose of instructing, or as a means of enforcing his own views, any more than I believe that his poetic inspiration was dependent on his personal experience.

In conclusion let it be admitted that *King John* as an acting play is not to be ranked with the greater productions of SHAKESPEARE, but this is not, by any means, to say that it is lacking in dramatic interest. What other playwright has ever produced

the thrilling horror of King John's veiled hints at murder and death in his instigation of Hubert? Where will be found words of grief and despair equalling those of Constance on the loss of Arthur? What moralist could picture a scene of retribution more complete than John's miserable death by poison in the orchard of Swinstead Abbey? These scenes, be it remembered, written by a dramatist not yet thirty-five years old. How incredulous would have been that young playwright had there stood beside his elbow a seer, who in strange words should inform him, as he finished the last ringing lines of his play, that four hundred years from that time those words should still find a responsive echo in the ears of his countrymen. And that he, the humble playwright, and not all the historians, had placed upon King John's unworthy brows the wreath of immortality.

It is again my pleasant task to return thanks to the Librarian of the Philadelphia Library, Mr. George M. Abbot, and his efficient assistants, Mr. Govan and Mr. Knoblauch, for unfailing courtesy in response to many demands. Also to Mr. H. S. Jones for painstaking research in the Libraries of New York and Boston; likewise to Dr. H. C. Folger and Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan for placing at my disposal their unrivalled collections of Folios for purposes of collation.

H. H. F., Jr.

June, 1919.

Dramatis Perſonæ

KING JOHN. 2
Prince Henry, *Son to the King.*
Arthur, *Duke of Bretaign, and Nephew to the King.* 4

1. *Dramatis Perſonæ*] First given by Rowe.

2. *KING JOHN*] *John*, King of England. Cap. Sta.

3. ...*Henry*, Son...King] Cam.+. his Son. Coll. Wh. i. ...*Henry*, his son, afterwards Henry III. Cap. et cet. (subs.)

4. Bretaign] Britaine Ktly. Bretagne Pope et cet.

and...King] his Nephew. Cap. Om. Coll. Wh. i. son of Geffrey, late Duke of Bretagne, the elder brother of King John. Mal. et cet.

---

2. **King John**] F. GENTLEMAN: The character of King John, except in two scenes and a few speeches, lies heavy on the actor; who therefore requires great judgement, with deep and strong expression, to assist the author; dignity of person and deportment are also necessary. [REED, the Editor of *Biographia Dramatica*, concludes his article on GENTLEMAN with the following: 'He was the author of the *Dramatic Censor;* and had the discredit of being editor of the worst edition that ever appeared of any English author: we mean Shakespeare, as printed by Mr. Bell, 1774.'—Gentleman's remarks reflect, however, a certain patronising attitude towards Shakespeare that was unfortunately characteristic of the latter part of eighteenth century criticism, and for that reason—not for their intrinsic value—are they here included.—ED.]—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 8) concurs with Gentleman, whom he does not, however, quote, that the part of King John is unremunerative for the actor because 'he must endeavor to arouse antipathy instead of sympathy, antagonism and not agreement in the audience; and yet every artistic effort must be exerted to excite an interest in the part; since John must be shown, in the early scenes, endowed with a strength and energy which later degenerate into cowardice and crime.'—[Estimates of the character of King John as portrayed by Shakespeare and as given by historians will be found in the *Appendix.*]

3. **Prince Henry**] FRENCH (p. 5): This Prince was born October 1, 1206, and immediately after his father's death was proclaimed king by the loyal earl of Pembroke, and crowned October 26, 1216; he was therefore only ten years old when he put on 'The lineal state and glory of the land.' [Shakespeare's Henry is, however, a youth of apparently seventeen or eighteen.—ED.]—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einfürungen*, i, 12): The part of Prince Henry may be best represented by a young actress. On account of the importance which this short rôle bears in the closing scene of the play its assignment demands a certain amount of consideration. Princely bearing and youthful modesty, together with deep pity for his father's suffering and death, should characterise the part.

4. **Arthur**] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL's ed., p. 13): Arthur should be a boy of small size, of tender, insinuating utterance, with sensibility of feeling.—KREYSSIG (i, 391): In the delineation of Arthur Shakespeare had a delicate task to discharge, all

[4. Arthur]

the more so since his earlier, masterly portrayal of a situation quite similar must have acted strongly upon his perception. With the simple motive of innocence trampled under foot by all the world, here, if anywhere, it would seem that a repetition was unavoidable. Like the sons of Edward, Arthur became, in fresh and sinless youth, the hapless victim of a question of legitimate succession to the crown. In the present play, as in *Richard III*, the tragic conflict lies not in the personality of the sufferer, but in his connection with those around him. In both cases there is grave danger of failure to obey that fundamental law of Tragedy which banishes from the realm of æsthetic representation the morally repugnant appearance of wholly unmerited suffering. It is, moreover, both remarkable and instructive to see how excellently the poet, avoiding any repetition, has accomplished this seemingly insuperable task in two totally different ways—and it is doubly instructive, since in both cases the material prescribes that the catastrophe be from without, and allows the poet a free hand only in development of character and motive, as well as peculiarities of execution. In one as well as in the other both renderings are carried out in a manner as masterly as it is original. The two youths themselves are drawn from a somewhat similar pattern, alike in age, situation, and fate, alike also through a passivity demanded by the circumstances.—HUDSON (*Life, Art & Characters*, etc., ii, 29): As Shakespeare used the allowable license of art in stretching the life of Constance beyond its actual date, that he might enrich his work with the eloquence of a mother's love; so he took a like freedom in making Arthur younger than the facts prescribed, that he might in larger measure pour in the sweetness of childish innocence and wit. Both of these departures from strict historic order are highly judicious; at least they are amply redeemed by the dramatic wealth which comes in fitly through them. And in the case of Arthur there is the further gain, that the sparing of his eyes is owing to his potency of tongue and the piercing touch of gentleness; whereas in the history he is indebted for this to his strength of arm. The Arthur of the play is an artless, gentle, natural-hearted, but high-spirited, eloquent boy, in whom we have the voice of nature pleading for nature's rights, unrestrained by pride of character or place; who at first braves his uncle, because set on to do so by his mother; and afterwards fears him, yet knows not why, because his heart is too full of the 'holiness of youth' to conceive how anything so treacherous and unnatural can be, as that which he fears. And he not only has a most tender and loving disposition, such as cruelty itself can hardly resist, but is also persuasive and wise far beyond his years; though his power of thought and magic of speech are so managed as rather to aid the impression of his childish age. Observe, too, how in the scene with Hubert [IV, i.] his very terror operates in him a sort of preternatural illumination, and inspires him to a course of innocent and unconscious cunning,—the perfect art of perfect artlessness. . . . Shakespeare has several times thrown the witchery of his genius into pictures of nursery life, bringing children upon the scene, and delighting us with their innocent archness and sweet-witted prattle; as in the case of Mamilius in *The Winter's Tale*, and of Lady Macduff and her son; but Arthur is his most charming piece in that line. That his great, simple, manly heart loved to play with childhood is indeed evident enough. Nor is it the least of his claims to our reverence, as an organ of Nature's bland and benignant wisdom.—BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, p. 246) compares, as does Kreyssig, the situation of the young Princes in *Richard III.* with that of Arthur. 'The nephews of Richard,' says Boas, 'were marked

Pembroke,
Essex,
Salisbury,
Hubert,
Bigot,
} *English Lords.*

6. *Essex*] Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. *Earl of Essex*, Jeffrey Fitzpeter, Chief Justice of England Ran. *Geffrey Fitz-Peter*, Earl of Essex. Coll. *Geffrey Fitz-Peter*, Earl of Essex, Chief Justiciary of England. Mal. et cet.

7. *Salisbury*] Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. *Earl of Salisbury*, William Longsword, son to Henry II. by Rosamund Clifford. Ran. *Earl of Salisbury*. Cam.+. *William Longsword*, Earl of Salisbury Mal. et cet.

8. *Hubert*] Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *Hubert*, an English Gentleman. Han. *Hubert*, Confidant of K. John Cap. *Hubert de Burgh*. Cam.+. *Hubert de Burgh*, Chamberlain to the King. Mal. et cet.

9. *Bigot*] Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. *Bigot*, Roger, Earl of Norfolk and Suffolk. Ran. Hal. *The Lord Bigot*. Cam. +. *Robert, Bigot*, Earl of Norfolk Mal. et cet.

---

by an ability and spirit beyond their years, and the elder bore himself with a true touch of regal dignity. Arthur is of an essentially different nature. He is a saintly, gentle child, without a touch of worldly ambition. . . . Arthur escapes the cruel doom of blinding, but we feel instinctively that he is one of the saintly creatures who are not long for this world. Thus Shakespeare showed his usual fine tact in choosing the tradition which represented him as perishing in an attempt to leap from his prison walls.'

5. **Pembroke**] 'William Marshal, Lord Marshal of England, was created Earl of Pembroke by King John in 1201; and on the accession of Henry III. (then only ten years of age) was declared protector of the realm. Upon coming into power he was fortunate enough to appease the minds of the discontented people, and took the sensible measure of republishing, at this critical juncture, the Magna Charta, in Henry's name. After several engagements, he succeeded in driving the French out of England, and thus restored peace to his distracted country, which had long been torn by faction, the unhappy result of John's pusillanimous reign. Pembroke survived not long the pacification which had been chiefly owing to his wisdom and valour; he died in 1219, lamented by the whole kingdom. This steady and gallant patriot, who saved his country from a foreign yoke, was buried in the Temple Church, in London, where his effigy is still to be seen, clothed in mail, in the centre of the group of antique tombs' (*Hist. Dramas of Sh. Illustrated*, i, 78).—FRENCH (p. 7): William Marshall obtained the title of Pembroke through his marriage with the great heiress Isabel de Clare, daughter of the potent earl Richard *Strong-bow;* and his five sons by her . . . were, in succession, lords marshal and Earls of Pembroke. The noble in this play did not fall away, as therein implied, to the French interest; on the contrary, he remained faithful to King John. . . . His eldest son, of the same name, one of the twenty-five Barons who obtained Magna Charta from John, was among the nobles who joined the Dauphin, and hence the mistake of the poet. [Shakespeare is, however, not singular in this error, as the anonymous author of the older play, *The Troublesome Raigne of John*, which he closely follows, has made Pembroke the spokesman for the revolting nobles. See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne*, Part 2: I, iii, p. 519.—ED.]—Miss NORGATE (p. 177, foot-

[5. Pembroke]

note): John, who in his prosperous days made almost a parade of disbelief in William's loyalty, and delighted in straining it to the uttermost by saying and doing everything he could think of to insult and provoke William, nevertheless knew well that in moments of peril William was the one counsellor to whose disinterestedness he could safely trust, the one follower on whom he could count unreservedly, the one friend whom he could not do without.

7. Salisbury] STEEVENS: Son to King Henry II. by Rosamund Clifford.—WRIGHT: If the play were historical, Salisbury would be William Longsword, Earl of Salisbury, son of Henry II. and Fair Rosamund. But in the old Play he is called 'Thomas Plantaginet, Earle of Salisburie.' Thomas Plantagenet was, however, not Earl of Salisbury; he was simply entitled Thomas of Lancaster.—FRENCH (p. 8): [William Long-sword's half-brother, Richard I,] had bestowed upon him the hand of a great heiress, Ela, daughter of William de Evereux, Earl of Salisbury, to which title Long-sword succeeded at the death of his father-in-law. In the beginning of John's reign he was Sheriff of Wilts., and Warden of the Welch Marches, and he was one of the King's securities for the observance of Magna Charta. With other peers Salisbury joined the army of the Dauphin, but on the accession of Henry III. returned to his allegiance. He afterwards served with distinction in the Holy Land, and died on his return thence in 1226. Sir Walter Scott, in his delightful Tale of the Crusaders, *The Talisman*, introduces William Long-sword as one of the companions of Cœur-de-Lion in Palestine.—[In a review of French's volume in the *Herald and Geneologist*, July, 1870, the anonymous reviewer remarks: 'Mr. French is not quite accurate. . . . Ela's father was not surnamed *de Evereux*, nor was it until after her father's death that she was bestowed with her earldom upon William Longespee.'—This is, however, a point of historic interest only, as the wife of Salisbury is not included among the characters in the present play.—ED.]—H. T. HALL (p. 152): [As portrayed by Shakespeare] Salisbury is a purely natural man, strong in love, a true friend, an excellent neighbour, but no politician. Lacking politics, Salisbury does not attract much attention until the close of the history. He is a man of feeling, not of reasoning powers, and by his feelings he is mostly actuated and directed.—KREYSSIG (i, 395): In contrast to the two kings, to the Dauphin and to the Legate, this upright, honourable soul stands like Nature in comparison to a degenerate painting, Nature in her purity, but certainly also with her narrowness. The difference between the ideal, inviolable king and the chance unworthy possessor of the sublime position is too delicate for him. His righteous anger at the murder of an innocent child recognises in the voice of fate the inclination of the heart, and persuades him that, under the banner of France, he is following not the destroyer of his country, but the avenger of innocence wronged. But this cosmopolitan virtue finds no favor in the eyes of the English poet. No bitter, painful consequence of his action, as beautifully human as politically blamable, will be spared Salisbury, that the spectator may learn that, fundamentally, the purest humanity becomes an empty phrase if it be not founded upon positive love of country. [See V, ii, 11–42.]

8. Hubert] COURTENAY (i, 26): We now regard Hubert de Burgh as the very essence of nobility; but, although at a later period of his life he was an eminent member of the aristocracy, he was, I believe, the artificer of his own fortune, and had not at this time attained the dignity of the peerage, though he had held important offices under the King. According to Dugdale (*Bar.*, i, 693) he was nephew

[8. Hubert]

to William Fitz Adelm, a favorite and servant of Henry II, and ancestor to the Earls of Clanricarde. He was himself created Earl of Kent by Henry III. in the 13th year of his reign; and in that reign, though sometimes in much favour with the king, he was repeatedly charged, both by king and nobles, with crimes of all sorts, political and personal. These occurrences may have been the original foundation for the jealousy and contempt of Hubert, which the play ascribes to the peers.—FRENCH (p. 9): There is nothing in the play to denote the proper rank of this celebrated person, who was of lofty lineage, and a noble of distinguished ability and great power. He was descended from Charlemagne . . . and his more immediate ancestor was Robert, Earl of Montaigne and Cornwall. . . . By King John he was made Lord Chamberlain, Warden of the Welch Marches, Sheriff of five counties, Seneschal of Poitou, and Governor of several castles. He sided with John in his contest with the Barons, and was one of his securities to the Great Charter, and on the day that it was signed at Runny-mead he was made justiciary of England, afterwards loaded with many honours and important posts, among them having the custody of Dover Castle. This key to the kingdom was defended by Hubert de Burgh with only 140 soldiers for four months against all the efforts of the French to take it, and when the Poet makes Faulconbridge say, 'All Kent hath yielded, nothing there holds out But Dover Castle,' [IV, i, 33], it should be borne in mind who was the castellan by whom it was so well guarded. [The Hubert de Burgh of history was undoubtedly the intrepid defender of Dover Castle, but the Hubert of Shakespeare's creation was occupied far otherwise as messenger between King John and the disaffected peers during those important military operations. (See IV, ii, iii.).—ED.]—ANON. (*Herald and Genealogist*, July, 1870, p. 316): In Hubert, the compassionate jailor of the lovely Prince Arthur, we have evidently a name derived from the great justiciary, Hubert de Burgh, Earl of Kent. In the *Dramatis Personæ* Hubert is classed, accordingly, among the Lords of the English court; but the fact that Shakespeare himself regarded him very differently is proved by the altercation in IV, iii, 86–92, where Hubert tells the Earl of Salisbury that he was provoked by the Earl's behaviour to forget 'Your worth, your greatness, and nobility'; and the Lord Bigot, a by-stander, exclaims 'Out, dunghill! darest thou brave a nobleman?' Now, admitting that Hubert is identical with Hubert de Burgh, there could not be a stronger example of Shakespeare's deficiency in genealogical lore, inasmuch as Hubert de Burgh was descended in the male line from the Emperor Charlemagne, and his own marriages were with royal houses, whilst he was justiciary of England in the reign of John, and Earl of Kent in the next reign.—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, etc., i, 12): The character of Hubert seems at first misanthropic, and capable of the commission of a gruesome deed. He interprets at once John's murderous hints and goes with determined mien upon his dreadful errand. At the same time he should not be represented as a typical villain since otherwise the sudden change to softer and more humane impulses will seem unnatural, but he should be shown rather as an embittered man, one who sees himself, on account of a repulsive exterior, misjudged by the world. In such men a misanthropic, cruel disposition is easily developed, which incites them to sinful deeds in order that they may thus be revenged upon mankind. On the other hand, such natures are quite as strongly influenced if one approaches them in a friendly, kindly manner. Thus Hubert's temptation is facilitated by the hypocritical, fulsome flatteries of King John, while later the innocent, touching appeals of Arthur

Faulconbridge, *Bastard-Son to* Richard the First. 10

10. *Faulconbridge...First*] Pope,+, Var. '78, '85. *Philip*, his bastard Brother, begotten by K. Richard. Cap. *Philip Faulcombridge*, his half-brother. Coll. *Falconbridge*...First Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words. *Philip*, the bastard, his half-brother Cam.+. *Philip Faulconbridge*, his half-brother...First. Mal. et cet.

10. ...*the First.*] ...the First; afterwards knighted by the name of Sir Richard Plantaganet. Han.

---

lead him the more easily to the path of humanity, wherein from that point on he remains. In his whole development I cannot detect any psychological inconsistency; although Hubert protests too much in saying: 'Within this bosom, never entered yet The dreadful motion of a murderous thought.'—[IV, ii, 265]. The blinding of Arthur was even worse than murder, granting that the implied intention be taken for the actual deed. He *wished* actually to commit a crime, but he *could* not. A better nature lived concealed in him beneath a repulsive exterior, as he himself tells the king. To portray his conversion, and its accompanying inward struggle, in Act IV, Scene i, as well as his grief over Arthur's death demands a capital actor, wherefore this rôle should be entrusted only to a character-actor of the first rank. Hubert should be represented as a man between fifty and sixty, of plebeian bearing, with dark, baleful features and hoarse, rough voice. His innermost thoughts must be reflected in his looks.

9. **Bigot**] FRENCH (p. 9): This baron has almost always been incorrectly called Robert Bigot, but history does not record any Earl of Norfolk, of the family, who bore that Christian name. The first of this family, Roger Bigot, came over with the Conqueror, and was rewarded with numerous lordships in Essex and Suffolk. His son, Hugh Bigot, was steward to King Stephan, who gave him the Earldom of Norfolk, which was confirmed to him by Henry II. He died in the Holy Land in 1177, leaving by his wife, Juliana, daughter of Alberic de Vere, his eldest son, Roger Bigot, second Earl of Norfolk, the personage in this play. He enjoyed the favour of Richard I, but was one of the twenty-five Barons against King John.

10. **Faulconbridge**] STEEVENS: Though Shakespeare adopted this character of Philip Faulconbridge from the old play [*The Troublesome Raigne*] it is not improper to mention that it is compounded of two distinct personages. Matthew Paris says: 'Sub illius temporis curriculo, Falcasius de Brente, Neusteriensis, et spurius ex parte matris, atque Bastardus, qui in vili jumento manticato ad Regis paulo ante clientelam descenderat,' &c., [ed. Luard, iii, 88]. Paris, in his *History of the Monks of St Albans*, calls him *Falce*, but in his *General History*, Falcasius de Brente, as above. Holinshed says that 'Richard I. had a natural son named Philip, who, in the year following, killed the viscount de Limoges to revenge the death of his father.' [This assertion by Steevens, that Shakespeare's Faulconbridge is compounded of two distinct characters mentioned in widely separated passages by two chroniclers, has been accepted heretofore without question. Steevens was doubtless influenced only by the slight similarity in the two names; nevertheless, even at the risk of being accused of presumption, I must say that I regard any such deduction as open to grave objection. Falcasius de Breauté, not de Brente, as Steevens gives it, was a man of evil reputation during the reigns of John and Henry III. He was a man of great courage but of savage and cruel nature, and was chosen by King John to be Warden of the Welch Marches. On one occa-

[10. Faulconbridge]

sion he pillaged the town of St. Albans and exacted a large sum of money from the Abbot; later he was employed by John in his raid upon the Barons, and, having taken Bedford Castle, John, through fear of him, gave it over to Falcasius. His name was among those proscribed for banishment in Magna Charta. In the reign of Henry, for various offences, he was besieged in Bedford Castle by the outraged barons in 1224; it was taken and, though he escaped, the castle was razed to the ground. His delayed sentence of banishment was put into effect and three years later, in 1227, he died in exile. The passage quoted by Steevens is an addition by Matthew Paris to Roger of Wendover's account of the siege of Bedford Castle, and the King therein referred to is Henry III, not John; Giles translates it thus: 'About this time there was one Faulkes de Breaute, a native of Normandy, a bastard by his mother's side, who had lately come on a scurvy horse, with a pad on his back, to enter the King's service' (vol. ii, p. 454). As far as can be determined by an examination of the various passages in which Falcasius is mentioned in Wendover and in Paris, this is the only one wherein he is called *Falcasius de Brente*, and Luard, in his careful edition of Paris's *Chronica Majora*, prepared for the Rolls Series of English Chronicles, uniformly gives the name throughout his Index as Fawkes de Breauté. It is reasonable to conjecture that as he was illegitimate he received this name from the district in Normandy whence he came, and this is slightly corroborated by the fact that there is a small town, Bréauté, in the district of Caux. This is, however, a minor point and is pure surmise on my part; that which is more important is, whence arose the changes in his name from Brenté, as given by Paris; Brenté, as it appears in the quotation by Steevens; and Breauté, as given by Luard? At first sight the simplest solution would seem to lie in a confusion of the written *n* and *u*; but curiously enough Fuller, in his *Worthies*, among those of Middlesex says: 'Falcatius, or Falke de Brent, was a Middlesex-man by his nativity, whose family so flourished therein in former ages (remaining in a meaner condition to this day) that an antiquary [Norden] will have the rivulet Brent, which denominateth Brentford, so named from them; which is preposterous in my opinion, believing them rather named from the rivulet' (ed. Nuttall, vol. ii, p. 321). Fuller then gives the history of Falcasius as related by Paris; in another passage (vol. i, p. 137) he calls him Falco or Falkerius de Breantee, and again the confusion between *n* and *u* confronts us—Breauté, Breantee (the *é* of the French name will account for the *ee*). We seem to have wandered far from Shakespeare and Faulconbridge in this discussion, but the question is not as irrelevant as, at first sight, it appears, and I should not have gone so fully into the mere spelling of the name were it not that both LLOYD, in his *Critical Essay* on *King John*, and FRENCH, in his *Shakspeareana Genealogica*, have adopted Steevens's suggestion that Falcasius de Brente was the prototype of Faulconbridge; neither, be it said, referring to Steevens as their authority. I fear that Lloyd has, however, read both Wendover and Paris to but little advantage—he admits that his examination has been cursory—when he says of Falcasius that 'he was a great figure for good or ill, but ever for energy as servant of King John.' Both historians are singularly reticent as to any good actions, and equally in agreement as to his evil deeds. 'Wicked robber,' 'iniquitous thief,' 'traitor' are but a few of the epithets applied to Falcasius. The passage which Lloyd quotes from Paris refers to John's appointment of Fawkes to the Wardenship of the Welch Marches, and is—like that given by Steevens—an addition by Paris to Wendover's account of the year 1212. Later,

[10. **Faulconbridge**]

it is quite true, John made use of Fawkes in his expedition against the Barons, but Paris distinctly says that John through fear of Fawkes was quite under his domination. Few, I think, will agree with Lloyd that from Fawkes de Brente to Faulconbridge is an easy transition, yet, as has been said, this slight similarity in sound suggested this to Steevens and to Lloyd, coupled with the fact that Fawkes and Philip were bastards, and both on one occasion plundered an Abbey. On the other hand, there is not the slightest similarity in their characters. The pride of bearing and intense love of king and country shown both by the Philip of the older play and the Faulconbridge of Shakespeare are quite lacking in the reprehensible robber Fawkes de Breauté or de Brenté. This question of the exact spelling of the name is one which I must leave for some student of history to decide, and it is to be regretted that French, whose volume on the historical characters in Shakespeare's plays is such a valuable contribution to the subject, should not have thrown a little more light on this puzzling question. Foulke de Breante is the name which French assigns to the prototype of Faulconbridge, accepting without question the conclusions of Steevens and Lloyd. On the authority of Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas, French says that Foulke de Breante was a baron by tenure, one of the managers and disposers in King John's will, and also one of the noble persons named in the first great charter of Henry III. But all this merely tells us more in regard to Falcasius or Foulke; it has not given us any more valid reasons for identifying him with Faulconbridge. We must have grounds more relative than any so far presented.—MOBERLY, in a note on the first appearance of the name in the text, says that it is 'the anglicized form of "Falkenberg," much as "Bridgwater" is a corruption of "Burgh Walter." The family is not the same as that of Lord Fauconberg, Cromwell's son-in-law, which belonged to the North Riding of Yorkshire, and had the family name of Bellasys.' Again he says (*Introd.*, p. xi.): 'Of the Faulconbridges of that time [the thirteenth century], one is recorded as having lost his estates for rebellion against King John, but having been restored by Henry III. Another may perhaps be the "Falco" of whom we read as "ravening like a lion" during John's expedition to Yorkshire. . . . Dugdale has no record of the time when the family settled in England.'—I regret that I am unable to identify Moberly's reference to the Faulconbridge who lost his estates in the time of King John; that name does not appear in the pages of Wendover, Paris, or Holinshed, but—*surgit amari aliquid*—can it be that the arch-traitor, free-booter, and villain, Falcasius de Breauté, is once more obtruding his unwelcome presence in borrowed robes? There is, however, a Eustachius de Faulconbridge mentioned by Stow (*Survay of London*, ed. 1618, p. 904) in that part of his work treating of the Spiritual Government under the year 1221, and Stow quotes Paris as his authority for calling Faulconbridge Treasurer of the Exchequor; in 1223 he was elevated to the see of London and—here is a curious coincidence—Stow says that Falcatius de Brent was delivered to the custody of Faulconbridge in 1224. Does not this somewhat militate against the suggestion that the name Faulconbridge is one formed from Falco de Brente or, rather, that one name suggested the other? Camden (*Remains*, p. 174) also alludes to this preferment of Eustachius from Treasurer to Bishop, and the name, in the margin, is there printed 'de Fauconberge'—a corroboration, if one be needed, of Moberly's derivation of the name.—The original note by Steevens has, I fear, been submerged beneath this sea of historical data; let us return, therefore, to that point. As regards his other quotation Steevens

Robert Faulconbridge, *suppos'd Brother to the Bastard.* 11

11. suppos'd...Bastard] Pope,+. half...bastard. Var. '78, '85. Son of a Sir Robert Faulconbridge. Cap. et cet. (...Falconbridge Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.)

---

is quite correct in saying that Holinshed gives the name of Philip to Richard, Cœur de Lion's illegitimate son; the passage which Steevens quotes, in part, reads thus: 'The same yere [1199] Philip, bastard sonne to King Richard, to whome his father had given the Castell and honor of Coinacke, killed the vicount of Limoges, in revenge of his father's death' (ed. 1585; vol. iii, p. 160, col. b).—MALONE quotes a passage from the continuation of Hardyng's *Chronicle*, 'One Faulconbridge, therle of Kent, his bastarde, a stoute-hearted man' (fol. 24, b. ad ann., 1472), and suggests tentatively that this induced the author of the *Troublesome Raigne* 'to affix the name of Faulconbridge to King Richard's natural son.' He adds: 'Who the mother of Philip was is not ascertained. It is said that she was a lady of Poictou, and that King Richard bestowed upon her son a lordship in that Province. In expanding the character of the Bastard Shakespeare seems to have proceeded on the following slight hint in the original play: "Next them, a bastard of the King's deceased, A hardie wild-head, rough, and venturous." '—STAUNTON considers that the latter part of this note by Malone has too long passed unchallanged. 'How far this statement is justifiable,' he adds, 'let the reader determine after perusing only a few extracts from the earlier work. . . . We miss in the original the keen but sportive wit, the exuberant vivacity, the shrewd worldliness, and the military genius of Shakespeare's Bastard; but his arch-type in the old piece was the work of no mean hand.' —Malone's quotation from Grafton—although it refers to a later period—is certainly more to the purpose than all the passages from Paris and Wendover in regard to Foulke de Beauté or Falcasius de Brente, since it does not necessitate any violent change either in sound or spelling. We must not, however, lose sight of the fact that the mere question of the name or its invention is of but slight importance as regards Shakespeare's Faulconbridge; that name he found ready to his hand in the older play; but how the unknown author obtained it can be answered only by one far abler than the present ED.]

11. **Robert Faulconbridge**] MARSHALL (*Irving's Sh.*, iii, 209): In the old play *Look About You*, 1600, the husband of *Lady Fauconbridge* is called Sir *Richard Fauconbridge*. That play deals very fully with the intrigue between Prince Richard and Lady Faulconbridge, so that probably there was some story or tradition on the point of which the author of *Look About You* and the author of the *Troublesome Raigne of John* both made use. [Inasmuch as there is a period of over ten years between *The Troublesome Raigne* and *Look About You* it is probable that the author of the latter comedy made use of certain characters from his predecessor's work. The style and method of *Look About You* clearly show it to belong to a date close to its first appearance in print, 1600.—Creizenach (p. 185) calls attention to the fact that Lady Fauconbridge is therein represented as the sister of the duke of Gloster, the hero of the piece, and that 'Robin Hood bears a prominent part in the intrigue between Richard and the Lady.'—This is, however, Robin's only appearance in such a character. Neither Ritson nor Child in their exhaustive collections of the Ballads and Legends dealing with the exploits of that Famous Hero—though they refer to this comedy—furnish any source for such

James Gurney, *Servant to the* Lady Faulconbridge. 12
Peter of Pomfret, *a Prophet.*
Philip, *King of* France.
Lewis, *the Dauphin.*
Arch-Duke *of Austria.* 16

13. Prophet.] Prophesier. Cap. supposed prophet. Sta.
15. *Lewis,* the Dauphin] Dauphin, his Son; afterwards Lewis VIII. Cap. Louis,... Dyce, Wh. i, Words. Lewis, the Dolphin Ktly.
16. *Arch-Duke...*] *Duke...* Cap. Lymoges. *Duke...* Cam. Neils.

an episode other than the imagination of the anonymous author of *Look About You.*—ED.]

12. **James Gurney**] MALONE: Our author found this name in perusing the history of King John, who not long before his victory at Mirabeau, over the French, headed by young Arthur, seized the lands and castle of Hugh Gorney, near Butevant, in Normandy.—WRIGHT: It is more probable that the name Gurney or Gourney was a familiar one to Shakespeare.

14. **Philip, King of France**] 'Philip II. (surnamed Augustus) ascended the throne of his father in the year 1189, and in the fifteenth year of his age. He soon gave proofs of consummate judgment; for, by his prudence, he dissolved a powerful league which had been formed among some of the greatest princes of France. He was religious, but his mind was not enfeebled by bigotry. . . . In his twenty-fifth year he made a league with Richard I. of England, founded on the most firm and cordial friendship. Those two young and warlike monarchs, inflamed with the enthusiasm of the times, resolved to make an expedition, with their united forces, to the Holy-Land, and set sail together; but some dissension having arisen between them at Sicily, it increased to a mutual distrust. . . . [King Philip died at Mantes] on the 25th of July, 1223, in the 58th year of his age and the 44th of his reign. He was a well-made man, but had a defect in one of his eyes. Laborious and active; undertaking nothing without deliberation, but executing what he had undertaken with celerity and ardour, he was, therefore, generally successful, and was honoured by his first historians with the surname of the Conqueror, which has been changed to the more elegant appellation of Augustus' (*Sh. Illustrated,* i, 83).

15. **Lewis, the Dauphin**] FRENCH (p. 15, foot-note): Perhaps it is too early to assign the title of 'Dauphin' to the eldest son of a French monarch at this date, as it is generally understood that it came in the next century on this wise: Humbert III, the Count-Dauphin of the Viennois, about the year 1345 bequeathed or ceded his territory to Philip of Valois [Philip VI.] on condition of his eldest son taking the title of Dauphin and the arms of the province. The style had been first assumed *circa* 1140 by Guy IV, Count of the Viennois, who took the dolphin for his arms from the name of the province, Dauphiny. Philip, son of Philip of Valois, is believed to be the first prince who bore the style and arms of the Dolphin, as he was called, or Delphinus.

16. **Arch-Duke of Austria**] See note, III, i, 44. OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen,* i, 22): The Archduke of Austria is a character which the Poet found in the older play. . . . Decked out in the historic lion's skin of Richard he is from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot a cowardly poltroon, in whom there is not a spark of

Pandulpho, *the Pope's Legate.* 17

17. *Pandulpho*] Pope. *Card.* or *Cardinal Pandulpho* Theob.+, Varr. Mal. Steev. *Pandulph* Cap. Sta. *Cardinal Pandulph.* Var. '03 et cet.

manliness or honourable feeling. Faulconbridge seems, the Archduke is, a swaggerer; the words of the former are completely concealed by his acts, with the latter it is all empty sound. The contemptuous remarks of the Bastard, who, at the first sight of him, as the murderer of his father makes him his butt, affect him as little as the still sharper tongue-lashings of Constance. By-play forms a very important part of the task of both Faulconbridge and Austria in both the scenes, Act II, scene i, and Act III, scene i. Although the whole figure of this vain poltroon is drawn in a comic style, yet the comic objective must not go beyond the bounds of ignominious derision; and assuredly it should not go so far as to make of Austria an utter clown, as one often sees on the German stage and always on the English, such was surely never the intention of the poet. Dress, manners, bearing, features, all must work naturally together, to give this figure its characteristic make-up; self-satisfied vanity particularly reflects itself in a sweet, weak smile which is constantly upon his lips.

17. **Pandulpho**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscellanies*, i, 39): The character of Pandulph has not, as yet, been represented with that air of dignity and importance which it demands. Macklin, whose skill in acting is acknowledged to be superior to that of any man, who is the best teacher of the art, and is still, at a very advanced age, a powerful comedian as well as a good comic writer, should have refused this part; neither his person, voice, action, or deportment conveyed any idea of a great delegate from the head of the church, the spiritual monarch of Christendom. Quin, who was present at the revival of *King John* at Drury Lane, said Macklin was like a Cardinal who had been formerly a parish clerk. And yet, it must be owned, Macklin understood the logic of the part, if I may be allowed the expression, better than anybody. But the man who presumes to control the will of mighty monarchs should have a person which bespeaks authority, a look commanding respect, graceful action, and majestic deportment. But Colley Cibber's Pandulph was less agreeable to an audience than Macklin's; the voice of the latter, though rough, was audible. The former's pipe was ever powerless, and now, through old age, so weak that his words were rendered inarticulate. His manner of speaking was much applauded by some, and by others as greatly disliked, in the Pope's Legate, as in most of his tragic characters. The unnatural swelling of his words displeased all who preferred natural elocution to artificial cadence. The old man was continually advising Mrs Pritchard, who acted Lady Constance, to *tone* her words; but she, by obeying her own feelings and listening to her own judgement, gained approbation and applause; which was not the case with his son, Theophilus, who acted the Dauphin, and Mrs Bellamy, who played Lady Blanch. They, by conforming to their director's precepts, were most severely exploded. But Colley's deportment was, I think, as disgusting as his utterance. He affected a stately, magnificent tread, a supercilious aspect, with lofty and extravagant action, which he displayed by waving up and down a roll of parchment in his right hand; in short, his whole behaviour was so starchly studied that it appeared eminently insignificant, and more resembling his own Lord Foppington than a great and dignified churchman. [The part of Pandulph in Shakespeare's *King John* is not given in

Melun, *a French Lord.* 18
Chattilion, *Ambassador from* France *to* King John.
Elinor, *Queen-Mother of* England. 20

18. *Melun*] *Meloone* Ktly.
19. *Chattilion*] Cam.+. *Chatilion* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *Chatillion* Var. '73, Ktly. *Chatillon.* Johns. et cet.
20. Queen-Mother of *England*] Pope, +, Varr. Mother to King John. Cam. +. Widow of Henry II. Del. Widow of Henry II. and Mother of King John. Mal. et cet.

Genest's list of characters acted by Colley Cibber. The foregoing acrimonious criticism by Davies refers to Cibber's performance of the character in his own alteration of Shakespeare's play, entitled *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John*, which was produced at Covent Garden, February 15, 1745, at the close of Cibber's career. After the tenth performance on February 26th Cibber retired from the Stage. For an account of Cibber's Adaptation, see *Appendix.*—ED.]—H. T. HALL (*Sh. Fly-Leaves*, p. 180): The character of Cardinal Pandulph is not only essentially true in its relation to humanity, but it is also true to history. The Annals of the Monastery of Burton, recently published, show how thoroughly correct Shakespeare is in his delineation of this papal prelate. Haughty and arrogant, the result of his vanity and the office which he held, Shakespeare fails not to pourtray these features of his character, and he justly puts in his mouth language by which the desires of the dictatorial priest are fully developed; language which cannot fail to awaken in a discerning and patriotic audience an intense disgust and hatred of papal pride and papal intolerance.—CALVERT (p. 141): An important character in the play of *King John* is Cardinal Pandulph, the Pope's legate. At that period papal power was paramount. Of Pandulph Shakespeare avails himself to represent a typical priest, that is, a man who assumes that he is empowered by Heaven to be the exclusive infallible expounder and interpreter of heavenly things, to guide and rule the spirituality of other men,—an assumption which, concentrating in itself the guilt of usurpation with the iniquity of despotism, is a blasphemy towards God and an offense and an insult to man.—DEIGHTON (*Introd.*, p. xxvi.): Pandulph is a hard, unlovely character; but he is what his profession made him, and we cannot altogether refuse a kind of admiration to the stern consistency of purpose with which, in the service of the church, he sweeps away all obstacles, even though among his weapons unblushing casuistry and chicane are those most frequently used.

19. Chattilion] For the accentuation of this name, see note I, i, 6.

20. Elinor] Mrs JAMESON (ii, 233): Elinor of Guienne and Blanche of Castile, who form part of the group around Constance, are sketches merely, but they are strictly historical portraits, and full of truth and spirit. At the period when Shakespeare has brought these three women on the scene together, Elinor of Guienne (the daughter of the last Duke of Guienne and Aquitaine, and like Constance, the heiress of a sovereign dutchy) was near the close of her long, various, and unquiet life—she was nearly seventy; and as in early youth her violent passions had overborne both principle and policy, so in her old age we see the same character only modified by time: her strong intellect and love of power, unbridled by conscience or principle, surviving when other passions were extinguished, and rendered more dangerous by a degree of subtlety and self-command to which her youth had

Constance, *Mother to* Arthur. 21

been a stranger.—STUBBS (*Preface* to *Historical Collections of Walter of Coventry*, vol. ii, p. xxviii.): Few women have had less justice done them in history than Eleanor. I do not speak of her moral qualities: although probably her faults have been exaggerated, she can hardly be said to shine as a virtuous woman or a good wife; but of her remarkable political power and her great influence not only in her husband's states, but in Europe generally; of her great energy, not less conspicuous than her husband's, both in early youth and in extreme old age, there can be no question. In an age of short-lived heroes one scarcely realises the length of her adventurous life or the great area of her wanderings. Fifty years before this [the first year of John's reign] she had gone on crusade, and by her undisguised flirtations had spread confusion and dismay and discord in the noblest host that ever went to the East. Her divorce [in 1154] had overthrown the balance of power in two kingdoms, producing in one of them a disruption which it required four hundred years of warfare to remedy. Her quarrel with her second husband [Henry II.] long retarded the reforming schemes of his great administrative genius, and consigned her to fourteen years of captivity. Yet those fourteen years appear but a short period in her long life. Henry's death brought her from prison to supreme power. As Richard's representative in England she repressed the ambition of John and thwarted the designs of Philip; she found time and strength at seventy to journey to Messina with a wife for her son, to Rome on an embassy, and to Germany with the ransom that her energy had helped to accumulate. After a few years of rest she is again on foot at Richard's death. To her inspiration John owed his throne; her influence excluded, no doubt, the unhappy, misguided Arthur; she herself took command of the forces that reduced his friends in Anjou to submission; she travelled to Spain to fetch the grand-daughter whose marriage was to be a pledge of peace between France and England. She outlived, it would seem, the grandchild who had outraged her. She lived long enough to see Philip's first attacks on Normandy; from her death-bed she was writing to the barons to keep them in their allegiance, and her death at the age of eighty-two was followed by the subversion of all the continental projects of her husband. But her own dominions in great part remained to her son's son, as if her mighty shade were able to defend them at least from the hated offspring of Lewis VII. [For a more complete study of the historic character of Elinor, see Miss STRICKLAND'S *Queens of England*, vol. i, pp. 287–358, and vol. ii, pp. 1–69.—ED.]

21. Constance] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL'S ed., p. 14): Constance should be an amiable appearance, possessed of features to describe settled sorrow and wild despair, with notes of voice answerable to such affecting sensations.—CORSON (p. 165): The Play [of *King John*] on its political side quite ignores the facts of history. So, on the personal side, there is an ignoring, to a greater or less degree, of the characters as represented by history of some of the *dramatis personæ;* and this is especially so in the case of Constance and Arthur, who must be estimated independently of history and almost as purely fictitious. We must not inquire of history what manner of woman Constance was—we must consider exclusively what she is in the play. And the same may be said of Arthur. Again, as I read the play, I see a purpose throughout to intensify the injustice, and crime, and baseness of John's usurpation through the characters given to Constance and Arthur.

Blanch, *Daughter to* Alphonso, King *of* Castile, and *Niece to* King John.

Lady Faulconbridge, *Mother to the Bastard and* Robert Faulconbridge.

Citizens of Angiers, Heralds, Executioners, Messengers, Soldiers, and other Attendants.

The SCENE, *sometimes in* England, *and sometimes in* France.

22. Daughter...*and*] of Spain, Cam. [Capell adds: an Officer under Hubert; a Servant.

26, 27. Citizens...Soldiers] Lords, Ladies, and divers other Attendants. Sheriff, Heralds, Officers, Soldiers, Massengers,... Mal. et seq.

28, 29. *The...France*] Scene dispers'd; in England and France. Cap. Om. Sta.

22. **Blanch**] Mrs JAMESON (ii, 236): Blanche of Castile was the daughter of Alphonso IX. of Castile and the grand-daughter of Elinor. At the time that she is introduced into the drama she was about fifteen, and her marriage with Louis VIII, then Dauphin, took place in the abrupt manner here represented. It is not often that political marriages have the same happy result. We are told by the historians of that time that from the moment Louis and Blanche met they were inspired by a mutual passion, and that during a union of more than twenty-six years they were never known to differ, nor even spent more than a single day asunder. . . . There cannot be a greater contrast than between the acute understanding, the steady temper, and the cool intriguing policy of Blanche, by which she succeeded in disuniting and defeating the powers arrayed against her and her infant son, and the rash confiding temper and susceptible imagination of Constance, which rendered herself and her son easy victims to the fraud or ambition of others. Blanche, during forty years, held in her hands the destinies of the greater part of Europe, and is one of the most celebrated names recorded in history—but in what does she survive to us except in a name? Nor history, nor fame, though 'trumpet-tongued,' could do for *her* what Shakespeare and poetry have done for Constance. The earthly reign of Blanche is over, her sceptre broken, and her power departed. When will the reign of Constance cease? When will *her* power depart? Not while this world is a world, and there exist in it human souls to kindle at the touch of genius, and human hearts to throb with human sympathies!

The life and death of King Iohn.

Actus Primus, Scæna Prima.

Enter King Iohn, Queene Elinor, Pembroke, Eſſex, and Salisbury, with the Chattylion of France.

King Iohn.

NOw ſay *Chatillion*, what would *France* with vs ?

Chat. Thus (after greeting) ſpeakes the King of France,

2. Actus Primus, Scæna Prima] ACT I. SCENE I. Rowe.

The Court of England. Pope,+. King John's Palace. Cam.+. Northampton. A Room of State in the Palace. Cap. et cet.

3. Enter...Elinor,] Enter King John, attended; Elinor, the Queen-Mother; Cap. King John discovered upon a throne. Bell, Kemble (subs.)

3, 4. and Salisbury] Salisbury, and Others. Cap. Mal. et seq.

4. with the Chattylion of France] Ff. with Chattilion. Rowe. with Chatillion. Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. King takes his State; Enter Chatillion, usher'd. Cap. with Chatillion. Var. '73, Ktly. with Chatillon. Johns. et cet.

6. *Now ſay*] Ff. *Now say*, Rowe,+, Knt, Fleay. *Now, say*, Cap. et cet.

Chatillion] F_2, Cap. Var. '73, Ktly. Chattylion F_3F_4. Chattilion Rowe. Chatilion Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Chatillon Johns. et cet.

7. *Thus (after greeting)*] *Thus, after greeting*, Rowe et seq.

France,] France. Ff. France Rowe, Cam.+.

---

1. **The life . . . King Iohn]** THEOBALD: Though this play have the title of *The Life and Death of King John*, yet the action begins at the thirty-fourth year of his life, and takes in only some transactions of his reign to the time of his demise, being an interval of about seventeen years.—MALONE: It takes in the whole of his reign, which lasted only seventeen years: his accession was in 1199, and his death in 1216.—POPE: *The Troublesome Reign of King John* was written in two parts, by W. Shakespeare and W. Rowley, and printed 1611. But the present play is entirely different, and infinitely superior to it. [Strict chronological sequence would demand this note by Pope precede that of Theobald. Pope's assertion was, however, the occasion of some discussion dealing with the authorship of the older play, rather than with the question of the exact title of Shakespeare's; this must, therefore, be an excuse, if one be needful, for this reversal.—ED.]—JOHNSON: The edition of 1611 has no mention of Rowley, nor in the account of Rowley's works is any mention made of his conjunction with Shakespeare in any play. *King John* was reprinted, in two parts, in 1622. The first edition that I have found of this play, in its present form, is that of 1623, in folio. The edition of 1591

[1. The life . . . King Iohn]

I have not seen. [Johnson's note is decidedly ambiguous, owing to his confusion of two plays. The *King John* which he speaks of as printed in two parts in 1622 is *The Troublesome Raigne*, to which Pope refers; by the words 'this play, in its present form,' Johnson means Shakespeare's *King John;* and finally 'the edition of 1591' refers again to the first edition of *The Troublesome Raigne*.—FARMER remarks that Johnson is mistaken in saying that there is no mention of any collaboration between Shakespeare and Rowley, as *The Birth of Merlin* entered at the Stationers in 1653 is ascribed to them jointly. 'I cannot,' adds Farmer, 'believe Shakespeare had anything to do with it'—(with which opinion the present Ed. is quite in accord). Farmer thus continues: 'Mr Capell is equally mistaken when he says (*Preface*, p. 15) that Rowley is called his partner in the title-page of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*. There must have been some tradition, however erroneous, upon which Mr Pope's account was founded. I make no doubt that Rowley wrote the first *King John;* and when Shakespeare's play was called for, and could not be procured from the players, a piratical bookseller reprinted the old one, with *W. Sh.* in the title page.'—On the point of authorship thus raised by Farmer, COLLIER (Ed. i, *Introd.*, p. 4) remarks: 'There is, however, reason to believe that Rowley was not an author at so early a date: his first extant printed work was a play, in writing which he aided John Day and George Wilkins, called *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, 1607. In 1591 he must have been very young; but we are not therefore to conclude decisively that his name is not, at any period, and in any way, to be connected with a drama on the incidents of the reign of King John; for the tradition of Pope's time may have been founded upon the fact that, at some later date, he was instrumental in a revival of the old *King John*.'—STEEVENS regarded Shakespeare as the author of the older play and included both parts of *The Troublesome Raigne of John* among the twenty plays which he published from the early quartos in 1766; subsequently he acknowledged that a more careful perusal disposed him 'to recede from that opinion.'—MALONE, without giving any reasons, is of the opinion that either Greene or Peele was the author of the older play. (See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne*, for further discussions as to authorship.)—It may have been an oral tradition to which Farmer leniently refers in order to excuse Pope's inaccurate statement concerning the joint authorship of *The Troublesome Raigne*. We have but few means of tracing the bibliographical knowledge in regard to dramatic compositions in Pope's day, the basis for such is mainly furnished by the lists of plays issued by publishers from time to time. Those of Rogers & Ley, 1656; Archer, 1656; and Kirkman, 1661 and 1671, are now accessible and made easy for reference, thanks to the painstaking efforts of W. W. Greg in the Appendix II. of his *List of Masques and Pageants* prepared for the Bibliographical Society, 1902. *John, King of England, both parts*, appears in the list of Rogers and Ley, 1656; *John, King of England, both parts*, Will. Shakespeare, in that of Archer, 1656; Will. Shakespear. *John K. of England*, 1st part. *Will. Shakespear. John K. of England*, 2nd part, are entered in Kirkman's lists of 1661 and 1671. These are entries which refer to the older play alone, and there is no mention of Rowley as part author. Langbaine's *Some Account of the English Dramatic Poets*, 1691, is the earliest Dictionary of Authors and works, but neither under the names of W. Rowley nor Shakespeare does Langbaine include *The Troublesome Raigne* as their joint work. It is, I think, reasonable to suppose that Pope simply con-

[1. The life . . . King Iohn]

fused *The Birth of Merlin* with *The Troublesome Raigne*. In this connection MALONE somewhat sharply remarks that 'Mr Pope is very inaccurate in matters of this kind,' but—to err is human, to forgive divine, and it is Pope himself who supplies this soft answer to turn aside our wrath.—ED.]

1. **King Iohn]** MABIE (p. 184): *King John* . . . marks the transition from the chronicle play to the true drama; in which incidents and characters are selected for their dramatic significance, a dramatic motive introduced, dramatic movement traced, and a climax reached. The older playwrights, dealing with the events of a whole reign, would have given the play an epical or narrative quality; Shakespeare selected, compressed, foreshortened, and grouped events and figures in such a way as to secure connected action, the development of character, and a final catastrophe which is impressive if not intrinsically dramatic. He instinctively omitted certain coarse scenes which were in the older play; he brought into clear light and consistency certain characters which were roughly sketched in the earlier work; in the scene between Hubert and Arthur he struck a new note of tenderness and pathos; while in giving marked prominence to the humour of Faulconbridge he opened the way for that blending of comedy with tragedy and history which is one of the marks not only of his maturity but of his greatness. The play has no hero, and is not free from the faults of the long line of dramas to which it belongs, but Shakespeare's creative energy is distinctly at work in it.

2. **Actus Primus]** FRENCH (p. 3): The action of this is mainly confined to the relationship between the usurping uncle and his hapless nephew. The first scene opens with a demand from the King of France that John should yield up his crown in favour of young Arthur. This scene, in which John is seated in his palace, surrounded by the chief nobles of his court, must have taken place in 1199, soon after his coronation, Ascension Day, May 27. The Fourth Act closes with the death of the Young Prince, but even in the Fifth Act his right is made use of by the Dauphin as a pretext for invading England. [French is possibly right in placing the time of this opening scene shortly after John's accession; such would undoubtedly be the fitting point for France's protest. At the same time it is well to remember that dates counted for little either with the earlier dramatist or Shakespeare; both of them refer to but two of John's coronations, whereas, actually John was crowned four times. See IV, ii, 3, and notes thereon.—ED.]—CALVERT (p. 124): In the first thirty lines of the opening scene are epitomized the drift and substance of the whole play. . . . How natural this is, and easy, how unavoidable! Each speech seems to carry the very words the speaker ought to utter; each speaker says just what he should say, neither more nor less.

3. **Enter King Iohn, etc.]** CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* II.): We have not followed Capell and the more recent editors in attempting to define the precise locality at which each scene took place, where none is mentioned in the body of the play or in the stage directions of the Folio. (See *Text. Notes.*) Nothing is gained by an attempt to harmonize the plot with historical facts gathered from Holinshed and elsewhere, when it is plain that Shakespeare was either ignorant of them or indifferent to minute accuracy. For example, the second scene of Act IV. is supposed to occur at the same place as the first scene of that Act, or, at all events, in the immediate neighborhood, and in England. But Holinshed distinctly states that Arthur was imprisoned first at Falaise and then at Rouen (pp. 554, 555, ed. 1577). —ORDISH (*Sh's London*, p. 27): The opening scene in *King John* is laid in 'King

In my behauiour to the Maieſty, 8

8. *behauiour*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Cam. +. *behaviour*, Theob. et cet. 8. *Maieſty*,] *Majesty* Han. *majesty*—Words.

John's Palace.' This has been supposed by some editors to mean the King's palace at Northampton. Without being in the least disputatious, it is allowable to refer the reader to the text. A Sheriff enters and tells the King there is the strangest controversy 'come from the country' to be judged by him. The disputants are Philip Faulconbridge and his brother; and presently Philip says to Queen Elinor, 'Our country manners give our betters way.' These are indications that the two youths had come up to London from Northamptonshire to lay their case before the King. In Shakespeare's time there was a tradition, mentioned by Stow, that a certain house, called Stone House, in Lombard Street, was formerly King John's House [*Survay*, ed. 1618, p. 375], and it is at least probable that the London play-goer would interpret the legend, 'King John's Palace,' as referring to this house. In this case, the Sheriff who came in to make the announcement to the King would be understood as being a sheriff of the city. [While I fully agree with Ordish that this scene is evidently laid in London, yet I think it hardly just to characterize as supposition the reason which led the earlier editors to place this at Northampton. As will be seen from the *Text. Notes* Capell was first so to designate it, and though he gives no ground for this specific locality, it may be inferred that his reason for so doing was based on a passage in the corresponding scene in *The Troublesome Raigne*, wherein occur these words spoken by Salisbury, 'Please it your Majestie, heere is the Shrive of Northamptonshire, with certaine persons that of late committed a riot.' Perhaps in those days the Sheriff accompanied those who wished to lay a case before the King; if so that would account for his presence in London; but at all events Capell had internal evidence from the earlier work to corroborate his choice of locality. (See note on l. 50, below).—ED.]

4, 6. **Chattylion . . . Chatillion**] WALKER (*Vers.*, 184), followed by R. G. WHITE, calls attention to the metrical requirement of pronouncing this name, as also *Rousillon* in *All's Well*, as a trisyllable with the accent on the second syllable. —DAWSON (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1887–1892, p. 137) adds to the numerous examples of such pronunciation in the present play one from *Henry V:* 'Iaques of Chatilion Admirall of France.'—IV, viii, 95.

4. **Chattylion of France**] FRENCH (p. 18): As King Philip would, without doubt, send a person of exalted rank upon so important an embassy as that which opens this play, it may be inferred that this individual is Hugh de Chatillon, who is named, with his brother Guy, Count de St. Pol, among the Grand Peers of France, who were assembled in a Parliament at Paris in 1223. In the treaty between King Richard and Philip Augustus, dated July 23, 1194, the concluding article sets forth, —'Now Gervais de Chatillon, as representative of the King of France, has sworn to observe all the articles above recited, and maintain the truce.' He, therefore, might be the person sent as ambassador to England five years after the above date. The family has played an important part in history.—IVOR JOHN: The Folios read 'with the *Chattylion* of France.' Perhaps 'Lord' had dropped out before 'Chattylion,' or perhaps 'Chattylion' was taken to mean 'Chatelain' or some similar title. [Stow (*Survay*, ed. 1618, p. 107) gives as the titles belonging to Robert Fitzwater, those of 'Chastilian and Banner-bearer of London,' which he held by right of his ownership of Castle Baynard in the city.—ED.]

8. **In my behauiour**] JOHNSON: The word 'behaviour' seems here to have a

The borrowed Maieſty of *England* heere.
Elea. A ſtrange beginning : borrowed Maieſty?

9, 10. *borrowed...borrowed*] Ff, Wh. i, Cam.+. *borrow'd...borrowed* Hal. *borrow'd...borrow'd* Rowe et cet.

10. *beginning: borrowed Maieſty?*] Ff. *beginning; borrow'd Majeſty!* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Cap. *beginning. Borrow'd majeſty!* Johns. *beginning!—borrow'd majeſty!* Var. '73, Huds. Wh. i. *beginning: 'borrowed majeſty!'* Cam.+. *beginning;—borrow'd majeſty!* Var. '78 et cet.

10. *Maieſty?*] *majeſty*— Words.

---

significatiom that I have never found in any other author. 'The king of France,' says the envoy, 'thus speaks in my *behaviour* to the majesty of England'; that is, the king of France speaks in the character, which I here assume. I once thought that these two lines had been uttered by the ambassador, as part of his master's message, and that 'behaviour' had meant the *conduct* of the King of France towards the King of England; but the ambassador's speech, as continued after the interruption, will not admit this meaning.—MALONE: 'In my behaviour' means, I think, *in the words and action that I am now going to use.* Compare: 'Now hear our English King For thus his royalty doth speak in me.'—V, ii, 134.—KNIGHT: *Haviour, behaviour*, is the manner of *having*, the conduct. Where then is the difficulty which this expression has raised up? The king of France speaks, in the conduct of his ambassador, to 'the borrowed majesty of England'; a necessary explanation of the speech of Chatillon, which John would have resented upon the speaker, had he not in his 'behaviour' expressed the intentions of his sovereign.—JOHN HUNTER: That is, in the tone or manner in which I speak.—FLEAY: Not only in my words, but in my bearing and manner; my assumption of superiority to the 'borrowed majesty' of John.—WRIGHT: That is, as represented in my person and by my outward acts and deportment. [For this use of 'in' Wright cites the passage given by Malone, and adds thereto: 'The cunning of her passion Invites me in this churlish messenger.'—*Twelfth Night*, II, ii, 24.]—MOBERLY: As in German 'das aüssere Behaben' means *the outward demeanour*, so here 'in my behaviour' means, in the tone and manner which I have assumed.—IVOR JOHN: That is, through my conduct as ambassador. Compare: 'inferior eyes, that borrow their behaviours from the great.'—V, i, 54.—[This chronological arrangement of the interpretations of a passage is, I think, not uninstructive, showing in how many ways the same idea may be expressed in slightly differing words. Were it possible to form a composite sentence from these, as is done with photographs to produce a typical face, we should probably find that the first one given, that of Johnson—'the king of France speaks in the character which I here assume'—would be the resultant sentence. His introductory remark that the word 'behaviour' here bears a meaning which he had never found in any other author is significant, when it is recalled that the Dictionary antedates his notes on this play by nearly ten years. This statement, furthermore, has not been refuted by later lexicographers.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*), after giving numerous examples of 'behaviour' in the sense of 'external carriage and deportment, as it is expressive of sentiments and disposition,' places the present by itself, under the caption 'Remarkable passage,' with the interpretation 'in the tone and character which I here assume,' evidently derived from the German, as Moberly also suggests.—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 1. †c.) quotes the present line as the only example wherein 'behaviour' is used in the sense of 'bearing of the character of another; personifica-

*K.Iohn.*Silence (good mother) heare the Embaſſie. 11
Chat. Philip of *France*, in right and true behalfe
Of thy deceaſed brother, *Geffreyes* ſonne,
Arthur Plantaginet, laies moſt lawfull claime
To this faire Iland, and the Territories: 15
To *Ireland*, *Poyctiers*, *Aniowe*, *Torayne*, *Maine*,

11. *Silence (good mother)*] Ff. *Silence, good Mother*, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Silence, good mother;* Theob. et cet.
Embaſſie] *embassy* Johns. et seq.
13. *deceaſed*] *deceaſed* Dyce, Huds. Words.
brother,] *brother* F_4 et seq.
Geffreyes] *Geffrey's* Rowe et seq.
14. Plantaginet] Plantaganet F_3. Plantagenet F_4 et seq.
14. *moſt*] Om. Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
15. *Territories:*] *territories,*— Dyce, Huds. Fle. Words.
16. Aniowe] Anjowe Ff, Ktly. *Anjou* Rowe et cet.
Torayne] Lorayne F_2. Loraine F_3F_4. *Touaine* Rowe i. *Toraine* Ktly. *Touraine* Rowe ii. et cet.

---

tion, "person." '—The line from Act V, quoted in illustration by Ivor John, is not, I think, a parallel. To 'borrow behaviour' from another is rather to imitate or to adopt the actions and expressions of that other. Chatillon does not, however, mean that he is imitating the king of France, but rather that he is speaking as his representative. Under the foregoing interpretation of *borrow* Murray quotes this example given by Ivor John.—ED.]

10. Elea. A strange . . . Maiesty] CALVERT (p. 126): Observe how this opening scene is enlivened by the interruption of Elinor; an interruption which Shakespeare would not have allowed her to make, had she not, in making it, given a strong taste of her quality as a proud, grasping, intermeddling Queen-dowager. While adding life to the scene, the line she utters characterizes herself. Shakespeare thus kills two birds with one stone, and both game-birds, a proceeding which he repeats oftener than—I had almost said—all other poets put together.

12–14. Philip . . . Arthur Plantaginet] COURTENAY (i, 3): I do not find, either in Holinshed or in any other history, English or French, that Chatillon, or any other diplomatic agent, was sent by Philip Augustus to John; or that the crown of England was demanded by the French King on the part of Arthur. Philip apparently, and with reason, disclaimed an interest in the disposal of that crown; whereas, of the transmarine possessions of the Kings of England, as well as of Brittany, he claimed to be lord paramount.

15. the Territories] IVOR JOHN: There is no other case of the use of 'the territories' in this way by Shakespeare. One is tempted to suggest either 'and *the* territories Of Ireland,' or '*her* territories.' In *The Troublesome Raigne*, ed. 1591, we have 'to England, Cornwall and Wales and to their territories.'—II, iii.

16. Poyctiers, Aniowe, Torayne, Maine] HUDSON: Arthur held the duchy of Brittany in right of his father Geffrey Plantagenet, an elder brother of John. Anjou, Touraine, and Maine, the ancient patrimony of the house of Anjou, were his by hereditary right. As Duke of Brittany Arthur was a vassal of Philip Augustus; and Constance engaged to Philip that her son should do him homage also for Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, and Poictou, on condition that Philip should support this claim to the English crown. England having declared for John, the

Deſiring thee to lay aſide the ſword 17
Which ſwaies vſurpingly theſe ſeuerall titles,

play opens with Philip's interference in behalf of Arthur. [See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne*, pt. i: I, i, 29–34.]

18. **Which ſwaies vſurpingly**, etc.] WARNER (p. 27): There was never any question among Englishmen as to John's right to reign over them until toward the end of his career, when the Barons were exasperated into the attempt of dethroning him as a liar, a slanderer, a breaker of promises, and a bawd of the nation's honor.—[John's legal or moral right to the crown during Arthur's lifetime is a question which concerns the student of history more fitly than readers of Shakespeare, for whom King John is a usurper. The following extract from Hallam is, however, interesting as testimony on the other side: 'The succession of John has certainly passed in modern times for an usurpation. I do not find that it was considered as such by his contemporaries on this side of the Channel. The question of inheritance between an uncle and the son of his deceased elder brother was yet unsettled, as we learn from Glanvil, even in private succession. In the case of sovereignties, which were sometimes contended to require different rules from ordinary patrimony, it was, and continued long to be, the most uncertain point in public law. John's pretensions to the crown might therefore be such as the English were justified in admitting, especially as his reversionary title seems to have been acknowledged in the reign of his brother Richard.'—(*Middle Ages*, ii, 325.)—Roger of Wendover's account of John's installation and coronation is as follows: 'About this time [1199] John Duke of Normandy came over into England, and landed at Shoreham on the 25th of May; on the day after, which was the eve of our Lord's Ascension, he went to London to be crowned there. On his arrival, therefore, the archbishops, bishops, earls, and all others, whose duty it was to be present at this coronation, assembled together in the church of the chief of the apostles at Westminster, on the 27th of May, and there Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, placed the crown on his head and anointed him king.'—To this account Matthew Paris adds: 'The Archbishop standing in the midst addressed them thus, "Hear, all of you, and be it known that no one has an antecedent right to succeed another in the kingdom, unless he shall have been unanimously elected under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, on account of the superior merits of his character, after the example of Saul the first anointed king, whom the Lord set over his people, not as the son of a king, nor as born of royal ancestry. . . . Thus those who excelled in vigour are elevated to kingly dignity. But, if any relations of a deceased king excel others in merit, all should the more readily and zealously consent to his election. We have said this to maintain the cause of Earl John, who is here present, brother of our illustrious King Richard, lately deceased without heirs of his body, and as the said Earl John is prudent, active, and indubitably noble, we have, under God's Holy Spirit, unanimously elected him for his merits and his royal blood." Now the archbishop was a man of bold character and a support to the kingdom by his steadiness and incomparable wisdom; no one, therefore, dared to dispute what he said as knowing that he had good cause for what he did. Earl John and all who were present acquiesced, and they unanimously elected the earl, crying out, "God save the king!" Archbishop Hubert was afterwards asked why he acted in this manner, to which he replied that he knew John would one day or other bring the kingdom into great confusion, wherefore he determined that he should owe his elevation to election and not to

And put the ſame into yong *Arthurs* hand,
Thy Nephew, and right royall Soueraigne.
K. Iohn. What followes if we diſallow of this?
Chat. The proud controle of fierce and bloudy warre,
To inforce theſe rights, ſo forcibly with-held,
K. Io. Heere haue we war for war, & bloud for bloud,
Controlement for controlement: ſo anſwer *France.*

19. Arthurs] Arthur's F_4 et seq.
20. *Nephew,*] *nephew* Knt, Dyce, Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Rlfe.
21. *followes*] Ff. *follows* Wh. Cam,+, Glo. Cla. Rlfe. *follows*, Rowe et cet.
23. *To inforce*] Ff, Rowe. *T' inforce* Pope,+, Fle. *T' enforce* Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *To enforce* Cap. et cet.
23. *rights,*] *rights* Rowe et seq.
with-held,] *with-held.* Rowe,+, Cap. *withheld.* Ff et cet.
24. *war, &*] F_2F_3. *war and* Cam.+, Glo. Wh. ii. *war, and* F_4 et cet.
25. *for controlement*] *for control* Vaughan.

hereditary right.'—(Ed. Giles, ii, 181).—See also Hallam, *op. et loc. cit.*, and Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, i, 578.—ED.]

21. **disallow**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 3. b.): To refuse to accept with approval; to reject, disown. [The present line quoted.]

22. **controle**] JOHNSON: That is, *opposition.*—M. MASON: I think it rather means *constraint*, or *compulsion.* So, in *Henry V*, when Exeter demands of the King of France the surrender of his crown, and the King answers: 'Or else what follows?' Exeter replies: 'Bloody constraint; for if you hide the crown, Even in your hearts, there will he rake for it.'—[II, iv, 97.] The passages are exactly similar. [So they may be, but only in respect of the similarity of situation; but in one case Shakespeare uses the word 'control' and in the other 'constraint.' The primary meaning of *constraint* is compulsion, just as the elemental meaning of *control* is *restraint*, or *opposition*, as Johnson gives it. For a parallel use of 'control' compare 'Even where his lustful eye or savage heart Without control lusted to make his prey.'—*Rich. III:* III, v, 84. And for 'proud' in the sense of *vigorous* as applied to an adversary compare: 'Our partie may well meet a prowder foe.'—V, ii, 84.—ED.]

24, 25. **Heere haue we war . . . controlement**] STEEVENS: King John's reception of Chatillon not a little resembles that which Andrea meets with from the King of Portugal, in the First Part of *Jeronimo*, 1605: '*And.* Thou shalt pay tribute, Portugal, with blood. *Bal.* Tribute for tribute then; and foes for foes. *And.* I bid you sudden wars.' [Haz.-Dods., iv, p. 363. This assignment of the date 1605 to *Jeronimo* was at once questioned by Malone, who asserts that '*Jeronimo* was exhibited on the stage before the year 1590.' Steevens replies with a quotation from a poem by Barnabie Googe, written in 1562, containing an apparent reference to the Tragedy of *Jeronimo*, thus showing it to have been composed much earlier than 1590. Malone returns to the charge and by quoting more of the context than had Steevens, shows that the lines refer to a translation by Neville, a friend of Googe. To this Steevens makes no reply. These quotations fill nearly three-quarters of a page in the *Variorum* of 1821; they are there produced in a discussion of the date of composition of *Jeronimo*, and, apart from the fact that the present passage in King John bears a slight resemblance to one in *Jeronimo*, have

Chat. Then take my Kings defiance from my mouth, 26
The fartheſt limit of my Embaſſie.
K. Iohn. Beare mine to him, and ſo depart in peace,
Be thou as lightning in the eies of *France*; 29

27. *farthe[ſt]*] *furthest* Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Hal. Words. Craig.
28. *peace,*] *peace.* Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly. Sta. Del. Fle. Rlfe.
29. *eies*] *eyes* F₂.

---

but a slight interest in a note on Shakespeare's play; for this reason they are not here repeated.—ED.]

25. Controlement . . . France] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* III.): This line must probably be scanned as an Alexandrine, reading the first 'controlment' in the time of a trisyllable and the second as a quadrisyllable. [For this note Clark is, I think, solely responsible; in the Clarendon Edition, of which Wright, twenty years later, was editor alone, there is the following: 'The word is spelt "controlement" in the Folios, but this does not imply that it was pronounced as a quadrisyllable, for in *Tit. And.* we find in the first Folio: "Without controlement, Iustice, or reuenge."—II, i, 68. In broken lines like the present it is not uncommon to find an unemphatic extra syllable introduced after the pause.'—Wright has, however, retained the note without change in the second Cambridge Edition, also edited by him alone in 1891. Clark died in 1878.—ED.]—HILGERS (*2 Abtheilung*, p. I.): In Shakespeare's early plays, both those with ryhme and with blank verse, there seldom occur lines with an extra syllable in the regular ten syllable iambic verse, for example, in *Tit. And.*, in *Hen. VI.*, in the *Com. of Err.*, the *Two Gentlemen*, and *Mid. N. Dream.* The assertion that no use was made of this jingling cæsura in the so-called histories is quite erroneous, certainly it is not so frequent in these as in the other plays. [Hilgers quotes the present line with but seven other examples from *King John* as a proof of this play's early composition, as against nearly two hundred examples from *Othello* alone. Hilgers's other examples from *King John* will be referred to as they occur in the course of the play.—ED.]

29. Be thou as lightning] JOHNSON: The simile does not suit well, the lightning, indeed, appears before the thunder is heard, but the lightning is destructive, and the thunder innocent.—RITSON (*Remarks*, etc., p. 80): The allusion may, notwithstanding, be very proper, so far as Shakespeare had applied it, i. e., merely to the *swiftness* of the *lightning*, and its *preceding* and *foretelling* the *thunder*. But there is some reason to believe that *thunder* was not thought to be innocent in our author's time, as we elsewhere learn from himself. See *Lear*, III, ii, 4, 5; *Ant. & Cleo.*, II, v, 77; *Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 49; and still more decisively *Meas. for Meas.*, II, ii, 110–116.—M. MASON: King John does not allude to the destructive powers either of thunder or lightning; he only means to say, that Chatillon shall appear to the eyes of the French like lightning, which shows that thunder is approaching: and the thunder he alludes to is that of his *cannon*.—PYE (p. 139): Shakespeare is shown by Ritson to have imputed a destructive quality to thunder in several passages; but this is certainly not one of them, for if it is, he must also impute a destructive quality to the report of the cannon, and not the ball.—FLEAY: That is, be thou the lightning; my cannon shall follow with the thunder. The allusion is to the rapidity with which the thunderclap follows the lightning flash; not to the destructive power of lightning, nor to its telling us that thunder is approaching. [The fol-

For ere thou canſt report, I will be there:
The thunder of my Cannon ſhall be heard. 30

30. *For*] *For*, Ktly, Fle. Huds. ii. *report*,] Ff, Rowe,+. *report* Cap. et cet.
31. *heard.*] Ff. Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Fle. Craig. *heard:* Cap. et cet.

---

lowing extracts from Batman vpon Bartolome—*De Proprietatibus Rerum*, 1582, are perhaps of interest in this connection, showing that the thunder and lightning were regarded as two manifestations: 'And with thunder commeth lightning, but lightening is sooner seene, for it is cleere and bright: and thunder commeth later to our eares, for the wit of sight is more subtil then the perseuerance of hearing. . . . Aristotle saith, That thunder is nought else, but quenching of fire in a Clowde. For dry vapour arreareth, and setteth it on fire and on flame, with heate of the aire & when it is closed in a clowde it is sodeinly quenched. And of such quenching the noise of Thunder is gendered. As when firie hot yron is quenched in water, it maketh greate boyling and noyse. Oft thunder commeth with lightening: and then he greeveth much, as *Beda* sayth. And so it scorcheth fruit, & corne, when he commeth without raine. And if he commeth with raine hee doth good, as he sayth. And thunder with his mouing, beateth and smiteth all things, stirreth the braine, and feareth the wit.'—Liber, xi, chap. 13. The next two chapters treat of different kinds of lightning: 'The lightening that is called *Fulmen*, is vapour sette on fire, and is fast and sadde, and falleth downe with great swiftnesse, and is of more strength then the lightening that is called *Fulgur*. And this lyghtening smiteth, thirleth and burneth things that it toucheth, and multiplyeth, and cleaueth and breaketh, and no bodilye thing withstandeth it.'—*Ibid.*, chap. 15.—ED.]

31. **my Cannon**] KNIGHT: We have the same anachronism in *Hamlet* and in *Macbeth*. It is scarcely necessary to tell our readers that gunpowder was invented about a century later than the time of John, and that the first battle-field in which cannon were used is commonly supposed to have been that of Cressy. And yet the dramatic poet could not have well avoided this literal violation of propriety, both here and in the second Act, when he talks of 'bullets wrapp'd in fire.' He uses terms which were familiar to his audience, to present a particular image to their senses. Had he, instead of cannon, spoken of the mangonell and the petraria, —the stone-flinging machines of the time of John,—he would have addressed himself to the very few who might have appreciated his exactness; but his words would have fallen dead upon the ears of the many.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 298) cites with approval Knight's justification of the introduction of this anachronism and adds: 'Shakespeare never, I think, introduces anachronism in the actions of his personages.'—CRIEZENACH (p. 156): Anachronisms play a great part in the dispute over the extent of Shakespeare's education, which aroused so much eager controversy among the English critics during the eighteenth century. . . . But in most instances these anachronisms appear to have been due to the indifference of genius rather than to intention. This was probably the case with the oft-quoted cannon in *King John* and *Macbeth*, for that part of Holinshed's *Chronicle* which Shakespeare had studied before writing *Henry VI.* must have already acquainted him with the fact that the bombardment of a town with artillery was still a complete novelty at the seige of La Mans in 1424. In addition to all this, it would have been impossible, even with the best intentions, for a poet to maintain any accuracy

So hence : be thou the trumpet of our wrath, 32
And ſullen preſage of your owne decay:

32. *So hence:*] Ff, Rowe, Fle. *So hence!* Pope, Theob. i, Sta. Cam.+, Rlfe. *So, hence!* Theob. ii. et cet.

33. *decay:*] Ff, Rowe. *decay.* Pope,+, Cam.+, Craig. *decay.*— Cap. et cet.

of historical setting at a period when the arts of scenic mounting and costume were completely inadequate for the purpose.

33. **sullen presage**] JOHNSON: By the epithet 'sullen,' which cannot be applied to a trumpet, it is plain that our author's imagination had now suggested a new idea. It is as if he had said, be a *trumpet* to alarm with our invasion, be a *bird* of *ill-omen* to croak out the prognostic of your own ruin.—MALONE: I do not see why the epithet 'sullen' may not be applied to a *trumpet* with as much propriety as to a bell. In *2 Henry IV.* we find: 'Sounds ever after as a sullen bell.'—I, i, 102. —BOSWELL: Surely Johnson is right: the epithet *sullen* may be applied as Milton has applied it to a *bell:* 'swinging slow with sullen roar,' [*Il Penseroso*, l. 76], with more propriety than to the sharp sound of a trumpet.—MONCK MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 153): Johnson says that the epithet 'sullen' cannot be applied to a trumpet, and founds upon that principle a very unnatural explanation of this passage; but if he had ever attended to that instrument, as used in an army, and heard a trumpet sound to horse, he would have found the epithet peculiarly proper. Blanche afterwards calls a trumpet 'the braying trumpet,' an epithet that corresponds with that of 'sullen.'—[Mason's Comments upon the notes in Johnson and Steevens's edition of 1778 are, for the most part, included in those of the Variorum of 1821. The foregoing is, however, an exception, and is here repeated not so much as a valuable contribution to the discussion of Shakespeare's proper use of a word, but rather as a curious illustration of association of ideas. 'Braying' applied to the loud, somewhat discordant blast of a trumpet is peculiarly applicable, although it be inseparably connected with the image of a donkey; but is not the first idea suggested by 'sullen,' *gloominess, moroseness?* How then can the two epithets be said to correspond?—ED.]—STEEVENS: That here are two ideas is evident; but the second of them has not been luckily explained. 'The sullen presage of your own decay' means the dismal passing bell, that announces your own approaching dissolution. [This note, even with a slight condemnation of an explanation by his great partner, Steevens withheld until after Johnson's death. It did not appear until Steevens's own edition in 1793.—ED.]—DELIUS: 'Sullen presage' is evidently in apposition to 'trumpet of our wrath,' whereby Shakespeare had in mind the Trumpet of Doom, and according to his accustomed construction connected this with the principal word of the sentence by the copula 'and.'—COLLIER (ed. ii.): It seems difficult to imagine how the sound of a trumpet could be a 'sullen presage,' although it might give a *sudden* warning of the approach of the English. Nevertheless, we leave 'sullen' in the text, as the word in all early authorities, and as an epithet not wholly inapplicable, although the corrected Folio, 1632, instructs us to read *sudden.* One word might be misheard for the other; and 'sullen' is actually misprinted *sudden* in the Folio, 1623, in *Rich. II:* I, iii, [p. 27, col. a]. The small difference between 'sullen' and *sudden* in sound is played upon in Fletcher's *Woman's Prize*, IV, iv, where a servant brings news of the illness of Livia: '*Serv.* Is fallen sick o' the sudden. *Rowl.* How, o' the sullens? *Serv.* O' the sudden, sir, I say; very sick.' See also *Bonduca*, V, ii, where Suetonius wishes 'some sullen

An honourable conduct let him haue,
Pembroke looke too't: farewell *Chatillion*.
Exit Chat. and Pem.
Ele. What now my ſonne, haue I not euer ſaid
How that ambitious *Conſtance* would not ceaſe
Till ſhe had kindled *France* and all the world,
Vpon the right and party of her ſonne.
This might haue beene preuented, and made whole
With very eaſie arguments of loue,
Which now the mannage of two kingdomes muſt
With fearefull bloudy iſſue arbitrate.

35. Pembroke] *Hubert* Kemble.
too't:] F_2F_3. *to't:* F_4, Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *to't.* Coll. et cet.
35. Chatillion] F_2. Chatilion F_3, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Chattylion F_4. *Chattilion* Rowe. *Chatillion* Cap. Var. '73, Ktly. *Chatilliön* Fl. *Chatillon* Johns. et cet.
36. Exit] Exeunt Warb. et seq.
37. *What now my ſonne,*] *What now, my son!* Dyce, Hal. Ktly, Cam.+, Words. Rlfe. *What now, my Son,* F_4 et cet.
39. *kindled*] *kindl'd* Cap. France] Ff, Rowe,+, Dyce, Wh. Cam.+, Fle. Words. *France,* Cap. et cet.
43. *mannage*] *manage* Rowe.
44. *fearefull bloudy iſſue*] *fearful, bloody issue,* Pope. *fearful, bloody issue* Theob. i, Var. '73. *fearful, bloody, issue* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. *fearful-bloody issue* Craig conj. John.

---

plague' to fall on Petillus, and where the epithet certainly ought to be *sudden*—some *instant* plague. [Although Collier at this period does not advocate a correction of the text, in his third edition he adopts this emendation of the MS. corrector.—ED.]—SINGER (*Sh. Vindicated*, p. 82): The Corrector has an unreasonable dislike to this expressive word, for he would again change it as unwarrantably in *Othello*. [See Coll. *Notes*, etc., ed. ii, p. 476.] But Shakespeare has also used it for *sad, gloomy*, in *Rich. II.* and in *2 Henry VI.*—WRIGHT: Although 'sullen' may not appropriately describe the trumpet's note, it may fitly characterise the mournful and threatening message which it accompanied.—DEIGHTON: It is not necessary to see here any allusion to the 'passing bell,' which was tolled *after* death, and while the spirit was supposed to be on its way to its new abode. All that seems to be meant is 'the gloomy foreteller of your own (France's) perdition,' in which sense 'decay' is often used by Shakespeare, e. g., *Rich. II:* III, ii, 102: 'Cry woe, destruction, ruin and decay.' [The excellent interpretation suggested by Steevens, that 'sullen' here qualifies the word 'presage,' and does not necessarily apply to the sound of the trumpet, renders quite unnecessary any change such as that of Collier's MS. corrector.—ED.]

39. **kindled**] For other examples of 'kindle' in the sense *to incite*, see SCHMIDT, *Lex.*, s. v. (b.).

40. **Vpon the . . . party**] Compare: '—and hopes to find you forward Upon his party for the gain thereof.'—*Rich. III:* III, ii, 47.

43. **mannage**] STEEVENS: That is, *conduct administration*. Compare: 'Now for the rebels which stand out in Ireland, Expedient manage must be made my liege.'—*Rich. II:* I, iv, 38.—WRIGHT: For the form of this word, a substantive derived from a verb, see I, ii, 269; III, iii, 119.

K. Iohn. Our ſtrong poſſeſſion, and our right for vs.
Eli. Your ſtrong poſſeſsiō much more then your right,
Or elſe it muſt go wrong with you and me,
So much my conſcience whiſpers in your eare,
Which none but heauen, and you, and I, ſhall heare.

45. *right*] *right*, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Hal. Sta. Del.
vs.] *us.*— Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
46. [Aside to K. John. Dyce ii, iii.
right,] *right* F_2F_3.
47. *you and me,*] *you, and me:* Cap. Var. '78, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. Huds. *you and me.* Niels.
49. *heauen,*] *Heav'n,* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Fleay.
you, and I,] *you and I* F_3F_4, Rowe, Dyce, Wh. Cam.+, Huds. iii. *you, and I* Pope,+. *you and I,* Hal. Coll. iii.
heare.] *heare:* F_2. *hear* F_3. *hear.* F_4 et seq.

---

45. **Our strong possession . . . for vs]** RUSHTON (*Sh's Legal Maxims*, p. 12): '*In aequali jure melior est conditio possidentis*' (Plowden, 296). Where the right is equal the claim of the party in possession shall prevail. The lowest and most imperfect degree of title consists in the mere naked possession, or actual occupation of the estate; without any apparent right, or any shadow or pretence of right, to hold and continue such possession. This may happen when one man invades the possession of another, and by force or surprise turns him out of the occupation of his lands; which is termed a *desseisen*, being a deprivation of that actual *seisen*, or corporal freehold of the lands which the tenant before enjoyed (2 *Black. Com.*, 195; 1 Inst., 345). Or it may happen that after the death of the ancestor and before the entry of the heir, or after the death of a particular tenant and before the entry of him in remainder or reversion, a stranger may contrive to get possession of the vacant land, and hold out him that had a right to enter. In such cases the wrong-doer has only a mere naked possession, which the rightful owner may put an end to by a variety of legal remedies. But until some act be done by the rightful owner to divest this possession and assert his title, such actual possession is *prima facie* evidence of a legal title in the possessor; and it may by length of time, and negligence of him who hath the right, by degrees ripen into a perfect and indefeasible title (2 *Black. Com.*, 196). King John seems to refer to this maxim when he says: 'Our strong possession, and our right for us,' but Elinor replies: 'Your strong possession, much more than your right,' because John was not *in aequali jure* with Arthur, but he was a wrong-doer, having merely a naked possession; for after the death of Richard I. John occupied the throne in defiance of the right of his nephew Arthur. [See l. 18 *ante;* extract from Wendover and Paris.—ED.]—MOBERLY: Shakespeare here makes hereditary right much more absolute than it was in the time of the Norman sovereigns, as, in fact, it only *began* to be really lineal in the generations from John to Richard II. John, according to Blackstone (i, 20), claimed as being next of kin to Richard; Arthur, as his brother's son, being one degree more remote. Even in common inheritances it was at that time, as Blackstone remarks (*ibid.*), a point undetermined whether the child of an elder brother should succeed to the land by right of representation, or the younger surviving brother in right of proximity of blood.

Enter a Sheriffe. 50

Eſſex. My Liege, here is the ſtrangeſt controuerſie
Come from the Country to be iudg'd by you 52

50. Enter a Sheriffe.] Ff, Cam.+. Om. Rowe,+. Enter Essex. Johns. Enter the Sheriff of Northamptonshire, and whispers Essex. Cap. Enter a Sheriff [and whispers to Essex] Neils. Enter the sheriff of Northamptonshire who whispers Essex. Var. '73 et cet. (after l. 44), Kemble, C. Kean, Marshall.

50. a Sheriffe.] English Herald. Kemble (after l. 44).

51. Eſſex.] Salisbury Fleay conj.

51, 52. *controuerſie...you*] Ff, Rowe, Pope i, Han. Glo. Wh. ii, Cla. Rlfe, Neils. *controversie ... you*, Pope ii, Cam. *controversy, ... you*, Theob. et cet.

50. **Enter a Sheriffe**] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* IV.): Here Steevens [Var. 1773] gives the same stage-direction as Capell [See *Text. Notes*], changing merely '*and*' to '*who*,' and, as usual, ignoring Capell, says in a note that he had taken it from the Old Quarto. He convicts himself of plagiarism, for the 'Old Quarto' has: '*Enter the Shrive and whispers the Earle of* Salis. *in the eare.*' It was Capell who changed 'Salis.' to '*Essex.*' The second and third editions of the Old Quarto (1611, 1622) agree in this stage direction *literatim*. The edition of 1591 has '*Sals.*' for 'Salis.'—MARSHALL: In following Charles Kean's Acting Edition [and placing the entrance of the Sheriff after l. 44] we only follow the dictates of common sense. There must be some little time allowed for the Sheriff to impart his information to Essex before Essex can impart it to the king. The Sheriff is whispering to Essex during Elinor's speech. [Kean was anticipated in this arrangement by J. P. Kemble. See *Text. Notes*.—ED.]

51. **Essex**] FLEAY (*Introduction*, p. 24): In the old play the Sheriff enters and whispers to Salisbury; but Essex, at the king's request, interrogates the Faulconbridges; in the present play Essex, not Salisbury, announces their approach, and the king interrogates them himself. As Essex speaks only three lines, and never reappears all through this play, and these three lines are taken from the speech of Salisbury in *The Troublesome Raigne*, I have no doubt that this character was intended to be struck out altogether, and only remained by inadvertence. This would be especially probable in 1596, in which year the Earl of Essex first grew out of favour with Elizabeth, and the name of Essex would consequently be avoided by contemporary dramatists. In fact, the name of Essex *never* occurs in the text of *any* play of Shakespeare; while those of Pembroke, Salisbury, and Norfolk (Bigot) are found in many of his histories. Note also that Pembroke does not speak in this scene in the present play. He does in the older play; hence his retention, as a mute, in the later version.—[Fleay's reference to events in the career of Essex during 1596, as a reason for the omission of that name in the present play, is, I think, unfortunate. It will be remembered that it was in June of that year that Essex and Raleigh made their successful expedition against Spain, and captured the city of Cadiz. Essex on his return became the popular idol of the hour. Fleay dates the first production of *King John* October, 1596; it seems likely then that the name of Essex would be one put prominently forward rather than suppressed. Essex did not actually fall into disfavor until 1599, after the disastrous campaign in Ireland.—ED.]

52. **to be iudg'd by you**] VERPLANCK: The *Aula Regis* of the first Norman kings was the highest court; followed the person of the king; was composed of his

That ere I heard : ſhall I produce the men ? 53
K.Iohn. Let them approach:
Our Abbies and our Priories ſhall pay 55
This expeditious charge : what men are you ?
Enter Robert Faulconbridge,and Philip.
Philip. Your faithfull ſubiect, I a gentleman,
Borne in *Northamptonſhire*, and eldeſt ſonne
As I ſuppoſe, to *Robert Faulconbridge*, 60

53. *heard:*] *heard.* Johns. Var. '73, Ktly.

men?] *men* F_4.

[Exit Essex. Johns. [Exit Sheriff. Var. '73 et seq.

54. *approach:*] Ff, Rowe. *approach.* Pope,+, Cam.+, Fle. *approach.*— Var. '73 et cet.

[Exit Sheriff; and Re-enters with Philip, the Bastard Faulconbridge, and Robert, his brother. Cap.

56. *expeditious*] Fleay. *expeditions* F_2F_3. *Expedition's* F_4 et cet.

charge:] *charge.* Ff, Rowe, Dyce, Sta. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Words. Neils. *charge*— Pope,+, Cap. *charge.*— Var. '78 et cet.

57. SCENE II. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

Enter...and Philip] Ff, Rowe,+ (—Var. '73), Neils. Re-enter sheriff with Robert Faulconbridge, and Philip, his brother (after *pay*, l. 55) Varr. Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. (after *charge*, l. 56) Dyce, Sta. Cam.+ (reading: Enter... Philip, his bastard brother). Del. Fl. Huds. ii, Words. Rlfe, Craig.

57. Faulconbridge] Falconbridge (throughout) Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.

Philip.] Ff. the Bastard. Rowe, Pope. Philip, his brother. Theob. Han. Johns. Varr. Ran. Philip, his brother, the Bastard. Warb. Philip, his half-brother. Words. Philip, his bastard brother. Mal. et cet.

58. *ſubiect, I a*] *subject, I, a* Rowe,+. *subject I; a* Coll. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. Fle. *subject I, a* Cap. et cet.

59. *ſonne*] *son,* Rowe et seq.

60. Robert] Om. Ff, Rowe.

---

officers of state, sitting in his hall wherever he was; and in theory, and sometimes in fact, held by the king in person. This was changed, by *Magna Charta*, to a stationary court, at Westminster Hall, with regular judges. Thus King John, in the early part of his reign, was the last sovereign who could thus have had a 'controversy come from the country to be judged' by him. A few years later it would have come before the Common Pleas, at Westminster Hall. [For an account of the rise and progress of this judicial chamber, which Hallam terms *Curia Regis*, see his *Europe during the Middle Ages*, ii, 332.—ED.]—MOBERLY: The notion that the king might judge causes in person was not finally extinct till James I. tried the experiment of sitting in his own courts, but was told by the judges that he could not legally pronounce an opinion (Blackstone, iii, 41).

55. Our Abbies and our Priories] FLEAY: The first indication of the ill-feeling between John and the clergy.

56. expeditious] As will be seen from the *Text. Notes*, all editors, with the exception of Fleay, regard this as a misprint and accept the reading of F_2, *expeditions*. Justification, if it be needed, may be found for this change in the fact that 'expeditious' in the sense *speedy* occurs only in *The Tempest*, V, iii, 315; and Murray (*N. E. D.*, s. v.) gives this latter line as the earliest use of the word in this sense. The present play antedates *The Tempest* by at least twelve years.—ED.

A Souldier by the Honor-giuing-hand
Of *Cordelion*, Knighted in the field.
K.Iohn. What art thou?
Robert. The ſon and heire to that ſame *Faulconbridge.*
K.Iohn. Is that the elder, and art thou the heyre?
You came not of one mother then it ſeemes.
Philip. Moſt certain of one mother, mighty King,
That is well knowne, and as I thinke one father:
But for the cerraine knowledge of that truth,
I put you o're to heauen, and to my mother;
Of that I doubt, as all mens children may.
Eli. Out on thee rude man, ỹ doſt ſhame thy mother,

61. *Souldier*] *Souldier*, F_4. *ſoldier*, Rowe et seq.
Honor-giuing-hand] Ff, Rowe i. *honor-giving hand* Rowe ii. et seq.
62. Cordelion,] Ff, Rowe, Del. Fle. *Cœur-de-lion*, Pope, Theob. *Cœur-de-lion* Han. et seq.
63. *What*] *And what* Cap.
65. *heyre?*] *heyr?* F_3. *Heir?* F_4 et seq.
66. *then*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *then*, Theob. et cet.
ſeemes.] *ſeems?* F_4, Rowe,+. *seems.* Cap. et seq.
67. *King,*] *King*— Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Words. Rlfe.
68. *and as I thinke*] F_2F_3. *—and as I think*, Wh. i, Rlfe. *and, as I think*, F_4 et cet.
69. *But*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. i, Cam.+, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *But*, Cap. et cet.
cerraine] F_1.
71–92. *Of that...lent vs here?*] Om. Words.
70, 78, 91. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
70. *mother;*] *mother:*— Dyce, Hal. Wh. i.
71. *mens*] *mens'* Warb. Johns.
72. *Out...y doſt*] *Out, out...Dost* Craig conj.
thee] *thee*, Rowe et seq.
rude man,] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *rúde-man*, Fle. *rude man!* Theob. et cet.
y] *thou* Ff.

---

71. **Of that I doubt**] STEEVENS: The resemblance between this sentiment and that of Telemachus, in the first book of the *Odyssey*, is apparent. The passage is thus translated by Chapman: 'My mother, certaine, says I am his sonne; I know not; nor was ever simply knowne, By any child, the sure truth of his sire.' [l. 335]. Mr Pope has observed that the like sentiment is found in Euripides, Menander, and Aristotle. Shakespeare expresses the same doubt in several of his other plays. —MARSHALL: A correspondent has sent (under the signature M. M.) an ingenious communication, proposing to amend the line thus: 'If that I doubt,' etc.—taking the speech of Eleanor's which follows to be an interruption. The writer's argument amounts to this: that the Bastard would not at this point 'commit himself to an avowal of a definite belief' in his own illegitimacy. But this cynical avowal of doubt is in accordance with Philip Faulconbridge's character, as Shakespeare has drawn it; and by 'Of that I doubt' he merely means to say that the legitimacy of every child is a fair subject for doubt; a variation of the old proverb that 'It is a wise child who knows his own father.' Facetious allusions to this *doubt* as to a child's paternity are to be found in all dramatists down to the time of Sheridan.
72. **rude man**] WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 136): *Richman, youngman, oldman, deadman.*

And wound her honor with this diffidence. 73
Phil. I Madame? No, I haue no reaſon for it,
That is my brothers plea, and none of mine, 75
The which if he can proue, a pops me out,
At leaſt from faire fiue hundred pound a yeere:
Heauen guard my mothers honor, and my Land.
K. Iohn. A good blunt fellow: why being yonger born
Doth he lay claime to thine inheritance? 80
Phil. I know not why, except to get the land:
But once he ſlanderd me with baſtardy: 82

74. *I Madame? No,*] F_2. *I Madam? No?* F_3F_4. *I, Madam? No:* Rowe i. *I, madam! no,* Ktly. *I, Madam? No,* Rowe ii. et cet.

it,] *it?* Pope ii. (misprint). *it,*— Dyce, Hal. *it:* Wh. i, Huds. Del. *it.* Ktly. *it;* Theob. et cet.

76. *a pops*] *he pops* Pope,+. *'a pops* Cap. et seq.

out,] *out* Rowe et seq.

77. *pound*] *pounds* Neils.

a yeere:] *a-year:* Knt, Sta. Fle. *a year.* Coll. Del. Rlfe, Neils.

78. *honor,*] *honour*— Wh. i, Rlfe.

78. *Land.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *land!* Theob. et cet.

79. *fellow: why...born*] *fellow: why... born,* F_4, Rowe. *fellow: why,...born,* Pope,+. *fellow:—Why,...born,* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *fellow.—Why,...born,* Coll. et seq. (subs.)

82. *But once*] *But, once,* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Del.

ſlanderd] *ſlandered* Ff. *slander'd* Rowe et seq. *slander* W. W. Lloyd (Athen., Aug. 24, 1878).

In fact, *man,* in combinations of this kind,—such of them, I mean, as from their nature are of frequent occurrence,—had an enclitic force. This is evident not only from their being so frequently printed either in the manner above, or with a hyphen, but also from the flow of the verse in many of the passages where they occur. [The present line quoted.] Was 'rudeman' a common phrase like *goodman,* &c.?— [FLEAY, in hyphenating these two words, intends, perhaps, to answer Walker's Query in the affirmative. See *Text. Notes.*—ED.]

73. diffidence] That is, *distrust;* the opposite of *confidence.*

76. a pops me out] How eminently characteristic of Faulconbridge is this humorously contemptuous description of the outcome of his brother's suit. Its utter disregard for anything like conventional deference in language, in the presence of majesty, evidently appealed to the king, as is shown by his next remark.—ED.

82. But once] DELIUS: 'Once' is hardly here used as referring to some particular time, but rather in the sense *once for all.* As in *Coriol.:* 'Once, if he do require our voices, we ought not to deny him.'—II, iii, 1.—WRIGHT objects to this interpretation of Delius on the ground that 'this would require *slanders* rather than *slander'd,* and there is no reason to suppose that the word "once" is used in other than its usual sense in reference to past time.'—W. W. LLOYD (*Athenæum,* 24th Aug., 1878, p. 240), apparently unconscious that he has been anticipated, proposes the same interpretation of 'once,' in the sense *once for all,* as does Delius. Lloyd also suggests that 'there is fair reason typographically for challenging the last *d* in "slandered." The general rule [in the Folio] when the last syllable of a participle or preterite is required by the metre to be contracted, is for the contraction to be

But where I be as true begot or no,
That ſtill I lay vpon my mothers head,
But that I am as well begot my Liege
(Faire fall the bones that tooke the paines for me)
Compare our faces, and be Iudge your ſelfe
If old Sir *Robert* did beget vs both,
And were our father, and this ſonne like him:
O old ſir *Robert* Father, on my knee
I giue heauen thankes I was not like to thee.

83. *where*] F_2F_3. *whether* F_4, Rowe, +, Cam.+. *whêr* Dyce, Huds. ii.
as] Om. Pope, Han.
true begot] Ff, Rowe,+, Dyce, Ktly, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. *true-begot* Del. Craig. *true begot*, Cap. et cet.
85. *But...well begot*] *But,...well begot*, Cap. Varr. Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt, Dyce, Ktly. *But...well-begot* Del. Craig.
86. *me*] *me!* Theob. et seq.
87. *ſelfe*] *self*. Rowe et seq.
90. *O*] *O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Huds. *Oh!* Ktly.
Robert] *Robert*, Pope et seq.
[kneeling. Coll. ii.
91. *thee.*] *thee!* Dyce et seq.

---

marked by an apostrophe; "slanderd," therefore, if the received reading is carried, should have appeared as *slander'd;* there is, therefore, a typographical lapse in any case—either an apostrophe is wanting or a final letter is superfluous.'

82. **slanderd**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v. vb. 3. b.): To accuse (unjustly or otherwise) *of*, charge or reproach *with*, something discreditable. Also with *that* and clause. [Compare: 'Then let not him be slander'd with revolt.'—*1 Henry IV:* I, iii, 112.]

83. **But**] WRIGHT: We should rather expect *Now*, the printer having repeated the 'But' from the previous line.

83. **where**] This contraction when the metre requires that *whether* be read as a monosyllable is quite common in the Folios; although, as the CAMBRIDGE EDD. note, the Folios are not therein consistent. 'They have, for instance, "Whether" in l. 142 of the present scene.'—ED.

85. **But . . . as well begot**] VAUGHAN (i, 3): There is only one point on which the speaker professes himself to make any statement, and that is whether under either supposition as to legitimacy he was as well begotten as his brother or not. *Yet* [not 'But'] is the right word to introduce his single statement.

85. **as well begot**] This is spoken with marked irony. Philip while seeming to praise is actually condemning the weak and slight figure of his brother by comparing it with his own manly form. The next line is in reference to the stalwart frame of his putative father, whoever he was, who took the pains to beget him.—Rolfe is, I think, mistaken in referring this to 'the frame that bore the pains of maternity.' See l. 129 below.—ED.

89. **And were our father**] MOBERLY: The 'were' expresses doubt of itself, and would be emphasized on the stage. Compare: 'I think my wife be honest, and think she is not.'—*Othello*, III, iii, 384. [The metrical accent falling on 'were' is corroboration of Moberly's sagacious comment.—ED.]

90. **old sir Robert Father**] FLEAY: Certainly no comma after 'Robert'; 'old Sir Robert father' is one compound noun.

K. Iohn. Why what a mad-cap hath heauen lent vs here? 92
Elen. He hath a tricke of *Cordelions* face,
The accent of his tongue affecteth him:
Doe you not read some tokens of my sonne 95
In the large composition of this man?

92. *lent*] *sent* Heath, Huds. ii.
93. *a tricke*] *the trick* Vaughan.
Cordelions] *Cordelion's* F_4, Rowe, Del. Fle. *Cœur-de-lion's* Pope et seq.
94. *him:*] *him.* Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Del.

92. lent] HALLIWELL: That is, *given*, from the old English verb *lene*, to give. The expression in the text is of usual occurrence in works, especially in the metrical romances, of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but it was getting obsolete in Shakespeare's time. 'A fulle harde grace was hir lentte Er she owt of this worde [*sic* Qu. *worlde*?—ED.] wente.'—MS. Cantab. Ff. v. 48, f. 43.—Both HEATH (*Revisal*, p. 222) and WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 117) suggest that 'lent' should here be changed to *sent*. Walker's unconsciousness that he was thus anticipated may be accounted for by the fact that he had, unfortunately, but few opportunities for consulting either earlier editors or commentators. Walker's Editor, Lettsom, adds in a footnote: 'Compare *Rom. & Jul.*, "That God hath sent us but this only child."—III, v, 166, where all the old copies but Q_1 read *lent*.'—VAUGHAN (i, 4), without reference either to Heath or Walker, also proposes the like change.—ED.

93–98. He hath . . . Richard] Were it not that the last words of l. 98, 'sirra speake,' are so closely connected with what follows, it would seem as though there were some corruption in the text and that these two speeches of Eleanor and John had been misplaced. There has been nothing said so far which might lead Eleanor to suspect the truth of Philip's paternity. Is it quite in Shakespeare's manner thus to anticipate that which is to be revealed in the next speech? Or are we to suppose that the resemblance was so striking that Eleanor could not restrain a remark upon it? In the corresponding scene in the *Troublesome Raigne* she does not acknowledge any likeness until after Robert has declared his suspicions. If, therefore, any change be necessary these two speeches might very fittingly follow l. 141.—ED.

93. tricke of Cordelions face] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. trick, sb. II, 8. b.): A characteristic expression (of the face or voice); a peculiar feature; a distinguishing trait. [The present line quoted. STEEVENS, on the other hand, takes 'trick' here in the sense of a 'tracing of a drawing'; it is quite true that this is one of its meanings, but only in the language of heraldry, a fact of which Steevens was apparently cognisant since he endeavors to strengthen his interpretation by explaining that the word here means that 'peculiarity of face which may be sufficiently shown by the slightest outline.'—ED.]

94. affecteth him] WRIGHT: That is, is an imitation of his. 'Affect' is used in Shakespeare in the sense of *imitate*, but not elsewhere with a personal object. Compare: '*Apem.* Men report thou dost affect my manners, and dost use them. *Tim.* 'Tis then because thou dost not keep a dog Whom I would imitate.'—*Timon*, IV, iii, 199.

96. large composition] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: This expression finely brings to the eye those magnificent proportions of manly strength that characterised Richard I, and which helped to make him the heroic ideal of his English hearts.

K. Iohn. Mine eye hath well examined his parts, 97
And findes them perfect *Richard*: ſirra ſpeake,
What doth moue you to claime your brothers land.
Philip. Becauſe he hath a half-face like my father? 100
With halfe that face would he haue all my land,
A halfe-fac'd groat, fiue hundred pound a yeere? 102

97–102. *Mine eye...a yeere?*] Om. Words.
97. *examined*] *examinèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii.
98. Richard:] *Richard.* Johns. et seq.
ſirra] *ſirrah* F_3F_4. *Sirrah*, Rowe et seq.
99. *land.*] *land?* Ff et seq.
100. *half-face*] *half-face*, F_4, Rowe et seq.
100. *father?*] *father*, Ff, Rowe,+. *father.* Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *father!* Del. *father:* Cap. et cet.
101. *halfe that face*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Coll. i, Cam.+, Del. Neils. Craig. *half the face* Anon. ap. Cam. *half a face* Vaughan. *that half-face* Theob. et cet.
102. Om. Donovan.
a yeere?] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *a year.* Cap. *a-year!* Knt, Sta. Fle. *a year!* Johns. et cet.

101. **halfe that face]** THEOBALD: But why 'with half that face?' There is no question but the poet wrote as I have restored the text. [See *Text. Notes.*]—COLLIER (ed. i.): The meaning is, that because Robert had only a thin narrow face, like his father, yet with only half the face of his father, he would have all his father's land. [Theobald's alteration] does not express what the poet seems to have intended. Philip ridicules Robert for having, in fact, only half of the half-face of his father, yet claiming all the inheritance by reason of it. [In his second edition Collier accepts Theobald's reading, though 'somewhat reluctantly,' as he acknowledges. He yields, however, only because it is corroborated by the MS. Corrector.—ED.]—DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 87): The 'half that' of the Folio is merely a transposition made by a mistake of the original compositor.... The context proves Theobald's alteration to be absolutely indispensable. According to the old reading (in spite of Collier's strange explanation) the second line contradicts the first. It may, perhaps, be worth remarking here that the following line of *Rom. & Jul.*, II, vi, 34, 'I cannot sum up half my sum of wealth,' is given in the old editions thus (the words 'half my' being shuffled out of their right place): 'I cannot sum up sum of half my wealth,' and 'I cannot sum up some of half my wealth.' [Wherein does one line, as printed in the folio, contradict the other? Collier's explanation, so far from being 'strange,' is, to my mind, a most lucid and convincing argument against any alteration of the text.—ED.]

102. **halfe-fac'd groat]** THEOBALD calls attention to the anachronism in thus alluding 'to a coin not struck till the year 1504, in the reign of Henry VII, viz.: a groat, which as well as the half-groat, bore but half-faces impressed. The poet sneers at the meagre sharp visage of the elder brother, by comparing him to a silver groat that bore the king's face in profile, so showed but half the face. [It will be noticed that Theobald here inadvertently refers this epithet to the wrong brother, Philip was the elder; the whole point of the controversy turns on the fact that the younger brother, Robert, claimed the inheritance. Theobald also says that although groats were coined in the time of Edward III, they, as well as all other coins, bore the king's face in full. He cites, in corroboration of the half-faced groat of Henry VII, Stowe: *Survay of London*, p. 47; Holinshed; Camden: *Remains*

Rob. My gracious Liege, when that my father liu'd, 103
Your brother did imploy my father much.
Phil. Well ſir, by this you cannot get my land, 105
Your tale muſt be how he employ'd my mother.
Rob. And once diſpatch'd him in an Embaſſie
To *Germany*, there with the Emperor 108

104, 106. *imploy...employ'd*] *imploy... imploy'd* Ff. (*imploi'd* F_2), Rowe,+. *employ...employ'd* Cap. et seq.
104. *much.*] *much*— Rowe, Han. Var. '73, Ktly. *much.*— Coll. *much;*— Theob. et cet.
105, 106. Om. Words. Donovan.
107. *And*] —*And* Wh. i, Huds. iii.
diſpatch'd] *despatcht* Fle.
in] *on* Ran.
108. Germany,] *Germany;* Pope,+.
there] Ff, Rowe,+ (—Var. '73), Dyce, Cam.+. *there,* Cap. et cet.

Concerning Britain.—ED.]—STEEVENS: The same contemptuous allusion occurs in *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntington*, 1601, 'You half-fac'd groat, you thick-cheeked chitty-face.'—[V. i; Haz.-Dods., p. 188.] Again, in *Histriomastix*, 1610: 'Whilst I behold yon half-fac'd minion.'—[IV, i, 57; ed. Simpson.]—NARES (*Gloss.*, s. v. *Half-faced*): Falstaff ridicules Shadow for his thin face, with the same contemptuous epithet: 'This same half-faced fellow, Shadow—he presents no mark to the enemy.'—*2 Henry IV:* III, ii, 283. I am inclined to think that no more than a contemptuous idea of something imperfect is meant by 'half-faced' in the famous rant of Hotspur: 'But out upon this half-faced fellowship!'—*1 Henry IV:* I, iii, 208. It has been supposed to allude to the half-facing of a dress; but that seems too minute. Here also it means merely imperfect: 'With all other odd ends of your half-faced English.'—Nashe: *Apology for Pierce Penilesse.* [This last reference from Nashe is quite wrong. In the first place, there is no such title among his writings, as given either in Grosart's or McKerrow's editions. The quotation is, however, correct, and is to be found in the tractate *Strange Newes of the Intercepting Certaine Letters*, ed. Grosart, vol. ii, p. 210. This inaccurate reference would hardly be worth the correction, were it not that unfortunately Nares has misled the astute editor of the *N. E. D.*, who has copied this fictitious title as a reference for the use of 'half-faced' in the sense *imperfect*, citing (N) as the authority, presumably Nares; but without reference to volume or page in any edition. From the context in all the passages quoted it is quite evident that 'half-faced' in the present line in *King John* means *unfinished, imperfect.* Does it not almost exactly correspond with what Gloucester says of himself?—'Deform'd, unfinished, sent before my time Into this breathing world scarce half made up.'—*Rich. III:* I, i, 20. —ED.]

103. **when that**] For other examples of 'that' used as a conjunctional affix, see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 287.

107, 108. **an Embassie To Germany**] BOSWELL-STONE (p. 50): Perhaps Sir Robert Faulconbridge usurped the mission of William Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, and Chancellor; sent by Richard in 1196 to confer with the Emperor Henry VI, who was anxious to prevent peace being made between the King and Philip of France. Or we may imagine that Sir Robert was one of the 'diverse noble men' who represented Richard at the coronation of the Emperor Otto IV. in 1198. The objection that neither of these dates is consistent with Faulconbridge's dramatic age need not trouble us, for Richard—who sent Sir Robert to Germany—

To treat of high affaires touching that time:
Th'aduantage of his abſence tooke the King,
And in the meane time ſoiourn'd at my fathers;
Where how he did preuaile, I ſhame to ſpeake:
But truth is truth, large lengths of ſeas and ſhores
Betweene my father, and my mother lay,
As I haue heard my father ſpeake himſelfe
When this ſame luſty gentleman was got:
Vpon his death-bed he by will bequeath'd
His lands to me, and tooke it on his death
That this my mothers ſonne was none of his;
And if he were, he came into the world

109. *time:*] *time.* F_4, Johns. Var. '73, Coll. Hal. Ktly, Glo. Cla.

110. *Th'*] Ff, Rowe,+ (—Var. '73), Knt, Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii. *The* Cap. et cet.

112. *Where...preuaile,*] *Where,...prevail,* F_4, Rowe,+. *Where...prevail* Coll. Cam.+, Del. Fle.

ſpeake:] *speak.* Ktly.

113–116. Om. Wordsworth.

113, 114. Om. Donovan.

113. *truth, large*] *truth; large* Pope et seq.

large...ſhores] *And true it is, my father* Words.

113 *lengths*] *length* Cap. conj.

115. *As...himſelfe*] F_2F_3. *As...himſelf,* F_4, Rowe, Coll. Cam.+, Del. Words. Fle. (*As...himself*) Pope et cet.

116. *got:*] Ff, Cap. *got.* Rowe et cet.

117. *he...bequeath'd*] *did...bequeath* Words.

118. *death*] *oath* Anon. conj. ap. Cam.

119–141. Om. Words.

119. *this...ſonne*] F_2. *this...son* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Sing. Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Fle. Rlfe. *this,...son,* Theob. et cet.

120. *And*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *An* Han. Del. S. Walker. *And,* Cap. et cet.

---

began to reign in 1189, and Faulconbridge could not therefore have numbered more than ten historic years at the opening of Act I. in 1199.

118. tooke it on his death] STEEVENS: That is, entertained it as his fixed opinion when he was dying.—STAUNTON dissents from this interpretation by Steevens, and adds: 'We believe it was a common form of speech, and signified that he swore, or took oath, upon his death, of the truth of his belief. Thus Falstaff says: "—and when mistress Bridget lost the handle of her fan, I took't upon my honour thou hadst it not."—*Merry Wives,* II, ii, 11. So also, in Beaumont & Fletcher's *Lover's Progress:* "—upon my death I take it uncompelled, that they were guilty." '—V, iii.—MOBERLY: 'Wished that he might die if it was not true.' Why should anyone propose to read *oath,* especially as Falstaff says: 'I'll take it on my death I gave him this wound'?—*1 Henry IV:* V, iv, 153.—WRIGHT: That is, maintained it by an oath, the asseveration being as true as his death was certain; or, as I rather incline to believe, staking his life as security for his truth. See Hall's *Chronicle, Henry VII,* fol. 51b: 'And there Perkyn standyng on a lytle skaffolde, redde hys confession, whiche before you haue heard, and toke it on hys death to be true.' [Wright quotes two passages from Holinshed wherein this and a like phrase of asseveration are used as guarantees for the truth of a statement. Such examples might doubtless be multiplied, but these are sufficient to show that Steevens is clearly wrong in putting a too literal interpretation on the phrase.—ED.]

Full fourteene weekes before the courſe of time: 121
Then good my Liedge let me haue what is mine,
My fathers land, as was my fathers will.
K. Iohn. Sirra, your brother is Legittimate,
Your fathers wife did after wedlocke beare him: 125
And if ſhe did play falſe, the fault was hers,
Which fault lyes on the hazards of all husbands
That marry wiues : tell me, how if my brother
Who as you ſay, tooke paines to get this ſonne, 129

121. *time:*] *time.* Johns. et seq.
122. *Then...Liedge*] *Then...Liege,* F_4. *Then,...Liege,* Pope et seq.
124. *Sirra,*] *Sirrah,* F_4 et seq. *Legittimate*] F_1.
126–136. *And if...fathers heyre*] Om. Donovan.
126. *And*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. Dyce, Cam.+. *And,* Cap. et cet.
127. *hazards*] *hazard* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Ran.
128. *wiues:*] *wives.* Rowe et seq.
129. *Who*] F_2F_3, Pope, Han. Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Del. Words. Neils. Craig. —*Who* Ktly. *Who,* F_4 et cet.
ſay,] *say* Pope, Han.
ſonne,] *son*— Ktly.

121. **Full fourteene weekes**] On the question of the viability of a child thus prematurely born, see, if needful, CHESNEY: *Sh. as a Physician,* p. 33 *et seq.*—ED.

124. **your brother is Legittimate**] GREY (i, 275): Shakespeare appears to be out in his law; [since Robert says] That his father was sent into Germany, and the king took advantage of his absence. Which was proof that his brother Philip was illegitimate. It would have been reckon'd otherways, if his father had been anywhere within the four seas (the jurisdiction of the King of England). See Wood's *Institute of the Laws of England,* book I, chap. 6.—C. K. DAVIS (p. 144): [In ancient common-law] a child born after the marriage, and during the husband's life, was presumed to be legitimate. It was formerly the established doctrine that this presumption in favor of legitimacy could not be rebutted, unless the husband was absent during the whole period of the wife's pregnancy. So, if a man be within the four seas and his wife hath a child, the law presumeth that it is the child of the husband; and against this presumption the law will admit no proof (*Co. Litt.*, 373*a*; *1 Phill. Ev. marg.*, p. 630). . . . Sir Robert was not absent in Germany during the whole period of the wife's pregnancy, and for that reason the presumption of the legitimacy, as it was at that time, became conclusive. It is also to be remarked that the king pays no attention to the declarations said to have been made by Sir Robert denying his paternity of Philip. In this he rules correctly, for nothing is better settled than that the declarations of father or mother are inadmissible to bastardize their children. This grotesque affront to common sense has long since ceased to be law. Evidence is admissible in our day to attack the legitimacy of a child even where the father was *infra quatuor maribus* during the whole period from conception to birth. The testimony, however, must be of the most cogent character, and leave no room for doubt.

127. **Which fault**] Compare III, i, 42; and for other examples of 'which' used as an adjective, see ABBOTT, § 269.

129. **you say, tooke paines**] This is not, I think, any inadvertence on Shake-

Had of your father claim'd this ſonne for his,
Inſooth, good friend, your father might haue kept
This Calfe, bred from his Cow from all the world:
Inſooth he might: then if he were my brothers,
My brother might not claime him, nor your father
Being none of his, refuſe him : this concludes,
My mothers ſonne did get your fathers heyre,
Your fathers heyre muſt haue your fathers land.
Rob. Shal then my fathers Will be of no force,
To diſpoſſeſſe that childe which is not his.

130. *his,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *his*— Ktly. *his?* Theob. et cet.
132. *Cow*] *Cow*, F_4, Rowe,+.
world:] *world.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *world*, Johns.
133. *might:*] *might.* Ktly.
134. *claime*] *clam* F_4.
135. *him:*] *him.* Fleay, Neils.
concludes,] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Ktly. *concludes.* Johns. *concludes;* Cam.+, Del. Fleay, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig. *concludes,*— Cap. et cet.
138. *Shal then*] *Shall then* Ff. *Shall, then*, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. Fleay.
force,] *force* F_4, Rowe,+, Coll. Dyce, Wh. i, Fleay.
139. *his.*] *his?* F_4 et seq.

speare's part; but one of those happy touches which contribute so much to the natural flow of the dialogue. It is quite in keeping that the king should not at once recall that it was Philip who used this phrase in regard to himself. (See l. 86, *ante*.)—ED.

132. **Calfe, bred from his Cow**] STEEVENS: The decision of King John coincides with that of Menie, the Indian lawgiver: 'Should a bull beget a hundred calves on cows not owned by his master, those calves belong solely to the proprietors of the cows.' See *The Hindu Laws*, etc., translated by Sir W. Jones, London edit., p. 251. [See also F. F. Heard: *Sh. as a Lawyer*, p. 97.]

135. **concludes**] JOHNSON: This is a *decisive argument*. As your father, if he liked him, could not have been forced to resign him, so, not liking him, he is not at liberty to reject him.—DELIUS considers that according to the punctuation of the Folio 'this concludes' is to be connected with the succeeding sentence, and therefore does not bear the interpretation given by Johnson.—WRIGHT, in support of Johnson, quotes: 'The text most infallibly concludes it.'—*Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, ii, 120.

138, 139. **Will . . . no force, To dispossesse**] VERPLANCK: The dramatist is both legally and historically accurate. From the time of the Norman conquest lands in England ceased to be devisable, as they had been under the Saxon law. This remained in force until the Statute of Wills, in 32 Henry VIII, authorising the devises of real estate, under some restrictions, afterwards re-enacted and extended under Charles II. (See II. Blackstone's *Commentaries*, 374–6.) One of the exceptions to this rule was in the county of Kent, which did not apply here, as the lands are described in Northamptonshire. I do not mention this as bearing on the question of Shakespeare's asserted legal studies, because it is taken from the old *King John*, and it is probable it was founded on a traditional account of a true incident.

Phil. Of no more force to diſpoſſeſſe me ſir,
Then was his will to get me, as I think.
Eli. Whether hadſt thou rather be a *Faulconbridge*,
And like thy brother to enioy thy land:
Or the reputed ſonne of *Cordelion*,
Lord of thy preſence, and no land beſide.

140. *me*] *me*, F_4 et seq.
141. *Then*] *Than* F_4.
142. *Whether*] *Say*, Pope, Han. *Whe'r* Sta. conj. Fleay, Huds. ii.
rather be] *rather,—be* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Faulconbridge] *Falconbridge* Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.
143. *And...brother*] F_2F_3, Huds. ii. *And...brother*, F_4, Rowe,+, Hal. Wh. i, Del. *And...brother*, Cap. et cet.
144. Cordelion,] F_2F_4, Rowe, Del. Fleay. Cordelion F_3. *Cœur-de-lion* Pope et cet.
145. *thy*] *the* Warb.
beſide.] *beſide?* F_4 et seq.

142, 143. **hadst thou rather . . . to enioy**] WRIGHT: In such clauses it is not uncommon to insert 'to' before the second infinitive, though it is omitted before the first. Compare: 'Brutus had rather be a villager Than to repute himself a son of Rome.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, I, ii, 173. [For other examples, see ABBOTT, § 380; and for an account of the origin of this phrase, see MASON: *English Grammar and Analysis*, § 529, foot-note.]

145. **Lord of thy presence**] WARBURTON: 'Lord of thy presence' can signify only *master of thyself*, and it is a strange expression to signify even *that*. However, *that* he might be, without parting with his land. We should read—'Lord of the presence,' i. e., prince of the blood.—HEATH (p. 222): 'Lord of the presence' never yet signified 'a Prince of the blood,' nor can Mr Warburton produce a single instance of this expression. The common reading means, Lord of thine own person, which comprehends the whole of thy lands, lordships, and titles. Mr Warburton objects, that Robert [*sic* Qu. Philip?] 'might be lord of his person without parting with his land.' So undoubtedly he might; but our critick seems not to have understood the alternative proposed by Queen Elinor, which was this: Whether he would choose to be the heir of Faulconbridge with the enjoyment of his lands, or to be the acknowledged son of Cœur de Lion at the expense of giving up his claim to those lands, to which, if he were really the son of Cœur de Lion, he could not have the least title.—JOHNSON: 'Lord of thy presence' means: master of that dignity and grandeur of appearance that may sufficiently distinguish thee from the vulgar without the help of fortune.' Lord of his presence apparently signifies: great in his own person, and is used in this sense by King John in one of the following scenes [I, ii, 389].—F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL'S ed., p. 9): This encouragement to own Bastardy upon supposition is a very indelicate stroke of her majesty's; and King John's knighting him without any merit to claim that honour, but impudence, is as silly a promotion as some other Kings have made.—KNIGHT: 'Presence' may here mean *priority of place*, preséance. As the son of Cœur de Lion, Faulconbridge would take rank without his land. If Warburton's interpretation be correct, the passage may have suggested the lines in Sir Henry Wotton's song on a *Happy Life*: 'Lord of himself, though not of lands, And having nothing, yet hath all.'—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh. Key*, p. 629): In this play twice occurs an expression which is to be found nowhere else used by Shakespeare. It is 'Lord of thy presence' and 'Lord of our presence,' employed to signify: master of thine own individuality, and:

Baſt. Madam, and if my brother had my ſhape 146
And I had his, ſir *Roberts* his like him,

146. Baſt.] Phil. Theobald, Warb. Varr. Ran. Words. Dono.
and if] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Fleay. *an if* Han. et cet.
147. *his, ſir* Roberts *his*] *his, Sir* Robert's *his* F$_4$. *his, Sir Robert's his,* Rowe, Cap. Var. '73, '78, Hal. Cam.+. *his; Sir Robert's his,* Pope. *his, Sir Robert's, his,* Han. *his Sir Roberts; his,* Fleay. *just Sir Robert's shape,* or *just Sir Robert his* Vaughan. *his, Sir Robert his,* Theob. et cet.

master of our own individuality. In the first of the two passages we think it is meant to include the sense of: master of that fine manly person inherited from Cœur-de-Lion, as well as, master of thine own self.—IVOR JOHN suggests that this phrase may here 'bear the meaning of: Lord from thy very appearance, that is, your mere appearance would tell people that you were nobly born.' [That 'of' may have the force of *from* or *in consequence of*, ABBOTT (§ 168) shows by several examples, but is it necessary here so to understand it, as Ivor John suggests? Heath's interpretation, as it is the simplest, seems to be all sufficient.—ED.]

146. **Bast.**] WRIGHT calls attention to this change in designation of Philip, following directly upon his choice.

147. **sir Roberts his like him**] JOHNSON: This is obscure and ill expressed. The meaning is—'If I had his shape, sir Robert's—as he has.' *Sir Robert his* for Sir Robert's is agreeable to the practice of that time, when the *'s* added to the nominative was believed, I think erroneously, to be a contraction of *his*. [The genitive or possessive case in Anglo-Saxon is formed by adding *as* to the nominative. The apostrophe, therefore, represents the omitted letter *a*.—ED.]—MALONE follows Theobald's regulation of the text (see *Text. Notes*), and points out that 'his' is here redundant, ascribing its use, as does Johnson, to the mistaken formation of the possessive.—WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 117), referring to Johnson and Malone's explanation, says: 'But *his* in this construction, without a substantive, is a different idiom, and one of which I have met with no example; nor is there any necessity of metre to palliate such a violence on language.' Walker conjectures that a comma should be inserted after 'Sir Roberts', wherein, as his editor LETTSOM points out, Walker is anticipated by Hanmer (see *Text. Notes*). Lettsom adds: 'I believe [the Folio reading] to be the genuine one, though I must own I doubt Walker's interpretation. The double genitive, though denounced by Malone, is occasionally heard even now in the mouths of the vulgar; and, though it may not accord with modern notions of grammar, it is not more repugnant to them than the double nominative, "God he knoweth," or the double accusative, "God I pray him," both of which examples (not to mention others elsewhere) occur in *Rich. III.*'—JOHN HUNTER: That is, And if Sir Robert had his shape like him; if Sir Robert's shape was like my brother's. [Hunter follows Theobald, but omits the comma after 'Robert.']—FLEAY: I understand the passage thus: His (my brother's) shape of Sir Robert; *his* (my brother's); like *him* (my brother)—Philip pointing at his brother at the words *his* and *him*. I take 'his Sir Robert's' to be a compound phrase, 'his' being an attributive to 'Sir Robert's' (shape).—WRIGHT: [Following the Folio], that is, his shape, which is also his father Sir Robert's.—GOLLANCZ: Surely his is used substantively with that rollicking effect which is so characteristic of Faulconbridge. There is no need to explain the phrase as equivalent to *his shape*, which is also his father Sir Robert's; 'Sir Robert's his' = *Sir Robert's shape*, 'his' emphasizing substantively

And if my legs were two ſuch riding rods, 148
My armes, ſuch eele-skins ſtuft, my face ſo thin,
That in mine eare I durſt not ſticke a roſe,
Leſt men ſhould ſay, looke where three farthings goes, 151

149. *ſtuft*] Ff, Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Ran. *stuffed* Dono. *stuff'd* Mal. et cet.

151. *looke...goes,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *'look...goes!'* Theob. Warb. *Look,...goes!* Johns. et cet.

the previous pronominal use of the word.—HERTFORD quotes with approval the foregoing explanation by Gollancz, and adds: 'The line might be paraphrased: "And I had his shape, in other words, a *his* of Sir Robert's." '—[Any interpretation which wrests an intelligible meaning from the Folio text without change of letter or punctuation is assuredly alluring. If 'his' be here used substantively it is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον not only for Shakespeare but all other writers according to that court of last appeal, the New English Dictionary; such being the case we must, I fear, reluctantly accept the decision of that lesser court, SCHMIDT'S *Lexicon*, that 'Sir Robert's his' is here a reduplicated genitive.—ED.]

148. **riding rods**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v.) quotes in illustration: 1555 Rutland MSS (1905), IV, 376: Paid for ij ryding-roddes of bone for my Ladie, and other thinges, xxij*d*.

150, 151. **roſe . . . three farthings** [THEOBALD: In this very obscure passage our poet is anticipating the date of another coin; humorously to rally a thin face, eclipsed, as it were, by a full blown rose. We must observe, to explain this allusion, that Queen Elizabeth was the first, and indeed the only prince, who coined in England three-half-pence, and three-farthing pieces. She coined shillings, six-pences, groats, three-pences, two-pences, three-half-pence, pence, three-farthings, and half-pence; and these pieces all had her head, and were alternately with the *roſe* behind, and without the rose. The shilling, groat, two-pence, penny, and half-penny had it not: the other intermediate coins, *viz.*, the sixpence, three-pence, three half-pence, and three-farthings, had the rose.—WARBURTON: The sticking roses about them was then all the court-fashion, as appears from this passage of the *Confession Catholique* du S. de Sancy, l. ii, c. i: 'Je luy ay appris à mettre des roses par tous les coins': i. e., in every place about him, says the speaker of one whom he had taught all the court fashions. [Does 'tous les coins' not rather mean in *every corner* or in *all places?* It can hardly refer to personal adornment.—ED.]—STEEVENS, in corroboration of the appearance of the Tudor rose on coins of that time, quotes: '—Here's a three penny-piece for thy tidings. *Firk.* 'Tis but three half-pence I think: yes, 'tis three-pence; I smell the rose.'—*Shoemaker's Holiday*, [ed. Pearson, vol. i, p. 41]. And in regard to the fashion mentioned by Warburton says: 'The roses stuck in the ear were, I believe, only roses composed of ribbons. In Marston's *What You Will* is the following passage: "Dupatzo, the elder brother, the fool, he that bought the half-penny ribband, wearing it in his ear," &c. [IV, i; ed. Bullen, p. 391]. Again, in *Every Man out of his Humour:* "—This ribband in my ear, or so." [II, i; ed. Gifford, p. 70]. Again, in *Love and Honour* (D'Avenant, 1649): "A lock on the left side, so rarely hung With ribbanding," &c.' [II, i; ed. Maidment, p. 128]. 'I think I remember,' adds Steevens, 'among Vandyck's pictures in the Duke of Queensbury's collection at Ambrosbury, to have seen one, with the lock nearest the ear ornamented with ribbands which terminate in roses; and Burton, in *Anatomy of Melancholy*, says, "that it was once the fashion to stick real flowers in the ear."

And to his ſhape were heyre to all this land, 152

152. *And to his ſhape*] *And with his shape* Han. *And, to his shape,* Cap. et seq.
152. *this land*] *his land* Vaughan.

At Kirtling (vulgarly pronounced—*Catlage*), in Cambridgeshire, the magnificent residence of the first Lord North, there is a juvenile portrait (supposed to be of Queen Elizabeth), with a red rose sticking in her ear.'—MALONE: Marston in his *Satires*, 1598, alludes to this fashion as fantastical: 'Ribbanded ears, Grenada nether-stocks.' [*Scourge of Villanie: Address to Reader;* ed. Hallowell, iii, 243.] And from the *Epigrams* of Sir John Davies, printed at Middleburgh, about 1598, it appears that some men of gallantry in our author's time, suffered their ears to be bored, and wore their mistress's silken shoe-strings in them. ['Yet for thy sake I will not bore mine ear To hang thy dirty silken shoe-tires there.'—*Ignoto.* Dyce's Marlowe, iii, 263.—That such a fashion as tying ribbons in the ears was practised by the gallants of the latter years of Elizabeth and the early years of King James, these passages quoted by Steevens and Malone abundantly prove, but that there is a reference to this fashion in the present passage in *King John* is not, I think, so clearly evident. Steevens's reference to the supposed portrait of Elizabeth with the red rose in the ear is much more to the point. PLANCHÉ (ii, 232) alludes to this latter fashion, giving as illustration of it a portion of a contemporaneous portrait of Richard Lee wherein a rose is worn in the same way, appending as explanation these lines from *King John.* There is, of course, the difficulty contained in Philip's words 'in my ear,' but we need not place too literal a meaning on the preposition, since the reference is to the appearance of the face on a coin with a rose as its background. Moreover, the word 'rose' applied to a bunch or knot of ribbon was not in use until after 1600, and even then was almost exclusively used to describe the ornament on a shoe. It is noticeable that in none of the quotations given by Steevens and Malone is this decoration called by any other name than a *ribbon,* whereas Philip distinctly mentions that which is, presumably, the well-known badge of the Tudors—a rose. The following passage in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is, I think, the one to which Steevens refers: ''Tis the common humor of all suitors to trick up themselves, to be prodigal in apparel, *pure lotus,* neat, comb'd and curl'd, with powder'd hairs, *comptus et calamistratus;* with a long love-lock, a flowre in his ear, perfumed gloves, rings, scarfs, feathers, points, &c.'—Part 3, Sec. 2, Mem. 4, Subsec. 1.—ED.]

151. **three farthings**] HALLIWELL says that 'the expression three farthings came to be used as typical of any thing or person very worthless or mean,' quoting in support of this, from *Nomenclator,* 1585: 'The least peece of coine or currant monie, as three-farthings with us.'—MOBERLY objects to Theobald's explanation, as in the foregoing note, on the ground that 'it seems a little hazy; for the rose was on other coins, and not only on the three-farthing piece; so why should laughers be particularly reminded of the latter? On the other hand, if we suppose the joke to mean that the rose was to the face as a halfpenny to a farthing, this is just the kind of disproportion which the mind of the lieges would be prepared duly to resent and stigmatise.'—[Is it necessary to limit the exact meaning conveyed by this contemptuous remark? It hardly needs Halliwell's assertion that 'three-farthings' was symbolical of paltriness; the very name of the coin suggests it, conveying the idea of smallness and incompleteness; it is not even so much as a penny; and the triplex dental sound of the words is almost the same as fie! or faugh!—ED.]

Would I might neuer ſtirre from off this place, 153
I would giue it euery foot to haue this face:
It would not be ſir nobbe in any caſe. 155

153. *Would...place,*] In parentheses, Del.
Would] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. i, Han. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Cam.+, Del. *'Would*, Theob. ii. et cet.
154. *I would...euery*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Cam.+. *I'd...ev'ry* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *I'd...every* Cap. et cet.
154. *face*] *hand* Fleay.
155. *It*] Knt. Del. i. *I* Ff. et cet.
ſir nobbe] *Sir Nobbe* F_4, Rowe,+. *sir Nob* Cap. et seq.

152. **his shape . . . this land**] MALONE: There is no noun to which 'were' can belong, unless the personal pronoun in the last line but one be understood here. I suspect that our author wrote 'And *though* his shape were heir to all his land.' Thus the sentence proceeds in one uniform tenour—'and if my legs were,' &c.—'*and though* his shape,' &c.—M. MASON (*Comments on Beaumont & Fletcher: Appendix*, p. 35): The difficulty in this passage arises from a transposition of the words 'his' and 'this'; it should run thus: 'And to this shape were heir to all his land.' By 'this shape' Faulconbridge means the shape he had just been describing.—STEEVENS: The old reading is the true one. 'To his shape' means, in *addition* to it. So, in *Tro. & Cress.*: 'The Greeks are strong, and skilful to their strength, Fierce to their skill, and to their fierceness valiant.'—I, i, 7. [For other examples of this construction, see ABBOTT, § 185.]

154, 155. **I would . . . in any case**] W. G. STONE (*Notes & Queries*, 1886, VII, i, 143): Halle relates that Dunois, natural son of Louis, Duke of Orleans, preferred, like the Bastard in *King John*, a splendid illegitimacy to a respectable name and an inheritance attached thereto. When Dunois was a year old his mother and nominal father, 'the lorde of Cauny,' died, shortly after Orleans's murder in 1407. The infant's paternity was debated before the Parliament of Paris by his mother's relatives and Cauny's next of kin, but the question remained undecided until Dunois was eight years old, 'at whiche tyme,' says Halle, 'it was demaunded of hym openly whose sonne he was: his frendes of his mothers side aduertised him to require a day, to be aduised of so great an answer, whiche he asked, & to hym it was graunted. . . . At the daie assigned, . . . when the question was repeated hym again, he boldly answered, "my harte geueth me, & my noble corage telleth me, that I am the sonne of the noble Duke of Orleaunce, more glad to be his Bastarde, with a meane liuyng, then the lawfall sonne of that coward cuckolde Cauny, with his four thousand crounes [a year]." '—Halle's *Chronicle*, ed. 1809, pp. 144, 145. What authority had Halle for this story? I have not found it in Monstrelet and his continuators (*Chroniques Nationales Francaise*, ed. Buchon). A similar story is recorded by Stow, under the year 1213: 'Morgan Prouost of Beuerley, Brother to K. John, was elected byshop of Durham, but he comming to Rome to be consecrated returned againe without it, for that he was a bastard, and K. Henry, father to K. John, had begotten him of the wife of one Radulph Bloeth, yet would the Pope have dispensed with him, if he would have called himself the son of the knight, and not of the king. But he vsing the aduise of one William of Lane his Clarke, aunswered, that for no worldly promotion, he would deny the kings blood.'—Stow's *Annales*, 1605, p. 256.—Stow's authority appears to be *Lib[er] Bermond[sey]*.—P. SIMPSON (*Notes & Queries*, 1900, IX, v, 393) quotes a passage from B. Riche: *The Irish Hvbbvb*, 1617, wherein is related an incident from a

Elinor. I like thee well: wilt thou forſake thy fortune,
Bequeath thy land to him, and follow me?
I am a Souldier, and now bound to *France.*
Baſt. Brother, take you my land, Ile take my chance;
Your face hath got fiue hundred pound a yeere,
Yet ſell your face for fiue pence and 'tis deere:
Madam, Ile follow you vnto the death.
Elinor. Nay, I would haue you go before me thither.

156. *well: wilt*] *well. Wilt* Johns Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Del. Fleay, Dono.
fortune] *fortunne* F_2.
159, 162. *Ile*] *I'le* F_4.
160. *pound*] *pounds* Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. ii, Del. Dono. Craig.
160. *a yeere*] *a-year* Knt, Sta. Fleay.
161. *deere:*] *deere.* F_2. *dear.* F_3F_4 et seq.

'French Historie,' closely following that given by Stone from Halle's *Chronicle*, save that the names are changed from the Duke of Orleans to the 'Duke of Guyses' and Cauny to 'Monsieur Granduyle.' The reply of the Bastard is almost in the same words as in Halle. [It is neither a profitable nor a pleasant task to collect further examples of such a choice as Philip Faulconbridge's; but the mere mention of the name of William D'Avenant will doubtless recall another case, certainly more widely known than any of those just given. See, if needful, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. D'Avenant, William, vol. v, p. 552.—ED.]

154. **face**] FLEAY: My emendation [*hand* for 'face'] is necessary for the rhyme, and also for the antithesis to 'foot,' which, after Shakespeare's usual custom, is used in a double sense, one meaning being merely glanced at.

155. **It would not**] MALONE: I am not sure that the correction [by the editor of F_2] is necessary.—The CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* VII.) call attention to a like apparent misprint in *Twelfth Night:* 'I cannot be so answered.'—II, iv, 87, where all the Folios read 'It cannot,' etc. In the present passage KNIGHT and DELIUS (ed. i.) retain the reading of the Folio and thus make 'It would' refer to 'this face.'

155. **sir nobbe**] CAPELL (I, pt. ii, p. 118): 'Nob' is a cant word for *head;* and from its relation in sound to another cant word *Bob* for *Robert*, it may well be that that name too is alluded to, as well as the brother's face, who was a knight and a Robert. [Has not Capell confused the father with the younger son? King John later makes the distinction between Philip, after his knighting, and Robert, who is left merely as a squire.—KNIGHT, and the COWDEN-CLARKES likewise, interpret 'Nob' here as the cant word for *head*, apparently independently. Excellent as the suggestion is, it is quite untenable, as the word 'nob,' in this sense, was unknown before 1700.—ED.]

157. **Bequeath**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. II, 4.): To make a formal assignation of property of which one is possessed to anyone, so as to pass to him at once: To transfer, hand over, make over. (Obs.) [The present line quoted.]

162. **vnto the death**] Compare: 'You are both sure and will assist me? *Conr.* To the death, my lord.'—*Much Ado*, I, iii, 71.

163. **Nay . . . before me thither**] DEIGHTON: Elinor, playing upon his words, says: 'Nay, I would rather you should precede me thither, i.e., on the road to death,' to which the Bastard, keeping up the joke, answers, 'our rustic manners teach us to give precedence to our superiors.'—[Deighton is possibly right; at the same time,

Baſt. Our Country manners giue our betters way.
K. Iohn. What is thy name?
Baſt. *Philip* my Liege, ſo is my name begun,
Philip, good old Sir *Roberts* wiues eldeſt ſonne.
K Iohn. From henceforth beare his name
Whoſe forme thou beareſt:
Kneele thou downe *Philip*, but riſe more great,
Ariſe Sir *Richard*, and *Plantagenet*.

166. Philip] Philip, F_4.
Liege,...begun,] Ff, Rowe, Pope, +. *liege,—...begun,—* Dyce, Hal. Sta. Words. *liege,...begun;* Cam.+. *liege; ...begun* Cap. et cet.
167. Philip] Om. Dono.
wiues] *wife's* Rowe et seq.
eldeſt] *eld'st* Dyce ii, iii, Fleay. *true eldest* Dono.
168, 169. *From...beareſt*] One line Pope et seq.
169. *beareſt*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Coll. Dyce i, Wh. i, Sta. Del. Craig. *bear'st* Pope et set.
170. *downe*] *down*, Ktly.
riſe] Ff, Rowe, Mal. Var. '21, Coll. Cam.+. *rise up* Pope,+, Cap. Marsh. *to rise* Ktly. *arise* Var. '73 et cet.
171. [knighting him. Capell.

since 'to the death' was a familiar phrase, Elinor may refer to the expedition to France, and object to the Bastard's too literal interpretation of her word 'follow,' which she here uses in the sense of entering her service.—ED.]

164. **Our . . . betters**] WRIGHT: 'Betters' in this sense will never become obsolete so long as it is retained in the Church Catechism.

167. **eldest**] WALKER (*Vers.*, 167) quotes the present line among others as examples wherein for the sake of the metre the *e* in superlatives is often suppressed. (See also, I, ii, 189.)

170. **but rise more great**] As will be seen in the *Text. Notes* there have been various suggestions to amend the irregularity in the metre of this line.—MALONE'S remark that '*more* is here used as a dissyllable,' provoked a characteristically sarcastic retort from RITSON (*Cursory Criticisms*, p. 61): 'What an admirable thing is it to have a delicate ear! A plain hobbling fellow unblessed with that advantage would have only thought the little word *up* wanting, and spoiled, of course, a most excellent monodissyllable.'—STEEVENS reprints Malone's note, not wishing, as he says, to 'suppress it,' though he does 'not concur.' Malone's last word on the subject appears in the *Variorum* of 1821; where he still maintains his preference for the dissyllable, and adds that 'Colonel Roberts suggested to him to read *rise up*,' thus ignoring Ritson and inadvertently betraying the fact that he had not consulted the texts of his predecessors, Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson, and Capell.—ABBOTT (§ 506) quotes this line among others as an illustration of a gesture used to supply the place of a syllable or foot in lines with four accents where there is an interruption; thus here the King's action of dubbing Philip at the words 'But rise,' etc., fills out the line.—ED.

171. **Plantagenet**] MALONE: It is a common opinion that *Plantaganet* was the surname of the 'royal house of England from the time of King Henry II.; but it is, as Camden observes in his *Remaines Concerning Britaine*, 1614, a popular mistake. Plantaganet was not a family name, but a nick-name, by which a grandson of Geoffrey, the first Earl of Anjou, was distinguished, from his wearing a *broom-stalk* in his bonnet. But this name was never borne either by the first Earl of

Baſt. Brother by th'mothers ſide, giue me your hand,
My father gaue me honor, yours gaue land:
Now bleſſed be the houre by night or day
When I was got, Sir *Robert* was away.

Ele. The very ſpirit of *Plantaginet*:
I am thy grandame *Richard*, call me ſo.

Baſt. Madam by chance, but not by truth, what tho;
Something about a little from the right,

172–184. Om. Words.

172. *Brother*] *Brother*— Sta.

th'] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Wh. i, Fleay, Huds. ii. *the* Cap. et cet.

173. *land:*] **Ff**, Knt, Sta. Huds. Cam. +, Del. Rlfe, Craig. *land:*— Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Huds. *land.* Rowe et cet.

174, 175. Om. Dono.

174. *bleſſed*] *blessèd* Dyce, Huds. ii.

be] *by* Pope.

houre...day] F_2F_3, Fleay. *hour... day*, Sing. Huds. *hour,...day*, F_4 et cet.

175. *got,*] *got* F_3, Coll.

away.] *away!* Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Cam.+, Del. Huds. ii, Rlfe, Craig.

176. Plantaginet:] Plantaganet. F_2-F_3, Fleay. Plantaganet: F_4, Rowe. Plantaganet! Pope et seq.

177. *grandame*] *grandam* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Del. Coll. iii, Huds. ii.

grandame Richard,] F_2F_3. *Grandam*, Richard, F_4, Rowe. *Grandam; Richard*, Pope,+. *grandame, Richard;* Cap. et seq.

178. *truth, what tho;*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *truth; what tho'?* Theob. Johns. Var. '73. *truth:—What tho'?* Cap. *truth. What though?* Ktly, Sta. Fleay. *truth; what though?* Warb. et cet.

179. *about*] F_2F_3, Pope. *about*, F_4 et cet.

Anjou, or by King Henry II, the son of that Earl by the Empress Maude, he being always called Henry *Fitz-Empress;* his son, Richard *Cœur-de-Lion;* and the prince who is exhibited in the play before us, John *Sans-terre*, or *Lackland.*—[JAMES TAIT (*Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Plantaganet, Family of*) says that the family did not assume the surname until the middle of the fifteenth century, and that the explanation of its traditional derivation from Geoffrey's adorning his cap with a sprig of the p anta genista 'cannot be traced to any mediæval source. One version ascribes it to his "having applied some twigs of the plant to his person by way of penance" (*Vestigia Anglicana*, i, 266).'—ED.]

178. **by chance, but not by truth**] JOHNSON: That is, I am your grandson, madam, by chance, but not by *honesty;* what then?—MOBERLY: Elinor of Guienne was not likely to object much to this freedom of tone, considering the youthful passages which had led to her divorce from Louis le Jeune, after the second Crusade.

179. **Something about,** etc.] JOHNSON: This speech, composed of allusive and proverbial sentences, is obscure. *I am*, says the sprightly knight, *your grandson*, a little *irregularly*, but every man cannot get what he wishes the legal way. He that *dares not go* about his designs by *day*, must *make his motions* in the *night; he*, to whom the door is shut, must climb *the window*, or leap *the hatch.* This, however, shall not depress me; for the world never enquires how any man got what he is known to possess, but allows that to have is to have, however it was caught, and that he *who wins shot well*, whatever was his skill, whether the arrow fell *near* the mark, or *far* off it.—WRIGHT: The proverbial sayings which follow are characteristic

In at the window, or elſe ore the hatch:
Who dares not ſtirre by day, muſt walke by night,
And haue is haue, how euer men doe catch:
Neere or farre off, well wonne is ſtill well ſhot,
And I am I, how ere I was begot.
K. Iohn. Goe, *Faulconbridge*, now haſt thou thy deſire,
A landleſſe Knight, makes thee a landed Squire:

180, 182. *hatch:...catch:*] *hatch:...catch.* Coll. Wh. i, Del. *hatch....catch.* Ktly.
183. *well ſhot*] *well-shot* Pope, Theob. i.
184. *how ere*] *how e're* F_4. *howe'er* Rowe et seq.
185. Faulconbridge] *Falconbridge* Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.
186. *Knight,*] *Knight* Rowe ii, et seq.
Squire:] *'Squire:* Pope,+, Cap. *'squire.*— Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. Hal. Wh. i. *squire.* Knt, Dyce, Ktly, Sta. Huds. Cam.+.

of the Bastard's rusticity of breeding. [Wright compares *Coriol.*, I, i, 199: 'They said they were an-hungry; sighed forth proverbs.']

180. **In at the window**] STEEVENS: These expressions mean, to *be born out of wedlock.* So, in *The Family of Love*, Middleton, 1608: 'Woe worth the time that ever I gave suck to a child that came in at the window!' [IV, iii, 113; ed. Bullen, p. 83.] So, in *Northward Hoe*, Dekker & Webster, 1607: '—kindred that comes in o'er the hatch.' [I, i; ed. Pearson, p. 7.] Such another phrase occurs in *Anything for a Quiet Life*, [Middleton, 1662]: '—then you keep children in the name of your own, which she suspects came not in at the right door.' [III, ii, 215; ed. Bullen, p. 299.] Again, in *The Witches of Lancashire*, Heywood & Brome, 1634: '—It appears then by your discourse that you came in at the window.' [I, i; ed. Pearson, p. 174.] Again, '—to escape the dogs hath leaped in at a window—'Tis thought you came into the world that way,—because you are a bastard.' [Ibid., II, i; ed. Pearson, p. 198.]

181. **Who dares . . . by night**] JOHNSON'S paraphrase of this line, 'He that dares not go about his designs by day, must make his motions in the night,' leaves it much as it was before, without a hint as to its special application. It is, however, with the greatest diffidence that I offer a possible explanation of this puzzling phrase—a proverb of the Bastard's own invention, as far as I have been able to ascertain. Thus: There is a very marked antithesis between the first part of the sentence and the second half. He who does not even *dare to move* in the day-time will be *compelled to walk* in the dark. That is, in seeking to avoid that which is easy, he must do that which is difficult; and Philip thus applies it to his case. If he had not dared to renounce the ownership of lands and money, mere outward ornaments, he would have been forced to forego the much higher honor of being Cœur de Lion's son.—ED.

183. **Neere or farre off**] PAGE dissents from Johnson's explanation ('he who wins shot well whether the arrow fell near the mark or far off it') on the ground that 'near or far off' rather means whether the contestant were *near or far off*, as the *winning* depends on the arrow falling near or on the mark. Page is undoubtedly right. A contestant whose arrow fell wide of the mark would never be declared a winner.—ED.

186. **a landlesse Knight**] JOHN HUNTER refers this to the king himself on ac-

Come Madam, and come *Richard*, we muſt ſpeed
For *France*, for *France*, for it is more then need.
Baſt. Brother adieu, good fortune come to thee,
For thou waſt got i'th way of honeſty.
Exeunt all but baſtard.

Baſt. A foot of Honor better then I was,
But many a many foot of Land the worſe.

187. *Madam*,...Richard,] *Madam*,... Richard; F_2. *madam*,—...*Richard*,— Cap. *Madam*,—...*Richard;* Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. ii, Words.

188. *For* France, *for* France] *For France*,—*for France!* Hal. *For France, for France!* Sta.

then] *than* F_4.

189, 190. Om. Dono.

189. *Brother adieu*,] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *Brother, adieu.* Ktly. *Brother, adieu;* Theob. et cet.

thee,] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Var. '78, '85. Coll. *thee!* Cap. et cet.

190. Om. Words.

waſt] *was* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

190. *i'th*] F_2F_3. *i'th* F_4, Rowe, Pope, +, Wh. i, Fleay. *i' the* Cap. et cet.

honeſty] *honesty!* Var. '73, '78, '85, Rann.

191. all but baſtard] Om. Cap. Dono.

SCENE III. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

SCENE II. The same. Ante-room of the same. Enter Bastard. Capell.

SCENE II. Before the Castle. Enter Richard. Donovan.

192. Baſt. *A foot...*] *A foot...* Rowe, +, Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce.

193. *many a many*] *many, a many* Pope. *many, many a* Han. *many, ah! many a* Coll. ii. (MS.).

---

count of his being known as Sans-terre or Lackland, but, as both Rolfe and Deighton remark, it can refer to Philip only, who by resigning his lands has made his brother a 'landed squire.'

189. **good fortune come to thee**] COLLIER: Alluding to the proverb that 'bastards are born lucky.' Philip wishes his brother good fortune, because Robert was not a bastard; had he been illegitimate, the wish, according to the proverb, would have been needless. [This may be called a superstitious belief rather than a proverb. It is given in Lean's *Collectanea*, ii, 609.—ED.]

191. **Exeunt all but bastard**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 118): To this editor [this] appears a direction of mere convenience, put in by the players; his cause of thinking so, this: The letters [Scene III.] that stand before: 'A foot of honour,' etc. . . . indicate an intended re-entry; [see *Text. Notes*] which some words of both the speeches before it make apparently proper, and has this propriety further—in admitting a new scene for the 'Lady' and her servant to enter on, which the first was most unfitted for certainly. The instant coming-in of a character who has but just made his exit is faulty, but not without its examples. [In support of this, see *Macbeth*, V, viii, where, after Macbeth's defiance of Macduff, the stage-direction in the Folio reads: '*Exeunt fighting*,' which is immediately followed by: '*Enter Fighting and Macbeth slaine. Retreat, and Flourish.*' etc.—ED.]

192. **A foot of Honor**] JOHNSON: That is, *a step, un pas.*

193. **many a many**] This is the only passage in Shakespeare wherein precisely this construction occurs. It is, moreover, the only example quoted by BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*) under 'many' used emphatically.—SCHMIDT compares *Hamlet*, III, iii, 9: 'Most holy and religious fear it is To keep those many many bodies safe.'—

Well, now can I make any *Ioane* a Lady,
Good den Sir *Richard*, Godamercy fellow, 195

194. *Lady*,] *Lady;* Ff, Rowe. *lady.* Pope,+, Knt, Ktly, Cam.+, Fleay. *lady:*— Cap. et cet.

195–215. Mnemonic Warb.

195. *Good den*] *Good denne* F_2F_3. *Good denne*, F_4. *Good-denn* Rowe. *Good-den* Pope,+, Cap. *Good den*, Var. '73 et cet.

Richard,] *Robert* Johns. *Richard!* Cam.+, Ktly. *Richard.* Coll. Huds. Sta. Wh. i, Del. Fleay.

195. *Godamercy fellow*,] *—Godamercy fellow*, Pope,+, Knt, Coll. ii, iii, Hal. Sta. *—'God-a-mercy, fellow!'*— Wh. Ktly, Cam.+, Huds. ii. *God-a-mercy, fellow;* Fle. *—God-a-mercy, fellow,*— Cap. et cet.

ABBOTT (§ 87) says: '*A* was frequently inserted before a numeral adjective for the purpose of indicating that the objects enumerated are regarded collectively as *one*. . . . The *a* in "a many men" is perhaps thus to be explained.' Abbott quotes from this play, 'A many thousand warlike French,' IV, ii, 209, and, as a still more curious example, the present passage, adding: 'Some explain "a many" by reference to the old noun "many," "a many men," for "a many (of) men." And the word is thus used: "A many of our bodies," *Henry V:* IV, iii, 95.'—[Abbott does not, I think, intend this as an explanation of the line under discussion; the use of the singular after the second 'many' precludes this. The lack of examples seems to point to this repetition being here used merely for emphasis; and that it is not a peculiar construction.—ED.]

194. **Well, now can I make**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 16) tells an odd anecdote in regard to Spranger Barry's first appearance as the Bastard: 'It was a matter of astonishment to every spectator that Barry, with the superior advantage of a fine person, should make so little of the Bastard. He seemed in that part to be quite out of his road: all the humour, gaiety, ease and gallantry of Falconbridge were lost in Barry. . . . On his endeavoring to repeat the following words in the First Act of the play, 'Well, now can I make any Joan a lady,' he was so embarrassed in the delivery of this single line that, not being able to repeat the words, he was forced to quit the stage, amidst the general applauses of the audience, who saw and felt his uneasiness. But, what is still more surprising, after going off and returning three several times, with the same kind encouragement of the spectators, he was forced to give it up; and I believe he did not recover himself till he was relieved by the entrance of Lady Falconbridge.'

194. **any Ioane**] That is, any peasant girl; Joan was as common a name for a woman as Jack was for a man.—WRIGHT compares: 'Some men must love my lady and some Joan.'—*Love's Labour's*, III, i, 207.—ED.

195. **Good den**] That is, *Good e'en, good even;* for examples, see Shakespeare *passim*.

195. **Sir Richard**] STEEVENS: In Act IV, [scene iii, l. 45] Salisbury calls him Sir Richard and the King has just knighted him by that name. The modern editors arbitrarily read, sir Robert. Faulconbridge is now entertaining himself with ideas of greatness, suggested by his recent knighthood.—'Good den, sir Richard,' he supposes to be the salutation of a vassal; 'God-a-mercy, fellow,' his own supercilious reply to it. [The only editor, ancient or modern, whose text reads 'sir Robert' is Dr Johnson, later Steevens's colleague in editing the *Variorum* of 1773. It is doubtless a typographical error; but Steevens was quite well aware that

And if his name be *George*, Ile call him *Peter*; 196
For new made honor doth forget mens names:
'Tis two reſpectiue, and too ſociable 198

196. *Ile*] *ile* F_2. *I'le* F_4.
197. *new made*] *new-made* Pope et seq.
198. *two*] F_1.
198. *too ſociable*] *unsociable* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *insociable* Mason. *too sociable*. Coll. MS.

Johnson printed from Theobald's second edition, and without examining that text was thus, perhaps, misled. Steevens did not correct this mistake in any subsequent edition.—ED.]

198. **respectiue**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2.): Of conduct, etc. Marked by regardful care or attention; heedful. Now *rare;* 1598 R. Haydocke tr. *Lomazzo* II, 65: 'To be very pleasant, but with such respective moderation, that their laughter exceed not.'

199. **your conuersion**] STEEVENS: [The Folio reading] may be right. It seems to mean, his late change of condition from a private gentleman to a knight.—[As may be seen in the *Text. Notes* Steevens was not fully convinced of the correctness of the Folio until his own edition in 1793.—ED.]—MALONE: Mr Pope, without necessity, reads—for your *conversing*. Our author has here, I think, used a license of phraseology that he often takes. The Bastard has just said that 'new-made honour doth *forget* men's names'; and he proceeds as if he had said, 'does not remember men's names.' *To remember the name of an inferior*, he adds, has too much of the respect which is paid to superiors, and of the friendly familiarity of equals, for your *conversion*,—for your present condition, now *converted* from the situation of a common man to the rank of a knight. [KNIGHT and R. G. WHITE also thus interpret that 'forget' is here equivalent to *not to remember*, without reference, however, to Malone's note.—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 43) quotes this passage as an example of the 'abstract for the concrete (understanding "conversion" in the sense of *change*); though this latter seems harsh.' [See also I, ii, 257, 258.]—COLLIER, whose MS. corrector places a period after 'sociable,' l. 198, and here reads *diversion* instead of 'conversion,' thus interprets: 'It was common to entertain "picked men of countries," for the *diversion* of the company at the tables of the higher orders, and this may be what the Bastard is referring to in the last two lines, while the sense of the first two is completed at "sociable." We are, nevertheless, disposed to adhere to the old reading.'—SINGER (*Sh. Vindicated*, p. 83), commenting on this correction, says: 'The punctuation in the First Folio is entirely against this innovation, which may have been probably suggested by Pope, who took the same erroneous view of the passage and read "for your conversing." Malone's view of the old authentic reading is quite satisfactory.'—[The sting contained in this consists, of course, in the hint that a modern editor suggested the change to the unknown corrector. Collier frequently remarks that Theobald and Pope have been anticipated by some of the suggested readings of his MS. corrector; Singer is, however, here comparatively mild, in fact, many of his comments unfortunately manifest quite as much of a spirit of Vindictiveness to Collier as a Vindication of Shakespeare.—ED.]—KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*, i, 255): And so this feeble platitude of the *diverting* traveller is to supersede the Shakespearean satire, that when there is a 'conversion'—a change of condition in a man—to remember names is too respective, and too sociable, for new-made honour.—HALLIWELL: The probability is that 'conversion' is an archaic term used in the sense of *conversation*.

For your conuerſion, now your traueller,
Hee and his tooth-picke at my worſhips meſſe, 200

199. *For your conuerſion,*] *For conversation.* Lloyd.
conuerſion,] *conversing.* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85. *convertion.* Hal. (misprint?). *conversion.* Cap. et cet. *diversion* Coll. MS.

So, in *Englishmen for my Money*, 'Impudent villaine, and lascivious girles, I have ore-heard your vild conversions,' [I, i; Hazlitt-Dods., x, p. 477].—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. *Conversion*, I. 5. *Rhet.*) quotes Huloet, 1552: 'Conuersion, or speakynge one to another,' and Wilson, *Rhetoric*, 107b: 'Conversion is an ofte repeatyng of the laste worde, and is contrarie to that whiche went before.' This, among the several senses of 'conversion' given by Murray, is the nearest to that of *conversation.*—FLEAY: Should there not be a period at 'sociable,' and in that case may not 'conversion' mean *conversation*, as *converse* does now? Mr P. A. Daniel thinks we should read *convertant*, one returned from travel. [Though Fleay does not refer to Collier's MS. correction, it is, perhaps, unjust to decide that he was quite unaware that he was anticipated in this conjectural punctuation. Daniel's suggestion is not among his *Conjectural Emendations* published in 1870; but as Fleay acknowledges in his Preface, and in the Appendix to his edition, indebtedness to Daniel for suggestions and help in the preparation of the text of the *Troublesome Raigne*, it is reasonable to suppose that this conjectural reading is contained in a separate communication.—ED.]—WRIGHT: That is, for one who has undergone such a change of rank as you have. It may be that 'your' is used in the colloquial indefinite sense of that which is familiar to everyone; just as in the next sentence 'your traveller,' and as Bottom says (*Mid. N. Dream*, IV, i, 36): 'I could munch your good dry oats.' It does not appear certain that in the passage [quoted by Halliwell] 'conversion' is intended to be equivalent to *conversation.* [The context shows, I think, that 'vile conversions' may be understood in the sense of *wicked changes of conditions* or *thoughts*, more fitly than as *conversations.*—ED.]

199. **now your traueller**] JOHNSON: It is said, in *All's Well*, that 'a traveller is a good thing after dinner.' In that age of newly excited curiosity one of the entertainments at great tables seems to have been the discourse of a traveller.—WRIGHT points out that the quotation to which Johnson refers is as follows: 'A good traveller is something at the latter end of a dinner.'—II, v, 30. Johnson evidently trusted to his memory.—STEEVENS likewise quotes from *The Partyng of Frendes*, a Copy of Verses subjoined to Churchyard's *Praise and Reporte of Maister Martyne Forboisher's Voyage to Meta Incognita*, &c., 1578: '—and all the parish throw At church or market in some sort, will talke of trav'lar now.' [Steevens's faculty of supplying an apt quotation is remarkable, but this is not a happy instance of it; the last words here evidently mean that everyone is talking about the traveller, not that the traveller is discoursing of his adventures.—STAUNTON quotes, more oppositely, from *Edward II:* 'Gav. What art thou? *Man.* A traveller. *Gav.* Let me see—thou wouldst do well To wait at my trencher, and tell me lies at dinner time.'—I, i.—ED.]

200. **Hee and his tooth-picke**] JOHNSON: It has been already remarked that to pick the tooth, and wear a piqued beard, were, in that time, marks of a man's affecting foreign fashions. [The remarks to which Johnson refers may be found in his own edition, vol. ii, pp. 181 and 325; or in *Variorum 1821*, vol. iv, p. 394; and vol. xiv, p. 395.—ED.]—STEEVENS: Among Gascoigne's poems I find one entitled:

And when my knightly ſtomacke is ſuffis'd, 201
Why then I ſucke my teeth, and catechize
My picked man of Countries : my deare ſir, 203

201. *And*] —*And* Neils.
203. *picked*] *piked* Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Ran. *picqued* Theob. *pickèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. *Countries: my...*] Ff, Rowe. *countries.—'My:...* Wh. i, Ktly, Neils. *countries: 'My...* Sta. Cam.+, Fleay, Huds. ii. *countries,—my...* Pope et cet.

Councell given to Maister Bartholomew Withipoll, a little before his latter Journey to Geane, 1572. The following lines may, perhaps, be acceptable to the reader who is curious enough to enquire about the fashionable follies imported in that age:

'Now, Sir, if I shall see your mastership
Come home disguis'd, and clad in quaint array:
As with a pike-tooth byting on your lippe
Your brave mustachios turned the Turkie way,' [ed. Cunliffe, i, 346].

Again in Jonson: *Cynthia's Revels:* 'A traveller, one so made out of the mixture and shreds of forms, that himself is truly deformed. He walks most commonly with a clove or pick-tooth in his mouth.' [II, i; ed. Gifford, p. 264. Steevens gives two other passages wherein the tooth-pick is mentioned as the distinctive mark of the traveller, and MALONE quotes from Overbury's *Characters* (*Article, an Affected Traveller*): 'his tooth-pick is a main part of his behaviour.'—ED.]—RALEIGH (p. 58): In this age of cheap printed information we are too apt to forget how large a part of his knowledge Shakespeare must have gathered in talk. Books were licensed and guarded; but in talk there was free trade. He must often have listened to tales, like those told by Othello, of the wonders of the New World. He must often have seen the affected traveller, described in *King John*, dallying with his tooth-pick at a great man's table, full of elaborate compliment. The knowledge that he gained from such talk, if it was sometimes remote and curious, was neither systematic nor accurate; and this is the knowledge reflected in the plays.

200. **at my worships messe**] MALONE: This means, at that part of the table where I, as a *knight*, shall be placed. 'Your worship' was the regular address to a knight or esquire in our author's time, as 'your honour' was to a lord. ['Your worship' appears to have been the commonest form of address from an inferior to a superior. Notice, for example, its indiscriminate use throughout *Merry Wives*. Slender and Shallow are thus uniformly addressed, and also Fenton by Mistress Quickly.—ED.]—WRIGHT: A mess was properly a party of four, as at the Inns of Court still, and Nares (*Gloss.*) says that at great dinners the guests were always arranged in fours.—Rev. JOHN HUNTER, doubtless on the ground that this sentence lacks a verb, interprets this as meaning: 'He and his tooth-pick mess at my worships house, or table.' [This is, I think, untenable, as MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) does not record any use of the word in this sense prior to 1700.—ED.]—MOORE-SMITH: I incline to think that after 'messe' a line has dropped out of the text.

202. **I sucke my teeth**] R. G. WHITE: The travelled man picked his teeth: the home-bred man sucked his. [Rev. JOHN HUNTER makes the same suggestion that 'picked' in the next line is used as a word-play on 'tooth-pick'; but is not this too slight and trivial? See next note.—ED.]

203. **picked**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2.): Adorned, ornate, trimmed; exquisitely

Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin,
I ſhall beſeeeh you; that is queſtion now,
And then comes anſwer like an Abſey booke:
O ſir, ſayes anſwer, at your beſt command,
At your employment, at your ſeruice ſir:
No ſir, ſaies queſtion, I ſweet ſir at yours,

205. *I ſhall...now*] Misplaced in Sing. ii. to follow l. 234.

you; that] Ff, Rowe, Fleay. *you,* —*that* Pope et cet.

206. *Abſey booke*] F_2. *Absey-book* F_3-F_4, Rowe, Knt, Sing. ii, Coll. ii, iii, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Del. *a-b-c. book* Cap. *Abcee-book* Dyce, Words. *Absey book* Cam.+, Fle. *A B C-book* Pope et cet.

208, 209. *ſir:...yours,*] *Sir:*—...*yours,* — Pope,+. *sir:*—...*yours:* Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. i, ii, Sta. Huds. *sir:...yours.* Coll. iii.

209. *No ſir,*] Ff, Pope. *No, Sir,* Rowe et cet.

I ſweet ſir] *I sweet, Sir,* F_4, Rowe i. *I, sweet Sir,* Rowe ii. et seq.

---

fashioned or apparelled, spruce, refined, exquisite, nice, finical, particular, fastidious. [Compare 'He is too picked, too spruce, too affected, too odd, as it were.'—*Love's Labour's*, V, i, 14. The consensus of opinion is in favor of this interpretation of 'picked.' Pope's reading of *piked* (see *Text. Notes*) naturally led to his explanation that this refers to the traveller being 'formally bearded' and was also the occasion for Johnson's reference to the traveller's beard in his note on l. 200. Theobald says: 'The Author certainly designed *picqued* (from the French Verb, *se piquer*); i. e., touchy, tart, apprehensive, upon his guard.' Theobald in his second edition retains the reading *picqued*, but does not repeat the above explanation of it.—ED.]

203. **picked man of Countries**] HEATH (p. 223) suggests that a comma be placed after the word 'man; that is, And catechize the man I have vouchsafed to cull out for my entertainment, concerning the countries he hath seen.'—[Heath's volume appeared in 1765, and in the *Variorum* of 1773 STEEVENS makes this same suggestion, with but a very slight change in the wording of Heath's explanation. Steevens was, unfortunately, not too punctilious in assigning credit where it was due.—MALONE acclaims Steevens's change and explanation as 'undoubtedly the true one,' which shows, perhaps, that as he did not know of Heath's note Steevens may also have been unaware that he was anticipated.—ED.]—MOBERLY: This is one of the many instances of Shakespeare's truly English contempt for foreign ways.

205. **beseeeh**] In my copy of the Folio this word is thus printed; so it appears in Staunton's fac-simile of the Ellesmere Folio, and also in Sidney Lee's fac-simile of the Devonshire Folio, but in the Booth reprint the word is plainly *beſeech*. This trifling deviation from the original seems hardly worth noticing, were it not that even such slight deviations are of the rarest in Booth's scrupulously exact reprint, wherein every battered letter and fault in alignment is accurately reproduced. Mr Charles Wright, the editor, informed a friend, in a letter, that in the preparation of Lionel Booth's reprint he had collated seven copies of the First Folio. It is but just, I think, to give Wright the benefit of the doubt and to believe that the copies which he consulted were printed after this slight change had been corrected by the printers while the pages were in course of printing.—ED.

206. **Absey booke**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. A B C. 4.): A B C-book, primer, horn-book; an introductory book to any subject, often in catechism or dialogue form. [The present line quoted.]

And ſo ere anſwer knowes what queſtion would, 210
Sauing in Dialogue of Complement,

211–213. In parentheses Pope, Han. Cap. Varr. Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Hal. Ktly, Sta. Huds. 211. *Sauing*] *Serving* Warb. Theob. i, Han. *Salving* Vaughan.

211–213. **Sauing in Dialogue . . . riuer Poe**] WARBURTON: At the first intimation of his desire to hear strange stories, the Traveller complies, and the answer comes as easy as an A, b, c book. Now, Sir, says the Knight, this is my question: The over-ready Traveller will scarce give him leave to make it, but, e'er Answer knows what question would,—What then? Why according to the Stupidity of the hitherto receiv'd reading, it grows towards supper time, And is not this worshipful Society? To spend all the time betwixt Dinner and Supper, before either of them knows what the other would be at. So absurdly is the sense vitiated by putting the three lines in a parenthesis [see *Text. Notes*]; which, we may suppose was first occasioned by their blunder in the word 'Saving,' instead of the true word, *serving*. Now my emendation gives the text this turn: 'And e'er Answer knows what the Question would be at, my Traveller *serves in* his Dialogue of Compliment, which is his standing Dish at all tables, then he comes to talk of the Alps and Appenines, &c., and by the time this discourse concludes it draws towards Supper.' All now here is sense and humour; and the phrase 'serving in' is a very humourous one, to signify that this was his Worship's second course.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 119): The second modern [Pope] only has pointed rightly, giving some lines their parenthesis, [which] will be sufficient to set aside a nonsensical reading of the three that come after him—*Serving* for 'Saving,' whose sense is excepting. Excepting, says the Bastard, that question gives occasion to much compliment, and to scraps of discourse concerning Alps and the rest, supper is well-nigh come without Answer's knowing even the meaning of what Question propounds to him, he's so lost in his compliments.—HEATH (p. 223): If we follow Pope's punctuation the construction, as well as the sense, is extremely clear. . . . [I] have not yet been able to discover how it appears that answer knows what question would be at, one jot the sooner or the better in Mr Warburton's correction, than in the former reading. But there is a farther objection to this conjecture (as it is scarce possible to adjust error so well with truth but the seam will betray itself somewhere or other), *serving in* is a participle, and consequently requires a substance. Now I would fain know what substantive it can be joined with in this passage consistently with grammatical construction. I must own myself utterly at a loss to find one, unless we should suppose, He, the said answer, to be understood, which if Mr Warburton pleases to accept, it is entirely at his service. But in truth our critic did not comprehend the delicacy of the poet's satire, which represents the traveller, after having sufficiently established his character for good breeding by the compliments in vogue, as launching out into a tedious common-place relation of his travels, without giving himself the leisure to inform himself, with what view, and to what purpose his patron had begun his enquiry. [Heath, in his laudable desire to rebuke Warburton, sometimes overreaches himself, as, I think, he has here. The substantive antecedent to the participle is undoubtedly the personified Answer; just as in l. 207 'O sir, says answer,' and in 209 'No sir, says question.' The picture presented by Warburton of the Traveller serving up a dialogue of compliments, wherein he must be both question and answer, is certainly 'humorous'; though possibly not quite in the way Warburton

And talking of the Alpes and Appenines, 212
The Perennean and the riuer *Poe*,
It drawes toward fupper in concluſion ſo.
But this is worſhipfull ſociety, 215
And fits the mounting ſpirit like my ſelfe;
For he is but a baſtard to the time 217

213. *Perennean*] *Pyrennean* Ff, Rowe. *Pyreneans* Coll. ii. (MS.). *Pyrenean* Pope et seq.
Poe] *Po* Rowe et seq.
214. *toward*] F_2, Cap. Var. '78, '85. *towards* F_3F_4, Rowe,+, Sing. Hal. Ktly, Huds.
214. *fupper*] F_1.
ſo] Om. Cap. Ran.
216. *the*] *a* Coll. MS.
ſpirit like] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Knt, Dyce, Sta. Cam.+, Neils. *spirit, like* Cap et cet.

---

intends. The latter part of Heath's explanation is much more satisfactory. Philip cares nothing about Alps, Apennines, or rivers, what he wants to know concerns only manners, customs, and good behaviour.—ED.]—IVOR JOHN: If we take the line as it stands—'Before the answering man knows what the questioner would, except in so far as customary complimentary retorts are concerned'—we leave 'And so' in the air; but having regard to the looseness of structure of the whole speech, this may not be impossible. We may shuffle out of the difficulty by suspecting a dropped line.—[Is it not simpler to follow Pope's arrangement, including these three lines in a parenthetical clause? 'And so' then has the force of *in this manner*.—ED.]

211. **Dialogue of Complement**] TOLLET: Sir W. Cornwallis's 28th *Essay* thus ridicules the extravagance of compliment in our poet's days, 1601: 'We spend even at his (i. e., a friend's or a stranger's) entrance a whole volume of words.—What a deal of synamon and ginger is sacrificed to dissimulation! "O, how blessed do I take mine eyes for presenting me with this sight!" "O Signior, the star that governs my life in contentment, give me leave to interre myself in your arms!"—"Not so, sir, it is too unworthy an inclosure to contain such preciousness," &c., &c. This, and a cup of drink, makes the time as fit for a departure as can be.'—WRIGHT: The cynic Jaques in *As You Like It* (II, v, 56) compares [such a dialogue] to 'the encounter of two dog-apes.'

214. **in conclusion so**] CAPELL, regarding 'so' redundant, omits it; but is it not here used for the more emphatic form *also*, as in 'Mad in pursuit, and in possession so.'—*Sonnet* cxxix. (See ABBOTT, § 65.)—MOBERLY interprets these words as meaning 'In this kind of trial at conversation'; apparently understanding 'conclusion' as in the phrase 'to try conclusions,' but the construction hardly admits this.—ED.

216. **the mounting spirit**] MADDEN (p. 204) compares the present line to a passage in *2 Henry VI:* II, i, 5 et seq., wherein is shown a royal hunting party with their falcons; and particularly the lines given to Gloucester, 'My lord, 'tis but a base ignoble mind That mounts no higher than a bird can soar.'—ED.

217–223. **bastard to the time . . . poyson for the ages tooth**] The following observations by CAPELL on the concluding lines of this soliloquy, although they somewhat anticipate other remarks, are so closely connected with each other that it seems better to give them here in full: 'And now we shall wind up our string of observations on this soliloquy, with acknowledging our own former ignorance of the sense of some parts of it, and certain consequent errors in the reading of this

That doth not ſmoake of obſeruation, 218

218, 219. *ſmoake...ſmacke*] *smack...* *smoak* Pope. *smack...smack* Theob. et seq.
218. *obſeruation*] *observation* Fleay.

copy. "Too," the Oxford editor's [Hanmer] reading in l. 222 [see *Text. Notes*], was embrac'd with great readiness; and his comment upon the words of next line seem'd a likely and just one,—that its "poison" was *flattery:* but when these were acceded to, it was perceiv'd that the parts of this period, read and pointed as now, did not accord nor had proper construction. To make the latter out tolerably, l. 222 must have another change yet, and "deliver" must be *delivers;* and to make the comment complete, *flattery* must be taken extensively, and comprehend its exteriors of complaisance and address; after which and with the pointing that follows it is conceiv'd the speaker's sense will be clear: "For he is but a bastard to the time, | That doth not smack of observation,— | And so am I, whether I smack, or no; | And not alone in habit and device, | Exterior form, outward accoutrement, | But from the inward motion too, delivers | Sweet, sweet, sweet poison for the age's tooth." "Observation" must be observation of foreign manners and things; and "poison" lyes not in that, unless it be in its nothingness, and the misspending of time in hark'ning to it, which is no mighty injury: persons void of this talent,—or not *smacking* of it, in this speaker's language,—are, according to him, "bastards to the time"; meaning that the time held them cheap, set as little by them as bastards. And having vented this maxim, and the wipe or gird on himself, he turns to another traveller's talent, which is a poison indeed, and of all ages; and yet the person that wants it, is as much in common esteem as he that wanted the other; and his rising to honour will be with difficulty, for this and no other talent strews the footsteps are made to it, makes the road to it easy. Thus understood, the construction and concord:—"he is but a bastard to the time, that doth not smack of observation and *he another, that not* delivers sweet poison, &c., in habit and device alone, &c., but from the inward motion too": the last expressions importing that the party must be sincere in his flattery, or have the appearance of being so; and in the expressions before them,—"device," "habit," &c.,—the necessity of address is insinuated, which has its flattery too, and produces all the effects of it.' [Capell has not, I think, shown in the foregoing his usual sagacity. In the first place, Hanmer's emendation, even with Capell's grammatical correction of the verb, is hardly to be commended; in fact, it completely alters the sense, where all was plain before, and is, therefore, unnecessary. Secondly, Capell refers the phrase 'bastard to the time' to the attitude of the polite world towards one who does not conform to usage; MALONE likewise interprets these words and thus paraphrases it: 'He is accounted but a mean man, in the present age, who does not show, by his dress, his deportment, and his talk that he has travelled and made observations in foreign countries.' Does not this expression rather mean, as WRIGHT interprets, 'He is no true child *of* this age'? Compare 'son *to* the King' in any *Dramatis Personæ*. Capell, on the other hand, is quite right in rejecting Hanmer's explanation of the 'sweet poison' as *flattery*, his own words are, however, *more suo*, so obscure and his sentences so involved that it is not, at first, quite apparent that the 'traveller's talent,' to which he refers, is the 'deceit' mentioned by Faulconbridge in l. 225. Thus the sweet poison for the age's tooth is mere outward show both in accoutrement and speech. Deception both in speech and action.—ED.]

And ſo am I whether I ſmacke or no:
And not alone in habit and deuice,
Exterior forme, outward accoutrement;
But from the inward motion to deliuer
Sweet, ſweet, ſweet poyſon for the ages tooth,

219. *am I...ſmacke*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *am I,...smack* Theob.+, Dyce, Ktly, Cam.+, Fleay. *am I,...smack,* Cap. et cet.

222. *motion*] *motion,* Sta. Fleay.
to deliuer] *to deliver* Han. *too, deliver* Cap.

---

218. **smoake of obseruation**] RANN: That is, exhibit some spice of foreign manners; and that not only by his outward habit and address, but also by the infallible criterion of politeness, a perpetual propensity to *flattery*, that *sweet poison* so highly palatable to the *age's tooth*.—WRIGHT: 'Observation' here seems to mean not so much the knowledge and experience gained by taking notice of what goes on around, as the habit of paying personal attention or court. It is derived from *observe* as used in *2 Henry IV:* IV, iv, 30: 'For he is gracious if he be observed.' So Hamlet was the 'observed of all observers' (III, i, 162), to whom they all paid court. [The whole tenour of the passage seems confirmatory of this excellent suggestion. —ED.]—Miss C. PORTER: Theobald's change is all that remains of various changes formerly made in this speech. Why is that left? What is meant by saying, I am one who smacks whether I smack or not? It is a curious contradiction, and seems less clear to the present writer than the unchanged original. Smoke is the sign of fire, as observation is of the time. The speaker who is not a bastard to the time, 'smokes' of it, is redolent of this universal trait of observation. So he is, whether he relishes it or not, whether I *smack or no.* [Miss Porter's attempt to wrest a meaning, from what has been accepted heretofore as a misprint in the Folio, is certainly praiseworthy; but has she not misunderstood Philip's parenthetical remark? See next note.—ED.]

219, 222. **And so . . . to deliuer**] BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*): [He also is] not a true child of the age, being without fashionable dress and manners, and without the disposition to flatter. 'From,' l. 222, is equivalent to *by reason of the lack of* [any inward motion]. Yet he will arm himself against the flattery which will be strewn in the path of his social ascent. [MOORE-SMITH'S interpretation is substantially the same as the foregoing.—ED.]

219. **And . . . or no**] WARBURTON: A nonsensical line of the players.

221, 222. **outward accoutrement . . . inward motion**] RUSHTON (*N. & Q.*, IV, x, 515] compares: 'This face were faire, if it were tourned, noting that the inward motions would make the outward favour but counterfeit.'—Lyly: *Euphues and his England*, [ed. Bond, ii, 61].

222. **motion**] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 9.): An inward prompting or impulse; an instigation or incitement from within; a desire or inclination. Also a stirring of the soul, an emotion. [Compare IV, ii, 264, 265: 'Within this bosome, never entred yet The dreadfull motion of a murderous thought.']

222–225. **to deliuer . . . I meane to learne**] HUDSON (ed. ii.): Something of obscurity here. But I take the infinitive 'to deliver' as depending upon 'I am.' . . . So that Sir Richard means that he is going to humour the world in his outward man,

Which though I will not practice to deceiue,
Yet to auoid deceit I meane to learne;
For it ſhall ſtrew the footſteps of my riſing:
But who comes in ſuch haſte in riding robes?
What woman poſt is this? hath ſhe no husband
That will take paines to blow a horne before her?
O me, 'tis my mother: how now good Lady,
What brings you heere to Court ſo haſtily?

224. *Which*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. *This* Johns. conj. Dono. *Which*, Han. et cet.
though] *tho* Pope ii. *tho'* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
will] *would* Words.
225. *Yet...deceit*] F_2F_3, Knt. *Yet,... deceit*, F_4 et cet.
226. *riſing:*] *rising*. Pope et seq.
227–289. Om. Dono.
227. *haſte in*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Cam.+, Fleay, Huds. ii. *haste, in* Cap. et cet.
227. *riding robes*] *riding-robes* Dyce, Hal. Huds. Cam.+, Fleay.
228. *woman poſt*] *woman-poſt* F_4.
229. *her?*] *her*, Rowe i.
230. *O me,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Fleay. *Oh, me!* Ktly. *O me!* Theob. et cet.
'tis] *it is* Pope et seq.
mother:] *mother*. Coll. et seq.
how now] F_2F_3. *now*, Pope,+. *how now*, F_4 et cet.
Lady,] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. *lady!* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Cam. i,+. *lady?* Cap. et cet.

---

and at the same time be thoroughly sound within; or that he *appear* what the age craves, and yet *be* what he ought. The 'Which,' in this latter member of the sentence, I understand as referring to the whole sense of the preceding member. The speaker means to learn the arts of popularity, and to practice them, not hollowly, that he may cheat the people, or play the demagogue, but from the heart, and that he may be an overmatch for the cheats and demagogues about him. The Poet here prepares us for the honest and noble part which Faulconbridge takes in the play; giving us an early inside taste of this most downright and forthright humorist, who delights in a sort of righteous or inverted hypocrisy, talking like a knave, and acting like a hero.

225. **to auoid deceit**] That is, to avoid being deceived.

226. **strew . . . my rising**] IVOR JOHN: As I rise flattery will be strewn before me like flowers before one making a progress.—[Miss PORTER'S interpretation is, I think, preferable, that deceit shall 'smooth his way, alluding to the rushes strewing the presence-chamber of the king, also the stage floor.' Philip's practical mind looks forward to an easy ascent, not a flowery path.—ED.]

229. **blow a horne**] JOHNSON: He means that a woman who travelled about like a 'post' was likely to 'horn' her husband.—COLLIER: The allusion is, of course, double,—to the horn of a *post*, and to the horn of such a husband as Lady Faulconbridge had rendered hers. [HUDSON also sees here this double allusion. It is somewhat rash to question the opinions of two authorities such as these; I can but say that I prefer to think them mistaken. In the first place Philip does not recognise the 'woman-post' until her nearer approach; secondly, it is not pleasant to think that he would thus make a jest of his mother's infidelity. Is not Johnson's explanation quite sufficient?—ED.]

Enter Lady Faulconbridge and Iames Gurney. 232

Lady. Where is that ſlaue thy brother? where is he?
That holds in chaſe mine honour vp and downe.
Baſt. My brother *Robert*, old Sir *Roberts* ſonne:
Colbrand the Gyant, that ſame mighty man,
Is it Sir *Roberts* ſonne that you ſeeke ſo?
Lady. Sir *Roberts* ſonne, I thou vnreuerend boy,
Sir *Roberts* ſonne? why ſcorn'ſt thou at ſir *Robert*?
He is Sir *Roberts* ſonne, and ſo art thou.

SCENE IV. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

232. Enter...and Iames Gurney] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. After *mother:* l. 230, Sta. Fleay. After l. 230 Cap. et cet.

Faulconbridge] Falconbridge Dyce, Hal. Huds. Words.

Iames Gurney.] Servant. Capell.

233. *ſlaue thy*] *ſlave, thy* F_4 et seq.

233, 234. *he?...downe.*] *he,...down?* Theob.+, Sing. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Cam.+. *he?...down?* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt, Sta. Fleay.

235, 236. Robert,...*ſonne:...man,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. Fleay. *Robert?...son? ...man?* Cap. et cet.

238. *ſonne, I*] F_2F_3. *Son, I*, F_4. *Son! ay*, Rowe i, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. *son; ay* Fleay. *Son? ay*, Rowe ii. et cet.

vnreuerend] *unrev'rend* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *unrev'rent* Han. *unreverent* Del.

239. *ſonne?*] F_2, Knt. *son!* Ktly. *ſon*, F_3F_4 et cet.

ſcorn'ſt] *ſcorneſt* F_4, Rowe.

240. *ſonne,*] *son!* Rowe ii, Pope. *son;* Theob. Warb. Cap. Var. '78, '85, Ran. Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt.

---

232. **Enter Lady Faulconbridge**] MOBERLY: By an admirable instinct Shakespeare has departed from the old play, which made Lady Faulconbridge present all through the unseemly discussion between the two brothers, and even bearing a disgracefully prominent part in the dialogue. In much the same spirit Desdemona, when summoned to declare whether she really was more the wooer than Othello, puts all such questions aside with the utmost dignity, by declaring that her duty is now to the Moor, as her mother's had been to her father.

234. **holds in chase**] Compare 'Spies of the Volsces Held me in chase, that I was forced to wheel Three or four miles about.'—*Coriol.*, I, vi, 19. This is not, as might seem, a term peculiar to hunting or the chase. It does not occur either in Turberville's *Noble Arte of Venerie*, 1576, or in N. Cox's *Gentleman's Recreation*, 1674.—ED.

236. **Colbrand the Gyant**] JOHNSON: Colbrand was a Danish giant, whom Guy of Warwick discomfited in the presence of King Athelstan. The combat is very pompously described by Drayton, in his *Polyolbion*, [Twelfth Song, ll. 216–235.—ED.].—COLLIER: This line reads as if quoted from an old romance or ballad, in which the acts of Guy and Colbrand were celebrated. *The History of Guy, Earl of Warwick*, by S. Rowlands, did not come out until 1607; but a romance on the same incidents had appeared long before, having been printed by W. Copland and J. Cawood. A fragment of an edition, from the types of Pynson, or Wynkyn de Worde, is also in existence.

Baſt. *Iames Gournie,* wilt thou giue vs leaue a while? 241
Gour. Good leaue good *Philip.*
Baſt. *Philip,* ſparrow, *Iames,* 243

241. Gournie] Gourney F_2F_3. Gurney F_4 et seq.
a while?] *awhile?* Hal. Huds. Cam.+.
243. Philip, *ſparrow,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. Philip!—*spare me,* Warb. Theob. Han. Philip!—*sparrow*— Johns. Var. '73. Philip! *sparrow:* Cap. Cam.+, Wh. ii. Philip! *sparrow!* Del. Huds. ii, Rlfe, Neils. Craig. Philip? *sparrow?* Fleay. Philip?—*sparrow!*— Upton, Var. '78 et cet. (subs.).

242. **Gour. Good leaue good Philip]** C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: Coleridge, in one of his Table Talks, said: 'For an instance of Shakespeare's power *in minimis,* I generally quote James Gurney's character in *King John.* How individual and comical he is with the four words allowed to his dramatic life!' [March 12, 1827.—ED.] They certainly suffice to show us the free-and-easy style of the confidential servitor; one entrusted with the family secrets of this country household; one accustomed to treat the eldest son, but not the heir, with a coolly easy familiarity tolerated by the good-humored young man, and only lightly waved aside by the new-made knight.—H. REED (p. 71): Notice the familiar and affectionate tone of this intercourse, as they address each other by their Christian names, and then the fine, gentlemanly, and considerate feeling which prompts Falconbridge to promise the old servant—his domestic friend—to tell him more after awhile as a kind of indirect apology for even asking him to withdraw. Minute as the instance is, it is a historical illustration of the gentleness with which the genuine principles of chivalry looked down to the humble, as well as upward to the high born.—[Rowe, who was the first to give a list of the *Dramatis Personæ,* has in the present instance been uniformly followed in designating James Gurney as 'servant to Lady Faulconbridge.' Coleridge did not, I think, so understand the character. He was the first to call attention to the clearness with which in a few words the personality of Gurney is shown; and those show that the mode of address both by him and by Faulconbridge is certainly not that of young master and old servant. In the first place the master—the acknowledged elder son—would not address an attendant on his mother with so much ceremony, giving the full name and requesting his departure; secondly, an old family servant would not have addressed the master by his first name. Notice, for example, Adam's form of address to Orlando and Oliver, in *As You Like It;* it is uniformly 'young master,' 'my kind master,' or 'masters both.' Excellent as are the remarks of Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke and of Reed, it is to be remembered that they are building a romance, concerning a faithful old servitor, on information furnished not by Shakespeare, but by Rowe. All that Shakespeare shows us is that James Gurney and Philip Faulconbridge were on easy terms of friendship; they were probably young men of about the same age; Gurney is merely acting as escort to Lady Faulconbridge. Had he been her attendant would he not have preceded her to announce her coming? It was the absence of such a vaunt-courier that called forth Philip's somewhat derogatory remark.—ED.]

243. **Philip, sparrow, Iames]** POPE: Philip is a common name for a tame sparrow.—THEOBALD: [According to Pope's *Gloss.*] Faulconbrdige would say, Call me Philip? You may as well call me Sparrow. The allusion is very mean and trifling; and everybody, I believe, will choose to embrace Mr Warburton's emendation.

[243. Philip, Sparrow, Iames]

[See *Text. Notes.*] *Spare me* and *Forbear me*, it may be observed, are our author's accustomed phrases; either when any one wants another to leave him, or be rid of a displeasing subject.—WARBURTON naturally adopts this reading in his own edition, and explains it thus: 'Don't affront me with an appellation that comes from a family which I disclaim.' [It will be noticed that this is quite different from Theobald's interpretation.—ED.]—GREY (i, 277): If there's any room to alter the old readings, it should, I think, come as near the trace of the letters as possible, and might be read as follows: 'Philip—spare oh! James.' But I imagine that Shakespeare had an eye to Skelton's poem, entitled *Philip Sparowe*. Faulconbridge might resent James's freedom, in calling him plain Philip, after he had received the order of knighthood from the king. What, call me Philip without any additional title? If you call'd me Philip Sparow it would not be so contemptible, but rather add to the dignity. Skelton, after he had lamented the death of Philip Sparow, and raised a monument of praise to its memory, gives it the preference to all sparrows; and puts it upon a footing with its royal namesake, Philip of Macedon. [For Skelton's poem, see Dyce's edition, vol. i, p. 51. The Laureate's muse was ever prolific, and in the present instance his lament runs on for over thirteen hundred lines.—ED.]—CAPELL (I, pt 2, p. 120): Words can hardly explain this, but tone readily; so readily that none who has heard a sparrow call'd Philip, and attends to what is in hand, will ask for more; and if he further attends to the speaker's manner and character, he will scarce relish a change of 'sparrow' to *spare me*.—UPTON (p. 156): 'Tis not to be wonder'd that Mr Theobald should turn a deaf ear to whatever Mr Pope offers by way of criticism. [A very shrewd remark; the *Dunciad*, it will be remembered, appeared about five years before Theobald's edition.—ED.]—HEATH (p. 224): Mr Theobald and Mr Warburton concur in discarding the common reading; the first, evidently because he did not understand it, as appears from his own note; the second, because he had forgot the distinction between a Christian name and a surname, or a family name. . . . The sense of the genuine reading is: Dost call me Philip? Call a sparrow so, James, but not me for the future. The reason of this inhibition was his having been just knighted, and new christened, which, being then engaged in conversation with his mother, he had not leisure to inform the servant of. This is plainly implied in the next line.—STEEVENS: Gascoigne has likewise a poem entitled *The Praise of Philip Sparrow*, [ed. Cunliffe, i, p. 455]. Again, in *The Northern Lass*, [Brome], 1633: 'A bird whose pastime made me glad, And Philip 'twas my sparrow,' [Act III, sc. ii; ed. Pearson, p. 52]. Again, in *Magnificence*, an ancient interlude by Skelton, published by Rastell: 'With me in kepynge such a Phylyp Sparowe,' [l. 1580; ed. Dyce, p. 276.—HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS has collected other passages wherein the sparrow is given the name of Philip (see his note on the present passage in Folio ed.); but those already given are sufficient to show the prevalence of the idea that the sound of the bird's chirping resembled the name. Other bird-names derived in the same manner will readily suggest themselves.—ED.]—COLERIDGE (p. 158): Theobald adopts Warburton's conjecture of 'spare me.' O true Warburton! and the *sancta simplicitas* of honest, dull Theobald's faith in him. Nothing can be more lively or characteristic than 'Philip? Sparrow!' Had Warburton read old Skelton's *Philip Sparowe*, an exquisite and original poem, no doubt popular in Shakespeare's time, even Warburton would scarcely have made so deep a plunge into the *bathetic* as to have deathified 'sparrow' into *spare me!*—J. W. GREEN (*Notes & Queries*, 1885, VI, xi, 182):

What, I am dub'd, I haue it on my ſhoulder: 258
But mother, I am not Sir *Roberts* ſonne,
I haue diſclaim'd Sir *Robert* and my land, 260

258. *What,*] Ff, Rowe, Fleay. *Why* Pope. *Why,* Han. *What!* Theob. et cet.
dub'd] *dubb'd!* Cam.+.
ſhoulder:] *shoulder.* Cap. et seq.

260. Robert...*land,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Walker. *Robert ... land;* Cam.+. *Robert; ... land,* Fle. *Robert, ... land;* Theob. et cet.

---

received on it, and its strain has an apparent similitude to plays that are earlier; and this *John* has one as apparent to such plays of its author as preceded his *Romeo.* But this matter may have a fuller discussion. [See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne of John.*—ED.]—WARBURTON acknowledges the origin of this expression as shown by Theobald, and adds: 'But the beauty of the passage consists in his alluding, at the same time, to his high original. His father, Richard I, was surnamed Cœur-de-lion. And the *Cor Leonis,* a fixed star of the first magnitude, in the sign Leo, is called *Basilisco.*—JOHNSON'S only comment on the foregoing note by Warburton is: 'Could one have thought it!'—'Could one have thought it, indeed!' says KENRICK, Johnson's truculent reviewer, 'A mighty pretty way this of writing annotations on Shakespeare! To copy two long notes from Theobald and Warburton, and then to exclaim, concerning some conundrum of the latter, *Could one have thought it!* Neither your subscribers, nor your book-sellers, I believe, Dr Johnson, thought you would have fobbed them off so shabbily. For, indeed, when a man promised so fair, *Could one have thought it?* But perhaps this is another stroke of our editor's *wit.* It is—ha!—like enough—but, *could one have thought it?*'—[One is moved to ask if this be likewise a sample of Mr Kenrick's wit!—and also whether Warburton was gratified by his doughty champion's characterising his high-flown interpretation as a 'conundrum.'—ED.]—EDWARDS (p. 119): Warburton should have said that the *Cor Leonis* is Basiliscus, or *Regulus;* for those are the names it goes by; but then there would have been no foundation for this, which is absolutely the conundrum of a Hypercritic. The words, put out of verse, are these: *I say, like Basilisco in the play, call me* (not *knave* but) *knight, good mother.* What pretence is here for any allusion to a star; which it does not appear that Shakespeare ever knew or thought of? Or how could the Bastard be in this instance like the *Cor Leonis;* unless that star were *knighted,* which Mr Warburton will as easily prove, as what he asserts of the allusion. [Needless to say Warburton's extravagant allusion does not appear in any edition subsequent to Johnson, and no commentator other than Edwards refers to it. That Cor Leonis is the same as Cœur de Lion and that the name of the star is Basiliscus, which name appears here, is a curious coincidence and as such has but a passing interest in any note on a line in *King John.*—ED.]

258. **What**] FLEAY: 'What' is here equivalent to *Why,* not to *what!* as usually printed.—[SCHMIDT (*Lex.,* s. v. (e)) cites the present line as an example of 'what' used as 'a word of exclamation expressing surprise, exultation, or impatience.'—ED.]

260. **Sir Robert and my land**] FLEAY: I think my punctuation gives the better sense. [See *Text. Notes.* I am inclined to agree with Fleay. 'Disclaim' can hardly mean both *disavow* and *renounce;* here it seems to apply to Sir Robert alone. —ED.]

Legitimation, name, and all is gone;
Then good my mother, let me know my father,
Some proper man I hope, who was it mother?
Lady. Haſt thou denied thy ſelfe a *Faulconbridge*?
Baſt. As faithfully as I denie the deuill.
Lady. *King Richard Cordelion* was thy father,
By long and vehement ſuit I was ſeduc'd
To make roome for him in my husbands bed:
Heauen lay not my transgreſſion to my charge,
That art the iſſue of my deere offence

262. *Then*] *Then*, F_4.
263. *hope, who...*] *hope. Who...* Ktly, Neils.
264. *denied*] *deny'd* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal.
266. Cordelion] Ff, Rowe, Del. Fle. *Cœur-de-lion* Pope et cet.
267, 268. Om. Words.
267. *ſeduc'd*] *ſeduc'd*. Rlfe.
268. *To...bed*] Om. Rlfe.
269. *Heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe, Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *Heaven*, Sing. i, Coll. ii, Wh. i. *Heaven!* Knt, Coll. i, iii, Huds. i.
269. *to my*] *to thy* Sta. conj. Long MS. ap. Cam. Huds. ii.
charge,] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Coll. i, Huds. i. *charge.* Fleay. *charge!* Pope et cet.
270. *That*] F_2F_3, Knt, Coll. i, Huds. i, Del. i. *Thou* F_4 et cet.
270–289. Om. Words.

263. **who was it mother**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: No one like Shakespeare for setting straight before the imagination the very look, gesture, and tone with which a few simple words should be uttered. By the way he has written these two lines, introducing the sentence at the close, we see the son's hugging arm thrown round her, the close drawing her to him, the manly wooing voice by which he accompanies this coaxing question.

265. **denie the deuill**] Is there not here possibly a faint echo of the phrase used both in the office of baptism and in the Catechism, 'renounce the devil and all his works'? The adverb 'faithfully' is a slight corroboration.—DELIUS thinks that the word 'deny' is used by the mother in the sense *disavow* (verläugnen), and by the Bastard as meaning *abjure* (absagen Einem). That the word may bear several meanings cannot be *denied;* also that Shakespeare uses it in various ways, but here it is used in both lines simply with the sense of *disavow*.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) so takes it, explaining 'thyself a Faulconbridge,' l. 264, as the double accusative. Compare *Matthew*, xxvi, 34.—ED.

270. **That art**] KNIGHT: [The Folio reading] appears to us more in Shakespeare's manner than the customary text, *Thou art*. Lady Faulconbridge is not invoking Heaven to pardon her transgression; but she says to her son, for Heaven's sake, lay not (thou) my transgression to my charge that art the issue of it. The reply of Faulconbridge immediately deprecates any intention of upbraiding his mother.—COLLIER (ed. i.): The meaning is: Let not heaven and you, *that art* the issue of my dear offence, lay the transgression to my charge. The modern reading has generally been to make a period at 'charge,' and to begin a new sentence with 'Thou art'; but no alteration [of the text of the Folios] is required. [In his second edition Collier, having the authority of his MS. corrector, accepts the reading '*Thou art,*' which, by the way, is not a modern correction, but that of the Fourth

Which was ſo ſtrongly vrg'd paſt my defence.
Baſt. Now by this light were I to get againe,
Madam I would not wiſh a better father:
Some ſinnes doe beare their priuiledge on earth,
And ſo doth yours: your fault, was not your follie,
Needs muſt you lay your heart at his diſpoſe,
Subiected tribute to commanding loue,

271. *vrg'd*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Varr. '73, '78, '85. *vrg'd*, Cap. et cet.
272. *Now...light*] *Now,...light*, F_4 et seq.
273. *father:*] *father*. Rowe et seq.
275. *fault,*] *fault* F_3F_4 et seq.
your follie,] *you folly* F_2. *your folly*. Ktly.
277. *Subiected*] *Subjécted* Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Huds. ii.

Folio. Malone assigns it to Rowe; this, I think, misled Collier, as it has several other editors.—ED.]—STAUNTON: Some alteration was certainly required; but [*Thou*] is not satisfactory. I am half persuaded the misprint to be corrected is in the preceding line, and that we ought to read 'to *thy* charge.' She had a moment before confessed that Richard Cour-de-Lion was his father; and 'Thou art the issue' is a needless repetition of the avowal. [Hudson (ed. ii.) adopts in his text this conjecture by Staunton.]—R. G. WHITE: The whole goes to show that Lady Faulconbridge is solicitous only on her own account. [White, therefore, dismisses as 'forlorn expedients' the attempts of Knight and Collier to wrest a meaning from the Folio text by making these two lines an address to the Bastard. He explains the misprint of 'That' for *Thou* through 'y^{u} being mistaken for y^{t}.'—ED.]—DELIUS (ed. i.), retaining the reading of the Folio, connects 'That' with 'transgression.' This note he does not, however, repeat in his second edition, but with the majority of editors accepts the reading of the Fourth Folio.—MOORE-SMITH: It is possible that 'That' is right, that 'lay' in l. 269 is an imperative, and that Shakespeare wrote 'Good, lay not' (compare *Tempest*, I, i, 3), which was misread *God* and then softened to 'Heaven.'—IVOR JOHN: Evidence and probability seem equally balanced between Lady Faulconbridge's praying that she should not be punished for her transgression since she was forced into it, and praying that her transgression should not be visited upon the innocent issue of it. If we read 'That' with the Folio, then it seems necessary to read '*thy* charge,' with Staunton. Delius's [connecting 'That' with 'transgression'] is hardly so likely.

274. **Some sinnes . . . on earth**] JOHNSON: There are *sins* that whatever be determined of them above, are not much censured *on earth*.—MOBERLY: That is, Bear their own immunity on earth, on the principle, probably, that as kings may not 'cut and carve' for themselves when they marry, so they are to be allowed a little compensative freedom in wandering love.—BRANDES (i, 171): In later years, at a time when his outlook upon life was darkened, Shakespeare accounted for the villainy of Edmund in *King Lear*, and for his aloofness from anything like normal humanity, on the ground of his irregular birth; in the Bastard of this play, on the contrary, his aim was to present a picture of all that health, vigour, and full-blooded vitality which popular belief attributes to a 'love-child.'

276. **dispose**] That is, *disposal*. For other examples, see SCHMIDT (*Lex.*).

277. **Subiected**] ONIONS (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2.): Reduced to a state of subjection;

Againſt whoſe furie and vnmatched force,
The awleſſe Lion could not wage the fight,
Nor keepe his Princely heart from *Richards* hand:
He that perforce robs Lions of their hearts,
May eaſily winne a womans; aye my mother,
With all my heart I thanke thee for my father:
Who liues and dares but ſay, thou didſt not well
When I was got, Ile ſend his ſoule to hell.
Come Lady I will ſhew thee to my kinne,

278. *vnmatched*] *unmatchèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii.
280. *hand:*] F_2F_3, Dyce, Hal. Coll. iii, Huds. *hands:* F_4. *hands.* Rowe, Pope, +. *hand.* Cap. et cet.
281. *He*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+. *He,* Theob. et cet.
perforce] *per force* F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han.
282. *womans; aye*] Ff, Rowe. *woman's. Ah,* Cap. Mal. *woman's. Ay,* Pope et cet.
283. *father:*] *father.* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *father!* Cap. et seq.
285. *Ile*] *ile* F_2. *I'le* F_4.
286. *thee*] *the* F_4.

---

under the dominion or authority of another. Hence, submissive, obedient. [The present line quoted.]

280. **keepe his . . . heart from Richards hand**] PERCY: Shakespeare here alludes to the old metrical Romance of *Richard Cœur-de-Lion,* wherein this once celebrated monarch is related to have acquired his distinguishing appellation by having plucked out a lion's heart, to whose fury he was exposed by the Duke of Austria, for having slain his son with a blow of his fist. From this ancient romance the story has crept into some of our old chronicles; but the original passage may be seen at large in the introduction to the third volume of *Reliques of Ancient Poetry.* [An abstract with certain passages in full is also contained in Ellis's *Specimens of Early English Metrical Romances,* vol. ii, pp. 186–290. That portion relative to Richard's combat with the lion will be found on p. 206 et seq. Ellis, in his Introduction, says that the earliest edition is that of W. de Worde, 1509.—ED.]—GREY quotes the following account from Rastell's *Pastyme of People,* 1529: 'It is sayd that a lyon was put to kynge Rycharde, beynge in prison to have devoured hym; and when the lyon was gapynge he put his arme in his mouth, and pulled the lyon by the harte so harde that he slewe the lyon, and therefore some say he is called Rycharde Coure de Lyon. But some say he is called Coure de Lyon because of his boldenesse and hardy stomake,' [ed. Dibdin, p. 171].—FARMER: I have an old black-letter *History of Lord Faulconbridge* whence Shakespeare might pick up this circumstance.—[MALONE says that the earliest edition of this History is 1616. See *Appendix: Source of Plot.*—ED.]—MALONE: In Heywood's *Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington,* 1601, there is a long description of this fabulous achievement, [ed. Haz.-Dods., viii, 178]. The same story is told by Knighton, inter Decem Scriptores, and by Fabyan, who calls it a *fable,* [ed. Ellis, p. 304]. It probably took its rise from Hugh de Neville, one of Richard's followers, having killed a lion when they were in the Holy Land; a circumstance recorded by Matthew Paris.

283, 284, 286. **thee . . . thou . . . thee**] PAGE: Observe the use of 'you' and 'thou' in this speech. When he is speaking to her as a lady—'Madam,' [l. 273]—

And they ſhall ſay, when *Richard* me begot, 287
If thou hadſt ſayd him nay, it had beene ſinne;
Who ſayes it was, he lyes, I ſay twas not.

Exeunt. 290

289. *ſayes it was,...I ſay twas*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Cam.+. *says, it was...I say, 'twas* Theob. et cet.

---

he uses the complimentary 'you'; when he addresses her as 'mother,' he employs the familiar 'thou,' and continues it to the end of the speech.

289. **Who . . . twas not**] HALLIWELL: This is confused even to contradiction. The Bastard says that he will show his mother to his new royal kindred, and they shall say if she had said nay to Richard it would have been sin; he then adds, who says it was a sin, lies; for I say it was not. The meaning intended by the Poet is, who says the yielding to Richard was a sin, lies; I say 'twas not a sin to yield to his begetting me.—VAUGHAN (i, 10): 'Who says it was'—what was? 'I say 'twas not' —what was not? The stanza is nonsense as the last line now stands, unless, although the first 'it' before 'had been sin' must refer to 'said him nay,' the second 'it' before 'was' without any intervening antecedent be by an unwarrantable license applied to 'Richard me begot,' in the sense 'Whoever says that when Richard begot me a sin was committed.' Shakespeare unquestionably wrote 'Who says "*ay*" was, he lies; I say 'twas not.' We have the same contrast below: 'If you say ay, the king will not say no,' [III, iii, 188]. 'Aye' is constantly in the old copies printed as it was written, 'i'; 'i,' however, being mistaken for the first personal pronoun which could make no sense, or, being misread, was changed into 'it' by the simple addition of a letter. The poet's meaning is clear—'They shall declare that if you had said Richard "nay" it would have been sin, and if anyone of them maintains, on the contrary, that your saying Richard "ay" was a sin,—he lies; I say it was no sin.'—IVOR JOHN: Vaughan's suggestion seems quite un-Shakespearean. Still literally the stanza *is* nonsense in its present shape. The meaning is obvious, but we arrive at it by wresting round the 'it' in the last line to mean Lady Faulconbridge's surrender to Cœur-de-lion.—[Vaughan's suggestion is not only 'quite un-Shakespearean,' as John says, but it is, I think, far from being an 'unquestionable' reading. The first, and principal, objection to it is, that it depends wholly on the eye and not on the ear—the printed word, not the word as uttered. Would any auditor comprehend the meaning at once, and understand that the 'I' in the last line was the affirmative and not the personal pronoun? It is but necessary to repeat the line with Vaughan's emendation, as it might be uttered on the stage, to realise that the phrase would be incomprehensible in the sense Vaughan suggests. Secondly, Vaughan's explanation of the origin of the error in this line weakens, rather than strengthens, his argument; that the affirmative 'ay' was almost universally represented in print by the single letter *I*—and doubtless also in MS.—is so well known as to require no corroboration, but Vaughan would, I think, find some difficulty in furnishing an example wherein 'ay' was represented by the lower case 'i' and not the capital; the Folio text in the line he quotes from this play reads, 'If you say, I.' Ivor John's explanation of this very elliptical sentence must commend itself, although, as he says, 'the meaning is obvious.'—ED.]

Scæna Secunda.

[*Act II. scene i.*]

Enter before Angiers, Philip King of France, Lewis, Daulphin, Austria, Conſtance, Arthur. 2

1. Scæna Secunda.] Ff, Rowe i, Fleay. Act I, Scene iii. Dono. Act II, Scene i. Rowe ii. et cet.

Scene: The French King's Tent. Dono. Before the Walls of Angiers. Rowe et cet. (subs.).

2, 3. Enter...Arthur.] Ff. Enter Philip, King of France, Lewis the Dauphin, the Arch-Duke of Austria, Constance, and Arthur. Rowe,+. Drums, &c. Enter Austria, and Forces, on one side: on the other King Philip of France and his Power; Lewis, Arthur, Constance, and Attendants. Capell, Cam. +. Enter on one side, the Archduke of Austria and Forces; on the other Philip, King of France, and Forces, Lewis, Constance, Arthur and Attendants. Mal. et cet.

2, 3. Lewis, Daulphin,] Ff, Fle. Louis, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i. (throughout).

3. Austria,] Anstria Booth reprint, Furnivall (Old Spel. Sh.).

1. **Scæna Secunda**] In the Folios this is the second scene of Act I, but as all modern editions subsequent to Rowe ii. make this the first scene of Act II, this latter arrangement is here adopted merely in order to facilitate reference to the modern editions.—ED.

Act II. scene i.] F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Cens.*, ii, 156): We apprehend the play would have begun with much more propriety at this period, and there is not a single passage in the First Act, save King John's reply to Chatillion, that could cause taste or judgment to lament the omission of it.—BOSWELL-STONE (p. 51): The historic time of Acts II. and III. extends to nearly three years, beginning at the interview of John and Philip 'on the morrow after the feast of the assumption of our ladie' (August 16), 1199, and ending 'on Lammas daie' (August 1), 1202, when Arthur was taken prisoner by John.—MOORE-SMITH: In spite of the fact that in the opening scene of the play Arthur's claim is represented as a just one, and John as a usurper, the present scene by no means enlists sympathy on behalf of Arthur's supporters. The very words in which Philip [Lewis] introduces Austria as the cause of the early death of Richard Cordelion are as a warning to the audience not to find their heroes here.

2. **Angiers**] 'Angers, or Angiers, anciently Juliomagus, Andegavum, and Andes, the capital of the government of Anjou, in France, situated a little above the place where the little rivers Loire and Sarte fall into the Maynne; which last river divides this city into two parts. Its ancient name it had from Julius Cæsar, who built it.... The first walls of this city were raised by John, surnamed Lackland, who was king of England, and Duke of Anjou. But Prince Lewis, son of King Philip Augustus, and afterwards King Lewis VIII, demolished these walls. His son and successor, St. Lewis, built them up again in the manner in which they still are; and besides these, it is surrounded with antique fortifications.'—*Shakespeare Illustrated*, vol. i, p. 79.—MOBERLY: Shakespeare well divines the character of this city, the cradle of the Plantagenets, warlike and powerful, a bulwark of France against the Dukes of Bretagne. M. Michelet remarks that its architecture even now shows

Lewis. Before *Angiers* well met braue *Auſtria,* 4

4, 21. Lewis.] K. Phi. Theob. conj. (Nichols, ii, 388), Dyce ii, iii, Col. iii, Huds. ii, Wh. ii, Words. Dono. Craig.

4. Auſtria,] Ff, Rowe i. Austria! Huds. ii. Austria. Rowe ii. et cet.

traces of this character, the walls of its cathedral being covered not with sculptured saints, but with armed warriors.

4. Lewis] THEOBALD (*Nichols*, ii, 388): Why does the Dauphin take upon him to anticipate his father in welcoming Austria, and his father here in presence? I doubt not but this speech should be placed to King Philip.—[This conjecture, made in a letter to Warburton in 1729, Theobald did not repeat in either his first or second editions.—ED.]—COLLIER (ed. ii.): It has been suggested, with some plausibility, that the King of France ought to open this scene, and that such is usually the case when Shakespeare introduces a king on the stage. This rule is by no means without exception, and, of course, we do not feel authorised upon mere speculation to alter the invariable regulation of the Folios.—[In his ed. iii. Collier assigns this and the next speech, l. 21, to Philip, and says that the prefix '*Lewis*' is doubtless an error, since the tenor of this speech and others shows that it belongs to Philip and not to Lewis.—ED.]—W. W[ILLIAMS] (*Parthenon*, 16 August, 1862, p. 506): This speech is given to *Lewis*, although the line 'At *our* importance hither is he come' is alone sufficient to show to whom it should belong. Again, after a few words from Arthur to the Duke, Lewis patronisingly commends him as 'A noble *boy*.' Yet we know that these young princes were about the same age and had been educated together. This blind adherence to the prefixes of the Folio (elsewhere admittedly most inaccurate) appears to have arisen from Shakespeare having crowded into this drama the events of several years. In the later acts Lewis plays a conspicuous part and heads the invasion of England; but at the period in question he was a mere youth, and was evidently so considered by the dramatist. If we read the whole of this scene carefully we can hardly fail to perceive that Lewis is not intended to speak until called upon to express his sentiments with regard to marrying the Lady Blanch. When King John proposes the marriage to King Philip, the latter addresses his son by 'What say'st thou, boy?' and King John afterwards asks 'What say these *young* ones?' How, consistently with real or dramatic decorum, could a 'beardless boy,' 'a cockered silken wanton,' as Lewis is described by Faulconbridge, be *the first* to welcome the Duke of Austria before Angiers, and this in the presence of his father, the King of France? The first speech given to King Philip in the received text commences with 'Well, then, to work,' and implies that he had previously spoken. With a few unimportant exceptions Shakespeare invariably makes his monarchs and great personages open and conclude the dialogue whenever they appear. This further exception in *King John* would be a strange and most suspicious instance of the reverse. I may add, too, that in the old play, *The Troublesome Raigne*, the corresponding speech is assigned, and with undeniable propriety, to King Philip.—[On the authority of Dyce the Shakespearean notes in *The Parthenon* (a weekly publication discontinued in 1863) are assigned to Mr W. W. Williams. The name does not appear in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, in *Allibone's Dictionary of Authors*, or in Jaggard's *Bibliography*.—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: In our previous editions we left the speech assigned [as in the Folio] under the impression that the forward part taken elsewhere by the Dauphin in the French political procedure warranted

[4. Lewis]

the assumption that here he takes the initiative, even in his father's presence. But on more mature consideration of the whole question (besides bearing in mind the frequent errors in prefixes made by the Folio), we think there is little doubt that King Philip is the speaker here. The expression 'At our importance hither is he come,' which we imagined might be spoken by Lewis in his royal father's name and his own, is, we confess, more consistent with the regal style put by Shakespeare into the mouths of his monarchs. Moreover, the word 'boy,' addressed to Arthur, makes for the belief that it is the French king who speaks, and not Lewis; since the latter is himself called by his father 'boy' further on in this same scene, and one so young would probably not use this epithet. The same argument applies to the next speech but one—'A noble boy'—which has also the prefix '*Lewis*' in the Folio, but which, from its tone of protection, seems properly to belong to the king.—FLEAY (*Introd.*, p. 28): In this scene, ll. 4–204, the King of France is called '*Lewis*' in the text, l. 153, and in the prefixed names, lines 4, 21, 160. In this scene only are some of his speeches assigned to *King* simply. Editors have tried emendation unsuccessfully. They either make *Lewis* two syllables, or *Philip* one; neither of which are admissible in the metre of this play. It seems more reasonable to infer that these two hundred lines and also III, ii, 1–10 were inserted hurriedly after the rest of the play had been written. This would also account for the confusion in the division into acts and scenes. The metrical test, which shows only two rhymes in these two hundred lines, and no rhyme in III, ii, confirms this conjecture; and when we consider that the passage alluding to the English fleet of 1596 (ll. 76–79) is also contained in these lines, I feel little doubt that these subsequent insertions were made after Hamnet's death, and that the blunders of *Philip* for *Richard* and *Lewis* for *Philip* are to be attributed to the confusion caused by grief in Shakespeare's mind. None but those who have had to write compulsorily under similar bereavements can tell how errors do creep in at such times. That the errors remained uncorrected causes no difficulty, for this play was not printed during Shakespeare's life, and its probable revivals in 1611 and 1622 took place after his retirement from the theatre, according to the most probable chronology, which gives 1611 for the production of his last complete play; the two plays produced afterwards being finished by Fletcher. The excision of the character of Essex from this play may also have been made after August, 1596, and with the same want of care; which would account for his name being left in the prefix to I, i, 51.—BRANDES (i, 174): All the scenes in which Arthur appears are contained in the older play, and, among the rest, the first scene of Act II, which seems to dispose of Fleay's conjecture that the first two hundred lines were hastily inserted after Shakespeare had lost his son. Nevertheless almost all that is gracious and touching in the figure is due to the great reviser. [See III, iv, 98 and notes thereon. —ED.]—Miss C. PORTER: The main dramatic object is to let the audience know the relation of Austria to Richard the Lionheart, and thereby to Faulconbridge, as well as to Arthur. But the most skilful way is to give the information to one in the play who does not know its relation to himself, and also to make this subsidiary matter a mere preliminary to the main business,—the attack on Angiers, the hearing of Chatillion, the reception of John, etc.,—in all of which the King leads necessarily. By means of this change [from King Philip, as in the older play, to Lewis], moreover, the two new characters of whom the audience has before heard nothing—Lewis and Austria—are both at once introduced and time

Arthur that great fore-runner of thy bloud,
Richard that rob'd the Lion of his heart,
And fought the holy Warres in *Paleſtine*,
By this braue Duke came early to his graue:

5. Arthur] Ff. Arthur! Pope,+. Arthur, Rowe et cet.

is saved. Shakespeare's speaker is not 'welcoming Austria,' but bidding little Arthur to welcome him, and the speech is recast [from the older play] to suit abridgement and new uses.

4. Before Angiers . . . Austria] ROSE (*Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1880, p. 49): If we want to be sure of Shakespeare's method of work we cannot do better than look at him actually in the workshop; not creating beings of his own, but improving, dovetailing together, planing down, or filling out other men's faulty work; adapting old plays, that is, and putting any amount of honest toil into the business. . . . Take a very small example: In reading the old *Troublesome Raigne of John* it struck me that after the first scene, when all the English characters had gone off and the French came on, the audience must be puzzled, for the first dozen lines or so, to know where they were and whom they had before them. It was a small enough matter, and the uncertainty would not last very long; yet I thought I would see whether Shakespeare was more or less careful in such things. I found that in his *King John* the very first line spoken on the entry of the French was this: 'Before Angiers well met, brave Austria!' In six words the place and person were set before the audience!

4. Angiers] B. DAWSON (*Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1887, p. 172), in speaking of Shakespeare's accentuation of proper nouns, shows that the accent is on the first syllable of Angiers in all cases where it occurs in this play, and he 'therefore claims "Angiers" as a Spondee in the present line. It consists of Iamb, three Spondees, Iamb; for as beat falling upon the *a* of "Austria" (which has neither accent nor emphasis) indisputably makes the line end in an Iamb, so surely may beat falling upon the *-giers* of *Angiers* (also without accent or emphasis) make it a Spondee.'—[It is, I think, reasonable to suppose that the *g* is here soft, as in the somewhat similar name Algiers.—ED.]

5. fore-runner of thy bloud] WRIGHT: By some strange carelessness Shakespeare here makes Arthur in the direct line of descent from Richard. [See note by MOBERLY, l. 16.]

6. rob'd the Lion of his heart] See note on I, i, 280.

8. By this braue Duke] CAPELL (i, pt 1, p. 121): A great falsification of history; and a wilful one certainly, for the purpose of blending two characters, and giving spirit to the Bastard's resentment which follows presently. Richard's chronicle story,—so much of it as concerns the explanation of Shakespeare,—is this: That, in his return from the Palestine wars, he was drove ashore on an enemy's country—the Duke of Austria—was discover'd by him and imprison'd, but purchas'd his liberty at last by a great ransom, his imprisoner dying soon after by a fall from his horse; that, warring some years after in France, he was kill'd by an arrow before the castle of a vicount of Lymoges, which vicount in some other encounter was kill'd by the Bastard. . . . Shakespeare revives Austria, and makes him Lymoges too; brings him so intitl'd to Angiers in the spoil of his prisoner, whose death he attributes to him, and kills him then by the Bastard in revenge of that death.—

And for amends to his poſteritie,
At our importance hether is he come,
To ſpread his colours boy, in thy behalfe,
And to rebuke the vſurpation
Of thy vnnaturall Vncle, Engliſh *Iohn*,
Embrace him, loue him, giue him welcome hether.
Arth. God ſhall forgiue you *Cordelions* death
The rather, that you giue his off-ſpring life,
Shadowing their right vnder your wings of warre:

9. *And*] *And*, Cap. et seq.
10, 14. *hether*] Fl. *hither* Ff. et cet.
10. *is he*] *he has* Words.
12. *vsurpation*] *usurpatïon* Fle.
13. *Vncle*,] *Uncle* F_3F_4.
Iohn,] Ff. John. Rowe,+, Ktly, Del. Neils. John: Cap. et cet.
15. Cordelions] F_2F_3. Cordelion's F_4, Rowe, Del. Fle. *Cœur-de-lion's* Pope et cet.
16. *rather, that*] *rather that* F_4, Rowe i, Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. ii.
17. *their*] *his* Coll. MS.

STEEVENS: The old play, [*The Troublesome Raigne*], led Shakespeare into this error of ascribing to the Duke of Austria the death of Richard. [*Ibid.*, note on III, i, 44.] In the person of Austria Shakespeare has conjoined the two well-known enemies of Cœur-de-lion. Leopold, Duke of Austria, threw him into prison in a former expedition (in 1193); but the castle of Chaluz, before which he fell (in 1199), belonged to Vidomar, viscount of Limoges; and the archer who pierced his shoulder with an arrow (of which wound he died) was Bertrand de Gourdon. The editors seem hitherto to have understood Lymoges as being an appendage to the title of Austria, and therefore enquired no further about it. Austria in the old play (printed in 1591) is called Lymoges, the Austrich duke. With this note I was favoured by . . . my friend Henry Blake, Esq.—MALONE: Harding says, in his *Chronicle*, that the cause of the quarrel was Richard's taking down the Duke of Austria's arms and banner, which he had set up above those of the King of France and the King of Jerusalem. The affront was given when they lay before Acre in Palestine, [ed. Ellis, p. 264]. Fabian says that Richard 'toke from a knighte of the Duke of Ostrich the sayd dukis banner, & in despyte of the sayd duke, trade it under foote, and dyd unto it all the despyte he myght,' [ed. Ellis, p. 301]. This circumstance is alluded to in the old *King John*, where the Bastard, after killing Austria, says: 'And as my father triumph'd in thy spoils, And trod thine ensigns underneath his feet.'

10. **importance**] JOHNSON: That is, *importunity*. Compare: 'Maria writ The letter at Sir Toby's great importance.'—*Twelfth Night*, V, i, 371.—[According to SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) these are the only examples of Shakespeare's use of 'importance' in this sense.—ED.]

16. **off-spring**] DELIUS thinks that by 'off-spring' Arthur here means not himself, but rather the whole of Richard's family collectively, as is shown by the use of 'their' in the next line.—MOBERLY: Of course Arthur was only nephew to Richard I, not his 'offspring.' Yet Shakespeare is only following the style of official documents in which kings are held to be *descended* from their predecessors. So even Henry VII. repeatedly speaks of 'our royal progenitor, King Edward the Fourth.'

17. **Shadowing**] WRIGHT: That is, *sheltering*. Compare: 'Behold, the Assyrian

I giue you welcome with a powerleſſe hand,
But with a heart full of vnſtained loue,
Welcome before the gates of *Angiers* Duke.

Lewis. A noble boy, who would not doe thee right?

Auſt. Vpon thy cheeke lay I this zelous kiſſe,
As ſeale to this indenture of my loue:
That to my home I will no more returne
Till *Angiers*, and the right thou haſt in *France*,
Together with that pale, that white-fac'd ſhore,
Whoſe foot ſpurnes backe the Oceans roaring tides,
And coopes from other lands her Ilanders,
Euen till that *England* hedg'd in with the maine,
That Water-walled Bulwarke, ſtill ſecure

18. *powerleſſe*] *pow'rless* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

19. *vnſtained*] *unstainèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *unstrained* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *unfeignèd* Bailey (ii, 244).

20. Angiers] Angiers, F_4.

21. *A noble boy,*] Ff, Rowe i, Fle. *A noble boy!* Rowe ii. et cet.

23. *As*] *A.* Johns. Var. '73.

25, 29, 32, 33, 36. *Till*] *'Till* Rowe, Pope, Han. Cap. Var. '78, '85.

28. *Ilanders*] *Iſlanders* F_3F_4.

29, 32. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Fle.

29. England] England, F_4.

30. *Water-walled*] *water-wallèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.

---

was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud.'—*Ezekiel*, xxxi, 3. So 'shadow' is used in the sense of shelter, protection in *2 Henry IV:* 'Alack what mischiefs might he set abroach In shadow of such greatness!'—IV, ii, 14.

17, 18. **their right . . . powerlesse hand**] THÜMMEL (*Jahrbuch*, x, p. 8) points out that this is Arthur's only attempt at politics as an heir to the throne, and, even so, the young Prince hastens to modify the slight force of his greeting by words which are anything but political, inasmuch as he asserts his own lack of power.

19. **vnstained**] COLLIER (*Notes & Emend.*, p. 201): The love of such a child would, of course, be 'unstained'; what he meant to say, according to the MS. Corrector, was that he bade Austria welcome with a heart full of love, which without effort flowed from it: 'with a heart full of *unstrained* love.'—SINGER (ed. ii.): The antithesis of the hand without *power*, but love without *stain*, is both lucid and forcible. Collier's MS. Corrector substitutes *unstrained*, which, in the sense of *unconstrained*, would be plausible, but Shakespeare twice applies *strained* to love and to faith and troth as expressive of *purity;* the implied sense is, therefore, not suitable to Shakespeare's phraseology.—DYCE (ed. ii, p. 78): Against [the MS. Corrector's] very plausible alteration Mr Knight (*Spec. of the Stratford Shakspere*, p. 2) has adduced from *Pericles:* 'my unspotted fire of love.'—I, i, 53. Compare, too, a passage of the present play: 'And the like tender of our love we make, To rest without a spot for evermore.'—V, vii, 115. [The above quotation from *Pericles* Knight did not include among the *Various Readings* when the Stratford Shakspere was published in 1854. The *Specimen* appeared in 1853; and was later issued, with some additional matter, under the title *Old Lamps or New?*—ED.]

26–31. **that white-fac'd shore . . . forreine purposes**] IVOR JOHN: This speech

And confident from forreine purpoſes,
Euen till that vtmoſt corner of the Weſt
Salute thee for her King, till then faire boy
Will I not thinke of home, but follow Armes.
Conſt. O take his mothers thanks, a widdows thanks,
Till your ſtrong hand ſhall helpe to giue him ſtrength,
To make a more requitall to your loue.
Auſt. The peace of heauen is theirs y lift their swords
In ſuch a iuſt and charitable warre.
King. Well, then to worke our Cannon ſhall be bent

31. *forreinc*] *forraine* F_2. *forrain.* *forcign* F_4.
32. *vtmoſt*] *outmoſt* F_4. Rowe,+.
33. *King,*] Ff, Pope,+. *King;* Rowe et cet.
35. *O take*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *O! take* Coll. Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh! take* Ktly. *O, take* Theob. et cet.
38. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73), Fle.
y] *who* F_4, Rowe,+. *that* F_2F_3 et cet.
40. King.] K. Philip. Rowe et seq. (subs.).
then to worke] F_2F_3. *then to work,* F_4. *then, to work,* Rowe. *then to work,* Pope. *then, to work.* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. ii, Del. Rlfe, Dono. *then, to work!* Neils. *then, to work;* Theob. et cet.
Cannon] *engines* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

recalls Gaunt's dying words in *Richard II*, and may have some bearing on the question of the dating of *King John* and *Richard II*.

31. forreine purposes] MOBERLY: In 1599, which was certainly *about* the time when this play was written, great preparations were being made against a new invasion from Spain, from which the Spaniards hoped better things than had come from the Armada eleven years before. Probably the burst of patriotism from Leopold's lips may be due to Shakespeare's feeling about the invasion, and introduced into the play some time after its first composition.

35. a widdows thanks] MALONE: This was not the fact. Constance was at this time married to a third husband, Guido, brother to the Viscount of Touars. She had been divorced from her second husband, Ranulph, Earl of Chester.

36. shall helpe] For other examples of the future tense used where we should use the infinitive or subjunctive, see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 348.

37. a more requitall] That is, *a greater*. For other examples, see Shakespeare *passim*.—DELIUS says that a more rational construction is here to consider 'more' as composite directly connected with 'requital,' as in 'her best is better'd with a more delight.'—*Ven. & Ad.*, l. 10.

40. Cannon] See note on I, i, 31.

40. bent] WRIGHT: That is, *aimed, directed*. The terms of archery were applied to other weapons than the bow. So of a cannon, as here, in *3 Henry VI*: 'To bend the fatal instruments of war Against his brother and his lawful king.'—V, i, 87. And in Stow's *Annales*: 'The same night, and the next morning, he bent seauen great peeces of Ordinance Culuerings, and Demi Canons, full against the foote of the Bridge and against Southwarke.' Also of a sword, as in *Richard III*: 'Queen Margaret saw Thy murderous falchion smoking in his blood; The which thou once didst bend against her breast.'—I, ii, 95.

Againſt the browes of this reſiſting towne,
Call for our cheefeſt men of diſcipline,
To cull the plots of best aduantages:
Wee'll lay before this towne our Royal bones,
Wade to the market-place in *French*-mens bloud,
But we will make it ſubiect to this boy.
Con. Stay for an anſwer to your Embaſſie,
Leſt vnaduis'd you ſtaine your ſwords with bloud,
My Lord *Chattilion* may from *England* bring
That right in peace which heere we vrge in warre,
And then we ſhall repent each drop of bloud,
That hot raſh haſte ſo indirectly ſhedde.

41. *towne,*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Huds. ii. *town.*— Cap. et cet.
43. *aduantages:*] *advantages.* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. i, ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Rlfe, Dono.
44. *Wee'll*] *We'l* F_3. *We'll* F_4.
45. French-*mens*] F_2F_3. *French-mens'* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *Frenchmen's* Cap. et seq.
45, 51. *bloud*] *blood* F_3F_4.
48. *bloud,*] *blood,* F_3F_4. *blood.* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Rlfe, Neils. Craig.
49. Chattilion] Ff, Rowe. *Chatilion* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *Chatillion* Cap. Var. '73, Ktly, Fle. *Chatillon* Johns. et cet.
52. *indirectly*] *indiscreetly* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Sing. ii, Ktly.

43. **To cull . . . aduantages**] HENLEY: That is, to mark such stations as might most over-awe the town.—WRIGHT: To select the positions which are most favourable for attack.

46. **But we will make it**] That is, *unless* or *except* we make it. Compare, perhaps, 'No jocund health that Denmark drinks today, But the great cannons to the clouds shall tell.'—*Hamlet,* I, ii, 126.

52. **indirectly**] COLLIER (*Notes & Emend.*, etc., p. 201): The MS. corrector says that we ought to read, 'indiscreetly shed.' Nevertheless, our great Poet sometimes uses 'indirectly' in a peculiar manner.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 84) rather grudgingly admits that this change is to be commended as having the 'character of correction of a printer's error.'—ANON. (*Blackwood's Maga.*, Sept., 1853, p. 304): 'Indirectly' is Shakespeare's word. The MS. corrector suggests *indiscreetly*—a most unhappy substitution, which we are surprised that the generally judicious Mr Singer should approve of. *Indiscreetly* means imprudently, inconsiderately. 'Indirectly' means *wrongfully, iniquitously,* as may be learnt from these lines in *Henry V,* where the French king is denounced as a usurper, and is told that Henry 'bids you then resign Your crown and kingdom indirectly held From him the native and true challenger.'—III, i, 275. It was certainly the purpose of Constance to condemn the rash shedding of blood as something worse than indiscreet—as criminal and unjust—and this she did by the term 'indirectly' in the Shakespearean sense of that word.—[On the authority of Furnivall this anonymous review of Collier's volume has been ascribed to W. N. Lettsom (*N. & Q.*, 1877, V, vii, 224); but evidently through some error, since Dyce, who in his second ed. gives several notes by Lettsom, also quotes from these remarks made by the anonymous reviewer.

Enter Chattilion. 53

King. A wonder Lady : lo vpon thy wiſh
Our Meſſenger *Chattilion* is arriu'd, 55
What *England* ſaies, ſay breefely gentle Lord,
We coldly pauſe for thee, *Chatilion* ſpeake, 57

54. *wonder Lady: lo*] *wonder, Lady; lo* F_4. *wonder, Lady! lo!* Rowe, Ktly. *wonder, Lady! lo,* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Cap. *wonder, lady: lo,* Fle. *wonder, lady!—Lo,* Johns. et cet.

55. Chattilion] Rowe. Chattillion F_2-F_3. Chattillon F_4. *Chatilion* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *Chatillion* Cap. Var. '73, Ktly, Fle. *Chatillon* Johns. et cet.

55. *arriu'd,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *arriv'd!* Dyce, Hal. Cam. +, Rlfe, Words. Neils. *arrived.*—Johns. et cet.

57. *thee,*] *thee.* Rowe, Pope,+. *thee;* Cap. et seq.

Chatilion] Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Chatillion Ff, Cap. Var. '73, Ktly, Fle. *Chattilion* Rowe. *Chatillon* Johns. et cet.

In the present instance, after giving the foregoing comment, Dyce quotes the following by Lettsom: 'Read *indiscreetly* with Collier's Corrector. Staunton would have it that "indirectly" may mean *wrongfully;* but *wrongfully* would make much more sense here than *indiscreetly.*' It will be seen that this is in complete contradiction to the opinion of the anonymous reviewer.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar,* p. 298): There can be no doubt of the propriety of the correction ['indiscreetly']. The *Constable* begs them to 'stay for an answer,' 'lest *unadvised*' they stain their swords with blood; and, in addition to this, the use of 'so' indicates that *indiscreetly* and not 'indirectly' was the word. 'That rash, hot haste so indirectly shed' is not sense. The typographical error might easily have been made.—[Is it not passing strange that so careful and conscientious an editor as White should herein make such a curious blunder as to ascribe this speech to the *'Constable'?* There is, of course, no such character in the whole play as the Constable of France which was evidently in White's mind; he was misled doubtless by the prefix *Const.* It will also be noticed that he quotes the line 'That rash, hot,' etc., whereas it reads: 'hot, rash.' In his edition a few years later White explains 'so indirectly' as here meaning 'so from the purpose, so extravagantly, and therefore wantonly'; and characterises the correction *indiscreetly* as 'a somewhat plausible emendation.' —ED.]—IVOR JOHN: 'Indirectly' generally means *underhandedly* in Shakespeare. Compare: 'Indirectly and directly too Thou hast contrived against the very life.' —*Mer. of Ven.,* IV, i, 359. The meaning here is nearer to *indiscreetly* than to *underhandedly,* although precipitating a fight before the return of a possibly peaceful answer from the opponent might be called 'indirection' by an honourable soldier. Cotgrave has '*Indirectement:* in-directly . . . by unfit means.'

54. **A wonder Lady**] JOHNSON: The wonder is only that Chatillon happened to arrive at the moment when Constance mentioned him; which the French king, according to a superstition which prevails more or less in every mind agitated by great affairs, turns into a miraculous interposition, or omen of good.

57. **coldly**] MOBERLY: That is, in unwilling inaction (not in the mere sense of *tranquilly*).—WRIGHT: Calmly, without passion or feverish impatience. Compare *Rom. & Jul.,* 'Either withdraw unto some private place, And reason coldly of your grievances, Or else depart.'—III, i, 55. And *Much Ado:* 'Bear it coldly but till midnight, and let the issue show itself.'—III, ii, 132.

Chat. Then turne your forces from this paltry ſiege,
And ſtirre them vp againſt a mightier taske:
England impatient of your iuſt demands,
Hath put himſelfe in Armes, the aduerſe windes
Whoſe leiſure I haue ſtaid, haue giuen him time
To land his Legions all as ſoone as I:
His marches are expedient to this towne,
His forces ſtrong, his Souldiers confident:
With him along is come the Mother Queene,
An Ace ſtirring him to bloud and ſtrife,

58. *paltry*] *paultry* F_4, Rowe,+.
59. *taske:*] *task.* F_4, Rowe et seq.
60. England] England, F_4, Rowe et seq.
61. *Armes,*] Ff, Rowe. *arms.* Dono. Neils. *arms;* Pope et cet.
62. *ſtaid*] *stay'd* Cap. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Del. Fle. *stayed* Dono.
giuen] *giv'n* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Fle.
63. *as I:*] *as I.* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Dono.
65. *confident:*] *confident.* Rowe et seq.
66. *Mother Queene*] *Mother-Queen* F_4 et seq.
67. *An*] *As* Coll. MS.
Ace] *Ate* Rowe, Cap. Glo. Wh. ii, Neils. Craig. *Até* Wh. i, Huds. *Até,* Pope et cet.
ſtrife,] Ff, Rowe ii. *strife.* Rowe i, Pope,+. *strife;* Cap. et cet.

64. **expedient**] That is, *quick, expeditious.* Compare l. 239 below, and for other examples, see SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. b.).

67. **An Ace**] STEEVENS: 'Até' [see *Text. Notes*] was the Goddess of Revenge This image might have been borrowed from the celebrated libel, called *Leicester's Commonwealth,* originally published about 1584: 'She standeth like a fiend or fury, at the elbow of her Amadis, to stirre him forward when occasion shall serve.'—[ed. 1641, p. 91. Seyffert (*Dict. of Classical Ant.*, ed. Nettleship, Sandys, s. v. *Ate*) says: 'According to Homer, the daughter of Zeus; according to Hesiod, of *Eris* or Strife. She personifies infatuation; the infatuation being generally held to imply guilt as its cause, and evil as its consequence. . . . In later times Até is transformed into an avenger of unrighteousness, like *Diké, Erinys,* and *Nemesis.*'—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 274) remarks that the corruption of *t* into *c* is frequent in old books, giving as examples the present line and 'Thus placed in habiliments of war,' for *plated.*—*Richard II*, Folio, p. 25, col. 2.—CRAIK (p. 299), in a note on *Jul. Caes.*, III, i, 271, 'With Até by his side,' says that 'this Homeric goddess had evidently taken a strong hold on Shakespeare's imagination'; in corroboration Craik quotes the present line from *King John* and 'You shall find her the infernal Até in good apparel.'—*Much Ado,* II, i, 263; also, 'More Atés, more Atés; stir them on! stir them on!'—*Love's Labour's,* V, ii, 694. 'Where,' asks Craik, 'did Shakespeare get acquainted with this divinity, whose name does not occur, I believe, even in any Latin author?'—[In the note on 'Até in good apparel,' *Much Ado,* this edition, the EDITOR, after giving the foregoing note by Craik, suggests that Shakespeare '*might* have learned about Até in Spenser,' and W. A. WRIGHT quotes from *The Faerie Queene,* IV, i, 19–30, wherein the description of Até and her dwelling occurs. Ate is mentioned several times throughout this Book of *The Faerie Queene,* and always as the instigator of strife and turmoil, as thus: 'Her

With her her Neece, the Lady *Blanch of Spaine*,
With them a Baſtard of the Kings deceaſt,
And all th'vnfetled humors of the Land,
Raſh, inconſiderate, fiery voluntaries,
With Ladies faces, and fierce Dragons ſpleenes,
Haue ſold their fortunes at their natiue homes,
Bearing their birth-rights proudly on their backs,

69. *Kings*] *King* Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Steev. Var. '03, '13, Huds. ii.
deceaſt] *deceaſ'd* F_3F_4, Rowe et seq.
70. *th'vnſetled*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. *the unsettl'd* Cap. *the unsettled* Var. '73 et cet.
71–75. *Raſh...heere:*] Om. Donovan.
71, 72. In parentheses Ktly, Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Huds.
71. *inconſiderate*] *inconsid'rate* Pope, +.
fiery] *firy* Mal. Steev. Var. '21.
voluntaries] *Volunteers* F_4, Rowe i.
72. *Ladies...Dragons*] *ladies'...dragons'* Theob. ii. et seq.
74. *birth-rights*] F_2, Cap. *birth-right* F_3F_4. *birthright* Rowe, Pope, Han. *birthrights* Theob. et cet.

---

name was Até, mother of debate And all dissension, which dayly grow Amongst fraile men, that many a publike state And many a priuate oft doth ouerthrow.'—ed. Grosart, IV, i, ll. 168–171; again, 'Thereto him Até stird, new discord to maintaine.'—Ibid., v, l. 203. This last is quite apposite to the present line in *King John*. Até is one of the *Dramatis Personæ* in *Locrine*, 1595, and there enacts the part of Chorus at the beginning of each Act and speaks the final speech as an Epilogue. In the note on the passage from *Jul. Cæs.* (quoted above) in this edition I hazarded the conjecture that Shakespeare may have obtained his knowledge of Até from a passage in Chapman's translation of Homer's *Iliad*, Bk xix, ll. 91–94; this, I now see, is quite untenable. The first seven books were translated in 1598, but the whole of the work did not appear until 1611, which is too late either for any reference in *Jul. Cæs.* or in the present play. I therefore now incline to regard Spenser as the likely source of Shakespeare's knowledge on this point.—ED.]—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 84): The correction of 'An Ace' to *An Até*, which had been set right since Rowe's time, is certainly not improved by being changed to *As Até* [by the MS. Corrector].

69. **With them . . . deceast]** MALONE: This line except the word 'With' is borrowed from the old play, *The Troublesome Raigne*, [see *Appendix*, p. 483, l. 68]. Our author should have written *king*. But there is certainly no corruption, for we have the same phraseology elsewhere. [Compare *Pericles:* 'She was of Tyrus the king's daughter.'—IV, iv, 39.]

74–79. **Bearing . . . Christendome]** MALONE (*Chronological Order*, etc., Var. '21, vol. i, p. 312): Perhaps the description contained in these lines was immediately suggested to Shakespeare by the grand fleet which was sent against Spain in 1596. It consisted of eighteen of the largest of the Queen's ships, three of the Lord Admiral's, and above one hundred and twenty merchant ships and victuallers, under the command of the Earls of Nottingham and Essex. The regular land forces on board amounted to ten thousand; and there was also a large body of *voluntaries* (as they were then called) under the command of Sir Edward Winkfield. Many of the nobility went on this expedition, which was destined against Cadiz. The

To make a hazard of new fortunes heere:
In briefe, a brauer choyſe of dauntleſſe ſpirits
Then now the *Engliſh* bottomes haue waft o're,
Did neuer flote vpon the ſwelling tide,
To doe offence and ſcathe in Chriſtendome:
The interruption of their churliſh drums

75. *heere:*] Ff, Rowe, Dyce, Cam. *here.* Pope et cet.
76. *choyſe*] *Choice* F_4.
77. *Then*] *Than* F_4.
79. *ſcathe*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce ii, iii, Col. iii, Huds. ii, Words. Craig. *scath* Cap. et cet.
79. *Chriſtendome:*] *christendom.* Rowe et seq.

---

fleet sailed from Plymouth on the third of June, 1596; before the end of that month the great Spanish armada was destroyed, and the town of Cadiz was sacked and burned. . . . Many of our old historians speak of the splendor and magnificence displayed by the noble and gallant adventurers who served in this expedition.

74. **birth-rights . . . on their backs]** JOHNSON: So in *Henry VIII:* '—many Have broke their backs with laying manors on them.'—I, i, 84.—[UPTON, whose *Remarks on three of Jonson's Plays* appeared in 1749, quotes (p. 65) the present passage as an allusion to the expedition of 1596, comparing it to one in *Epicœne:* 'I had as fair a gold jerkin on that day, as any was worne in the iland-voyage, or at Cadiz.'—I, iv. (ed. Gifford, p. 362). It is but fair, I think, to give Malone the benefit of the doubt that he was not aware of his having been thus anticipated.—ED.]—STAUNTON (*Introd.*, p. 391), in commenting upon the foregoing observation by Malone, which he, however, ascribes to Johnson, says: 'We must be cautious in attaching particular meaning to descriptions which would apply with equal truth to almost any expedition. The fleet which the Earls of Nottingham and Essex led against Cadiz was not the only one which had been partly manned by gentlemen. History furnishes too many instances where men "Have sold their fortunes at their native homes" that they might participate in adventures of a similar kind; and Shakespeare may have derived the materials of Chatillon's description from the chronicles of different periods and various countries.'—[The same idea occurs in Gascoigne's *Epilogus* to the *Steele Glas*, 1575: 'The elder sorte, go stately stalking on, And on their backs, they beare both land and fee, Castles and Towres, revenewes and receits, Lordships and manours, fines, yea fermes and al.' (ed. Cunliffe, i, 173). —Marshall likewise furnishes a passage from Burton, *Anat. of Melan.*, ''tis an ordinary thing to put a thousand okes, and an hundred oxen into a suit of apparel; to wear a whole manour on his back.'—Part iii, Sec. 2, Mem. 3, Subs. 3.—ED.]

77. **waft]** For other examples of the past tenses and participles of verbs ending in *t*, where the present remains unaltered, see WALKER, *Crit.*, ii, p. 324 et seq., or ABBOTT, § 242. Compare 'The iron of itself though heat red hot.'—IV, i, 69.

79. **scathe]** That is, *harm, injury.* Compare 'To pray for them that have done scathe to us.'—*Rich. III:* I, iii, 317.

80. **churlish drums]** WRIGHT: The same epithet is applied to the drum in *Venus & Adonis:* 'Scorning his churlish drum and ensign red.'—l. 107.

80. **drums]** MOBERLY: As Shakespeare introduces drums at Athens and Rome, he may well use them in France in the twelfth century. The word 'timbale,'

Cuts off more circumſtance, they are at hand, 81
Drum beats.
To parlie or to fight, therefore prepare.
Kin. How much vnlook'd for, is this expedition.
Auſt. By how much vnexpected, by ſo much 85
We muſt awake indeuor for defence,
For courage mounteth with occaſion,
Let them be welcome then, we are prepar'd.

Enter K. of England, Baſtard, Queene, Blanch, Pembroke, and others. 90

K.Iohn. Peace be to *France*: If France in peace permit
Our iuſt and lineall entrance to our owne;
If not, bleede *France*, and peace aſcend to heauen.
Whiles we Gods wrathfull agent doe correct
Their proud contempt that beats his peace to heauen. 95
Fran. Peace be to *England*, if that warre returne

81–83. *hand,...To parlie or to fight,*] *hand. To parley or to fight,* Pope,+. *hand, To parley, or to fight;* Cap. et seq.
82. Drum beats.] Drummes beats. F_2F_3. Drums beat. F_4. et seq. (subs.).
84. *expedition.*] *Expedition!* F_4 et seq.
86. *indeuor*] *endeavor* F_3F_4.
87. *occaſion*] *occaſion* Fleay.
88. SCENE II. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
89, 90. Enter...and others.] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. Enter King John, Elinor, Blanch and Richard. Donovan. Flourish: Enter King John, and his Power: Bastard, and Lords with him; Elinor and Lady Blanch. Cap. et cet.
89. K.] King. Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. King John. Cap. et seq.
Baſtard,] Faulconbridge, Theob. Warb. Varr. Rann. Falconbridge, Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.
89. Queene] Elinor Pope et seq.
Pembroke] Pembrook F_3F_4.
90. and others.] and Forces. Mal. et seq.
91. France:] France! Huds. i.
92. *owne;*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Cam. *own.* Fleay. *own!* Cap. et cet.
93. *If not,*] *If not;* Cap. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Ktly. *If not,*— Hal.
93, 95. *heauen....heauen.*] Ff. *Heav'n. ...Heav'n.* Rowe, Warb. Johns. *Heav'n! ...heaven* Pope, Theob. Han. *heaven; ...heaven.* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly. *heaven,... heaven.* Cam.+, Del. Fle. *Heaven!... heaven.* Cap. et cet.
94. *Whiles*] *Whilst* Rowe, Pope,+.
95. *beats*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Dono. *beat* Han. et cet.

being derived, according to Diez, from the Arabic *tabal*, proves the Oriental origin of this instrument, which, in fact, came from the Moors in Spain.

96. **if that warre returne**] MOBERLY: Perhaps Philip points at the English army (war) as he speaks.—[The image evoked of a personified War returning to England 'there to live in peace' is certainly unusual; but is it any more so than that of 'grim-visaged War' smoothing his 'wrinkled front' and capering 'nimbly in a lady's chamber,' as in the first lines of *Richard III.*?—Page explains this line substantially as Moberly above, taking 'that' as redundant instead of demonstratively;

From *France* to *England*, there to liue in peace:
England we loue, and for that *Englands* ſake,
With burden of our armor heere we ſweat:
This toyle of ours ſhould be a worke of thine;
But thou from louing *England* art ſo farre,
That thou haſt vnder-wrought his lawfull King,
Cut off the ſequence of poſterity,
Out-faced Infant State, and done a rape
Vpon the maiden vertue of the Crowne:
Looke heere vpon thy brother *Geffreyes* face,
Theſe eyes, theſe browes, were moulded out of his;
This little abſtract doth containe that large,

97. *peace:*] Ff. *peace.* Rowe, Pope, Johns. Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Cam. +, Del. Fle. Rlfe, Neils. Craig. *peace!* Theob. et cet.

98. *and for*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Huds. Cam.+, Neils. *and, for* Cap. et cet.

99. *burden*] *burthen* F_4, Rowe, Pope, +, Varr. Rann. Mal. Wh. i.

ſweat:] *sweat.* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Neils.

101. *farre*] *far* F_4.

102. *his*] *its* Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Var. '73, '78, '85. Rann. *her* Coll. ii. (MS.). *this* S. T. P. (N. & Q., V, i, 263).

103–105. Om. Words. Dono.

104. *Out-faced*] *Outfacèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii.

105. *maiden vertue*] *maiden-virtue* Rowe, Pope, Ktly.

Crowne:] *crown.* Rowe et seq.

106. Geffreyes] *Geffrey's* Rowe.

face,] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *face;* Cap. *face.* Ktly. *face;*— Var. '73 et cet.

108–110. Om. Donovan.

---

but is it not here the conjunctional affix, equivalent to *if* (*so be*) *that*, as explained by ABBOTT (§ 287), with the example, 'If that the youth of my new interest here Have power to bid you welcome.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, III, ii, 224?—ED.]

102. **vnder-wrought**] STEEVENS: That is, *underworked, undermined.*

102. **his**] COLLIER (ed. ii.): Countries are usually spoken of in the feminine, and the MS. Corrector properly substitutes *her* for 'his'; *her* and 'his' were frequently confounded because both, of old, were spelt with the same vowel.—[WRIGHT, commenting on this alteration, says: ' "his" is, however, the neuter possessive pronoun.' See l. 202, below.—ED.]

104. **Outfaced Infant State**] WRIGHT: That is, browbeaten, put down by intimidation or bravado, the state that belongs to an infant. See V, i, 53: 'outface the brow Of bragging horror,' and *Hamlet:* 'Dost thou come here to whine To outface me.'—V, i, 301. And compare *Henry V:* 'I will not say so for fear I should be faced out of my way.'—III, vii, 90.

108–110. **abstract . . . breefe**] H. BAYLEY (p. 189) compares, for this use of 'abstract' and 'breefe' as classicisms, '—whose body is an abstract or a brief Contains each general virtue in the world.'—Anon., 1596, *Edward III:* II, i, 82.—ROLFE compares: 'Behold, my lords, Although the print be little, the whole matter And copy of the father.'—*Winter's Tale*, II, iii, 97.

108. **that large**] PAGE: We take 'large' here as a noun antecedant to 'which,' and equivalent to *largeness, full size, full growth.* Arthur's little form is a com-

Which died in *Geffrey*:and the hand of time,
Shall draw this breefe into as huge a volume:
That *Gef frey* was thy elder brother borne,
And this his ſonne, *England* was *Geffreys* right,
And this is *Geffreyes* in the name of God:

109. *died*] *dy'd* Rowe,+, Varr. Rann, Mal.
110. *huge*] *large* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
112. *ſonne,*] *son;* Pope,+, Cap.
Geffreys] Geffreyes F_2.
113. *this*] *his* Mason (Comments, p. 154), Wh. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
113. Geffreyes] F_3. Geffreyes: F_2. Geffreys, F_4. Geffrey's, Knt. Geffrey's. Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Del. Dono. Craig. Geffrey's *son* Jervis. Geffrey's; Rowe et cet.
God:] *God* Pope, Han. Sta. Cam. +, Fle. Wh. ii, Neils. *God.* Knt.

---

plete abstract or miniature copy of the fully-grown Geoffrey. 'That large' is thus in antithesis with 'this brief' in l. 110, as well as with 'little abstract' in this same line.

110. **this breefe . . . a volume**] MOBERLY: Shakespeare's experience of law-deeds was in many ways sufficient to show him the expansive force in such documents when paid for by the line.

110. **huge**] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* VIII, p. 99): *Large*, which was doubtless a misprint for 'huge' in Rowe's edition, remained uncorrected by Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson, though Grey noticed the mistake (*Notes*, i, p. 230). Capell restored the true reading.

113. **this is Geffreyes**] MASON (*Comments*, p. 154): I have no doubt but we should read—'And *his* is Geffrey's.' The meaning is, 'England was Geffrey's right, and whatever was Geffrey's, is now *his*,' pointing to Arthur.—KNIGHT: We have restored the punctuation of the original: 'And this is Geffrey's, in the name of God.' Perhaps we should read with Mason: 'his is Geffrey's.' In either case, it appears to us that King Philip makes a solemn asseveration that this (Arthur) is Geffrey's son and successor, or 'Geffrey's right' is his (Arthur's)—in the name of God; asserting the principle of legitimacy by divine ordinance. As the sentence is commonly given, Philip is only employing an unmeaning oath.—[As will be seen, Knight's punctuation—a period at the end of the line—is not a 'restoration' of the Folio text, but is a reading original with Knight.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: Although it passes the power of human understanding to comprehend what would, by [the Folio] reading, be spoken of as Geffrey's, it has been hitherto retained. Mason corrected the almost obvious typographical error, one easily made at any time, and still more probable here on account of the occurrence of 'And this' immediately above.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The construction of the sentence 'this his son' in the previous line, being elliptical for 'this boy is his son,' leads us to believe that 'this is Geffrey's' elliptically implies 'this boy is Geffrey's' —meaning: 'this boy's right is what was Geffrey's,' or 'to this boy now belongs that which was Geffrey's.' The repetition of a word in a sequence of sentences, like 'this' in the present one, is quite accordant with Shakespeare's style; and he has instances of the possessive case understood instead of expressed.—HUDSON (ed. ii.): I suspect the correction ought to be carried still further [than Mason's *his* for 'this'], and *Arthur's* substituted for 'Geffrey's': 'England was Geffrey's

How comes it then that thou art call'd a King,
When liuing blood doth in theſe temples beat
Which owe the crowne, that thou ore-maſtereſt?
K.Iohn. From whom haſt thou this great commiſſion
To draw my anſwer from thy Articles? (*France*,
Fra. Fro that ſupernal Iudge that ſtirs good thoughts
In any beaſt of ſtrong authoritie,
To looke into the blots and ſtaines of right,

116. *owe*] *own* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
117. *commiſſion*] *Commiſſion*, F_4. (France] Om. Rowe.
118. *from thy*] *to thy* Pope,+. *forth by* Vaughan (i, 21).
119. *Fro*] *From* Ff.
120. *beaſt*] F_1. *breaſt* Ff.
121. *blots*] *bolts* Warb. (misprint). *right*,] Ff, Rowe. *right:* Cam. +, Wh. ii. *right*. Pope et cet.

---

right, and his [right] is Arthur's.'—VAUGHAN (i, 12): [This and the preceding line] imply that the speaker has already shown some living person to own the crown of England; and yet such an assertion is not to be found elsewhere than in the reading, 'England *was* Geffrey's, and *is this* Geffrey's?' I think it most probable, therefore, that Shakespeare wrote: 'And *is this* Geffrey's?' but if not so, thus: 'And this is Geffrey.'—Miss C. PORTER: That is, this right is Geffrey's. The word *right*—which implies *England* also, that being Geffrey's right—is carried over in thought from the preceding line. It has been explained otherwise: i. e., 'this is Geffrey's heir.' But the argument proceeds with some form, and, on the stage, must have been accompanied with gestures toward Arthur, at 'this is son,' his 'eyes' and 'brows.' This personal designation must render further repetition of the assertion needless, and the formal progress of the argument demands a conclusion. As the last step of the speech it comes—the England, the crown that was Geffrey's right is Geffrey's son's right, and is his crown.—HERFORD: That is, this boy is Geffrey's son (and as such inheritor of his right to England). The phrase is ambiguous, but the other possible interpretations (e. g., this territory is Geffrey's) are less natural.

116. **Which . . . that**] Compare, for this use of 'which' and 'that,' 'If he see aught in you that makes him like That anything he sees which moves his liking.'—ll. 536, 537 below. See, if needful, ABBOTT, § 267.

118. **from thy Articles**] COLLIER: It has been suggested that we ought to read '*to* thy articles'; but the old wording is very intelligible; the answer of John was to be drawn *from* the articles of the King of France, just before propounded.—[Collier refers, I think, to a note on this passage in the *Variorum* of 1821 signed simply 'Roberts'; but the change is more than a suggestion; it is the reading of all editions from Pope to the *Variorum* of 1773. Collier's note did not appear in either of his subsequent editions.—ED.]

119–121. **Fro that . . . of right**] SNIDER (ii, 297): The character of the man in other situations can leave no doubt concerning the sincerity of these words; it is the religious conscience which speaks in him and directs his actions. He, therefore, will develop a twofold conflict with the influences of his own party, besides his struggle with John. He is not a mere politician, hence he will collide

That Iudge hath made me guardian to this boy, 122
Vnder whoſe warrant I impeach thy wrong,
And by whoſe helpe I meane to chaſtiſe it.
*K.Iohn.*Alack thou doſt vſurpe authoritie. 125

124. *And*] *And*, Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Sing. Knt, Hal. Ktly. *chaſtiſe*] *châstise* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt i, Dyce, Fle. 125–159. In margin, Pope, Han.

---

with the political selfishness which is seeking to control the French expedition; nor is he a mere devotee of the Church, hence he will oppose its violation of good faith and moral rectitude. Conscience thus arrays him against the policy of the Dauphin and the policy of the Legate.—MOBERLY: The idea of these lines seems to be that God sets in motion the authority of kings, as the judge of a supreme court does that of inferior judges by mandamus. So in l. 122 God is like the Lord Chancellor, who appoints guardians to heirs during their minority. [Lines 120, 121] might, perhaps, be stopped as follows: 'In any breast—of strong authority To look into the blots,' etc.

121. blots and staines] JOHNSON: Mr Theobald reads, with the first Folio, 'blots,' which being so early authorised, and so much better understood, needed not to have been changed by Dr Warburton to *bolts*, though *bolts* might be used in that time for *spots;* so Shakespeare calls Banquo *spotted with blood*, 'the blood-boltered Banquo.' The verb to 'blot' is used figuratively for to disgrace in ll. 139, 141. And, perhaps, after all, *bolts* was only a typographical mistake.—[HEATH (p. 225) also concludes that this unnecessary change by Warburton is an error of the press.—ED.]—STEEVENS: 'Blots' is certainly right. The illegitimate branch of a family always carried the arms of it with what, in ancient heraldry, was called a *blot* or *difference*. So, in Drayton's *Epistle from Queen Isabel to King Richard II:* 'No bastard's mark doth blot his conquering shield.'—[ed. Hughs, p. 99]. 'Blots' and 'stains' occur together again in Act III, scene i, [l. 47].—MALONE: 'Blot' had certainly the heraldical sense mentioned by Steevens. But it here, I think, means only *blemishes*. [That 'blot' ever had any special heraldic meaning is, I think, very doubtful. It is not included in the glossaries appended to Guillim's *Display of Heraldry*, Edmondson's *Complete Body of Heraldry*, or in Boutell's *Handbook of English Heraldry*. Murray (*N. E. D.*) does not include any such technical sense of the word among its several significations. The general meaning given by the latter is *blemish*. I am inclined to think that Steevens was misled by a note on the line from Drayton which he has quoted, wherein occurs the following: 'Showing the true and indubitate birth of Richard, his right unto the crown of England, as carrying the arms without blot or difference.' This might be taken to mean that the words 'blot' and 'difference' were synonymous; but a more likely interpretation is that 'blot' is used in the sense of *blemish* and 'difference' as the badge of cadency; that is, neither blemish nor mark of cadency (bastardy) appear on Richard's shield.—ED.]

125. K. Iohn. Alack thou dost vsurpe] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL, ed. 16): This encounter of the Kings is not unlike that of Prettyman and Volscius in *The Rehearsal;* with this difference, that the burlesque Princes are rather more polite than the real Monarchs; and the Bastard, regardless of all decorum, appears a

Fran. Excuſe it is to beat vſurping downe. 126
Queen. Who is it thou doſt call vſurper *France*?

126. *Excuſe it is*] Ff, Rowe i. *Excuse it, 'tis* Rowe ii, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *Excuse it; 'tis* Cap. Varr. Rann. *Excuse,—it is* Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. ii, Words. *Excuse, it is* Fle. Rlfe. *Excuse; it is* Mal. et cet.
127. *is it*] *is't* Rowe ii, Pope,+.
thou] *that thou* Rowe, Pope,+.

Billingsgate bravo. The scene as here offered to view [in the acting copy] is considerably and, we think, very justifiably, curtailed.

126. **Excuse it is**] P. SIMPSON (1900, *N. & Q.*, IX, v, 164): Malone's punctuation is now, I think, generally accepted; but this absolute use of the verb 'excuse' seems very un-English. I should either keep [the Folio reading] as it stands, or perhaps put a comma after the word 'is,' taking the line to mean: 'It is sufficient excuse for my usurpation of authority that I am fighting against usurpation.'—[Miss PORTER (*Folio* ed.) and BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) also thus interpret; and, on the whole, this is, I think, much to be preferred either to Rowe's 'Excuse it, 'tis,' which seems somewhat too deferential, or Malone's punctuation where 'excuse' is used in a rather forced construction, as Simpson points out.—ED.]

127. **Queen. Who is it . . . France**] FLETCHER (p. 35): Small a space as Queen Elinor occupies in the dialogue of this play, it is important to mark the clear indications, which every line of it assigned to her, affords us of the character as conceived by the dramatist. Here, indeed, we have arrogance and unscrupulous love of power personified, and, accordingly, her vehemence in repelling the charge of usurpation against herself and John is proportioned to the clear consciousness which she betrays of the justice of the imputation. In her violent altercation with Constance she makes up for the inferiority of her eloquence to that of her rival by boldness of assertion and fierceness of reproach. Her sentences are brief, but each one speaks a volume respecting her own predominant qualities; and her vituperation, it must be owned, is truly imperial.—H. COLERIDGE (ii, 151): I should be glad to find that this altercation was transferred from the old *Troublesome Raigne*, for it is very troublesome to think it Shakespeare. I do not exactly know how great ladies scold, and there are reasons for supposing that Queen Elizabeth herself was not always quite queenlike in her wrath; but there is so little of humour, propriety, or seemliness in the discourse of the two princesses, and Constance is at last so confused and unintelligible, if not corrupt, that the whole might well be spared. Massinger, in *The Duke of Milan*, has a yet grosser dialogue between Mariana, Isabella, and Marcelia, but it is not so utterly out of place; and, besides, Massinger's ladies are seldom gentlewomen.—WEISS (p. 240): None of the women in the historical plays stand by the men so emphasized as the mother of Arthur is; she agitates his claims with a passionate intensity that ought to have kept him alive to reign. A high-minded man who claims his rights, and a high-minded woman who does the same, express themselves in different styles. The feminine style is shown in Constance with great discrimination. Both sexes can hate injustice, and may be opposed to compromises. Both can have indignation for a crime. But see how Constance puts into these moral feelings a scorn and a swiftness of dissent, urged by a volubility more native to a woman than to a man. Woman is apt, indeed, to be too voluble: each minute of her phrases breeds new ones; so she does not stop to notice that her indictment is shorter than her breath. . . . But the invective of Constance is the swift weapon-play of mater-

Conſt. Let me make anſwer : thy vſurping ſonne. 128
Queen. Out inſolent, thy baſtard ſhall be King,
That thou maiſt be a Queen, and checke the world. 130
Con. My bed was euer to thy ſonne as true
As thine was to thy husband, and this boy 132

128. *anſwer: thy*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam.+. *answer;—thy* Cap. et cet.
129–161. Om. Dono.
129. *Out inſolent*] *Out insolent!* Pope. *Out, insolent!* Theob. et seq.
129–141. Om. Words.
130. *maiſt*] *may'ſt* F_4.
world.] *World!* Rowe et seq.

nity: it flashes through every guard, touches rapidly to and fro, and draws blood at every unexpected touch.

130. **That thou maist be a Queen**] MALONE: 'Surelie,' [says Holinshed,] 'queene Elianor, the kings mother, was sore against hir nephue Arthur, rather mooved thereto by enuie conceived against his mother, than vpon any iust occasion giuen in behalfe of the child, for that she saw, if he were king, how his mother Constance would look to beare most rule within the realme of England, till hir sonne should come to lawfull age, to gouerne of himselfe. So hard a thing it is to bring women to agree in one mind, their natures commonlie being so contrarie.'—[vol. iii, p. 158].—CORSON (p. 166): These words have, I think, misled many commentators; and they have made ambition the ruling motive of Constance. It is not safe to take the opinions which hostile characters in Shakespeare's plays, and sometimes characters which are not hostile, are made to express of each other as opinions which must go for anything in our estimation of the characters; quite as unsafe as it sometimes is in real life to judge of people by what we hear others say of them. In Shakespeare's plays what characters say must often be taken as representing themselves rather than others. This is especially true in the case of Elinor. We do not learn what others are from what she says of them; we certainly do not learn what manner of woman Constance really is; but we learn a great deal of what *she* is. . . . No careful reader of the play will, I am assured, take Elinor's accusations as at all representing the Poet's dramatic purpose in Constance. The old Elinor is the political genius and guide of her son John, and we must not look for the truth from *her* in regard to Constance. . . . But what Constance says of Elinor we can take as the truth in regard to the old queen mother.

130. **checke the world**] STAUNTON: It has been doubted whether Shakespeare, who appears to have had cognizance of nearly every sport and pastime of his age, was acquainted with the ancient game of chess; we believe the present passage may be taken to settle the question decisively. The allusion is obviously to the Queen of the chess-board, which, in this country, was invested with those remarkable powers that render her by far the most powerful piece in the game, somewhere about the second decade of the 16th century.—FLEAY: 'Check,' that is, *overbear*. No allusion to chess, as Staunton thinks; this game is only mentioned once in Shakespeare (*Tempest, V*, i, stage-direction).—WRIGHT compares: 'But to command, to check, to o'erbear such As are of better person than myself.'—*3 Henry VI:* III, ii, 166.

132. **As thine . . . thy husband**] VAUGHAN (i, 13): This line, although hitherto unsuspected, involves a difficulty. It is scarcely possible that Constance should have vindicated her son's legitimacy by affirming that her own fidelity to her

Liker in feature to his father *Geffrey*
Then thou and *Iohn*, in manners being as like,
As raine to water, or deuill to his damme;
My boy a baſtard? by my ſoule I thinke
His father neuer was ſo true begot,
It cannot be, and if thou wert his mother.
Queen. Theres a good mother boy, that blots thy fa- (ther

134. *Then*] *Than* F_4.
Iohn, *in manners*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Knt, Coll. Sta. Del. Fle. *John, in manners;* Var. '73. *John in manners,*— Dyce, Hal. Wh. i. *John in manners,* Neils. *John in manners;* Roderick, Cap. et cet.
135. *damme;*] *Dam.* Rowe et seq.
136. *baſtard?*] *Bastard!* Rowe et seq.
ſoule I thinke...] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Craig. *soul, I think...* Dyce, Wh. i, Huds. Cam.+. *soul, I think,...* Theob. et cet.
137. *true begot*] *true-begot* Theob. Han.
138. *and*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *an* Theob. et cet.

---

husband was as unimpeachable as that of Elinor to hers. In the first place, she afterwards declares that Elinor's motherhood was a sufficient proof in itself of the illegitimacy of any child of which she was mother. . . . In the second place, Constance proceeds immediately to advance a second argument for the lawful parentage of her son founded on a resemblence between him and her husband, equal to the resemblance of Elinor's child, not to Elinor's husband, but to Elinor herself, thus carefully avoiding any supposition of Elinor's fidelity, although it would have best suited her argument to make it; and here it is observable that the very same emphatic assertion of the resemblance of a child to his mother, Margaret of Anjou, is in *Henry VI.* accompanied by the direct and notorious imputation to that mother of infidelity to her husband. The first two lines of the reply of Constance were, or ought to have been, written thus: 'My bed was ever to thy son as true, As *to me* was *my* husband.' How easily would the words 'to me' pass into the word 'thine,' and how frequently *my* and 'thy' are exchanged cannot need proof.— IVOR JOHN: It may be that Shakespeare was content to make Constance femininely illogical in her passion. Mr Craig's suggestion that Constance meant 'My bed was *at least* as true as yours' avoids the difficulty.

134. **Then thou and Iohn, in manners**] RODERICK (ap. EDWARDS, p. 251): It does not appear that Elinor and John were alike in *feature*, though they were mother and son; and what follows, '—in manners being as like As rain to water,' etc., comes in but awkwardly. But the transposition of one comma makes all easy and natural. John had before been pretty rough with King Philip; and Elinor, in the speech to which this is an answer, calls Constance's son Arthur a Bastard. To which she, taunting Elinor's gross expression, says in reply that her son Arthur is 'Liker in feature to his father Geoffrey, Than thou and John in *manners;* i. e., as like him as possible; for (says she) you two are equally unmannerly, and in that as like one another as Rain and Water, or Devil and Dam.— CAPELL (i, pt 2, p. 121): [Roderick] puts a wrong sense on 'manners,' referring it to, what he calls, John's unmannerliness; whereas the word's general sense is intended—to wit, general manners—a sense of much more severity.

138. **and if . . . his mother**] MALONE: Constance alludes to Elinor's infidelity

Conſt. There's a good grandame boy
That would blot thee.
Auſt. Peace.
Baſt. Heare the Cryer.
Auſt. What the deuill art thou?
Baſt. One that wil play the deuill ſir with you,
And a may catch your hide and you alone:
You are the Hare of whom the Prouerb goes
Whoſe valour plucks dead Lyons by the beard;
Ile ſmoake your skin-coat and I catch you right,

140, 141. One line Pope et seq.
141. *would*] *wouldst* Theob. i.
142. *Peace.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *Peace.*— Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *Peace!*— Var. '73. *Peace!* Cap. et cet.
145. *deuill ſir*] *Devil, Sir*, F_4.
146. *And a*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *And 'a* Hal. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii. *An' a* Theob. et cet.
146. *alone:*] *alone.* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce.
147. *Hare*] *Hare*, F_4, Rowe,+.
149. *Ile...skin-coat*] *I'le...Skin-coat*, F_4.
and] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *an* Theob. et cet.

---

to her husband, Louis VII, when they were in the Holy Land, on account of which he was divorced from her. She afterwards (1151) married King Henry II.—MOBERLY: In her passion Constance attempts to prove too much; for if Geoffrey were not legitimate he would have no title to hand down to Arthur.

143. **Heare the Cryer**] MALONE: Alluding to the usual proclamation for *silence* made by criers in courts of justice, beginning *Oyez*, corruptly pronounced *O-Yes*. Austria has just said 'Peace!'

147, 148. **Hare . . . dead Lyons**] STEEVENS: So, in *The Spanish Tragedy*, 'He hunted well that was a lion's death; Not he that in a garment wore his skin: So hares may pull dead lions by the beard.'—[I, ii, 170; ed. Boas, p. 12].—MALONE: The proverb alluded to is, 'Mortuo leoni et lepores insultant.'—Erasmi, *Adagia*.—GREY (i, 280): This proverb is an allusion to the ill-usage which the body of Hector met with from the Greeks, after he was slain by Achilles.—GREEN (p. 304): Claude Mignault, in his notes to Alciatus (*Emblem*, 153), quotes an epigram from an unknown Greek author, which Hector is supposed to have uttered as he was dragged by the Grecian chariot: 'Now after my death ye pierce my body The very hares are bold to insult a dead lion.' . . . The device itself [in Alciatus, Reusner, and Whitney] is a representation of Hares biting a dead Lion, [with the motto: *Cum laruis non luctandum*].—WRIGHT: To pluck by the beard was a mark of contempt.—[Compare Gloucester's indignant remonstrance: 'By the kind gods, 'tis most ignobly done To pluck me by the beard.'—*King Lear*, III, vii, 35.—ED.]

149. **Ile smoake your skin-coat**] DELIUS sees in these words an allusion to the use of smoke for expelling moths from fur garments. The Bastard, in like manner, will drive Austria from his skin-coat.—WRIGHT, justly, dissents, remarking that 'in the North Country Dialect "to smoke" is synonymous with *to thrash*, and Carr, in his *Craven Glossary*, quotes Miege (*Fr. Dict.*), "I shall smoke ye for 't,

Sirra looke too't, yfaith I will, yfaith.
Blan. O well did he become that Lyons robe,
That did diſrobe the Lion of that robe.
Baſt. It lies as ſightly on the backe of him
As great *Alcides* ſhooes vpon an Aſſe:

150. *Sirra*] *Sirrah*, Rowe.
too't,] *to't*, F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *to't;* Theob. et cet.
yfaith...yfaith] *i'faith...i'faith* F_4.
151. *O*] *O!* Coll. Del. *Oh*, Ktly.
did] *doth* Anon. ap Cam.
152. *robe.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. *robe!* Cap. et cet.
154. *ſhooes*] F_2F_3. *ſhoos* F_4. *shoes* Rowe, Pope, Var. '78, '85, Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. i, ii, Dyce i, Hal. Huds. i. Fle. *show'd* Ktly. *does* Vaughan, Huds. ii. *spoil* Kinnear. *shews* or *shows* Theob. et cet.
Aſſe:] *ass.*— Coll. Wh. i, Huds. *ape* Fle. Orger.

---

je vous punirai de la belle maniere." '—In explanation of the word 'skin-coat' Wright also quotes: 'Cotgrave (s. v. *En*), "I' en auray (blowes being vnderstood) I shall be well beaten; my skin-coat will be soundly curried." And again (s. v. *Contrepoincté*): "I' ay la peau toute contrepoinctée de coups, My skinne-coat hath received as many knockes as a quilt hath stitches." '

151. **Blan. O well . . . that Lyons robe**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: This speech has struck us as more fitly belonging to Constance than to Blanche; who seems intended by the dramatist to take no part in what is going forward, until there is a question of her marriage with the Dauphin, and she is addressed by him. Whereas, from Constance, the implied sneer at Austria's unfitness to wear the spoil that so well became Cœur-de-lion, comes precisely in accordance with her subsequent more open and violent vituperation, where she exclaims, 'Thou wear a lion's hide! Doff it for shame.' The misappropriation of the Folio prefixes in this scene, as in many others, helps to confirm our opinion; yet, such is our reluctance to alter, that we leave the text as it is, contenting ourselves with the present suggestion.—ROLFE, in answer to the foregoing note by the Clarkes, points out that Shakespeare is here following the older play 'in which Blanch says: "Joy tide his soul, to whom that spoil belong'd: Ah Richard how thy glory here is wrong'd!" '

154. **Alcides shooes vpon an Asse**] THEOBALD: But why his 'shoes,' in the name of propriety? For let Hercules and his shoes have been really as big as they were ever supposed to be, yet they (I mean the *shoes*) would not have been an overload for an ass. I am persuaded I have retrieved the true reading (*shews*); and let us observe the justness of the comparison now. Faulconbridge, in his resentment, would say this to Austria: 'That lion's skin, which my great father King Richard once wore, looks as uncouthly on thy back, as that other noble hide which was borne by Hercules would look on the back of an ass.' A double allusion was intended; first, to the fable of the ass in the lion's skin; then Richard I. is finely set in competition with Alcides, as Austria is satirically coupled with the ass.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 121): [Theobald's] *shews* and *Alcides'* apostrophiz'd are both indisputable; and the line, in his reading, wants no comment, other than that '*robe*' is understood before *shews*, and *shews* put for 'would shew.'—MALONE: That is, upon the hoofs of an ass. Theobald thought the shoes must be placed on the *back* of the ass. This endeavor to make our Author's similes

[154. As great Alcides shooes vpon an Asse]

correspond exactly on both sides is, as has been more than once observed, the source of many errors.—STEEVENS: The 'shoes' of Hercules are more than once introduced in the old comedies on much the same occasions. So, in *The Isle of Gulls*, J. Day, 1606: '—are as fit . . . as Hercules's shoe for the foot of a pigmy,' [ed. Bullen, p. 6]. Again, in Greene's *Epistle Dedicatory* to *Perimedes the Blacksmith*, 1588: '—and so lest I should shape Hercules' shoe for a child's foot, I commend your worship to the Almighty,' [ed. Grosart, vii, 6]. Again, in Greene's *Penelope's Web*, 1601: 'I will not . . . go about to pull a Hercules shoe on Achilles foot,' [ed. Grosart, vii, 203]. Again: 'Hercules' shoe will never serve a child's foot,' [Ibid., vii, 229]. Again, in Gosson's *School of Abuse*, 1579: '—to draw the lion's skin upon Æsop's asse, or Hercules' shoes on a child's feete,' [ed. Arber, p. 21.—To these Rushton (1873, *N. & Q.*, IV, xii, 304) adds: 'And therefore me thinketh, the time were but lost, in pullyng *Hercules* shooe vppon an Infants foot.' —Lyly: *Euphues and his England*, 1580 (ed. Bond, ii, 41).]—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 27) opines that the frequent mention of the shoes of Hercules among old authors is apparently suggested by the proverb *ex pede Herculem*.—A. E. B. (*N. & Q.*, 1853, I, viii, 29): Out of five quotations given by Steevens there is not one in which *the shoes* are not provided with *feet*. But Shakespeare nowhere alludes to feet! His ass most probably *had feet*, and so had Juvenal's verse (when he talks of his 'satyrâ sumente cothurnam'), but neither Shakespeare nor Juvenal dreamed of any necessary connection between the feet and the shoes. Therein lies the difference between Shakespeare and 'our old poets'; a difference that ought to be sufficient, of itself, to put down the common cry that Shakespeare borrowed his allusions from them. If so, how is it that his expositors, with these old poets before their eyes all this time, together with their own scholarship to boot, have so widely mistaken the true point of his allusion? It is precisely because they *have* confined their researches to these old poets, and have *not* followed Shakespeare to the fountain head. There is a passage in Quintilian which, very probably, has been the common source of both Shakespeare's version and that of the old poets. Quintilian is cautioning against the introduction of solemn bombast in trifling affairs: 'To get up,' says he, 'this pompous tragedy about mean matters is as though you would dress up children with the mask and buskins of Hercules.' Here the addition of the mask proves that the allusion is purely theatrical. The mask and buskins are put for the stage trappings, or properties of the part of Hercules: of these, one of the items was *the lion's skin;* and hence the extreme aptitude of the allusion as applied by the Bastard to Austria, who was assuming the importance of Cœur-de-lion. It is interesting to observe how nearly Theobald understood the necessity of the context. [The latter part of Theobald's note is here quoted.] One step further, and Theobald would have discovered the true solution; he only required to know that *the shoes*, by a figure of rhetoric called synecdoche, may stand for the whole character and attributes of Hercules, to have saved himself the trouble of conjecturing an ingenious, though infinitely worse, word as a substitute.—[The latter half of this note appears in HALLIWELL'S Folio, ed. 1859, but signed *Anon.* I strongly suspect that the initials A. E. B. stand for ANDREW EDWARD BRAE, the doughty opponent of Collier and Dyce.—ED.]—KEIGHTLEY (*N. & Q.*, 1853, I, viii, 267): It appears to me that [Theobald] came very near the truth and would have hit it completely if he had retained *Alcides'*, for it is the genitive, with *robe* understood. Were it not that

[154. As great Alcides shooes vpon an Asse]

doth is the usual word in this play, I might be tempted to read *does*. In reading or acting, then, the *cæsura* should be made at *Alcides'*, with a slight pause to give the hearers time to supply *robe*. I need not say that the robe is the lion's skin, and that there is an allusion to the fable of the ass.—[Had Keightley but read Theobald's note more carefully he would have seen, I think, that Theobald did not intend to place Alcides on the ass's back. The apostrophe marking the possessive case is plainly marked in Theobald's text. In 1867 Keightley published his *Expositor;* in reference to this passage he there says: 'This line and all that has been written upon it is sheer nonsense.' In this sweeping condemnation of the work of his predecessors it is hardly to be supposed that he wishes to include his own remarks made fourteen years before. He does not, however, repeat his conjecture *doth* or *does*, but says (p. 220): 'I prefer *shew'd* to Theobald's *shews* in the conjunctive mood. We might also, and better perhaps, read *should*. "After Alcides'" *lion's robe* is, of course, to be understood.'—ED.]—P. MUIRSON (*N. & Q.*, 1853, I, viii, 384): I consider *shows* to be the true reading; the reference being to the ancient *mysteries*, called also *shows*. The machinery required for the celebration of the mysteries was carried by *asses*. Hence the proverb: 'Asinus portat *mysteriae*.' The connection of Hercules with the mysteries may be learned from Aristophanes and many other ancient writers. And thus the meaning of the passage seems to be: The lion's skin, which once belonged to Richard of the Lion Heart, is as sightly on the back of Austria as were the mysteries of Hercules upon an ass.—R. G. WHITE accepts without hesitation Theobald's correction; and remarks that Malone's reason for retaining the Folio reading is untenable, since the word 'lies' in the preceding line answers for the whole sentence. White likewise points out that in the examples wherein occur references to the shoes of Hercules 'the allusion is to the unfitness of Hercules' shoe to a smaller foot.' 'He might,' adds White, 'as well have quoted passages in which the demigod's club was mentioned.'—W. N. LETTSOM (ap. DYCE, ii.): The Variorum argument [in defence of the old reading] amounts to this: Some inferior writers have made an allusion with propriety; therefore we are warranted in believing that one infinitely their superior made the same allusion ridiculously.—FLEAY, in support of the Folio reading, quotes the passage from Gosson, given above by Steevens, and thus continues: 'There are two allusions. The error lies in the word "ass" repeated (as so often happens) from the line below. Read *dwarf*, *child*, *ape*, or some equivalent word for "ass." I insert, provisionally, *ape*, as most like in the *ductus literarum*, for the word "asse" in the Folio. The pronunciation of "shoes" and *shows* was, however, the same; in *Solyman and Perseda*, I, iii, *shoes* rhymes to *blows*.'—[ORGER (p. 10) also suggests that we here read *ape* for 'ass.']—VAUGHAN (i, 14): It seems clear that the dress intended here, whether shoes or other raiment, was not conceived by Shakespeare as clothing any part of the animal but its back; for the speaker proceeds: 'But, ass, I'll take that burden from your back.' Theobald, therefore, I consider to have been justified in rejecting 'shoes' as the right reading. . . . But *shows* is not by any means a perfect synonym of 'lies' and does not so well accord with 'as sightly'; there being some tautological weakness in 'shows as sightly.' I propose confidently to read 'As great Alcides' *does*,' etc.; that is, 'as great Alcides's robe does upon an ass.' Nothing could be more appropriate. As the ass in the fable put upon himself, as a robe, the lion's skin, which when taken from the lion by Hercules had been worn by Hercules, so the Duke of Austria

But Aſſe, Ile take that burthen from your backe,
Or lay on that ſhall make your ſhoulders cracke.
Auſt. What cracker is this ſame that deafes our eares
With this abundance of ſuperfluous breath?
King *Lewis*, determine what we ſhall doe ſtrait.

155. *Ile*] *I'le* F_4. *I'll* Rowe.
burthen] F_2F_4, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Wh. i, Cam.+. *burden* F_3 et cet.

159. *King* Lewis, *determine*...] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Var. '73, '78, '85. Phi. *Lewis, determine*... Cap. (K. Phi.) Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Coll. Dyce, Wh. Huds. Cam. i, Glo. *King,—Lewis, determine*... Knt, Del. Craig, Dtn. *Lewis, determine* Sing. ii. *Kind Lewis, determine* Vaughan. Lew. *Let us determine* Orger. *King Philip, determine* Theob. et cet.

159, 160. Lewis...Lew.] *Louis*...Lou. Dyce i, Wh. i.

159. *ſtrait*] F_2F_3, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, '78, 85. *ſtreight* F_4, Rowe, Pope. *straight* Han. et cet.

---

had assumed for a robe the lion's skin, which as taken from the lion by Richard had been worn by Richard; and the one robe lay upon the Duke of Austria as sightly as the other robe did upon the ass.—WRIGHT: Theobald's emendation may not be absolutely necessary, but it makes the comparison more complete, and also lends some probability to Dr Ingleby's suggestion that in *Hamlet*, I, ii, 147, 'Or ere those shoes were old,' 'shoes' is a misprint for *shows*, the mourning garments of the widow. In Middleton's *Family of Love* 'shoes' is printed *showes* (ed. Dyce, ii, 127).—MARSHALL adopts Theobald's emendation, characterising the Folio reading as 'a ridiculous mistake; for a donkey would hardly attempt to wear Hercules' *shoes;* nor can that reading be justified by the various passages quoted by Steevens.'—MOORE SMITH suggest that possibly Shakespeare wrote this line 'with a confused recollection of Gosson's sentence in his mind.' [See note by Steevens, *ante*.]—IVOR JOHN: [Theobald's emendation] is in any case preferable to the Folio's reading, which can only be defended by supposing that Shakespeare was guilty of a most senseless confusion. There is no possible point in speaking of an ass wearing the shoes of Hercules. [John's text reads, however, 'Alcides shows,' i. e., the nominative and not the possessive; possibly this is but an error of the press.—ED.]—DEIGHTON: That is, it looks as well on his back as the lion's skin worn by Hercules would look on the back of an ass. Malone seems to me to make the absurdity [of defending the Folio reading] complete when he explains 'upon an ass' to mean 'upon the hoofs of an ass.' The allusion is, of course, to the fable of the ass wearing the lion's skin.—SCHLEGEL, in his translation of this passage, has, I think, quite misunderstood Theobald's correction, since he makes it refer not to the robe or ornaments of Hercules, but to Hercules himself; and Tieck thus interprets: 'As Alcides would look, riding on an ass' (ed. 1830, iii, 341).—ED.

157. cracker] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2.): A braggart, a boaster. [The present line quoted.]—FLEAY: Note the triple pun in 'cracker': (1) an impudent boy; (2) a firework; (3) to break down, in previous line.

159. King Lewis] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 122): Why is Lewis call'd *King?* or why in this passage only? and, secondly, why addressed for such business and his father in presence? The father, indeed, may very reasonably make his son the declarer of a thing preconcerted, and the Poet has cause to put him on doing so; for, first, it shows the son's consequence and weight with the father; and, next (which is

[159. King Lewis]

cause enough of itself), rescues him from the state of a cypher in a scene of great length, for he has no other speech in it from his second in its very beginning to its final conclusion. Such are the objections to both the old and new readings of this line, and such the reasons for making *Lewis* the speaker in those that follow it; and we may throw in another to make the matter full weight, namely, their free manner of opening, which has a juvenile air with it. The correction before us sets all matters right; which we may call a slight one; for 'tis founded on the only supposal that the copy had 'King' for French King, without scoring or stopping it, and that the printer was too faithful.—MALONE, without referring to Theobald or Capell, and with Steevens's approval, makes the same change in this line as does Capell, and accounts for the Folio reading substantially in the same way; he says in conclusion: 'I once thought that this line might stand as part of Austria's speech and that he might have addressed Philip and the Dauphin by the words: "King—Lewis," &c., but the addressing Philip by the title of King, without any addition, seems too familiar, and I therefore think that the error happened in the way above stated.'—KNIGHT: We have here restored the original reading [see *Text. Notes*]. Austria is impatient of the 'superfluous breath' of the Bastard, and appeals to Philip and the Dauphin.—[As will be seen, Knight's restoration is, actually, the reading which Malone first proposed and later rejected. In the *Sratford Shakspere*, 1854, Knight deserts the Folio text and adopts Theobald's correction without comment.—ED.]—COLLIER adopts Theobald's correction, since this line 'clearly belongs to King Philip.'—WALKER (*Vers.*, p. 4) says that this line as given in the Folio is correct, since the metre requires 'Lewis' to be a monosyllable, which, as he shows by several examples, it frequently is.—DYCE opines that reasons are not wanting for considering that the word 'King' is the prefix to this line. 'In the first place,' he continues, 'the Folio prefixes "*King*" to the three earliest speeches of Philip in this scene. Secondly, if Austria were here addressing Philip, he would not term him simply "King," but "King Philip," as he afterwards does: "King Philip, listen to the cardinal."—III, i, 130; "Do so, King Philip; hang no more in doubt."—Ibid., 154. Thirdly, if Austria had called on *Philip and Louis* to determine what was to be done, we can hardly suppose that the Dauphin would take upon himself to speak before his father had uttered a word. . . . The commencement [of the next line] is, however, more suited to the young and impetuous Dauphin than to his father.'—HALLIWELL: The next speech seems clearly to be spoken by the King of France, who makes the claim on King John. The Dauphin would scarcely be represented as speaking in these terms, 'do I claim of thee.' In support of Theobald's first alteration it is to be observed that Austria elsewhere addresses France as King Philip. On the other hand, l. 159 seems scarcely appropriate to Austria, who is in great indignation at the taunts of the Bastard, and seems then attentive to little else; unless, indeed, we presume he knows he will be foiled in repartee, and is anxious to change the subject. —C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: At one time we believed that [the prefix '*Lewis*' to line 160] was in consonance with his father's referring the decision to him, and with his own more vivacious manner. But the 'I claim' in l. 163, though it might by possibility have been uttered by the Dauphin in his father's name, yet seems more naturally to come from the king himself; while the reply of John—'I do defy thee, France'—appears conclusively to settle the point that we ought to assign this speech to King Philip.—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* IX.): The objections to the

Lew. Women & fooles, breake off your conference. 160

160. Lew.] K. Philip or King Phi. Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, '78, '85, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Cam. ii, Rlfe, Cla. Words. Neils. Craig. King. Orger. Dtn.
160. &] *and* Ff.

Folio reading are, of course, first, that Lewis was not a king, and, secondly, that Austria would rather have appealed to Lewis's father. The objection to the usual emendation [Theobald's] is that throughout the scene King Philip is not designated in the stage-directions as *King*, but as *Fran.* or *Fra.*—[The Editor of the 2nd Cambridge ed., Dr W. Aldis Wright, adds to the foregoing: 'But, on the whole, Theobald's reading seems preferable, as the lines 160–164 are more appropriate to Philip than to Lewis, who is regarded as a youth.'—ED.]—MOBERLY: Capell's alteration to 'Lewis,' and his assigning the words to the King of France, are not happy; for why should Philip Augustus refer such a matter to his son? and why should the Dauphin adopt such a tone to Leopold as to class him among the fools who are to hold their peace?—WRIGHT (*Clarendon Ed.*): Although Capell's reading has been most generally followed, it seems extremely probable that Theobald's emendation is the true one. . . . It is hardly probable that Lewis, who is treated in this scene as a mere boy, would be appealed to for the purpose of deciding so important a question, or would adopt such a tone in his reply.—MARSHALL's objections to the prefix '*Lew*' of the next speech are substantially those of the Clarkes; and he considers these lines as they stand in the Folio 'undoubtedly wrong.' Marshall thus concludes: 'The objection that the reading "King Philip," l. 159, gives a redundant syllable is of no importance, as, in the case of proper names, Shakespeare often does not strictly adhere to the metre; and it is possible *Philip* might be pronounced sometimes as a monosyllable.'—MOORE SMITH: If this is what Shakespeare wrote, it was a strange slip to call the king of France here *Lewis* and not *Philip*. Many editors read 'King Philip,' but, unfortunately, the metre is against this change. While 'Lewis' is generally a monosyllable in Shakespeare, 'Philip' is never so.—[If this be a slip on the part of Shakespeare, as Moore Smith says, he himself demonstrates how easily confusion of these very names may occur; see his note on line 1, this scene.—ED.]—IVOR JOHN decides that as 'Lewis was not king, and Austria was not likely to appeal to him for a final decision in anything of moment, we must suppose a mistaken substitution of Lewis for Philip.'—Miss PORTER: Under a pretence of annoyed superiority Austria is really scared. There is a good deal of clownishness in the fun of Faulconbridge's desire to get at the pretentious coward. The stage action probably brought this out fully, and, here, it best explains what seems a blunder in this line. Austria, anxious to divert Faulconbridge's belligerent attentions from himself, calls first on the king, who was occupied with John, and then on Lewis, nearer him and disengaged. 'King, —Lewis,' is the form in which the line might be punctuated to explain it as it stands. So Knight puts it, but he seems blind to the humor of the scene. With France hectoring England in a dignified way, Constance railing at Elinor, and Faulconbridge spoiling for a fight with a man who is trying to cover his fright with dignity, there could be no one disengaged to heed him except Lewis.—DEIGHTON: It seems altogether improbable that the decision in the matter should be made to rest with Lewis, though Austria might not improperly appeal to both for their opinion.—[Deighton therefore adopts Malone's conjectural reading, credit for which has been, by some editors, assigned to Knight.—ED.]

King *Iohn*, this is the very ſumme of all:
England and *Ireland*, *Angiers*, *Toraine*, *Maine*,
In right of *Arthur* doe I claime of thee:
Wilt thou reſigne them, and lay downe thy Armes?
Iohn. My life as ſoone: I doe defie thee *France*,
Arthur of *Britaine*, yeeld thee to my hand,
And out of my deere loue Ile giue thee more,
Then ere the coward hand of *France* can win;
Submit thee boy.
Queen. Come to thy grandame child.
Conſ. Doe childe, goe to yt grandame childe,
Giue grandame kingdome, and it grandame will
Giue yt a plum, a cherry, and a figge,
There's a good grandame.
Arthur. Good my mother peace,

162. Angiers] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *Anjowe* Ktly. *Anjou* Theob. et cet.
Toraine] Ff, Ktly. *Tourain* Rowe. *Touraine* Pope et seq.
163. *doe I*] *I do* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
165. *ſoone:*] Ff. *ſoon.* Rowe, Pope, Han. Ktly. *ſoon.*— Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *ſoon;*— Cap. *ſoon!*— Sta. *ſoon:*— Var. '78 et cet.
165, 169. *thee*] *thee*, F_4.
165. France,] France. Rowe et seq.
Donovan here inserts ll. 211–213: *Some trumpet... or* Iohns.
166. Britaine] F_2, Ktly, Fle. Brittain F_4. Britain F_3, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. Bretagne Han. et cet.
167. *And...loue*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, +, Cam.+. *And,...love*, Cap. et cet.
167. *Ile*] *I'le* F_4. *I'll* Rowe.
168. *Then*] *Than* F_4.
coward hand] *coward-hand* Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
win;] *win.* Pope et seq.
169–210. *Submit thee...repetitions:*] In margin Pope, Han.
170, 171, 172. *grandame*] F_2F_3, Cap. Knt, Sta. Fle. *Grandam*, F_4 et cet.
171. *Doe childe, goe*] *Do, child, go* F_4. *Do, go, child, go; go* Cap. *Do, child, go, child, go* Lettsom (ap. Dyce ii.).
171, 172. *yt...it*] *it...it* Ff, Rowe, Pope, +, Wh. Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Del. *it's... it's* Cap. *it'...it'* Johns. et cet.
173. *yt*] *it* Ff.
175. *peace,*] *peace;* Theob. Warb. Johns. *peace!* Cap. et seq.

171, 172. yt . . . it] WALKER (*Vers.*, iii, 118): I suspect this is merely an old form for *its*. The old poets certainly employed 'it' now and then—probably only under particular circumstances—where we should use *its*.—[To this Walker's editor, LETTSOM, adds in a foot-note: 'I may observe, however, that Constance here is evidently mimicking the imperfect babble of the nursery.'—On this point EARLE (p. 456), quoting the present passage, says: 'It seems as if children in Shakespeare's time used *it* for the adjectival *its*. The possessive *its* is not yet found either in Shakespeare or in our Bible of 1611. Where we now should use *its*, these have *his*.'—For the etiology of *its*, see Murray, *N. E. D.*, s. v.—ED.]—DYCE (ed. ii.): With Mr Lettsom's observation I am quite in accord.—MOBERLY: Such changes as Capell's [see *Text. Notes*] forget that on the stage a sardonic laugh might follow the first two words and occupy the time of a foot.

I would that I were low laid in my graue,
I am not worth this coyle that's made for me. (weepes.
Qu. Mo. His mother ſhames him ſo, poore boy hee
Con. Now ſhame vpon you where ſhe does or no,
His grandames wrongs, and not his mothers ſhames
Drawes thoſe heauen-mouing pearles frõ his poor eies,
Which heauen ſhall take in nature of a fee:
I, with theſe Chriſtall beads heauen ſhall be brib'd
To doe him Iuſtice, and reuenge on you.

176. *low laid*] *low-laid* Ktly.
178. Qu. Mo.] Eli. Rowe et seq.
179. *Now...or no,*] Om. Dono. *where*] F_2F_3, Rowe, Pope, Knt i. *whe're* F_4, Theob. Warb. *whether* Johns. Var. '73, Cam.+. *wher* Knt ii, Hal. *whêr* Dyce, Huds. ii, Words. *whe'er* Fle. Wh. ii, Neils. *whe'r* Han. et cet. *no,*] *no.* Rowe, Pope. *no!* Theob. et seq.
180. *grandames*] F_2F_3, Cap. Knt, Sta Fle. *Grandam's* F_4 et cet. *wrongs*] *wrong* F_4, Rowe, Pope, +.
181. *Drawes*] F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. Cam.+, Fle. *Draw* Cap. et cet.
181, 182, 183, 185, 186. *heauen*] *heav'n* Rowe, Pope,+.
183. *I*] *Ay* Rowe, Om. Han. *theſe*] *theſe ſad* F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *those* Ktly. *heauen ſhall*] *ſhall heaven* Coll. MS.

177. **coyle**] That is, *disturbance, turmoil, confusion;* for other examples, see Shakespeare *passim.*

179. **where**] That is, *whether;* compare I, i, 83.

179. **she does**] RITSON: Read 'whe'r *he* does or no!' i. e., whether he weeps or not. Constance, so far from admitting, expressly denies that *she* shames him.—DOUCE (i, 402): It may be answered that this reading [Ritson's] is *equally* objectionable; for Constance admits also that her son wept. In either case there is ambiguity; but the words as they stand are infinitely more natural, and even defensible, according to common usage.—VAUGHAN (i, 23): Ritson errs in his emendation and in his reason for it. Constance does not expressly deny that she shames her son. All editors and critics, too, have misunderstood the connection of her ideas and words. We should print and punctuate: 'Now shame upon you! —whether she does, or no,' etc. Constance affirms that, whether she shames her son or not, her son's tears are due not to his mother's shames, but to his grandmother's injuries.—[As will be seen from the *Text. Notes*, the majority of editors follow Theobald's punctuation, placing an exclamation point at the end of the line instead of after the word 'you.' It is this which has brought upon them the general accusation of misunderstanding conveyed in the foregoing note. —ED.]

182. **in nature of**] WRIGHT: That is, as a kind of fee. Compare: 'The state of man . . . suffers then The nature of an insurrection.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, II, i, 69. [Also, 'Of a strange nature is the suit you follow.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, IV, i, 177.]

183. **beads . . . brib'd**] JOHN HUNTER: There is here an implied reference to *prayers* as one of the meanings of the word 'beads.'—IVOR JOHN: Mr Craig suggests that here we have a reflection of the old voyagers' stories of bribing Indians with beads.

184. **To doe him Iustice**] CARTER (*Sh. & Holy Scripture*, p. 204) quotes in illus-

Que. Thou monſtrous ſlanderer of heauen and earth.
Con. Thou monſtrous Iniurer of heauen and earth,
Call not me ſlanderer, thou and thine vſurpe
The Dominations, Royalties, and rights
Of this oppreſſed boy ; this is thy eldeſt ſonnes ſonne,
Infortunate in nothing but in thee:
Thy ſinnes are viſited in this poore childe,

185. *earth.*] *earth!* Theob. et seq.
186. *earth,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. *earth;* Sing. *earth!* Han. et cet.
187. *not me*] *me not* F_4, Rowe, Pope, +.
ſlanderer,] Ff. *slanderer!* Huds. i, Neils. *slanderer;* Rowe et cet.
thou and thine] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Wh. i, Ktly. Cam.+. *thou, and thine,* Theob. et cet.
188. *Dominations*] *domination* Ff, Rowe, Pope,+.
189. *oppreſſed*] *oppressèd* Dyce, Huds. Dono. *oppresst* Fle.
189. *boy;*] *boy.* Johns. Var. '73, Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Huds. Del. Fle. Rlfe, Neils. *boy:* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Dyce. *boy,* Coll. MS.
this is] Om. Ritson, Coll. MS. Huds. ii, Words. *this'* Fle. *this* Vaughan (i, 15).
eldeſt] *eld'st* Cap. Coll. MS. Walker (Vers., 167), Hal. Dyce ii, iii, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Fle. Words.
ſonnes ſonne,] *Son's Son,* F_4. *son's son.* Warb. *son's* Dono.
190. *thee:*] *thee.* Neils.

---

tration of these lines: 'Yee shall not trouble any widowe, nor fatherlesse child. If thou vexe or trouble such and so he cal and cry unto Mee, I will surely heare his cry. Then shall My wrath be kindled and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widowes and your children fatherlesse.'—*Exod.*, xxii, 22 (*Geneuan Version*).

189. **this is . . . sonnes sonne**] As will be seen by the *Text. Notes*, there have been several attempts to render regular the metre of the latter half of this line; such are, perhaps, unnecessary, since GUEST (i, 86) says: 'All words which qualify others, as adjectives, adverbs, and others of the same class, receive a fainter accent than the words qualified. It has been observed (*Edin. Rev.*, N°. 12, Art. 10) that when "a monosyllabic adjective and substantive are joined, the substantive has the acute, and the adjective the grave, unless the adjective be placed in antithesis, in which case the reverse happens." This rule might have been stated more generally. The primary accent of the adjective ought *always*, when not emphatic, to be weaker than that of the substantive.'—Guest, among other examples, quotes the present passage, where the word 'eldest' is the adjective that thus receives a weaker accent than the word 'son's.' (See also Ibid., pp. 263, 264, where this line is quoted as an example of a modern Alexandrine.)—ED.

189. **eldest**] For numerous examples in justification of the cacophonous elision *eld'st*, see, if needful, WALKER (*Vers.*, 167) or ABBOTT, § 473.

190. **Infortunate**] WRIGHT: In *Othello*, V, ii, 283, the Quartos read: '—most infortunate man,' where the Folios have 'unfortunate.' On the other hand, in II, iii, 42, the Folios have: 'I am infortunate in the infirmity,' while the Quartos read 'unfortunate.'

191. **visited**] WHITNEY (*Cent. Dict.*, s. v. 5.): In Scriptural phraseology: (*a*) To send a judgment from heaven upon, whether for the purpose of chastising or

The Canon of the Law is laide on him, 192
Being but the ſecond generation
Remoued from thy ſinne-conceiuing wombe.
Iohn. Bedlam haue done. 195
Con. I haue but this to ſay,
That he is not onely plagued for her ſin, 197

192–203. Om. Dono.
192. *Canon*[*cannon* Rowe ii.
194. *wombe*] *self* C. Clarke.
195. *Bedlam*] *Beldam* Ritson, Rann, Mitford (Gentleman's Maga., Aug., 1844), S. T. P. (N. & Q., 4 April, 1874).
197. *he is*] *he's* Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *she's* Lettsom. *her ſin*] *her sins* Vaughan.

---

afflicting, or of comforting or consoling; judge. 'Oh visit me with thy salvation.' —*Psalm* cvi, 4. (*b*) To inflict punishment for (guilt) or upon (a person), 'Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children.'—*Exodus*, xxxiv, 7.—[This last quotation is, of course, 'the Canon of the Law' to which reference is made in the next two lines.—ED.]

191. in] WRIGHT compares: 'Yet execute thy wrath in me alone.'—*Rich. III:* I, iv, 71.

195. Bedlam] WRIGHT: That is, *lunatic.* So in *Lear:* 'Let's follow the old earl, and get the Bedlam To lead him where he would.'—III, vii, 103.—[With this interpretation Ritson's conjectural emendation (see *Text. Notes*), though attractive, is quite unnecessary.—ED.]

197–202. That he is not . . . of this childe] JOHNSON: This passage appears to me very obscure. The chief difficulty arises from this, that Constance, having told Elinor of her 'sin-conceiving womb,' pursues the thought, and uses 'sin' through the next lines in an ambiguous sense, sometimes for *crime* and sometimes for *offspring*. He is not only made miserable by vengeance for her *sin* or *crime*, but her *sin*, her *offspring*, and she are made the instruments of that vengeance on this descendant, who, though of the second generation, is plagued for her and *with her;* to whom she is not only the cause but the instrument of evil. The next clause is more perplexed. I point thus: '—plagu'd for her And with her.—Plague her sin! his injury Her injury, the beadle to her sin.' That is, instead of inflicting vengeance on this innocent and remote descendant, *punish her sin*, her immediate offspring; [This is evidently a misprint, as in the *Variorum* of 1773 it is corrected to read '*her son.*'—ED.] then the affliction will fall where it is deserved; *his injury* will be her *injury*, and the misery of her *sin;* her son will be a beadle, or chastiser, to her *crimes*, which are now *all punished in the person of this child.* [The CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* X.) say: 'The word "sin" is twice printed by mistake for "son" in Johnson's note.'—The sentences to which they thus refer are presumably (1) the misprint which was corrected in the next edition; and (2) 'He is not only made miserable by vengeance for her *sin* or *crime*, but her *sin*, her *offspring* and she,' etc., which seems as though we should read 'her son, her offspring.' Inasmuch as this is not changed, and as Johnson begins by saying that 'sin' here is 'sometimes used for *crime* and sometimes for *offspring*,' the note as given is, I think, in accord with his reasoning.—ED.]—RODERICK (ap. EDWARDS, p. 252): Constance had before said that Elinor's sins were visited upon her grandson, Arthur; in this

[197–202. That he is not . . . of this childe]

speech she adds farther—That He was not only punished for Her sins, but that God had been pleased to make use of Her as the Means, the Instrument, whereby that punishment was inflicted on him. This is all the sentiment of the speech; which (for the sake of a miserable jingling between *Plague and Sin*) is thrice repeated, with varied expressions. Read and point ll. 199, 201 thus: 'On this removed issue; plagu'd for her And with her plagued; Her sin, His injury, Her injury the Beadle to her Sin.' The last line and a half may want some little explanation: 'Her sin, his *injury*'—i. e., his loss, his damage, his punishment. 'Her *injury* the Beadle to her Sin'—Her injury—her injustice—her violence in taking part with King John in his endeavors to rob him of his right to the crown. (And, by the way, this using the same word—*Injury*—in the same sentence in two different senses is not at all disagreeable to Shakespeare's usual manner.) The Beadle in a Corporation is the officer whose business it is to execute the sentences pass'd upon any offenders; such as Whipping, &c., to which Shakespeare alludes; and because her injustice was the instrument by which the punishment of her sins was inflicted upon Arthur, he therefore calls it the *Beadle* to her sins.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 122): For the speech's sense, it is this: John, Arthur, and Elinor, and the speaker's self in the end are said in jingling expressions to be punish'd and plagu'd for the only sins of that Elinor: John is spoke to first, and denoted by pointing; and,—after tracing Arthur's misfortunes, and Elinor's own, to the root she set out with,—the speaker ends with herself; who, though guiltless, had her punishment too in her child's punishment, brought upon him by Elinor: What she says of herself is oblique, and convey'd in 'All': what of Elinor, must be piec'd in this manner—'*And* in sinning as she does against Arthur, she finds *her* own *plague; his injury* is *her injury, the beadle to her sin*,' i. e., lasher or whipper of it: The plagues of John and his mother are—this war and their own troubles for Arthur.—STEEVENS (*Variorum, 1778*): We may read: '—this I have to say, That he's not only plagued for her sin, But God hath made her sin and her the plague On this removed issue, plagu'd for her; And, with her sin, her plague, his injury Her injury, the beadle to her sin,' i. e., *God hath made her and her sin together, the plague of her most remote descendants, who are plagued for her;* the same power hath likewise *made her sin her own plague, and the injury she has done to him her own injury, as a beadle to lash that sin*, i. e., Providence has so ordered it that she, who is made the instrument of punishment to another, has, in the end, converted that other into an instrument of punishment for herself.—[The principal change made by Steevens is in l. 200, where it will be seen that the words 'plague' and 'sin' are transposed as in Capell's text, but not so credited by Steevens. The slight change in the words of l. 196, 'this I have to say,' is not, I think, intended by him as a new reading; if so, he later withdrew it, as it does not appear in the repetitions of this note after the *Variorum of 1785*.—ED.]—TOLLET: Constance observes that *he* (*iste*), pointing to King John ('whom from the flow of gall she names not'), is not only plagued (with the present war) for his mother's sin, but God hath made her sin and her the plague also on this removed issue, Arthur, plagued on her account, and by the means of her final offspring, whose injury (the usurpation of Arthur's rights) may be considered as her injury, or the injury of her sin-conceiving womb; and John's may also be considered as the beadle, or officer of correction, employed by her crimes to inflict all these punishments on the person of this child.—MALONE (*Variorum, 1785*): If part of this obscure sentence were included in a

[197–202. That he is not . . . of this childe]

parenthesis the sense would, perhaps, be somewhat clearer: 'But God hath made her sin (the plague On this removed issue—plagued for her, And with her) plague her son; his injury,' etc. Instead of 'beadle to her *sin*,' I would read '*sins*.' '*Removed*,' I believe, here signifies *remote*. So in *Mid. N. Dream*, 'From Athens is her house remov'd seven leagues.'—[I, i, 159. Is not 'removed' used in this line in precisely the same sense as in l. 193, where it means relationship of the second generation? We still use the phrase 'cousin once removed' to designate a parent's cousin. In his own edition, published five years later, Malone substitutes the following: 'Not being satisfied with any of the emendations proposed, I have adhered to the original copy. I suspect that two half lines have been lost after the words "And with her"—. If the text be right, "with," I think, means *by*, and Tollet's interpretation the true one.'—He retains, however, his interpretation of 'removed.'—ED.]—RANN also, with a few slight verbal changes, accepts Tollet's explanation.—HENLEY: The key to these words is contained in the last speech of Constance, where she alludes to the denunciation of the *second commandment*. Young Arthur is represented as not only suffering *from* the guilt of his grandmother; but also by *her*, in person, she being made the very instrument of his sufferings. As he was not her *immediate*, but *removed*, *issue*—the second generation from her sin-conceiving womb—it might have been expected that the evils to which, upon her account, he was obnoxious would have *incidentally* befallen him; instead of his being punished for them all, by *her* immediate *infliction*. He is not only plagued on account of her sin, according to the threatening of the commandment, but she is preserved alive to her *second generation*, to be the instrument of inflicting on her grandchild the penalty annexed to her sin; so that *he is plagued on her account*, and *with her plague*, which is, *her sin*, that is (taking by a common figure the cause for the consequence), the *penalty entailed upon it*. *His* injury, or the evil *he* suffers, *her* sin brings upon him, and her injury, or, the evil *she* inflicts, he suffers from *her*, as the beadle to her sin, or executioner of the punishment annexed to it.—KNIGHT offers neither comment nor explanation.—COLLIER remarks that though the text is 'involved the sense is sufficiently clear.'—HUDSON and SINGER accept Henley's elucidation without attempting to intrinsicate some of his involutions.—ARROWSMITH (*N. & Q.*, 1857, II, iv, 469): At their commencement the reproaches of Constance are couched in general terms. Elinor and Arthur are an exemplification of the canon of the law, of the sins (in the plural) of the grandmother visited upon the grandchild, punished, as she aggravates the case, in the second generation. The phrase 'sin-conceiving womb,' being alike applicable to all mothers, has no farther special force here, than as a mother of a King John may be considered an eminent illustration of its truth. To attach such a significance to the epithet 'sin-conceiving' as, bye and bye, in the same sentence, under the word *sin* to jumble together the guilt for which Elinor was justly accountable, with a sinful offspring, from which no mother is exempt, introduces a solecism in discourse that requires better warrant than the lame and impotent construction of the sequel, which it was devised to bolster up. [See note by Johnson, *ante*.] When she resumes her upbraidings, Constance enters into particulars. . . . It is sin in the singular, a specific sin, of which Constance now speaks; that sin the second line and the rest of the context clearly show to be Elinor's instrumentality in depriving Arthur, the rightful heir, of his kingdom. 'God hath made her sin and her (the crime and the criminal) the plague on this removed

[197–202. That he is not . . . of this childe]

issue'; before, when speaking generally, it was, as we have seen, an aggravation that the sins should be visited upon 'but the second generation'; now the remoteness of the issue adds emphasis to the wrong; that injury should be sustained immediately at the hands of the grandmother by an issue so far removed as her grandchild. 'Plagued for her and with her plague, her sin'; he is plagued for her, and he is plagued by and with her. He suffers for the guilt of her sin, and he suffers the evil of her sin, and that evil he suffers as penalty for the guilt; so that the evil of the sin being identical with the penalty of its guilt, the whole mischief of the sin lights upon him; but by virtue of the relationship between them, it also recoils upon Elinor, because the defeat of a grandchild's inheritance, whether she so regard it or not, is an injury to the grandmother; or, as Shakespeare pursues the argument, 'his injury is her injury,' and thus the evil of her sin, redounding upon herself, becomes the beadle to its guilt; yet, as Elinor was a willing agent, and *volenti non fit injuria*, it is 'all punished in the person of this child, and all for her, a plague upon her'; and I fear the intelligent reader will add, a plague upon you too, that have superfluously explained what again and again explains itself.—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* X.): Mr Roby, whose punctuation we have adopted, says: 'I suppose the sense to be: "God hath made her sin and herself to be a plague to this distant child, who is punished for her and with the punishment belonging to her: God has made her sin to be an injury to Arthur, and her injurious deeds to be the executioner to punish her sin; all which (viz., her first sin and her now injurious deeds) are punished in the person of this child."' Mr Lloyd, who, with the same punctuation, would read [l. 200] 'her sin, her injury,' interprets thus: 'Elinor's injuries to Arthur are God's agents to punish him, both for the sin of being her grandchild, and for the inherited guilt of these very injuries.' —STAUNTON: The thought running through this passage and which sufficiently explains it seems to be that there is peculiar hardship in Arthur suffering not only for the sins of the grandmother (which might be regarded as the common lot—'the canon of the law'), but by the instrumentality of the person whose sins were thus punished; the grandmother being the agent inflicting retribution on her grandson for her own guilt.—R. G. WHITE: [Line 200, 'And with her plague,'] is quite incomprehensible, in spite of two pages and a half of not very valuable comment in the *Variorum* [of 1821]. With the simple correction of an easy misprint, which was suggested by Roderick, the passage is as plain as any other in these plays. The allusion to the denunciation of vengeance upon children for the sins of their parents, in the second commandment of the Mosaic table, is obvious.—JOHN HUNTER [reading l. 200 according to Roderick]: The remainder of Constance's speech is grossly misprinted in the Folio. The meaning is: Plagued on her account and plagued by means of her; her sin being the wrong he suffers, and her wrong-doing being the chastiser of her sin.—FLEAY: I follow the Folios . . . and interpret thus: Plagued on her account, and by means of her wrong-doing, which is a plague inflicted by her (cf. 'her sin . . . the plague,' l. 198); the injury inflicted on him, the injury inflicted by her, being the beadle, the chastiser (in Arthur's sufferings), of her original wrong-doing. Editors have altered and given various interpretations of the text in several ways (surely without cause).—HERR (p. 20): The word 'plague' has as various meanings in this passage as they are variously played upon by Constance; but these can be best understood by paraphrasing thus: 'I have but this to say: Arthur is not only punished for Elinor's sin, but God has made

[197–202. **That he is not . . . of this childe**]

her sin and herself the evil-worker on this displaced offspring, who is punished for her, and through her evil work and her sin; He has made his wrong-suffering grow out of her wrong-doing—which wrong-doing serves as the scourger to her own sin—or the lash to her own sin; all, sins and injuries inflicted, punished in the person of this child, and all on her account; may a curse light upon her!' That such was the general thought and idea of Constance may be fairly inferred from her preceding words uttered a few lines back, ll. 191–194. It will be seen that the same idea pervades both passages, only expressed in a different form. So in the least manner to mar the text, and in order to convey the above interpretation, the lines should run thus: 'And by her plague *and* her sin: *made* his inj'ry *Through* her inj'ry,—the beadle to her *own* sin.' To omit the Italicized words is to leave the passage a puzzle; to retain them is to make its meaning clear to the general reader—they are, in fact, merely ellipses restored. At least it is essential that '*made*' should be retained, as it is the key of the whole passage, and will be seen properly to refer to 'God hath,' [l. 198]. '*Through*' is important as marking the different kinds of injuries meant.—[Herr also suggests that, in order to preserve the metre of l. 201, 'beadle' is to be pronounced as a monosyllable; how this is either phonetically or intelligibly to be accomplished is not very apparent.—ED.]—MOBERLY: The notion is like that in *Hamlet*, 'It hath pleased high heaven To visit me with this, and this with me'; that is, to lay this enterprise like a curse upon me, and at the same time to make my weak nature a curse upon the enterprise. So here Arthur has not only to suffer the consequences of Elinor's sin, but she herself and her evil nature are of themselves a curse beyond any consequence. [Roby's] is clearly the right punctuation. . . . It would be easy on the stage to indicate the double meaning of 'injury'; the second being like 'injurious Hermia' in *Mid. N. Dream*.—WORDSWORTH in his edition omits ll. 201–203, remarking: 'The modicum of sense, and the tautology of these three lines, together with the metrical defect in l. 203, seem to warrant their omission. . . . King Philip may well condemn "these ill-timed repetitions"; and more than enough remain to justify the condemnation.'—HERFORD follows Capell's interpretation, only referring the words 'All punish'd' to 'Elinor's sin and her present injurious deeds.' He adds: 'Mr Roby understands "with her plague" to be "with the punishment belonging to her," which is not supported by the parallel clauses below: "her sin his injury," "her injury . . . sin." '—Miss PORTER: The clew to this word-puzzle may lie not in further metaphysics, but in the invective of insult intended by Constance against Elinor's virtue. Suspicion that Elinor's rumoured infidelity is true grows in Constance. From his 'grandames wrongs' to Arthur, she infers, now, that John is a child of sin, and therefore favoured by his mother to 'usurp' the 'royalties and rights' legitimately belonging to Arthur. According to the Scriptures . . . he is now suffering because of Elinor's 'sin-conceiving womb.' In further applying these ideas Constance has *but this to say:* Not only is Elinor's *sin*, in a general way, visited upon him, but, actually in this war against them, the issue of her *sinne*—John, and Elinor, herself, are themselves the plague that plagues him. So Arthur is plagued on her account, because of her sin and at her instigation, and along with the plague of her—herself, he is plagued with the *sinne* of her—John. *And with her plague her sinne:* his injury (Arthur's injury, i. e., Elinor herself), *Her injurie* (her injurious deed, i. e., the issue of her infidelity—John), both being the *Beadle to her sinne* (that infidelity itself); and *all*, viz., this her sin and these

But God hath made her ſinne and her, the plague
On this remoued iſſue, plagued for her,
And with her plague her ſinne: his iniury
Her iniurie the Beadle to her ſinne,
All puniſh'd in the perſon of this childe,
And all for her, a plague vpon her.
Que. Thou vnaduiſed ſcold, I can produce

198. *her ſinne*] *her son* Spence (N. & Q., 27 Jan., 1894).

199. *remoued*] *removèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii.

iſſue,] *issue;*— Sing. ii, Sta. Huds.

plagued] *plagu'd* Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr, Sing. Knt. *plaguèd* Dyce, Fle, Huds. ii.

for her,] *for her;* Cap.

200. *And with her plague her ſinne:*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Coll. *And with her.—Plague her sin;* Johns. *And with her.—plague her son!* Id. conj., Var. '78, '85. *And, with her sin, her plague,* Cap. *And with her plagu'd; her sin;* Roderick, Rann, Sing. ii, Dyce ii, iii, Hunter, Huds. ii, Words. *And with her plague—her sin:* Sta. *And with her plague; her sin* Roby, Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *And with her plague, her sin;* Mal. et cet.

200. *his iniury*] *his injury;* Sing. ii.

201–203. Om. Words.

201. *Her iniurie*] *Her injury,* Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Varr, Rann. Sing. i, Ktly. *Her injury,*— Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds.

Beadle] *bedel* Han.

202, 203. *All...And all*] *All...And punished all* or *Are...And punished all* Vaughan.

203. *for her,*] *for her;* Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Wh. i. *for her.* Fle. Huds. ii. *for her—For her:* Marshall, Craig.

vpon her.] *upon her!* Theob. et seq.

204. *vnaduiſed*] *unadvisèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

---

executant personified injuries are punished upon Arthur, for her sake. No change in words or pointing are required with this explanation. This denunciation of Elinor demands passionate gesture, the injuries claimed being personified, and the sin an accusation.—[On the conclusion of this long note I have but this to say: The interpretation offered by Roby, accepted by the Cambridge Editors, by Dr Wright in the Clarendon ed., and later editors, as it is the simplest, is the one which is unhesitatingly accepted by the present ED.]

197. **plagued**] That is, *punished.* Compare: 'And God, not we, hath plagued thy bloody deed.'—*Richard III:* I, iii, 181. Both noun and verb bear this meaning throughout these lines; Constance herself so interprets the verb in l. 202.

203. **And all . . . vpon her**] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 119) prints this line with a *Qu.*, on which his editor Lettsom says in a foot-note: 'This is the usual reading, which Walker evidently intended to alter, though, by a slip of the pen, he left it as he found it. *Qu* ."And all for her, *and by her;* a plague upon her." '—[COLLIER (ed. iii.), in a note on this line, without giving any name, says: 'Poetry-patchers would insert "and by her" in the middle of this line, most injuriously.' Lettsom died ten years before the appearance of Collier's third edition.—ED.]—MOBERLY: Either 'then' has fallen out, or the line was ended on Shakespeare's stage by some gesture more emphatic than elegent—spitting, we may fear. (So Queen Elizabeth sometimes expressed disapprobation.)—DAWSON likewise suggests that a gesture was here introduced to complete the metre.

204. **vnaduised**] That is, *lacking consideration, rash.* Compare l. 48, *ante.*

A Will, that barres the title of thy ſonne. 205
Con. I who doubts that, a Will: a wicked will,
A womans will, a cankred Grandams will.
Fra. Peace Lady, pauſe, or be more temperate,
It ill beſeemes this preſence to cry ayme 209

206. *I...that,*] *Ay,...that?* Rowe et seq. *that*] Om. F_4.
a Will:] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Ktly, Fle. *a will!*— Theob. et cet.
207. *cankred*] F_2F_3, Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. '73, '78, '85. *cankered* F_4. *cank'red* Fle. *canker'd* Rowe et cet.
207. *Grandams*] *grandame's* F_2F_3, Cap. Knt, Sta. Fle.
208. *Lady,*] *lady!* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Del. Words.
temperate,] *temperate.* Coll. i, ii, Wh. i, Rlfe, Words. Neils. *temperate.* [exit *Constance.* Dono.
209, 210. Om. Donovan.
209. *ayme*] *ay me* Ff, Rowe i. *Amen* Rowe ii, Pope. *aim!* Sta. *hem* Moberly conj. *aim* Theob. et cet.

205. **A will . . . thy sonne**] Roger of Wendover, under the year 1190, says: 'At this time Tancred, king of Sicily (who had succeeded to king William), in order to keep on peaceable terms with king Richard, gave to that king twenty thousand ounces of silver in discharge of all his claims against him, and the same quantity of gold as a quit-claim of the will, which king William had made in favour of king Henry, Richard's father, and in consideration of the marriage which had been agreed to be contracted between Arthur, Duke of Brittany, and the daughter of king Tancred; on which king Richard appointed the before named Arthur his heir, in case of his dying without any lawful heir, after which he set out on his pilgrimage' (ed. Giles, ii, 95). This Richard revoked at his death in 1199; Holinshed says: '—feeling himselfe to wax weaker and weaker, preparing his mind to death, which he perceiued now to be at hand, he ordeined his testament, or rather reformed and added sundrie things vnto the same which he before had made, at the time of his gooing foorth towards the holie land. Vnto his brother John he assigned the crowne of England, and all other his lands and dominions, causing the Nobles there present to sweare fealtie vnto him' (iii, 155, *b*).—COURTENAY (i, 8) cites Hoveden, p. 791, as the contemporary authority 'for the dying declaration of Richard in favor of John.' On this WORDSWORTH (i, 436) remarks: 'Doubtless his change of purpose was caused, more or less, by his mother's influence—"the woman's *will*"—to which Constance, playing upon the word, alludes; and the mother, we may suppose, was influenced by jealousy of her daughter-in-law.'—[Possibly; but Elinor was not present at the time of Richard's death at Chaluz; she was in England with John.—ED.]

207. **A womans . . . Grandams will**] COLLIER: So in the old play Elinor says: '—I can infer a will That bars the way he urgeth by descent.' And Constance replies: 'A will indeed! a crabbed woman's will.'—[Part i, sc. ii, l. 100].

209. **to cry ayme**] JOHNSON: That is, *to encourage.* I once thought it was borrowed from archery; and that *aim!* having been the word of command, as we now say *present!* 'to cry aim,' had been to *incite notice* or raise *attention.* But I rather think that the old word of applause was *J'aime,* which the English, not easily pronouncing *Je,* sunk into *aime* or *aim.* Our exclamations of applause are still borrowed, as *bravo* and *encore.*—[It is, perhaps, not wholly fair to Dr Johnson's reputation as a philologist to repeat this conjectural derivation; but he himself made no attempt to suppress it in later editions.—ED.]—STEEVENS: Dr John-

To theſe ill-tuned repetitions:
Some Trumpet ſummon hither to the walles
Theſe men of Angiers, let vs heare them ſpeake,
Whoſe title they admit, *Arthurs* or *Iohns*.

Trumpet ſounds.
Enter a Citizen vpon the walles.

Cit. Who is it that hath warn'd vs to the walles?
Fra. 'Tis France, for England.

210. *ill-tuned*] Ff, Cap. Var. '78, 85, Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. *ill-turned* Rowe i. *ill-tunèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *ill tuned* Rowe ii. et cet.

repetitions:] *repetitions*. Rowe et seq. (*repetitiõns*. Fle.).

211. *Some Trumpet*] *Sound trumpet!* Craig conj.

212. *Angiers*] *Angiers*. Neils.

ſpeake,] *speak*. Theob. i. (misprint). *speak* Cam.+, Neils.

214, 215. Trumpet ſounds...the walles.] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Fle. Trumpets sound ... the walls. Johns. Trumpet. Enter certain Citizens on the walls. Cap. Trumpet sounds...citizens...the walls. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. ii, Craig. Trumpet sounds...certain citizens...the walls. Cam.+, Words. Trumpets sound. Enter Citizens. Dono. Trumpet sounds...the walls [attended]. Neils. Trumpets sound...citizens...the walls. Var. '73 et cet.

SCENE III. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

216. Cit.] Knt, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Huds. Citti. F_2. Citi. F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. 1. c. Capell. 1 Cit. Var. '73 et cet.

217. Fra.] Ff, Fle. K. Philip. Rowe et cet. (throughout).

---

son's first thought, I believe, is best. So, in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Love's Cure:* 'Can I cry aim To this against myself?'—[ed. Dyce, IV, ii, p. 166]. Again, in *Tarlton's Jests*, 1611: 'The people had much ado to keep peace: but Bankes and Tarleton had like to have squared and the horse by, to *give aime.*'—[Ashbee reprint, sig C2, *verso*]. Again, in *Churchyard's Charge*, 1580: 'Yet he that stands, and giveth aime, Maie judge what shott doeth lose the game.'—p. 8, b. Again, in *Merry Wives*, Ford says: '—and to these violent proceedings my neighbors shall cry aim.'—III, ii, 45.—[J. CROSBY, in the *American Bibliopolist*, August, 1875, in explanation of the phrases 'cry aim' and 'give aim,' calls attention to a note by Gifford on Massinger's *The Bondman*, II, iii, which in part is as follows: 'To cry *aim!* . . . was to encourage; to *give aim* was to direct, and in these distinct and appropriate senses the words perpetually occur. There was no such office as *aim-cryer;* the business of encouragement being abandoned to such of the spectators as chose to interfere; to that of direction, indeed, there was a special person appointed. Those who cried *aim!* stood by the archers; he who *gave it* was stationed near the butts, and pointed out, after every discharge, how wide or how short the arrow fell of the mark.'—WRIGHT also points out that Steevens has here confused these two phrases, and quotes the latter part of Gifford's note.—ED.]

215. **Enter a Citizen**] COLLIER: The economy of our old stage could only allow one citizen to make his appearance.

216. **warn'd**] WRIGHT: That is, *summoned*. Compare: 'And sent to warn them to his royal presence.'—*Richard III:* I, iii, 39.

Iohn. England for it ſelfe:
You men of Angiers, and my louing ſubiects.
Fra. You louing men of Angiers, *Arthurs* ſubiects,
Our Trumpet call'd you to this gentle parle.
Iohn. For our aduantage, therefore heare vs firſt:
Theſe flagges of France that are aduanced heere
Before the eye and proſpect of your Towne,
Haue hither march'd to your endamagement.
The Canons haue their bowels full of wrath,
And ready mounted are they to ſpit forth
Their Iron indignation 'gainſt your walles:
All preparation for a bloody ſiedge
And merciles proceeding, by theſe French.
Comfort yours Citties eies, your winking gates:

218. *it ſelfe:*] *itself.* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Neils. Craig.
219. *ſubiects.*] Ff, Knt i, iii. *subjectsl* Knt ii. *subjects*— Rowe et cet.
220. Arthurs] Arthur's F_4.
221. *parle.*] *parle*— Rowe, Pope,+, Knt ii, Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Cam.+, Del. Rlfe, Words. Craig.
222. *aduantage,*] Ff. *advantage;* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Dyce, Wh. i, Ktly, Neils. *advantage;*— Cap. et cet.
vs firſt:] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *us first:*— Johns. Var. '73. *us first.* Cap. Mal. Knt, Dyce, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Words. Neils. *us first*— Rann. *us first.*— Var. '78 et cet.
223. *aduanced*] *advancèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
229. *preparation*] *preparations* Pope, + (—Var. '73).
ſiedge] *Siege* F_4.
230. *And...proceeding,...French.*] Ff. *And...proceeding,...French,* Rowe, Pope, Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Knt, Hal. Sta. Fle. *And,...proceeding,... French,* Theob. i. *And...proceeding... French* Dyce, Wh. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig. *And...proceeding...French,* Han. et cet.
231. *Comfort yours*] F_2. *Comfort your* F_3F_4, Coll. i. *Confront your* Rowe, Pope, +, Steev. Varr. Sing. Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. Del. Coll. iii, Dono. *Come 'fore your* Coll. ii. (MS.), Ktly. *Confronts your* Cap. et cet.

---

218. **it selfe**] WRIGHT: This shows that 'his' in l. 102 is not masculine, but neuter.

222. **Iohn. For our . . . vs first**] CAPELL (I, ii, p. 123): He were hardly an Englishman that is not charm'd with John's brisk interruption and conquest of Philip in this line; it is but imperfectly seen in other copies, for want of the break [see *Text. Notes*]; which shows that the parts of the line are address'd differently, the first to Philip himself.

222. **our aduantage**] TYRWHITT: If we read 'For *your* advantage,' it will be a more specious reason for interrupting Philip.

223. **aduanced**] That is, *raised, lifted up.* Compare: '—beauty's ensign yet Is crimson in thy lips and in thy cheeks, And death's pale flag is not advanced there.'—*Rom. & Jul.*, V, iii, 94.

231. **Comfort**] KNIGHT, accepting Capell's emendation, remarks: 'Although "comfort" might be used by John in irony, . . . "preparation" is here the nomi-

[231. Comfort yours Citties eies, your winking gates:]

native, and therefore we use *confronts*.'—COLLIER (ed. i.) justifies the Folio reading on the ground that 'King John is evidently speaking ironically.'—To this DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 88) replies: 'Mr Knight was the first who suggested that "'Comfort' might be used by John in irony"; and if this suggestion had been thrown out by Steevens, I should have supposed that it had originated in the hope of inducing the next editor to adopt a reading which the "malicious George" would afterwards have great satisfaction in pronouncing to be an absurdity. . . . I appeal to the plain sense of the most uncritical reader, if he can discover in [the whole speech] even a shadow of *irony;* a rhetorical figure, indeed, which would naturally be avoided by King John, whose object in the present address is to gain over the citizens of Angiers.'—COLLIER evidently felt the force of this remark; in his *Notes and Emendations*, p. 202, he says: 'It has been urged by those who wished to adhere to the text of the Folios, as long as it was unimpugned by any old authority, that "comfort" was here used ironically. Rowe did not think so when he printed *confront;* but the MS. Corrector, with less violence, has "Come 'fore."'—It is, I think, somewhat difficult to explain this slightly veiled sneer at those who wished to force a meaning from the Folio reading; Collier himself and Knight being the only two. In his 2nd Edition Collier omits all mention of an ironical meaning to 'comfort,' and adds to his comment on the MS. correction: 'There is a singular confirmation of the misprint of *Comfort* for "Come 'fore" in the Folio of 1632 itself, for in *2 Henry VI:* III, ii we meet with a line which stands thus: "Comfort, my sovereign, gracious Henry *com fore*." In the last instance "comfort" ought, of course, to be repeated.' [Even at the risk of appearing captious on a point so slight, it is well, I think, to say that in the 2nd Folio the line is divided at the first syllable 'com' with a very perceptible hyphen connecting the next syllable 'fore' in the next line. This is quite different from the MS. correction *come 'fore*.]—KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*, i, p. 256) says: '*Come 'fore* may be rejected as a slavish adherence to ten syllables. Shakspere would have written *come before*.'—HALLIWELL concurs with Dyce that the whole tenour of this speech precludes taking 'comfort' as spoken ironically; Rowe's or Capell's emendation is, therefore, necessary.—MOBERLY: Capell's correction is manifestly right, though perhaps *confront* would be still more accurate, as the preparation is for a siege, and also for 'merciless proceedings.'—[It is hardly likely that so careful an editor as Moberly was unaware that Capell's is but an emendation of Rowe's reading. With the first portion of his note I quite agree.—ED.]

231. yours] LETTSOM (ap. WALKER, *Crit.*, ii, 591, foot-note) explains the presence of the superfluous *s* as having been removed from the end of the preceding word. This is a corroboration of the correctness of Capell's emendation *confronts*.

231. your winking gates] MALONE: That is, gates hastily closed from an apprehension of danger. So in *2 Henry IV:* 'And winking leap'd into destruction.'—I, iii, 33.—[Beyond the fact that the word 'winking' occurs in both passages, there is no similiarity. In the line from *Henry IV*. 'winking' means, as often used, closing the eyes tightly.—Steevens quotes, in illustration of the present line, 'Whether it were lead or lattin that haspt [downe] those winking casements, I know not' (*Old Fortunatus*, Dekker; ed. Pearson, p. 124); but this is really no better than Malone's, as the speaker is referring to the eyes of two who have fallen asleep. It is, in fact, exactly the reverse of this line in *King John;* Shakespeare compares the gates to *eyes* hastily closed; Dekker compares the eyes to *windows*

And but for our approch, thoſe ſleeping ſtones,
That as a waſte doth girdle you about
By the compulſion of their Ordinance,
By this time from their fixed beds of lime
Had bin diſhabited, and wide hauocke made
For bloody power to ruſh vppon your peace.
But on the ſight of vs your lawfull King,
Who painefully with much expedient march
Haue brought a counter-checke before your gates,

232. *And*] *And*, Theob. Warb. Cap. Varr. Rann, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Words.
approch] *approach* F_4.
233. *waſte*] *waiſte* F_4. *waist* Var. '78 et seq.
doth] Ff, Wh. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. *do* Rowe et cet.
234. *Ordinance,*] Ff, Ktly, Sta. *ordnance* Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. Del. *ordinance* Rowe et cet.
235. *fixed*] *fixèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
236. *diſhabited*] *dishabit'* Fle.
237. *peace.*] *peace,* F_3F_4.
238–241. *But...cheekes:*] Om. Dono.
238. *But...vs*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam.+. *But,...us*, Cap. et cet.
on] *for* Ed. conj.
239–241. *Who...cheekes:*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Coll. Wh. Sta. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Neils. In parentheses Pope et cet.
239. *Who painefully*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, +, Cam.+. *Who painfully*, Mal. et cet.

---

hastily shut.—Wright, for a like use of 'wink,' compares: 'Was this the face That, like the sun, did make beholders wink?'—*Richard II:* IV, i, 284.—ED.]

232–235. **sleeping . . . beds**] WHITER (p. 91): Can the reader doubt that the words 'sleeping' and 'beds' in this passage were inpressed on our Author by the preceding image of the 'city's eyes' and the 'winking gates'? The metaphor is not continued, though the words belonging to it succeed.—[The avowed purpose of Whiter's volume, as expressed in his title page, is to explain Shakespeare's use of certain similes through the association of ideas.—John Hunter also calls attention to the continuation of the metaphor in 'winking,' 'sleeping,' and 'beds.' —ED.]

233. **waste**] That is, a girdle, or garment for the waist; compare: '—the noble Talbot Who now is girdled with a waist of iron And hemm'd about with grim destruction.'—*1 Henry VI:* IV, iii, 20.

233. **doth**] For other examples wherein the relative takes a singular verb, though the antecedent be plural, see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 247.

236. **dishabited**] STEEVENS: That is, dislodged, violently removed from their places; a word, I believe, of our Author's coinage.—[MURRAY (*N. E. D.*), in confirmation of this supposition by Steevens, gives the present line as the only example of 'dishabit' used in this sense.—DELIUS quotes from Carew, *Survey of Cornwall*, 'dishabited towns' (67a), but this means towns deprived of inhabitants, and is a variant of *disinhabited*, of which Murray gives other examples.—ED.]

239. **expedient**] Compare l. 64, *ante*.

240. **counter-checke**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. sb. 2.): A check that opposes or arrests the course of anything. [The present line quoted.]

To ſaue vnſcratch'd your Citties threatned cheekes:
Behold the French amaz'd vouchſafe a parle,
And now inſteed of bulletts wrapt in fire
To make a ſhaking feuer in your walles,
They ſhoote but calme words, folded vp in ſmoake,
To make a faithleſſe errour in your eares,
Which truſt accordingly kinde Cittizens,
And let vs in. Your King, whoſe labour'd ſpirits
Fore-wearied in this action of ſwift ſpeede,
Craues harbourage within your Citie walles.

241. *vnſcratch'd*] *unscratcht* Fle.
threatned] F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. *threatened* F_2, Cam.+. *threat'ned* Fle. Neils. *threaten'd* Cap. et cet.

242. *Behold the French amaz'd*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Behold, the French amaz'd* Coll. Wh. Cam.+, Del. *Behold! The French amaz'd*, Ktly. *Behold, the French, amaz'd*, Theob. et cet.
vouchſafe] *youchſafe* Methuen facsimile F_4.

243. *And now*] *And now*, Theob. et seq.
inſteed] *inſtead* F_3. *in ſtead* F_4.

243. *wrapt*] *wrap'd* Rowe, Pope,+, Var. '78, '85. *wrapp'd* Mal. et seq.

248. *vs in. Your King,*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Sta. *in us, your king*, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *in us your king*, Han. *us in, your king;* Cap. et cet.

249. *Fore-wearied*] *Forweary'd* Var. '78 et seq.

250. *Craues*] Ff, Rowe, Knt. *Crave* Pope et cet.
Citie walles] *city-walls* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Dyce, Hal. Ktly.

---

245. **words . . . in smoake**] MALONE compares: 'This helpless smoke of words, doth me no right.'—*Lucrece*, l. 1027.

246. **faithlesse errour**] SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. faithless) cites the present line under the meanings *disloyal, perfidious*, taking 'error' in its usual sense of *a mistake*.—MOBERLY explains the passage as 'A disloyal confusion.'—[Is it not rather, deception in which all trust is lacking? In any case the adjective 'faithless' seems tautological.—ED.]

249. **Fore-wearied**] WRIGHT: That is, *exhausted*. Spelt 'forewearied' in the Folios; just as it is usual to write *forego* instead of *forgo*, while no one would use *forebid* or *foreget* for *forbid* and *forget*. Compare: 'Thine armes shalt thou sprede abrede, As man in warre were forwerede.'—*Romaunt of the Rose*, l. 2563. Palsgrave (*Lesclarcissement de la langue Francoyse*) has, 'I forwerye.'—*Ie lasse*, prim. conj. So also Spenser: 'And well I wote, that of your later fight Ye all forwearied be.'—*Faerie Queene*, I, i, 32.—['*For-*, as a prefix to verbs, has usually an intensive force, or preserves the sense of *from*, to which it is nearly related,' SKEAT (*Dict.*).]—KNIGHT, in defence of the Folio punctuation of l. 248, says: 'It is to be observed that "forweary" and *weary* are the same; and that "forwearied" may be used not as a participle requiring an auxiliary verb, but as a verb neuter. "Our spirits wearied in this action" would be correct even in modern construction.'

250. **Craues**] KNIGHT: 'Your king' is the nominative to 'craves.' (See preceding note.)—WRIGHT: The Folios have 'craves,' which is not an instance of the survival of the ancient plural in *s*, but a blunder due to the singular 'speed,' which

France. When I haue ſaide, make anſwer to vs both.
Loe in this right hand, whoſe protection
Is moſt diuinely vow'd vpon the right
Of him it holds, ſtands yong *Plantagenet,*
Sonne to the elder brother of this man,
And King ore him, and all that he enioyes:
For this downe-troden equity, we tread
In warlike march, theſe greenes before your Towne,
Being no further enemy to you
Then the conſtraint of hoſpitable zeale,
In the releeſe of this oppreſſed childe,
Religiouſly prouokes. Be pleaſed then
To pay that dutie which you truly owe,
To him that owes it, namely, this yong Prince,

252. *Loe*] *Lo!* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Lo,* Cap. et cet.
protection] *protectiön* Fle. Words.
256. *enioyes:*] *enjoys.* Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Del. Dono. Neils.
258. *warlike march,*] *warlick march.* F_4, Rowe i. *warlike march* Pope et seq.
259. *further*] *farther* Coll. Wh. i.
260. *Then*] *Than* F_4.
261. *oppreſſed*] *oppressèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.
262. *pleaſed*] *pleasèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
264. *owes it,*] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Words. *owns it,* Pope, Han. *owns it;* Theob.+. *owes it,*— Knt, Sta. *owes it;* Cap. et cet.

---

comes between the nominative ['spirits'] and the verb.—[I am not altogether certain that either Pope's or Capell's change is here necessary. The Folio reading, with its emphatic 'It is your king craves harbourage,' is more forceful than a reference to his wearied spirits requiring a resting place.—ED.]

252. **in this right hand]** WRIGHT: Compare: 'Led in the hand of her kind aunt of Gloucester.'—*Richard III:* IV, i, 2. And *Genesis,* xxi, 18: 'Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand.' Hagar was ordered not to take Ishmael in her arms, but to lead him by the hand.

253. **vow'd vpon the right]** Compare, for this construction, '—you both have vow'd revenge On him, his sons, his favourites and his friends.'—*3 Henry VI:* I, i, 55; and 'That he may vow, in that sad hour of mine, Revenge on him.'—*Lucrece,* l. 1179.

258. **greenes]** WALKER (*Crit.,* ii, 348) quotes the present line as an example wherein 'greens' is used 'for plants or vegetation in general.' This is, of course, a perfectly logical explanation, but is the word not here used in the sense of an open space covered with grass? This use is common in England; MURRAY (*N. E. D.,* s. v. *green,* 12. b.) gives many examples, the earliest dated 1477, and continuing to the present time.—ED.

263, 264. **owe . . . owes]** The first 'owe' is here used in its modern sense; the second, in that of *owns,* as so frequent in Shakespeare and other authors of that time.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) furnishes many examples.

And then our Armes, like to a muzled Beare,
Saue in aſpect, hath all offence ſeal'd vp:
Our Cannons malice vainly ſhall be ſpent
Againſt th'involuerable clouds of heauen,
And with a bleſſed and vn-vext retyre,
With vnhack'd ſwords, and Helmets all vnbruis'd,
We will beare home that luſtie blood againe,
Which heere we came to ſpout againſt your Towne,
And leaue your children, wiues, and you in peace.
But if you fondly paſſe our proffer'd offer,
'Tis not the rounder of your old-fac'd walles,
Can hide you from our meſſengers of Warre,
Though all theſe Engliſh, and their diſcipline
Were harbour'd in their rude circumference:

265–268. *And...heauen*] Om. Dono.
265. *muzled*] *muzl'd* Cap.
266. *aſpect*] *aspèct* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
hath] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cam.+, Fle. *have* Han. et cet.
268. *involuerable*] *invulnerable* Ff.
heauen] *heav'n* Rowe, Pope+.
269. *And*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Cam.+, Del. *And,*— Cap. *Then* Dono. *And,* Var. '73 et cet.
bleſſed] *blessèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
vn-vext] *unvex'd* Var. '73 et seq.
273. *and you*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Cam.+. *and you,* Cap. et cet.
274. *our*] *your* Theob. i.
proffer'd offer] *proper offer* Jervis (Emend., p. 14). *proffers here* Vaughan conj. (withdrawn). *proffer'd terms,* or *favours* Id. conj. *proffer'd peace* Huds. ii, *proffer by* Moberly conj.
275. *rounder*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Knt, Huds. i. *rondure* Sing. ii, Dyce, Hal, Ktly, Huds. ii, Words. *roundure* Cap. et cet.
277. *Though*] *Tho* Pope ii,+.
278. *circumference:*] *circumference.* Pope et seq.

---

266. **aspect**] The accent, as in nearly all cases, is on the second syllable in this word; compare IV, ii, 74 and 234.

274. **proffer'd offer**] WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 290): The bad English ('proffer'd offer') the cacophony, and the two-syllable ending, so uncommon in this play, prove that 'offer' is a corruption originating in 'proffer'd.' Read, I think, *love.* Compare *1 Henry VI:* 'But if you frown upon this proffer'd peace.'—IV, ii, 9; and just below, l. 14, 'if you forsake the offer of their love.' [Wordsworth adopts, in his text, Walker's conjecture, *love.*]—HUDSON (ed. ii.): 'Proffer'd offer' seems to me a plain instance of sophistication in order to avoid a repetition of 'peace' [in l. 273]. But I should rather say that the word ought to be repeated here, for peace is precisely what the speaker has just proffered.

275. **rounder**] STEEVENS: 'Roundure' means the same as the French *rondeur,* i. e., the circle. Compare: '—all things rare, That Heaven's air in this huge rondure hems.'—*Sonnet* xxi.

278. **rude circumference**] COLLIER (ed. ii.): A correspondent (Mr W. W. Williams of Tiverton) suggests that we ought here to read '*wide* circumference,' and in l. 215 '*bold*-fac'd' for 'old-fac'd.' We cannot concur in either proposal; the walls

Then tell vs, Shall your Citie call vs Lord,
In that behalfe which we haue challeng'd it?
Or ſhall we giue the ſignall to our rage,
And ſtalke in blood to our poſſeſſion?
Cit. In breefe, we are the King of Englands ſubiects
For him, and in his right, we hold this Towne.
Iohn. Acknowledge then the King, and let me in.
Cit. That can we not: but he that proues the King
To him will we proue loyall, till that time

279. *Then*] *Then*, Cap. et seq.
vs,] *us*,— Wh. i.
280. *which*] *in which* Ktly.
it?] *it;* Var. '73. *it*, Coll. Del.
282. *poſſeſſion*] *possessiön* Fle.
283. Cit.] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Sta. Huds. Del. Neils. 1. C. Capell. First Cit. Dyce, Hal. Cam +, Craig. 1. Cit. Mal. et cet.
Englands] *England's* F_4.
287. *loyall,*] *loyal;* Rowe et seq.

---

of Angiers may most properly be termed 'old-fac'd' from their ruggedness and their antiquity, and 'rude' is also a most applicable epithet. If any alteration of the text were needed the case would be different, but here all is intelligible and appropriate.—[Williams did not repeat either of these conjectures among those communicated to *The Parthenon* in 1862–63. They may, therefore, be considered as withdrawn.—ED.]

280. In that behalfe which] For other examples of this construction, see ABBOTT, § 394.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) here takes 'which' as used adverbially, and thus interprets: 'In the interest of him on whose behalf we have demanded the lordship of the town.'

284. For him . . . this Towne] COLLIER: So in the old *King John*, [*The Troublesome Raigne*, etc.,] the Citizen on the wall replies: 'For him, and in his right, we hold *our* town.'—[Marshall calls attention to the fact that in the older play these words are taken from a passage in prose, not verse, as it might seem from Collier's quotation.—ED.]

286, 287. he that . . . To him] ABBOTT (§ 417), s. v. *Noun Absolute*, quotes the present line, also: 'Rather proclaim it, Westmoreland, through our host That he which hath no stomach to this fight, Let him depart.'—*Henry V:* IV, iii, 34, and adds in explanation: '"He," being regarded as the normal form of the pronoun, is appropriate for this independent position. So "But I shall laugh at this a twelvemonth hence That *they* who brought me in my master's hate I live to look upon their tragedy."—*Richard III:* III, ii, 57. These three examples might, however, come under the head of construction changed through change of thought.'

286, 287. proues the King . . . proue loyall] MOULTON (*Moral System*, etc., p. 272): The citizens of Angiers have exactly anticipated the spirit of the future Jacobite toast:

'God bless the King; God bless our faith's defender;
God bless—no harm in blessing—the Pretender,
But who pretender is, and who is King,
God bless us all, that's quite another thing!'

Haue we ramm'd vp our gates againſt the world.
Iohn. Doth not the Crowne of England, prooue the King?
And if not that, I bring you Witneſſes
Twice fifteene thouſand hearts of Englands breed.
Baſt. Baſtards and elſe.
Iohn. To verifie our title with their liues.
Fran. As many and as well-borne bloods as thoſe.
Baſt. Some Baſtards too.
Fran. Stand in his face to contradict his claime.
Cit. Till you compound whoſe right is worthieſt,

291. *breed*] Ff. *breed*— Rowe, Pope, +, Ktly. *breed,*— Cap. et cet.
292. Baſt....*elſe.*] Om. Words. Dono. Baſt.] Faulc. Theobald, Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. Bast. [Aside.] Coll. ii, Hal. Sta. Fle.
Baſtards and elſe.] Ff, Rowe. (*Bastards and else*) Pope,+. *Bastards, and else.* Cap. et cet.
293. *To*...] —*To*... Varr. Rann, Wh. i, Huds. ii.
294. *As many*] F_2F_3, Dyce, Hal. *As many*, F_4 et cet.
294. *as thoſe.*] *as those*— Rowe et seq.
295. Baſt....*too.*] Om. Words. Dono. Baſt.] Bast. [Aside.] Coll. ii, Hal. Fle.
Some...too.] (*Some...too.*) Pope, +.
Baſtards] *Baſtards*, F_4, Coll. Sta. Huds.
296. *Stand*] —*Stand* Varr. Rann. Wh. i, Huds.
297. *compound*] *compound*, Theob. Warb.

[Bartlett (*Fam. Quot.*, 9th ed., p. 351) assigns these four lines to John Byrom not as a 'Jacobite toast,' but as *extempore To an Officer*. The first line also differs slightly from that given by Moulton: 'God bless the King,—I mean the faith's defender.'—ED.]

289. **Crowne . . . prooue the King**] C. K. DAVIS (p. 150): In this instance King John asserts the law of a sovereign *de facto*, as afterwards declared by the statute of Henry VII: 'If there be a king regnant in possession of the crown, though he be but *rex de facto* and not *de jure*, yet he is *seignior le roy;* and if another hath right, if he be out possession, he is not within the meaning of the statute.'—*2 Henry VII:* c. 1, 3 Inst. 7.

292. **Bastards and else**] MOORE SMITH: That is, Bastards and otherwise (not, I think, as Schmidt says, 'bastards and such like'). Philip's humorous interpolation adds a touch of realism to the scene.

297. **compound**] DEVECMON (p. 35) compares, for this use of 'compound,' 'And we here deliver . . . what We have compounded on.'—*Coriol.*, V, vi, 84; 'Content you, gentlemen; I will compound this strife.'—*Tam. of Shrew*, II, i, 343. This last is quoted by DAVIS, p. 124, as a legalism, on which Devecmon remarks: 'To "compound" is in all these cases used in the general sense of to settle or determine; but in a legal sense it is to settle in a particular manner, as where a creditor agrees to receive part of his debt in satisfaction of the whole. . . . Today in general literature the word is used in pretty much the same sense as Shakespeare uses it —perhaps this is due to the force of his great example.'

We for the worthieſt hold the right from both.
Iohn. Then God forgiue the ſinne of all thoſe ſoules,
That to their euerlaſting reſidence,
Before the dew of euening fall, ſhall fleete
In dreadfull triall of our kingdomes King.
Fran. Amen, Amen, mount Cheualiers to Armes.
Baſt. Saint *George* that ſwindg'd the Dragon,
And ere ſince ſit's on's horſebacke at mine Hoſteſſe dore

298. *We...worthieſt*] *We,...worthiest,* Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Hal. Sta. Huds. Fle. Neils.
from] *for* Wh. ii, Neils.
both.] *both.* [Exeunt Citizens. Dono.
299. *ſinne*] *sins* Coll. MS. Craig.
300. *reſidence,*] *residence* Coll.
301. *fall,*] *fall* F_2F_3, Coll. i.
ſhall fleete] *shall fleet,* Pope et seq.
302. *King.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *King!* Theob. et cet.
303–311. Fran. *Amen...rore*] Om. Dono.
303. *Amen, Amen,*] Ff. *Amen, Amen.* Rowe, Pope, Fle. *Amen, Amen.*— Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann, Coll. Wh. i, Del. *Amen, Amen!* Han. et cet.
Cheualiers] Ff, Rowe. *chevaliers,* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Fle. *chevaliers!* Cap. et cet.
303. *Armes.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *arms!* Theob. et cet.
304, 305. *Saint* George...*And ere ſince*] One line Pope et seq.
304. *ſwindg'd*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Knt, Sta. Fle. *swinged* Cam.+. *swing'd* Theob. et cet.
305. *ere*] *e're* F_2F_4. *e'er* Rowe et seq.
ſit's] *ſits* F_3F_4.
on's] *on his* Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr.
horſebacke] *horse'back* Walker (Vers., 253), Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *horse back* Cam.+.
dore] *dore,* F_2. *door,*— Cap. *door,* F_3F_4 et cet.

304, 305. **Saint George . . . at mine Hostesse dore**] KNIGHT: How exceedingly characteristic is this speech of the Bastard! 'Saint George' was the great war-cry of Richard; but the universal humorist lets down the dignity of the champion in a moment by an association with the hostess's sign.—HALLIWELL (Folio ed., p. 394) calls attention to the fact there is here a slight anachronism, since the inn-sign with such a figure, though familiar in the time of Elizabeth, could hardly have existed in the time of King John. In support of its popularity he quotes from Brathwait's *Strappado for the Divell*, 1615: 'What fame in forraine coasts this hero got, The lake Silene shewes, if we should not; Where in the reskew of a lovely mayde, A fearefull dragon he discomfited, So as we have portraide to every viewe, On signes of innes, how George the dragon slew.'—[Lyly, possibly referring to the same sign-board, twice uses the painted figure of St George as an example of arrested motion: 'But I would not have young men slowe to followe my precepts or idle to defer the time lyke Saint *George*, who is euer on horse backe yet neuer rideth.'—*Euphues and his Ephœbus*, ed. Bond, vol. i, p. 260, l. 24. Again, 'I have fulfilled thy request, but I feare me thou wilt vse them as *S. George* doth his horse, who is euer on his backe but neuer rideth.'—*Euphues to Philautus*, Ibid., p. 313, l. 13.—ED.]

305. **sit's on's**] LETTSOM, the editor of Walker's *Criticisms* and *Versification*, in his *Preface*, p. xiii, gives this line as it appears in Walker's MS.: 'Swings on his horse' back,' etc., and Lettsom thus comments: 'Had this mistake occurred in

Teach vs ſome fence. Sirrah, were I at home
At your den ſirrah, with your Lionneſſe,
I would ſet an Oxe-head to your Lyons hide:
And make a monſter of you.
Auſt. Peace, no more.
Baſt. O tremble: for you heare the Lyon rore.
Iohn. Vp higher to the plaine, where we'l ſet forth
In beſt appointment all our Regiments.
Baſt. Speed then to take aduantage of the field.
Fra. It ſhall be ſo, and at the other hill

306. *fence.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *fence;*— Sing. i. *fence!* Han. et cet.

306–309. *Sirrah...you.*] Om. Words.

306. *Sirrah,...*] [To Aus.] *Sirrah,...* Coll. Sing. ii, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Del.

307. *den*] *den*, F_4.

ſirrah,] *sirrah,* [to Aus.] Cap. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Sta.

308. *I would*] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Del. *I'd* Pope et cet.

309. *you.*] *you.* [To Austria. Rowe ii, Var. '85. *you.*— [To Austria. Theob. +, Var. '78, Rann.

310. *Peace,*] *Peace!* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Del. *Peace! Peace! I say,* Words.

311. *O tremble:*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *O! tremble,* Coll. Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh! tremble;* Ktly. *O, tremble;* Theob. et cet.

rore.] *roar!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. ii.

312. *plaine,*] *plain!* Johns. *plain;* Cap. et seq.

314. *aduantage*] *th' advantage* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

field.] *field.* [Exeunt English. Cap.

315, 316. Fra. *It...right.*] Om. Dono.

315. *ſo,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *so;*— Varr. Rann. *so;*— [to Louis] Dyce, Wh. i, Huds. ii. *so;* Cam.+. *so;* [to Lew.] Cap. et cet.

---

the First Folio, and had any poor editor proposed to substitute for *swings* the genuine word "sits," his proposal would no doubt have been condemned as wanton and unnecessary, and the other reading would have been stoutly defended as an instance of Shakespeare's propensity to play on words.'—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XII.): Capell's copy of F_2 has 'sit's on's'; that which belonged to Dr Long has *it' sons*'.—[My copy likewise reads as Capell's; and so also does the Methuen facsimile. It is possible that Long's copy was an earlier printing, and later impressions were corrected while the type was still in the chase. Examples of such variations in copies of F_1 have been noticed.—ED.]

305. **horsebacke**] For examples, wherein the plural and possessive case of nouns, in which the singular ends in *s* or *se*, are frequently written, and, still more frequently, pronounced without the additional syllable, see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 471.

315. **the other hill**] Miss PORTER: An indication that the stage of Shakespeare had a slanting elevation arranged at the rear, on either side of it. In the battle-scenes of *Jul. Cæs.* and *Ant. & Cleo.* mention of this simulation of a hill also occurs. . . . The entire fore-stage and platform, here spoken of as the 'plaine' and the 'field,' was open to the manœuvres of the two armies. And it may be suspected that the hill, or hills, was a device to bring the corners of the rear-stage into better view of the audience, as well as to give the impression of hills in the open country near the walls of Angiers.

Command the reſt to ſtand, God and our right. *Exeunt* 316
Heere after excurſions, Enter the Herald of France with Trumpets to the gates.
F. Her. You men of Angiers open wide your gates,
And let young *Arthur* Duke of Britaine in, 320
Who by the hand of France this day hath made,
Much worke for teares in many an Engliſh mother, 322

316. *ſtand,*] Ff. *stand.* Rowe, Pope, +, Cam.+. *stand.*— Var. '73 et cet.
right.] *right!* Rowe ii. et seq.
Exeunt] exeünt French. Cap. Exeunt severally the English and French Kings, etc. Dyce, Hal. Words. Exeunt on opposite sides, the English and French kings with their Forces. Wh. i, Huds. ii. Exeunt all severally. Coll. iii.
SCENE IV. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. SCENE II. The same. Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Ktly, Sta. Huds. Del. ACT II, SCENE I. The same. Fle. Dono.
317. Heere after...of France] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Cam.+, Fle. A long charge sounded: then, after...of France Theob. Warb. After...of France Johns. Varr. Rann, Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii. Alarums as of a battle join'd; Excursions; afterwards Retreat. Enter a French Herald. Cap. Enter a French Herald, meeting Citizens who have been summoned. Dono. Alarums and Excursions; then a Retreat. Enter a French Herald. Mal. et cet.
318. gates.] gates [The Citizens on the Walls.] Fle.
319. *You*] *Ye* Johns. Var. '73.
320. *Britaine*] F_2, Ktly. *Britain* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *Bretagne* Rowe ii. et cet.
321. *Who*] *Who,* Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt, Sing. Dyce, Hal. Fle.

---

316. **God and our right**] DOUCE (i, 402): An English motto is here improperly put into the mouth of a Frenchman. Richard the First is said to have originally used DIEU ET MON DROIT.

317. **Heere after excursions**] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL, p. 19): This fighting a battle behind the scenes, and leaving the stage empty till it is fought, we consider a violent attack upon critic patience; and we think this indeterminate engagement should be omitted by leaving out ll. 317–372; performed so, the scene would give less offence to probability, and save the stunned ears of an audience from much unnecessary drumming and trumpeting.

317. **Enter the Herald**] R. G. WHITE: [A change of scene here] is not only unnecessary and unwarranted, but entirely at variance with actual fact, and no less with dramatic truth. The kings leave the gate only for a better fighting ground; and, after a brief and indecisive onset, they return, preceded by their heralds to the same gate, upon the battlements over which the 'scroyles of Angiers' have remained during the skirmish, and where they find the citizen who had harangued them before ready to give them further advice in the premises. Even in actual representation the scene must remain open and unchanged; unless indeed it were to change to the battlefield merely to show the fight, and back again when the heralds enter.—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XIII.): The word '*Heere,*' used in the stage-direction, seems to indicate that the scene was supposed to continue.

319. **You men of Angiers, etc.**] JOHNSON: This speech is very poetical and, except the conceit of the 'widow's husband' embracing 'the earth,' is just and beautiful. [See *Appendix: Criticism:* J. M. ROBERTSON, p. 636.]

Whoſe ſonnes lye ſcattered on the bleeding ground:
Many a widdowes husband groueling lies,
Coldly embracing the diſcoloured earrh,
And victorie with little loſſe doth play
Vpon the dancing banners of the French,
Who are at hand triumphantly diſplayed
To enter Conquerors, and to proclaime
Arthur of Britaine, Englands King, and yours.

Enter Engliſh Herald with Trumpet.

E.Har. Reioyce you men of Angiers,ring your bels,

323. *ſcattered*] Ff, Wh. Cam.+. *scatt'red* Fle. *scatter'd* Rowe et cet.
ground:] *ground.* Ktly, Neils.
324. *Many*] *And many* Pope,+.
325. *diſcoloured*] Ff, Wh. Cam.+. *discolour'd* Rowe et cet.
earrh,] F_1. *earth*, Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. *earth;* Cap. et cet.
326. *And*] *While* Pope,+.
victorie...loſſe] *victory,...loss*, Cap. et seq.
327. *French,*] *French;* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta. Huds.
328. *Who...diſplayed*] *Triumphantly displayed; who are at hand*, Ktly.
hand] *hand*, Cap. et seq.
diſplayed] Ff. *display'd* Rowe, Var. '73. *displayed*, Neils. *display'd*, Theob. et cet.
329. *Conquerors,*] *conquerors;* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Mal. Sta. Del. *conquerors* Cam.+.
330. *Britaine,*] F_2, Ktly. *Britaine* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *Britaine* Fle. *Bretagn*, Dyce, Cam.+, Del. Huds. ii, Rlfe, Words. Neils. Craig. *Bretagne*, Rowe ii. et cet.
330, 333. *Englands*] *England's* F_4.
330. *King,*] *King* Dyce, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Rlfe, Words. Neils. Craig.
yours.] *yours!* Sta.
331. Enter ... Trumpet.] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Enter an...trumpets, to the same. Capell. Enter...Heralds,... trumpets. Rann. Enter...Herald. Dono. Enter...trumpets. Han. et cet.
332. E.Har.] E. Her. F_4.
Reioyce ... Angiers, ... bels,] *Rejoice,...Angiers;...bells;* Rowe, Pope,+. *Rejoice,..Angiers,...bells;* Cap. et seq.

328. **Who . . . displayed**] KEIGHTLEY (*Exp.*, p. 221) considers the transposition he makes in this line as necessary (see *Text. Notes*), remarking, 'It is strange that no one seems to have observed the error.'—[Keightley is possibly right; but the placing of the words 'triumphantly displayed' between the relative and its antecedent, 'banners,' is both awkward and unusual. I am inclined to think, therefore, that 'displayed' refers not to the banners, but to the French army; it is used in the technical military sense.—Murray (*N. E. D.*, s. v. display, vb. 1. b.) gives 'To spread out (troops) so as to form a more extended line = Deploy.' He quotes as examples of this use: '1581. Savile, *Agricola* (1622), 198: Agricola . . . fearing lest hee should be assailed on the front and flankes both at one time, displayed his army in length'; and, '1581. *Tacitus' History*, iv, xxxv. (1591), 196: Fought with troops displayed out thinnely in length.' It is, however, but fair to say that this is the only passage in Shakespeare wherein 'display' may be understood in this technical sense. In l. 340, below, it occurs with its usual signification.—ED.] —MOORE SMITH: These words, which refer to the banners, are inserted in the clause 'Who . . .,' which refers to the French.

332. **E. Har. Reioyce**, etc.] JOHNSON: The English Herald falls somewhat below

King *Iohn*, your king and Englands, doth approach,
Commander of this hot malicious day,
Their Armours that march'd hence ſo ſiluer bright,
Hither returne all gilt with Frenchmens blood:
There ſtucke no plume in any Engliſh Creſt,
That is remoued by a ſtaffe of France:
Our colours do returne in thoſe ſame hands
That did diſplay them when we firſt marcht forth:
And like a iolly troope of Huntſmen come
Our luſtie Engliſh, all with purpled hands,
Dide in the dying ſlaughter of their foes,

334. *day,*] Ff. *day!* Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta. Huds. i. *day:* Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. ii. *day.* Rowe et cet.

335. *Armours*] *armours*, Rowe et seq.

ſiluer bright] Ff, Rowe, Han. *silver-bright* Pope et cet.

336. *with*] *in* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns.

Frenchmens] *Frenchmens'* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73, '78, '85. *Frenchmen's* Cap. et seq.

blood:] *blood.* Del. Rlfe, Dono. Neils.

338. *remoued*] *removèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *remov'd* Coll. ii.

338. *by a*] *by any* Coll. ii. (MS.).

France:] F_2F_3, Coll. *France.* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. *France;* Cap. et cet.

339. *thoſe*] *thoſ* F_4.

340. *marcht*] Ff, Fle. *march'd* Rowe et cet.

341. *And...Huntſmen*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Coll. Wh. i, Huds. *And,... huntsmen*, Theob. et cet.

342. *purpled*] *purpl'd* Cap.

343. *Dide*] F_2F_3. *Stain'd* Pope, Han. *Died* Steev. Varr. Knt i. *Dyed* Sing. Coll. Knt ii, Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Huds. ii. *Dy'd* F_4 et cet.

foes,] *foes.* Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. Coll. Ktly. *foes:* Coll. et cet.

---

his antagonist. *Silver armor gilt with blood* is a poor image. Yet our author has it again in *Macbeth:* 'Here lay Duncan, His silver skin laced with his golden blood,' [II, iii, 117].—STEEVENS, in further illustration of this use of 'gilt,' quotes: 'The curets from great Hector's breast, all gilded with his gore.'—Chapman, *Iliad*, bk xvi, [l. 773]; and also, 'And showed his point gilt with the gushing gore.'—Ibid., *Odyssey*, xix, [l. 627].—[MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) gives several other examples, but quotes the present line in *King John* as the earliest use in this sense.—ED.]

342, 343. **hands, Dide in the . . . slaughter**] JOHNSON: It was, I think, one of the savage practices of the chase for all to stain their hands in the blood of the deer as a trophy.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 28): There is in *Jul. Cæs.*, III, i, 205 a passage quite similar to this; Mark Antony in an apostrophe to the dead body of Cæsar compares his murderers to hunters stained with the blood of the slain deer: '—here thy hunters stand Sign'd in thy spoil, and crimson'd in thy lethe.' Upon looking into Turberville's book of Hunting, I can see no trace of that practice [alluded to by Johnson]; but there are two different accounts of the French and English manner of dissecting or breaking up the deer. In dividing the several parts of the deer the French employed the hands of huntsmen alone; but our English kings, barons, and other great men took part of that office upon themselves. 'Oure order is,' says Turberville, 'that the Prince or chiefe (if so please them) doe alight and take assaye of the Deare with a sharpe knyfe, the whiche is done in this

Open your gates, and giue the Victors way.
Hubert. Heralds, from off our towres we might behold 345

345. Hubert.] Knt, Sta. Hunter. Hub. Ff. 1. Cit. Capell. First Cit. Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. Craig. Citi. Rowe et cet.
345. *towres*] F_2. *tow'rs* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *towers* F_3F_4 et cet.

maner. The deare being layd upon his backe, the Prince, chiefe, or such as they shall appoint, commes to it: And the chiefe huntsman (kneeling if it be to Prince) doth holde the Deare by the forefoote, whiles the Prince or chief, cut a slyt drawn alongst the brysket of the deare, somewhat lower than the brysket towards the belly. This is done to see the goodness of the flesh, and how thick it is. This being done we use to cut off the deares heades. And that is commonly done by the chiefe personage,' [ed. 1576, Clarendon reprint, p. 133]. In these operations the dissectors must necessarily be sprinkled or besmeared with the blood of the animal, and to this our author, in both passages, seems plainly to allude.—STEEVENS (ed. 1793), KNIGHT, and MADDEN (p. 64) also quote the passage from *Jul. Cæs.* in illustration of the present lines, but without further corroboration of the staining the hands of the hunters with the blood of the deer as a common practice. [For a discussion of this hunting-custom, see *Jul. Cæs.*, this edition, p. 155.—ED.]

345. **Hubert**] KNIGHT: Without any assigned reason the name of this speaker has been altered by the modern editors to *Citizen*. The Folio distinctly gives this, and all subsequent speeches of the same person to the end of the Act, to *Hubert*. The proposition to the kings to reconcile their differences by the marriage of Lewis and Blanche would appear necessarily to come from some person in authority; and it would seem to have been Shakspere's intention to make that person Hubert de Burgh, who occupies so conspicuous a place in the remainder of the play. In the third Act John says to Hubert: 'thy voluntary oath Lives in this bosom.' It might be his 'voluntary oath' as a Citizen of Angiers, to John, which called forth this expression.—[The voluntary oath to which John refers is, I think, more likely that made by Hubert, when, as one of the very few, he sided with John in his contest with the barons. See *Dram. Personæ: Hubert.*—ED.]—COLLIER: Possibly the actor of the part of Hubert also personated the Citizen in order that the speeches might be well delivered, and this may have led to the insertion of his name in the MS.—The CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XIV.) also offer this explanation of the substitution of names; adding that 'in the old play the Citizen who proposes the league to the two kings is a distinct person from Hubert de Burgh.'—HUDSON: This and the following speeches are most evidently from the same person who was introduced as *Citizen* at the opening of the preceding scene, and whose speeches there have the prefix *Cit.* What makes the case still stronger is, that in the original the *two* scenes are printed as *one*, the Citizens having remained on the walls during the fight. [In corroboration of Collier's suggestion Hudson says]: It was certainly not uncommon for two or more parts to be sustained by one actor, and this often occasioned mistakes in the distribution of the dialogue. [The present instance is given by WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, § lxxxv.) among many others wherein there is either a mistake or substitution of the prefixes.]—R. G. WHITE: Hubert de Burgh was an Englishman, and a nephew to William Fitz Adelin, who was in the service of John's father. But even supposing that Shakespeare did not know these facts, what was the Chamberlain to King John doing in Angiers at such a time? The prefix

From firſt to laſt, the on-ſet and retyre 346
Of both yonr Armies, whoſe equality
By our beſt eyes cannot be cenſured: (blowes:
Blood hath bought blood, and blowes haue anſwerd 349

346. *on-ſet*] *onset* Rowe et seq.
347. *yonr*] F_1.
Armies,] *armies;* Cap. et seq.
348. *cenſured:*] *censurèd:* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. *censured.* Ktly, Sta. Neils.
349. *blood,*] *bloud,* F_2.

---

is, doubtless, a trace of the prompter's book, resulting from the fact that the actor who played *Hubert* was expected to 'double' in the Citizen of Angiers.—JOHN HUNTER: We believe that Shakespeare in the present scene meant to represent Hubert de Burgh as a Citizen of Angiers.—Miss PORTER: There are some signs that Shakespeare chose to differ from the older play herein, as in many things bearing on character and human nature. Hubert's proposition denoted him to be the man of resource in Angiers. As a leader there John would seek to attach him to his person, rewarding him as the proposer of the match, attaching him to service as he had Faulconbridge, and acting magnetically towards him as he does toward King Philip. In accord with such probabilities drawn from Shakespeare's conduct of the Play are John's profession that his mother and he 'owe' Hubert 'much,' and that he has given them his 'voluntary oath,' and Hubert's reply that he is 'much bounden' to John, and Melloone's message to one Hubert with your King. The propriety of giving into French hands the charge of Geffrey's son, and the scorn of the English lords for Hubert are in general agreement with the implication that John picked out for trust and preferment this clever and gentle Angevin, whose French name also suits it.—[The same objections as were urged against Knight's explanation of Hubert's voluntary oath are equally applicable to Miss Porter's amplification of this point. John and Hubert's mutual protestations of friendship may be more probably referred to Hubert's loyalty and John's recognition of it. The suspicion and hatred of the English lords is due to the same cause. The propriety of John's placing Arthur in the hands of a citizen of Angiers is not very apparent; John had but just defeated the French, and they were as much his enemies as Arthur of Bretagne. Hubert de Burgh had long been in his councils and John knew he could be trusted. I therefore, albeit reluctantly, decide against the Folio text, and accept Collier's explanation.—ED.]

345. **Heralds, from off our towres,** etc.] JOHNSON: These three speeches seem to have been laboured. The Citizen's is the best; yet 'both alike we like' is a poor gingle.

347. **equality**] MALONE: Our author ought rather to have written 'whose *superiority*,' or 'whose *inequality*,' cannot be censured.

348. **censured**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 1.): To form or give a 'censure' or opinion of; to estimate, judge of, pass judgement on, criticize, judge.—MARSHALL: 'Censured' is generally explained as *estimated, determined.* But does it not rather mean here *questioned?* The sense seems to be that the two armies have shown themselves to be so equally matched that the citizens cannot say which is the superior; as the speaker says below: 'Both are alike, and both alike we like.'—l. 351.

Strength matcht with ſtrength, and power confronted power,
Both are alike, and both alike we like:
One muſt proue greateſt. While they weigh ſo euen,
We hold our Towne for neither: yet for both.

Enter the two Kings with their powers, at ſeuerall doores.

Iohn. France, haſt thou yet more blood to caſt away?
Say, ſhall the currant of our right rome on,

350. *matcht*] F_2, Fle. *match* F_3. *match'd* Rowe et cet.

power,] Ff. *power.* Rowe, Pope, + (—Var. '73), Neils. *power:* Cap. et cet.

351. *like:*] *like.* Cap. et seq.

352. *greateſt.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Neils. *greatest:*— Var. '73. *greatest;* Sing. Ktly, Huds. *greatest:* Cap. et cet.

SCENE V. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

354, 355. Enter...doores.] Flourish. Enter King John, and his Power, on one side, Bastard, Elinor, Blanch, &c. On the other, King Philip, and French, Austria, and Lewis. Capell. Enter at one side King John, with his power; Elinor, Blanch, and the Bastard; at the other, King Philip, Lewis, Austria, and Forces. Malone, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Re-enter, on one side King John, Elinor Blanch, the Bastard, Lords and Forces; on the other King Philip, Louis, Austria, and Forces. Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. ii, Words. Re-enter the two Kings, with their powers, severally. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. Enter...doores, [Elinor, Blanch, Bastard, Lewis and Austria.] Fleay.

356. *blood*] *bloud* F_2.

357–362. *Say...Ocean.*] Om. Dono.

357. *rome*] *runne* F_2. *roam* Malone, Var. '21, Knt. Coll. i, ii, Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. *run* F_3F_4, Rowe et cet.

on,] *on?* Pope et seq.

354, 355. **Enter the two Kings . . . at seuerall doores**] COLLIER calls attention to the simplicity of this stage-direction, remarking that 'it is worth preserving, on account of the manner in which the two armies, headed by their kings, are represented to come upon the stage.'

357. **rome on**] MALONE: The editor of the Second Folio substituted *runne.* I do not perceive any need of change. In *The Tempest* we have: 'the wandering brooks,' [IV, i, 128. 'Wandering' is Steevens's emendation for *windring* of the original text; the adjectival participles are doubtless synonyms.—ED.]—STEEVENS: I prefer the reading of the Second Folio. So in *Henry V:* 'As many streams run into one self sea,' [I, ii, 209; the Qq. reading]. The King would rather describe his right as *running on* in a *direct* than in an *irregular* course, such as would be implied by the word 'roam.'—KNIGHT: Neither the poetry nor the sense appear to have gained by the fancied improvement [of the Second Folio].—SINGER (ed. ii.): I differ from Knight, for surely a *current* does not *roam,* but '*run* right on.' The whole context shows that this is the true reading.—DYCE suggests that the word in the MS. may have have been written 'ronne,' and in defense of the Second Folio reading compares: 'And calmly run on in obedience Even to our ocean, to our great King John'—V, iv, 60.—R. G. WHITE: 'Rome' might be an easy misprint of *runne.* But it is to be observed that the comparison is to the current

Whoſe paſſage vext with thy impediment, 358
Shall leaue his natiue channell, and ore-ſwell
with courſe diſturb'd euen thy confining ſhores, 360
Vnleſſe thou let his ſiluer Water, keepe

358. *paſſage*] *passage*, Rowe, Pope,+. *vext*] *vex'd* Mal. et seq.
360. *euen*] *ev'n* Pope,+.
361. *Water*,] F_2F_3. *waters* Coll. iii. (MS.), Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. water F_4, Rowe et cet.

---

of a stream whose 'silver waters keep a peaceful progress to the ocean.' Now such a stream does not run directly, but always roams about; and especially is this true in England; and if it be objected that Shakespeare's metaphors are rarely correspondent, the answer is that they sometimes are, and that according to authentic evidence here is one, at least, that is so. And besides, Shakespeare evidently had in his mind's eye the same stream that furnished him with the comparison which he puts into Julia's mouth in the *Two Gentlemen*, in eight of the loveliest lines he ever wrote. The very details of the two pictures are alike, although the earlier is the more highly finished:

> 'The current that with gentle murmur glides,
> Thou know'st being stopped impatiently doth rage;
> But when his fair course is not hindered,
> He makes sweet music with th' enamell'd stones,
> Giving a gentle kiss to every sedge
> He overtaketh in his pilgrimage
> And so by many winding nooks he strays
> With willing sport to the wild ocean.'—[II, vii, 25–34].

Is there in all literature a more marked instance of the use of the same thoughts twice? This passage forbids us to change the reading of the Folio.—[Few will, I think, deny that White's comparison is very striking. Is it, however, hypercritical to point out that the present play antedates the *Two Gentlemen*, and that, therefore, the passage quoted is an amplification of this in *King John*?—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 155), in a section devoted to illustrations of Ovid's influence on Shakespeare, quotes: 'Sic ego torrentem, qua nil abstabat eunti.'—*Metam.*, iii, 568, remarking, 'Is it fanciful to suppose that this simile caught Shakespeare's fancy, and recurred to him on many occasions? *Two Gentlemen*, II, vii, 25–34; *Meas. for Meas.*, III, i, 249; *Venus & Adonis*, lvi, and *Lucrece*, xciii, clx.'—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) quotes the present line, s. v. *roam*, and thus explains it: 'Shall the current continue to overswell its banks, instead of remaining in its channel?'—WRIGHT, in referring to this interpretation, says: 'But an overflowing river which has broken its banks can hardly be said to "roam," and John implies that it has not left its native channel.'

361. Water] R. G. WHITE: There is no doubt that Collier's Folio in reading 'silver waters' corrects a trivial misprint. In Shakespeare's time, as well as in ours, the singular was not used except in speaking of water as a fluid, not as a body. Thus the waters of the sea are blue; but sea-water is salt. [Compare: 'If by your art, my dearest father, you have Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them.' —*Temp.*, I, ii, 1; and: 'our garments . . . being rather new-dyed than stained with salt water.'—*Ibid.*, II, i, 62.]

A peacefull progreſſe to the Ocean.
Fra. England thou haſt not ſau'd one drop of blood
In this hot triall more then we of France,
Rather loſt more. And by this hand I ſweare
That ſwayes the earth this Climate ouer-lookes,
Before we will lay downe our iuſt-borne Armes,
Wee'l put thee downe,'gainſt whom theſe Armes wee
Or adde a royall number to the dead: (beare,
Gracing the ſcroule that tels of this warres loſſe,
With ſlaughter coupled to the name of kings.
Baſt. Ha Maieſty: how high thy glory towres,
When the rich blood of kings is ſet on fire:
Oh now doth death line his dead chaps with ſteele,
The ſwords of ſouldiers are his teeth, his phangs,

362. *Ocean*] *oceän* Ktly, Fle.
364. *triall...France,*] *trial,...France;* Rowe et seq.
365. *Rather*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Fle. *Rather,* Cap. et cet.
more.] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. *more;* Hal. *more:* Var. '73 et cet.
366. *earth*] *earth,* Fle.
ouer-lookes,] *over-looks,*— Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing.
367. *lay downe*] *lay by* Pope,+, Var. '78.
370. *ſcroule*] *scroll* Steev. et seq.
371. *coupled*] *coupl'd* Cap.
372. *Ha Maieſty:*] Ff. *Ha! Majesty;* Rowe, Pope, Han. *Ha! Majesty,*— Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Coll. Wh. i. —*Ha, Majesty!* Ktly. *Ha, Majesty,* Fle. *Ha, majesty!* Cap. et cet.
372. *towres*] F_2. *tow'rs* Wh. i. *towers* F_3F_4 et cet.
373. *fire:*] Ff. *fire.* Rowe, Wh. i. *fire!* Pope et cet.
374–377. *Oh now...of kings.*] Om. Dono.
374. *Oh now*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *Oh, now* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '78, '85, Rann. *Oh, how* Var. '73. *O! now* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh! now* Ktly. *O, now* Cap. et cet.
374, 375. *ſteele,...phangs,*] Ff. *steel;... phangs,* Theob. *steel;...phangs;* Rowe et cet.
375. *phangs*] *fangs* Steev. et seq.

365. **this hand**] That is, Arthur's hand, which the King here holds aloft; that he does not swear by his own hand is shown by the next line.—ED.

366. **Climate**] WRIGHT: That is, region of the sky. Used also of a region of the earth in *Rich. II:* 'O forfend it God, That in a Christian climate souls refined Should show as heinous, black, obscene a deed!'—IV, i, 130. [In this latter sense SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v.) quotes also: '—they are portentous things Unto the climate that they point upon.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 31; and gives the present line as an exceptional use of this word in reference to a region of the sky.—ED.]

371. **the name of kings**] DEIGHTON: That is, with the record of the slaughter of kings; though the plural is used, the king refers to himself only.

372. **glory**] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 119) quotes the present line in illustration of 'glory' used in the sense of '*vaunting, ut sæpe.*'—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) does not, however, include that meaning among the several which are assigned to this word. He cites the present as an example of the meaning, *splendor, magnificence.*

And now he feaſts, mouſing the fleſh of men
In vndetermin'd differences of kings.
Why ſtand theſe royall fronts amazed thus:
Cry hauocke kings, backe to the ſtained field
You equall Potents, fierie kindled ſpirits,

376. *mouſing*] *mouthing* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Steev. Var. '03, '13. *mouzing* Cap. *mounching* Orger.

377. *differences*] *diff'rences* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

kings.] *kings.*— [Aside. Ktly.

378. *amazed*] *amazèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

thus:] *thus?* F_4.

379. *Cry hauocke kings,*] Ff. *Cry Havock, Kings,* Rowe, Pope, Fle. *Cry havock, Kings;* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *Cry havock, kings!* Var. '73, Ktly, Huds. Rlfe. *Cry 'havoc' Kings!* Dyce ii, iii. *Cry 'havoc!' kings;* Cam. +, Words. Craig. *Cry, havoc! kings.* Neils. *Cry, havock, kings!* Cap. et cet.

379. *ſtained*] *stainèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

380. *equall Potents,*] *equal potent,* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *equal-potents,* Sta. Del. Dono. Craig. *equal-potent* Walker, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.

fierie kindled ſpirits,] Ff, Rowe. *firy-kindled spirits!* Mal. Steev. Var. '21. *fire-ykindled spirits,* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *fiery kindled spirits!* Cam.+. *fire-en-kindled* Lettsom conj. *fiery-kindled ·spirits.* Fle. *fiery-kindled spirits!* Pope et cet.

---

376. **mousing**] MALONE deprecates Pope's change of this word (see *Text. Notes*), and in support of the Folio quotes: 'Well moused, lion!'—*Mid. N. Dream*, V, i, 274; and: 'Whilst Troy was swilling sack and sugar, and mousing fat venison, the mad Greekes made bonefires of their houses.'—Dekker, 1603, *Wonderful Year*, [ed. Grosart, p. 101]. 'Mousing is, I suppose,' says Malone, 'mamocking, and devouring eagerly, as a cat devours a mouse.'—Murray (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Mouse, vb, 3.) gives two examples prior to the present line wherein the word bears this sense.—STEEVENS, in justification of Pope, quotes: 'First mouthed to be last swallowed.'—*Hamlet*, IV, ii, 20, and adds: 'Shakespeare designed no ridicule in this speech; and therefore did not write (as when he was writing the burlesque interlude of *Pyramus and Thisbe*) "mousing."'—MALONE, well seeing that this is but begging the question, replies: 'Shakespeare is perpetually in the habit of using familiar terms and images in his most serious scenes.' And in proof of this quotes from the present play: 'Now for the bare-picked bone of majesty Doth dogged war bristle his angry crest.'—IV, ii, 158; 'Have I not here the best cards for the game.'—V, ii, 110; 'Unthread the rude eye of rebellion.'—V, iv, 15.—[The *Text. Notes* will show that Steevens is quite in the minority.—ED.]—IVOR JOHN: A much better sense [than 'tearing as a cat tears a mouse'] is given by taking the more obvious meaning of gnawing, nibbling as a mouse does. The 'Well moused Lion!' of *Mid. N. Dream* will also bear this interpretation.

379. **Cry hauocke**] JOHNSON: That is, *command slaughter to proceed.* So, in *Jul. Cæs.*, 'Cry, havoc, and let slip the dogs of war.'—[III, i, 273. For illustrations of the use of this phrase, see note on above line from *Jul. Cæs.*, this ed., p. 161, where it is opined that 'to "cry havoc" was the prerogative of the Monarch.' —MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Havoc, I.) gives as a partial explanation of the origin that it is from the 'Anglo-French *havok*, altered in some way from Old French *havot* (c. 1150 in Du Cange *havo*), used in same sense, especially in phrase *crier havot.* Probably of Teutonic origin.'—ED.]

380. **Potents**] STEEVENS: That is, *potentates.* So, in *Ane verie excellent and*

Then let confuſion of one part confirm
The others peace: till then, blowes, blood, and death.
Iohn. Whoſe party do the Townefmen yet admit?
Fra. Speake Citizens for England, whoſe your king.
Hub. The king of England, when we know the king.
Fra. Know him in vs, that heere hold vp his right.
Iohn. In Vs, that are our owne great Deputie,
And beare poſſeſſion of our Perſon heere,
Lord of our preſence Angiers, and of you.

382. *till*] *'till* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Cap. Varr. Rann. *death.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Ktly, Fle. *death!* Han. et cet.
384. *Speake Citizens*] *Speak, citizens,* Johns. et seq.
384. *whoſe*] *who's* Ff. et seq.
387. *Deputie*] *Deputy.* F_2. *Deputy* F_4.
388. *poſſeſſion*] *procession* Coll. MS.
389. *of you*] *if you* F_2F_3.

---

delectabill Treatise intitulit Philotus, 1603: 'Ane of the potentes of the town.'—[MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. sb². B. 2.) quotes the present line as the earliest example of 'Potent' used in the sense 'of one having authority, a power,' and gives but one other passage, dated 1642, wherein it is so used. Steevens's somewhat indefinite reference is, I fear, open to suspicion.—LETTSOM (ap. WALKER, *Crit.*, i, 28) notes that 'this is the only passage in which Shakespeare uses "potent" as a substantive.'—ED.]—COLLIER: 'Potents' may, as Steevens says, be put for *potentates;* but by 'equal potents' the Bastard seems rather to mean that the victory being undecided, the two kings are *equi-potent.*—KINNEAR (p. 192): 'Equal' is equivalent to *equally,—equally potent* is explained by 'undetermined differences,' l. 377. 'Equal' is so used, *Henry VIII:* I, i, 159, 'for he is equal ravenous As he is subtle.' *Equally potent* is equivalent to equally prevailing in this undecided action; so the *Citizen's* speech 'whose equality By our best eyes cannot be censur'd.' 'Equal potent' has no reference to the relative general potency of the two kings. 'Potents' [in the Folio is] an instance of the misprint of adding a final *s*.

380. **fierie kindled**] COLLIER (ed. ii.): It is, we think, beyond dispute a restoration of the genuine language of the Poet to print the passage as in the corrected Folio [see *Text. Notes*], meaning that the kings and their armies are equally strong and 'fire-*ykindled*,' not *fiery-kindled.*—IVOR JOHN: I would suggest '*fury-kindled* spirits.' Compare: 'Or that enkindled fury turn to flame.'—*Edward III:* III, iii, 113; and, 'Wrath-kindled gentlemen, be ruled by me.'—*Rich. II:* I, i, 152.

388. **beare possession of our Person**] MOBERLY: This may be a corruption for '*bar* possession of our person' (or 'in our person'); that is, 'I in my own person bar the possession which you claim as Arthur's attorney'; as a suitor would who by the remedy called 'assize' establishes his title to land by showing his own or his ancestor's possession of it (Blackstone, iii, 184). As this process was applicable in cases where the wrong done was (1) recent, (2) after the death of father or mother, brother or sister, uncle or aunt (Ibid., 185), the allusion suits the matter here in hand. The word *bar*, it may be remarked, occurs with peculiar frequency in this play.—[This is a slight exaggeration; the word occurs in *two* passages—I, ii, 205 and III, i, 118.—ED.]

Fra. A greater powre then We denies all this, 390

390. Fra.] Citi. Rowe, Pope,+, Var. '78, '85. 1. C. Capell. 1. Cit. Malone et seq. (subs.).
powre] F_2. *pow'r* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Wh. i. *power* F_3F_4 et cet.
390. *then*] *than* F_4.
We] *ye* Warb. Theob. Han. Johns. Cap. Var. '73, '78, '85, Words.

390–393. **A greater powre then We . . . Kings of our feare]** THEOBALD: We must certainly read, as Mr Warburton acutely observ'd to me: 'A greater pow'r, than *Ye*, denies all this'; i. e., Tho' each of you pretend to be our rightful Kings, you are yet only so in swaying over our fears, in the terrors we have of you; not acknowledg'd Kings in our obedience.—WARBURTON: We should read '*than ye.*' What power was this? their *fears*. It is plain, therefore, we should read: 'Kings are our fears,'—i. e., our fears are the Kings which at present rule us.—CAPELL (I, i, p. 123): That the citizens should be 'Kings of their fear, till their fears were depos'd' is a piece of evident nonsense; but, evident as it is, the certainty of its correction is more so, if 'depos'd' be reflected on: For what is to be *depos'd?* why, their '*fears*': their fears then are the '*Kings*'; and *are* and *fears* a true reading, spoil'd by printers. And now we come at the sense of the words 'greater power'; and, with it, the propriety of the correction that follows—*ye* for 'we': the city's fears' were [*sic*] that *power;* and a power so strong at that time that it made her set at defiance the power of both kings, till she could be satisfied rightly who was her king.—[Theobald's better judgment was at times overborne by the remarks of his dogmatic correspondent, Warburton; but it is strange that an editor so conservative as Capell should commend, and adopt, the needless change of 'we' to *ye*. In corroboration of the correctness of this line, compare: 'A greater power than we can contradict Hath thwarted our intents.'—*Rom. & Jul.*, V, iii, 153.—ED.]—TOLLET: 'A greater power than we' may mean, 'the Lord of hosts who has not yet decided the superiority of either army; and till it be undoubted the people of Angiers will not open their gates.' Secure and confident as lions, they are not at all afraid, but are *kings*, i. e., masters and commanders of their fears, until their fears or doubts about the rightful King of England are removed.—TYRWHITT: Dr Warburton saw what was requisite to make this passage sense; and Dr Johnson, rather too hastily, I think, has received his alteration into the text. As the same sense may be obtained by a much slighter alteration [than Warburton's] I am more inclined to read: 'King'd of our fears'; *King'd* is used as a participle passive by Shakespeare more than once I believe. The Dauphin says of England: 'she is so idly king'd.'—*Henry V:* II, iv, 26. It is scarcely necessary to add that 'of' here (as in numberless other places) has the signification of *by*.—MALONE: '*King'd* of our fears'; i. e., our fears being our kings or rulers. *King'd* is again used in *Richard II:* 'Then am I king'd again.'—[V, v, 36]. It is manifest that the passage in the old copy is corrupt, and that it must have been so worded that their *fears* should be styled their *kings* or masters, and not they kings or masters of their fears; because in the next line mention is made of these *fears* being *deposed.* Tyrwhitt's emendation produces this meaning by a very slight alteration, and is, therefore, I think, entitled to a place in the text. The following passage in our author's *Lucrece* strongly, in my opinion, confirms his conjecture: 'So shall these slaves [Tarquin's unruly *passions*] be kings, and thou their slave,' [l. 659]. Again, in *King Lear:* 'It seems she was a queen Over her passion, who, most rebel-

[390–393. A greater powre then We . . . Kings of our feare]

like, Sought to be *king* o'er her.'—[IV, iii, 75].—KNIGHT: The change of this passage is amongst the most remarkable of the examples which this play furnishes of the unsatisfactory nature of conjectural emendation. . . . If the safe rule of endeavoring to understand the existing text, in preference to guessing what the author ought to have written, had been adopted in this and hundreds of other cases, we should have been spared volumes of commentary. The two kings peremptorily demand the citizens of Angiers to acknowledge the respective rights of each,—England for himself, France for Arthur. The Citizens, by the mouth of Hubert, answer, 'A greater power than we denies all this.' Their quarrel is undecided—the arbitrement of Heaven is wanting. 'And until it be undoubted, we do lock Our former scruple in our strong-barr'd gates, Kings, of our fear,' on account of our fear, or *through* our fear or *by* our fear, we hold our former scruple, kings, until our fears, resolv'd, 'Be by some certain king purg'd and deposed.'—COLLIER (ed. i.): The sense does not require us to alter [the Folio reading]. The meaning of the Citizens is that they will be ruled by their fear, admitting no other monarch, until it shall have been seen which power is the strongest, that of England or France. [In his second edition Collier adopts Tyrwhitt's change and Malone's interpretation, adding: 'We were originally anxious to preserve the reading of the Folios, but this is a case in which we think it must be relinquished.']—VERPLANCK: I understand 'Kings of our fear' to be meant as an address to the two sovereigns: 'We say to you, sovereigns whom we fear, that we must bar our gates against both, until that fear is dissipated by the victory or withdrawal of one of you.' If this is not satisfactory, 'King'd of our fear' must be adopted.—HUDSON: It is not easy to extract a meaning out of the original text, as may be seen by consulting Knight and Collier. Tyrwhitt's emendation seems to us eminently happy.—DELIUS: 'Kings' is a vocative, the usual recurrent address to both Kings, which is here interjected into the connected sentence 'our strong-barred gates of our fear,' i. e., our gates strong-barred of our fear.—STAUNTON: The meaning of the speaker, however quaintly expressed, we imagine to be simply this: Each of you lays claim to our allegiance, but neither has produced satisfactory proof of his right to it; and until all doubts upon that point are resolved we shall trust to *our strong barred gates* as the protectors, or *Kings*, of our fear.—[HALLIWELL (*Folio Ed.*) offers the same interpretation without, however, mentioning Staunton's. It is, I think, hardly fair to accuse Halliwell of plagiarism, since both editors were working almost contemporaneously, and Halliwell may not have seen Staunton's note—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE adopt Tyrwhitt's correction, since it is difficult to make clear sense of the Folio reading. They thus interpret the whole passage: 'Till our scruple be satisfied, we lock it within our strong-barred gates: kinged only by our fears, until our fears, set at rest, be dispersed and deposed by some ascertained sovereign.'—KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor*, p. 221): We should punctuate, 'Kings of our fear!' i. e., Kings whom we fear.—[Has not Keightley overlooked the fact that the Citizens have so far recognised but *one* king—the King of France? How could there then be two?—ED.]—FLEAY: We lock up our fear within our gates, and so are kings over it, till it (this usurping fear) be laid at rest and deprived of power by some ascertained King of England; or it may mean, 'Made kings (however unwillingly) *by* our fear.' But Tyrwhitt's conjecture, i. e., *ruled by*, gives a clearer meaning.—MOBERLY interprets l. 390 thus: 'It does not appear that Providence has yet

And till it be vndoubted,we do locke
Our former ſcruple in our ſtrong barr'd gates:
Kings of our feare, vntill our feares reſolu'd
Be by ſome certaine king, purg'd and depos'd.
Baſt. By heauen, theſe ſcroyles of Angiers flout you kings,
And ſtand ſecurely on their battelments,

391. *And*] *And*, Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing.
till] *'till* Rowe, Pope,+.
392. *ſtrong barr'd*] *strong-barr'd* Pope et seq.
gates:] *gates.* Pope,+. *gates,*— Ktly.
393, 394. *Kings...depos'd*] In margin Pope, Han. Om. Dono.
393. *Kings of our feare,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. Neils. *Kings of our fears,*— Theob. Var. '78, '85. *Kings are our fears,*— Warb. Johns. Cap. Var. '73. *Kings, of our fear;* Knt, Sta. Del. *Kings of our fear;* Coll. i. *King'd of our fear,* Dyce i, Coll. ii, iii, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. i. *Kings of our fear!* Ktly. *Kings of ourselves;* Del. conj. Craig. *King'd of our fears* Tyrwhitt, Mal. et cet.
393. *feares reſolu'd*] *fears, resolv'd,* Cap. et seq.
394. *king,*] *king* F_3F_4 et seq.
purg'd...depos'd] *purged...deposed* Fle.
395. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Fle.
theſe] *the* Warb. Johns.
ſcroyles] *scroils* Hal.
you kings,] *you, kings;* Cap. et seq.

willed that the battle should be so decisive as you each maintain.'—WRIGHT: Tyrwhitt's conjecture [is] unquestionably the true reading, as the context shows. The Folio has 'Kings of our fear.' It is evident, however, that the citizens were not masters of their fear, but were overpowered by it, and resolved to acknowledge no other sovereign till it was allayed by the appearance of the rightful king. Knight, adopting the words, but changing the punctuation of the Folios, gratified his conservatism by a reading which is not, indeed, nonsense, but has no point.—DAWSON: The Folio reading does not give a satisfactory meaning, because the Citizens were not masters of their fears, but were mastered by them. Their fear of admitting the wrong king is to serve as their interim king.—DEIGHTON: Tollet thought that the 'greater power' might mean the Lord of Hosts; but, surely, the 'greater power' is their *fears*. The sense of the passage will be: Owing allegiance to our fears, recognising them only as the masters we must obey, until those masters are deposed, those fears resolved, by one or other of you proving himself our King.—[DEIGHTON is, I think, correct in rejecting Tollet's interpretation. Reference to the Lord of Hosts is, here, quite irrelevant; what follows shows that their fear is that greater power. I am also strongly inclined to accept Staunton's excellent suggestion that the phrase 'Kings of our fear' refers not to the Citizens themselves, but to the strong-barred gates. This is further commendable since it avoids all necessity for either Warburton's or Tyrwhitt's alteration.—ED.]

395. **Bast. By heauen . . . kings**] MOBERLY: This burst of passion is exactly like Cœur-de-Lion's fierce threat to hang all the garrison of Chaluz down to the children in arms.

395. **scroyles**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*): A scoundrel wretch. (The conjecture that it is from Old French *escroele*, scrofulous sore, is not quite satisfactory as to form, and the assumed development of sense, though plausible, has no evidence.)—Craigie (*N. E. D.*) quotes the present line as the earliest example; also

As in a Theater, whence they gape and point
At your induſtrious Scenes and acts of death.
Your Royall preſences be rul'd by mee,
Do like the Mutines of Ieruſalem,

398. *induſtrious*] *illustrious* Cap. conj. Mal. conj. (withdrawn).
399. *Your...preſences*] *You...presences*, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
399. *mee,*] *me:*— Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Words. *me.* Ktly. *me;* Sta.
400. *Do*] *Do*, Hal.

Jonson, *Poetaster*, 1601: 'I cry mercy (my good scroile) was 't thou.'—IV, iii, 35.—STEEVENS likewise quotes from Jonson, *Every Man in his Humour*, 'Hang them, scroyles! there's nothing in them in the world.'—I, i.

398. **industrious Scenes**] STEEVENS: That is, your *laborious industry* of war. So in *Macbeth*: '—and put we on Industrious soldiership.'—[V, iv, 15].

399. **Your Royall presences**] CAPELL (I, i, 124): A tenderness has been shown in this passage that we should have dispensed with; for though *let* may be understood before 'Your,' and a sense struck out that way, yet the passage wants the ease in this reading that moderns have given it by making 'Your' *You*, and printing 'presences' vocatively. [See *Text. Notes.*] 'Presence' and 'presences' are words very indefinite; as that critic will find who shall go about to interpret them in I, i, 145, in 389 above, and in this passage with the precision expected: *personages* may do for the latter; but for the former, *person* (the only word that occurs) serves very inadequately.

400. **like the Mutines of Ierusalem**] MALONE: The 'mutines' are the *mutineers*, the *seditious*. So in *Hamlet:* '—and lay Worse than the mutines in the bilboes.' —[V, ii, 6]. Our Author had probably read the following passages in *A Compendious and Most Marvellous History of the Latter Times of the Jewes Common-Weale*, &c., written in Hebrew by Joseph Ben Gorion,—translated into English by Peter Morwyng, 1575: 'The same year the civil wars grew and increased in Jerusalem; for the citizens slew one another without any truce, let or quietnesse. The people were divided into three parties; whereof the first and best followed Anani, the high-priest; another part followed seditious Jehochanan; the third, most cruel Schimeon. . . . Betweene these three there were also most cruel battailes for the space of four daies. Titus' campe was about six furlongs from the towne. The next morrowe they of the towne seeing Titus to be encamped upon Mount Olivet, the captaines of the seditious assembled together, and fell at argument every man with another, intending to turn their cruelty upon the Romaines, confirming and ratifying the same atonement and purpose, by swearing one to another; and so became peace amongst them. Wherefore joyning together, that were before three severall parts, they set open the gates, and all the best of them issued out with an horrible noyse and shoute, that they made the Romaines afraide withall, in such wise that they fled before the seditious, which sodainly did set upon them unawares.' This allusion is not found in the old play.—COLLIER: Joseph Ben Gorion's *Historie* [was] translated by Peter Morwyng, and originally published, not, as Malone states, in 1575, but in 1558. Henslowe, in his Diary, mentions a play to which he gives the title of *Titus and Vespasian*, under date April, 1591, perhaps relating to the siege of Jerusalem, in which the combination of the 'mutines of Jerusalem' might form an incident. [Since Collier, in his second edition, omits this con-

Be friends a-while, and both conioyntly bend
Your ſharpeſt Deeds of malice on this Towne.
By Eaſt and Weſt let France and England mount.
Their battering Canon charged to the mouthes,
Till their ſoule-fearing clamours haue braul'd downe
The flintie ribbes of this contemptuous Citie,
I'de play inceſſantly vpon theſe Iades,
Euen till vnfenced deſolation
Leaue them as naked as the vulgar ayre:
That done, diſſeuer your vnited ſtrengths,
And part your mingled colours once againe,
Turne face to face, and bloody point to point:

401. *a-while*] F_2. *awhile* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Words. Craig. *a while* F_3F_4, Rowe et cet.

402. *Towne.*] *town:* Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. *town;* Hal.

403. *mount.*] *mount* Ff.

404. *battering*] *batt'ring* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
charged] *chargèd* Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
mouthes,] *mouths;* Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Ktly.

405. *braul'd*] *brawl'd* Cap. et seq.

406. *Citie,*] Ff. *city.* Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Rlfe, Neils. *city;* Hal. *city:* Cap. et cet.

407. *Iades,*] *jades;* Rowe, Pope,+, Cap.

408. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Fle.
vnfenced] *unfencèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

409. *ayre:*] *air.* Pope et seq.

411. *againe,*] Ff, Pope, Sta. Fle. *again.* Rowe. *again;* Theob. et cet.

412. *point:*] *point.* Pope,+.

---

jecture as to the source of Shakespeare's knowledge of the incident, it may, I think, be considered as withdrawn.—ED.]—WRIGHT says that Josephus, in his *Jewish War* (v, 6, § 4), gives an account of the manner in which the leaders of the factions in Jerusalem ceased their assaults upon each other to combine in resisting the Roman attack; but as no translation of Josephus into English appears to have existed before 1602, Shakespeare might have derived his knowledge from Morwyng's translation, as Malone has shown.

405. **soule-fearing**] That is, *soul-affrighting.* For other examples of 'fear' used in the active sense, see SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. vb. 2).

405. **braul'd downe**] Is there, possibly, here a faint suggestion of a reference to the walls of Jericho thrown down by the clamour of the trumpets of Joshua? 'So the people shouted, when they had blowen trumpets: for when the people had heard the sounde of the trumpet, they shouted with a great shoute: and the wal fell downe flat: so the people went up into the citie, every man streight before him and they tooke the citie.'—*Joshua*, vi, 20, *Geneva Vers.*—ED.

409. **naked as . . . ayre**] That is *unarmed, defenceless.* Compare: 'Look in upon me then and speak with me, Or, naked as I am, I will assault thee.'—*Othello*, V, ii, 258.

412. **point to point**] Compare: 'Point against point rebellious, arm 'gainst arm.'—*Macbeth*, I, ii, 56.

Then in a moment Fortune ſhall cull forth
Out of one ſide her happy Minion,
To whom in fauour ſhe ſhall giue the day,
And kiſſe him with a glorious victory:
How like you this wilde counſell mighty States,
Smackes it not ſomething of the policie.
Iohn. Now by the sky that hangs aboue our heads,
I like it well. France, ſhall we knit our powres,
And lay this Angiers euen with the ground,
Then after fight who ſhall be king of it?
Baſt. And if thou haſt the mettle of a king,
Being wrong'd as we are by this peeuiſh Townc:
Turne thou the mouth of thy Artillerie,
As we will ours, againſt theſe ſawcie walles,
And when that we haue daſh'd them to the ground,

413. *Then...moment*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, +, Fle. *Then,...moment*, Cap. et cet.
414. *ſide*] *ſide*, F_4.
Minion,] *Minion.* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *minion;* Theob. Han. Warb. Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. Ktly, Sta. Neils. *miniön*, Fle.
416. *victory:*] *victory.* Rowe et seq.
417. *States,*] *states?* Pope et seq.
418. *Smackes ... policie.* Om. Pope, Han.
policie.] *policy?* Ff.
420. *well.*] *well:*— Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta.
powres] *powers* Ff. *pow'rs*, Pope, + (—Var. '73), Wh. i.
422. *Then after*] Ff, Rowe, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *Then after*, Pope, Theob. Han. *Then, after*, Warb. et cet.
423. *And if*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Fle. Dono. *An if* Cap. et cet.
king,] *king,*— [to Phi. Capell.
424. *Being...Townc:*] —*Being...town*— Ktly.
wrong'd...are] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Dono. *wrong'd,...are*, Cap. et cet.
Townc] F_1.
426. *walles,*] *walls;* Pope et seq.
427. *daſh'd*] *dasht* Fle.

---

418. **the policie**] FLEAY: Not elsewhere in Shakespeare with the definite article. The politic art, the art of Machiavel.—IVOR JOHN quotes two passages from Middleton's *Roaring Girl* and one from Webster's *Vittoria Corombona* to show that this word *policy*, in 'Elizabethan plays, denotes crafty dealings.' [So it does in those passages quoted by JOHN; but MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Policy, sb. 3) gives a number of quotations wherein this word means merely political sagacity, expediency, as well as cunning, craft. Here 'policy,' I think, means only *strategy*, as suggested by Fleay and Wright. Crafty dealing conveys an idea of underhandedness or secrecy which is quite lacking in the open proposal of Faulconbridge in the hearing both of the kings and the citizens.—ED.]—WRIGHT: That is, the policy which is so much thought of. Compare: 'O, 'tis the curse in love.'—*Two Gentlemen*, V, iv, 43. [For other examples of this use of 'the' used to denote notoriety, see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 92.]

Why then defie each other, and pell-mell,
Make worke vpon our ſelues,for heauen or hell.
Fra. Let it be ſo: ſay, where will you aſſault?
Iohn. We from the Weſt will ſend deſtruction
Into this Cities boſome.
Auſt. I from the North.
Fran. Our Thunder from the South,
Shall raine their drift of bullets on this Towne.
Baſt. O prudent diſcipline! From North to South:
Auſtria and France ſhoot in each others mouth.

428. *Why then...other, and*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Cam.+, Neils. *Why then,... other; and,* Theob. *Why then...other; and,* Johns. Var. '73. *Why, then...other, and,* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Del. Words. Dono. *Why, then...other; and,* Warb. et cet.

429. *ſelues,*] *ſelves* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, + (—Var. '73), Coll. Hal. Wh. i.
heauen] *Heav'n* Rowe, Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

430. *ſo:* *ſay,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. *so:—Say,* Cap. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Huds. i. *so.—Say,* Coll. et cet.

431. *deſtruction*] *destructiön* Fle.

434. *Thunder*] *thunders* Cap. conj. Wh. Ktly, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.

436–438. Baſt. *O prudent...away.*] In margin Pope, Han. Aside. Cap. Ktly, Huds. Del. Dono.

437, 438. *Auſtria ... to it*] Aside. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Fle.

428, 429. **Why then . . . or hell**] In the earlier play, *Richard III*, there is a couplet somewhat similar: 'March on, join bravely, let us to 't pell-mell If not to heaven, then hand in hand to hell.'—V, iii, 312.

429. **Make worke**] SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. Make, 3) gives many examples wherein the verb 'make' is joined in periphrastical way to various substantives to denote the performance of the respective action; and under the division 'make work' he cites, besides the present line, seven examples from *Coriol.* In five of these occur the words 'make good' or 'fair work'; and in each case the phrase seems to have a direct reference to feats of arms; for example, 'List what work he makes Amongst your cloven army.'—I, iv, 20. Again: 'Alone I fought . . . And made what work I pleased.'—I, viii, 9. And it is, perhaps, in this sense that the words are here used by Faulconbridge. Compare also l. 321 above, which is likewise cited by Schmidt: 'Who by the hand of France this day Hath made much work for tears,' etc.—ED.

436. **O prudent discipline**] TALBOT: The Poet has made Faulconbridge forget that he had made a similar mistake. (See ll. 403, 404.)—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE defend Shakespeare of this charge of forgetfulness, rather considering that this is 'One of Shakespeare's ironical phrases. The speaker has just before slily suggested this very course of firing from opposite quarters; and now rejoices to see his suggestion blindly adopted.'—MOORE SMITH, in reply to Talbot's note, says: 'But the two cases are not parallel, France and Austria being allies, and England and France enemies.'

Ile ſtirre them to it: Come, away, away.
Hub. Heare vs great kings, vouchſafe awhile to ſtay
And I ſhall ſhew you peace, and faire-fac'd league:
Win you this Citie without ſtroke, or wound,
Reſcue thoſe breathing liues to dye in beds,
That heere come ſacrifices for the field.
Perſeuer not, but heare me mighty kings.
Iohn. Speake on with fauour, we are bent to heare.
Hub. That daughter there of Spaine, the Lady *Blanch*
Is neere to England, looke vpon the yeeres

438. *Ile*] *I'le* F_4.
to it:] *to't* Sing. i. *to it.*— Coll. Dyce, Hall. Wh. Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Rlfe, Words. Dono. Neils. Craig.
Come, away, away, away.] Ff, Fle. *come away, away.* Rowe, Pope, Han. *come, away! away!* Coll. ii. *come, away, away!* Theob. et cet.
[Enter Elinor and Blanche.] Donovan.
439. *kings,*] Ff, Rowe. *kings!* Sing. Coll. ii, Ktly, Huds. Neils. *kings;* Pope et cet.
awhile] F_2F_3, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Del. *a while* F_4 et cet.
440. *faire-fac'd*] *fair-faced* Steev. Varr. Knt, Cam.+, Fle.
440. *league:*] Ff, Hal. Wh. Ktly, Sta. *league.* Rowe et cet.
443. *field.*] Ff, Coll. Neils. *field;* Rowe et cet.
444. *Perſeuer*] *Perſevere* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. Rann.
445. *Speake on with fauour,*] Ff. *Speak on; with favour* Rowe, Pope, Han. Rann. Mason (Com., p. 155). *Speak on with favour;* Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *Speak on, with favour,* Theob. et cet.
447. *neere*] *niece* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Sing. ii, Dyce, Wh. Ktly, Cam.+, Del. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils.
England,] Ff, Rowe. *England.* Del. Dono. Neils. *England;* Pope et cet.

---

447. **neere to England**] STEEVENS: The Lady Blanche was daughter to Alphonso IX, King of Castile, and was niece to King John by his sister Eleanor.—COLLIER (*Notes & Emend.*, etc., p. 202): The MS. Corrector tells us, naturally enough, to read: 'Is *niece* to England.' This is unquestionably right, and the mistake was readily made; we only wonder that it was not till now corrected.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 84): The correction of 'near' to *niece* is quite legitimate and undoubted on all accounts.—[In his second edition Singer follows this correction, remarking that 'the error is an easy one.' 'No doubt of it,' replies Collier in his second edition, 'and so are many other errors which, till pointed out in the corr. fo. 1632, neither Mr Singer nor any other editor during the last century and a half thought of setting right.'—If any justification be sought for such a personal and wholesale attack by Collier it may be found in the fact that this is one of the very few MS. corrections which Singer, in his volume, accepted half-heartedly, treating the majority with severe censure and thinly veiled hints of grave doubt as to their validity.—ED.]—ANON. (*New Readings*, etc., Blackwood's *Maga.*, Sept., 1853, p. 304): For 'near' the MS. correction is *niece.* But the Lady Blanch is repeatedly, throughout the play, spoken of as niece to King John and the Queen Mother. Therefore, if for no other reason than that of varying the expression, we must give our suffrage most decidedly in favour of the original reading. '*Near* to England' of course means nearly related to England; and it seems much more

Of *Lewes* the Dolphin, and that louely maid. 448
If luſtie loue ſhould go in queſt of beautie,
Where ſhould he finde it fairer, then in *Blanch*: 450

448. Lewes] Lewis Ff. Louis Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. ii, Words.
Dolphin] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet. (passim).
449. *luſtie*] *youthful* Words.
450. *then*] *than* Ff.

natural, as well as more poetical, that the Citizen should speak in this general way of Lady Blanch, than that he should condescend on her particular degree of relationship, and style her the 'niece to England.'—DYCE (ed. ii.) unhestitatingly accepts the MS. correction for the very same reasons that prompt its rejection by the anonymous writer in Blackwood, i. e., that the Lady Blanch is repeatedly referred to as the niece of King John. Dyce adds: 'Lest some over-subtle critic should object to this very slight alteration, on the ground that the Folio gives "neece" [in other passages] with a capital letter and "neere" without one, I may observe that, as a matter of course, the compositor would not use a capital letter for a word which he had erroneously supposed to be an adjective.'—KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor*, p. 221): In *Two Gentlemen* we have: 'An heir and niece allied unto the Duke.'—IV, i, 49.—[This is Keightley's justification of the present reading of the Folio; but it is not, I think, quite to the point. The line from *Two Gentlemen* reads, in the Folio, 'And heire and Neece, allied unto the Duke.' The first 'And' is corrected in the 3d Folio, and Theobald, who made the change of 'Neece' to *near*, remarked, pertinently, that 'Shakespeare would not have been guilty of such tautology as to say that the lady was a niece and allied to the Duke'; but this objection does not apply to the present line in *King John;* no other relationship is mentioned. Keightley is to be commended for adhering to the Folio text, but his reason for so doing is unfortunate.—ED.]—Miss PORTER: Why is this expression for the niece already introduced, and here spoken of as held dear by John, not better in this place than the repetition, *Neece?* It seems to be an utterly needless change. [The opinion expressed in the last sentence is quite in accord with that of the present ED.]

448. **the Dolphin**] R. G. WHITE: So the Folio invariably, whenever this title occurs, either in this or any other of these plays; and so the Chronicles and all the contemporary literature; the old French word, too, was not *Dauphin*, but *Daulphin*. This is consequently not an old irregular spelling (which, indeed, it could not be), but an old English form of the title, which, therefore, an editor has not the right to change. And, indeed, there is no more cogent reason for calling Louis the *Dauphin*, than for calling Philip the *Roi* of France, except the usage of the present day, with which we have not to do. With the modern form of the title Talbot's punning sneer, 'Pucelle or puzzel, Dolphin or dog-fish' (*1 Henry VI:* I, iv), would be utterly pointless. [See *Dram. Personæ*, s. v. Lewis: note by FRENCH.]

449–453. **If lustie loue . . . of birth**] RUSHTON (*Sh. and The Arte of Eng. Poe.*, p. 135) quotes these lines in illustration of what Puttenham calls 'Symploche or the Figure of Reply.'—'In the works of many of the authors of Shakespeare's time,' says Rushton, 'this form of Repetition appears. It is very old. Homer makes use of it in the *Iliad*, xiv, 317.' As other examples from Shakespeare he gives: *Rich. III:* V, iii, 255–262; *Lucrece*, ll. 736–749. [See *Appendix: Criticism*, BRANDES.]

If zealous loue ſhould go in ſearch of vertue,
Where ſhould he finde it purer then in *Blanch?*
If loue ambitious, ſought a match of birth,
Whoſe veines bound richer blood then Lady *Blanch?*
Such as ſhe is, in beautie, vertue, birth,
Is the yong Dolphin euery way compleat,
If not compleat of, ſay he is not ſhee,
And ſhe againe wants nothing, to name want,
If want it be not, that ſhe is not hee:

451. *ſhould*] Om. Ff.
452. *then*] *than* Ff.
454. *bloud*] *bloud* F_2.
then] *than* F_4.
Blanch] *Blanch'* Walker (Vers., 266).
457–463. *If not...in him.*] Om. Words. Dono.
457. *compleat of, ſay*] *compleat of,—say* Theob. *compleat, oh! say*, Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Sta. Dyce, ii, iii, Coll. iii, Marsh. *complete of, say*, Knt, Coll. i, ii, Sing. ii, Ktly, Del. Fle. *complete them; say* Moberly conj. *of way complete* Herr. *complete so, say* Kinnear.
458. *to name want*] (*to name want*) Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
459. *not, that*] *but that* Jervis, Lettsom. Huds. ii. *that not* Herr.
hee:] *he.* Rowe, Pope,+, Var. '85, Ktly.

451. **zealous**] JOHNSON: 'Zealous' seems here to signify *pious*, or *influenced by motives of religion.* [SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. *zealous*) quotes other examples besides the present line where 'zealous' conveys the idea of religious piety: *Sonnet* xxvii, 6; *All's Well*, III, iv, ii; *Richard III:* III, vii, 94.]

457–463. **If not . . . in him**] WORDSWORTH (i, 436), in justification of his omission, says: 'These lines appear so unworthy of Shakespeare, even as put into the mouth of a citizen, that I was unwilling to retain them in the text.'

457–459. **If not compleat of . . . not hee**] PYE (p. 139): I cannot but think these lines, so disgraceful to a most beautiful passage, are the interpolation of some person who could not reconcile the Dauphin being complete with his being only the half part of a blessed man, and so inserted this stuff to make up the deficiency, whereas the word 'complete' is used here by no very uncommon irregularity of our Poet for *completely;* the meaning of these lines is: that the Dauphin was as completely endowed with beauty, virtue, and birth as the Lady Blanch; but for both to be as completely happy as they are completely accomplished they must each possess their counterpart in marriage.

457. **compleat of, say**] KNIGHT: Hanmer's change, 'O say,' is to substitute the language of the eighteenth century for that of the sixteenth.—COLLIER: The meaning is that if the Dauphin be not complete of, or in, these qualities, it is merely because he is not Blanch.—[Hudson's interpretation and that of the Cowden Clarkes is substantially the same as Collier's; in his second ed. Hudson rejects the Folio reading, remarking that it 'can hardly be made to yield any sense at all'; for the word 'of' he substitutes *then*, adding, 'The context naturally suggests this reading; but possibly we ought to read: "If not complete *he*, say he is not she." '] —WRIGHT, following Hanmer, says: 'The misprint is a very easy one, and no parallel use of "of" has, so far as I am aware, been found.'

He is the halfe part of a bleſſed man,
Left to be finiſhed by ſuch as ſhee,
And ſhe a faire diuided excellence,
Whoſe fulneſſe of perfection lyes in him.
O two ſuch ſiluer currents when they ioyne
Do glorifie the bankes that bound them in:
And two ſuch ſhores, to two ſuch ſtreames made one,
Two ſuch controlling bounds ſhall you be, kings,
To theſe two Princes, if you marrie them:
This Vnion ſhall do more then batterie can
To our faſt cloſed gates: for at this match,
With ſwifter ſpleene then powder can enforce
The mouth of paſſage ſhall we fling wide ope,
And giue you entrance: but without this match,
The ſea enraged is not halfe ſo deafe,
Lyons more confident, Mountaines and rockes

460, 461. *bleſſed...finiſhed*] *blessèd... finished* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words.

461. *as ſhee*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Coll. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Del. Neils. *a She* Thirlby, Theob. Coll. ii. (MS.) et cet.

462. *faire diuided*] *fair-divided* Walker (Crit., i, 35).

464. *O two*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. i. *Oh! Two* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *O! two* Han. Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh, two* Var. '78, '85, Rann. *O, two* Cap. et cet.

468. *them:*] *them.* Pope et seq.

469. *then*] *than* Ff.
can] Coll. Dyce, Wh. Cam.+, Del. Neils. *can*, Ff. et cet.

470. *faſt cloſed*] *fast-closed* Theob. et seq. *fast-closèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words. Dono.

471. *ſpleene*] *speed* Pope, Herr.
then...enforce] *than...enforce*, Ff.

474. *enraged*] *enragèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words. Dono.

475, 476. *more...More*] *so...So* Pope, +, Cap.

---

463. **perfection lyes in him**] ROLFE: For the idea that woman was completed, or perfected by marriage, compare *Twelfth Night*, I, i, 38 et seq., and II, iv, 42. See also Lord Berners's translation of Froissart: 'My daughter should be happy if she might come to so great a perfection as to be enjoined in marriage with the Earl of Guerles'; Overbury, *The Wife:* 'Marriage their object is; their being then, And now perfection, they receive from men,' [Capell's *Prolusions*, p. 4,] and Donne, *Epithalamium:* 'Weep not, nor blush, here is no grief nor shame; To-day put on perfection, and a woman's name,' [ed. Grosart, p. 275].

470. **at this match**] JOHNSON: I am loath to think that Shakespeare meant to play with the double of 'match' for *nuptial*, and the 'match' of a *gun*.—[To Johnson, in his immortal *Preface*, we are indebted for the trenchant phrase that: A quibble was for Shakespeare the fatal Cleopatra for which he lost the world, and was content to lose it.—ED.]

471. **swifter spleene**] THEOBALD: That is, with a passion of desire more swift in its influence than your fire and fury can compel us to. The Poet uses this word again afterwards in this play in the very same sense: 'Oh, I am scalded with my violent motion And spleen of speed to see your majesty.'—[V, vii, 56].

More free ftom mo1ion, no not death himfelfe
In mortall furie halfe fo peremptorie,
As we to keepe this Citie.
Baſt. Heeres a ſtay,

476. *ftom mo1ion*] F1.
no not] *no, not* Theob. et seq.
—*no, not* Ktly.
478. *Citie.*] *city.* [The Kings, &c., talk apart. Coll. iii.
479. *ſtay*] *ſtaw* Johns. conj. Huds. ii. *say* Sing. ii. (Becket). *story or storm* Spedding (ap. Cam.). *style* Vaughan.

479. **Heeres a stay**] JOHNSON: I cannot but think that every reader wishes for some other word in the place of 'stay,' which though it may signify an *hindrance*, or *man* that *hinders*, is yet very improper to introduce the next line. I read: 'Here's a *ſtaw*.' That is, here is a *gust* of bravery, a *blast* of menace. This suits well with the spirit of the speech. 'Stay' and *ſtaw*, in a careless hand, are not easily distinguished; and if the writing was obscure, *ſtaw* being a word less usual, was easily missed.—STEEVENS (*Var.*, 1778): Perhaps the force of the word 'stay' is not exactly known. I meet with it in *Damon & Pythias*, 1582: 'Not to prolong my lyfe thereby, for which I reckon not this, But to set my things in a stay.'—[Haz. Dods., iv, 54]. Perhaps by a 'stay,' in this instance, is meant a steady posture. Shakespeare's meaning may therefore be: 'Here's a *steady, resolute fellow*, who shakes,' etc. A 'stay,' however, seems to have been meant for something *active* in the following passage in the 6th Canto of Drayton's *Baron's Wars:* 'Oh could ambition apprehend a stay, The giddy course it wandereth in, to guide.' Again, in *The Faerie Queene:* 'Till riper years he raught, and stronger stay.'—II, x, [20]. Perhaps the metaphor is from navigation. Thus, in Chapman's version of the tenth book of Homer's *Odyssey:* 'Our ship lay anchor'd close, nor needed we Feare harm on any stays,' [l. 123]. A marginal note adds: 'For being cast on the staies, as ships are by weather.' [In all subsequent editions Steevens, wisely I think, omits this last conjectural explanation which has no possible bearing on the use of 'stay' in the present line in *King John*. In its place he follows the quotation from Spenser, with this amplification: 'Shakespeare, therefore, who uses *wrongs* for *wrongers*, &c., might have used a "stay" for a *stayer*. Churchyard, in his *Siege of Leeth*, 1575, having occasion to speak of a trumpet that sounded to proclaim a truce, says: "This staye of warre made many men to muse."—[ed. Chalmers, p. 92]. I am therefore convinced that the first line of Faulconbridge's speech needs no emendation.'—It is to be regretted that Steevens has not furnished an example wherein Shakespeare uses *wrongs* for *wrongers;* if there be such it has escaped the vigilant eyes of both SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) and ABBOTT. Steevens's quotation from Churchyard is certainly apposite to the present passage, whether 'stay' be taken to mean *stayer* or *pause*. His complete rejection of Johnson's emendation was doubtless withheld during the lifetime of his greater co-editor.—ED.]—MALONE: 'Stay,' I apprehend, here signifies *a supporter of a cause*. Here's an extraordinary partizan, that shakes, &c. So, in this play: 'What surety of the world, what hope, what stay.'—V, vii, 76. Again, in *3 Henry VI:* 'Now thou art gone, we have no staff, no stay.'—[II, i, 69]. Again, in *Rich. III:* 'What stay had I, but Edward, and he's gone.'—[II, ii, 74]. Again, in Davies's *Scourge of Folly*, 1611: 'England's fast friend, and Ireland's constant stay.'—[*Epigram* 189; ed. Grosart, p. 29]. It is observable that *partizan*, in like manner, though now generally used to signify an adherent to a party, originally meant a *pike* or

[479. Heeres a stay]

halberd. Perhaps, however, our Author meant by the words, 'Here's a stay.' Here's a fellow, who whilst he makes a proposition as a *stay* or *obstacle*, to prevent the effusion of blood, shakes, &c. The Citizen has just said: 'Hear us, great Kings, vouchsafe a while to stay. And I shall show you peace.' It is, I conceive, no objection to this interpretation that an *impediment* or *obstacle* could not shake death, &c., though the person who endeavored to *stay* or prevent the attack of the two kings might. Shakespeare seldom attends to such *minutiæ*. But the first explanation seems to me more probable.—MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 155): I have no doubt but Johnson is right in reading *flaw* instead of 'stay.' Steevens says that possibly by 'stay' is meant a *steady posture*. But I don't see how a steady posture could shake the carcase of death out of his rags.—[Steevens evidently felt the force of Mason's objection, since this explanation is omitted in his own edition of 1793 and subsequent ones.—ED.]—KNIGHT: Malone and Steevens have two pages to prove, what requires no proof, that 'stay' means *interruption*.—SINGER, without assigning his authority, *more suo*, adopts Malone's first explanation, that 'stay' here means *a supporter of a cause*. He speaks in commendation of the conjecture *say* (Becket's, by the way, though Singer does not give the name), and adopts it in his ed. ii.; remarking in a note: 'The context shows that "stay" was a mere misprint for *say*. What follows, "Here's a large mouth, indeed, that spits forth death," etc., is, I think, quite conclusive. . . . Mr Knight does not tell us how *interruption* could "shake old death out of his rags." A vehement speaker Shakespeare has elsewhere described as tearing "a passion to tatters, to very rags." And in a future scene in similar language Constance says: "O that my tongue were in the thunder's mouth. Then with a passion would I shake the world And rouse from sleep that fell anatomy Which cannot hear a lady's feeble voice."' —CARTWRIGHT (*New Readings*, p. 15) also suggests this emendation, but 'after a six-months' ecstasy over this word *say*, so apposite and so characteristic of the dashing, rollicking speaker,' finds he is 'anticipated and the emendation rejected by at least one editor.'—[It would, I think, be nearer the mark to say that it had been *accepted* by at least one; thus far Singer is the only editor who has admitted the word to his text.—ED.]—COLLIER (ed. ii.): We cannot see the necessity for changing 'stay' to any other word, least of all, to *say*, which Shakespeare never uses as a substantive. Sir Roger Lestrange, according to our dictionaries, was the first to employ *say* in that manner. If we made any, it might be to *story*, which, as Mr W. W. Williams suggests, was easily misprinted 'stay'; but no emendation whatever is called for. What the Bastard refers to is the *pause* and silence naturally occasioned by the unexpected speech of the Citizen, which induced all parties to gaze upon each other. The Bastard ought not to begin speaking until the two Kings have *stayed* for some little time.—VERPLANCK: As the Citizens have just before asked the kings to 'stay,' the Bastard ridicules their proposed 'stay' being accompanied by so many bold and big words.—DELIUS: 'Stay,' in the sense of an *interruption, obstruction*, is here evidently used for *interrupter*, inasmuch as the Citizen, by his proposition, opposes the project of the two kings.—STAUNTON: 'Stay,' if that be the Poet's word, is used, we suppose, in the sense of a *sudden* check or obstacle. It may not be the most suitable expression to introduce the following line; but it appears at least as good as *flaw* or *say*, which have been proposed to supersede it.—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 294): Johnson's *flaw* is indisputably right; *flawe—stay* is like the error in *Romeo & Juliet*, II, i, fol., p. 59, col.

[479. **Heeres a stay**]

1, 'Prouant, but Loue and *day*' for 'Pronounce but Loue and *doue*.'—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The word 'stay' has been objected to here; but we think it is not only far better than either of the substitutions proposed, but that it conveys the sense intended to be conveyed. The Citizen has previously said, 'Vouchsafe a while to stay'; that is, to restrain yourselves, to hold your hands, to forbear; consequently he is banteringly called a 'stay,' in the sense of a *restraint*, or *prudent restrainer*. Spenser and Bacon use the word 'stay' in the sense of *staid judgment, wise discretion;* and Phillipps also has a passage aptly showing that it bore this signification: 'With prudent stay he long deferr'd the rough contention.' Elsewhere, when Shakespeare uses the word as a noun, he employs it in the sense of a *prop, support;* therefore, inasmuch as the Citizen is upholding the cause of the city, and vindicating its firm resolution, the epithet 'stay' has double force of propriety. That a *re*straint and a support should be personified sufficiently to be supposed capable of shaking 'the rotten carcass of old Death' is not beyond that which is permitted to the license of poetry in figurative language.—LETTSOM (ap. DYCE, ii.): 'Stay' is perhaps the last word that could have come from Shakespeare. Steevens and Malone defend it by the customary argument: A crowd of ordinary writers have used 'stay' properly; therefore Shakespeare must have used it improperly.—FORSYTH (p. 110): We suspect that the word in the text, along with the words suggested as substitutes, are all wrong, and that Shakespeare wrote *storm*, in the sense of a hurricane of high-flown verbiage, which agrees with the remainder of the passage. [Forsyth is herein anticipated by Spedding. See *Text. Notes.*]—FLEAY: That is, an *obstacle* to our course, running against which produces violent shaking by collision. Commentators have in several ways amended and misinterpreted.—HERR (p. 22): The difficulty consists in finding a word that will correspond with the image and various figures of the speech that follow; and such a word, fulfilling these requirements, I confidently believe is expressed in that of *sway*. . . . Shakespeare uses the word further on: 'This sway of motion, this commodity,' l. 604. And again: 'Are not you moved when all the sway of earth Shakes like a thing unfirm?'—[*Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 3]. Here 'sway' and 'shakes' are brought into juxtaposition with the like words in the passage in question, and furnish stronger confirmation of the correctness of the emendment.—[While Herr may gain adherents for his conjectural change—even as did Johnson and Becket—there will scarcely be found one, I think, who will accept his illustrative examples as apposite. In the line from this play 'sway' clearly means that which *governs* motion; and in *Jul. Cæs.* it has been explained as the whole *dominion* of the earth. To speak of the whole earth shaking is certainly proper; but to speak of a governing power, or a dominion, that shakes death out of his rags is beyond even poetic license.—ED.]—ELZE (*Athenæum*, June 22, 1867, p. 821): I think we should read, 'Here's a *bray*.' The Heralds both of the besiegers and the besieged play a conspicuous part in this scene and have just opened the parley with the blowing of their trumpets; King Philip says (l. 222): 'Our trumpet call'd you to this gentle parle.' Under such circumstances the citizen of Angiers may be said not inappropriately to 'bray out' his defiance to the kings like a 'harsh-resounding trumpet' (see *Rich. II:* I, iii, 135, 'With harsh-resounding trumpets dreadful bray'), and, in the Bastard's language, by such a clang to shake 'the rotten carcass of old Death out of his rags.' Compare *Hamlet:* 'The kettledrum and trumpet thus bray out The triumph of

[479. Heeres a stay]

his pledge.'—I, iv, 11.—Br. NICHOLSON (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1880, p. 107), in reference to this conjecture, says: 'Professor Elze . . . forgets two circumstances: 1. That the citizens answered neither of the summonses to a parley by a trumpet. 2. That no trumpet, if used, could then be called a note of defiance, and especially on this third occasion, when the sole intent is to propose a peaceful solution. It is to this occasion alone that the fiery but practical Richard, son of Cœur-de-Lion, can refer.'—ELZE (*Notes*, etc., 2nd Series, p. 199) thus replies: 'Dr Nicholson entirely mistook my meaning in thinking that I referred my conjectural emendation *bray* . . . to the blowing of trumpets by the men of Angiers. I referred (and still refer) *bray* to the defiant speech of the Citizen of Angiers, and think it quite immaterial whether or not the customary trumpets were blown on the occasion of this parley; only the expression would be so much the more appropriate if they were. I am ready to grant that there were no trumpets in the case, since Dr Nicholson attaches so much importance to their absence; but still I uphold my conjecture as stoutly as before. Compare Greene, *Dorastus and Fawnia*, "—who as in a fury brayed out these bitter speeches" (*Sh. Library*, ed. Hazlitt, I, iv, 43).'—MOBERLY: Either 'stay' means 'Here's a check' or Johnson's reading must be accepted.—KINNEAR (p. 193) adopts Spedding's second alternative reading, *storm;* and in regard to Johnson's conjecture, *flaw*, says: 'Shakespeare does not use this word as a figure for *stormy words*, but for sudden *impetuous violence;* as of Prince Hal: "As humourous as winter, and as sudden As flaws congealed in the spring of day."—*2 Henry IV:* IV, iv, 35; of Jack Cade's insurrection: "Like to the glorious sun's transparent beams, Do calm the fury of this mad-bred flaw."—*2 Henry VI:* III, i, 354.'—WRIGHT: That is, a *check* or *hindrance*, that calls upon us to stop. We must not examine too nicely the figure which follows, or enquire how a stay can be said to shake anything.—PAGE: That is, here's an interruption or obstacle to our course, that shakes, etc. The Bastard sarcastically continues the inflated language of the Citizen. The commentators have looked in vain for any definite or consistent meaning where none is intended.—Miss PORTER: The objection [to the word 'stay'] vanishes if the idea of an authoritative and sudden stay of proceedings be understood to be called out, as in a tournament when, in the set-to of a deadly encounter, the trumpet to part the combatants halts them so suddenly that it shakes them on their steeds as the 'carkasse of old death' by this 'stay,' disappointed of his prey, is said to be similarly shaken.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) considers this 'a humorous comment on the close of the Citizen's speech. His resolution to hold the city is so strong that "old Death" himself, charging against it in peremptory fury will find his rotten carcass jarred out of its rags.'—DEIGHTON: That is, Here's an obstacle, check; which makes old Death so furious with rage, at having the career of carnage interrupted, that he almost bursts his tattered clothes. His rottenness makes him all the more easily shaken. So far from 'stay' being inappropriate here, as it is contended, it seems to me peculiarly appropriate. Death would not be alarmed by either a boast or a menace; but his terrible agitation is natural at the thought of being disappointed of the feast that was 'toward,' provided that the kings were not dissuaded by the Citizen from their first intention. It is to be noticed that the remainder of the speech, which deals with the boastful character of the Citizen's declaration, has reference to the effect which the Bastard humourously pretends it has had upon the hearers, but no reference to the effect

That ſhakes the rotten carkaſſe of old death 480
Out of his ragges. Here's a large mouth indeede,

481. *ragges.*] *rags!* Cap. et seq.

produced upon Death.—[Although chronologically out of its proper position, I have here placed at the end of this long note the following excellent elucidation contributed to the *Transactions of the New Sh. Soc.* for 1880 (p. 107) by that most sagacious of commentators, Dr BRINSLEY NICHOLSON. It constitutes a summing up of the whole discussion so complete that any remarks thereafter by me would, I feel, be quite superfluous: 'Various of the conjecturers, and even some critics, have expended a surplus portion of their ingenuity on this line. Johnson suggested *flaw* in the sense of "gust or blast"; that is, some of the storm of war being overpast, this peaceful proposal which comes like a great calm is likened by him—not Shakspere—to such a sudden gust or flaw as, for instance, sunk the Eurydice. Spedding's *storm* may be classed with this. His *story* is no better, for I know not how a calm, peaceful story can—as a story—shake death out of his rags. Becket's *say*, adopted by Singer, only requires mention to cause the usual result of his conjectures.' [Here follows Nicholson's objections to Elze's conjecture *bray*, see *ante*.] 'Let us now turn to the original. Lettsom will have it that "'stay' is perhaps the last word that would have come from Shakspere." But he, though very ingenious and acute, is too fond of seeking that which will suit his own supposition of what Shakspere must have meant, instead of seeking for his author's intent and meaning. Preferring this latter plan, I would say that "stay" is one of the best words that could have been chosen. The opposing armies have hurried up to engage one another, and the Bastard, taking part of his metaphor from this hurrying up, and continuing the line of thought expressed in his previous speech, "O now doth Death line his lean chops with steel," speaks of Death as impetuously hurrying up in anticipation of great gala days. But now comes this sudden compromise; instead of "soldiers' swords being Death's fangs," he, in his hot haste, has run against an unexpected stay, an unseen impediment, as an impetuous boy runs against a man, post, or wall. If readers in this nineteenth century cannot remember their boyish days, they can at least remember the effects of a railway collision, which is enough in sober prose to shake one's rags off one's body, and, in the case of Death, would probably injure his scythe-handle. An eminent Shaksperian—though it should be added a German one—has since written to me that "stay" in the senses of *stop* or *hindrance* is not given in our Dictionaries. I reply that all I know of, from Cotgrave downwards, give these senses. Richardson, besides the meanings "to stop . . . obstruct or hinder," and besides giving quotations both of the verb and substantive in these senses from other authors, has this from Holland's *Pliny*, bk ix, c. 27, where there are also two other examples of the verb: "Our Stay-Ship Echeneis, *Trebius Niger* saith, is a foot long . . . and that oftentimes it stayeth [hindreth] a ship." Shakspere uses it in *Jul. Cæs.*, "Nothing but death shall stay me."—IV, iii, 127. "A stay," in nautical or mechanical idiom, is used in the secondary sense of "support," because it stays or hinders the mast, &c., from falling. "This is a stay (hindrance)" is, too, a recognised phrase, like "It stays me." Indeed, even if the substantive did not—as it does—follow the senses of the verb, as stop, the act of stopping, does the intransitive, and stop, the cause of stopping, or hindrance, the transitive form, every Englishman, besides Shakspere, would be entitled so to use them.']

That ſpits forth death, and mountaines, rockes, and ſeas,
Talkes as familiarly of roaring Lyons,
As maids of thirteene do of puppi-dogges.
What Cannoneere begot this luſtie blood,
He ſpeakes plaine Cannon fire, and ſmoake, and bounce,
He giues the baſtinado with his tongue:
Our eares are cudgel'd, not a word of his
But buffets better then a fiſt of France:
Zounds, I was neuer ſo bethumpt with words,
Since I firſt cal'd my brothers father Dad.
Old Qu. Son, liſt to this coniunction, make this match
Giue with our Neece a dowrie large enough,
For by this knot, thou ſhalt ſo ſurely tye
Thy now vnſur d aſſurance to the Crowne,

484. *puppi-dogges.*] Ff. (*puppy-dogs.*) Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Del. *puppy-dogs!* Cap. et cet.

485. *luſtie blood,*] *luſty bloud*, F$_2$. *lusty blood?* Pope et seq. *lusty-blood* Anon. ap. Cam.

486. *Cannon fire,*] Ff, Rowe, Cam.+, Neils. *cannon-fire*, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. i, Fle. *cannon,—fire* Dyce, Huds. ii, Words. *cannon, fire*, Cap. et cet.

487. *baſtinado*] *bastonado* Theob.

490. *Zounds,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Huds. ii. *'Zounds*, Cap. *Faith*, Words. *Zounds!* Warb. et cet.

490. *bethumpt*] *bethump'd* Mal. et seq.

491. *I firſt*] *first I* Anon. ap. Cam. *father*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. Coll. Dyce, Wh. Huds. Fle. Cam.+. *father,—* Hal. *father*, Cap. et cet.

492. Old Qu.] Eli. Rowe et seq.

492–503. *Son...what it was.*] Aside to John. Capell, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Craig.

492. *match*] *match*, Ff, Rowe, Pope, +. *match;* Cap. et seq.

495. *now vnſur d*] *now vnſur'd* Ff. *now-unsur'd* Pope, Theob. i, Dyce, ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *now unsured* Cam.+. *now unsure* Anon. ap. Cam. ii.

---

486. **He speakes . . . bounce**] STEEVENS suggests that Shakespeare 'seems to have taken the hint of this speech from a passage in *The Famous History of Thomas Stukely*, 1605: "Why here's a gallant, here's a king indeed, He speaks all Mars, Tut, let me follow such a lad as this, This is pure fire; every look he casts Flasheth like lightning; there's mettle in this boy He brings a breath that sets our sails on fire, Why now I see we shall have cuffs indeed,"' [ed. Simpson, vol. i, p. 252, ll. 2357–2362. While such insinuations by the earlier editors as to a lack of inventiveness in Shakespeare are somewhat irritating, in the present instance there is, perhaps, a little more probability than is at first apparent. Simpson (*School of Shakspere*) includes this *Play of Stucley* among those early dramatic pieces upon which Shakespeare may have tried his 'prentice hand. The date given by Steevens is 1605, but this is from the printed title-page; the date of composition has been shown to be nearly twenty years anterior to this; and Simpson goes even as far as to indicate a short passage which may be ascribed to Shakespeare; who the other authors are need not concern us. It is to be deeply deplored that Simpson did not live to see his work in print; but few, if any, have gainsaid his conclusions.—ED.]

491. **I . . . father Dad**] IVOR JOHN: An inimitable turn of a common saying to suit the Bastard's own case.

495. **vnsur d**] SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) records this as the only passage wherein 'unsured'

That yon greene boy ſhall haue no Sunne to ripe
The bloome that promiſeth a mightie fruite.
I ſee a yeelding in the lookes of France:
Marke how they whiſper, vrge them while their ſoules
Are capeable of this ambition,
Leaſt zeale now melted by the windie breath
Of ſoft petitions, pittie and remorſe,
Coole and congeale againe to what it was.

496. *yon*] *you* F_3. *yond'* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i.
497. *fruite.*] *fruit,* Ff. *fruit:* Rowe.
499. *Marke...whiſper,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Mark,...whisper.* Ktly, Neils. *Mark,...whisper;* Theob. et cet.
500. *ambition*] *ambitiõn* Fle. Words.
501–503. *Leaſt...it was.*] Om. Dono.
501. *Leaſt*] *Left* F_4.
zeale now melted] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *zeal, now melted* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Fle. Words. Neils. Craig. *zeal, now melted,* Han. et cet.

is used in the sense *made uncertain* or *unsafe.*—ABBOTT (§ 294) and WRIGHT interpret 'unsured' as here meaning *unassured, insecure.*

498. **I see a yeelding,** etc.] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 119): Compare, 'I see a blessed yielding in thy eye.'—Middleton, *Triumph of Truth,* ed. Dyce, vol. v, p. 231.

499, 500. **vrge them . . . ambition**] C. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh. Char.*, p. 324): This is counsel not unworthy of a Richelieu or a Mazarin. Mrs Montague's was a felicitous illustration of the genius of Shakespeare when she compared him to that dervis who possessed the power of trajecting his soul into the body of any individual that suited his purpose (p. 37). The mind that conceived the spirit of Ariel, and the spotless innocence of Miranda, is here equally at home in describing the crooked and thorny policy of a court intriguer.

501–503. **Least zeale . . . Coole and congeale**] JOHNSON: We have here a very unusual and, I think, not very just image of *zeal,* which in its highest degree is represented by others as a flame, but by Shakespeare as a frost. To *repress zeal,* in the language of others, is to *cool;* in Shakespeare's, to melt it; when it exerts its utmost power it is commonly said to *flame,* but by Shakespeare, to be *congealed.*—STEEVENS: Sure the Poet means to compare 'zeal' to *metal* in a state of fusion, and not to dissolving ice.—MALONE: The allusion, I apprehend, is to dissolving ice; and if this passage be compared with others in our author's plays, it will not, I think, appear liable to Dr Johnson's objection. The sense, I conceive, is, 'Lest the now zealous and to you well-affected *heart* of Philip, which but lately was cold and hard as ice, and has newly been *melted and softened,* should by the breath of supplications of Constance, and pity for Arthur, again *become congealed* and frozen.' I once thought that 'the windy breath of soft petitions,' &c., should be coupled with the preceding words, and related to the proposal made by the Citizen of Angiers; but now I believe that they were intended to be connected, in construction, with the following line. In a subsequent scene we find a similar thought couched in nearly the same expressions: 'This act, so evilly born, shall cool the hearts Of all his people, and freeze up their zeal.'—[III, iii, 154]. Here Shakespeare does not say that 'zeal' when 'congealed exerts its utmost power,' but, on the contrary, that when it is congealed or frozen it ceases to exert itself at all; it is no longer zeal. We again meet with the same allusion in

[501–503. **Least zeale . . . Coole and congeale**]

Henry VIII: '—cold hearts freeze Allegiance in them.'—[I, ii, 61]. Both zeal and allegiance, therefore, we see, in the language of Shakespeare, are in their highest state of exertion when *melted;* and repressed or diminished when frozen. The word 'freeze,' in the passages just quoted, shows that the allusion is not, as has been suggested, to *metals*, but to *ice*. The obscurity of the present passage arises from our Author's use of the word 'zeal,' which is, as it were, personified. Zeal, if it be understood strictly, cannot 'cool and congeal to what it *was*' (for when it cools it ceases to be zeal), though a person who has become warm and zealous in a cause may afterwards become cool and indifferent, *as he was* before he was warmed. 'To what it was,' however, in our Author's licentious language may mean to what it was *before it was zeal.*—[The first part of this note, down through the quotation from *Henry VIII*, appears first in the *Variorum* of 1785, receiving neither comment nor objection from the editor, STEEVENS, but his friendly feeling had evidently cooled and congealed from what it was, when, eight years later, he compiled the notes for his own edition, having in the meanwhile read and incorporated the latter part of this note by Malone. He there says: '"The windy breath" that will *cool metals in a state of fusion* produces not the effects of *frost.* I am, therefore, yet to learn how "the *soft petitions* of Constance and *pity* for Arthur" (two gentle agents) were competent to the act of freezing. There is surely somewhat of impropriety in employing Favonius to do the work of Boreas.' —ED.]—KNIGHT: There is great confusion in what the commentators say on this image. All this discordance appears to us to be produced by not limiting the image by the Poet's own words. The 'zeal' of the King of France and of Lewis is 'now melted'—whether that melting represent metal in a state of fusion or dissolving ice; it has lost its compactness, its cohesion; but 'the windy breath of soft petitions'—the pleading of Constance and Arthur—the pity and remorse of Philip for their lot—may 'cool and congeal' it 'again to what it was'; may make it again solid and entire.—[The fatal malady—confusion—which Knight diagnoses as the cause of the errors of his predecessors seems here to have been infectious. When Knight speaks of 'the Poet's own words' he means, of course, the text of the Folio; but he has inadvertently failed to take note of the fact that his explanation is dependent not on the punctuation of the Folio, but on that of Hanmer. It also may be noticed that Knight's elucidation does not differ materially from Malone's; in fact, it is but little more than a paraphrase.—ED.]—DELIUS, adopting Hanmer's punctuation, accepts Malone's explanation that 'zeal' here refers to the friendly feelings of Philip, which may, by the prayers of Constance, be rendered cold as they were before.—R. G. WHITE: This passage has hitherto been understood and punctuated as if zeal were spoken of as melted by soft petitions, pity, and remorse; which has made much work for the commentators; and inevitably. For what had pity and remorse to do with the disposition of France to abandon the cause of Constance? Queen Elinor says, 'Lest zeal now melted by the windy breath of soft petitions on the part of Louis and Blanch, pity and remorse for Constance, cool and congeal to what it was before this marriage was proposed.'—VAUGHAN (i, 29): I understand this passage to mean: Lest the favourable and melting condition, which as such is now zeal for us, but which has been produced by the artificial influence of petitions, pity and remorse, blowing on the congealed surface of an icy and adverse feeling, return again to that cold, hard, and hostile feeling which it was before it was zeal. [At this point Vaughan, having Hanmer's

Hub. Why anſwer not the double Maieſties,
This friendly treatie of our threatned Towne.
Fra. Speake England ſir ſt, that hath bin forward firſt
To ſpeake vnto this Cittie : what ſay you?
Iohn. If that the Dolphin there thy Princely ſonne,
Can in this booke of beautie read, I loue:

504. Hub.] Cit. Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. 1. C. Capell. 1 Cit. Malone et seq.
the] *ye* Lettsom (ap. Dyce ii.).
505. *threatned*] Ff, Rowe, Fle. Neils. *threatened* Wh. i. *threaten'd* Pope et cet.
Towne.] *Towne?* Ff.
506. *Speake England*] *Speak, England*, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Hal.
506. *hath*] *have* Anon. ap. Cam.
507. *Cittie:*] *city;*— Cap. Huds. ii. *city.* Ktly, Sta. Fle. Neils.
508. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. i, Ktly. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
there] *there*, F_4.
509. *I loue:*] "*I love,*" Dyce, Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Rlfe, Words. Craig. —*I love,*— Hal.

---

reading before him, stumbles into that same quagmire as did Knight, and after accusing all his predecessors of a complete misunderstanding of the passage, offers as his solution of all difficulties that the lines be punctuated as in the Folio.—ED.]—PAGE, accepting Malone's interpretation that 'zeal' is here used to denote *friendly feeling*, quotes in illustration, 'My zeal to Valentine is cold.'—*Two Gentlemen*, II, iv, 203; 'Intend a kind of zeal both to the Prince and Claudio.'—*Much Ado*, II, ii, 36.—IVOR JOHN: Lest the desire which the French king now has to fall in with the suggestion, a desire melted by the windy breath, etc., should cool and freeze into its previous form if advantage be not now taken.—[Ivor John is here, I think, quite right in taking 'zeal' as referring to the desire of the French king for the proposed alliance, and not to the friendly feelings of Philip towards John. It is not in accord with Elinor's argument that John urge the king of France, lest this friendship, which is now melted, should cool and congeal; quite the contrary, in fact. Her words are a direct sequence to her observation on the yielding which she notices in the looks of King Philip. She goes on to say that this desire is melted or destroyed in part by the windy breath of soft petitions—a characteristically contemptuous description of any petitions made by Constance in Arthur's behalf. In brief, Elinor's words may be paraphrased: Strike while the iron is hot.—ED.]

504. **the**] IVOR JOHN objects to Lettsom's suggestion (see *Text. Notes*) on the ground that 'Shakespeare's usage would then require two *ye's*—"Why answer ye not, ye double majesties."—[In point of grammatical accuracy John is quite correct; but Shakespearean usage in such a case is, I fear, an unsafe guide. Bartlett's *Concordance* shows how purely arbitrary is Shakespeare's use of 'ye' and 'you'; take, as one example among many: 'Therein, ye gods, you make the weak most strong.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 91.—ED.]

509. **booke of beautie**] STEEVENS compares: 'Her face the book of praises.'—*Pericles*, I, i, 15; and MALONE adds: 'Your face, my thane, is as a book where men May read strange matters.'—*Macbeth*, I, v, 63.—[Likewise compare, perhaps, 'Yea, this man's brow, like to a title leaf Foretells the nature of a tragic volume.' —*2 Henry IV:* I, i, 61.—ED.]—WHITER, whose volume deals with the association

Her Dowrie ſhall weigh equall with a Queene:
For *Angiers*, and faire *Toraine Maine, Poyctiers*,
And all that we vpon this ſide the Sea,
(Except this Cittie now by vs beſiedg'd)
Finde liable to our Crowne and Dignitie,
Shall gild her bridall bed and make her rich
In titles, honors, and promotions,
As ſhe in beautie, education, blood,
Holdes hand with any Princeſſe of the world.
Fra. What ſai'ſt thou boy? looke in the Ladies face.
Dol. I do my Lord, and in her eie I find
A wonder, or a wondrous miracle,
The ſhadow of my ſelfe form'd in her eye,

510. *a Queene:*] *the Queene:* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *a Queen.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *a queen's* Ktly.

511. Angiers] Ff, Rowe, Pope i. Anjowe Ktly. Anjou Pope ii. et cet.
Toraine] Ff, Ktly. Tourain Rowe. Touraine Pope et cet.

515. *bed*] Ff, Rowe, Cam. i,+, Craig. *bed,* Han. Coll. Wh. Huds. i, Del. Fle. Cam. ii, Neils. *bed;* Theob. et cet.

516. *promotions*] *promotiöns* Fle.

517. *As*] *And* Rowe, Pope.
blood] *bloud* F_2.

518. *hand*] *hands* Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Dono.

519. *fai'ſt thou*] *fay'ſt thou,* F_4.

520. Dol.] Lewis. Rowe et seq.

522–524. In margin Pope, Han. Om. Dono.

522. *her eye*] *that orb* Words.

---

of ideas and the train of thoughts flowing therefrom, quotes (p. 114) the present line and also ll. 519 and 520 below as convincing evidence that 'the *book* and the *eye of beauty* (whatever might be the cause of so strange an association) were deeply engrafted on the imagination of our Poet.'

511. **Angiers**] The obvious misprint of 'Angiers' for *Anjou* was corrected by THEOBALD in his *Shakespeare Restored* (p. 160), a work printed in 1726, and designed to show the many errors, both of omission and commission, whereof Pope, in his edition, was guilty. Theobald (ed. i.) says: 'King John, consenting to match the Lady Blanch with the Dauphin, agrees, in part of her Dowry, to give up all he held in France except the City of Angiers, which he now besieged and laid claim to. But could it be thought that he should at one and the same time give up all except Angiers, and give up *that* too? . . . *Anjou* was one of the provinces which the English held in France; and which the French king by Chatilion claimed of King John in right of Duke Arthur at the very beginning of the Play. "*Angiers*" instead of *Anjou* has been falsely printed in several other passages of this History.' [See l. 162, above.]—STEEVENS: Theobald found, or might have found, the reading, which he would introduce as an emendation of his own, in the old Quarto.—[True; so also might Rowe and Pope, but they did not.—ED.]

514. **liable**] WRIGHT: That is, *subject.* So in *Jul. Cæs.:* 'And reason to my love is liable.'—II, ii, 104.

522. **The shadow . . . in her eye**] MARSHALL: Allusions to the miniature reflection of one's face, as seen in the pupil of another's eye, are very numerous in

Which being but the ſhadow of your ſonne,
Becomes a ſonne and makes your ſonne a ſhadow:
I do proteſt I neuer lou'd my ſelfe
Till now, infixed I beheld my ſelfe,
Drawne in the flattering table of her eie.

Whiſpers with Blanch.

523, 524. Om. Words.

524. *a ſonne*] *a Sun* Rowe ii. et seq. *a ſhadow:*] *a shadow.* Del. Rlfe, Neils.

525. *proteſt...my ſelfe*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Cam.+, Neils. *protest,...myself* Theob. i. *protest...myself,* Dyce, Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words. *protest,...myself,* Theob. ii. et cet.

526. *Till now, infixed*] Ff, Rowe. *Till now, infixed,* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *Till now infixed* Pope et cet.

526. *infixed*] *infixèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words. *beheld*] *behold* Han.

527, 529. *flattering*] *flatt'ring* Pope,+.

528. Whiſpers...] Whispering... Rowe ii, Pope,+. Courts in dumb show. Capell.

---

the poets of Shakespeare's time. Compare with this passage the following one from Beaumont's *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus:*

> 'How should I love thee, when I do espy
> A far more beauteous nymph hid in thy eye?
> When thou dost love let not that nymph be nigh thee,
> Nor, when thou woo'st, let that same nymph be by thee;
> Or quite obscure her from thy lover's face,
> Or hide her beauty in a darker place.
> By this the nymph perceived he did espy
> None but himself reflected in her eye.'—[ed. Dyce, vol. xi, p. 465].

524. **sonne . . . sonne a shadow**] Rowe's change of the first 'sonne' to *sun* seems necessary not only for the sake of the quibble but also for the sense. Compare: 'And turnes the Sun to shade: alas, alas, Witnesse my Sonne, now in the shade of death.'—*Richard III:* I, iii (Folio, p. 179, col. *a*).—ED.

525–527. **I do protest . . . of her eie**] CAPELL (vol. i, pt ii, p. 125): The high-flown nonsense of this speech is the very perfection of French courtship from a lover of no feeling; and well deserves the ludicrous comment that follows upon one of its lines, and on the commenter's supplement; which line and its supplement are so dreadfully pointed in former copies that if the sense and mode of pronouncing are discovered in them, the person discovering owes it to his sagacity.—[The *Text. Notes* show that Capell's changes in the 'dreadful pointing' of his predecessors are actually only changes in the form of punctuation marks. By 'the commenter's supplement' he means *the Bastard's additional comment;* but if any person can discover wherein a dash and a comma are superior to an exclamation point in elucidating this passage the person discovering owes it to his own sagacity. Mine is, I fear, sadly at fault.—ED.]

527. **Drawne . . . table of her eie**] STEEVENS: So in *All's Well:* '—to sit and draw His arched brows, his hawking eye, his curls, In our heart's table.'—[I, i, 106]. 'Table' is *picture,* or rather, the board or canvas on which any object is painted. —[Compare also: 'Mine eye hath play'd the painter, and hath stell'd Thy beauty's form in table of my heart.'—*Sonnet* xxiv, l. 1.—ED.]

Baſt. Drawne in the flattering table of her eie,
Hang'd in the frowning wrinkle of her brow,
And quarter'd in her heart, hee doth eſpie
Himſelfe loues traytor, this is pittie now;
That hang'd, and drawne, and quarter'd there ſhould be
In ſuch a loue, ſo vile a Lout as he.
Blan. My vnckles will in this reſpect is mine,
If he ſee ought in you that makes him like,

529. [Aside] Dyce, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Huds. ii.

529–531. *eie,...brow,...heart,*] *eye!... brow!...heart!* Pope,+, Var. '85, Cam. +, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig. *eye,—... brow,—...heart;—* Cap. *eye!—...brow! —...heart!—* Var. '78. Mal. Rann. Steev. Varr. Knt, Dyce, Sta. Words. *eye!—... brow!—... heart?—* Sing. *eye,... brow,... heart!—* Wh. i. *eye;... brow;... heart;* Fle.

532. *traytor,...now;*] *traitor;...now,* Rowe et seq.

535. *will*] *will,* [to Lew.] Capell.

mine,] F_2. *mine.* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope,+, Del. Fle. Neils. *mine:* Cap. et cet.

536, 537. *you...like,...ſee's*] Ff, Rowe. *you...like;...sees,* Pope. *you...like,... sees,* Dyce, Cam.+, Wh. Neils. *you,... like,...sees,* Theob.

---

534. **so vile a Lout as he**] ROSE (p. 76): One does not quite know why Faulconbridge should be so much annoyed at the betrothal of Blanch to the Dauphin; nor why Blanch should have backed up Faulconbridge in his apparently unjustifiable attack upon Austria. In the original [*The Troublesome Raigne*] we find that Elinor had half promised Blanch's hand to the Bastard, whom the Lady gave up for Lewis with some reluctance.

536–538. **If he see . . . my will**] VAUGHAN (i, 30): I understand the construction here differently from all other critics and editors, and would therefore punctuate differently—in this way: [omitting the comma at end of l. 536, and also after 'sees,' l. 537; see *Text. Notes*]. That which causes liking is naturally the object of liking. We thus too are rid of the double accusative 'that anything' and 'it,' or the slightly awkward nominative absolute 'that anything.' 'Translate it to my will' means 'transfer from John's will, on which it is now acting, to my will, with the same effect on my will as on his.' This sense of 'translating,' as *transferring* from one place to another, is rare in Shakespeare.—[SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) does not record a single example of 'translate' used in the sense of *transfer;* under (3) to interpret, to explain, he quotes the present passage. He is, however, alone in this explanation. Fleay and Deighton, more naturally, take 'translate' in the sense *transform* or *render,* as in 'He hath studied her will, and translated her will out of honesty into English'—*Merry Wives* I, iii, 54—a passage nearly parallel. The latter thus paraphrases the present lines: That thing, whatever it may be that inclines him to like you, I can easily bring myself to hold in similar regard, making his liking my own. I will force it upon my love (though I shall not have much difficulty in doing so), compel my heart to give it entrance. 'Of course,' adds Deighton, 'the distinction which she pretends to draw is merely a playful one.' —Hunter, Moberly, and Ivor John limit their explanations to the words 'That anything,' i. e., That thing which he sees, whatever it may be.—ED.]

That any thing he ſee's which moues his liking,
I can with eaſe tranſlate it to my will:
Or if you will, to ſpeake more properly,
I will enforce it eaſlie to my loue.
Further I will not flatter you, my Lord,
That all I ſee in you is worthie loue,
Then this, that nothing do I ſee in you,
Though churliſh thoughts themſelues ſhould bee your Iudge,
That I can finde, ſhould merit any hate.

Iohn. What ſaie theſe yong-ones? What ſay you my Neece?

Blan. That ſhe is bound in honor ſtill to do
What you in wiſedome ſtill vouchſafe to ſay.

Iohn. Speake then Prince Dolphin, can you loue this Ladie?

Dol. Nay aske me if I can refraine from loue,
For I doe loue her moſt vnfainedly.

Iohn. Then do I giue *Volqueſſen, Toraine, Maine,*

537. *any thing*] *any thing*, Han. *anything* Wh. i.
538. *it to*] *into* Anon. ap. Cam.
539. *Or*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Dyce, Cam.+. *Or*, Cap. et cet.
to ... properly,] In parentheses Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Hal. Ktly.
540. *eaſlie*] *eaſily* F_3F_4.
541. *Further*] *Farther* Coll. Wh. i.
543. *Then*] *Than* Ff.
this,] Ff, Rowe, Huds. ii, Neils. *this;* Pope,+, Cam.+, Fle. Craig. *this,*— Cap. et cet.
544. *Though...Iudge*] In parentheses Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Hal. Ktly.
546. *yong-ones*] *young ones* Rowe et seq.
547. *ſtill*] *shall* Cap. conj.
548. *ſtill*] *will* Pope, Han. *shall* Var. '85, Steev. Varr. Sing. Ktly.
549. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
551. *vnfainedly*] *unfeinedly* F_3. *unfeignedly* F_4.
552. Toraine] *Tourain* Rowe i. *Touraine* Rowe ii. et seq.

537. **That . . . which**] For this marked change of relative, compare l. 116; and see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 267.

546. **What say you my Neece**] MOBERLY: Blanch's speech, just ended, had been addressed aside to the Dauphin.

547, 548. **still . . . still**] KNIGHT: The change of 'still' [l. 548] to *shall* is certainly not called for.—[The *Text. Notes* will show how general is the agreement with Knight. Possibly both Pope and Steevens overlooked the fact that 'still' bears a signification which frequently varies with the context. The first 'still' means here, as in many instances, *constantly, always*, e. g., 'Thou still hast been the father of good news.'—*Hamlet*, II, ii, 42. The second 'still' is equivalent to *in future, no less than formerly*, e. g., 'That still I lay upon my mother's head.' —I, i, 84.—ED.]

552–554. **Then do I giue . . . more**] COURTENAY (i, 11): This representation

Poyctiers, and *Aniow*, theſe fiue Prouinces
With her to thee, and this addition more,
Full thirty thouſand Markes of Engliſh coyne:
Phillip of France, if thou be pleaſ'd withall,
Command thy ſonne and daughtet to ioyne hands.
Fra. It likes vs well young Princes: cloſe your hands
Auſt. And your lippes too, for I am well aſſur'd,

553. Aniow] F_2F_3. *Anjowe* Ktly. *Anjou* F_4 et cet. (Note xi. Cam.).
555. *coyne:*] *coin.* Rowe et seq.
557. *daughtet*] F_1.
558. *vs well*] Ff, Huds. i, Cam.+. *us well;* Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann. Steev. Varr. Sing. *us well.* Knt et cet.
559, 560. Auſt. *And...aſſur'd*] In margin Pope, Han.
559. *too, for*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *too; for*, Theob.+, Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. *too; for* Cap. et cet.

of the marriage settlements is not borne out by history; John did not give up the five provinces, but only 'the city of Evreux, and some other towns, being those (according to Holinshed) which the King of France had taken from him in the war. The King of England likewise did homage to the French King for Brittany, and again received homage for the same country, and for the country of Richmond, of his nephew Arthur.'—[MALONE points out that this passage is taken almost verbatim from the older play. The anonymous author, therefore, and not Shakespeare must bear the blame for this wanton disregard of historical accuracy.—ED.]—MARSHALL: Shakespeare has—perhaps in order to condense the scene somewhat, it being very long in the old play—made an alteration in the details of this scene, the effect of which is to set John's character in a more unfavourable light. In *The Troublesome Raigne* John offers, in addition to 'her dowrie out of Spaine,' thirty thousand marks; but King Philip demands the provinces as well. John hesitates at first, but Queen Eleanor advises him to yield.

552. **Volquessen**] STEEVENS: This is the ancient name for the country now called the *Vexin;* in Latin, *Pagus Velocassinus.* That part of it called the *Norman Vexin* was in dispute between Philip and John.

555. **thirty thousand Markes**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Mark, sb². 1): A denomination of weight formerly employed (chiefly for gold and silver) throughout western Europe; its actual weight varied considerably, but it was usually regarded as equivalent to 8 ounces. In England, after the conquest, the ratio of 20 sterling pennies to an ounce was the basis of computation; hence the value of the mark became fixed at 160 pence = 13*s.* 4*d.* or two-thirds of a pound sterling. [Blanch's dowry was, therefore, about £20,000.—ED.]

558, 559. **close your hands . . . And your lippes**] MALONE (Note on *Wint. Tale*, I, ii, 104): This was a regular part of the ceremony of troth-plighting, to which Shakespeare often alludes. So in *Meas. for Meas.*: 'This is the hand, which with a vow'd contract Was fast belocked in mine.'—V, i, 209. So also in *No Wit Like a Woman's*, Middleton, 1657: 'There these young lovers shall clap hands together,' [IV, i.—ROLFE, as a further illustration, quotes: 'A contract of eternal bond of love, Confirm'd by mutual joinder of your hands, Attested by the holy close of lips, Strengthen'd by interchangement of your rings.'—*Twelfth Night*, V, i, 159.—For a description of the ceremony of betrothal or troth-plight, see note by DOUCE, *Twelfth Night*, p. 290, this edition.—ED.]

That I did ſo when I was firſt aſſur'd.
Fra. Now Cittizens of Angires ope your gates,
Let in that amitie which you haue made,
For at Saint Maries Chappell preſently,
The rights of marriage ſhallbe ſolemniz'd.
Is not the Ladie *Conſtance* in this troope?
I know ſhe is not for this match made vp,
Her preſence would haue interrupted much.
Where is ſhe and her ſonne, tell me, who knowes?
Dol. She is ſad and paſsionate at your highnes Tent.

560. *ſo*] *so*, Rowe et seq.
aſſur'd] Walker. *affied* Huds. ii, Dono.
561. *Angires*] *Angiers* Ff.
563. *Saint*] *Saints* F_2.
564. *rights*] *rites* F_4.
566. *I know*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Coll. iii, Fle. *I know*, Theob. et cet.
is not] F_2. *is not*, F_3F_4, Rowe, Cam.+, Neils. *is not;* Pope et cet.
match] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Knt, Cam.+, Craig. *match*, Cap. et cet.
566. *vp,*] *up* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Dyce, Ktly, Cam.+, Words.
567. *much.*] *much:*— Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Words. Craig.
568. *ſonne,...knowes?*] *son;...knows?* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann. *son?...knows.* Steev. et seq.
569. *She is*] *She's* Pope,+, Dyce ii, iii.
highnes] *Highneſſe* Ff. *highness'* Pope et seq.

559, 560. **assur'd . . . assur'd**] STEEVENS: 'Assur'd' is here used both in its common sense and in an uncommon one, where it signifies *affianced, contracted.* So in *Com. of Err.*, 'called me Dromio, swore I was assur'd to her.'—III, ii, 145.—WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 273): It is impossible that this repetition of the same word in a different sense—there being no quibble intended or anything else to justify it—can have proceeded from Shakespeare. Read: 'when I was first *affied*,' i. e., *betrothed. Tam. of Shr.*, 'Where then do you know best, We be affied.'—IV, iv, 49.—[Hereupon Walker furnishes many examples in corroboration of the fact that *affy* was used in the sense of *betroth;* but so equally was 'assur'd.' The alteration of a word in the text when it yields an intelligible meaning, merely because it does not seem to the emender what Shakespeare would have used, is hardly a sound method of criticism. Such repetitions are, on the contrary, eminently characteristic. All that may be said in justification of Walker's change is that the letters *ur'd* and *ied* in the hand-writing of the time might easily be confused; but why then in only one case and not in both?—ED.]

563. **Saint Maries Chappell**] ROLFE: This is said to be the so-called Church of Ronceray, dedicated to St Mary the Virgin in 1028 and re-dedicated in 1119 by Pope Calixtus II. It is now used as a chapel for the students of the School of Arts.

569. **passionate**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 5): Moved with sorrow; grieved, sad, sorrowful.—[The present line quoted. Ivor John compares also: 'How now, Ales? what sad and passionate.'—*Arden of Feversham*, III, v, 45. Steevens quotes in illustration 'Thou art passionate, Hast thou been brought up with girls?' —*Wit Without Money*, II, iv; but, as Dyce says, 'passionate' is there 'used ironically and is equivalent to *pathetic*.'—ED.]

Fra. And by my faith, this league that we haue made
Will giue her ſadneſſe very little cure:
Brother of England, how may we content
This widdow Lady? In her right we came,
Which we God knowes, haue turn d another way,
To our owne vantage.

Iohn. We will heale vp all,
For wee'l create yong *Arthur* Duke of Britaine
And Earle ofRichmond, and this rich faire Towne
We make him Lord of. Call the Lady *Conſtance*,
Some ſpeedy Meſſenger bid her repaire
To our ſolemnity: I truſt we ſhall,

571. *cure:*] *cure.* Pope et seq.
573. *widdow*] *widow'd* Coll. ii. (MS.), Wh. i, Huds. ii.
came,] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Del. *came;* Theob. et cet.
574. *we God*] *we, God* F_4.
574. *turn d*] *turned* Ff.
577. *Britaine*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Fle. *Bretagne* Han. et cet.
581. *ſolemnity:*] *solemnity.*— Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Del. Rlfe, Dono. Neils.

573. **widdow Lady**] COLLIER (ed. ii.) considers the reading of his MS. Corrector (*widow'd*) an undoubted improvement on that of the Folio, since the latter is 'as if Constance were merely some respectable dowager. The epithet "widow'd" gives dignity to this reference to Constance, who was not historically a widow.' (See note by Malone on l. 35, *ante.*—ED.)—R. G. WHITE: The Folio has 'widow lady'; by accident I think, because the poor terms 'widow woman' and 'widow lady' were unknown in Shakespeare's time. [White therefore adopted the reading of Collier's MS. Corrector in his first ed. In his *Supplementary Notes* (vol. i, p. xlix.) he says, however, 'When I wrote the note upon this passage I forgot the story of the "widow woman" and her cruse of oil, told in the seventeenth chapter of the first book of *Kings*. The old reading must stand.'—With White's acceptance of the Folio reading I am quite in accord; at the same time it is, perhaps, worth noting that the words 'widow woman' appear first in the *Authorised Version*, 1611; in both the Geneva Bible, 1560, and the Bishop's Bible, 1568, the word 'widowe' is alone given in the passage to which White refers. Furthermore, as regards White's objection to the phrase 'widow lady,' the reverse of this, 'Lady widow,' is of common occurrence; see, for example, the pseudo-Shakespearean play, *The Puritan Widow, passim;* and *Rom. & Jul.*, I, ii, 69: 'The Lady widow of Vitruvio.' Constance is frequently spoken of as the 'Lady Constance,' and in the present passage the word 'Lady,' in the Folio text, is printed with a capital, as it is also in the line from *Rom. & Jul.;* and though but small reliance can be placed on the capitalized words in the Folio, yet I think we may reasonably say that the two phrases were practically synonymous.—ED.]

578. **Earle of Richmond**] WRIGHT: Arthur's grandfather, Conan le Petit, Duke of Brittany, and father of Constance, was the first who styled himself Earl of Richmond, although the lordship of the Honour of Richmond had been originally granted to his ancestor, Alan Fergaunt, Count of Brittany, by the Conqueror. (See Nicholas, *Historic Peerage of England*, ed. Courthope.)

581. **solemnity**] That is, *marriage ceremony.*

(If not fill vp the meaſure of her will)
Yet in ſome meaſure ſatisfie her ſo,
That we ſhall ſtop her exclamation,
Go we as well as haſt will ſuffer vs,
To this vnlook'd for vnprepared pompe. *Exeunt.*
Baſt. Mad world, mad kings, mad compoſition:

584. *exclamation,*] Var. '85. *exclamation.* Ff. et cet. (*exclamatiön.* Fle.).

585. *Go we*] *Go we,* Rowe et seq.

586. *vnlook'd for*] *unlook'd for,* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Neils. *unlook'd-for* Cap. Knt, Del. Dono. Craig. *unlook'd-for,* Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds.

vnprepared] *unpreparèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

Exeunt.] Ff. Ex. all but Bast. Rowe, Pope, Han. Cam.+, Dono. Neils. Ex. all but Faulconbr. Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. Citizens come from the Walls; and exeunt, to the Town, the two Kings, and their Powers, Lewis, Austria, Elinor, Blanch &c. Capell. Exeunt into the town all but the Bastard. The Citizens retire from the walls. White i. Exeunt all but the Bastard. The Citizens retire from the Walls. Malone et cet.

587. SCENE VI. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

world, ... kings,] *world! ... kings!* Cap. et seq.

compoſition:] *composition!* Pope et seq. (*compositiön!* Fle.).

587. **Bast. Mad world, mad kings,** etc.] MRS GRIFFITH (p. 178): This speech, though delivered with an air of levity and expressed in humourous words and images, supplies occasion for three very just reflections. The first, That *self-interest,* in the mere worldly sense of the term, is the ruling principle of mankind. Secondly, That men are too apt to inveigh against corruption, more from the being void of temptation themselves, than their being free from this vice; and, lastly, That bad examples in the superior ranks of life have a dangerous tendency to injure the morals of the inferior classes of a people.—FRANCOIS VICTOR HUGO (iii, 459): This soliloquy, superb and eternally true, wherein the Poet jeers at the inconstancy of France, dominated by that maker of false vows, self-interest, was singularly appropriate at the close of the sixteenth century, whether it were uttered at the time when a French prince of the blood, the Duc d'Anjou, proposed marriage to Queen Elizabeth, the jailer of his sister-in-law Mary Stuart, whether it were said after the conversion of Henri IV, abjuring his faith and declaring, 'Paris vaut bien une messe,' whether it were said after the conclusion of peace between the court of France and Philip II.—MATTHEWS (*Sh. as Playwright,* p. 97): The opening scenes cheat us with the belief that Faulconbridge is to take a prominent place in the plot, and we are disappointed when we find that this is impossible, since he is only an outsider, involved in no important situation and useful at best only to give color to certain scenes and to comment upon the events like a chorus. Faulconbridge is a largely conceived character with Shakespeare's unfailing appreciation of a free and unconventional nature; and Shakespeare lends him wit, shrewdness, and even eloquence; yet his best bravura passages have but little dramatic value, since he is not firmly tied into the action. He exists for his own sake—for the sake of the vivacity and the variety his presence imparts to the scenes in which he appears. He is a pleasant fellow of an easy and contagious mirth; he has a captivating humour of his own, forecasting that of Mercutio; but his part is so loosely related to the action that he cannot be forced into prominence.

Iohn to ſtop *Arthurs* Title in the whole,
Hath willingly departed with a part,
And France, whoſe armour Conſcience buckled on,
Whom zeale and charitie brought to the field,
As Gods owne ſouldier, rounded in the eare,
With that ſame purpoſe-changer, that ſlye diuel,
That Broker, that ſtill breakes the pate of faith,
That dayly breake-vow, he that winnes of all,
Of kings, of beggers, old men, yong men, maids,
Who hauing no externall thing to looſe,

590-592. *whoſe...ſouldier,*] In parentheses Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly.
592. *eare,*] *ear* F_3F_4.
593. *diuel*] *Devil* F_4.
596. *maids,*] *maids;*— Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Wh. i, Huds. Del.
597-599. *Who...commoditie*] Om. Words. Dono.
597, 598. *Who...that.*] In parentheses Cap. Varr. Rann, Ffe.
597. *hauing*] *as they have* Han.

587. **composition**] That is, *compact, agreement.* Compare: 'Sweno, the Norway's king, craves composition.'—*Macbeth*, I, ii, 59.

589. **departed**] STEEVENS: To *part* and to 'depart' were formerly synonymous. So in *Every Man in his Humour*, 'Faith, sir, I can hardly depart with ready money.'—[Steeven's quotation is correct, but the line is from *Every Man out of his Humour*, IV, vii. (ed. Gifford, p. 159). Wright compares also: 'I may depart with little, while I live.'—*Two Noble Kinsmen*, II, i.—ED.]

592. **rounded**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s.v. vb.[2] 1.): To whisper, to speak in a whisper; to converse or talk privately. (From Anglo-Saxon *rúnian.* The normal modern form would have been *rown.*)—WRIGHT compares: 'She will not stick to round me i' the ear.'—*Pass. Pilgrim*, l. 349. See also *Wint. Tale*, I, ii, 217.

593. **With**] For other examples wherein 'with' is equivalent to *by*, see ABBOTT, § 193.

594. **That Broker**, etc.] Miss PORTER: Shakespeare has developed this shrewd and pregnant speech from four embryonic lines spoken by Constance at the same point in the action in the older Play: '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.'

597, 598. **Who hauing . . . of that**] MALONE: The construction here appears very harsh to our ears, yet I do not believe there is any corruption; for I have observed a similar phraseology in other places in these plays. The construction is—Commodity, he that wins of all—he that cheats the poor maid of that only external thing she has to lose, namely, the word maid, i. e., her chastity. 'Who having' is used as the absolute case, in the sense of *they having;* and the words 'who having no external thing to lose but the word maid' are in some measure parenthetical; yet they cannot with propriety be included in a parenthesis, because then there would remain nothing to which the relative 'that' at the end of l. 598 could be referred. In *Wint. Tale* we find a similar phraseology: 'This your son-in-law, And son unto the king (whom heavens directing), Is troth-plight to your daughter.' —[V, iii, 150]. Here the pronoun 'whom' is used for *him*, as 'who,' in the passage

But the word Maid, cheats the poore Maide of that.
That ſmooth-fac'd Gentleman, tickling commoditie,
Commoditie, the byas of the world,
The world, who of it ſelfe is peyſed well,
Made to run euen, vpon euen ground;
Till this aduantage, this vile drawing byas,
This ſway of motion, this commoditie,

598. *Maid, ... Maide*] *maids...maids* Han. *—maid,...maid* Cap. *maid,— ... maid* Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i. *"maid,"...maid* Dyce ii, iii, Cam.+, Coll. iii. *maid,...maid* Huds. ii.
601–606. Mnemonic Warb.
601. *who*] *which* Pope,+.
peyſed] F_2F_3. *poyſed* F_4. *poised* Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. MS. (*poisèd* Fle.). *peized* Wh. i, Rlfe, Craig. *peised* Cap. et cet. (*peisèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Words.).
602. *euen,*] *even;* Knt. *even* Dyce, Coll. ii, Hal. Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils.
603. *vile drawing*] *vile-drawing* Pope, +, Walker (Crit., i, 34), Cam.+, Del.

before us, is used for *they*. [See ABBOTT, § 399.]—VAUGHAN (i, 32): I prefer to consider 'who' as the relative to 'break-vow' and the subject of 'cheats,' and 'having' as the participle in the accusative agreeing with the 'poor maid.' The whole construction is this: 'who cheats the poor maid, having no external thing to lose but the word maid, of that word.'

599. commoditie] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2. *c*): Advantage, benefit, profit, interest; often in the sense of private or selfish interest. 'I will use his friendship to mine own commodity'—*Damon & Pythias*, IV, 41.

600. Commoditie . . . the world] HENDERSON (*Var.*, 1785): So in *Cupid's Whirligig*, 1607: 'O the world is like a byas bowle, and it runs all on the rich men's sides.'—[ed. 1630; Sig. F3 *recto*].—P. SIMPSON (*N. & Q.*, 1901, IX, vii, 345) compares Bacon, *Of Wisdom for Man's Self*: (Bad servants) 'set a bias upon the bowl of their own petty ends and envies, to the overthrow of their master's great and important affairs.' [See next note.]

600. byas] WRIGHT: The weight of lead introduced into one side of a bowl in order to make it turn towards the side on which the weight is. A perfectly uniform spherical bowl on a perfectly level and smooth ground would run in a perfectly straight line. The word 'bias' is derived from the French *biais*, and this again is said by Brachet to be from the Latin *bifacem*, which is applied to a person whose vision is crooked.—[STRUTT (*Sports & Pastimes*, ed. Hone, p. 266) says: 'Bowling, whether practised upon open greens or in bowling-alleys, was probably an invention of the Middle Ages. I cannot by any means ascertain the time of its introduction; but I have traced it back to the thirteenth century.'—Bartlett's *Concordance* records eight other passages besides the present wherein Shakespeare makes use of this simile of the bias and bowl. Does this not present to the inward eye an attractive picture of the stretch of smooth green turf, and Shakespeare himself either as an interested onlooker or keen participant in the game?—ED.]

601–604. The world . . . this commoditie] Compare: ''Tis the generall humour of the world; commodity steers our affections throughout; we love those that are fortunate and rich, that thrive, or by whom we may receive mutuall kindness, hope for like curtesies, get any good, gain or profit; hate those, and abhor, on the other side, which are poor and miserable, or by whom we may sustain loss or in-

Makes it take head from all indifferency,
From all direction, purpose, course, intent.
And this same byas, this Commoditie,
This Bawd, this Broker, this all-changing-word,
Clap'd on the outward eye of fickle France,

606. *intent.*] Ff, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Knt. *intent;* Rowe, Hal. *intent:* Han. et cet.

608. *this all-changing-word*] *that all-changing-world* F_2F_3. *that all changing-world* F_4, Rowe. *this all-changing wooer* Herr. *this all-changing word* Pope et seq.

convenience.'—Burton: *Anatomie of Melancholy*, Part II, Sec. 1, Mem. 2, Subs. i. —ED.

605. **take head**] Not, as in the common meaning of the phrase, *to start running* (the earliest use of this is given by Murray as 1674), but in the sense of *take all life or power* from indifferency.—ED.

605. **indifferency**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. I, 1): Absence of bias, prejudice, or favour for one side rather than another; impartiality, equity, fairness.—WRIGHT, in illustration, says: 'One of the clauses in the Prayer for the Church Militant is that those in authority "may truly and indifferently minister justice."'

608. **Broker**] That is, a *procurer*, a *pander*. Compare *Two Gentlemen*, I, ii, 41.

608. **all-changing-word**] VAUGHAN (i, 34): The dissatisfaction which prompted such an emendation [as that of the Folios. See *Text. Notes*] is better than the emendation. How can either a 'world' or a 'word' be 'clapped on the outward eye'? Certainly we should read the passage with such a change as this: 'all-changing *wand*.' The wand, being the accredited instrument by which all the transformations of the magician and enchanter are ostensibly effected, is the very object to which the epithet 'all-changing' is appropriate, and it is most naturally imagined to exercise supernatural powers or vision by the actual application of it to 'the outward eye.' [Vaughan here inserts two passages from Ovid: *Metamorphoses*, xiv, Fab. v, vi, to show whence Shakespeare may have derived his knowledge of the conjuror's rod or wand. 'It is possible,' continues Vaughan, 'that *rod* and not *wand* is the right word; for the translators of the Bible use *rod* for the *wand* that transforms, . . . and *rod*, like *wand*, resembles "word" closely. But I decidedly prefer *wand*.'—Vaughan's emendation *wand* for 'word' is, to my mind, open to very grave objection. In the first place, *wand* in the sense of the conjuror's magical instrument was apparently unknown to Shakespeare. Prospero would not have spoken of his 'staff' had *wand* been the proper term; and Shylock would not have used the word 'wands' in recounting the thrift of Jacob if the word had any hint of magical charms. Milton's *Comus* is, I think, the first to employ the word as it is now generally accepted in the peculiar sense of a conjuror's implement. But the objections to any change in the text lie deeper than this. Vaughan has, I fear, quite misunderstood the whole passage. It is not 'this all-changing word' any more than it is 'this bawd' or 'this broker' that is clapped on the outward eye of France; Faulconbridge, still using the metaphor taken from the game of bowling, pauses to add again three other epithets to the word 'commodity.' France's eye is thus compared to the ball; and the bias is commodity, or self-interest, which, as he goes on to say, has drawn the king (who is now himself the ball) out of his proper course.—ED.]

609. **on the . . . eye**] STAUNTON: The aperture on one side which contains the

Hath drawne him from his owne determin'd ayd, 610

610. *owne determin'd*] *own-determin'd* Cap. Mal. Ran. *ayd*] *aim* M. Mason, Sing. ii, Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Wh. Ktly, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Neils. *deed* Bubier ap. Cam.

bias was sometimes called the eye.—MOBERLY: [Commodity] is the transforming spell which makes the eye see all things amiss. The metaphor can hardly be, as Staunton supposes, from the lead run into the eye of the bowl.—MOORE SMITH: That is, suddenly presented to the eye. Compare: '—a penny worth of sugar clapped into my hand.'—*1 Henry IV:* II, iv, 25; and III, i, 170 below. I cannot accept Mr Worrall's suggestions that Commodity is thought of here as having the effect of 'spectacles' of a distorting kind.—[This refers to a suggestion by Mr Walter Worrall of Worcester College, Oxford, to whom Moore Smith acknowledges, in his *Preface*, his indebtedness for many valuable hints in the preparation of his notes to this play.—ED.]

609. **the outward eye**] W. L. RUSHTON (*N. & Q.*, IV, x, 291, 1872): Shakespeare speaks of the outward eye [in the present passage] and the eye of reason: 'The eye of reason may pry in upon us.'—*1 Henry IV:* IV, i, 72. This eye of reason, of which Spenser also speaks, is the inward eye: 'The eie of reason was with rage yblent.'—*Faerie Queene*, I, ii, v. Shakespeare's use of the outward eye and the eye of reason may be well illustrated by an extract from an author who wrote long before his time: 'When the first man Adam was create, he received of God a double eye, that is to say, an outward eye, whereby he might see visible things, and know his bodily enemies, and eschew them, and an inward eye, that is the eye of reason, whereby he might see his spiritual enemies that fight against his soul, and beware of them.'—*Doctor and Student.*—[*Dialogue* I; cap. xiv; ed. 1554, sig. Ci, *recto*. (See *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, article Christopher St German, for an account of this legal compendium.) The comparison might, I think, be carried even further; Faulconbridge says in the beginning that 'conscience,' the *inward* eye, caused France to 'buckle on' his armour.—ED.]

610. **owne determin'd**] CAPELL (I, ii, 125) accuses his predecessors of a lack of judgment in omitting the hyphen between these words; 'for a want of junction in that place tends to mislead, the more obvious sense of the words without junction being a sense that is false; the compound wants no interpreting.'

610. **ayd**] M. MASON: The word 'eye' in the line preceding, and the word 'own,' which can ill agree with 'aid,' induces me to think that we ought to read 'own determined aim' instead of 'aid.' His *own aid* is little better than nonsense.—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 202): Mason was right, as appears by a correction in the Folio, 1632, but the necessity for the change is not very evident.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 84): The confirmation of Mason's correction is another *coincidence*, and the confirmation of Collier's view of the correction required in the Bastard's speech is equally remarkable.—R. G. WHITE: 'Aid' seems clearly a misprint. It can only refer to the aid which France had promised Arthur; and that could not by any proper use of language be called 'his own determin'd aid.' Besides, commodity is 'clapped on the *outward eye* of fickle France'; and the outward eye is used for taking aim.—[In reference to Collier's comment on the change *aim* for 'aid,' WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 299) says: 'If a tithe of the changes in that volume were as imperatively demanded as this is, Mr Collier's discovery would have done ten times the service that it has done.'—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: Though

From a reſolu'd and honourable warre,
To a moſt baſe and vile-concluded peace.
And why rayle I on this Commoditie?
But for becauſe he hath not wooed me yet:
Not that I haue the power to clutch my hand,
When his faire Angels would ſalute my palme,

612. *vile-concluded*] *vile concluded* Ff, Rowe et seq.
613. *on this*] *thus on* Anon. ap. Cam.
614. *for becauſe*] *for the cause* Vaughan conj. (withdrawn).
615. *Not that...the*] *Nor that...the* Han. *Not but...the* or *Not that...not* Coll. conj. *Not that...no* Coll. MS.

there is plausibility in Mason's argument, yet *aim* does not so well agree with the context that follows as 'aid.' 'His own determin'd aid' means that aid which he himself had determined to lend.

614. **for because**] EASTWOOD & WRIGHT (*Bible Word-Book*, s. v.): A redundant expression in which the two words are equivalent in meaning; the combination of the two being employed to make the whole more forcible. Compare: 'an if,' 'or ere.' [*Genesis*, xxii, 16 cited, and the present line quoted in illustration. See also *Rich. II:* V, v, 3.—ED.]

615. **Not that I haue the power**] COLLIER (ed. i.): The sense would perhaps be clearer if we read: 'Not *but* I have'; or, with as slight a change, 'Not that I have *not*'; though the meaning of the Poet is sufficiently explained by what follows in the sentence: the Bastard says that he has the power to clutch or close his hand, but that he has yet had no temptation to do so.—ANON. (*Blackwood's Maga.*, Sept., 1853, p. 304): The meaning of these lines is certainly sufficiently obvious. Yet Mr Collier's Corrector is not satisfied with them. He reads: 'Not that I have *no* power,' &c. But unless Mr Collier can prove—what will be difficult—that 'power' here means *inclination*, it is evident that this reading directly reverses Shakespeare's meaning. If 'power' means *inclination*, the sense would be this: I rail on this commodity, not because I have no inclination to clutch my hand on the fair angels that would salute my palm, but because I have not yet been tempted; when temptation comes I shall doubtless yield like my neighbors. But 'power' never means, and cannot mean, *inclination;* and Mr Collier has not attempted to show that it does; and therefore the new reading must be to this effect: 'I rail on this commodity, not because I am *unable*,' &c. But Faulconbridge says the very reverse. He says: 'I rail on this commodity not because I have the power to resist temptation, or am able to shut my hand against the fair angels that would salute my palm; for I have no such power; in this respect I am just like other people, and am as easily bribed as they are.' The new reading must therefore be dismissed as a wanton reversal of the plain meaning of Shakespeare.—[COLLIER (ed. ii.) accepts the dictum of his Anonymous critic, though with no mention of him, and likewise omits both of his former conjectural emendations. —ED.]

615. **clutch**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. v[1]. 2) quotes the present line as the earliest example of 'clutch' in the sense To close or clench the hand.

616. **Angels**] WRIGHT: The Angel was a gold coin worth ten shillings, and was so called from having on one side a figure of Michael and the dragon. See *Mer. of Ven.:* 'They have in England A coin that bears the figure of an angel Stamp'd

But for my hand, as vnattempted yet,
Like a poore begger, raileth on the rich.
Well, whiles I am a begger, I will raile,
And ſay there is no ſin but to be rich:
And being rich, my vertue then ſhall be,
To ſay there is no vice, but beggerie:
Since Kings breake faith vpon commoditie,
Gaine be my Lord, for I will worſhip thee. *Exit.*

617. *But for*] *But that* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
617. 618. *as...Like*] *is...Like as* Herr. *is...Like* Vaughan.
619. *Well,*] *Well!* Han.
whiles] *while* Pope,+.
620, 622. *And ſay...To ſay*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Huds. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *And say,...To say,* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Coll. Dyce, Wh. i, Ktly, Del. Huds. ii. Words. *And say, —...To say,—* Cap. et cet.
622. *beggerie:*] *beggary.* Pope,+, Wh. i, Ktly.
624. *Gaine...Lord,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Gain,...lord!* Var. '21, Sing. Knt, Ktly, Sta. Huds. i. *Gain,...lord,* Coll. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Neils. Craig. *Gain,...lord,—* Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words. *Gain,...lord;* Theob. et cet.

in gold.'—II, vii, 55.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*): Of the innumerable exercises of wit suggested by the two meanings of this word (see also III, ii, 28), the most famous is Donne's *The Bracelet*, which Ben Jonson told Drummond he had 'by heart.' [The Elegy to which Belden refers may be found in Donne's *Works*, ed. Grosart, vol. i, p. 192. It is there entitled, *Upon the Losse of his Mistresses Chaine.*—ED.]

616. **salute**] RUSHTON (*Sh. Illust. by Old Authors*, p. 15): 'Our gold is either old or new. The old is that which hath remained since the time of King Edward the Third or beene coined by such other princes as have reigned since his decease, and without anie abasing or diminution of that mettall. Thereof also we have yet remaining, the riall, the George noble, the Henry riall, the salut, the angell, and their small peeces as halfes, or quarters, though these in my time are not so common to be seene.'—Harrison, *Description of England*, Bk ii, cap. xxv, [ed. Furnivall, p. 362]. 'Salute, salus, was a coyn of gold stamped by King Henry the Fifth in France, after his conquests there: whereon the arms of England and France were stamped quarterly.'—Stowe, *Chronicles*, p. 589. I think that Shakespeare plays upon the word 'salute' in this passage, using it in a double sense in connection with the word 'angel,' and I am able to quote a passage from Beaumont & Fletcher, in which the word 'salute' is also played upon in a similar way: 'Pr'ythee, old angel-gold, salute my family, I'll do as much for yours.'—*Scornful Lady*, II, iii. Although the word 'rail' is used immediately after the words 'salute' and 'angel,' it may be considered very doubtful whether Shakespeare there plays upon that word, although he often uses in a double sense words which do not differ more from each other in sound and meaning than the words 'rail' and *riall*.

619–624. **Well, whiles . . . worship thee**] CORSON (*Intro. to Sh.*, p. 172): All this is pure self-slander, as his subsequent disinterested and magnanimous words show.

624. **Gaine . . . thee**] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL, p. 25): The second Act consists of altercation, martial noise, and bustle; great sound, little matter; for, save a few speeches, the whole rather drags—the concluding soliloquy has great, but obscure, merit.

Actus Secundus

[*Act III. Scene i.*]

Enter Conſtance, Arthur, and Salisbury.

Con. Gone to be married? Gone to ſweare a peace? 3 [1]

1. Actus Secundus] Act II, SCENE I. Rowe i. Scene continued Rowe ii. ACT I, SCENE VII. Pope. ACT II, SCENE II. Wh. i, Fle. Dono. ACT III, SCENE I. Theob. et cet.
SCENE. The French King's Pavilion. Theob. et seq. (subs.).

1. **Actus Secundus]** Theobald's rearrangement whereby this scene is made the first scene of Act III. is adopted by the majority of editors, and is here followed in order to facilitate references to modern editions. See l. 75 and notes below.—ED.

2. **Constance]** F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL, p. 25): Our Author, who took very little pains in general with female characters, there being no performers of that sex upon the stage in his time, has, however, roused his genius in favour of Constance; he has entered into and expressed her complaints in a most masterly manner; the ideas through the whole of this scene are happily pathetic; they appeal so successfully to the heart that even common feelings must submit to their force. [Reed's opinion on Gentleman's qualification as an editor seems justified by this evidence of a lack of critical acumen. See note on *Dram. Personæ*, l. 2.—ED.]

3. **Gone to be married]** CAMPBELL (*Life of Mrs Siddons*, i, 215), among other memoranda furnished him by the actress, gives the following: 'Whenever I was called upon to personate the Character of Constance, I never, from the beginning of the play to the end of my part in it, once suffered my dressing-room door to be closed, in order that my attention might be constantly fixed on those distressing events which, by this means I could plainly hear going on upon the stage, the terrible effects of which progress were to be represented by me. Moreover, I never omitted to place myself, with Arthur in my hand, to hear the march, when, upon the reconciliation of England and France, they enter the gates of Angiers to ratify the contract of marriage between the Dauphin and the Lady Blanche; because the sickening sounds of that march would usually cause the bitter tears of rage, disappointment, betrayed confidence, baffled ambition, and, above all, the agonizing feelings of maternal affection to gush into my eyes. In short, the spirit of the whole drama took possession of my mind and frame by my attention being riveted to the passing scenes.'—J. KNIGHT (*Harper's Maga.*, May, 1903, p. 834): Among the sillinesses that have been uttered concerning Shakespeare, one of the best known and most futile is the assertion that he killed Mercutio for fear that Mercutio might otherwise kill him. With slightly less absurdity it might be maintained that he killed Constance because the white heat of passion which she reaches in her early scenes and the agonies of suffering to which she is subsequently a prey, could neither be enhanced nor sustained. Such passion as she exposes does indeed kill. Not at all the kind of 'grief that will not speak' is that of Constance. Her woes are clamorous as her sorrow is 'proud.' All the same, they whisper the o'erfraught heart and bid it break. Her opening words in the

Falſe blood to falſe blood ioyn'd. Gone to be freinds? [2]
Shall *Lewis* haue *Blaunch*, and *Blaunch* thoſe Prouinces? 5
It is not ſo, thou haſt miſpoke, miſheard,
Be well aduiſ'd, tell ore thy tale againe. [5]
It cannot be, thou do'ſt but ſay 'tis ſo.
I truſt I may not truſt thee, for thy word
Is but the vaine breath of a common man: 10
Beleeue me, I doe not beleeue thee man,
I haue a Kings oath to the contrarie. [10]
Thou ſhalt be puniſh'd for thus frighting me,
For I am ſicke, and capeable of feares, 14 [12]

4. *ioyn'd.*] *joined!* Rowe et seq.
freinds] F1.
5. Lewis] *Louis* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i.
8, 9. *be,...thee,*] Ff, Rowe. *be;...thee,* Pope, Han. Coll. Del. Dono. Craig. *be;...thee;* Theob. et cet.
8. *ſo*] *so;* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Sta. Cam.+, Huds. ii.
9. *I truſt*] *I think* Pope, Han.
10. *man:*] *man.* Ktly, Rlfe, Neils.
11. *Beleeue...man*] Om. Pope, Han.
thee man] *thee, man* Theob. et seq.
14. *feares,*] *feares.* F2. *Fears.* F4, Rowe i, Sing. *fears;* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Craig.

Third Act surpass in emotional vigor and intensity almost any others assigned to a woman in Shakespeare, and seem to defy the utmost power of the actress. No artist has accordingly risen to the height of them, though almost all the greatest have essayed the part.—[Knight quotes but a part of the foregoing memoranda by Mrs Siddons, with this comment: 'Words were not the medium in which Mrs Siddons worked, otherwise this very declaration, designed to show how thoroughly she entered into the part, might be taken to prove only how incompetent she was to grasp it.' Though it is hardly germane to the discussion of a passage in *King John*, yet, as Knight has introduced the subject, it may be of interest to note in passing that the 'silliness' in regard to Mercutio was perpetrated by Dryden in his *Defence of the Epilogue*, appended to the *Conquest of Grenada*, pt ii. It merits, I think, even a harsher term; Dryden gives it as a remark of Shakespeare himself.—ED.]

14–17. **For I am sicke . . . to feares**] RUSHTON (*Sh. & Arte of Poesie*, p. 127): In this passage Shakespeare uses the sort of repetition called Antistrophe or the Counterturn, which Puttenham thus describes: 'Ye have another sort of repetition quite contrary to the former' [where one word is made to begin many verses in sute] 'when ye make one word finish many verses in sute, and that which is harder, to finish many clauses in the middest of your verses or dittie,' [ed. Arber, p. 208. Compare, for a similar series of lines, *Mer. of Ven.*, V, i, 193–197.—ED.]

14. **I am sicke**] BUCKNILL (*Mad Folke*, etc., p. 276): There is one word in this passage which must not pass without comment. Constance avows herself in ill health: 'For I am sick.' This point of physical disturbance is rarely omitted by Shakespeare in the development of insanity. It may be referred to in this instance in the most casual and careless manner, for the drama can take little cognizance of the physical imperfections of our nature. Still, however skilfully and imperceptible, the point is made. In a sick frame, passion like that of Constance would have fuller sway. The irritable nerves and the irritated mind would

Oppreſt with wrongs, and therefore full of feares, 15 [13]
A widdow, husbandles, ſubiect to feares,
A woman naturally borne to feares; [15]
And though thou now confeſſe thou didſt but ieſt
With my vext ſpirits, I cannot take a Truce,
But they will quake and tremble all this day. 20
What doſt thou meane by ſhaking of thy head?
Why doſt thou looke ſo ſadly on my ſonne? [20]
What meanes that hand vpon that breaſt of thine?
Why holdes thine eie that lamentable rhewme,
Like a proud riuer peering ore his bounds? 25 [23]

16. *ſubiect*] *subject'* Fle.
17. *feares;*] *fears.* Pope, Han. Ktly.
18, 19. *ieſt...ſpirits,*] Ff, Knt, Coll. i. *jest,...spirits* Rowe et cet.
19. *vext*] *vex'd* Mal. et seq. *ſpirits*] *sprites* Fle.
24. *rhewme*] *rheume* F_3F_4.

act and react on each other. Emotion would obtain more complete and disastrous empire.

14. **capeable**] Compare II, i, 500.

16. **A widdow, husbandles**] In a modern text these words should, perhaps, be separated by a dash, thus making the adjective apply to Constance herself emphatically. A husbandless widow is, to say the least, tautological. See II, i, 573 and notes.—ED.

16. **subiect**] WRIGHT: 'Subject' is here accented on the second syllable.—DAWSON (*University Shakespeare*) opines that 'the unusual recurrence of the same word at the end of four consecutive lines makes it probable that the second syllable of "subject" is to be accented here.'—[Sir Andrew when taxed for an exquisite reason said he had 'no exquisite reason, but reason good enough.'—ED.]

18, 19. **ieſt . . . vext ſpirits,**] DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 89): So the passage is pointed in the old editions, and, I believe, by all the modern editors, directly against the sense. [Dyce then shows that the proper punctuation is the placing of a comma after 'jest,' l. 18, and its removal after 'spirits,' l. 19. Had he but consulted any edition preceding Knight's or Collier's, against whom his remarks were directed, he might have found strong grounds for a change in his belief as regards 'all the modern editors.' See *Text Notes*.—ED.]—VERPLANCK: The sense is, obviously, that in spite of the confession that the bad news just communicated was but in jest, yet she cannot gain any interval of repose for her disturbed mind. The ordinary punctuation [the Ff.] gives a different and erroneous sense.

19. **take a Truce**] DYCE (*Remarks*, p. 89): To 'take a truce with' is a common expression: 'Could not take truce with the unruly spleen Of Tybalt,' *Rom. & Jul.*, III, i, 162. 'Take truce awhile with these immoderate mournings,' *The Coxcomb*, IV, iv. [Also, *Tro. & Cress.*, II, ii, 75.]

21–26. **What dost thou meane . . . thy words**] IVOR JOHN: This may be compared with Northumberland's speech on hearing of Hotspur's death, *I Henry IV:* I, i, 94–103.

23. **breast of thine**] For this redundant possessive compare: 'Death of thy soul! Those linen cheeks of thine Are counsellors to fear.'—*Macbeth*, V, iii, 16.—ED.

25. **Like a proud riuer . . . bounds**] MALONE: This seems to have been imi-

Be theſe ſad ſignes confirmers of thy words? 26
Then ſpeake againe, not all thy former tale, [25]
But this one word, whether thy tale be true.
Sal. As true as I beleeue you thinke them falſe,
That giue you cauſe to proue my ſaying true. 30
Con. Oh if thou teach me to beleeue this ſorrow,
Teach thou this ſorrow, how to make me dye, [30]
And let beleefe, and life encounter ſo,
As doth the furie of two deſperate men,
Which in the very meeting fall, and dye. 35
Lewes marry *Blaunch*? O boy, then where art thou?
France friend with *England*, what becomes of me? [35]
Fellow be gone: I cannot brooke thy ſight,
This newes hath made thee a moſt vgly man. 39 [37]

26. *ſignes*] *ſighs* Warb. Theob. ii, Johns.

27. *againe,*] Ff, Theob. *a gain* Var. '73. *again,*— Dyce, Hal. Words. *again;* Rowe et cet.

28. *word,*] *word,*— Sta.

29. *As true as I beleeue*] Ff, Dyce, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils. Craig. *As true, as I believe* Rowe, Pope, Han. Fle. *As true as, I believe,* Var. '73, Sing. ii, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Del. Coll. iii. *As true, as, I believe,* Theob. et cet.

you] *you'll* Ktly.

falſe,] *falſe* Rowe ii, Dyce, Cam. +, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils. Craig.

31. *Oh*] *O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Huds. *Oh!* Ktly.

34. *deſperate*] *desp'rate* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

35. *Which...meeting fall,*] Ff, Coll. Del. *Which...meeting fall* Rowe, Dyce, Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. ii. *Which,... meeting, fall* Pope, Theob. Han. *Which ...meeting, fall* Warb. Johns. *Which,... meeting, fall,* Cap. et cet.

dye.] *die,* Warb. *die!*— Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Rlfe.

36. Lewes] Lewis Ff.

marry] *wed* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

Blaunch?] F_2F_3. Blanch? F_4. *Blanch!* Rowe et seq.

37. England,] Ff, Rowe i, Cam.+, Fle. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. *England!* Rowe ii. et cet.

38. *be gone:*] *be gone!* Neils. Craig.

39. *This*] *The* Cap.

---

tated by Marston, *Insatiate Countess*, 1603: 'Then how much more in me, whose youthful veins, Like a proud river, overflow their bounds?'—Act III, [ed. Halliwell, p. 156].—WRIGHT compares: 'The ocean overpeering of his list.'—*Hamlet*, IV, v, 99; and IVOR JOHN, 'Have every pelting [paltry] river made so proud That they have overborne their continents.'—*Mid. N. Dream*, II, i, 92.

25. **proud**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. II, 7. c.): Of the sea or a stream: Swelling, swollen, high, strong, in flood. Coverdale, *Job*, xxxviii, ii: 'Here shalt thou laye downe thy proude and hye waues.'

29. **them**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: 'Them' refers to those who occasion her grief; in Shakespeare's mode of sometimes employing a relatively used pronoun in reference to an implied particular. The way in which Salisbury's character is drawn, refined in speech, gentle in manner, has fitness as well as beauty. [See *Dram. Person.*, s. v. Notice Salisbury's use of the deferential 'you,' while Constance uniformly addresses him with 'thou' and 'thee.'—ED.]

Sal. What other harme haue I good Lady done, 40 [38]
But ſpoke the harme, that is by others done?
Con. Which harme within it ſelfe ſo heynous is, [40]
As it makes harmefull all that ſpeake of it.
Ar. I do beſeech you Madam be content.
Con. If thou that bidſt me be content, wert grim 45
Vgly, and ſlandrous to thy Mothers wombe,
Full of vnpleaſing blots, and ſightleſſe ſtaines, [45]
Lame, fooliſh, crooked, ſwart, prodigious, 48

40–43. In margin Pope, Han.
40. *I good Lady*] *I, good Lady*, F_4.
42. *Which*] *What* Fle. (misprint).
heynous] *hainous* F_3F_4. *heinous* Pope.
44. *you Madam*] *you, Madam*, F_4. *you, mother*, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
45–56. *If thou...Roſe.*] Mnemonic, Warb.
45. *grim*] *grim*, F_4.
46. *ſlandrous*] *ſlanderous* Coll. Dyce, Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Del. Words. Craig.
47. *ſightleſſe*] *unsightly* Coll. MS.
48. *prodigious*] *prodigiöus* Fle.

---

42. **Which harme**] For this use of 'which' with repeated antecedent, compare I, i, 126, 127; and see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 269.

44. **I do beseech you**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The boy's artless appeals to his mother amidst her vehement indignation and passionate lamentation, a compound of maternal ambition and maternal love, should have sufficed to teach her heart the lesson so subtly inculcated by the Poet, that ambitious projects indulged for the sake of a being beloved, until they merge affection in violence and absorbing purpose, gradually undermine love in the bosom of the one beloved. It is curious to observe how little of tenderness there is in Arthur towards his mother, as response to all the passionate (but vehemently and violently passionate) love she lavishes upon him. Thus acutely and truly does Shakespeare inculcate his moral lessons.—MARSHALL: I do not think that on the strength of this line one can, as Clarke does, build any theory that Arthur was lacking in affection towards his mother. The boy was naturally alarmed at her vehemence; gently, and respectfully, he seeks to calm her agitation. Dramatic exigencies forbid any long speech on his part. For a similar use of the word 'content,' compare *Rich. II:* V, ii, 80–82: '*York.* Peace, foolish woman. *Duch.* I will not peace, &c. *Aum.* Good mother, be content.'

44. **be content**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. content, I. b.): *Be content*, be satisfied in mind; be calm, quiet, not uneasy.

46. **Vgly, and slandrous**] Compare *Rich. III:* I, iii, 231.

47. **blots**] MALONE compares: 'Worse than a slavish wipe or birth-hour's blot,' *Lucrece*, l. 537.

47. **sightlesse**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v. I. 3): *Unsightly.* [The present line and a passage from Lithgow's *Travels*, 1632, quoted as the only examples of the word in this sense.—ED.]

48. **prodigious**] JOHNSON: That is, *portentous*, so deformed as to be a *foretoken of evil.* [Compare *Rich. III:* I, ii, 21, 22: 'If ever he have child abortive be it, Prodigious and untimely brought to light.']

Patch'd with foule Moles, and eye-offending markes, [47]
I would not care, I then would be content,
For then I ſhould not loue thee: no, nor thou
Become thy great birth, nor deſerue a Crowne. [50]
But thou art faire, and at thy birth (deere boy)
Nature and Fortune ioyn'd to make thee great.
Of Natures guifts, thou mayſt with Lillies boaſt, [53]

51. *ſhould*] *would* Rowe i.
thee:] *thee;*— Ktly.
53. *birth (deere boy)*] Ff. *birth, dear boy,* Rowe, Cap. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Rlfe. *birth, dear boy!* Pope et cet.
54. *great.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Neils. *great;* Sta. Fle. Rlfe. *great:* Cap. et cet.
55. *guifts*] *gifts* Ff.

50. **I would not care**] BUCKNILL (*Mad-Folk*, etc., p. 274): The attack on Salisbury, the innocent messenger, so unworthy of a lady and a princess, can only be excused on the supposition that she is beside herself with fruitless rage, and vents it on any one within reach. It wants but little that she should turn her tongue or her hands even upon Arthur. When, alarmed by her fury, he interposes, 'I do beseech you, madam, be content,' she replies with a strange sophistry which a true mother's heart would never employ. When was true mother's love ever measured by the beauty of her child? When did it not rather increase with the child's imperfections? Sacred miracle of nature, a mother's love hangs not on such casual gifts as form and beauty. The cretin idiot, hideous and half human, receives more than its share. . . . But the love of Constance is alloyed with pride, and ambition, and selfishness. Not simply because Arthur is her son is he dear to her, but also because he is rightful heir to a crown, and because his beauty flatters her pride. With the true selfishness of intense pride she attributes the sufferance of all Arthur's injuries to herself. She alone feels and must underbear the woes of disappointed ambition.

55, 56. **Lillies . . . Rose**] Miss PORTER: The fairness of skin and ruddiness of cheek is not alone suggested by these flowers. The lilies of France and the Rose of England are fitly blended in the boy born of both races and heir in both lands to dominance over them. 'Nature' and 'fortune' are joined here in their gifts.—[This possible reference to the national flowers of France and England has been also suggested by an anonymous editor of a selection of the Plays, published by Edward Lumley, London, no date, unrecorded by Jaggard. Attractive as it undoubtedly is, it will, I fear, prove untenable; the comparison of the fresh complexion of youth to the lily and rose is far too common among ancient writers to make it necessary to suppose that it here means anything but a compliment to Arthur's youthful beauty. Here are but a few examples of this comparison: 'There did I behold them [the Ladies of England] of pure complexion, exceeding the lillie, & the rose, of favour (wherein ye chiefest beautie consisteth) surpassing the pictures that were feyned,' Lyly, *Euphues and his England*, ed. Bond, ii, p. 200; 'In my beloved's face the Rose and lily strive; Among ten thousand men not one is found so fair alive,' Drayton, 1591, *Harmonie of the Church*, ch. v, l. 25, ed. Hooper, iii, p. 254. These next following are quoted by Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, in his Chapter on *Love Melancholy: Symptomes of Love:* 'lac, et lilium Albamque simul rosam et rubicundam, Et expolitum ebur Indicum.' (These lines are of un-

And with the halfe-blowne Roſe. But Fortune, oh, 56
She is corrupted, chang'd, and wonne from thee, [55]
Sh'adulterates hourely with thine Vnckle *Iohn*,
And with her golden hand hath pluckt on France
To tread downe faire reſpect of Soueraigntie, 60
And made his Maieſtie the bawd to theirs.
France is a Bawd to Fortune, and king *Iohn*, [60]
That ſtrumpet Fortune, that vſurping *Iohn*:
Tell me thou fellow, is not France forſworne?
Euvenom him with words, or get thee gone, 65
And leaue thoſe woes alone, which I alone [64]

56. *Roſe.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. i, iii, Sing. ii, Wh. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Dono. Neils. Craig. *rose:* Cap. et cet.
oh,] Ff, Rowe, Fle. *oh!* Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Ktly. *O,* Cam.+, Dono. Neils. *O!* Mal. et cet.
57–63. *She is...vſurping* Iohn:] Om. Dono.
58. *Sh'*] Om. Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *She* Cap. et seq.
58. *thine*] *thy* F_4, Rowe i.
61. *theirs*] *them* Vaughan.
62. *king* Iohn] *to John* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
63. Iohn:] *John!* Pope,+, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Del.
64. *me thou*] *me, thou* F_4.
65. *Euvenom*] F_1.
66. *thoſe*] *theſe* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+.

certain origin, but usually assigned to Cornelius Gallus, a contemporary of Virgil. Burton assigns them to Petronius, which is certainly an error.) Burton thus translates: 'The milk, the lily do not come thee near; the rose so white, the rose so red to see, and Indian ivory comes short of thee.' And this from Chaucer: 'That Emelye, that fairer was to sene Than is the lilie upon his stalke grene And fressher than the May with flowres newe For with the rose colour stroof hir hewe,' *The Knightes Tale* (ed. Skeat, ll. 1035–1038). Perhaps, also, *Mid. N. Dream*, III, i, 96, 97. Again, Spenser: 'And in her cheekes the vermeil red did shew Like roses in a bed of lillies shed,' *Faerie Queene*, Bk II, can. iii, st. 22. For those who still prefer Miss Porter's interpretation, there is one other objection, though, it must be admitted, a very slight one, viz.: that for Constance to refer to the rose as typical of England would be an anachronism; the rose was not adopted as the national emblem until after the Wars of the Roses, when Henry VII. made it his cognizance; the lily of France, or the fleur de lys, was, of course, much older.—ED.]

55. **boast**] VAUGHAN (i, 38) interprets 'boast with,' as here used, in the sense *vie with*, quoting in confirmation: 'Nor should that nation boast it so with us,' *1 Henry VI:* III, iii, 23; but MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. boast, II. 3) quotes his same line in illustration of, To speak vaingloriously, extol oneself; and among the several meanings of this word that suggested by Vaughan does not appear. The simpler meaning is, therefore, to be preferred, as thus: Thou mayst, as well as the lily and rose, praise thyself for having nature's gifts.—ED.

59. **pluckt on**] That is, *incited, instigated;* compare: 'I am in So far in blood that sin will pluck on sin.'—*Richard III:* IV, ii, 65.

65. **Euvenom**] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. envenom, 1.): To venom (a person, an animal); to poison by contact, bite, inoculation, etc., *c* 1400. Maundeville, v (1839), 54: 'The serpentes byten hem & envenyme hem.' [Compare: 'Oh what

Am bound to vnder-beare. 67 [65]
Sal. Pardon me Madam,
I may not goe without you to the kings.
Con. Thou maiſt, thou ſhalt, I will not go with thee, 70
I will inſtruct my ſorrowes to bee proud,
For greefe is proud, and makes his owner ſtoope, 72

68. *me*] *me*, F_4.
70. *maiſt*] *mayeſt* F_4. *may'st* Rowe. *thee*,] F_2. *thee*. F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, +, Coll. *thee:* Cap. et cet.
71. *ſorrowes*] *sorrow* Rowe ii, Pope, Han.
72. *proud*] *poor* H. A. C. (Athenæum, 29 June, 1867).
72. *and*] *an't* Anon. ap. Cam. *his*] *its* Var. '21. *his owner ſtoope*] Ff, Rowe. *his owner stout.* Han. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann, Steev. Var. '03, '13, Sing. Dyce, Sta. Huds. ii. *dishonour stoop.* Bulloch. *his owner too* Cartwright. *his owner stoop.* Pope et cet.

---

a world is this, when what is comely Envenoms him that bears it.'—*As You Like It*, II, iii, 15.]

67. **vnder-beare**] That is, *endure*. Compare: 'Wooing poor craftsmen with the craft of smiles And patient underbearing of his fortune.'—*Rickard II:* I, iv, 28.

70. **I will not go with thee**] BOADEN (*Life of Kemble*, i, 134): I am clearly of opinion that among the finest things Mrs Siddons ever did are to be numbered the majestic sorrows—the look—the mode of taking the earth as a throne—the pride of soul, with which she prepared, deserted, and devoted as she found herself, to shame the assembled sovereigns, who had so basely abandoned her cause. The lines of Shakespeare, it is true, suggest it all; but never did the grand conceptions of a poet find more congenial imagination, never perhaps equal powers to embody the creation of his fancy.

72. **greefe is proud . . . stoope**] JOHNSON: In *Much Ado*, the father of Hero, depressed by her disgrace, declares himself so subdued by grief that a *thread may lead him*, [IV, i, 250 et seq.]. How is it that grief in Leonato and Lady Constance produces effects directly opposite, and yet both agreeable to nature? [It is to be borne in mind that Johnson adopted Hanmer's reading *stout*.—ED.] Sorrow softens the mind while it is yet warmed by hope, but hardens it when it is congealed by despair. Distress, while there remains any prospect of relief, is weak and flexible, but when no succour remains, is fearless and stubborn; angry alike at those that injure and at those that do not help; careless to please where nothing can be gained, and fearless to offend when there is nothing further to be dreaded. Such was this writer's knowledge of the passions.—STEEVENS (*Var.*, 1778), in corroboration of the justice of Hanmer's change, quotes: 'Full, with stout grief, and with disdainful woe.'—Daniel: *Civil Wars*, [bk vii, stanza 44. Beyond the fact that the words 'stout' and 'grief' appear close together, there is no similarity whatever. Hanmer's change refers to the sufferer from grief who is made stout or resolute thereby; but the line from Daniel merely gives a descriptive epithet to grief. It is to be regretted that Hanmer has not furnished us with any note as to the exact shade of meaning he attached to 'stout' in this connection. Schmidt (*Lex.*) gives examples of the word used in various senses, as, *strong, proud, overbearing, resolute, brave*, etc.—ED.]—MALONE: Our Author has rendered this passage obscure by indulging himself in one of those conceits in which he too much delights,

[72. **For greefe is proud, and makes his owner stoope**]

and by bounding rapidly, with his usual license, from one idea to another. [The reading *stout* for 'stoop'] has been too hastily adopted in the subsequent editions. The confusion arises from the Poet's having personified grief in the first part of the passage, and supposing the afflicted person to be *bowed* to the earth by that pride or haughtiness which Grief, which he personifies, is said to possess; and by making the afflicted person, in the latter part of the passage, actuated by this very pride, and exacting the same kind of obeisance from others that Grief has exacted from her. 'I will not go (says Constance) to these kings; I will teach my sorrows to be proud: For Grief is proud, and makes the afflicted *stoop;* therefore here I throw myself, and let them come to me.' Here, had she stopped, and thrown herself on the ground, and had nothing more been added, however we might have disapproved of the conceit, we should have had no temptation to disturb the text. But the idea of throwing herself on the ground suggests a new image; and because her *stately* grief is so great that nothing but the huge earth can support it, she considers the ground as her *throne;* and having thus invested herself with regal dignity, she, as queen in *misery*, as possessing (like Imogen) 'the supreme crown of grief,' calls on the princes of the world to bow down before her, as she herself has been *bowed down* by affliction. Such, I think, was the process that passed in the Poet's mind; which appears to me so clearly to explain the text that I see no reason for departing from it.—M. MASON (*Additional Comments*, p. 35): Hanmer's reading, *stout*, is an admirable amendment which renders this noble passage agreeable to the feelings of human nature, and consistent with the rest of the speech, which is perhaps the proudest and stoutest that ever was uttered: 'To the state of my great grief Let kings assemble.' Is it in such terms as those that a grief would be expressed which made the owner stoop? I am really surprised that Mr Malone should endeavor, by one elaborate argument, to support the old debasing reading [of the Folio]; a pride which makes the owner stoop is a kind of pride I have never heard of; and though grief in a weaker degree, and working in weaker minds, may depress the spirits, despair such as the haughty Constance felt at this time must naturally rouse them. This distinction is accurately pointed out by Johnson in his observation on this passage.—CAPELL (I, pt 2, p. 126): '*Stout*' is no easy word, nor of much fitness for the mouth of a lady; whose sentence is very perfect with 'stoop,' and her word necessary to introduce with propriety her own stooping and the stooping she insists on from 'kings'; the emphatical word in it is the word before 'stoop.'—[J. H. Voss, one of the early German translators of Shakespeare, and whose work was issued in 1822, provided for his readers a select number of notes elucidating the English idioms which he was unable to give directly in his own language. For the most part the notes are short translations of the earlier English commentators; but at other times Voss waxes bold and fearlessly ventures into the dangerous domain of conjectural emendation, doubly perilous for a foreigner dealing with Elizabethan English. Voss's attempt for the present passage is a notable example; he says: 'We might here read "grief is proud and makes his *downer* stoop." The two kings have laid pressing grief upon Constance (have downed Constance); but the pride in grief shall cast under foot these downers themselves. If only the existence of a substantive "downer" might be proved.' —Voss's implied wish has not yet been fulfilled; even examples of the verbal form of 'down' in the sense *to put down* are not common until much later than the sixteenth century.—ED.]—KNIGHT: The meaning of the passage appears to us,

[72. For greefe is proud, and makes his owner stoope]

briefly, thus: Constance refuses to go with Salisbury to the kings—she will instruct her sorrows to be proud; for grief is proud in spirit, even while it bows down the body of its owner. The commentators substituted the ridiculous word *stout* because they received 'stoop' in the sense of submission. Constance continues the fine image throughout her speech: 'To me and to the state of my great grief Let kings assemble'; here grief is 'proud.' 'Here I and sorrows sit'; here grief 'makes his owner stoop,' and leaves the physical power 'no supporter but the huge firm earth.' A valued friend, for whose opinion we have the highest regard, has no doubt that 'stoop' is the word, but that the meaning is, makes its owner stoop *to it*—to grief. He thinks that the 'and' joins and assimilates the two clauses of the sentence, instead of contrasting them. At any rate, we cannot but choose to abide by the restoration [of the Folio text].—J. MITFORD (*Gentleman's Maga.*, Aug., 1844): *Stout* is an emendation of Sir T. Hanmer's, approved by Johnson and Monck Mason, and received into the text, which in the old copy is, 'and makes its owner stoop.' Why 'its' should be altered to *his* we cannot see; we also doubt Hanmer's alteration, which is too distant from the original to be at once admitted. We would read, 'For grief is proud, and makes its *owners too*'; only leaving one redundant letter, *p*; *owners too* was easily corrupted into 'owner stoop,' or it might be *owners so*.—[On the authority of Dyce (ed. ii.) I assign this and other notes on the text of *King John* in this number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* to John Mitford; the article entitled *Conjectural Emendations of the Text of Shakespeare* is unsigned; but Dyce was Mitford's literary executor and doubtless had some substantial evidence whereon to base his assertion. The Cambridge Edd., without locating these notes, also assign all of the conjectural readings to John Mitford.—ED.]—COLLIER: The old and sufficiently intelligible reading has been misunderstood by most modern editors [see *Text. Notes*]. The meaning seems to be that grief (which the Poet personifies) is proud even while he compels his owner to stoop, as Constance did to the earth, to receive the homage of monarchs. [In his second ed. Collier adds to this:] She stooped to the earth in her pride, and was, in fact, the more proud by this act of seeming condescension.—DELIUS: Grief is personified as overbearing and forcing those who own it to submit; it presses her in its pride to the ground so that she also can do nothing but obey its commands. Constance thus furnishes the motive for her refusal to listen to the behest of kings, who should more fittingly come to her.—STAUNTON, who adopts Hanmer's reading, says: 'I must confess, despite the elaborate defence of the ancient reading by Malone, and its adoption by Messers Collier and Knight, that 'stoop' appears to me entirely inconsistent both with the context and with the subsequent language and demeanour of Lady Constance before the Kings of France and England. Shakespeare, I conceive, intended to express the very natural sentiment that grief is proud, and renders its possessor proud also; but wishing to avoid the repetition of *proud*, which had been introduced twice immediately before, he adopted a word, *stout*, which was commonly used in the same sense.—HUDSON: The meaning seems to be that *grief* is so *proud* that even in receiving the homage of kings its *owner stoops* or condescends.—R. G. WHITE: Those who have concluded that the passage is corrupt must surely have done so without sufficient examination of the context. Constance has just said, 'And leave those woes alone, which I alone Am bound to under-bear.' And two lines below she says: 'My grief's so great That no supporter but the huge firm Earth Can hold it up.' She means to represent her-

[72. **For greefe is proud, and makes his owner stoope**]

self as bowed to the earth by her great sorrow; and she uses 'proud' in the double sense of *haughty*, which it still preserves, and of *great, swollen*, which it had in Shakespeare's time. The following passages afford almost needless illustration and support of this interpretation. 'When Octavia by the imploiment of Antonie . . . throws her selfe great with child, & as big with sorrowe, into the travaile of a most laboursome reconciliation.'—Daniel's *Letter from Octavia*, &c., The Argument, 1599. 'Wherein I may say they are a greate deale more fruiteful than Hares, for they are reported to conceiue, to goe prowde, and to litter their leverets at one instaunt. But these were great with fearing before they conceiue it.'—Gosson's *Ephemerides of Phialo*, 1579, fol. 27; finally, in l. 25 *ante*, 'Like a proud river peering o'er his bounds.' 'His owner' is not a personification; nor should we read '*its* owner.' 'His' is used for *its*.—KEIGHTLEY (*Exp.*, 222): I see no need of Hanmer's change. We talk of a person being bowed to the earth with grief, and this is what the Poet meant. 'Owner' was used of one who simply had, as 'But like the owner of a foul disease.'—*Hamlet*, IV, i, 24.—ELZE (ap. ULRICI, *Sh.*, vol. i, p. 237): While '*stout*' is quite unobjectionable to the sense of the passage, at the same time it not only forms a disagreeable harmony with the foregoing word 'proud,' but is also feebly tautological. I think we should more likely read: '*none* makes his owner stoop.' Kings alone, says Constance, are in the position to make me stoop; I am royal as they are, and my grief is my throne. [To this note the editor, Ulrici, added: 'I should rather think that Sh. simply wrote, "makes his owner stop," to stop in the sense *make immoveable*. Constance means, she cannot go with Salisbury because her grief is too proud and her weariness so heavy that she cannot move.'—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: We think that the mere word 'instruct' suffices to show that 'stoop' is the right word here. Constance, 'sick,' 'oppress'd with wrongs,' 'full of fears,' in 'vex'd spirits' that 'quake and tremble,' feels herself bowed down by grief, beat to the earth, sinking beneath the load of her sorrows and injuries, and may well say that she will teach them to be proud, to resist the pride of grief which makes her 'stoop' to its overpowering weight. She feels herself physically giving way under the load of the burden laid upon her; and with her rich imagination converts the earth to which she is compelled to 'stoop' into a 'supporter' and 'throne.'—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: We prefer the old reading, because we apprehend that 'his owner' denotes not the individual that is proud, but the king, lord, or master of that individual. Constance will not go to the kings, but will have the kings come to her. She immediately adds: 'To me and to the state of my great grief let kings assemble'; and in concluding her speech she says: 'Here (that is, on the ground) is my throne, let kings come bow to it.'—[It will be noticed that Voss, though rather indirectly, arrived at somewhat the same conclusion in his interpretation.—ED.]—FLEAY: That is, stoop to grief. I bow to my grief, let others (kings or otherwise) also bow to grief, who is embodied in me. Hanmer's reading is not required.—HERR, in answer to the foregoing laconic note by Fleay, says (p. 24): 'Constance does not say—nor is it implied—that "she bows to her grief," but summons kings to do so, as before a throne; nor does she say that she will, or that she intends to "stoop to her grief"; on the contrary, she invokes the aid of pride to sustain and instruct her how to combat the weaknesses of grief,—"to suffer and be strong,"—and to enable her to rise in proud and rebellious resistance to the depressing effects of grief or sorrow. She desires her grief to become proud

[72. For greefe is proud, and makes his owner stoope]

in order that both may be firm, resistive, and unyielding. "Thou *shalt*, I *will* not go with thee." Here she is uncomplying, aggressive, and rebellious in a material sense, and she is determined that her grief shall likewise rise proud and hostile in a moral sense to oppose the ills of fortune or the machinations of her enemies. So far from her "stooping to grief" or aught else, a striking manifestation of her being proud is evinced in her haughty charge, "bid kings come bow."' Herr then suggests that the most likely word selected by Shakespeare to express the conditions indicated is *stiff*, and quotes several passages from the Bible in illustration of the use of *stiff* in connection with pride as corroboration of his emendation.—MOBERLY: That is, Grief is a proud and stern master, who bows down every one who has to submit to him.—WRIGHT: The Authorized Version of *Proverbs*, xii, 25, is: 'Heaviness in the heart of man maketh it stoop,' and it might be thought that Shakespeare had this in his mind; but *King John* was written long before the Authorised Version appeared, and the earlier English versions have not the expression 'maketh it stoop.' While, however, the passage cannot be quoted as having suggested the expression, it contains the same idea and shows that Hanmer's alteration arose from a misconception.—VAUGHAN (i, 39): I believe that 'stoop' is an error, but am not fully satisfied with *stout*. I propose for consideration: 'makes his own *so too*.' The speaker is giving a reason for instructing 'her sorrows to be proud.' And as her sorrows are 'her own sorrows,' it is reasonable to show that Grief, being proud, makes what is its own proud too. 'Owne so too' easily became 'owner stoop.'—PAGE: This passage has never been satisfactorily explained. Perhaps it means: I have to bow down to my grief; let others bend to it also. It subdues all who come under its influence. In the preceding line 'instruct' signifies *command, direct, order*, as in 'If thou dost as this instructs thee.'—*Lear*, V, iii, 29. The line then signifies: I will direct my grief to act according to its proud nature.—IVOR JOHN: There is evidently some corruption of the text here, and the context leads one to suspect 'stoop' and perhaps 'his owner.' All the suggested emendations wrest some meaning out of the passage, but not one of them carries conviction with it. Perhaps 'proud' is the corrupt word, which ought to be *poor* (as suggested by H. A. C., [*Text. Notes*]) or some such equivalent. This would make Constance say in effect: I will—in spite of my grief which is apt to bow me down and make me humble—be proud in my sorrow and make kings come to me.—MARSHALL: The meaning of this passage is tolerably plain in spite of the various efforts that have been made to amend it. Constance says she *will instruct* her *sorrows to be proud;* and adds that grief or *sorrow* is *proud*, and makes his owner, i. e., the person who owns the grief or sorrow, stoop beneath its weight. . . . The metaphor and the various ideas expressed are alike rather confused; but this is not unnatural, considering the agitation of the speaker, and is quite in keeping with the style of Shakespeare's earlier plays.—DEIGHTON: I think the text is sound. In strict logic, if grief is naturally proud, there would be no need to instruct her sorrows to be so; but the sense seems to be, that as grief is proud and makes those subject to it bow their heads, so here she will teach her sorrows to show themselves so proud that, in their magnitude, others, even kings, shall be compelled to pay homage to them. If there be corruption I should suppose it to be not in 'stoop,' but in 'proud,' which, caught from the line above, may have ousted some such word as *meek*.—Miss PORTER: It is, of course, King Grief that makes Constance 'stoop,' and she, being his subject, is his owner,

To me and to the ſtate of my great greefe, 73 [70]
Let kings aſſemble: for my greefe's ſo great,
That no ſupporter but the huge firme earth 75
Can hold it vp: here I and ſorrowes ſit, [73]

73. *To me*] Ff. *To me.* Pope, Rowe, Cam.+ et cet.
75. *earth*] *earth* [throwing herself upon it. Cap.
76. *vp:*] *up.* Wh. i, Ktly, Rlfe, Neils.
ſorrowes] *ſorrow* Pope,+, Rann, Steev. Var. '03, '13, Sing. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. Coll. iii, Wh. i, Words. Neils.

the one who owns the sway, within her, of the mastery of Grief. Therefore she stoops, and Grief is proud, as she will instruct her 'sorrows' also to be. The point of the difference made by Shakespeare between the older Constance and the Constance of this play consists, in fact, in bowing her beneath the stroke of her grief first, and later rousing her against it. Here begins the first stir of her consciousness against submission to this blow of fate. She stoops, but refuses to obey the summons, and thus begins to instruct her 'sorrows' to assume the dignity of 'grief.'—[The simplest explanation of a passage as involved as this is ever the best, therefore let us accept that one which makes Constance, however illogically, say That she will not humble herself so far as to go to the kings, but will teach her sorrow to show more pride, because grief makes the one suffering from it humble, therefore the two kings must come to her. Such seems to be the consensus of opinion. I have but a very slight suggestion to offer—and with much diffidence—possibly the word 'owner' here is to be taken not in its usual sense of *possessor*, but *one who acknowledges* or *recognizes*, as in 'Two of these fellows you must know and own; this thing of darkness I acknowledge mine.'—*Tempest*, V, i, 275. With this meaning Constance says: The kings must acknowledge her grief, for Grief is proud and makes him who recognises it as grief, stoop or bow down before it.—ED.]

72. **his**] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XV.): In Boswell's edition (*Variorum, 1821*) the reading 'its owner' is derived from a misprint of Johnson, who quotes it as the reading of the old editions. Collier incorrectly attributes it to Malone.

73. **state**] That is, *throne, chair of state.* Compare: 'Our hostess keeps her state; but in best time We will require her welcome.'—*Macbeth*, III, iv, 5.

75. **no supporter but the . . . earth**] MALONE: Perhaps our Author here remembered the description of Elizabeth, widow of Edward IV, given in an old book that, I believe, he had read: 'The quene sat alone belowe on the russhes, all desolate and dysmaied, whom the Archbisshop comforted in the best maner that he coulde.'—*Continuation of Hardyng's Chronicle*, 1543, [Fol. xlii; ed. Ellis, p. 480]. So also in a book already quoted [see note on II, i, 400] that Shakespeare appears to have read: 'All those things when I Joseph heard tydings of, I tare my head with my hand, and cast ashes upon my beard, sitting in great sorrow upon the ground.'—*History of the Latter Times of the Jewes Commonweale.* [Is not the custom of even greater antiquity than either of these citations? Compare: 'So they sate by him upon the grounde seuen dayes, and seuen nightes, and none spake a worde vnto him: for they sawe that the griefe was very great.'—*Job*, ii, 13 (*Geneva Vers.*).—ED.]

76. **sorrowes**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 126): [As] for the change of 'sorrows,' who perceives not in that a greater energy than in its singular—*sorrow?* and it is besides

Heere is my Throne, bid kings come bow to it. 77 [74]

77. *it.*] *it.* Ff, Rowe, Pope. *it.* [sits down on the floor. Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Fle. *it.* [She sits on the ground. Exit Salisbury. Wh. i. *it.* [Throws herself on the ground. Var. '78 et cet.

---

a repeating of what the speaker throws out in l. 71; the change's classical air should be no argument for it in an author who made not classics his model.—M. MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 156): A slight corruption has here destroyed a very beautiful image. There is no poetical reader that will not join with me in reading: 'Here I and sorrow's sit.'—[I am loath to be excluded from such goodly company as Mason indicates; but I fear I must exclaim with Touchstone, changing but the pronoun, 'Truly, I would the gods had made *me* poetical'; I do not understand his 'beautiful image.'—ED.]—MALONE (*Var.*, '85): I believe the author meant to personify *sorrow*, and wrote, 'here I and *Sorrow* sit'; which gives a more poetical image. The transcriber's ear might easily have deceived him, the two readings, when spoken, sounding exactly alike. Marlowe had before our Author introduced the same personage in his *Edward II:* 'While I am lodg'd within this cave of Care, Where Sorrow at my elbow still attends,' [ed. Dyce, vol. ii, p. 258.—In his own edition, five years later, Malone appended to the foregoing note: 'In this conjecture I had once great confidence; but a preceding line, "I will instruct my *sorrows* to be proud," now appears to me to render it somewhat disputable.'—Had Malone also, perhaps, not discovered that in this reading he had been anticipated by Pope? (see *Text. Notes*).—In regard to the personification of sorrow, suggested by Malone, Vaughan pertinently remarks (i, p. 39): 'If sorrow were a personality, surely the throne to be bowed to would not be that of Constance exclusively, but rather that of *Sorrow* alone, or with her.'—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 234): The interpolation of an *s* at the end of a word—generally, but not always, a noun substantive—is remarkably frequent in the Folio. Those who are conversant with the MSS of the Elizabethan age may perhaps be able to explain its origin. Were it not for the different degree of frequency with which it occurs in different parts of the Folio—being comparatively rare in the Comedies (except, perhaps, in *Winter's Tale*), appearing more frequently in the Histories, and becoming quite common in the Tragedies—I should be inclined to think it originated in some peculiarity of Shakespeare's handwriting. [Among others Walker quotes the present line as an example of this interpolation.]

77. **Heere . . . to it]** GILDON (p. 340): There is a considerable Part of the second Act lost of this Piece, it containing only two pages, which are so well adorn'd with the well-drawn passion of *Constance*, that we are obliged to fortune that it is not lost with the rest. Her passion in the first Scene of the Third Act is likewise just and masterly, and well worthy our perusing with Care.—Shortly after the appearance of POPE'S edition THEOBALD published his volume *Shakespeare Restored*, wherein he showed the many faults both of omission and commission in the work of his predecessor. In the *Appendix* (p. 159) Theobald says: 'The Editor (who tells us that in the oldest *Folio* Edition, where the *Acts* and *Scenes* are first distinguish'd, they were divided according as they play'd them, often where there was no pause in the action, or where they thought fit to make a breach in it) has sometimes taken care to regulate the *Shufflings* and *Transpositions* of the *Scenes*, and rectify the injudicious Divisions of the *Acts*. But this part of Criticism does not display itself thro' the whole Work. I shall subjoin one Passage

[77. Heere is my Throne, bid kings come bow to it]

for example, in which he seems to have employ'd none of this skill in marking the division of an *Act*, viz., the end of the Second *Act* of *King John*. 'Tis true he errs here in following the old Copies . . . by contradicting them.' [Here follows a description of the situation at this point; and the quotation of ll. 73–77.] 'It is evident, I think, beyond contradiction, that *Constantia* [sic] here, in her despair, seats herself upon the Floor of the Stage. And can she be supposed immediately to rise again, only to *go off* and *end* the Act decently? And if she does not, how can the Act end here? There is but one other method for it; and that is, of the foremost *flat-scene* shutting her in from the sight of the audience, an Absurdity never once practised by Shakespeare. In the very next scene which follows, and stands as the *first* Scene of the *Third* Act, the Kings are introduc'd, and *Constancia* is likewise upon the stage, and speaks within eight lines of the Scene's beginning. We must therefore either suppose an *Unity* of the *two* scenes, and that they come in to her so soon as she sits down on the Floor; or rather (which I think has been an Opinion of long standing) that an *intermediate* Scene or two have been lost, whereby we cannot now be certain how the Act ended; and that an *Hiatus in Manuscripto* ought to be mark'd to signify the imperfection.'—Pope (ed. ii.) appended to his last volume a list of *Various Readings, Guesses, &c.*, which was in reality an attempt to answer many of the accusations of carelessness made by Theobald. The sarcastic sneer is evident in nearly all of Pope's comments, particularly so in that dealing with the foregoing, where he says: 'He thinks this Act ends wrong, and that some Scene follow'd which is lost. . . . It seems to be so, and it were to be wish'd the Restorer could supply it.'—To this challenge Theobald, in his edition, thus replied: 'To deserve this great man's thanks I'll venture at the task; and hope to convince my readers that nothing is lost; but that I have supplied the suspected chasm only by rectifying the division of the Acts. Upon looking a little more narrowly into the constitution of the play, I am satisfied that the third Act ought to begin with that scene which has hitherto been accounted the last of the second Act; and my reasons for it are these: The match being concluded, in the scene before that, betwixt the Dauphin and Blanch, a messenger is sent for Lady Constance to King Philip's tent, for her to come to Saint Mary's church to the solemnity. The princes all go out as to the marriage; and the Bastard staying a little behind, to descant on interest and commodity, very properly ends the Act. The next scene then, in the French king's tent, brings us Salisbury delivering his message to Constance, who, refusing to go to the solemnity, sets herself down on the floor. The whole train returning from the church to the French king's pavilion, Philip expresses such satisfaction on occasion of the happy solemnity of that day that Constance rises from the floor, and joins in the scene by entering her protest against their joy, and cursing the business of the day. Thus, I conceive, the scenes are fully continued and there is no chasm in the action, but a proper interval made both for Salisbury's coming to Lady Constance, and for the solemnization of the marriage. Besides, as Faulconbridge is evidently the Poet's favourite character, it was very well judged to close the Act with his soliloquy.'—'This whole note,' says JOHNSON, 'seems judicious enough; but Mr Theobald forgets that there were, in Shakespeare's time, no moveable scenes in common playhouses.'—Did Johnson forget, however, that this was an expedient which Theobald particularly declared absurd and one of which he did not accuse Shakespeare? —STEEVEN'S love of mischief, I think, prompted him to ask: If there were no scenes

[77. Heere is my Throne, bid kings come bow to it]

capable of being shifted, why did Shakespeare himself mention shifting scenes, as in *Henry V: Chorus*, Act II: 'Unto Southampton do we shift our scene.' Steevens must have known that Johnson was quite correct; but the subject of moveable scenery is one which concerns the general history of the Stage, and is not in any way germane to the present discussion.—MALONE declares Theobald's division and rearrangement 'is certainly right.'—R. G. WHITE strongly condemns Theobald's change, and makes this scene the second of Act II. In explanation he says: 'Theobald's notion, that to end the Act decently Constance must rise and go off the stage, is as little worth attention as his remark about the "flat scene." In Shakespeare's day there were no flat scenes; and that the curtain should fall upon Constance as, drawing her boy to her breast, she seats herself upon the ground, will certainly be considered by stage-managers and dramatic critics not only a "decent," but a very impressive manner of using the situation and closing the Scene. In the phraseology of the modern stage it presents a very fine tableau.' 'With regard to the "chasm in the action," and the "proper interval" for Salisbury's "coming to Lady Constance," Theobald and his followers seem to have forgotten, first, the relative situation of places and personages, and next, when a King sends an Earl to bid a Princess to a royal marriage, at least time enough is to be allowed for the messenger to perform his office and return. The Kings, just at the gate of Angiers, are about to go, in such "unprepared pomp" "as haste will suffer" to St Mary's chapel, to celebrate the marriage; a "speedy messenger" is required to summon Constance to the ceremony, and the Earl of Salisbury undertakes the office. He has only to go to the French King's tent, just outside the walls of the town; and he leaves the gates at the same time that the royal parties enter them. The Bastard's soliloquy gives him time to reach the French King's tent, and there, at the opening of the next scene, we find him, having, as we learn from Constance's exclamations, just delivered his message. She refuses to be present at the marriage and sits enthroned in sorrow upon the ground. Salisbury returns with her answer; the preparation for the marriage and the ceremony itself take place between the Acts, without her presence; and the third Act opens with the entrance of the newly allied Kings and the newly married pair,—Philip naturally being host in his own land, and introducing his daughter-in-law to his pavilion, where, of course, the moody Constance is found with Arthur. But, according to Theobald's disarrangement of the order of the original copy, at the very time when Salisbury delivers his message to Constance, summoning her to the solemnization of the marriage, the ceremony has already taken place; and she has hardly refused to be present at it when the royal trains enter the tent, which Salisbury has little more than reached, although since he left them they have made some hasty preparation for the marriage, gone to Saint Mary's Chapel in the town, had the ceremony performed, and come thence to the very place whither their "hasty messenger" was sent! Theobald might know no better than this, but Salisbury did; for his last speech, when Constance tells him to return without her, and before she sits upon the ground, is, "Pardon me, madam, I may not go without you to the Kings"; which shows his consciousness that the ceremony awaited his return, and which is made ridiculous by the immediate entrance of Philip with Blanch as his daughter-in-law. The interval between the Acts is necessary, as Theobald remarks, for the solemnization of the marriage, but clearly not for Salisbury's coming to Constance; and the marriage takes place

[77. Heere is my Throne, bid kings come bow to it]

between the Acts according to either arrangement. It is noteworthy that although the *exits* at the ends of Acts and scenes are marked with particular care in the Folio, none is directed after Constance's last speech in this scene; which supports the belief that on Shakespeare's stage the curtain fell as she sat upon the ground. With the third Act, too, according to the original division, comes in a new element of dramatic interest: the power of Rome in the person of Pandulph appears upon the scene, which hitherto has been entirely occupied by the conflicting interests of France and England, John and Arthur. A break in the action is therefore required by that unity of dramatic interest, which seems to have been the great principle upon which Shakespeare constructed his dramas. Neither history nor the old *King John* aids us in determining this question. For no such events as those which occupy the second Act of this play and the first scene of the third Act took place; Blanch having been espoused in England and brought solemnly over to France to be married, and Pandulph not having been appointed legate until five years after the espousals. In the old play Constance and Arthur are present when the Citizen of Angiers proposes the marriage; and they remain on the stage during its solemnization. This noble scene, unsurpassed in Dramatic literature, is in its action no less than its poetry entirely Shakespeare's.'—[White's 'falling curtain' is, I think, quite as open to serious objection as the 'flat-scene' of Theobald; and a detailed discussion of the one quite as inappropriate as the other at the present time. The following short extract from Lawrence's excellent volume, *The Elizabethan Playhouse*, p. 121, is, however, to the point: 'At what period the normal ascending curtain of today first came into use in the English theater it would be difficult to say. Before one has examined all the pros and cons one is inclined to jump to the conclusion that the period synchronised with the introduction and regular employment of scenery, say somewhere about 1664. But the cautious investigator, confronted by disturbing data, will hesitate to advance an opinion. There is some reason to believe that the double curtains, pulling up on either side, were the first employed in the English scenic theater and that the principle obtained until at least the second decade of the eighteenth century.'—ED.]—FLEAY (*Introd.*, p. 12): This play is one of those in which the Folio gives us the division in use at that date. One heading has, however, dropped out (*Actus Secundus: Scena Prima*), and hence Act II, scene ii. is headed only *Actus Secundus*. That the second Act should consist only of seventy-four lines is palpably absurd. The probability is that the second Act has been greatly abridged for stage purposes; and hence arose a confusion in the manuscript as to where the new second Act should begin. Various methods have been proposed to set this right. My own differs from any other. I have Grant While's authority for not admitting Theobald's unjustifiable interference with the Folio text as to the commencement of Act III, but he follows the multitude in reducing Act I. to 270 lines, and crowding the French scenes into the second Act. This is not like Shakespeare: he cared nothing for change of place during an act; the unity of subject is the only one to guide us. The division as I have given the Acts falls thus: I. The Embassy of Chatillion. II. War and Peace. III. The Rupture through Pandulph. IV. The Rebellion of the Barons (on account of Arthur). V. The invasion; French treachery (revealed by Melun), and John's death. [Fleay thus makes the Folio's Act I, scene ii. into I, ii. and II, i. The Act II. of the Folio, the present scene, is thus with Fleay Act II, scene ii.—ED.]—Miss PORTER regards Theobald's division

Actus Tertius, Scæna prima.

Enter King Iohn, France, Dolphin, Blanch, Elianor, Philip, Auſtria, Conſtance.

Fran. 'Tis true (faire daughter) and this bleſſed day, [75]
Euer in *France* ſhall be kept feſtiuall: 5
To ſolemnize this day the glorious ſunne
Stayes in his courſe, and playes the Alchymiſt, 7 [78]

1. Actus...prima.] Ff. ACT III, SCENE I. Rowe, Pope, Wh. i, Fle. ACT III, SCENE II. Han. Warb. Johns. Scene continued, Theob. et cet.

2. Enter...] The Same. Constance and Arthur. Enter, from the marriage,... Wh. i.

France,...Philip,...] Ff. King Philip, Lewis, Blanch, Elinor, Faulconbridge, and,... Theob. Warb. Varr. Rann. Flourish. Enter the two kings, and their Train; Blanch, Lewis, Elinor, Bastard, and... Cap. King Philip, Lewis, Blanch, Elinor, Philip the Bastard... Rowe et cet.

3. Conſtance] Om. Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, '78, '85. and attendants. Mal. et seq.

4. Fran.] K. Philip. Rowe (throughout).

(*faire daughter*)] *fair daughter;* Rowe et seq.

7. *Alchymiſt*] *alchemist* Steev. Var. '03, '13, Sing. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Words. Neils. Craig.

---

as questionable and suggests the following scenic arrangement to obviate a change of scene: 'Constance's tent may be placed on the ground of the battle-field in front of an exit, at the rear of the fore-stage. For this scene it is thrown wide open and placed on the slanting rise at the rear, so that the audience may see her withdraw within when she dismisses Salisbury; and see her "stoop" to the earth and sit there prone, crouching on her haunches, in the dignity of her sorrows, disobeying the royal summons. Only Arthur, with a double fitness, is with her, to draw down the foreflap of the tent upon her woe, and thus Shakespeare has cleared his stage while bowing, himself, before the imperious sorrows of the royal mother. This arrangement demands the striking out of the present Act division, and the transposition of the preceding *Scæna Secunda* and the present *Actus Secundus*. The righting of a mere misprint of transposition is all that is necessary to give us the arrangement obviously intended by the Folio division.'

1. **Actus Tertius, Scæna prima**] The majority of editors have followed Theobald's arrangement and made this but a continuation of the preceding scene; therefore to facilitate reference the line numbers as given in the *Globe* Edition are here placed in brackets in addition to the number as in the Folio; in all cases, however, the latter are used both in the *Commentary* and the *Text. Notes*.—ED.

3. **Constance**] FLEAY (*Chron. of Eng. Drama*, ii, 199): [In the Folio stage direction] Salisbury and Arthur are not on the stage, as the modern editors, with one exception, have them. I am the exception, and deserve praise for my courage, or blame for my rashness, in adhering to the version of Shakespeare's fellows.

6, 7. **the . . . sunne Stayes in his course**] Miss E. PHIPSON (*Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1887–92, p. 352): To men accustomed to think that this earth was the centre of the universe, and that the planets rolled in their spheres for no other purpose

Turning with ſplendor of his precious eye 8
The meager cloddy earth to glittering gold: [80]
The yearely courſe that brings this day about, 10
Shall neuer ſee it, but a holy day.
Conſt. A wicked day, and not a holy day.
What hath this day deſeru'd? what hath it done,
That it in golden letters ſhould be ſet 14 [85]

9. *glittering*] *glitt'ring* Rowe ii, Pope, +.
11, 12. *holy day*] *Holy-day* F. *holiday* Cam.+, Del. Words. Neils. Craig.
12. *A...day.*] Om. Pope.
wicked day,] *wicked day,* [rising] Cap.
12. *a holy*] *an holy* Theob. Warb. Johns.
day.] Ff, Rowe. *day:*— Cap. *day.*—[Rising] Theob. et cet.
14. *letters*] *letter* Warb. Johns.

than to give light and beauty to this all-important orb, there was no difficulty in supposing that the lives and fortunes of the dwellers on this planet were a subject of interest to the heavenly bodies. It was a beautiful, if unscientific, theory that in important crises of human affairs the sun or moon should stand still for a while to watch or aid the progress of events. If this theory somewhat diminished the dignity of the heavens it certainly had the effect of adding to the glory of man; moreover, it served Shakespeare's purpose in this way to connect the outer world with the physical and mental condition of his characters. [Miss Phipson, in support of this, quotes the present passage, and also: '—the air, which but for vacancy Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra too, And made a gap in nature.'—*Ant. & Cleo.*, II, ii, 221; likewise from *Rom. & Jul.*: 'A glooming peace this morning with it brings; The sun for sorrow will not show his head.'—V, iii, 305. Compare, V, v, 3–6 below.—ED.]—T. CARTER (*Sh. & Holy Scrip.*, p. 207) compares for this idea: 'So the sunne abode in the middes of the heaven, and hasted not to goe downe for a whole day. And there was no day like that before it, nor after it, that the Lord heard the voyce of a man: for the Lord fought for Israel.'—*Joshua*, x, 13 (*Genevan Vers.*).

7. **playes the Alchymist**] STEEVENS: Milton has borrowed this thought: '—Rivers run Potable gold, when with one virtuous touch Th' Arch-chemic sun so far from us remote Produces with terrestrial humor mixt Here in the dark so many precious things.'—*Paradise Lost*, Bk iii, [l. 609].—MALONE: So in our Author's xxxiii. *Sonnet:* 'Gilding pale streams with heavenly alchymy.'—MARSHALL, in reference to this last comparison by Malone, says: 'It is always interesting to mark any similarity of expression between the Sonnets and the earlier plays, in view of the theory that the Sonnets were written by Shakespeare when young; this is, certainly, a remarkable one.'

9. **meager**] DEIGHTON: In *Mer. of Ven.*, III, ii, 104, 'meagre lead,' the colour of which is much the same as that of earth, is mentioned in connection with 'gaudy gold'; but the meaning of 'meagre' is *scanty, barren*, and both there and here the contrast is rather between poverty and richness, than between the dulness and brightness of colour.

14. **golden letters**] IVOR JOHN: Probably a reference to the 'golden number' used in calculating the feast days of the Church.—[DEIGHTON queries, also, whether there be not here an allusion to the Dominical Letter and the Golden Number.

Among the high tides in the Kalender? 15 [86]
Nay, rather turne this day out of the weeke,
This day of ſhame, oppreſſion, periury.
Or if it muſt ſtand ſtill, let wiues with childe
Pray that their burthens may not fall this day, [90]
Leſt that their hopes prodigiouſly be croſt: 20
But (on this day) let Sea-men feare no wracke, [92]

16. *rather*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Cam.+, Fle. Craig. *rather*, Cap. et cet.

17–24. *This day...change.*] Om. Dono.

18, 19. *Or...Pray*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Coll. ii, iii, Wh. i. *Or,...Pray*, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *Or... Pray*, Coll. i, Del. *Or,...Pray* Dyce, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Fle. Words. Neils. Craig.

19. *burthens*] *burdens* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal.

20. *croſt*] *cross'd:* Mal. et seq. (*cross'd.* Ktly).

21. *But (on this day)*] F_3F_4. (*But on this day*) F_2. *But, on this day*, Rowe i, Theob. Hal. *But on this day*, Rowe ii, Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. i, ii, Huds. i, Wh. i. *Except on this day*, Pope, Han. *But on this day* Dyce, Ktly, Sta. Cam. +, Del. Coll. iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig.

I think it is, however, more likely that this refers to the old custom of printing, in the Church calendar, the Saint's days and Holidays in red letters; the terms *red* and *gold* were nearly synonymous, many examples of which might be furnished, as one which seems peculiarly applicable compare: 'My red dominical, my golden letter.'—*Love's Labor's Lost*, V, ii, 44. See also note on I, ii, 342 above.—ED.]

15. **high tides**] STEEVENS: That is, solemn seasons, times to be observed above others.—MALONE (*Supplemental Obs.*, i, 168): I do not suppose that the Poet used 'high tides' as synonymous to *solemn seasons*. The meaning, I apprehend, is, Why should this day be set down in the calendar, in golden letters, among the *high tides* and other remarkable occurrences, which are distinguished by a special mark? The 'high tides' are marked in every almanac.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 37): Mr Malone did not reflect that 'high tides' bear a very different meaning from his intention. They are marks of ruin and desolation, not of prosperity and festivity; and, I believe, are oftener found in chronological tables than in the rubric of a calendar. [As Malone did not repeat the foregoing note in any subsequent edition, it may be presumed that he felt the force of this rebuke by Davies and accepted Steevens's explanation.—ED.]

16. **turne this day . . . weeke**] UPTON (*Crit. Obs.*, ed. ii, p. 224): In allusion to *Job*, iii, 3: 'Let the day perish,' &c. And v. 6: 'Let it not be joined unto the days of the year, let it not come into the number of the months.'—[Other later commentators, notably, Wordsworth, Carter, Eaton, and Wright, have called attention to the similarity in thought contained in these two passages.—ED.]—MALONE: Compare *Macbeth:* 'Let this pernicious hour Stand aye accursed in the calendar!'—IV, i, 133.

20. **prodigiously be crost**] STEEVENS: That is, be disappointed by the production of a prodigy, a monster. So, in *Mid. N. Dream*, 'Nor mark prodigious such as are Despised in nativity.'—[V, i, 419. Compare also l. 48, preceding scene.]

21. **But (on this day)**] JOHNSON: That is, *except* on this day. [For other examples see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 128.]

No bargaines breake that are not this day made; 22 [93]
This day all things begun, come to ill end,
Yea, faith it ſelfe to hollow falſhood change. [95]
Fra. By heauen Lady, you ſhall haue no cauſe 25
To curſe the faire proceedings of this day:
Haue I not pawn'd to you my Maieſty?
Conſt. You haue beguil'd me with a counterfeit
Reſembling Maieſty, which being touch'd and tride, [100]
Proues valueleſſe: you are forſworne, forſworne, 30
You came in Armes to ſpill mine enemies bloud, [102]

23. *This day*] *This day,* Theob. et seq.
come] *came* Pope.
24. *it ſelfe*] *it ſelf,* F_3F_4, Rowe. *itself* Warb. et seq.
change.] *chang'd.* Pope. *change!* Theob. et seq.
25. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe.
29. *Maieſty, which*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *majesty, which,* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Coll. Cam.+, Del. Neils. *majesty; which* Var. '85. *majesty; which,* Cap. et cet.
being] Om. Pope,+.
29. *touch'd and*] Om. Dono.
tride] *try'd* F_3F_4. *tried* Steev.
30. *valueleſſe:*] *valueless.* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Del. Fle. Dono. Neils.
forſworne,] Ff, Rowe i, Warb. Johns. *forsworn.* Rowe ii, Pope, Theob. Han. *forsworn!* Var. '73, Neils. *forsworn;* Cap. et cet.
31. *mine*] *my* F_4, Rowe.
enemies] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. *enemy's* Var. '85. *enemies'* Cap. et cet.
bloud] *blood* F_3F_4.

22. **No bargaines breake**] STEEVENS: In the ancient almanacs (several of which I have in my possession) the days supposed to be favorable or unfavorable to bargains are distinguished among a number of other particulars of the like importance.—[Steevens then gives several examples from later plays wherein allusion is made to this custom of the ancient almanac makers. This feature was continued even down to the eighteenth century, notably in those almanacs issued by Coley, entitled *The Starry Messenger.* See an interesting article on this subject by Thomas Wright in Macmillan's *Magazine,* Jan., 1863, p. 161.—ED.]

28. **a counterfeit**] MALONE: That is, a false coin. A 'counterfeit' formerly signified also a *portrait.* A representation of the king being usually impressed on his coin, the word seems to be here used equivocally.

29. **touch'd and tride**] STEEVENS: 'Being touch'd' signifies, having the *touch-stone* applied to it. The two last words, 'and tried,' which create a redundancy of measure, should, as Mr Ritson observes, be omitted.—[For this observation of Ritson I regret that I am unable to give any reference other than Steevens, in whose ed. 1793 it appears for the first time.—WALKER (*Vers.,* 174), with the same end in view—mending the irregularity of the metre—declares that 'majesty' is here to be pronounced as a dissyllable—that is, *maj-ty* or *mashly.*—ED.]

30. **forsworne, forsworne**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh. Key,* p. 629) call attention to the 'remarkable abundance of passages with repeated similar words in this play.' See ll. 36, 41, and 43 below. I think we might go even further in saying that such repetitions are peculiarly characteristic of Constance; of the nine passages quoted by the Cowden-Clarkes, seven are from speeches by Constance. See III, iii, 24, 29, 63.—ED.

But now in Armes, you ſtrengthen it with yours. 32 [103]
The grapling vigor, and rough frowne of Warre
Is cold in amitie, and painted peace, 34 [105]

32. *yours.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Ktly, Sta. Fle. Rlfe, Neils. *yours;* Cap. et cet.
34. *cold*] *cool'd* Han. *clad* Cap. Rann. *in amitie*] *inanity* J. Beale (N. & Q., 4 Nov., 1871, p. 384). *inamity* Crowdown (Ib., p. 504). *painted*] *faint in* Coll. iii. (MS.).

31, 32. **in Armes . . . in Armes**] JOHNSON: I am afraid here is a clinch intended: 'You came *in war* to destroy my enemies, but now you strengthen them *in embraces.*'—W. W. LLOYD (*Athenæum*, Aug. 24, 1878, p. 240): Johnson's note is, at least, an admission of a certain hesitation about the line as expressive of a continued warlike attitude, and thus contradictory to the antithesis between peace and war in the next two lines. It is the conviction that the antithesis of the last two lines is intended to strengthen that of the two preceding, which suggests to me this correction: 'But now *unarm'd* you strengthen it,' etc. This correction implies that the kings and their attendants, who, in the previous scene, at the end of the second Act, were in the warlike equipment befitting an impending conflict in the field, make their appearance in the present scene, on their return from the marriage ceremony, which reconciled them, not merely in the meeds of peace, but even in something of the appropriate bedizenment of the festive occasion. The value of such a contrast to the previous scene even theatrically, and still more to the misery of Constance, who has thrown herself on the ground in a rage of pride and grief and obstinacy just as the wedding train comes in, is manifest, and that it was not neglected by the Author is quite borne out by the general context. . . . We have to assume that the transliteration by the reader or compositor involved a substitution of 'in arms' for *vnarmed*, as the word is spelt elsewhere in the Folio. But such an error is moderate enough for printers of any time; it is too familiar to many how the occurrence of *unarm'd* exactly below so similar a combination as 'in arms' in the previous line would be likely to invite confusion. Be it frankly admitted that in this case the received reading does not make nonsense, especially if care be taken not to throw emphatic stress upon 'arms' in either line. But assuredly we help ourselves so to a halting antithesis: 'You cáme in arms to spíll mine enemies blóod; But nów in arms you stréngthen it with yoúrs.' As against this, the contention is that Shakespeare wrote: 'You came in árms to spíll mine enemies blóod; But now únarm'd you stréngthen it with yoúrs.' And so I leave the case, and so it stands for judgment.

34. **cold in amitie . . . painted peace**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 126): 'Cold,' the former reading for *clad*, cannot be predicated of either the 'vigour' or 'frown' of war without the greatest absurdity; nor is the absurdity lessen'd by the Oxford editor's [Hanmer's]—*cool'd*. It is apparently the speaker's intention to contrast the war she had seen with what she sees now; and she could not more effectually do it than by attiring (poetically) the late frowning and vigorous war in the soft habits of peace and friendship; 'painted' is peculiarly happy, as including the idea of gawdiness and hypocrisy jointly; it is therefore emphatical.—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 203): Why should the epithet 'painted' be applied to peace? What propriety is there in it, unless we can suppose it used to indicate hollowness and falsehood? The correction in the margin of the Folio, 1632, shows that the ear of the scribe misled him: Constance is referring to the friendship just established

And our oppreſſion hath made vp this league: 35 [106]

35. *hath*] *had* F_2. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Ktly, Cam.+, Del.
league:] *league.* Pope, Han. Coll. Words. Neils. Craig.

between France and England, to the ruin of her hopes, and remarks: 'The grappling vigour, and rough frown of war, Is cold in amity, and *faint in* peace.'—SINGER (*Sh. Vindicated*, p. 85): Now it appears to me that there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the old text, nor has it ever before been doubted. Constance upbraids Philip with having 'beguil'd her with a counterfeit.' He came in arms to spill her enemies' blood, but now his warlike help against John is cooled down into a league with him,—the rough collision of war to the smooth or 'painted' courtesies of peace. But if any change should be thought advisable it would not be the substitution of the Corrector—'*faint in* peace'—but '*feigns* a peace.' The old reading, being perfectly intelligible, should not, however, be disturbed.—STAUNTON: The ingenious annotator of Mr Collier's Folio would read: '*faint in* peace'; but if any alteration be required, of which I am by no means certain, it should be simply to read *coil'd* for 'cold.' The meaning seems to be: The vigorous arms are coil'd in amity, and grim-visaged war become a smooth-faced peace.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: This line appears to us to be a continuation of the figurative allusion to a portrait or picture; and that the whole phrase means, 'the contentious vigour of appearance, and threatening warlike visage with which you came here on our behalf is now turned into a lifeless pretence of amity and simulated peace.'—C. M. CHARNOCK (1871, *N. & Q.*, IV, viii, 220): Mr Collier says: 'Why should the epithet "painted" be applied to peace?' . . . I take it that 'painted' is here used figuratively. Compare *Hamlet:* 'Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it, Than is my deed to my most painted word.'—III, i, 53.—ELZE (*Notes*, etc., 2nd Series, p. 58): Mr Collier's MS. Corrector, whoever he may have been, has rightly felt the want of symmetrical agreement between the two clauses of the second line, but the remedy by which he has meant to restore it seems to be wrong. I rather incline to the belief that Shakespeare wrote: 'Is *scolding* amity and painted peace.' Constance reproaches King Philip with perjury, and denounces his warlike preparations as a sham; they are, she says, not more dreadful than amity, which scolds a friend, or peace which is painted to look like war. The required harmony of the sentence is thus very naturally recovered; and I need not dwell on the easy misapprehension by which the words *Is scolding*, particularly when spoken, can be transmuted into 'Is cold in.'—[The foregoing note, with a few slight verbal changes, appeared first in a communication by Elze to the *Athenæum*, June 22, 1867, and was later included by him among his notes contributed to the German Shakespeare Society's ed. of the Schlegel-Tieck translation, under the editorship of Ulrici, in that same year. As this volume of *Notes*, 2nd Series, appeared in 1880, it may therefore, I think, be taken as the final form in which he wished it to appear.—ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 40): Capell alters 'cold' to *clad;* but this does not imply change in the essence of the matter which is changed, and 'frowns and grapples' are not objects which require clothing or allow of it. I propose with confidence: 'Is *clos'd* in amity,' etc. '*Closed*' is *ended*, and there is therein a strong tinge, too, of the same sense which is predominant in a passage in *Jul. Cæs.*, 'To close In terms of friendship with thine enemies,' III, i, 202, where it seems to be applied to circumstances very like those which the Poet now describes. . . . The loss of a single letter and the transposition of a single letter effected the corruption of *closd* into 'cold.'

Arme, arme, you heauens, againſt theſe periur'd Kings, 36 [107]
A widdow cries, be husband to me (heauens)
Let not the howres of this vngodly day
Weare out the daies in Peace; but ere Sun-ſet, [110]
Set armed diſcord 'twixt theſe periur'd Kings, 40

36. *you heauens*] *you Heav'ns* Rowe. *ye heav'ns* Pope,+. (*ye heavens* Var. '73).
Kings,] *kings!* Cap. et seq.
37. *cries,*] *cries;* Cap. et seq.
me (*heauens*)] Ff. *me, Heav'ns,* Rowe. *me, heav'n!* Pope,+ (*me, heaven!* Var. '73). *me, heavens,* Fle. *me, heavens!* Cap. et cet.
39. *daies*] *day* Theob. et seq.
Sun-ſet] *sun set* Fleay, Anon. ap. Cam. ii.
40. *armed*] *armèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words.
Kings,] *kings!* Cap. et seq.

36. **Arme, arme, you heauens**] MATTHEWS (p. 98): [Constance's] later outbreaks are hysteric, even if they are the result of maternal devotion. She is superb in mother-love and eloquent in high-sounding words; but her temper is painfully shrewish and she revels in her opportunities for vehement protest. Her violence therefore detracts not a little from the pathos of her plight, and even from the appeal of her heartfelt plaints. Overdone as they seem to us now, her swelling invectives, excited by a natural emotion, must have been grateful to the boy-actor entrusted with the part (possibly the same youthful performer who was soon to be entrusted with Katherine in the *Taming of the Shrew*).—[Pleasant as this last conjecture may be in contemplation, I fear that the cold, hard facts of dates make it very unlikely. There was an interval of at least ten years between the first performance of *King John* at the Theatre in Shoreditch and *Tam. of Shr.* at the Globe; the company had likewise undergone many changes in personnel during that period—ED.]

37. **A widdow cries**] GREY (i, 283): An allusion to *Psalm* lxviii, 5: 'He is father of the fatherless, and defendeth the cause of the widows.'—WATSON (p. 136): Compare: 'Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child; if thou afflict them in anywise, and they cry at all unto Me, I will surely hear their cry.'—*Exodus,* xxii, 22.—CARTER (p. 208) also quotes this passage from *Exodus,* and likewise the following from the Apocryphal book *Judith:* 'O God, O my God, heare me also a widow.'—xiv, 4. [Carter's design is to show that the many scriptural parallels throughout the plays prove a familiarity, on the part of Shakespeare, with the Genevan Version of 1560, rather than the Bishop's Bible of 1568.—ED.]

39. **Sun-set**] FLEAY reads 'sun set' on the ground that Shakespeare pronounces *súnset* always for the noun. *3 Henry VI:* II, ii, 116, not by Shakespeare, has *sunsét* (noun). So has Chettle, *Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington,* [ed. Haz.-Dods., viii,] p. 294.—ROLFE: Perhaps Fleay is right. The only other passages in which the noun occurs are *Sonnet* lxxiii, 6, and *Rom. & Jul.,* III, v, 127.—MARSHALL: I had altered 'sun-set' to *sun set* before I saw that Mr Fleay had made the same suggestion. In *Rom. & Jul.,* III, v, 127, 128: 'When the sun sets, the air doth drizzle dew; But for the sunset of my brother's son,' &c. There we have *sun sets* and the noun *sunset* coming close together, the accent being in the first case on *sets,* and in the second on *sun.* [Marshall also quotes the line from *Sonnet* lxxiii, already cited by Rolfe.]

40. **Set armed discord**] JOHNSON: Shakespeare makes this bitter curse effectual.

Heare me, Oh, heare me. 41 [112]
Auſt. Lady *Conſtance*, peace.
Conſt. War, war, no peace, peace is to me a warre:
O *Lymoges*, O *Auſtria*, thou doſt ſhame
That bloudy ſpoyle: thou ſlaue, thou wretch, ỹ coward, 45 [115]

41. *Heare me,*] *Hear me!* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Craig.
Oh, heare me.] Ff, Rowe i, Fle. *O, hear me!* Cap. *Oh hear me!* Rowe ii. et cet.
42. *peace.*] *peace!* Coll. Sing. ii, Dyce, Hal. Wh. Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Del. Craig.
43. *War, war, no peace,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Fle. *War! war! no peace!* Var. '73 et cet.
44. Lymoges,] *Lymoges!* Var. '73 et seq.
Auſtria,] F_2F_3, Cap. Anſtria, F_4. *Austria!* Pope et cet.
45. *coward,*] *coward!* Dyce, Hal. Cam. +, Words. Neils. Craig.

43. **War, war, no peace**] BUCKNILL (*Mad-Folk*, etc., p. 276): When Constance, unobserved before, rises from the ground amidst the congratulating court, with the dignified and solemn denunciation of kingly treachery, one of the finest possible dramatic effects is produced with the simplest means. Her eloquence throughout this scene is magnificent. The interests even of kingdoms seem below its lofty aim. The truth of kings, and, as a minor term, the truth of all other men, is counterfeit. The invocation to the Heavens, that they should arm for her and be husband to her, and set discord betwixt these perjured kings, is the climax of eloquence. To Austria's entreaty, 'Lady Constance, peace,' she replies in utter forgetfulness of all miseries except her own: 'War! War! no peace!' No idea of the Pythoness, or of any woman inspired by good or evil influences, ever represented a more ecstatic state of eloquent emotion. The Poet's own representation of inspired insanity, Cassandra in *Troilus & Cressida*, is tame and indistinct in comparison: 'Cry Trojans cry! Lend me ten thousand eyes And I will fill them with prophetic tears.'—[II, ii, 101].

43. **O Lymoges, O Austria**] See note II, i, 8.—F. VICTOR-HUGO (iii, 460): This confusion of two historic characters, which is found also in the older play, was without doubt a tradition of the English stage, a popular tradition which, in attributing an odious rôle to a member of the house of Austria, authorized a number of hostile allusions to that perfidious enemy of England.

45. **thou slaue, thou wretch**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 37): This vehement charge of perfidy, cowardice, perjury, and every species of villainy, which is concluded with the most stinging reproach and contemptuous raillery, requires the utmost skill of the speaker. Mrs [Theophilus] Cibber's voice was so happily modulated by a most accurate ear that every maternal word in this uncommon burst of indignation was impressed so judiciously and harmoniously upon the audience that they could not refrain a loud and repeated testimony of their approbation. But part of the pleasure to be obtained from this scene must be owing to the corresponding behaviour of Austria; if he does not contribute to the general deception by feeling the reproaches of Constance, the vigour of the sentiments will be weakened, and the intention of the author disappointed. The character of Austria is very unamiable; and Mrs Cibber, when the play was first in rehearsal, could not easily prevail on Winstone to make Austria appear as odious to an audience as he ought. Winstone was an actor of singular skill in two or three parts:

Thou little valiant, great in villanie,
Thou euer ſtrong vpon the ſtronger ſide;
Thou Fortunes Champion, that do'ſt neuer fight
But when her humourous Ladiſhip is by
To teach thee ſafety: thou art periur'd too,
And ſooth'ſt vp greatneſſe. What a foole art thou,
A ramping foole, to brag, and ſtamp, and ſweare,
Vpon my partie: thou cold blooded ſlaue,
Haſt thou not ſpoke like thunder on my ſide?
Beene ſworne my Souldier, bidding me depend

46. *little valiant*] *little-valiant* Del. *villanie,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Fle. *villany!* Theob. et cet.
47. *ſide;*] *side!* Var. '73 et seq.
48. *Fortunes*] *Fortune's* Rowe.
50. *ſafety:*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Fle. *safety!* Theob. et cet.
51. *art*] *wert* Lettsom. Huds. ii.
52. *foole,*] *fool,*— Hal.
52. *and ſtamp*] *to ſtamp* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
53. *partie:*] *party!* Cap. et seq. *cold blooded*] *cold-blooded* Rowe et seq.
54. *ſide?*] *side,* Rowe, Pope, Han. Cam.+.
55. *Souldier,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. *soldier?* Cap. et cet.

he was as honest and awkward a country booby in John Moody, in the *Provok'd Husband*, as the author designed him; and, in Ben Jonson's Downright, [*Every Man in his Humour*,] he made an excellent grotesque picture of abrupt plain-dealing and unfashionable simplicity. . . . It was impossible for any man long to resist the persuasive manner of Mrs Cibber; Winstone fully answered her idea of Austria's character.

51. **sooth'st vp**] WRIGHT: That is, *flatterest*. Compare: 'You soothed not, therefore hurt not.'—*Coriol.*, II, ii, 77. 'Up' is emphatic, as in IV, iii, 142. See Holland's Plutarch, *Morals*, p. 86: 'These parasites (I say) whose toong (as one said verie well) will be walking so soone as men have washed their hands, and be readie to sit downe to meate, cogging and soothing up their good masters at everie word.'—[COLLIER quotes in illustration Lodge, *Fig for Momus*, 1595, 'To wink at follies and to sooth up sins.'—*Satire i.*; but this is not a parallel at all; 'sooth up' there means to *smooth* or *gloss over*, which it could not possibly mean here. (See CRAIGIE, *N. E. D.*, s. v. soothe, vb. 6 b.)—IVOR JOHN compares Greene, *Friar Bacon*, 1594: 'This is a fairing, gentle sir, indeed To soothe me up with such smooth flatterie.'—I, iii, 21, 22. A somewhat better illustration than that from Holland's Plutarch, as it is nearer the date of the present play.—ED.]

52. **ramping**] WRIGHT: 'Ramping' is suggested by the lion's skin which Austria wears, and is a proper epithet of the lion, in the sense of tearing, pawing. So in *3 Henry VI:* V, ii, 13: 'Under whose shade the ramping lion slept.'—IVOR JOHN: That is, *wildly gesticulating*. Cotgrave gives: '*Grimpement:* a climbing, crawling, creeping, ramping, running upwards'; and, '*Grimper:* to ramp.' 'Lion rampant' in heraldry ought therefore to mean a lion climbing, and this is just the attitude of the lion's 'rampant' given in Woodward and Burnett's *Heraldry*, i, plate xxi. It would require little imagination, however, to deem this the representation of a lion seeking whom he might devour, and there is no doubt that in this speech of Constance 'ramping' bears the meaning of rushing wildly about.

Vpon thy ſtarres, thy fortune, and thy ſtrength, 56 [126]
And doſt thou now fall ouer to my foes?
Thou weare a Lyons hide, doff it for ſhame,
And hang a Calues skin on thoſe recreant limbes.
Auſ. O that a man ſhould ſpeake thoſe words to me. 60 [130]
Phil. And hang a Calues-skin on thoſe recreant limbs

56. *ſtrength,*] Ff, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. *strength?* Rowe et cet.
57. *foes*] *foe* F_2.
58. *weare*] *wears* F_4. *wear'st* Rowe. *wear* Pope et seq.
hide,] F_4. *hide?* F_2F_3, Rowe, Pope. *hide;* Fle. *hide!* Theob. et cet.
59. *Calues skin*] *Calves-skin* F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. *calf's-skin* Cap. et seq.
60. *ſhould*] *would* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85.
me.] *me!* Theob. et seq.
61, 62. Phil. *And...thy life.*] Om. Dono.
61, 63. *Calues-skin*] F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope,+. *Calves skin* F_2, Fle. *calf's-skin* Cap. Var. '73 et seq.

59. **Calues skin**] Sir JOHN HAWKINS: When fools were kept for diversion in great families, they were distinguished by a calf's-skin coat, which had the buttons down the back; and this they wore that they might be known for fools, and escape the resentment of those whom they provoked with their waggeries. In a little penny book, entitled *The Birth, Life, and Death of John Franks, with the Pranks he played though a meer Fool*, mention is made in several places of a calf's-skin. In ch. x. of this book Jack is said to have made his appearance at his lord's table having then a new calf-skin red and white spotted. This fact will explain the sarcasm of Constance and Faulconbridge, who mean to call Austria a *fool*.—STEEVENS: I may add that the custom is still preserved in Ireland; and the fool, in any of the legends which the mummers act at Christmas, always appears in a calf's or cow's skin. [Steevens quotes four passages from the old play *Wily Beguiled*, wherein reference is made to a 'calf's skin' as the garb of the fool or jester.—ED.]—RITSON (*Remarks*, etc., p. 81): It does not appear that Constance means to call Austria a *fool*, as Sir John Hawkins would have it; but she certainly means to call him a *coward*, and to tell him that *calf's skin* would suit his 'recreant limbs' better than a lion's. They still say of a dastardly person that he is a *calf-hearted fellow;* and a run-away schoolboy is usually called a great *calf*.—MALONE: The speaker in the play [*Wily Beguiled*] is Robin Goodfellow. Perhaps, as has been suggested, Constance, by clothing Austria in a 'calf's-skin,' means only to insinuate that he is a coward. The word 'recreant' seems to favour such a supposition.—[Ritson is, I think, undoubtedly right; it is the cowardice of Austria to which Constance refers, not his qualification for a fool or jester.—ED.]

60. **O that a man . . . to me**] DYCE: I am rather surprised that the commentators, in their rage for discovering parallel passages, should have overlooked the following one in Sydney's *Arcadia:* 'O God (cried out Pyrocles), that thou wert a man that vsest these words vnto me!'—lib. iii, p. 315, ed. 1598.—GERVINUS (p. 369): The old play makes Faulconbridge in this scene in love with Blanche; Shakespeare judiciously omitted this trait, that the Bastard's judgment, which should guide us in all these matters, might not in any way be injured by personal interest; his fierce attack upon Austria, in the spirit of the enemy Constance, is thus the wholly pure expression of honorable disgust at unnatural alliances, aye, of joy at their interruption, and of design in their dissolution.

Auſ. Thou dar'ſt not ſay ſo villaine for thy life. 62
*Phil.*And hang a Calues-skin on thoſe recreant limbs. [132]

62. *dar'ſt*] *darest* Cam. Glo. Cla. Huds. ii. 62. *ſo villaine*] *ſo, Villain,* F$_4$.

63. **And hang . . . limbs.]** After this line Pope inserts the following twelve lines from the *Troublesome Raigne:*

'*Aust.* Me thinks that Richard's pride and Richard's fall
Should be a precedent to fright you, Sir.
Bast. What words are these? how do my sinews shake?
My father's foe clad in my father's spoil!
How doth Alecto whisper in my ear;
Delay not Richard, kill the villain strait,
Disrobe him of the matchless monument,
Thy father's triumph o'er the savages—
Now by his soul I swear, my father's soul,
Twice will I not review the morning's rise,
Till I have torn that trophy from thy back,
And split thy heart, for wearing it so long.'

In justification of his interpolation Pope says: 'What was the ground of this quarrel of the Bastard to Austria is nowhere specify'd in the present play; nor is there in this place or the scene where it is first hinted at (namely, the second of Act II.) the least mention of any reason for it. But the story is, that *Austria,* who kill'd *K. Richard Cœur-de-lion,* wore as the spoil of that Prince a Lion's hide which had belong'd to him. This circumstance renders the anger of the Bastard very natural, and ought not to have been omitted. In the first sketch of this play (which *Shakespeare* is said to have had a hand in jointly with *William Rowley*) we accordingly find this insisted upon, and I have ventured to place a few of those verses here.'—[On the question of Shakespeare's joint authorship of the *Troublesome Raigne,* see note I, i, 1.]—THEOBALD (who also inserted these lines) says: 'As the verses are not bad, I have not casheer'd them; tho' I do not conceive them so absolutely essential to clearing up any circumstance of the action, as Mr Pope seems to imagine. . . . "The ground of this quarrel is nowhere specified in the present play." This is the Editor's assertion; but let us examine how well it is grounded. In the very beginning of the 2nd Act, the Dauphin, speaking of Austria to young Arthur, says: "Richard, that robb'd the lion of his heart. . . . By this brave Duke came early to his grave." To which Arthur replies: "God shall forgive you Cœur-de-lion's death, The rather that you give his offspring life." Is not this a sufficient ground for Faulconbridge's quarrel to Austria? It may be objected, Faulconbridge is not present to hear this. But, what if he be not? So the audience be informed duly of the circumstance, the fact was too notorious to suppose Faulconbridge did not know of it. The ground of his quarrel is fairly implied in that knowledge; and the Poet's art, perhaps, better shown (if we were to contend the point) to let the information come from any other mouth than that of Faulconbridge. But then to a second material point.' [Here follows the last part of Pope's note objecting to the omission of the fact that Austria was wearing Cœur-de-lion's robe of a lion's skin.] 'But is it omitted? Or, else, 'tis but begging the question. In the 3d Act, when Lady Constance per-

[63. **And hang a Calues-skin on those recreant limbs**]

ceives that Austria has abandon'd her interest, she says to him: "O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame That bloody spoil. Thou wear a lion's hide! doff it, for shame." Now Faulconbridge is present here, and sees Austria thus habited. But before, in the 2nd Act, where Faulconbridge begins to quarrel with Austria, let us attend to their dialogue: "*Aust.* What the devil art thou? *Faulc.* One that will play the devil, sir, with you, An' he may catch your hide and you alone." But may it not here again be objected that though Faulconbridge saw Austria clad in a lion's hide, yet he might not know it to be the very hide which was worn by K. Richard, his Father? But to put that point out of all doubt, let us only hear what Lady Blanch immediately replies: "O well did he become that lion's hide, That did disrobe the lion of that robe." I submit it, therefore, whether these lines have not been inserted rather arbitrarily than necessarily. Upon the whole, as Mr Pope has generally been unfortunate in his criticisms, so he is no less unhappy in his diligence, when he would aim at giving a reason for what he does.' [In his second ed. Theobald retains the inserted lines, and omits entire any mention of Pope's note or his own objections to it. Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson follow Pope's text.—ED.]—JOHNSON: To the insertion of these lines I have nothing to object. There are many other passages in the old play of great value. The omission of this incident, in the second draught, was natural. Shakespeare, having familiarised the story to his own imagination, forgot that it was obscure to his audience; or, what is equally probable, the story was then so popular that a hint was sufficient at that time to bring it to mind, and these plays were written with very little care for the approbation of posterity.—CAPELL (vol. i, pt ii, p. 126): After the arch rejoinder of Richard to a sort of challenge of Austria's (l. 62), they who look into any of the four latter moderns [Pope, Theob., Han., Warb.] will find Richard and Austria both in a different vein; that of the former, one they have never seen him in yet, nor ever will do; but in the lines that follow, which the second modern pick'd up in the Quarto, or pick'd out of it rather; for a speech of twenty-four lines is reduc'd to ten, changes made in those ten, and another place found for them, the speech from which they are taken coming in before the summons to Angiers, [I, ii, 216]. We shall give the reader the speech, and a speech before it, as the inserter has given them (marking briefly their changes, and the garblings of one of them) and then leave him to his reflections. [Here follow the lines as given by Pope]. Between 'spoil' [l. 4] and 'How' [l. 5] come in three foolish lines, nine after 'savages' [l. 8] foolisher than the former, nor does the speech end at 'long'; and 'all,' 'Philip' and 'For' are the Quarto's expressions in place of those [in ll. 2, 6, 9, *Sir; Richard; Now*].• The cause alleged for inserting is as curious as the insertion itself; it were idle to mention it, because a step of this sort is to be justified by no reasons whatever; certainly not by those that are given; which the most indiligent reader may overturn of himself; which are overturn'd by the third modern [Theobald], who (notwithstanding) is one of the followers of what himself proves unnecessary, and of what is here prov'd absurd.—STEEVENS objects to the insertion of these lines on the ground that the older play was printed in 1591, 'before Shakespeare appears to have commenced a writer.'—TYRWHITT: I cannot, by any means, approve of the insertion of these lines from the other play. If they were necessary to 'explain the ground of the Bastard's quarrel to Austria,' as Mr Pope supposes, they should rather be inserted in the first scene of the second Act, at the time of *the first altercation* between the

*Iohn.*We like not this, thou doſt forget thy ſelfe. [134]
Enter Pandulph. 65

64. *ſelfe.*] *self.* SCENE II. Pope. *self.* SCENE III. Han. Warb. Johns.
65. Pandulph.] Pandulpho. Johns.
Pandulph, attended. Cap. Huds. ii, Words. (After l. 66 Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.)

Bastard and Austria. But indeed the ground of their quarrel seems to be as clearly expressed in the first scene as in these lines; so that they are unnecessary in either place; and therefore, I think, should be thrown out of the text, as well as the three other lines which have been inserted, with as little reason in Act III, scene ii: 'Thus hath King Richard's,' etc.—PYE (p. 141): The insertion of these spirited lines by Pope do as much honor to the taste of Pope as the rejection of them are disgraceful to the taste of Tyrwhitt. They are so much in the spirit of Shakespeare that it is a shame they should be rejected on the chronological authority by Steevens. Garrick, whose judgment with regard to Shakespeare is worth that of a million such critics as Steevens, always spoke them, and with an energy that always met with loud applause.—HALLIWELL: There is great spirit in this addition [from the older play], which would no doubt be spoken effectively on the stage by a competent actor, but it is impossible to sanction its incorporation into the text, were it only that the sentiment is not in consonance with the intention of the dialogue, where the Bastard is treating Austria with the greatest contempt quite irreconcilable here with an outburst of angry passion; and, moreover, these two speeches do not occur in that part of the old play corresponding with the present scene.—[Bell's edition, 1773, which purports to give the text of *King John* as acted at Drury Lane, contains these interpolated lines; that they were spoken by Garrick we have on the testimony of Pye. J. P. Kemble, whose acting copy was published in 1804, wisely omits them; and they do not, therefore, appear in any of the subsequent acting editions, viz.: Inchbald, Oxberry, and Cumberland.—ED.]

64. **We like not this**] A notable line, as the only instance where King John rebukes that bluntness in Philip which was one of the traits which first attracted him.—ED.

65. **Pandulph**] OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 21): The most important part among the opponents of John is that of Pandulph, who, moreover, was not historically Cardinal of Milan, but archdeacon. It is a finely delineated rôle of an intriguer, which is become the typical model for a whole tribe of spiritual diplomats. Pride, cleverness, casuistical sharpness, jesuitical cunning, lack of regard in the choice even of immoral means, as long only as they lead to the one fixed goal, the strengthening and widening the power of Rome, all these fix a stamp upon the rôle, while the mantle of religious hypocrisy covers all. The character appears in its most unpleasant phase in that passage, Act III, sc. i, where Pandulph demonstrates to King Philip the lack of guilt in his broken pledge—a companion picture to Richard's casuistry in *Henry VI.* The cold, unfeeling Italian foresees that John will do away with Arthur; this inhumanity shall further his own plots; beyond this for him it is of no import. Action, bearing, and speech, wherein at times the linguistic sharpness of the diplomat and intriguer predominate over the pathetic softness of the priest, must give individual life and complete the figure typical of a man who overrides all things in his life's task. Pandulph should be represented as a man of ripe years and must always be accompanied with a following of a Prince of the Church. It must also be noted here that the

Fra. Heere comes the holy Legat of the Pope. 66 [135]
Pan. Haile you annointed deputies of heauen;
To thee King *Iohn* my holy errand is:
I *Pandulph*, of faire *Millane* Cardinall,
And from Pope *Innocent* the Legate heere, 70
Doe in his name religiouſly demand [140]
Why thou againſt the Church, our holy Mother,
So wilfully doſt ſpurne: and force perforce
Keepe *Stephen Langton* choſen Arſhbiſhop
Of *Canterbury* from that holy Sea: 75
This in our foreſaid holy Fathers name [145]
Pope *Innocent*, I doe demand of thee.
Iohn. What earthie name to Interrogatories 78 [147]

66. *of*] *from* Var. '85.
67. *Haile*] Ff. *Hail!* Huds. i. *Hail*, Rowe et cet.
heauen;] Ff. *Heav'n;* Rowe. *heav'n.* Pope. *heav'n!* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *heaven:*— Sing. *heaven.* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. *heaven!* Cap. et cet.
68. *is:*] *is.* Cap. et seq.
69. Millane] Ff, Ktly. *Milain* Rowe, Pope,+. *Milan* Cap. et cet.
71. *Doe...name*] *Do,...name*, Cap. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Fle. Rlfe.
72. *Church,...Mother,*] *church...mother* Pope, Han.
73. *ſpurne:*] *ſpurn*, F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope,+.
73. *and...perforce*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam.+, Dono. Neils. *and,...perforce*, Cap. et cet.
74. *Arſhbiſhop*] F_1F_2. *Archbiſhop* F_3F_4.
75. *Sea:*] F_2F_3. *See:* F_4, Cam. ii, Dono. *see?* Rowe et cet.
76. *This*] *This*, Cap. et seq.
foreſaid] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Fle. Words. Neils. Craig. *'foresaid* Theob. et cet.
78. *earthie*] Ff. *earthy* Rowe, Coll. i, Cam. Glo. Cla. Neils. *earthly* Pope et cet.
to Interrogatories] *to Interrogarories* F_4. *to interrogatories*, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Ktly. *t' interrogatories* Fle.

Cardinals of that period did not wear red hats, these were first given them by Pope Innocent V. in 1243.

69. **Millane Cardinall**] ROLFE: Mrs Clarke's *Concordance* has the curious misprint 'fair Milan cathedral' in the reference to this passage under 'Milan.'

74. **Stephen Langton**] WRIGHT: On the death of Hubert Fitzwalter, archbishop of Canterbury, 13 July, 1205, the monks elected Reginald the sub-prior, and sent to Rome to have the election confirmed by the Pope. The Pope, however, refused to confirm it in the absence of letters recommendatory from the King. The monks then, fearing the King's displeasure, begged him to nominate one whom they might elect, and he ordered them to vote for John Gray, Bishop of Norwich, who was accordingly chosen. But the Pope quashed this election also, 'and procured by his papall authoritie the monks of Canterburie . . . to choose one Stephan Langton, the Cardinall of S. Chrysogon, an Englishman borne' (Holinshed, iii, 171), whom John refused to acknowledge.—[For the corresponding passage. in prose, which Shakespeare has turned into such stirring verse, see *The Troublesome Raigne*, pt i, ll. 71–78, in *Appendix*, p. 493.—ED.]

78. **Iohn. What**, etc.] JOHNSON: This must have been at the time when it was written, in our struggles with popery, a very captivating scene. So many pass-

[78. Iohn. What earthie name to Interrogatories]

ages remain in which Shakespeare evidently takes his advantage of the facts then recent and of the passions then in motion, that I cannot but suspect that time has obscured much of his art, and that many allusions remain yet undiscovered, which perhaps may be gradually retrieved by succeeding commentators.—BIRCH (p. 254): The answer of John to the Legate shows Shakespeare no Roman Catholic, and would be applauded to the echo by the audience of the theater and the occupants of the throne of England. Though in character and in the mouth of a villain, we must allow that Shakespeare spoke here in his own person, and that he uttered the sentiments of England. [In reading the various passages from Birch's *Enquiry into the Religion and Philosophy of Shakespeare*, it should ever be borne in mind that the author, while declaring in his preface that his Enquiry was strictly impartial, nevertheless, seems at times actually to endeavor to twist some phrase or speech into an evident example of a lack of religious belief on the part of Shakespeare himself, although it be one of his creations who utters words quite consistent to character.—ED.]—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 9): The behaviour of John reaches its highest point of interest for the audience in his unsurpassable dismissal of the Papal Legate. Shakespeare has here given one of those immortal examples of his genius, which recognised, indeed, divinely foresaw, equivocation as the governing principle, the evident end and aim. Almost three centuries have elapsed since he hurled these annihilating words against Rome, and yet today it is hardly possible to describe or stigmatize the way and purpose of Papal politics more clearly or sharply than has Shakespeare in these undying words.—GOLDWIN SMITH (*Macmillan's Maga.*, Jan., 1889, p. 234): Where the scene of his play is in Roman Catholic times or countries Shakespeare takes the religious environments and costume with the rest, and introduces friars as ministers of good. This is hardly more significant than his introduction of the gods of Rome in *Jul. Cæs.*, or of weird heathenism in *King Lear*, where it harmonizes with the character of the piece. That he had any latent hankering after Roman Catholicism, or that his heart was on the Papal side of the great quarrel between the nation and the Pope, it is impossible to believe in face of such lines as these—[ll. 78–91]. Much with what the author does not agree may be written dramatically; but there are things which even dramatically he who does not agree with them will not write. Any one who had the slightest leaning to the Papal side would have manifestly outraged his own feelings by penning these lines. The passage on Indulgences [ll. 96–98] has a sting in it if anything in Shakespeare has. The exposure of the false miracles of healing at St Albans (*2 Henry VI:* II, i.) may be cited in the same connection, if the passage is by Shakespeare, as we believe it is.—BOWDEN (p. 118): These lines have indeed furnished quotation for anti-Catholic declamations of Prime Ministers, Lord Chancellors, and Archbishops in our own time. Their value as representing Shakespeare's opinions, however, assumes a different complexion if we apply one of Aristotle's canons of criticism, and inquire not what the speech is in itself, but who spoke it, and with what end it was spoken. The language and action of a hero may be supposed to represent the Poet's type of what is good and noble, and therefore what he would wish his own language and action to be. The sentiments of a scoundrel, on the other hand, are intentionally drawn as false, base, and treacherous, and therefore presumably not those of the Poet's ideal self. Now we are quite content that Shakespeare should be judged by this rule throughout his plays, but this rule must be uniformly applied. According to some critics,

[78. Iohn. What earthie name to Interrogatories]

if Henry V. speaks as a Catholic, this is only from dramatic necessity, or because the Poet is following Holinshed's *Chronicles*, and such speeches therefore give us no clue as to his own judgment. Does John, however, rant in true Exeter Hall fashion, or Duke Humphrey malign Cardinal Beaufort, or an added scene by Fletcher in *Henry VIII.* extol Elizabeth, there we have the Poet himself. With such a method of argument Shakespeare can be proved as rabid a bigot as these writers desire. But if the canon be impartially applied, an opposite result is, we believe, attained. In this particular instance is John a hero or villain? . . . His bold defiance proves mere bombast; he ends by eating his words. He humbles himself to the dust before the Legate, and as a penitent receives the crown again at his hands, and his kingdom in fief from the Pope. John's anti-Catholic speeches, then, no more prove Shakespeare a Protestant than the fool's saying in his heart 'There is no God' makes David a sceptic.—[Although the following extract from CARTER (*Sh. Puritan and Recusant*, p. 175) does not refer specifically to the present passage in *King John*, yet, as it bears upon the question of Shakespeare's attitude towards Roman Catholicism, it may fittingly follow the foregoing remarks.—ED.] 'In 1597 Shakespeare bought the house in New Place, and engaged in numerous business transactions in the neighborhood of Stratford, and at the request of a number of his friends invested some £440 in the purchase of the tithe leases of Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe. In view of the oft-asserted Roman Catholicism of the Shakespeares, this purchase of the tithe leases is noteworthy. Would a Papist have been allowed to invest his money in this way? And if allowed by the Prelatist and Puritan opponents, would the Roman Catholic Church have held him guiltless in thus trafficking in sacred things? For in the eyes of devoted Papists this was spoliation with a vengeance. William Shakespeare may, no doubt, be a great gain to their Church in Roman Catholic eyes, but surely the heroism of Papists during the long dark years of Elizabeth is something far better and nobler. The Romish church records are full of splendid examples of heroism for conscience' sake during these truly awful times; hedges, byeways, secret chambers, dungeons, and martyrdoms bore witness to the devoted constancy of the old Faith. But what can be said of the claimed Roman Catholicism of the Shakespeares? It was a disgrace to the annals of the church of Rome, and it is a very wide charity indeed which, after a knowledge of the undeniable acts which they committed in antagonism to Papistry, still claims to number them among the Faithful. If John Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic, he was a dishonest hypocrite of the worst type, and one whom it is exceedingly difficult to believe could have continued so long in the affections of the Stratford people. In the face of his official and private acts and undoubted leadership among his fellow townsmen, it is incomprehensible how anyone could dub him Papist. It is only on the lines of Puritanism that his career becomes intelligible and inspiring, and all the facts of his life seem to marshal themselves in proper order, and show him to be a man of sterling honesty and integrity, a sufferer for conscience' sake, and one who would dare every risk of imprisonment and death rather than be coerced into what he considered ceremonialism and dishonesty.'—BULTHAUPT (*Dramaturgie*, p. 76): It may be said that he knows but little of Shakespeare's Historical plays who would take perjury, false-swearing, and the bottomless villainy of low self-seeking as characteristic of this scene, of this play, and also as due to Papal influence. Just as Philip of France and the blustering Austria break their words, so likewise does

Can taſt the free breath of a ſacred King? 79 [148]

79. *taſt*] F_2. *taſte* F_3F_4, Rowe i, *task* Theob. et cet. Vaughan. *tax* Rowe ii, Pope, Han. 79. *free breath*] *free-breath* F_3F_4, Rowe.

the Dauphin Louis in this same play from quite different motives; so too does York, Warwick, and Clarence in the other Histories whenever it seemed good and if interest so urged them. Finally, let us accept the fact that John proves himself as the most impossible personality for the exploiting of an anti-Romanist idea, since he, for all his bravado and loud-sounding words, completely humbles himself to the Church, just as Henry did at Canossa, and so of this 'historical' or 'political' idea nothing remains. Assuredly these speeches and attacks are neither 'historic' nor are they dramatic; they have only a tendency that way.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*, p. 119): Here is voiced for the first time in this play the feeling of patriotism which animates all Shakespeare's Histories. That it should come from the mouth of John, who is, after all, a weakling and a villain, is unfortunate for dramatic effectiveness, but was imposed by the conception of the character in the original play, and indeed by the historic material itself. Later Salisbury and the Bastard become the exponents of this sentiment.

78. **What . . . Interrogatories**] MALONE: That is, what earthly name subjoined to interrogatories can force a king to speak and answer them?—H. C. C. (*Notes & Queries*, 1864, III, vi, 323): The true *ordo verborum* of this sentence is this: 'What earthly name can task the free breath of a sacred king to interrogatories?' . . . The interrogatories which the Cardinal threatens are those which were, and are, familiar to the Canon Law. To those interrogatories the name of the ecclesiastical ordinary, by whose authority they were to be administered, never was subjoined, but was always prefixed; and the same practice is adhered to in this country whenever the ecclesiastical jurisdiction is curially exercised. When the necessity for this exercise arises the Ecclesiastical Court cites the delinquent to answer to 'articles, heads, positions, or interrogatories, touching and concerning his soul's health and the lawful correction and reformation of his manners and excesses'; and to these interrogatories the name of the ordinary is prefixed, though they cannot, under 13 Car. II, c. 12, 3, 4, be actually administered now to the defendant; and are therefore only pleadings in the suit.

78. **earthie**] COLLIER: Modern editors, since the time of Pope, have substituted *earthly* for 'earthy,' an alteration not required. ['Not required!' remarks DYCE, p. 90—'In *Richard II:* I, iii, vol. iv, p. 125, Mr Collier gives: "O! thou, the earthly author of my blood"; and observes in a note, "The Folio of 1623 reads *earthly*." It happens that in the latter passage only one old copy has the misprint, which in the former passage all the old copies exhibit. In Massinger's *Duke of Milan*, Act v, sc. ii, Sforza says to the Doctors, according to the old eds., "O you earthy gods, You second natures," &c.; but in a copy quarto, 1623 (now in my possession), Massinger has crossed out "*earthy*" with a pen, and written *earthly* on the margin.']

78. **Interrogatories**] FLEAY: The word is 'inter'gatories' in *Mer. of Ven.*, V, i, 298–300, and in *All's Well*, IV, iii, 207; 'interrogàtories' here and in *Cymb.* V, v, 392. Some editors explain it wrongly; it means questions asked on oath. [For the pronunciation as in *Mer. of Ven.* and *All's Well*, compare: 'You were best sweare me on the intergatories.'—*Arden of Feversham*, III, vi, 6.—ED.]

79. **tast**] STEEVENS: The emendation [*task;* see *Text. Notes*] may be justified

Thou canſt not (Cardinall) deuiſe a name 80
So ſlight, vnworthy, and ridiculous [150]
To charge me to an anſwere, as the Pope:
Tell him this tale, and from the mouth of *England*,
Adde thus much more, that no *Italian* Prieſt 84 [153]

82. *Pope:*] Ff, Rowe. *Pope's.* Ktly. *Pope.* Pope et cet.
83. England,] *England* Pope,+.
84. *more,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam. Glo. Cla. Neils. *more:* Fle. Craig. *more,*— Cap. et cet.

by the following passage: 'How show'd his tasking? seem'd it in contempt?'—*1 Henry IV:* V, ii, 51. Again, in *Henry V:* 'That task our thoughts concerning us and France.'—I, ii, 6. [The words 'task' and *tax* appear to have been once almost identical; compare the once common vulgarism *ax* for *ask*. Cotgrave has s. v. '*Taille:* A taske or tax, a tallage, tribute.' Here, I think, 'task' (*tast* is manifestly a misprint) is used in the sense assigned by MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. task, 2.), to force, put, or set (a person) to a task; to impose a task on; to assign a definite amount of work to. Thus John asks of the Cardinal, what earthly power can assign a task to the free speech of an anointed deputy of heaven.—ED.]

83. **England,**] CAPELL (I, pt i, p. 127) substitutes for the comma a colon, which in his system of punctuation has almost the force of the full stop, and, commenting upon his change, says: 'If the editor is not deceived in his feelings, this passage's spirit is improved by its pointing: "England" has but a comma in some copies, in others no stop at all; the latter making only two sentences where three were design'd (for the comma is of ancient editions), but not sufficiently noted for want of a fuller stop.'

84–86. **no Italian Priest . . . supreame head**] LORD CAMPBELL (p. 77): Shakespeare clearly shows that whatever his opinion might have been on speculative dogmas in controversy between the Reformers and the Romanists, he spurned the ultramontane pretensions of the Pope, which some of our Roman Catholic fellow subjects are now [1845] too much disposed to countenance, although they were stoutly resisted before the Reformation by our ancestors, who were good Catholics. At the same time it is clear, from Shakespeare's portraiture of Friar Lawrence and other Roman Catholic ecclesiastics who do honor to their church, that he was no bigot, and that he regarded with veneration all who seek to imitate the meek example of the divine founder of the Christian religion.—BOSWELL-STONE (p. 56, foot-note): Perhaps the parallel speech in *The Troublesome Raigne* was an anachronistic development of an opinion held by a contemporary of John, a theologian named Alexander the Mason, who asserted 'that it apperteined not to the pope to have to doo concerning the temporall possessions of any kings or other potentates touching the rule and government of their subjects.'—Holinshed, vol. iii, p. 174, col. i, l. 7.—RUSHTON (*Sh. and Lex Scripta*, p. 60) quotes from a statute, 24 Henry VIII, cap. 12: '*Where* by divers sundry old authentick histories and chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same.'—R. SIMPSON (*Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1874–75, p. 439): The feelings of Shakespeare about the Church perhaps come out in his representation of Churchmen. There is none good among them from Pandulph to Cranmer, except the Bishop of Carlisle

Shall tythe or toll in our dominions: 85
But as we, vnder heauen, are ſupreame head, [155]
So vnder him that great ſupremacy 87

85. *dominions*] *dominiöns* Fle.
86. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
ſupreame] *súpreme* Fle. Words.
87. *So...him...ſupremacy*] Ff,+. *So ...him...supremacy*, Cam.+. *So,...him, ...supremacy*, Theob. et cet.
87. *him*] *it* Rowe ii, Pope, Han. *heaven* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.).

---

in *Richard II.* and Rutland's tutor in *3 Henry VI.* All the prelates are Machiavellians; all the inferior clergy are conjurors or impostors. . . . Did Shakespeare colour these pictures, and (as in Beaufort's case) alter and exaggerate history for the condemnation of the historical church which was established in the times he represented, or of the Church which was present to his experience? . . . One thing is certain, that the only reproach which he allows himself to make against the old religion is connected with the political pretensions of the Papacy. All the libellous satire against monks and nuns with which the old *King John* is filled was cleared away by him. He gives us quite natural and touching pictures of the piety (superstitious in the eyes of his generation) of Richard II. and Henry V. In fact, he is careful not to outrage any one's religious conscience, however severe he may be on religious politicians. This abstinence on his part places him in the strongest possible contrast to all his brother playwrights, who all spent their deepest-sought wit in ridiculing and outraging the religion which they did not like, whether that was Popery or Puritanism. In this characteristic we may trace not the influence of Essex, for in Shakespeare it was natural and independent of any political views; but a frame of mind which would naturally incline him to take the part of the unlucky Earl.—SNIDER (ii, 303): This is a most emphatic statement of the political significance of the Reformation, which brought about the subordination of Church to State. Pandulph, on the contrary, asserts ecclesiastical supremacy, absolves the nation from its allegiance, takes away kingship; in fine, he seeks to destroy utterly the civil relation between monarch and subject. [This speech and the next by King John, with Pandulph's denunciation, have been taken as arguments both for and against Shakespeare's adherence to Roman Catholicism; for the views of various writers on this point, see *Appendix, Sh. and Roman Catholicism.*—ED.]

87. him] COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 203): For *heaven* [the MS. correction] the invariable reading has been 'him.' Nevertheless, satisfactory as this emendation may appear, it is possible that the original reading (before the passing of James I. against the use of the name of the Creator on the stage) was *God*, for 'heaven' in l. 86, and then 'him,' in this line, might be proper enough. When *heaven* was substituted for *God* the repetition of *heaven* in the next line became necessary.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 86): The substitution of *heaven* for 'him' is a piece of supererogation entirely unwarranted and uncalled for.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 300): Evidently 'heaven' in l. 86 should be *God*, as is shown by the pronoun in this line. The correction is made in Mr Collier's folio. The original word was evidently changed to 'heaven' on account of the statute of James I, while the corresponding change in the pronoun was neglected. . . . Mr Collier's folio gives *heaven* for 'him'; but needlessly and, indeed, injuriously, as it destroys the parallel between the king's tenure of power and his exercise of it. This is another marked

Where we doe reigne, we will alone vphold 88 [157]
Without th'aſſiſtance of a mortall hand:
So tell the Pope, all reuerence ſet apart 90
To him and his vſurp'd authoritie. [160]
Fra. Brother of *England*, you blaſpheme in this.
Iohn. Though you, and all the Kings of Chriſtendom
Are led ſo groſſely by this medling Prieſt,
Dreading the curſe that money may buy out, 95
And by the merit of vilde gold, droſſe, duſt, [165]
Purchaſe corrupted pardon of a man,
Who in that ſale ſels pardon from himſelfe: 98 [167]

89. *hand:*] *hand.* Pope,+.
90. *Pope,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cam. +, Fle. *pope;* Cap. et cet.
reuerence] *rev'rence* Pope,+.
95–100. *Dreading...cheriſh,*] Om. Dono.
96. *And*] *And,* F_4, Rowe et seq.
by] *buy* Warb.
vilde] F_2F_3. *vild* Fle. *vile* F_4 et cet.
98. *from*] *for* Var. '85 (misprint).

evidence of the conjectural nature of the corrections in that folio. The corrector having made the necessary change of 'heaven' [l. 86] to *God*, either from the sight of an actor's copy of his part, from memory, or from conjecture, went on to improve the text by guesswork, and struck from it the very word which gave force to the passage. [It is never a pleasant task to call attention to the errors of others; but in justice to Collier, it must be pointed out that the major part of White's objection is founded on a misreading of Collier's note. Collier says, as does White, that the word 'heaven' in l. 86 was evidently *God*, but does *not* give this as one of the MS. corrections as White asserts, and as he repeats in the note in his edition. White follows Theobald's punctuation of this line; not that of the Folio.—ED.]

90. **all reuerence set apart**] HUDSON (ed. ii.) That is, 'All reverence to him and his usurp'd authority *being* set apart.'

91. **vsurp'd authoritie**] WARNER (p. 36): These words were like sweet honey to the Virgin Queen, Elizabeth, to whom undoubtedly Shakespeare paid his court in writing them. For she had been through exactly such a papal struggle as was now to follow in the case of John. She felt the 'supreme headship' of the Church as keenly as any who preceded or followed her. Largely through her personality, which was a sort of concretion of the English thought and English feeling of the day, England was an armed camp of religious and patriotic soldiers. It was an intense age, and the ideal England of Elizabeth, of her nobles, of her commoners was just that exploited in Shakespeare's line: 'That no Italian priest Shall tithe or toll in our dominions.'

93. **Though . . . Christendom**] COLLIER: This line shows how Shakespeare sometimes altered merely a word in order to render a prose passage verse; in the old *King John* it stands: 'Though thou and all the *princes* of Christendom,' etc.

98. **Who . . . sels . . . from himselfe**] DELIUS: The Pope while selling a pardon granted for a bribe, brings upon himself, by this sale, the need for his own Absolution.—[DEIGHTON likewise so interprets this; but such a meaning seems, I think, inconsistent with the preceding lines: John says, You are afraid of a curse which

Though you, and al the reſt ſo groſſely led, [168]
This iugling witchcraft with reuennue cheriſh,
Yet I alone, alone doe me oppoſe [170]
Againſt the Pope, and count his friends my foes.
Pand. Then by the lawfull power that I haue,
Thou ſhalt ſtand curſt, and excommunicate,
And bleſſed ſhall he be that doth reuolt

99. *al*] F_1.
100. *witchcraft*] *witch-craft* Ff, Rowe, +.
reuennue] *revénue* Sta. Fle.
101. *Yet I*] Ff, Rowe, +, Cam.+, Fle. Dono. Neils. Craig. *Yet I*, Cap. et cet.
101. *alone doe*] F_2. Cam.+, Del. *alone, do* F_3F_4 et cet.
104. *curſt*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. *cursed* Cam.+. *curs'd* Han. et cet.

can be bought off with gold, and so purchase pardon from a mere man who sells you a pardon which he himself grants; that is, anyone can buy a pardon *from* the Pope.—ED.]

103. **the lawfull power**] 'Innocent III. grounded his temporal pretensions on the right which he possessed of judging of sin, and of the obligations of oaths. . . . At first, indeed, the popes contented themselves with spiritual censures; but in an age when all were remodelled after the feudal jurisprudence, it was soon admitted that princes by their disobedience became traitors to God; that as traitors they ought to forfeit their kingdoms, the fees which they held of God; and that to pronounce such sentence belonged to the pontiff, the vice-gerent of Christ upon earth. By these means the servant of the servants of God became the sovereign of the sovereigns, and assumed the right of judging them in his court, and of transferring their crowns as he thought just.'—Lingard (*Hist. of England*, vol. ii, p. 326, foot-note).

104. **Thou shalt . . . excommunicate**] WATSON (p. 7): The original of this denunciation led to the establishment of Magna Charta; for the Barons, fearful that the King would be intimidated by the threat, forced him to sign the great charter of the land, the first words of which are: 'The Church of England shall be free, and shall have her whole rights and liberties inviolable.'—[For a graphic account of the effects of this interdict on the people and realm, see Hume's *History*, vol. i, ch. xi, p. 489.—ED.]

105–110. **And blessed . . . Thy hatefull life**] JOHNSON: This may allude to the bull published against Queen Elizabeth. Or we may suppose, since we have no proof that this play appeared in its present state before the reign of King James, that it was exhibited soon after the popish plot. I have seen a Spanish book in which Garnet, Faux, and their accomplices are registered as saints.—MALONE: Dr Johnson is incorrect in supposing that there is no proof that this play appeared before the reign of King James. It is mentioned by Meres in the year 1598; but if any allusion to his own times was intended by the author of the old play (for this speech is formed on one in *King John*, 1591) it must have been to the bull of Pope Pius V, 1569. [See *Troublesome Raigne*, in *Appendix*, p. 493. Both Froude (vol. vi, p. 59) and Haydn (*Dictionary of Dates*) give the date of Pius's bull of Excommunication as 1570; so likewise does Meyer (p. 77), who says (p. 85): 'No event in English history, not even the Gunpowder

From his Allegeance to an heretique, [175]
And meritorious ſhall that hand be call'd, 107

107–110. *And...life.*] Om. Dono.

Plot, produced so deep and enduring an effect on England's attitude to the Catholic church as the bull of Pius V. Englishmen never forgot their queen's excommunication. Whenever in later ages men's minds were stirred up against the Roman church, the remembrance of 1570 was enough to justify their implacable hatred. When more than a century after the days of the excommunication, the excitement roused by the Popish Plot spread throughout the country and fanned men's passions into a blaze, it seemed as though the times of Elizabeth had returned to warn men against all charity and conciliation. The story of the excommunication, and of the pope who freed men from their oaths, and subjects from their allegiance, was a weapon that kept its edge for centuries and effectively put a stop to every thought of toleration for the papists.'—ED.]—STAUNTON (*Introd.*, p. 392): Such hypotheses as these [Johnson's and Malone's], however, if they do little towards establishing the chronology of Shakespeare's writings, are forcible confirmations of the fact that he wrote 'not for an age, but for all time.' His representations are so truthful and life-like that it is the easiest of undertakings to find a model whence he may be presumed to have drawn them. He describes the ruinous extravagance into which noblemen and gentlemen are seduced in equipping themselves for a foreign enterprise, and the arrogant pretensions of the Catholic Church in dealing with a rebellious monarch, with such fidelity that we seem to be reading a particular relation of whichever individual occurrence of the kind our memory first brings to notice.—JOSEPH HUNTER (ii, 14): [This passage] must forever decide the question whether the Poet, when he wrote it, was a member of the Roman Church, or favourable to any scheme for its regaining its supremacy in England. Shakespeare, it may be said, is only writing in the character of the speaker, as a dramatist ought to do. But if he had been a favourer of the system which many in his day would gladly have seen restored, he would not have put into the mouth of the representative of the Church a doctrine which the enemies of the Church attributed to its authorities, charged them with encouraging, while it is a doctrine which strikes at the root of all personal security, and is shocking to the common sense of right and wrong. If he had been at all solicitous for the honor of the Church, he would have qualified and screened such a sentiment as this or, rather, he would have suppressed it altogether; and that he has done neither the one nor the other is a plain proof that he did not scruple to expose to the execration of the people the darkest parts of the system, and do his part to keep in mind that such extreme opinions might be cherished in the Church. If he himself secretly approved of them, which we cannot believe, he still would not have cared to expose them in all their native deformity. It should be remembered that something like encouragement was actually held out to take the life of Queen Elizabeth, or, at least, her ministers chose to have it thought so.—BROOKE (p. 231): Imagine what Shakespeare's audience felt when they heard this anathema of death. It went home to the heart of the audience. There was not a man in the pit who had not heard that Rome had treacherously played for the assassination of Elizabeth, had openly attacked her legitimacy, and urged the Roman Catholics of England to throw off their allegiance. I should like to have been in the theatre and heard the roar which saluted this dialogue of John and Pandulph.

Canonized and worſhip'd as a Saint, 108 [177]
That takes away by any ſecret courſe
Thy hatefull life. 110
Con. O lawfull let it be
That I haue roome with *Rome* to curſe a while, 112 [180]

108. *Canonized*] *Canónizèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
111, 112. *O lawfull...a while,*] Om. Dono.
111. *O*] *O!* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *O,* Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. *Oh,* Ktly.
112. *roome*] *leave* Pope, Han. Kemble. *a while,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+. *awhile.* Coll. Wh. i, Del. Fle. Craig. *awhile!* Dyce, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils. *a while!* Cap. et cet.

108. **Canonized . . . as a Saint**] These words are an addition by Shakespeare to the text of the older play; they seem to be almost an echo of those of Anthony Tyrrell's report of the answer of Gregory XIII. on being asked 'whether any one, who for the benefit of the Church and the delivery of the Catholics from their afflictions, attempted to destroy the Queen of England, should have for the fact his pardon.' The Pope thus replied: 'As touching the taking away of that impious Jezebel, whose life God has permitted thus long for our scourge, I would be loath you should attempt anything unto your own destruction, and we know not how our censure on that point amongst her subjects which profess themselves our children would be taken; but if you can wisely give such counsel as may be without scandal to the party or to us, know you we do not only approve the act, but think the doer if he suffer death simply for that to be worthy of canonisation.' This was in 1581, and such words must have produced a strong impression upon the minds of all men of that time. For the full account of Tyrrell's mission, see Froude, *Reign of Elizabeth,* v, pp. 303–305.—ED.

111. **O lawfull let it be**] MOORE SMITH: When Constance joins her curses with those of Pandulph, she is acting a part unsympathetic to the audience, although at the outset of the play she was the injured woman, and John the villain. The issues of the play are now confused.

112. **roome with Rome**] THEOBALD: Mr Pope, in the nicety of his Ear, has, against the Authority of all the copies, displaced a jingle here [see *Text. Notes*]; tho' it is obvious to every knowing reader how customary it is with our Poet, in a thousand instances, to play on words similar in sound and differing in signification. He repeats the very same conundrum on the two words now before us in *Jul. Cæs.*, [I, ii, 165]: 'Now is it Rome, indeed, and room enough.'—[I have given this note by Theobald as a proof that even as late as his time (1733) there was no distinction made between the sound of these two words.—EARLE (ed. iii, p. 165) says: 'The fashion has not yet quite passed away of pronouncing *Rome* as the word *room* is pronounced. This is an ancient pronunciation, as is well known from puns in Shakespeare. No doubt it is the phantom of an old French pronunciation, and it bears about the same relation to the French utterance of *Rome* (pron. *Rom*) that *boon* does to the French *bon*. But it is remarkable that in Shakespeare's day the modern pronunciation (like *roam*) was already heard and recognised, and the two pronunciations have gone on side by side till now, and it has taken so long a time to establish the mastery of the latter. The fact probably is, that the *room* pronunciation has been kept alive in the aristocratic region, which is almost above the level of orthographic influences; while the rest of the world

Good Father Cardinall, cry thou Amen
To my keene curſes; for without my wrong
There is no tongue hath power to curſe him right.
Pan. There's Law and Warrant (Lady) for my curſe.
Conſ. And for mine too, when Law can do no right.
Let it be lawfull, that Law barre no wrong:
Law cannot giue my childe his kingdome heere;
For he that holds his Kingdome, holds the Law:
Therefore ſince Law it ſelfe is perfect wrong,
How can the Law forbid my tongue to curſe?
Pand. *Philip* of *France*, on perill of a curſe,
Let goe the hand of that Arch-heretique,
And raiſe the power of *France* vpon his head,
Vnleſſe he doe ſubmit himſelfe to *Rome*.
Elea. Look'ſt thou pale *France*? do not let go thy hand.

113. *cry thou Amen*] Ff, Coll. Dyce, Huds. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *cry thou "Amen"* Hal. Wh. i. *cry thou, Amen,* Theob. et cet.
115. *power*] *pow'r* Pope,+.
117. *too,...right.*] Ff, Rowe i. *too.... right,* Sta. Neils. *too;...right,* Rowe ii. et cet.
118. *wrong:*] *wrong.* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Del. Rlfe, Neils. *curse* Herr.
125. *power*] *pow'r* Pope,+.
127–129. Elea. *Look'ſt...ſoule.*] Om. Words.

---

has been saying the name according to the value of the letters. *Room* is said to have been the habitual pronunciation of the late Lord Lansdowne and the late Lord Russell. The Shakespearean evidence is from the following passages.' [The present line in *King John*, and that quoted by Theobald]. 'But in *1 Henry VI:* "*Winch.* Rome shall remedie this. *Warw.* Roame thither then."—III, i, 51.'—WRIGHT adds to these the two following passages from *Lucrece:* 'So fares it with this faithful lord of Rome. . . . For now against himself he sounds this doom,' l. 715; and, 'And never be forgot in mighty Rome The adulterate death of Lucrece and her groom,' l. 1644.—For further discussion on this point, see *Julius Cæsar*, this ed., p. 41.—ED.]

117–122. And for mine . . . to curse] IVOR JOHN: That is, When the law cannot see people righted then let no wrongdoing at all be hindered. Law cannot give Arthur his kingdom, for John is master of the law; therefore since the law is 'perfect wrong,' how can I be rightfully restrained from cursing. This mixture of quibbling with passionate argument is characteristic of this play.—DEIGHTON: Here again Constance seems to be using wrong in a double sense: (1) when it is out of the power of the law to enforce justice, let it be considered most truly in accordance with the spirit of law that it hinder no wrong (injury) from redressing itself; (2) that it hinder no wrong (ill-doing), if it can be called a wrong for me to curse. . . . Since law in this instance is in itself the highest injustice (wrong), it cannot have the right to forbid my doing what is wrong (cursing John), it cannot be so illogical as to forbid my following its own example.

Con. Looke to that Deuill, leſt that *France* repent, 128 [196]
And by diſioyning hands hell loſe a ſoule
Auſt. King *Philip*, liſten to the Cardinall. 130
Baſt. And hang a Calues-skin on his recreant limbs.
Auſt. Well ruffian, I muſt pocket vp theſe wrongs, [200]
Becauſe,
Baſt. Your breeches beſt may carry them.
Iohn. *Philip*, what ſaiſt thou to the Cardinall? 135
Con. What ſhould he ſay, but as the Cardinall?
Dolph. Bethinke you father, for the difference 137 [204]

128. *that Deuill*] Ff, Rowe. *that, devil;* Cap. Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Coll. iii, Fle. Huds. ii. *that, devil*, Var. '21, Coll. i, ii, Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Neils. Craig. *that, Devil!* Pope et cet.

129. *And...hands*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i. *And...hands*, Dyce, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig. *And,...hands*, Theob. et cet.

130–134. Auſt. *King...them.*] Om. Dono.

131–134. Baſt. *And...them.*] Om. Words.

131. *Calues-skin*] Ff, Rowe,+, Fle. *calf-skin* Var. '85. *calf's-skin* Cap. et cet.

limbs.] *Limbs*, F_3.

133. *Becauſe,*] Ff, Fle. *Because*— Rowe et cet.

134. *Your*] —*your* Hal.

137. *father,*] *father;* Pope et seq.

128, 129. **Looke to that . . . soule**] DEIGHTON: That is your business, Satan; it is for you to take care that France does not repent; for, if he does, you will lose a soul which evidently ought to be yours.

127–148. WORDSWORTH omits these lines, giving as his justification that: 'They add nothing of importance to the dialogue, which is spun out more than enough without them; and between quibbling and coarseness, they provoke an exclusion which no reader can regret.'

132. **ruffian I must pocket**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 45): The person who acted Austria, on the revival of *King John* at Covent-Garden in 1737, was one Boman, a dyer. This actor, in answering Faulconbridge's repeated insult, whether through ignorance, haste, or chance, instead of uttering the reply to Faulconbridge as he ought, with a loud vulgar tone pronounced it thus: 'Well, *ruffiun*, I must *pockut* up these wrongs.' The audience did not observe the impropriety, but Walker, in the Bastard, by changing the word 'breeches' to *pockut*, imitated Boman's manner, look, action, and tone of voice so archly and humourously that he threw the audience into as merry a fit as ever Quick, or Parsons, or any actor ever did, in the most comic situation; they were absolutely convulsed with laughter for a minute or two, and gave such loud applause to Walker that poor Boman was thunderstruck.

133. **Because,**] P. SIMPSON (p. 32) notes this as an example where a comma is used, in the Folio, to mark an interrupted speech.

134. **Your breeches . . . them**] STEEVENS: Perhaps there is something proverbial in this sarcasm. So, in the old play of *King Leir*, 1605: '*Mum.* Well I have a payre of slops for the nonce Will hold all your mocks.'—[*Six Old Plays*, vol. ii, p. 437].

Is purchaſe of a heauy curſe from *Rome*, 138 [205]
Or the light loſſe of *England*, for a friend:
Forgoe the eaſier. 140

Bla. That s the curſe of *Rome*.

Con. O *Lewis*, ſtand faſt, the deuill tempts thee heere
In likeneſſe of a new vntrimmed Bride. 143 [209]

138. *Is*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Cam.+, Dono. Neils. Craig. *Is*, Cap. et cet.

139. *friend:*] *friend.* Ktly, Neils.

141. *That s*] F1. *That is* Ff, Rowe i. *That's* Rowe ii. et seq.

142–155. Con. *O* Lewis...*lout.*] Om. Words.

142. *O* Lewis] *Lewis* Pope,+. *O Louis* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii.
ſtand faſt] *stand fast!* Coll. Hal. Wh. i, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Neils. Craig.

143. *new vntrimmed*] *new and trimmed* Theob. Warb. Han. Johns. *new up-trimmed* Sing. ii. (Dyce), Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *new-uptrimmèd* Dyce, Del. Huds. ii, Dono. *new untrimmèd* Fle.

---

138. **Is purchase . . . Rome**] JOHNSON: It is a political maxim, that *kingdoms are never married*. Lewis, upon the wedding, is for making war upon his new relations.

143. **new vntrimmed Bride**] THEOBALD (*Sh. Restored*, p. 120): I cannot conceive what the Poet is supposed to mean here by 'untrimmed,' unless its opposite, as I take it, in sense, *trim;* i. e., neat, spruce, fine. But I cannot admit it, without some proof for conviction, to carry that signification. Again, there is no room surely to imagine that the Poet intends to compare the Lady Blanch, as *unmarried*, to a vessel wanting either the proportion of her ballast or rigging, or not being *complete in her trim*, as the sea-phrase is; and therefore calls her 'untrimmed.' This would be a remote *Allusion* with a vengeance; and, especially, when it is put in the mouth of a woman too. As I profess myself to have suspected the passage, so I endeavor'd, as far as an unsupported conjecture or two would go, to reconcile it to an intelligible meaning. I say, a conjecture or two, for which I have no warrant or assistance from the copies; and therefore I shall urge them barely as such, and leave them to be embraced, or renounced, at pleasure. If it did not depart too widely from the present text, to make such a correction reasonable, it is not impossible but the Poet might have wrote, 'a new *untamed* bride,' i. e., a Virgin-bride. I cannot, indeed, recollect any instance in which the Poet has ever taken the liberty of using this epithet in that metaphorical sense; but it is a sense in which I am sure he may be borne out, and justified, by the usage of other languages. An *untamed bride* exactly amounts to what the Latins call'd *Virgo indomita;* which I believe they took from the παρθένος ἀδάμαστος of the Greeks; that is, a bride *untasted, unenjoyed*. And it will be no new doctrine to say that temptation and desire are generally heightened in men by that circumstance. But I observe that *trim* is used by our Author to signify not only *neat, spruce*, &c., but *substantively* too, for a peculiar quaintness and elegance of Habit. So in *1 Henry IV:* 'Came there a certain lord, neat, *trimly* drest; Fresh as a bridegroom,' [I, iii, 33]. So in *Cymbeline:* 'Your laboursome and dainty TRIMS,' [III, iv, 167]. And he employs it besides to signify personal beauty, and the hue and brightness of colours. So in *Venus & Adonis:* 'The flow'rs are sweet, their colours fresh and TRIM, But true sweet beauty liv'd and dy'd in him,' [ll. 1079, 1080]. It is not improbable, therefore, that the passage before us ought to be re-

[143. In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

stored thus: 'In likeness of a new BETRIMMED bride,' i. e., *adorn'd* and *deck'd with charms*. It is familiar with our Poet to use the word *betrim* in these senses; and it is certainly of Saxon derivation; among whom *getrymmed* signified *neat, fine, finished*, &c. . . . But if *betrimmed* may seem to depart too far from the traces of the text as it now stands, I'll propose another correction, that requires but a very minute change, and comes up to the sense of the former; As, 'a new AND TRIMMED bride,' i. e., of a *new bride*, and one, as I said before, deck'd with all the charms of personal beauty.—[In his edition, which appeared six years later, Theobald adopts his third and last conjecture in his text, omitting completely the first, *untamed*, with its signification, and merely mentions as a possible reading the second, *betrimmed*, offering as an interpretation of the original text that 'It might indeed admit of this explanation: *undress'd, ready to go to bed*,' and rejects it on the ground that 'it is giving in to an allusion too gross for Lady Constance.' In his ed. ii. even the conjecture '*betrimmed*' is omitted, and the reading 'new and trimmed' alone admitted as in any way satisfactory.—WARBURTON, in answer to Theobald's objection to 'untrimmed,' says: 'It squares very well with the sense, and signifies *unsteady*. The term is taken from navigation. We say too, in a similar way of speaking, *not well manned*.' It is hardly likely, I think, that Warburton was acquainted with the remarks on this passage in Theobald's *Shakespeare Restored;* had he been so, he would doubtless have referred to the fact that Theobald's rejection of the word *trim* as a term in navigation here was erroneous. This passage is not among those to which reference is made in their correspondence.—ED.]—JOHNSON: I think Mr Theobald's correction more plausible than Dr Warburton's explanation. A commentator should be grave, and therefore I can read these notes with proper severity of attention; but the idea of *trimming* a lady to *keep her steady* would be too risible for any common power of face.—[KENRICK, in his review of Johnson's *Shakespeare*, selects this note as an excuse for a personal attack on Johnson, who in his *Preface* had found fault with Pope for speaking of the 'dull duty of an editor.' Kenrick in the same manner takes Johnson to task for speaking of the necessary 'gravity of a commentator'; but as the reviewer's remarks in no way help us to a better understanding of the present line their transcribing seems hardly necessary.—ED.]—GREY (i, 284): Shakespeare probably alludes to the old legend of the devil's tempting Saint Dunstan; of whom the monkish writers observe that he was tempted by the devil to lewdness, in the shape of a fine lady. —[Grey has, I think, confused St Dunstan with St Anthony. The legends attaching to both are, perhaps, more widely known than any others in hagiology.—ED.]—EDWARDS (p. 150): I am afraid Mr Warburton, with all his gravity here, will be found to have made more haste than good speed. *Unsteady*, which is no great recommendation of a bride, cannot *square well* with the sense; where the speaker designs to express a *strong* and irresistible temptation; but Mr Warburton is perpetually out in his philosophy upon this subject. Nor, though the term should be taken from navigation (which I see no reason for in this place), does the *trim* of a ship signify its ballast; but its sails, colors, and pendants. . . . *Trim* here, and in many other places, means finery; as in *1 Henry IV:* 'A certain lord, neat, trimly dress'd, Fresh as a bridegroom,' [I, iii, 33]. The very same image as here, 'a *new* and *trimmed* bride.' And from this common signification, it is applied to a ship, when she has all her *bravery* on. And now let Mr Warburton judge whether Lady Blanch appeared before such an assembly with or without her *trim*.—HEATH

[143. In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

(p. 226) declares that the reasons given by Edwards in support of Theobald's emendation, 'new and trimmed bride,' have convinced him that that is 'the true and genuine reading.'—CAPELL (vol. i, pt ii, p. 127): We need only reflect upon the situation of the lady that's spoke of—a bride fresh come from church, and upon the influence such a bride may be expected to have upon the person she's join'd to, to be satisfied that the sense put on 'untrimmed' (vide *Glossary*) is a true sense, and fitted most to the speaker's intention; namely, to express a temptation of the greatest strength possible; as her thought is indelicate, it is convey'd in a term of great decency; and yet sufficiently open when its source is discovered. [The elucidation in Capell's *Glossary*, to which he refers, is as follows: '*untrimmed*, unman'd: When a ship has her complement of men, and her rigging complete, she is said to be in her trim.'—This is practically the same as Warburton's explanation; it is not after Capell's usual procedure thus to take a predecessor's interpretation without comment, and although there is evidence throughout his *Notes* that he had seen Warburton's edition which appeared in 1747, it is not so easy to ascertain when Capell's *Glossary* was prepared; it was published after his death by Collins as a part of the first volume of the *Notes* in 1779. Neither Johnson nor Edwards, I think, wholly comprehended the innuendo contained in the last sentence of Warburton's note.—ED.]—STEEVENS: *Trim* is *dress*. An *untrimmed* bride is a bride *undrest*. Could the tempter of mankind assume a semblance in which he was more likely to be successful? By Shakespeare's epithet, 'untrimmed,' I do not mean absolutely *naked*, but: 'Nuda pedem, discincta sinum, spoliata lacertos,' [Mantuanus, *Eclogue* i.]; in short, whatever is comprised in Lothario's idea of *unattired* [see Rowe's *Fair Penitent*, I, i; works, i, p. 162], 'Non mihi sancta Diana placet, nec nuda Cythera; Illa voluptatis nil habet, haec nimium.' [Ansonius, *Epigram* xxxix, ll 5, 6.—These classical quotations Steevens obtained, I think, from Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part III, sec. ii, memb. iii, subsec. iv, where the author treats of Beauty as a Cause of Love Melancholy. Steevens adds to these, four other passages from later writers wherein *trimmed* is used in the sense of *dressed;* such might easily be multiplied, and as both Theobald and Edwards have already called attention to this meaning of the word, they need not be repeated. Steevens thus continues:] The devil (says Constance) raises to your imagination your bride disencumbered of the forbidding forms of dress, and the memory of my wrongs is lost in the anticipation of future enjoyment. Mr Collins inclines to a colder interpretation, and is willing to suppose that by an 'untrimmed bride' is meant 'a bride unadorned with the usual pomp and formality of a nuptial habit.' The propriety of this epithet he infers from the haste in which the match was made, and further justifies it from King John's preceding words: 'Go we as well as haste will suffer us, To this unlook'd for, unprepared pomp.' Mr Tollet is of the same opinion, and offers two instances in which 'untrimmed' indicates a deshabille or a frugal vesture. In Minsheu's Dictionary it signifies one not finely dressed or attired. Again in Vives's *Instruction of a Christian Woman*, 1592, pp. 98, 99: 'Let her (the mistress of the house) bee content with a maide not faire and wanton, that can sing a ballad with a clere voice, but sad, pale, and untrimmed.' —MONCK MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 156): Warburton's explanation of this passage is truly ridiculous, and that of Steevens also is somewhat ludicrous; I mean that part of his note in which he seems to insinuate that by 'untrimmed' Constance means *naked*. To *trim* means to *dress-out*, but it does not signify to *clothe;* and

[143. In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

'untrimmed' may mean *unadorned*, but it cannot mean *unclad;* perhaps we should read *untried*, or *untrained*, or adopt Theobald's amendment.—MALONE: I incline to think that the transcriber's ear deceived him, and that we should read as Mr Theobald has proposed. [Malone here quotes, in illustration of *trim* signifying spruceness of attire, the three passages given by Theobald in *Sh. Restored* to this same purpose, those, namely, from *1 Henry IV;* from *Cymbeline* and *Venus & Adonis*, to these Malone adds: 'Go, waken Juliet; go, and trim her up; Make haste; the bridegroom he is come already.'—*Rom. & Jul.*, IV, iv, 24. Malone thus continues:] The freshness which our Author has connected with the word *trim* in the first and last of these passages ['trimly dress'd'; 'colours fresh and trim'], and the 'dainty trims that made great Juno angry,' which surely a bride may be supposed most likely to indulge in (however scantily Blanch's toilet may have been furnished in a camp), prove either that this emendation [by Theobald] is right or that Mr Collins's interpretation of the word 'untrimmed' is the true one. Minsheu's definition of *untrimmed*, 'qui n'est point orné,—*inornatus*, *incultus*,' as well as his explanation of the verb *to trim*, which according to him means the same as 'to prank up,' may also be adduced to the same point.—SINGER (ed. i.): *Trim* is dress. *Comptus virgineus* is explained by the dictionaries, 'The attyre of maydens, or maidenly trimming.' An 'untrimmed' bride may therefore mean a bride *undressed* or disencumbered of the forbidding forms of dress. It is, however, probable that this term may have been used for a *virgin bride*. [For this last suggestion Singer acknowledges his indebtedness to a note on a line in Chapman's *May Day*, Act IV, sc. i, as given in vol. iv. of the *Ancient Drama*. This is the title as given by Singer; but the note to which he undoubtedly refers is to be found on p. 95, vol. iv. of the supplement to Dodsley's Collection, which was edited by Charles Wentworth Dilke and published in 6 volumes, 1816, with the simple title *Old Plays*. The passage in Chapman's licentious play, wherein this word occurs, need not here be quoted, as Dilke says: 'the indelicate sense in which it is used is too plain to need comment;' he excuses his having called attention to it on the ground that the commentators are not agreed as to the meaning of the word in the present passage in *King John*. He characterises Steevens as the ablest commentator, but finds his interpretation 'rather forced, and as Constance describes Blanch *as she then stood before him*,' Dilke believes Constance's meaning to be 'a new and virgin bride.' He then quotes three other passages wherein this word is used, and manifestly can have but one meaning. These are as follows: *Titus Andronicus*, V, i, 93–96; Beaumont & Fletcher, *The False One*, II, iii. (ed. Dyce, p. 253); Ibid., *The Loyal Subject*, II, i. (ed. Dyce, p. 32); although Dilke quotes these passages in full, the last of these only shall be transcribed—Theodore is describing the ravages of the Tartars and says to Boroskie: 'They would not only have abused your buildings, Your goodly buildings, sir, and have drunk dry your butteries, Purloined your lordships plate, the duke bestowed on you For turning handsomely o' th' toe, and trimmed your virgins, Trimm'd 'em of a new cut, an't like your lordship, 'Tis ten to one, your wife too.'—DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 91), after a short summary of the notes in the *Variorum* of 1821, says in conclusion: 'Let the next editor of Shakespeare merely state that 'untrimmed' means *virgin*, without any comment, though I now think it right to adduce the following passage, among many others which might be cited. [Here follows the passage from *The Loyal Subject* quoted above.]—BARRON FIELD, in an article on *Some*

[143. In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

Obscure Passages in Shakespeare contributed to the Old Shakespeare Society's Papers, 1847, vol. iii, p. 137, calls attention to a remark by Richardson in his 'excellent Dictionary' to the effect that '*untrimmed*, in this passage, is only a corruption of *entrimmed*, as *unrip* is of *enrip*.' (Which is, however, rather of philologic interest than Shakespearean.) Speaking of Dyce's interpretation Field says: 'There is no doubt, from the passage cited by Mr Dyce, and from another loose song in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, Act I, sc. iii, that the verb *to trim* was used in such a sense; but I must think it was then always a canting word, just as we employ the word *to dress* in the sense of *to chastise*. It cannot be supposed that the Lady Constance would use the word in a wanton sense; and in any other "untrimmed" would bear the same meaning that it does in the following passage from the Poet's *Sonnet xviii*, namely, *undecorated*, whereas the argument here would require *decorated:* "And ev'ry fair from fair sometimes declines, By chance, or nature's changing course, untrimmed." '—Field therefore declares that there is no doubt that Theobald's reading is correct. The advice contained in Dyce's Remark was at once accepted by Hudson, one of Dyce's firm adherents; in his ed. i. he has merely: 'An "untrimmed bride" is, no doubt, a *virgin* bride.'—Not so, Dyce himself, however; in a communication to *Notes & Queries* for July 3, 1852, Singer says that Dyce proposes for the original reading the emendation *uptrimmed*, with which new reading Singer expresses great satisfaction, and Dyce himself, in his *Few Notes*, published in 1857, thus retracts his former views: 'On the word "untrimmed" how have the commentators written! how have I myself written! how foolishly all of us! I now see (and with wonder at my former blindness) that nothing more is required than the change of a single letter—that, *beyond the possibility of doubt*, Shakespeare wrote: "In likeness of a new u*p*-trimmed bride." Compare what he elsewhere says *of a bride:* "Go, waken Juliet; go, and *trim* her *up*."—*Rom. & Jul.*, IV, iv, 24. [Theobald anticipated Malone, and Malone anticipated Dyce in this illustration.—ED.] So too Marlowe: "But by her glass disdainful pride she learns, Nor she herself, but first *trimmed up*, discerns."—*Ovid's Elegies: Works*, iii, 174, ed. Dyce.'—Singer makes no verbal recantation beyond saying at the end of his communication to *Notes & Queries*: 'It is satisfactory, by such a simple and undoubted correction, to get rid of heaps of idle babble and verbiage about a word that the Poet certainly never wrote, and certainly never conceived, with the meaning that some of the commentators would give to it.' In support of this he quotes the lines from the eighteenth Sonnet given above by Field.—Singer therefore adopts Dyce's emendation in the text of his ed. ii, as, of course, did likewise Hudson, with no mention in either case of a *virgin* bride.—COLLIER (ed. i.) accepts the reading of the Folio, although 'a misprint may be suspected here.'—VERPLANCK: That is, a *virgin* bride, for which sense there is abundant authority in the old dramatists.—STAUNTON (ed. i.): As 'untrimmed' is usually conceived to mean unadorned, and the sense appears to require a word implying the reverse, we have adopted the happy and unforced emendation of Mr Dyce.—IBID. (*Addenda and Corrigenda*, vol. i, p. lxvi.): I am not at present so satisfied of the propriety of Dyce's ingenious emendation, *uptrimmed*, as I was formerly. In old times it was a custom for the bride at her wedding to wear her hair unbraided, and hanging loose over her shoulders. May not Constance refer to this custom? Peacham, in describing the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth with the Palsgrave, says that 'the bride came into the chapell with a coronet of

[143. In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

pearle on her head, and *her haire* dischevelled and hanging down over her shoulders.' Compare, too, *Tancred and Gismunda:* 'So let thy tresses flaring in the wind *Untrimmed* hang about thy bared neck.'—Act V, sc. i.—R. G. WHITE: 'Trimmed' meant, in Shakespeare's day, gayly, finely, or, as we even now say, trimly dressed. An 'untrimmed bride' is, therefore, a bride in deshabille; and in some such condition was Blanch on account of her unexpected nuptials, and the haste in which they were performed; a consideration which, by the way, disposes of the corrections '*and* trimmed' by Theobald, and '*up* trimmed' in Collier's Folio. The latter expression needs neither explanation nor justification in itself; but there was no time to trim Blanch up. The obvious allusion, too, to the temptation of St Anthony makes it clear that the old text is correct. It is, of course, not intimated that Blanch was then and there in a condition approaching that in which the temptress of St Anthony is generally supposed to have won the victory for the Devil. Constance's epithet has at once a slight taint of womanish spite, and a forward look for Louis.—COLLIER (ed. ii.): The proper change is made by the MS. Corrector [see *Text. Notes*], viz.: *uptrimmed.* The conjecture of Rev. Mr Dyce was thus long anticipated, and there could be no reasonable doubt about it.—J. O. HALLIWELL: The ordinary meaning of 'untrimmed,' *unadorned* or *undressed,* hardly makes sense, Constance meaning to speak of the bride as an attraction; unless indeed the refined criticism, that the term means loosely apparelled, be adopted with the idea that a beautiful woman so clothed is more fascinating than when attired in all the elegancies of fashion. '*Acosmus,* one that is undecked or untrimmed, a slooven.'—Eliote's Dictionarie, ed. Cooper, ed. 1559. . . . Mr Dyce ingeniously suggests *up-trimmed;* but the rapidity with which the match has been made and the King's allusion to 'this unlook'd for, unprepared pomp,' appear to show that Constance would not refer especially to the splendor of the bride's dress. Allusions to brides and bridegrooms being trimmed or trimmed up, in other words, sprucely dressed on the occasion of their marriages, are not uncommon; but they by no means prove that Constance speaks of a lady so adorned, and the context shows that such is probably not the case. Without the necessity of considering a wanton allusion is intended, which it clearly cannot be, 'untrimmed' may merely mean virgin, used as innocently as we might 'a new maiden bride,' in allusion to her absolute freshness, a meaning far more forcible than the very prosaic one of a new well-dressed wife. The verb, to *trim,* is used with a double meaning in *Titus Andronicus.* [Halliwell quotes as examples of this double meaning the passages from Chapman's *May Day;* from *The False One;* and *The Loyal Subject,* and cites the song in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece,* to which reference has already been made in the preceding notes.]—CARTWRIGHT (p. 15) objects to Dyce's emendation on the ground that 'We say dressed up, but never updressed. . . . A word, of which there is no example in the language, cannot be admitted as an emendation.' [While I am not favorably inclined to Dyce's proposal, I think that Cartwright's reasoning is unsound: we say *upstand* for stand up; *upstart* for start up, and many other compounds of the same kind. An example of *uptrim* may yet be forthcoming.—ED.]—KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor,* p. 222): 'Untrimmed' would seem to express the indecent haste of the wedding, the bride having, as it were, no trousseau, but being married in her ordinary clothes.—BENJ. EASY (*Notes & Queries,* 1863, III, iv, 366) offers the same explanation as did Staunton several years before, viz.: that 'untrimmed' here refers to the loose-flowing hair of the bride as was cus-

[143. **In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride**]

tomary at the time, and in illustration quotes: 'Come, come, my lord, untie your folded thoughts And let them dangle loose as a bride's hair.'—*Vittoria Corombona* (ed. Dyce, vol. i, p. 83). 'It is curious,' says Easy, 'that Steevens, in a note on this last passage, states that brides (and among them Anna Boleyn) formerly walked to church with their hair hanging loose behind, and yet missed the meaning of "untrimmed bride" so far as to give a ludicrous explanation of it.'—A. SCHMIDT (*Jahrbuch*, iii, 1868, p. 356): That is, in likeness of a bride who has removed her ornaments, or rather a wife who has laid aside her bridal finery. 'Untrimmed' would have had this same meaning if it occurred only here and in no other place in Shakespeare. The verb is, however, to be found in this same sense in *Sonnet xviii.* [see note by B. Field, *ante;* it is quite unlikely that Schmidt had any cognisance of this note.—ED.]. Only the *lues emendatoria*, which at last catches even such editors as Dyce, could have led him to read *uptrimmed* bride, since it is as clear as daylight that we should only speak of a '*new up-trimmed bride*' *before* the marriage, not, as in the present case, after the ceremony. [In his *Lexicon* Schmidt explains 'untrimmed' in the present passage as 'a bride recently divested of her wedding gown.'—ED.]—Br. NICHOLSON (*Athenæum*, 7th Sept., 1878): I confess my astonishment that an editor so learned and well read, and reputed of excellent judgment [as Dyce], should have substituted *uptrimmed* in this line. Did Mr Dyce not know the custom of the time? Doubtless a bride was uptrimmed then as now and in every age. Doubtless, also, her hair was so far trimmed by art as to look more naturally and more beautifully flowing. But in Shakespeare's day a virgin bride had by custom the sole right of appearing at the altar with her hair flowing and loose, and, so to speak, untrimmed or dishevelled, not tied in the matron's knot, and she wore it thus *in token of her virginity*. As the devil could appear as an angel of light, so, says Constance, he tempts you now in the guise of a pure and innocent maiden. Thus, too, we obtain and see the full meaning of the explanatory and intensitive adjective 'new,'—that is, a new or untouched bride. [Compare] Jonson's *Hymenaei*, the description of the celebrating presentation: 'Betwixt these a personated bride, supported, her hair flowing loose, sprinkled with gray,' [ed. Gifford, vii, 52]. . . . Thus this so-called emendation of Mr Dyce's alters the sense of the passage, weakens immeasurably its force, and destroys the meaning of 'new.'—FLEAY (p. 114): I note that Shakespaere never uses the verb *trim* except of dress; and though my plan is not to alter the text where any probable meaning can be got from it as it stands, I yet believe that Dyce's reading is correct. Compare in support of Staunton, *Tancred & Gismunda:* 'O let me dress up those untrimmed locks.'—V, iii. *Trim* is used in a different sense in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, sc. iv, and elsewhere; but there is no need for us to discuss interpretations (although they have been seriously advanced by some editors) which are not of a character to allow of their having been put in Constance's mouth by Shakespeare.—HERR (p. 26) says that it is altogether improbable that Constance should refer to Blanche's personal appearance, but that it is her position as one interposed between the two kings. Hence 'is it not likely that the author wrote: "In likeness of a new *intervened* bride"? Which may be interpreted to mean: "the devil tempts you here in the shape of a bride newly brought forward as an intermediary."' If *intervened* be not acceptable, Herr offers as alternatives *upsprung* or *upsummoned*, either of which, he says, 'would be infinitely better than to retain the senseless one, "untrimmed," in the text.'—[The

143. [In likenesse of a new vntrimmed Bride]

word *intervened* in the modern sense was unknown until the beginning of the seventeenth century. Herr's explanation of the passage is, besides, open to objection.—ED.]—DYER (*Folk-Lore of Sh.*, p. 53) opines that there may be here an allusion to the custom of the bride wearing her hair loose and dishevelled.—MOBERLY: That is, a new bride not yet enjoyed. It is strange that editors should wish to change the word (see *Titus Andronicus*, V, i, 93).—WRIGHT is unusually noncommital; he considers the suggestion that 'untrimmed' means divested of her bridal attire is not probable, and questions whether Staunton's interpretation may not be the true meaning.—VAUGHAN (i, 42): Shakespeare uses *trim*, both as noun and verb, to signify elaborate attire; and therefore I should fully incline to Theobald's emendation as most probable, and to Collier's MS. Corrector's as not improbable, were it not for the words, 'The devil tempts thee *here* in likeness,' and she was not present in the likeness of a trimmed bride. But 'trimmed' and 'uptrimmed' are very light matters as elements of a sensual temptation by the devil. Although, then, 'untrimmed' enhances the effect of 'new,' denoting the absence of all artificial decorations, and therefore may be Shakespeare's 'word'; yet I think it not improbable that the Poet wrote: 'a new *untamed* bride.' [See note by Theobald (*Sh. Restored*), *ante*.] No classical scholar could fail to see in this expression the equivalent to 'a new and virgin bride,' even if Shakespeare had not himself defined it virtually, and indicated its value as a spur to love and desire, by a passage in *Tro. & Cress.*, where Diomede, rebuking the eagerness shown by Paris and Menelaus for the possession of Helen, speaks of the latter as 'a flat tamed piece'—the absolute opposite of the 'new *untamed* bride' here, *Trimmed* or 'untrimmed.' Blanche was the new and virgin bride—a real temptation. It may be observed, too, that Shakespeare in the quoted passage makes a whole syllable of the last three letters of 'tamed,' as would be the case with *untamed* here.—MARSHALL: There is no doubt that *to trim* meant 'to dress more or less finely' and not simply 'to clothe'; so that those commentators who maintain that the meaning of 'untrimmed' is *undrest* have gone, probably, a little too far. At the most it would mean only in *deshabille;* but the epithet here might refer to the fact that Blanche was not fully dressed as a bride should be. I cannot see any reason for Grant White's statement that here is an allusion to the temptation of St Anthony. [Marshall mentions also the 'plausibility' of Staunton's interpretation.]—HERTFORD takes 'untrimmed' to mean '*disarrayed*, i. e., either divested of her wedding robe, or with her hair hanging loose.'—MOORE SMITH: I incline to think that we should interpret these words as 'a bride newly divested of her marriage clothes.' Though tresses may be 'untrimmed,' it does not follow that 'an untrimmed bride' should naturally mean 'a bride with untrimmed tresses,' and if 'new' is left to stand alone, it is quite otiose.—IVOR JOHN: Taking the passage as it stands, we may explain it by supposing Constance to mean that Blanch was a new-made bride having just laid aside the trimmings in which she had been married.—DEIGHTON: The strongest objection to '*un*-trimmed' is, I think, to be found in the word 'new,' which seems here to be used as an adverb, 'newly decked out.' The allusion to the temptation of St Anthony seems to me as apt whether Blanch was '*un*trimmed' or '*up*trimmed,' and the objection that 'there was no time to trim Blanch up' is almost puerile.—[In the face of so great an array of discussion and explanation of the meaning of a word, will it be considered presumptuous to say, that throughout one important fact seems to have been disregarded,

Bla. The Lady *Conſtance* ſpeakes not from her faith, [210]
But from her need. 145
Con. Oh, if thou grant my need,
Which onely liues but by the death of faith,
That need, muſt needs inferre this principle,
That faith would liue againe by death of need:
O then tread downe my need,and faith mounts vp, 150 [215]
Keepe my need vp,and faith is trodden downe.

144–155. Bla. *The Lady...lout.*] In margin Pope, Han. Om. Dono.
150. *O then*] *Oh, then!* Ktly, Huds. *O! then* Del. Craig.
151. *downe.*] *down!* Cam.+, Neils.

viz.: the circumstance under which the word is used. From first to last the interpretation of the whole line has been that Blanche is used by the devil as a lure to swerve Lewis from his allegiance. For this I think Steevens is responsible. It was, I admit, with some hesitation that I transcribed the whole of his salacious note; only the facts that his remarks have been referred to by several later commentators, and to show how one early idea may give a bias to future interpretations, are my excuse for giving them in full. But is this the only construction that can be put upon the words of Constance? Consider what has led up to her bitter speech. Lewis says to his father, 'Bethink you, you have two alternatives to choose, the consequence of the heavy curse of Rome, or the consequence of the loss of England's friendship, I advise you to forego the easier'; and, of course, he means the friendship of King John. Blanch hastily interposes that the easier to forego is the consequence of Rome's curse. With the loss of England's friendship she will lose her new-made husband. It is this remark that calls forth from Constance the appeal to Lewis to stand fast in his decision, from which he is being tempted to swerve by the words of the devil issuing from the mouth of his newly acquired bride. Friendship between Philip and John means the overthrow of all of Constance's hopes. Whether we take 'untrimmed' here to mean a *virgin bride*, with Dyce's first interpretation; or *with hair unbound*, as Staunton decides; or in *deshabille*, *undrest*, as Steevens and others have done, there can, I think, be very little reason to regard the speech of Constance as referring to Blanch herself as the temptation. She is already won by Lewis and married to him; she is not presented as a bribe to make him forswear his oath, but it is her soft, insinuating *words* that are tempting him from his allegiance. As to the particular meaning of the word 'untrimmed' here, but little need be said by the present editor; after the patient reader has examined the many opinions he is quite as competent to select that view which is held by the major number as to have it pointed out to him. Let it be said, however, that of all possible interpretations, that by Steevens is, in my opinion, the least possible; that, if a single example of the opposite of *trim* in the sense first quoted by Dilke, and accepted by Dyce, were produced it might be acceptable; that, as several examples of 'untrimmed,' in the sense given by Staunton, are well known, his explanation is deserving of high respect; that, the meaning in disarray or in deshabille is almost as bad as Steevens's. Why should Blanch be in this condition any more than Constance or Elinor? Personally I incline to Staunton's interpretation.—ED.]

146–151. **Oh, if . . . trodden downe**] MARSHALL: This speech of Constance

Iohn. The king is moud, and anſwers not to this. 152 [217]
Con. O be remou'd from him, and anſwere well.
Auſt. Doe ſo king *Philip*, hang no more in doubt.
Baſt. Hang nothing but a Calues skin moſt ſweet lout. 155 [220]
Fra. I am perplext, and know not what to ſay.
Pan. What canſt thou ſay, but wil perplex thee more?
If thou ſtand excommunicate, and curſt? 158 [223]

152. *king*] *kind* F_2F_3.
moud] *moued* Ff, Cam.+, Huds. ii. *mov'd* Rowe et cet.
153. *O*] *O!* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh!* Ktly.
remou'd] *removed* Cam. Glo. Cla. Fle. Huds. ii.
well.] *well:* Ff, Rowe. *well!* Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils.
154. *ſo king*] *ſo, King* F_4.
155. *Calues skin*] *Calues-skin* Ff, Rowe, Fle. *calve's-skin* Pope,+. *calf's-skin* Cap. et cet.
156. *perplext*] Ff, Rowe,+, Fle. *perplex'd* Cap. et cet.
157. *wil*] F_1.
more?] *more,* Rowe et seq.
158. *excommunicate*] *excommunicate'* Fle.
curſt] Ff, Rowe,+, Var. '78, '85, Cap. *cursed* Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii.

---

is very characteristic of Shakespeare's earlier style; in its elaborate antithesis and play upon words it rivals some of the most affected speeches in *Richard II.* Compare Gaunt's speeches in II, i. of that play. [See also II, i, 449–453, note by RUSHTON, *ante.*]—DEIGHTON: That is, O, if you admit my need, which need would have no existence if faith had been kept with me, that need necessarily infers this consequence, that if my need were put an end to, faith would once more be a living one. O, then if you tread my need under foot (i. e., take away the causes of it), faith necessarily mounts up, while if you maintain my need (i. e., the causes of it), you are, by doing so, treading faith under foot. 'Only' and 'but' in l. 147 are tautological.

156. **I am perplext**] SNIDER (ii, 303) calls attention here to the careful differentiation of the characters of father and son acting in accordance with their different principles. 'The son is without conscience. He sees in the present turn of affairs an opportunity for personal advantage greater than those which the fulfillment of the marriage contract offered—he uses the church as a means. At once he becomes very pious, and insists upon obedience to Pandulph's order. To be sure, he violates good faith, and endangers the new-born family to which he has pledged his sacred fealty; but these are moral considerations, which have not the weight of a feather against his self-interest. Passing to the father, we observe one of the most profound collisions to be met with in the works of Shakespeare. Philip possesses a powerful—indeed, controlling—principle in conscience. Good faith, amity, oaths are spiritual elements which he cannot disregard. But here is the Church, which commands him to break them; and the Church, too, is a principle which he acknowledges most devoutly. What is he to do? Philip hesitates to obey the mandate of Pandulph, and maintains the right of moral obligation as revealed in the human heart. It is the great function of the Church to foster and enforce the moral conscience of man; but the Church now has a political end, to which it subordinates its religious end. It is thus in contradiction with itself, and is really destroying the purpose of its existence. The King of France, therefore, asserts the internal spirit of the Church against its formal authority.'

Fra. Good reuerend father, make my perſon yours,
And tell me how you would beſtow your ſelfe? [225]
This royall hand and mine are newly knit,
And the coniunction of our inward ſoules
Married in league, coupled, and link'd together
With all religous ſtrength of ſacred vowes,
The lateſt breath that gaue the ſound of words [230]
Was deepe-ſworne faith, peace, amity, true loue
Betweene our kingdomes and our royall ſelues,
And euen before this truce, but new before,
No longer then we well could waſh our hands,
To clap this royall bargaine vp of peace, [235]

159. *reuerend*] *rev'rend* Pope,+.
160. *your ſelfe?*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *your self:* Han. *your self.* Theob. et cet.
162–173. *And...kings:*] Om. Dono.
164. *religous*] F_1.
vowes,] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Warb. *vows.* Johns. Var. '73, Knt, Coll. ii, Sta. Fle. Rlfe, Neils. *vows;* Var. '78 et cet.
166. *deepe-ſworne*] *deep ſworn* F_4, Rowe.
167. *ſelues,*] Ff, Rowe i, Cam. Glo Cla. Wh. ii. *selves.* Rowe ii,+. *selves:* Cap. Var. '73 et cet.
168. *euen*] *ev'n,* Pope,+.
169. *then*] *than* F_3F_4.
170. *of peace*] *in peace* F_4, Rowe i.

159. **make my person yours**] MOBERLY: Nothing can be finer than Philip's vain appeal to Nature and Nature's law, which had little weight indeed at a period when even truth and right would have been considered as wickedness in disguise, unless they moved in the pathways of the Church, as Dean Milman has shown in his sketch of the Emperor Frederick II. (*Lat. Christ.*, iv, 370).

160. **bestow your selfe**] That is, *behave, act.* Compare: 'How and which way I may bestow myself To be regarded in her sun-bright eye.'—*Two Gentlemen,* III, i, 87.

162. **And the coniunction**] IVOR JOHN: There is a looseness of construction in this sentence, for, although 'conjunction' is the subject of '(is) married,' '(is) coupled,' and '(is) linked,' these participles agree in meaning with 'inward souls.'—DEIGHTON: It seems doubtful whether the construction here is 'the conjunction of our souls *is* married in league,' the words 'coupled . . . vows' being an amplification of 'married in league'; or, 'the conjunction of our souls *being* married in league' is 'coupled,' etc. In either case there is tautology; for the meaning is nothing more than 'the inward union of our souls is outwardly ratified by the solemn compact we have made with formal exchange of vows.'

163. **coupled, and link'd together**] T. CARTER (p. 209) compares: 'Let no man therefore put asunder that which God hath coupled together.'—*Matthew,* xix, 6 (*Genevan Vers.*).

168–171. **And euen before . . . ouer-staind**] The lines preceding this make us apt to lose sight of the fact that what follows refers to the words 'this royal hand and mine.' The simple statement is thus: Our hands are but lately joined in friendship; only just before this truce Heaven knows how smeared they were with blood, the making of this league has barely given us time to cleanse them.—ED.

170. **To clap . . . vp**] WRIGHT: The figure is taken from the joining of hands

Heauen knowes they were beſmear'd and ouer-ſtaind 171 [236]
With ſlaughters pencil; where reuenge did paint
The fearefull difference of incenſed kings:
And ſhall theſe hands ſo lately purg'd ofbloud?
So newly ioyn'd in loue? ſo ſtrong in both, 175 [240]
Vnyoke this feyſure, and this kinde regreete?
Play faſt and looſe with faith? ſo ieſt with heauen,
Make ſuch vnconſtant children of onr ſelues
As now againe to ſnatch our palme from palme: 179 [244]

171, 177, 201. *Heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
173. *difference*] *diff'rance*] Pope.+. *incenſed*] *incensèd* Dyce, Fle. Words.
173. *kings:*] *kings.* Warb. Johns. Var. '73.
175. *loue?*] *love,* Rowe et seq.
177. *heauen,*] *heav'n?* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Fle.
179. *palme:*] *Palm?* F_4 et seq.

at the time the bargain was made. Compare *Tam. of Shr.*, 'Was ever match clapp'd up so suddenly.'—II, i, 327.

172. **slaughters pencil**] The earliest meaning of 'pencil,' as given by Murray (*N. E. D.*), is a broad brush used by painters to cover a large surface with varnish or paint, in illustration whereof he quotes among other passages: 'We shoulde with a bundel of humility, as it were with a paynters pensell, dypped in the redde bloude of Christe, marke oure selfe on euerye syde.'—1534, More, *Treat. Pass.*, Works, 1297/2.—ED.

175. **so strong in both**] JOHNSON: I believe the meaning is, love so strong in both *parties*.—HENLEY: Rather, in *hatred* and in *love;* in deeds of *amity* or *blood*.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 129): 'Both' refers to 'love,' and to 'blood' in l. 174; but as 'blood' is not very intelligible in conjunction with 'strong,' we must understand by it *enmity* (an idea included in it), and the whole sentence thus: the strengh too of this love and this enmity being seen.—DELIUS suggests as the likeliest construction that 'strong' relates to 'hands'; 'both' to 'blood' and 'love.'—MOBERLY: That is, both in quarrel and in love.—WRIGHT: That is, in fighting and in friendship.—DEIGHTON: [Henley's] explanation seems to me the better one, as completing a climax, the degrees of which are 'so lately purged,' 'so newly joined,' 'so strong,' etc. [Is not 'strong' merely intensive here? that is, so strongly, or completely, purged of blood; and so strongly *because* newly joined in love.—ED.]

176. **regreete**] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v.): A (return of a) salutation or greeting. [The present line quoted.]

177. **Play fast and loose**] NARES (*Gloss.*, s. v.): A cheating game, whereby gipsies and other vagrants beguiled the common people of their money. It is said to be still used by low sharpers, and is called *pricking at the belt*, or *girdle*. It is thus described: 'A leathern belt is made up into a number of intricate folds, and placed edgewise upon a table. One of the folds is made to resemble the middle of the girdle, so that whosoever should thrust a skewer into it would think he held it fast to the table; whereas, when he has so done, the person with whom he plays may take hold of both ends and draw it away.'—Sir J. Hawkins, [note on 'Like a right gipsey, hath, at fast and loose, Beguil'd me to the very heart of loss.'—*Ant. & Cleo.*, IV, xii, 28].

Vn-ſweare faith ſworne, and on the marriage bed 180 [245]
Of ſmiling peace to march a bloody hoaſt,
And make a ryot on the gentle brow
Of true ſincerity? O holy Sir
My reuerend father, let it not be ſo;
Out of your grace, deuiſe, ordaine, impoſe 185 [250]
Some gentle order, and then we ſhall be bleſt
To doe your pleaſure, and continue friends.
Pand. All forme is formeleſſe, Order orderleſſe,
Saue what is oppoſite to *Englands* loue.
Therefore to Armes, be Champion of our Church, 190 [255]
Or let the Church our mother breathe her curſe,
A mothers curſe, on her reuolting ſonne:
France, thou maiſt hold a ſerpent by the tongue, 193 [258]

183. *O holy Sir*] *O! holy sir*, Coll. Huds. i, Del. Craig. *O, holy sir*, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils.

184. *ſo;*] *so!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils. Craig. *so.* Del. Fle.

186. *and then*] *and* Pope,+. *then* Lettsom, Huds. ii, Words.
bleſt] *bless'd* Steev. et seq.

190. *to Armes,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Knt i, Fle. *to arms!* Theob. et cet.
Church,] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Huds. i, Cam.+, Del. Fle. Neils. Craig. *church.* Pope. *church!* Theob. et cet.

191. *Church our mother*] *church, our mother*, Cap. et seq.

191, 192. *curſe,...curſe,*] *curse,—... curse,—* Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.

192. *ſonne:*] *ſonne.* or *ſon.* Ff, Rowe et seq.

180, 181. **on the marriage bed . . . to march**] MOBERLY: It is easy to find fault with such metaphors as these; but the inward meaning should be considered: To make our armies trample down the peace which a marriage has so lately sanctioned; and (in the next line) to make a riot where true Sincerity, with her candid brow, should be mistress of all. The metaphors are not, therefore, incongruous, though the compression makes them appear so.

182. **make a ryot**] This is a somewhat unusual expression; the more common one is, to *raise* or *commit* a riot. GRANT WHITE in his *Memoirs of Sh.* (Wks, i, p. xlii.), in speaking of the quarrels between Sir Thomas Lucy and the Corporation of Stratford, says: 'Records of one about common of pasture in Henry VIII.'s time are still preserved in the Chapter House at London; and among the papers at the Rolls' House is one containing "the names of them that made the ryot uppon Master Thomas Lucy, esquier."'—This is, of course, long before W. Shakespeare's time, but it is possible that this legal use of the phrase suggested a like use in the present passage.—ED.

186. **and**] LETTSOM (ap. DYCE ii.): 'And' seems to have intruded from the line next below.

193. **a serpent by the tongue**] MOBERLY: The tongue was supposed to be the sting; as by Bunyan, who thought it a miracle that in his rash youth he had forced open a viper's mouth with a stick, and pulled out its tongue unharmed. [This ignorance of a fact in natural history was possibly peculiar to Bunyan. It can hardly be said to be general. Pliny, *Natural History* (trans. Holland), says: 'Some

A cafed Lion by the mortall paw, 194 [259]

194. *cafed*] Ff, Rowe, Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Coll. i. *chased* Pope, Knt. *caged* Coll. ii, iii, Ktly (*'raged* Id. conj.). *chafed* Theob. et cet.

say, that a serpent hath but one venomous tooth; which because it is crooked,' therefore, 'he turneth and bendeth it upright when he would sting or bite withall.'—Bk xi. (ed. 1635, p. 337); and Topsell in that part of his volume devoted to Serpents tells us: '—in their teeth they carrie poyson of defense and annoyance. . . . In the upper chap they have two longer then all the residue, on either side one, bored through with a little hole, like the sting of a Scorpion, by which they utter their poyson.'—(ed. 1608, p. 11). There are many proofs that Shakespeare's main sources of information on points in Natural History were these two authors; and if he here speak of the dangerous quality of the serpent's tongue, it is, I think, rather on account of its proximity to the death-dealing teeth.—ED.]

194. **A cased Lion**] STEEVENS: The modern editors read 'a *chafed* lion.' I see little reason for change. 'A cased lion' is a lion irritated by confinement. So in *3 Henry VI:* 'So looks the pent up lion o'er the wretch That trembles under his devouring paws.'—I, iii, 12.—MALONE: Again in Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me*, 1621: 'The lyon in his cage is not so sterne As royal Henry in his wrathful spleene.' Our Author was probably thinking on the lions, which in his time, as at present, were kept in the Tower, in dens so small as fully to justify the epithet he has used.—[Malone is unfortunate in his quotation; as the significant word *cage* is evidently a misreading of the line as it appears in the other quartos, where the words are, 'The lion in his *rage*,' ed. Elze, p. 64. In his careful reprint of this play Elze does not record *cage* as the reading of any text.—Marshall says that in his copy of the Qto, 1632, 'the word is very indistinct and seems intended for *rage* more than *cage*.' The first quarto is dated 1605. This would hardly be worth the noting were it not that Collier has used this quotation, as given by Malone, in support of the MS. Corrector's change, *caged*.—ED.]—KNIGHT, who follows Pope in reading *chased*, says: 'We have ventured here upon a slight change. The original is supposed to mean a lion in a cage. The image is, strictly taken, weakened, if not destroyed, by this epithet; for the paw of a confined lion is often held with impunity. And yet "cased" may mean irritated by confinement.'—DYCE (*Remarks*, p. 92): With a full recollection of the passages cited by Steevens and Malone to support this reading ('cas'd'), I think it decidedly wrong. Shakespeare would not have used 'cased' in the forced sense of *caged*, because in his time 'a cased lion' meant properly 'a lion stript of his skin, flayed.' So in *All's Well:* 'We'll make you some sport with the fox, ere we case him,' III, vi, 111; and in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Scornful Lady:* 'then with my tiller Bring down your gibship, and then have you cas'd, And hung up in the warren.'—V, i. Knight prints '*chased lion*.' But the right reading is undoubtedly *chaf'd;* in the following passage of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*, where the quarto of 1620 has '*chaf'd*,' the other eds. have *chast*, and (let it be particularly observed) 'cast': 'And what there is of vengeance in a lion Chaf'd among dogs or robb'd of his dear young.'—V, iii. I may add, that in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.* we find: '—so looks the chafed lion Upon the daring huntsman that has gall'd him,' III, ii, 206; and in Fletcher's *Loyal Subject:* 'He frets like a chaf'd lion,' V, iii.—SINGER in his ed. i. accepted the explanation of the Folio reading given by Steevens; in his ed. ii. he, however, discards this and 'unhesitatingly accepts the reading *chafed*,' which, through inadvertence, he as-

[194. A cased Lion by the mortall paw]

cribes to Dyce.—WHITE decides that *caged*, although doing the least violence to the text, cannot be received for much the same reasons as given by Knight, that a caged lion is less dangerous than one at liberty. In support of Theobald's reading he quotes the passage from *Henry VIII*, given above by Dyce, and also: 'As a chaft Lion, which now meets, now turns, From an untamed Bulls well brandished horns.'—*Il Pastor Fido*, IV, ii, trans. Fanshawe; ed. 1647, p. 130.—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 295, reading *chafed*): Carew seems to have had this passage in *King John* present to his mind when he wrote his lxivth Poem (*Separation of Lovers*, ed. Clarke, p. 84), and to have read *chased;* for *chafed*, as in Clarke's Carew, contradicts the context:

'Stop the chafed boar, or play
With the lion's paw, yet fear
From the lover's side to tear
Th' idol of his soul away';

and that Carew should have read *chased* was natural; for the language of Shakespeare's time was then, of course, perfectly well understood, so that no one could possibly take 'cased' for anything but nonsense, and an error of the press; and, this being taken for granted, *chased* was the most obvious correction; while, on the other hand, to complete the emendation by substituting *chafed* for *chased* was what would have occurred to none but a critic. In other parts of this poem Shakespeare is equally visible; compare St. ii. with *Sonnet* cxvi. and St. v. with *Sonnet* lvi. (Poem xci. (The Companion), *init. Sonnet* cxxx.?) By the way, *Two Noble Kinsmen*, IV, ii, Moxon's Beaumont & Fletcher, ii, 573, col. i, 'And as a *heated* [hunted] lion so he looks'; Heywood, *Woman Kill'd with Kindness:* '—as void of pity As chased [*chafed*] bears.'—Dodsley, vii, 262.—FLEAY: 'Lions always take their prey by springing on it from some concealed station.' W. S. Dallas on *Felidæ*. Hence 'cased' (*concealed*) is equivalent to watching for prey, hungry. [Fleay cites passages from *Two Gentlemen*, *Mid. N. Dream*, and *As You Like It*, wherein the adjective *hungry* is applied to the *lion*, which seem hardly relevant.] The '*chafed* lion' in *Henry VIII:* III, ii, 206, which some editors rely on for their unnecessary alterations in this passage, is Fletcher's, not Shakespeare's, who does not apply this epithet to animals. [Fleay cites passages from *Tam. of Shrew*, *3 Henry VI*, and *Timon of Athens* (which last, by the way, should be *Titus Andronicus*) wherein *chafed* is applied to the boar and bull; all these passages Fleay asserts are not of Shakespeare's writing. In supoprt of the Folio reading he cites I, v, 61 of this play, 'What shall they seek the lion in his denne.' —ED.]—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*), possibly under the influence of the foregoing note by Fleay, interprets 'cased lion': a lion hid in his cave; and indicates his surprise at Theobald's reading by printing *chafed* in parentheses and with an exclamation mark.—WRIGHT accepts Theobald's reading, since Steevens has not produced any instance wherein 'cased' has such a meaning as 'irritated by confinement; and chafed agrees better with the epithet "fasting" applied to the tiger in the next line.'—MARSHALL: We have adopted *chafed* as being, on the whole, the most probable reading.—MOORE SMITH: That is, shut in a box (or cage? or cave?). The point of the epithet would seem to be that if the lion were shut in, the man would be shut in also, and so much more courage would be required.—IVOR JOHN: None of the suggested meanings for the Folio reading seems satisfactory. I fail to see why the man should be supposed to be shut in [as Moore Smith takes it]. There is something to be said for Pope's reading [see *Text. Notes*] which would also

A faſting Tyger ſafer by the tooth, 195 [260]
Then keepe in peace that hand which thou doſt hold.
Fra. I may diſ-ioyne my hand, but not my faith.
Pand. So mak'ſt thou faith an enemy to faith,
And like a ciuill warre ſetſt oath to oath,
Thy tongue againſt thy tongue. O let thy vow 200 [265]
Firſt made to heauen, firſt be to heauen perform'd,
That is, to be the Champion of our Church,
What ſince thou ſworſt, is ſworne againſt thy ſelfe,
And may not be performed by thy ſelfe,
For that which thou haſt ſworne to doe amiſſe, 205 [270]
Is not amiſſe when it is truely done:
And being not done, where doing tends to ill,
The truth is then moſt done not doing it: 208 [273]

197. *diſ-ioyne*] *diſioyne* F_2. *disjoin* Cap. et seq.

200. *O let*] *O! let* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Craig. *Oh let* Ktly.

201. *perform'd,*] *performed!* Ktly.

202. *Church,*] Ff, Rowe i. *church.* Rowe ii,+, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Cam. Glo. Cla. Del. Fle. Dono. Craig. *church!* Cap. et cet.

204. *performed*] *performèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

thy ſelfe,] Ff, Rowe. *thy self.* Pope, Theob. Han. *thyself.* Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *thyself,* Cam.+, Words. Neils. *thyself:* Cap. et cet.

205. *For that*] *For that,* Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Coll. Hal.

206. *Is not*] *Is most* Han. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. *Is yet* Warb. Cap. *Is't not* Johns. Var. '73, '78. *Is but* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Wh. i. *Is done* Spedding.

done:] *done?* Johns. Var. '73, '78, '85.

208. *it:*] *it.* Pope,+, Ktly, Neils. Craig.

---

hold in the *Henry VIII.* passage. A lion that had been hunted and, so to speak, driven to bay would not be a pleasant creature to take by the paw.

202. **Champion of our Church**] WRIGHT: The King of France was styled the Eldest Son of the Church and the Most Christian King.

206–208. **Is not amisse . . . not doing it**] WARBURTON: This is a conclusion *de travers.* We should read, '*Is yet* amiss—.'—JOHNSON: I rather read, '*Is't* not amiss—,' as the alteration is less, and the sense which Dr Warburton first discovered is preserved.—RITSON (*Remarks,* p. 32): All these objections to, and proposed alterations of, the old reading arise entirely from its not being understood. If the reader will consider the passage a moment, he will perceive that it has sense and meaning,—is quite in the spirit of the Cardinal's quibbling logic,—and infinitely superior to any of these pretended emendations. Pandulph having conjured the king to perform his first vow to heaven,—to be champion of the Church,—tells him that what he has since sworn is sworn against his-self, and therefore may not be performed by him: for *that,* says he, which you have sworn to *do amiss,* is *not amiss* (i. e., becomes right) when it is *done truly* (that is, as he explains it, not done at all); and being *not done,* where it would be *sin* to *do it,* the *truth* is *most done* when you *do it not.* So, in *Love's Labour's,* 'It is religion to be thus forsworn.'—[IV, iii, 363].—M. MASON (*Comments,* etc., p. 156): The old reading cannot be right. Some amendment, therefore, was neces-

[206–208. Is not amisse . . . not doing it]

sary, and all of those proposed will make sense of the passage; but I should prefer that of Hanmer to that of Johnson, because all the rest of Pandulph's argument is in the way of assertion, not of question; and it agrees with what he says in the next line but one: 'The truth is then most done, not doing it.' And also with what he says afterwards in ll. 221, 222.—MALONE accepts approvingly Ritson's interpretation of 'truly done,' i. e., *not done;* since 'the licentiousness of the expression is certainly sufficiently suitable to the other *riddling* terms used by the legate.' Malone adds that 'by placing the second couplet of this sentence before the first, the passage will be perfectly clear. *Where doing tends to ill*, where an intended act is criminal, the *truth* is *most done*, by *not doing* the act. The criminal act therefore which thou hast sworn to do, *is not amiss*, will not be imputed to you as a crime, if it be done *truly*, in the sense I have now affixed to *truth;* that is, if you do *not* do it.'—[SINGER prints the latter part of Malone's note, dealing with the paraphrase of the passage, without comment or (it is to regretted) without acknowledgement; it may therefore be presumed that he prefers this to Ritson's.—ED.]—HUDSON (ed. i.): That is, not amiss when done *according to truth*, because it is then *left undone:* in the sense of 'truly,' as here used, a crime is done *truly*, when it is *not* done. Where an intended act is criminal, the *truth* is *most done* by *not doing* the act. [In his ed. ii. Hudson adopts Hanmer's reading 'inasmuch as it just makes a balance between the two branches of the sentence: "On the one hand, the wrong which you have sworn to do, is most wrong when your oath is truly performed; on the other hand, when a proposed act tends to ill, the truth is most done by leaving the act undone."'—ARROWSMITH (*Ed. of N. & Q. and Singer*, p. 6): Heming and Condell contrast advantageously with their blundering successors; for the corruptions of the text introduced by Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson absolutely invert their author's meaning, and stultify his whole argument, if Shakespeare may be his own interpreter. The adverb 'amiss,' l. 205, expresses Pandulph's construction of the deed which King Philip had sworn to do, but no part of King Philip's purpose in swearing to do it: the deed the latter had sworn to do was, in his estimation, at the time of swearing, just and right; and ll. 207, 208 are Shakespeare's own exposition of the meaning attached by himself to the words 'truly done,' when applied to a deed, which, according to Pandulph's construction, it was amiss to do: so that Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson make Shakespeare say that a wrong is done amiss when it is not done at all!! How truly might Shakespeare describe his own lot by the words which he has put into the mouth of one of his characters—of one of his clowns: 'When a man's verses cannot be understood, nor a man's good wit seconded with the forward child, understanding, it strikes a man more dead than a great reckoning in a little room.' In swearing, so reasons Shakespeare, the particular act is subordinate to the main purpose: the bond of an oath is from its righteous intendment: no self-imposed obligation can tye a man to violate the paramount moral obligation not to do evil. The text uncorrupted is both good logic and sound morality; adulterated by the logicians Hanmer and Warburton, and by the great moralist and lexicographer Johnson, it is sheer nonsense.—DELIUS: That, which you have wrongly sworn to do, is no longer wrong, if it be accomplished by means which are correct—namely, in contrary fashion. That the Legate joins this hidden meaning with words apparently contradictory is brought out in the following sentence.—COLLIER (*Notes & Emend.*, etc., ed. ii.): For 'not amiss' it is evident

[206–208. Is not amisse . . . not doing it]

that we ought to read '*but* amiss,' 'not' for *but*, and *vice versa*, being one of the commonest errors. [This note is unfortunate in its ambiguity; at first sight it appears to be an original conjecture by Collier. Staunton suggests this same alteration as necessary beyond question for the success of the argument, and does not so much as hint that it is not original with him, although Collier's volume antedates Staunton's edition by at least four years. In the note on these lines in his ed. ii. of this play, five years later, Collier leaves us in no doubt as to this being a reading in his corrected Folio: 'Here a great difficulty is entirely swept away by the simple change of "not" to *but*, as we find it in the corr. fo. 1632: what a person swears to do amiss "is but amiss," or is still amiss "when it is truly done." Nothing more can be required to clear the whole passage, and it would be mere waste of time and space to advert to what has been written by all editors on the original and absurd line. The whole passage is struck out in corr. fo. 1632, but the emendation of *but* for "not" is nevertheless inserted in the margin. No misprint could well be more common, and we have already had several instances of it.'—Collier makes no reference to Staunton's conjecture agreeing with the MS. correction; but the latter's edition did not appear until after Collier's, although, as Staunton says in his *Preface*, the greater number of the notes were written between 1857 and 1860.—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: It has been proposed to alter 'not' here to *but;* which we think would destroy the intention of the passage. As it stands it seems to us to give precisely the kind of sophistical argument characteristic in the mouth of its speaker; for Pandulph goes on to explain his own meaning of the words he uses in this line by what he says in the next two. He interprets 'truly done' to mean *left undone*, or being not done; which he asserts then most affects truth by non-fulfilment. This he would naturally preface by the sophistry, 'That which thou hast sworn to do amiss is not amiss when it is *truly done.*' The very involvement and obscurity of the casuistry makes it the more dramatically and characteristically accurate; and the whole speech forms a fine specimen of a series of plausible fallacies, strung together with Tartuffian adroitness in confounding right with wrong, and making wrong appear to be right. —WORDSWORTH (*Sh's Knowledge & Use of Bible*, p. 74): We may conjecture that Shakespeare had heard read in church the Homily 'against swearing and perjury,' the second part of which contains what follows: 'Therefore, whosoever maketh any promise, binding himself thereunto by an oath, let him foresee that the thing which he promiseth be good and honest and not against the commandment of God; and that it be in his own power to perform it justly; and such good promise must all men keep evermore assuredly. But if a man at any time shall, either of ignorance or of malice, swear to do anything which is either against the law of Almighty God, or not in his power to perform, let him take it for an unlawful and ungodly oath,' [ed. 1683, p. 45]. Godly and wholesome doctrine, which Shakespeare has taken occasion to insist upon in several passages: *3 Henry VI:* 'Perhaps thou wilt object my holy oath: To keep that oath were more impiety Than Jephthah's, when he sacrificed his daughter.'—V, i, 89–91; *2 Henry VI:* 'It is great sin to swear unto a sin, But greater sin to keep a sinful oath.'—V, i, 182, 183. [In his quotation of the passage in the present play Wordsworth reads 'Is *more* amiss,' etc., which he says is his proposed reading for the 'not' of the Folio; in his own edition of *King John* he has, however, passed from the comparative to the superlative, and reads '*most*' with Hanmer.—ED.]—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: Here Shakespeare's habit of

The better Act of purpoſes miſtooke,
Is to miſtake again, though indirect, 210 [275]

210. *Is...again,*] *Is,...again;* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Hal. Del. Fle.

inverting arrangement has, as in many other instances, puzzled his commentators. I believe he meant: 'For to do amiss that which thou hast sworn,' &c.; that is, to act against what thou hast sworn, when such acting is done according to the truth, is not really amiss.—FLEAY: For to fail in doing that which thou hast sworn to do is no wrong action if done with good intention. The construction is: to do amiss (incompletely) that which thou hast sworn (to do) is not amiss when it (your course of proceeding) is truly (honestly) done. Some commentators have been anxious to show ingenuity in emendations, but have missed the sense. All this speech of Pandulph's is intentionally confused by Shakespeare as a specimen of Jesuitical casuistry. The Jesuits were specially hated by the English at the time of this play's production and revival.—MOBERLY: If the Folio reading 'Is not amiss' be correct, the emphasis is on 'truly,' and the meaning, 'is not amiss when it is done *truly*' (that is, in the very opposite way to what was proposed). But Hanmer's emendation gives a clearer sense.—WRIGHT: That is, as explained in the next two lines, when it is not done at all. It is therefore unnecessary to read [according to any of the proposed emendations].—HERR (p. 27): In l. 208 that 'done' and 'doing' are used in the sense of *fulfil* and *fulfilling* is conclusively shown by their association with the word 'performed,' l. 204, which is likewise a synonymous term referring to the carrying out, the fulfilling of the truce or vow entered into by Philip with John. 'To do amiss' does not mean *to act wickedly*, but *to fulfil wrongly*.—VAUGHAN: 'Amiss' in l. 205 ought, in construction of the passage, to adhere closely to 'do' and not to 'sworn,' as Warburton, Johnson, and Delius make it. The same word in l. 206 ought also to precede 'done' immediately in our construction of it—just as 'truly' also should precede 'done.' The quibble of the Cardinal's argument lies in identifying *doing the truth* with *truly doing* what one has sworn. The reading of the old copies is not only right, but it constitutes the sole conclusion which can possibly be deduced from the argument which follows it.—RAICH (p. 158): This is no sophism, but the very foundation of the Shakespearean theory of vows. In God's sight there is no validity in vowed promises which from the start tend towards evil, or which later will be misused for evil, as was Herod's vow to his daughter. God cannot be bound to sin. Such a vow, whether sworn to or not, is void. But if two oaths stand against one another, the last one made must perforce weaken the earlier; since the later can be accomplished only insofar as the observation of the earlier oath shall not be thereby prejudiced, as the Papal Legate rightly explains: 'Therefore thy later vows against thy first Is in thyself rebellion to thyself,' ll. 223, 224.—MOORE SMITH: An act which you have sworn to commit unrighteously is not unrighteous if, after all, you perform it as truth requires; and in the case of an act which tends to evil, what truth requires is that it should not be performed at all.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*, reading, with Hanmer, *most*): The Folio reading, 'not amiss,' may be right, with a quibble upon the word 'truly.' 'The evil you have sworn to do is not evil when it is *truly* done; for the *true* (i. e., right) way to do an evil thing is not to do it at all.'—DEIGHTON's paraphrase is substantially the same as Ritson's.

210, 211. **indirect . . . indirection**] WRIGHT: That is, *unjust*. Compare I, ii,

Yet indirection thereby growes direct, 211 [276]
And falſhood, falſhood cures, as fire cooles fire
Within the ſcorched veines of one new burn'd:
It is religion that doth make vowes kept, 214 [279]

213. *ſcorched*] *ſcorching* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *scorchèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. 213. *new burn'd:*] *new-burn'd.* Pope, +, Del. Rlfe, Neils.

52 above, and *Richard III:* I, iv, 224: 'He needs no indirect or lawless course To cut off those that have offended him.' [For 'indirection' in sense of *injustice*, Wright compares: 'To wring From the hard hands of peasants their vile trash By any indirection.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, IV, iii, 75.]

212. as fire cooles fire] BUCKNILL (*Med. Knowledge*, etc., p. 65): This notion of one heat driving out another . . . appears to be formed upon an old-fashioned custom of approaching a burnt part to the fire, to drive out the fire, as it is said; a practice certainly not without benefit, acting on the same principle as the application of turpentine and other stimulants to *recent* burns. [Bucknill compares with the present passage: 'Even as one heat another heat expels, Or as one nail by strength drives out another.'—*Two Gentlemen*, II, iv, 192.]—WRIGHT: Compare *Coriol.*, IV, vii, 54: 'One fire drives out one fire; one nail, one nail.' And *Jul. Cæs.*: 'As fire drives out fire, so pity pity.'—III, i, 171. Again, *Romeo & Juliet:* 'Tut, man, one fire burns out another's burning.'—I, ii, 46.

214–220. It is religion . . . to sweare] WARBURTON: In this long speech the Legate is made to show his skill in casuistry; and the strange heap of quibble and nonsense of which it consists was intended to ridicule that of the schools. For when he assumes the politician, at the conclusion of the third Act, the Author makes him talk at another rate. I mean in that beautiful passage where he speaks of the mischiefs following the King's loss of his subjects' hearts. This conduct is remarkable, and was intended, I suppose, to show us how much better politicians the Roman courtiers are than divines.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 128) seems mainly concerned with the shortcomings of his predecessors' efforts to amend the present lines; and with commendation of his own changes [see *Text. Notes*, ll. 216, 218], whereby 'the speaker's reasoning is broke into two distinct arguments, one ending at l. 218, the other at a second full stop, l. 222; and that his ensuing conclusion is proper to both of them. The only harshness remaining is in the finishing words of the last argument; a harshness which the Poet is drawn into by his then predominant passion—a playing on words; else he had not been led to express with so much over-conciseness—"when *the* only *truth* prov'd by it, is—that *thou art unsure.*"'—JOHNSON: The propositions, that 'the voice of the church is the voice of heaven,' and that 'the Pope utters the voice of the church,' neither of which Pandulph's auditors would deny, being once granted, the argument here used is irresistible; nor is it easy, notwithstanding the jingle, to enforce it with greater brevity or propriety [than as given in ll. 215–220]. I think 'By what,' l. 216, should be rather 'By *which*' [than as Hanmer reads]. That is, 'thou swear'st against the thing by *which* thou swear'st'; that is, '*against religion.*' Warburton's [pointing of l. 218] leaves the passage, to me, as obscure as before. I know not whether there is any corruption beyond the omission of a point. The sense, after I had considered it, appeared to me only this: 'In swearing by religion against religion, to which thou hast already sworn, thou makest an oath the security for

[214–220. It is religion . . . to sweare]

thy faith against an oath already taken.' I will give, says he, a rule for conscience in these cases. Thou mayst be in doubt about the matter of an oath; 'when thou swearest, thou may'st *not* be always *sure* to swear rightly'; but let this be thy settled principle, 'swear only not to be forsworn': let not the latter oaths be at variance with the former. *Truth*, through this whole speech, means *rectitude* of conduct.—[HEATH (p. 226) also proposes the same pointing, viz.: a period after 'oath,' l. 218, as the only means of rendering these lines intelligible, and his interpretation naturally is substantially the same as Johnson's. Since Heath's *Revisal* and Johnson's ed. were practically contemporaneous, each may be said to have arrived at this solution independently of the other.—ED.]—MALONE: I believe the old reading of l. 216 is right; and that 'By *what*,' &c., is put in apposition with that which precedes it: 'But thou hast sworn against religion; thou hast sworn, *by what thou swearest*, i. e., in that which thou hast sworn, *against the thing thou swearest by*, i. e., religion. Our Author has many such elliptical expressions. [For examples of omission of prepositions in certain cases, see ABBOTT, §§ 200–202.] The old copy in l. 219 reads 'sweares,' which, in my apprehension, shows that two half lines have been lost, in which the person supposed to *swear* was mentioned. When the same word is repeated in two succeeding lines the eye of the compositor often glances from the first to the second, and in consequence the intermediate words are omitted. For what has been lost, it is now in vain to seek; I have therefore adopted the emendation made by Mr Pope, which makes some kind of sense. [The change *swear* for 'swears' was made by Rowe in his ed. ii, not Pope.—ED.]—STAUNTON: There are critics who profess to understand this and similar textual imbroglios of the First Folio, which is more than the Author himself would do. I venture to suggest the following as a probable reading of the passage in its original form. [Staunton makes these conjectural emendations: 'By *that*,' l. 216, wherein, except the added comma, he is anticipated by Hanmer; '*proof*' for 'truth,' l. 218, which is original; a period after 'unsure,' l. 218, wherein Capell anticipated him; and '*Who swears*' for 'To sweare,' l. 219, wherein Capell also anticipated him; finally, querying whether 'thou swear'st,' l. 216, should not be 'thou swearest *by*,' which is again Capell's reading. Is it ungenerous to observe that Staunton might have saved time and labour had he but consulted the work of some of his predecessors? Even the *Variorum* of 1821 might have been sufficient.—ED.]—HUDSON (ed. i.): Shakespeare doubtless had a purpose in putting such a string of verbal and logical subtleties and evasions into the mouth of Pandulph: at all events, it very well illustrates the casuistical art which can easily turn all moral obligations wrong-side out. The meaning of the text appears to be: the oath (truth) in swearing which you are unsafe, defeats your own security,—that oath was taken only that you might not be forsworn; and therefore cannot stand against the former oath wherein you swore to what was right and binding *in itself:* there you swore to that truth from which all other oaths derive their obligation. [For the changes adopted by Hudson in the text of his ed. ii, see *Text. Notes*, ll. 216–219. Of Staunton's change of *proof* for 'truth,' l. 218, he says: 'This would be a rather bold change; and I prefer *test*, as a word more likely to be misprinted *truth*. I see no possibility of making any sense out of the passage without some such change; and *test* is repeatedly used by Shakespeare as an equivalent for *proof*. Perhaps we ought also to read *untrue* instead of "unsure"; but "unsure" may well be taken in much the same sense as *untrue—not to be relied on*, or *untrustworthy*. Some of the strain-

[214–220. It is religion . . . to sweare]

ings and writhings of exegetical ingenuity that have been resorted to in support of the old text are ludicrous enough.'—Whether this last be intended by Hudson as a recantation of his own interpretation, is not quite manifest.—ED.]—R. G WHITE characterises the Folio reading 'By what,' l. 216, as 'a manifest misprint,' and although he follows Capell in reading 'By which,' considers the emendation 'By *that*' very plausible, and possibly the Author's word. He credits this last to Staunton, however. In regard to the last three lines White says: 'The words being taken in their ordinary and obvious signification, the passage has the very meaning and all the clearness which the casuistical churchman intended it should have.' Of Malone's elucidation White says: 'Who shall explain the explanation?' —SNIDER (ii, 304): The form of Pandulph's argument is most happy; the bald, logical utterances of scholastic divinity echo from every line; the vein of fine-spun casuistry, confusing the head and misleading the heart, gives a suspicious subtlety to the whole speech. But it is far from being a mere sophistical jumble of words; on the contrary, it is a genuine statement of the right of religious authority against the right of individual opinion. There is, however, a most important suppression in the argument of the Legate. It is that the prime duty of religion is to quicken the conscience of man; and when the organization of religion—the Church—for its own purposes seeks to deaden that conscience, its right of existence has ceased. Philip is manifestly not convinced, but withdraws his opposition, and henceforward drops out of the play.—PERRING (p. 193): That is to say, by swearing two things which are irreconcilable with each other, the one being fidelity to the King of England, the other fidelity to the Church; and so thou art making an oath a surety for thy truth against an oath. Surety for thy truth indeed! *The truth*, as to which thou art so unsure—for how canst thou with all thy vacillation and equivocation give any suretyship for it?—the truth, the tongue of truth, the man of truth, swears only not to be forsworn; truth's sole object is truth, but thy object is falsehood—thou dost swear only to be forsworn.—MARSHALL (reading l. 216, 'By *that* . . . thou swear'st *by*') thus paraphrases: 'By that (i. e., swearing against religion) you swear against that by which you swear, and make your second oath the guarantee of your truth in not keeping your first one. The truth (i. e., the loyalty to the Church) to which you are *unsure* (i. e., hesitating) to swear, takes an oath only with the object of not breaking it, and Pandulph adds: But you take an oath only with the object of breaking it; that is, by taking an oath of fidelity to John, who was the declared enemy of the Church to which he had already sworn allegiance, Philip was deliberately forswearing himself. The change of "swears," l. 219, to *swear* (imperative) is not necessary. All attempts, however, to render this passage clear must be only partially successful, the obscurity being intentional.' —PAGE: With the pointing as in the Folio the meaning might be: It is only religion which gives a binding sanctity to oaths; but you have sworn against religion itself, by the fact that you have sworn against the very thing you swear to (as a matter of universal obligation); and you make your oath a security for your truth against a previous and absolutely binding oath. When yourself about an uncertain matter (not a religious vow), you swear a really binding oath only in case you are not forsworn (by breaking the former absolutely binding oath); if this were not so, swearing itself would be a mockery; but you actually swear only to break your oath. These lines have never been satisfactorily explained. They are probably intended as a specimen of mediæval casuistry, purposely obscure.—

But thou haſt ſworne againſt religion: 215 [280]
By what thou ſwear'ſt againſt the thing thou ſwear'ſt,

216. *what*] *that* Han. Marsh. *which,* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Rlfe.
thing...ſwear'ſt] Ff, Rowe, Han. Knt. *thing...swear'st by;* Cap. Marsh. *thing...swear'st,* Pope et cet. *thing... swor'st* Ktly conj.

MOORE SMITH follows the Folio in coupling lines 214 and 215, and connecting l. 216 with what follows; he also inserts a stop after 'oath,' l. 218. He interprets these lines: 'Of course Pandulph is arguing that Philip's oath to John is perjury, because it is a violation of his primary vow to heaven'; and continues his paraphrase from l. 216 on thus: 'In so far as thou takest an oath contrary to an oath already taken, and makest the new oath a surety of thy truth as against the old one, thy second oath which thou art unstable enough to swear, is only taken as a pledge that thou wilt not forswear thyself: without such a pledge the oath would be a mere mockery: but in thy case thou art actually swearing to forswear thyself, and accordingly art most deeply forsworn by keeping the oath.' Moore Smith adds: 'In ll. 218, 219 a difficulty arises from the fact that "the truth" is made the grammatical subject of "swears," whereas logic requires (instead of "swears") "thou swearest."'—IVOR JOHN: These lines can be taken to mean: You have sworn against religion by calling in religion to witness an oath which will do her harm. 'The truth . . . forsworne' is the phrase that offers most difficulty. It yields sense by supposing it to be a slight digression from the main argument, meaning: 'and when you are asked to take an oath of which you are not sure of the consequences (such as, Pandulph would imply, the oath you took with John) you only swear, i. e., on condition that it is not contrary to some greater oath.'—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*): Philip is under vow, presumably from the time of his coronation, 'to be the champion of our Church'; it is the Church, i. e., religion, that makes an oath binding; his recent oath to John can be kept only against the church and religion, and is therefore null and void. 'The truth thou art unsure to swear, swears only not to be forsworn' must apparently mean: 'The pledge there is so little confidence of your ability to keep that you have to confirm it with an oath, is confirmed with an oath only in order that it may be kept'; a rather empty proposition.—WRIGHT: That is, by the oath thou hast taken thou hast sworn against religion, which is the thing thou swearest by. Compare: 'This has no holding To swear by him whom I protest to love, That I will work against him.'—*All's Well,* IV, ii, 27–29. The great difficulty of the passage lies in the words, 'the truth, thou art unsure To swear, swears only not to be forsworn.' Pandulph's argument is that no oath is binding which is opposed to the higher obligations of religion. The vow to God must be kept before and above all others. Other pledges of faith are of less certain obligation, and only bind the person who gives them not to commit perjury; but if by keeping them he breaks his vow to God he commits perjury in the highest degree, and to avoid this must break that pledge which is less binding than his religious obligation. The language is made intentionally obscure. [Commenting on the changes made by Staunton and Hudson, Wright says that 'thereby they have given the passage a meaning which is sufficiently clear, but may not be what Shakespeare intended.']

And mak'ſt an oath the ſuretie for thy truth, 217 [282]
Againſt an oath the truth, thou art vnſure

217–222. *And mak'ſt...ſweare,*] Om. Words. Dono.

217. *oath ... truth*] *oath— ... truth—* Huds. ii.

218. *oath*] *oath.* Johns. Var. '73, Ktly, Neils. Moore Smith. *oath:* Var. '78, '85, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Hal. Wh. Sta. Cam.+. *oath,*— Huds. ii.

the truth,] *the truth;* Rowe ii. *the truth* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *that truth* Han. *the proof* Sta. conj. *the test* Huds. ii. *the truth* Herr. *the oath* Kinnear.

218. *thou art*] *thou be'st* Herr. *then most* Orson.

vnſure] *untrue* Han. *unsure*— Warb. *unsure.* Cap. Fle. Huds. ii, Orson.

218, 219. **the truth . . . forsworne**] KNIGHT: That is, the *troth*, for which you have made an oath the surety, against thy former oath to heaven—this troth which it was unsure to swear—which you violate your surety in swearing—has only been sworn—swears only—not to be forsworn; but it is sworn against a former oath, which is more binding, because it was an oath to religion—to the principle upon which all oaths are made.—COLLIER'S explanation of these lines is substantially that of Knight; taking 'truth' as the nominative to 'swears,' since Rowe's change *swear* leaves the verb without any word to govern it. [Rowe intended, I think, that 'swear' should here be taken as the categorical imperative.—ED.]—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XVIII.): In l. 218 Mr Halliwell appears to adopt *swear'st* in his note, though he leaves 'swears' in the text.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: This appears to mean, 'The truth thou art hesitating to abide by, swears itself not to be forsworn.' The difficulty and obscurity in this speech chiefly arise from the expression 'swear' and 'swear'st,' being equally used for what has been sworn at different times; or in other words, 'thy later vows' and 'thy first'; but the very confusion thus produced in the line of argument has characteristic effect.—MOBERLY: This line, 218, is the most difficult in the speech. As the meaning at the bottom of it plainly is, that swearing would be to no purpose unless oaths were taken with an intention of keeping them, we may render it by, 'The truth according to which you cannot be trusted to swear, swears only not to be forsworn'; that is, 'with a view of keeping its oath. But your oath is in itself a perjury (ll. 221, 222), and most a perjury if you keep what you have sworn.' [VAUGHAN (i, 46) paraphrases substantially as the foregoing.—ED.]—BULLOCH (p. 129) somewhat rashly asserts that 'unsure' is here a misprint for *adjured*, and this it is which makes Pandulph's meaning 'not quite clear'; although, as Bulloch says, this word does not occur in Shakespeare, yet it 'was in common use in his day, occurring several times in the common English Bible.' [By this last reference it may be presumed that Bulloch means the Authorised Version of 1611. He is quite correct in saying that *adjure* or *adjured* occurs therein; in fact, the words may be found in seven passages, but in the corresponding sentences in both the Genevan Version, 1560, and the Bishops' Bible, 1568, the Hebrew word is translated either *sware* or *charged*, and the word *adjured* is found but once common to both translations of the Greek word ὁρκίζομεν in *Acts*, xix, 13: 'We adjure you,' etc. The word can, therefore, hardly be said to have been in 'common use' at the date of composition of the present play.—ED.]—W. W. LLOYD (*N. & Q.*, 1889; VII, viii, 302): The mischief here evidently lies in the negative term 'unsure.' The argument, which has to be accommodated by whatever change is made, runs to

To ſweare, ſweares onely not to be forſworne,
Elſe what a mockerie ſhould it be to ſweare? 220 [285]
But thou doſt ſweare, onely to be forſworne,
And moſt forſworne, to keepe what thou doſt ſweare,
Therefore thy later vowes, againſt thy firſt, 223 [288]

219. *To ſweare*] *Who swears* Cap. Huds. ii. *In swearing* Herr.
ſweares] *swear* Rowe ii,+. *ſwears* F_3F_4 et cet.
219, 220. *to be...ſhould*] *to seem...will* Herr.
220. *ſweare?*] *swear!* Dyce, Hal. Ktly, Sta. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig.
222. *And*] *Art* Vaughan.
ſweare,] *swear.* Pope et seq.
223. *later*] *latter* F_3F_4, Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing.
vowes] *vow* Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Kinnear.

---

the effect, 'What a mockery should it be to swear, unless the proper tenor of the oath—such an oath as thou art alone authorized to swear—is not to be forsworn.' To read 'the truth thou art *assured* to swear,' using *assured*, as Shylock does, in the sense of having sufficient security, would suit the argument; and the general parallelism with the phrase 'surety for thy truth,' in the preceding line, is quite in the style of his eminence's inversions and repetitions throughout the speech. Another suggestion would be '*secure* to swear,' but more risky.—HERFORD: Pandulph argues that Philip's oath to John is perjury as a violation of his primary vow to heaven; that perjured oath he takes as a surety of his good faith. But to take an oath of good faith (otherwise insecure) is a mere mockery, unless it implies that he who takes it is not thereby forsworn, whereas Philip is forsworn in the very act of swearing.—Miss PORTER: Both [Johnson's period after 'oath' and the modern colon] seem less clear and strong than the ellipsis of the entire original line unbroken, followed by the next line which adds a clause: *Against an oath* (strong emphasis on *Against*) is that truth which thou art unsure to swear without that oath! (which needs your Christian fealty as the oath to ensure it)—that truth which the oath swears, only not to be (itself) forsworn (i. e., solely on condition it is not forsworn itself), is itself a sound security, held inviolate. [There could, I think, hardly be produced a proof of the success of Pandulph's casuistry more conclusive than the foregoing array of paraphrases and suggestions; and, on the other hand, the silence of Philip, baffled and bewildered, is quite as strong an evidence that the result which the Legate intended is accomplished.—ED.]

223, 224. **Therefore thy . . . vowes . . . Is**] MOBERLY: That is, Therefore *to put* thy later vows, etc., whence the singular verb. Pandulph's support of inward truth and right as against conventional honour and faithfulness (and against the reasoning of those who say, like Lady Macbeth, 'You have sworn to do this thing, and therefore must do it') is an admirable specimen of the way in which an argument, true in itself, even though employed for a sophistical purpose, may be thrown into the most varied lights; perhaps also the most striking instance known to literature of close and compressed antithesis, such, it might have been supposed (how vain a supposition when Shakespeare is its object), that no one could have been capable of writing without a thorough training in scholastic logic. [DAWSON in like manner accounts for this use of the singular verb.]—WRIGHT: The verb is singular on account of 'rebellion,' which follows. Exactly the opposite is found in *Richard II:* 'Now, sir, the sound that tells what hour it is, Are clamorous groans,' V, v, 56. [This explanation is, I think, preferable to that of Moberly and Dawson.

Is in thy ſelfe rebellion to thy ſelfe:
And better conqueſt neuer canſt thou make, 225 [290]
Then arme thy conſtant and thy nobler parts
Againſt theſe giddy looſe ſuggeſtions:
Vpon which better part, our prayrs come in,
If thou vouchſafe them. But if not, then know
The perill of our curſes light on thee 230 [295]
So heauy, as thou ſhalt not ſhake them off
But in deſpaire, dye vnder their blacke weight.
Auſt. Rebellion, flat rebellion.
Baſt. Wil't not be? 234

224. *thy ſelfe:*] *thyself.* Johns. Var. '73.
227. *theſe*] *those* Huds. i.
giddy looſe] *giddy-loose* Walker, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
ſuggeſtions] *suggestiöns* Fle.
228. *prayrs*] *prairs* F_2. *pray'rs* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Wh. i. *prayers* Han. et cet.
229. *them.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Cam.+, Neils. *them:* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *them;* Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Del. Fle. Words. Dono. Craig.
229. *then know*] *then, know,* Cap. *then, known,* Var. '73. *then know,* Sing. Knt, Coll. Hal. Wh. i, Sta. Huds. i, Del. Fle. Dono.
230. *light*] *lights* Hal. Ktly.
233–235. *Rebellion...thine?*] Om. Dono.
233. *flat rebellion.*] *flat rebellion!* Var. '78 et cet.
234. *Wil't*] F_2F_3. *Wilt* Cap. *Will't* F_4 et cet.

For this construction we may compare the familiar words: 'The wages of sin is death.'—ED.]

226. **Then arme**, etc.] MOORE SMITH: 'Mr Worrall sends me an excellent parallel from Shirley's *Doubtful Heir*, IV, ii: "I cannot Now right you more than mourn and give belief to you."'

227. **suggestions**] That is, *temptations, promptings to evil.*

229. **If thou vouchsafe them**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh. Key*, p. 322): That is, if you vouchsafe to accept them on the conditions stated.

230. **curses light**] WRIGHT: Here 'light' is plural on account of the nearer substantive 'curses.' Compare: 'The posture of your blows are yet unknown.' —*Jul. Cæs.*, V, i, 33.

233. **Rebellion, flat rebellion**] MOBERLY: That is, flat rebellion of John against the Church.—DEIGHTON, with more likelihood, I think, says, 'this seems to refer to Pandulph's words, l. 224: "Is in thyself rebellion to thyself."'—ED.

234. **Wil't not be**] It is somewhat strange that Capell's sagacious omission of the second *l* and the apostrophe has received such scant attention. With his reading the phrase at once becomes, Wilt (thou) not be (quiet); but the words as usually printed can only mean 'Will it not be flat rebellion,' a rather tame phrase for Faulconbridge to utter in corroboration of a speech by Austria, and having no connection with the next line. Moberly interprets: 'Will nothing settle you?' but just how such a meaning can be wrested from the words 'Will't not be?' is not quite clear. Deighton says: 'That is, that you will hold your tongue'; by which, if I understand him, he means: Will it not be flat rebellion when you will

Will not a Calues-skin ſtop that mouth of thine? 235 [298]
Daul. Father, to Armes.
Blanch. Vpon thy wedding day? [300]
Againſt the blood that thou haſt married?
What, ſhall our feaſt be kept with ſlaughtered men?
Shall braying trumpets, and loud churliſh drums 240
Clamors of hell, be meaſures to our pomp?
O husband heare me: aye, alacke, how new [305]
Is husband in my mouth? euen for that name
Which till this time my tongue did nere pronounce;
Vpon my knee I beg, goe not to Armes 245
Againſt mine Vncle.
Conſt. O, vpon my knee made hard with kneeling,
I doe pray to thee, thou vertuous *Daulphin*, 248 [310]

235. *Calues-skin*] Ff, Rowe, Fle. *calve's-skin* Theob.+. *calf's-skin* Cap. et cet.

236. Daul.] Lewis. Rowe et seq.

to Armes.] *to arms!* Han. Johns. et seq.

237, 238. *day?...married?*] *day!...married!* Ktly.

238. *married*] *marrièd* Fle. Words. Dono.

239. *What,*] *What!* Coll. iii, Craig.

240, 241. *drums...hell,*] *drums,—... hell,—* Cap. Var. '78, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Hal. Huds. Words.

242. *heare me:*] *hear me!* Cap. et seq.

242, 243. *aye,...mouth?*] In parentheses Theob.+, Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Knt, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Sta. Huds. Del. Rlfe, Words, Dono.

242. *aye, alacke,*] *ah! alack,* Theob ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *ah, alack,* Steev. Varr. Dono. *ah, alack!* Sing. Coll. ii, iii, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. *ay, alack!* Craig.

243. *my mouth?*] *thy mouth!* Han. *my mouth;* Craig.

euen] *ev'n* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

244. *nere*] *ne're* F$_4$. *ne'er* Rowe.

247–249. *O, vpon...heauen*] Lines end: *knee,...thee,...doome...heauen.* Pope et seq.

247. *O,*] *O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Huds. Del. Craig. *Oh!* Ktly.

248. Daulphin] Ff, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.

---

hold your tongue. He also adds as an alternative interpretation that we read here *Wilt*, apparently unaware that therein he is anticipated by Capell.—ED.

235. **of thine**] For other examples of this construction see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 239. Compare III, ii, 81: 'this foot of mine.'

240, 241. **Shall . . . to our pomp**] MALONE: This is formed on the following lines in *The Troublesome Raigne:* '*Blanch.* And will your grace upon your wedding day Forsake your bride, and follow dreadful drums. . . . *Phil.* Drums shall be music to this wedding day.' [See *Appendix, Troublesome Raigne*, pt i, p. 494.]

240. **braying trumpets**] HOLT WHITE, quite needlessly, I think, quotes seven passages from various writers in support of his statement that '"Bray" appears to have been particularly applied to express the harsh grating sound of the trumpet.' It might, on the other hand, be said that such was but a transferred meaning, and that the word was particularly applied originally to the characteristic cry of the donkey.—ED.

Alter not the doome fore-thought by heauen.
Blan. Now ſhall I ſee thy loue, what motiue may 250
Be ſtronger with thee, then the name of wife?
Con. That which vpholdeth him, that thee vpholds, [315]
His Honor, Oh thine Honor, *Lewis* thine Honor. 253

249. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+. *heaven!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Cam.+, Del. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils.

250. *loue,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *love.*— Var. '73, Knt, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Del. Fle. Dono. Neils. *love;* Theob. et cet.

251. *then*] *than* F_4.

253. *Honor, Oh*] *honour. Oh* F_3F_4, Rowe.+, Wh. i, Ktly, Dono. Neils. *honour;—O,* Cap. Dyce, Hal. *honour: Oh,* Var. '78, '85, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta. Huds. Cam.+, Words. *honour O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Craig.

253. Lewis] *Louis* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words.

Lewis *thine Honor.*] F_2F_3. Lewis, *thine Honor.* F_4, Rowe, Coll. Del. Fle. Dono. *Lewis, thine honour!*— Theob. et cet.

252, 253. **That which . . . thine Honor**] DEIGHTON: These words recall Lovelace's lines to Lucasta, on going to the wars: 'I could not love thee, dear, so much Lov'd I not honour more.'

253. **Lewis thine Honor**] CAMPBELL (*Life of Mrs Siddons*, i, 210): When she patted Lewis on the breast, with the words, 'Thine honour!—oh, thine honour!' there was a sublimity in the laugh of her sarcasm.—FLETCHER, whose knowledge of Mrs Siddons's acting of the part of Constance is derived from Campbell's and her own account, objects to this conception of these words on the following grounds (p. 24): 'We must affirm that anything like sarcastic expression of this passage is quite inconsistent with the essential character of Constance, and most inappropriate to the occasion upon which it is delivered. . . . She is now encouraged to strain every nerve of her intellect and her eloquence in enforcing the Cardinal's denunciation against her principal oppressor, and his menace to the most potent of her treacherous friends. The Dauphin, whose sense of honour throughout the piece is represented as more susceptible than his father's, is the first to show signs of their late political engagements. Upon this relenting emotion she eagerly lays hold; and in opposition to the entreaty of his bride, who kneels to beg that he will not turn his arms against her uncle, makes the fervent religious adjuration, 'Thou virtuous dauphin, alter not the doom Forethought by heaven!' And to Blanch's last appeal she rejoins by urging triumphantly the noble moral sentiment [contained in ll. 252 and 253]. And on Philip's consenting to break the treaty, she concludes with the grateful exclamation: 'Oh, fair return of banish'd majesty!' Where, we would ask, is the tone of *sarcasm* in all this? The slightest touch of it might have defeated the very object, dearest to her on earth, for which she was pleading, by checking and offending those 'compunctious visitings' the first symptoms of which she was alert to observe and to nourish in the breasts of her unfaithful friends. *Sarcasm* from her lips at such a moment! No, indeed—Constance, and Shakespeare, know too well what they are about. [In another article, written a few years later, Fletcher deals with the acting of the part of Constance by Helena Faucit, later Lady Martin. In speaking of her action at this present passage he says: 'Most affectingly and impressively beautiful, to our mind, is the expression of the noble nature of the heroine, which her representation gives to the kneeling appeals which Constance makes to the virtuous dauphin. Already,

Dolph. I muſe your Maieſty doth ſeeme ſo cold, [317]
When ſuch profound reſpects doe pull you on?
Pand. I will denounce a curſe vpon his head.
Fra. Thou ſhalt not need. *England*, I will fall frõ thee. [320]
Conſt. O faire returne of baniſh'd Maieſtie.
Elea. O foule reuolt of French inconſtancy.
Eng. France, ỹ ſhalt rue this houre within this houre. 260
Baſt. Old Time the clocke fetter, ỳ bald ſexton Time:
Is it as he will? well then, *France* ſhall rue. 262 [325]

254. Dolph.] Ff. Lou. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words. Lewis. Rowe et cet.
255. *on?*] *on.* Han. Cap. et seq.
257. *need.*] *need* F_4.
I will] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Dyce i, Wh. Hal. Sta. Cam.+, Dono. *I'll* Pope et cet.
258, 259. *Maieſtie....inconſtancy.*] *Majesty!...inconstancy!* Pope et seq.
260. Eng.] K. John. Rowe et seq.
ỹ] *thou* Ff.
261, 262. Baſt. *Old...rue*] Om. Dono.
261. *bald*] *bauld* F_3.
262. *Is it*] *Is it,* Pope,+.

---

in speaking of Mrs Siddons's acting of the part, we have fully expressed our opinion as to the true reading of this important passage. We have here only to add that Miss Faucit gives that reading, as it seems to us, with admirable affect, delivering especially, with all that noble and generous fervour which we conceive belongs to it, the unanswerable answer to Blanch contained in ll. 252 and 253.']

255. respects] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v. sb. 14.): A consideration; a fact or motive which assists in, or leads to, the formation of a decision; an end or aim. [The present line quoted. Compare V, ii, 47; V, iv, 45.]

256. denounce] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. *vb.* 1.): To give formal, authoritative, or official information of; to proclaim, announce, declare.

257. fall frõ] WRIGHT: That is, *desert.* Compare Heywood: 'If he will recant And fall from Lewis again.'—*2 Edward IV:* I, vi.

261, 262. Old Time . . . shall rue] VISCHER (*Vorträge*, iv, 34): A charming idea; thoroughly Shakespearean, with its train of images. It was not to be a cause, only Time, that old bald Sexton, the clock-setter, a lean gray mannikin who goes in and out of a tower in order to strike upon a bell. A capital example, if one were to speak on the subject of the value of metaphor.—VAUGHAN (i, 99): The order of thought here is indistinctly and elliptically expressed. It is as follows: Old Time sets the clock, and as he does this duty of the parish sexton, also probably does his other duty of digging graves. By his calling therefore he is bound to wish for as many deaths as possible. If Time, therefore, is to do what he likes, he will make the French rue.—MOORE SMITH: Is the remorse of France to be, as John says, contingent merely on the course of Time? Well then, it is a certainty.—DEIGHTON'S interpretation is substantially the same as Moore Smith's; he adds: 'Of course there is no logical connection between the two things [i. e., Time's decision and France's repentence]; in fact, the humour consists in their irrelevancy.'—IVOR JOHN thinks this comment of the Bastard lacks the 'usual salt of his remarks.' [But is it not just such a sarcastic speech as we should expect from him? In effect he says: What! Is France's punishment to depend upon the action of an old bald sexton? Well, if that is all; France will indeed be

Bla. The Sun's orecaſt with bloud : faire day adieu, 263 [326]
Which is the ſide that I muſt goe withall?
I am with both, each Army hath a hand, 265
And in their rage, I hauing hold of both,
They whurle a-ſunder, and diſmember mee. [330]
Husband, I cannot pray that thou maiſt winne:
Vncle, I needs muſt pray that thou maiſt loſe:
Father, I may not wiſh the fortune thine: 270
Grandam, I will not wiſh thy wiſhes thriue:
Who-euer wins,on that ſide ſhall I loſe: [335]
Aſſured loſſe, before the match be plaid. 273

263. *day*] *pay* F_4.
adieu,] *adieu!* Theob. et seq.
267. *a-ſunder*] *aſſunder* F_3F_4. *asunder* Rowe.
268, 269. *maiſt*] *may'ſt* F_4 et seq.
271. *Grandam*] *Grandame* Cap. Knt, Sta. Fle.
273. *Aſſured*] *Assurèd* Dyce, Fle, Huds. ii, Words. Dono.
plaid] *play'd* Pope et seq.

well punished. Faulconbridge has previously shown his utter scorn of anything less than vigorous action for the settlement of a quarrel.—ED.]

264. withall] Rev. JOHN HUNTER: When 'withal' is, as here, a preposition equivalent to *with*, it always follows its object, which is often a relative pronoun, as in the present instance. It will, of course, be without an object when it belongs to the passive participle of a preposition-verb, as in: 'He's within, sir, but not to be spoken withal.'—*Tam. of Shr.*, V, i, 22. Frequently its object, when that is a relative pronoun, has to be supplied in parsing; as in: 'The adversary (whom) I come to cope withal.'—*King Lear*, V, iii, 123. When 'withal' is an adverb, it signifies *therewith;* as in: 'I must have liberty withal.'—*As You Like It*, II, vii, 48. But we sometimes meet with the redundant form, 'therewithal, as in: 'And therewithal came to this vault to die.'—*Rom. & Jul.*, V, iii, 289. [See ABBOTT, § 196; or MAETZNER, ii, p. 146.]

267. They . . . dismember mee] STEEVENS: Alluding to a well-known Roman punishment: '—Metium in diversa quadrigæ Distulerant.'—*Æneid*, viii, 642. [On this note MALONE remarks that 'Shakespeare was much more likely to have alluded in cases of this sort to events which had happened in his own time than to the Roman history'; and refers to a note of his on 'Death on the wheel, or at wild horses heels,' *Coriol.*, III, ii, 2, wherein he says: 'Shakespeare had probably read or heard that Balthazar de Gerrard, who assassinated William, Prince of Orange, in 1584, was torn to pieces by wild horses,' and so likewise was John Chastel in 1594 for attempting to assassinate Henry IV. of France. Since this last date is near to that of the composition of the present play it may be that Shakespeare here alludes to that mode of punishment reserved for the most heinous crimes.—ED.]

272. Who-euer wins] Rev. JOHN HUNTER: Similarly, in *Ant. & Cleo.*, III, iv, 12, Octavia, perplexed about the hostility between her brother Cæsar and her husband Antony, says: 'A more unhappy lady, If this division chance, ne'er stood between, Praying for both parts. . . . Husband win, win brother, Prays, and destroys the prayer.'

Dolph. Lady, with me, with me thy fortune lies. [337]
Bla. There where my fortune liues, there my life dies. 275
Iohn. *Coſen*, goe draw our puiſance together,
France, I am burn'd vp with inflaming wrath, [340]
A rage, whoſe heat hath this condition;
That nothing can allay, nothing but blood,
The blood and deereſt valued bloud of *France*. 280
Fra. Thy rage ſhall burne thee vp, & thou ſhalt turne
To aſhes, ere our blood ſhall quench that fire: [345]
Looke to thy ſelfe, thou art in ieopardie. 283

274. *Lady, with me,*] *Lady, with me;* Cap. et seq.
lies] *lives* Cap. Words.
275. *liues*] *li'es* Fleay.
276. *puiſance*] *puiſſance* F_3F_4.
together,] *together.* [Ex. Bast. Pope et seq.
278. *condition;*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *condition* Theob.+. *condition,* Cap. et cet.
279. *allay*] *allay't* Cap. conj. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
280. *The blood*] Ff, Rowe. *The best,* Walker, Huds. ii, Words. *The blood,* Pope et cet.
and] *the* Huds. ii. (conj.).
deereſt valued] *dearest valu'd* Rowe, Pope, Var. '85, Sing. Ktly, Huds. i. *dearest-valued* Theob. et cet.
bloud] *blue* Bulloch.
281. *ſhalt*] *ſhall* F_4, Rowe i.

274. **thy fortune lies**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, 129): This [reading *lives* for 'lies'] may be pronounc'd with great certainty—a genuine reading, and 'lies' its corruption by one enamour'd of rhyme; for the reply is created by it, and depends on it wholly, and inattention or blindness must have been the cause of its appearing in no modern.

275. **liues**] FLEAY: 'Lives' was often pronounced *lees*, as here [see *Text. Notes*]; so that *lie* and *live* had the same sound. The letter *v* could be omitted between any two vowels. Thus in *Tancred and Gismunda*, III, *chorus*, *lo'e* (love) rhymes to over*throw*, and in *Edward III*, *gi'e* (give) rhymes to *buy; London Prodigal*, II, i, *mo'e* (move) rhymes to *too*. Chapman is distinguished from all other dramatists by his frequent adoption of this pronunciation.

280. **The blood**] MOBERLY: Walker must surely be right in proposing, 'The *best*, and dearest-valued.' [Moberly does not, however, adopt this in his text.—ED.]—IVOR JOHN: The repetition of the word 'blood' has led to emendation. The text is, however, defensible. John says, nothing can allay his rage but blood; he is going to state that it must be French blood, and when half-way through the sentence he sees a method of heightening the effect and interjects 'and (that the) dearest valued blood.'—[So far from agreeing with Moberly or those who have adopted Walker's change, I think that any substitution here appreciably weakens the effect produced by this explosive repetition. John is fairly stammering with rage; the reiterated 'nothing' in the preceding line has the same force.—ED.]

283. **ieopardie**] WRIGHT: The origin of this word seems to be the French *jeu parti*, a game in which the risk is evenly divided. In Du Cange (Gloss., s. v. *Jocus*) *Jocus partitus* is 'an alternative.' 'The risk involved in accepting an alternative is taken as the representative of any risk whatever, and hence *jeopardy* has the general meaning of "hazard"' (Wright, *Bible-Word-Book*, s. v. Jeopard).—[MOORE SMITH notes that the word does not occur elsewhere in Shakespeare.]

Iohn. No more then he that threats. To Arms le'ts hie. [347]
Exeunt. 285

Scœna Secunda.

Allarums, Excurſions: Enter Baſtard with Auſtria's head. 2

Baſt. Now by my life, this day grows wondrous hot,
Some ayery Deuill houers in the skie, 5

284. *then*] *than* F_4.
To Arms] *To Arms!* Var. '73, Sta. *To arms*, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal.
le'ts] F_1.
hie.] Ff, Rowe,+, Sta. Fle. *hie!* Cap. et cet.
285. Exeunt.] Exeunt, severally the English and French Kings, &c. Dyce, Hal. Words.
1. Scœna Secunda] SCENE III. Pope. SCENE IV. Warb. Johns. ACT III, sc. i. Dono.
A Field of Battle. Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann. In Castle of Angiers. Dono. Plains near Angiers Mal. et cet.
1–15. Om. Dono.
2. Allarums] Allarms F_4. Alarms, Rowe. Alarums, as of a Battle join'd; Cap.
Baſtard] Faulconbridge Theob.+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.
Auſtria's] a Capell.
5. *ayery*] *fiery* Warb. Theob. Han. Coll. iii. (MS.), Huds. ii.

284. **To Arms**] MALONE (*Supplement. Obs.*, i, 168): I would point thus, 'To arms let's hie.'—The proposition is, I believe, single. *Let us begone to arms!* [Malone was apparently unaware that he thus restored the reading of the Folio; although in his own text he returns to the pointing of his predecessors.—ED.]

2, 3. **Enter . . . head**] OECHELHAÜSER, in his stage arrangement, here makes a wide divergence from the original. The scene is still before Angiers; sounds of battle are heard; the Bastard pursues Austria across the stage, and then enters carrying the lion's skin, which he casts down, with the words: 'Lie thou there, the ass that wore thee's fled!' This line is, of course, Oechelhaüser's own contribution, but the substitution of the lion's skin for Austria's head he obtained, I think, from J. P. Kemble. In the latter's arrangement Faulconbridge enters, and after the words 'mischiefe,' l. 6, encounters Austria, attacks him, and drives him off; then re-enters with the lion's-skin, which he apostrophises as 'Austria's head.' Charles Kean also adopted this arrangement.—ED.

4. **Bast.**] F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Cens.*, ii, 160): We think the lion's-skin, as a trophy of honor worn by his father, should be worn by the Bastard through the remainder of the play.

5. **ayery**] WARBURTON: We must read 'Some *fiery* devil' if we will have the *cause* equal to the *effect*.—THEOBALD, in support of Warburton's change, says: 'It is a very inconclusive inference, sure, that because it grows wond'rous hot, some airy devil hover'd in the sky. It is a sort of reasoning that carries an air of ridicule; unless we could determine that the Poet meant no more by the epithet than to express the sacred text, in which the Devil is stiled the *Prince of the Air*.—JOHNSON: Dr Warburton will have the devil *fiery* because he makes the day *hot;* the Author makes him 'airy' because 'he hovers in the sky,' and the heat and mischief are natural consequences of his malignity.—EDWARDS (*Canons*, etc.,

And pour's downe miſchiefe. *Auſtrias* head lye there, 6
Enter Iohn, Arthur, Hubert.

6. *pour's*] *pours* F_4.
7. Enter...Hubert.] After l. 8 Cap. et seq.
7. Iohn...Hubert.] King John, with Arthur prisoner; Hubert following. Cap.

p. 53): 'Airy devil' seems an allusion to the Prince of the power of the air; but the effect described is *pouring down* mischief, which would suit a *watery* devil better than a *fiery* one.—PERCY: Shakespeare here probably alludes to the distinctions and divisions of some of the demonologists, so much regarded in his time. They distributed the devils into different tribes and classes, each of which had its peculiar qualities, attributes, etc. These are described at length in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part I, sect. ii, p. 45, ed. 1632: 'Of these sublunary devils—Psellus makes six kinds; fiery, aeriall, terrestriall, watery, and subterranean devils, besides those faieries, satyres, nymphes, &c. Fiery spirits or divells are such as commonly worke by blazing starres, fire-drakes, and counterfeit sunnes and moones, and sit on ships' masts, etc., etc. Aeriall divells are such as keep quarter most part in the aire, cause many tempests, thunder lightnings, teare oakes, fire steeples, houses, strike men and beasts, make it raine stones,' etc.—HENDERSON: There is a minute description of devils or spirits, and their different functions, in *Pierce Pennilesse his Supplication*, 1592. With respect to the passage in question, take the following: '—the spirits of the aire will mixe themselves with thunder and lightning, and so infect the clyme where they raise any tempest, that sodainely great mortalitie shall ensue to the inhabitants. The spirits of fire have their mansions under the regions of the moone,' [ed. Grosart, p. 115 et seq.].—FLEAY, [after quoting the foregoing passages from Burton and Nash, adds]: 'But when proud Lucifer fell from the heavens, . . . They which offended less hung in the fire, And second faults did rest within the air; But Lucifer and his proud-hearted fiends Were thrown into the centre of the earth.'—Greene, *Friar Bacon*, sc. ix. This last quotation explains the origin of the belief in airy devils.—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 204): The MS. Corrector has changed the word 'ayery' to *fyery*, which, we may feel confident, was that of the Poet, and which is so consistent with the context. [In his ed. ii. Collier adds: 'An "airy devil" was not likely to be the Bastard's word, in the midst of the heat and fury of the conflict.'—ED.]—KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*): We may venture to think that Collier carries his advocacy too far when he quotes [but a part of] what Burton says of 'fiery devils,' and there stops, although Percy continues the quotation. . . . We turn to Burton, and find in another place, where he says of this class who pours down mischief: 'Paul, to the Ephesians, calls them forms of the air.' Shakespeare knew this curious learning from the Schoolmen; but the Corrector knew nothing about it.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 86) likewise finds fault with Collier for quoting but a part of the passage from Burton, and entirely omitting that from Nash, given by Henderson. In conclusion Singer observes that 'Nash and Shakespeare most probably drew their pneumatology from the same source. The evidence is therefore decisive in favour of the old reading.' [It is, at times, painfully evident that Collier, for his knowledge of the work of his predecessors, relies upon the notes contained in the *Variorum* of 1821 alone. In the present instance Warburton's, Theobald's, and Johnson's notes on this word are conspicuously absent; and Collier makes no mention of the coincidence of Warburton's reading with that of his MS. Corrector.—ED.]

While *Philip* breathes. 8
Iohn. *Hubert*, keepe this boy: *Philip* make vp,

8. *While...breathes.*] Om. Pope,+.
9. Hubert] *There, Hubert* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. *Here, Hubert* Ktly, *Good Hubert* Fle.
keepe] *keep thou* Tyrwhitt, Rann, Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words.
9. *boy:*] *boy.*— Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Neils. Craig.
Philip] *Cousin* Han. Words. *Richard* Theob. Warb. Johns.

8. While Philip breathes] POPE omits these words, and in their stead substitutes from *The Troublesome Raigne* the following lines:

> 'Thus hath king Richard's son perform'd his vow,
> And offer'd Austria's blood for sacrifice
> Unto his father's ever-living soul.'

In this substitution he is followed by Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson, and the *Variorum* of 1773.

8, 9. Philip . . . Philip] CAPELL (I, pt 2, p. 129): 'Philip' is either a slip of the Poet's, caus'd by his remembrance of what had passed in the Quarto, or we may ascribe it to haste in both the persons it comes from; in either case it ought not to be alter'd. [See *Text. Notes*, l. 9.]—STEEVENS also calls attention to this very natural forgetfulness on the part of the King who had given Philip the name of Richard on knighting him.—DEIGHTON, while admitting that the words 'while Philip breathes' may possibly be rightly explained as referring to Philip himself, taking breath with a view to renewing the combat, prefers to think that the Bastard here means 'until I have slain Philip,' adding that 'it seems more in the character of the Bastard to determine upon Philip's death as well as that of Austria.' —It may be said, however, that Deighton has failed to notice how utterly out of character it would be for the Bastard to speak of the King of France without any title; even his brother King speaks of him and to him as 'France.'—PERRING is also of the opinion that the Bastard does not here refer to himself; he says (p. 194) in regard to the name 'Philip' in l. 9: 'It may be said that Shakespeare probably made the slip [of Philip for Richard]. I think it much more likely that a copyist did. His eye caught and his ear yet tingled with the name of Philip, *King of France, who is mentioned in the preceding line.* If we could but peep into the Author's MS. I believe we should find: "Richard, make up."'—[Had Perring but peeped into Theobald's ed. he would have found that herein he was anticipated.—ED.]

9. Hubert, keepe . . . make vp] DYCE (ed. ii.): In Guest's *Hist. of English Rhythms*, vol. i, p. 238, this line is cited from the old copy as right, and *as resembling in metre certain lines of Anglo-Saxon poetry!* [The italics and exclamation point are Dyce's.—ED.]—Br. NICHOLSON (*N. & Q.*, 1887, VII, iii, 264): An ordinary eye can see that the dramatist made John make this lapse that he might the more contrast the brother and son of Cœur-de-Lion. The battle is, according even to the son, 'wondrous hot.' . . . The king shows himself weak in resolution and fearful, gives Arthur into other keeping . . . and fears that his camp is assailed and his mother taken. The deed-doing and resolute son of King Richard has, unknown to the nominal leader of the army, rescued her and warded off the danger. The king, in his flurry and fear, recurs to the name under which he first knew the supposed son of Sir Robert Faulconbridge. Like new-made honour, fear forgets the new names of men.

My Mother is aſſayled in our Tent,
And tane I feare.
Baſt. My Lord I reſcued her,
Her Highneſſe is in ſafety, feare you not:
But on my Liege, for very little paines
Will bring this labor to an happy end. *Exit.*

[*Scene III.*]

Alarums, excurſions, Retreat. Enter Iohn, Eleanor, Arthur Baſtard, Hubert, Lords.

Iohn. So ſhall it be: your Grace ſhall ſtay behinde
So ſtrongly guarded: Coſen, looke not ſad,

10. *aſſayled*] *assailèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
11. *tane*] *ta'en* Rowe.
12. *her,*] her. Ff.
13. *not:*] *not.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Ktly, Neils.
14. *on my Liege,*] *on my Leige,* F_2. *on, my Liege,* F_4.
15. *an*] *a* Cap. Knt, Sing. ii, Hal. Coll. iii.
Exit.] Exeunt. Rowe.

SCENE IV. Pope. SCENE V. Han. Warb. Johns. SCENE III. Var. '73 et seq.
1. Alarums] Alarms F_4.
Enter...] Re-enter... Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
3. *behinde*] *behind* [To Elinor. Han. et seq. (after *be:* Capell).
4. *So*] *More* Lettsom, Huds. ii.
guarded:] *guarded.* Cap. et seq.
ſad,] *sad,* [to Arthur. Pope et seq.

10, 11. My Mother . . . tane I feare] MALONE: The Author has not attended closely to the history. The Queen-Mother, whom King John had made Regent in Anjou, was in possession of the town of Mirabeau, in that province. On the approach of the French army with Arthur at their head, she sent letters to King John to come to her relief; which he did immediately. As he advanced to the town, he encountered the army which lay before it, routed them, and took Arthur prisoner. The Queen in the meanwhile remained in perfect security in the castle of Mirabeau. Such is the best authenticated account. Other historians, however, say that Arthur took Elinor prisoner. The author of the old play has followed them. In that piece Eleanor is taken by Arthur and rescued by her son.

16. FLEAY (*Chron. Eng. Drama*, ii, 200): The omission [*Scena Tertia*] in the Folio arose from the common mistake of printing *Exit* for *Exeunt* at the end of III, ii. The MS. had probably *Ex.* The new scene is proved by '*Enter John, Arthur, Hubert*' in III, iii. It should be edited as III, ii*b* to preserve the old notation through the Act.

4. So] MARSHALL objects to Lettsom's change '*more*' on the ground that Queen Elinor had asked for some specified number of forces, see l. 94 below. '"So," therefore, although it looks very much like an accidental repetition by mistake of the word in the line above, may be the right reading, the meaning being, "so strongly guarded as you have asked to be."'

4. Cosen, looke not sad] KNIGHT (*Studies*, p. 204): Up to the concluding scene of the third Act we have not learnt from Shakespeare to hate John. We may think him an usurper. Our best sympathies may be with Arthur and his mother.

Thy Grandame loues thee, and thy Vnkle will
As deere be to thee, as thy father was.
Arth. O this will make my mother die with griefe.
Iohn. Cofen away for *England*, haſte before,
And ere our comming ſee thou ſhake the bags
Of hoording Abbots, impriſoned angells
Set at libertie: the fat ribs of peace
Muſt by the hungry now be fed vpon:

5. *Grandame*] *Grandam* Rowe et seq.
7. *griefe.*] *grief!* Cam.+.
8. *before,*] *before,* [to the Baſt. Pope, +, Var. '78, '85. (after *Cofen*) Mal. et seq.
10. *hoording*] *hoarding* F_3F_4.
10, 11. *impriſoned angells Set at libertie*] *their imprison'd angels Set at liberty* Pope, Var. '73, Coll. ii. (MS.). *their imprison'd angels Set thou at liberty* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Steev. *angels imprison'd Set thou at liberty* Var. '03, '13, '21, Sing. i. *imprison'd angels Set thou at liberty* Knt. *set at liberty Imprison'd angels* Walker (Crit., iii, 119), Wh. i, Ktly, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Rlfe, Words. Dono. Craig. *imprison'd angels Set all at liberty* Anon. ap. Cam. *imprisoned angels Set at good liberty* Vaughan.
12. *now*] *war* Warb. Theob. *maw* Han.
vpon:] *upon.* Pope.

But he is bold and confident, and some remnant of the indomitable spirit of the Plantaganets gives him a lofty and gallant bearing. We are not even sure, from the first, that he had not something of justice in his quarrel, even though his mother confidentially repudiates 'his right.' In the scene with Pandulph we completely go with him. We have yet to know that he would one day crouch at the feet of the power that he now defies. . . . But the expression of *one thought* that had long been lurking in the breast of John sweeps away every feeling but that of hatred, and worse than hatred; and we see nothing hereafter in the king but the creeping, cowardly assassin, prompting the deed which he is afraid almost to name to himself, with the lowest flattery of his instrument, and showing us, as it were, the sting which wounds, and the slaver which pollutes, of the venomous and loathsome reptile. . . . The warrior and the king vanish.

9, 10. **see thou shake . . . Abbots**] H. COLERIDGE: In the old play Faulconbridge's execution of this order is exhibited on the stage, and he finds a young-skinned nun in a chest where the Abbot's treasures were supposed to be deposited. It showed the good taste and boldness of Shakespeare that he did not retain this incident, so well calculated to make vulgar spectators laugh. He makes no reflection on the doctrine or discipline of Rome, far less does he calumniate the purity of her devoted virgins. He makes a king speak the sentiments of every king who did not need the Pope's countenance. John, when he found this need, crouched as vilely to the Pope as the most grovelling of Papists, and Shakespeare does not conceal the circumstance. How different from the absurdity of Bishop Bale, who makes the murderous, lastful, impious infidel John a Protestant hero.

10. **imprisoned angells**] Miss PORTER: This is, perhaps, a quip on imprisoned *nuns* quite as much as on the coins called 'angels.' The first pun would be understood by those who knew the older play.

12. **Must . . . now be fed vpon**] WARBURTON: This word 'now' seems a very idle term here, and conveys no satisfactory idea. An antithesis, and opposition

Vſe our Commiſſion in his vtmoſt force. 13
Baſt. Bell, Booke,& Candle, ſhall not driue me back,

13. *his*] *its* Rowe,+.

of terms, so perpetual with our Author, requires: 'by the hungry *war*.' *War* demanding a large expense, is very poetically said to be 'hungry,' and to prey on the wealth and 'fat' of 'peace.'—JOHNSON: This emendation is better than the former word, but yet not necessary. Hanmer reads *maw*, with less deviation from the common reading, but not with so much force or elegance as *war*.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 129): The word that follows 'hungry' is so far from 'an idle term' that 'tis strongly emphatical, carrying with it the idea of that very word—*war*—which [has been put] in its place; for the time that calls upon John to make this fat-ribbed peace feed the hungry, is—a time of war. For opposition—we have now as much as is commendable, and in the best way, that is—indirect; for it lies between *leanness*, which is comprehended in 'hungry,' and the above-described peace. This image is doubtless excited by the idea we commonly have of such churchmen as fall within the Bastard's 'commission.' Which commission the Quarto makes him execute openly; much to the diversion of that play's auditors, who had papists and papistry fresh in hatred by reason of the Spanish invasion.—STEEVENS: Either emendation may be unnecessary. Perhaps 'the hungry now' is *this hungry instant*. Shakespeare uses the word 'now' as a substantive in *Meas. for Meas.*, '—till this very *now*, When men were fond, I smil'd and wonder'd how,' II, ii, 186.—[To this MARSHALL pertinently replies: 'Unfortunately "till this very now" is only the conjectural reading of Pope. The Ff. have "ever till now."'—ED.]—MALONE: The meaning, I think, is, the fat ribs of peace must now be fed upon by the hungry troops,—to whom some share of this ecclesiastical spoil would naturally fall. The expression, like many other of our Author's, is taken from the sacred writings: 'And there he maketh the hungry to dwell, that they may prepare a city for habitation.'—*Psalm* cvii. Again: 'He hath filled the hungry with good things,' &c.—*Luke*, i, 53. This interpretation is supported by the passage in the old play, which is here imitated: 'Ransack their abbeys, cloysters, priories, Convert their coin unto my soldiers' use.'—[Pt i, sc. ix, ll. 19, 20. On the strength of this Malone conjectured that in the present line the word 'soldiers' had dropped out after the word 'hungry'; but later decided that his foregoing interpretation rendered any alteration unnecessary.—ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 48): Although Warburton is often as wrong as he is peremptory, I cannot forbear pointing out that his emendation is almost proved to be correct by two considerations combined—by the contrast afforded through the two portraits, 'fat ribs of peace' and 'hungry war,' and by the fact of the same epithet being applied to war in *Henry V:* '—the poor souls for whom this hungry war Opens his vasty jaws.'—II, iv, 105. And by a like epithet in *3 Henry VI:* 'With need of soldiers for this needy war.'—II, i, 147.

14. **Bell, Booke, & Candle**] GREY (i, 285), in reference to the present line, gives a detailed account of a cursing, wherein at certain points candles were extinguished, but there is no mention of either bell or book. The following extract from Grafton is, I think, sufficient to illustrate the method; as will be seen it deals with an important episode in the time of King John: 'In the same yere, Gualo the Popes Legate renued his great cursse vpon Lewes the French kinges soone, for vsurping vpon King John. Likewise vpon Symon Langton and Geruys Ho-

When gold and ſiluer becks me to come on.
I leaue your highneſſe: Grandame, I will pray
(If euer I remember to be holy)
For your faire ſafety: ſo I kiſſe your hand.
Ele. Farewell gentle Coſen.
Iohn. Coz, farewell.
Ele. Come hether little kinſman,harke,a worde.
*Iohn.*Come hether *Hubert.* O my gentle *Hubert,*

15. *becks*] *beck* Theob. Warb. Johns. Hal.
16. *Grandame*] *Grandam* Rowe et seq.
19. *Farewell*] *Färewell* Ktly. *Fare you well* Fle.
gentle] *my gentle* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Cap. Steev. Varr. Sing. i.
20. *farewell.*] *farewell.* [Exit Faulc. Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '78, '85. *farewell.* [Exit Bast. Pope et cet.
21, 22. *hether*] *hither* F_3F_4.
21. *kinſman,*] *kinsman,*— Pope,+.
worde.] *word.* [Taking him to one side of the stage. Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. *word.* [To Arthur, drawing him aside. Cap. *word.* [She takes Arthur aside. Mal. et seq.
22. Iohn.] K. John. [To Hubert on the other side.] Pope,+.
O] *Oh!* Ktly.

bruge, for provoking him to the same, and that with a wonderfull solempnitie. For in that doing, he made all the Belles to be rong, the Candels to be light, the dores to be opened and the booke of excommunications and interdictions publiquely to be reade, committing them wholy to the Deuill for their contumacie and contempt. He also commaunded the Bishops and Curates to publishe it abroad ouer all the whole realme, to the terror of all subiects' (ed. Ellis, ii, p. 244). —ED.

22. **Come hether Hubert, etc.**] STEEVENS: This is one of the scenes to which may be promised a lasting commendation. Art could add little to its perfection; no change in dramatic taste can injure it; and time itself can subtract nothing from its beauties.—[The following extract is from an *Essay on the Writings of Massinger*, by Dr JOHN FERRIAR, prefixed to Gifford's *Massinger*, vol. i.: 'In *The Duke of Milan*, Act I, sc. ult., where Sforza enjoins Francisco to dispatch Marcelia, in case of the emperor's proceeding to extremities against him, the Poet has given him a strong expression of horror at his own purpose. After disposing Francisco to obey his commands without reserve, by recapitulating the favours conferred on him, Sforza proceeds to impress him with the blackest view of the intended deed. . . . If we compare this scene with the celebrated scene between King John and Hubert, we shall perceive this remarkable difference, that Sforza, while he proposes to his brother-in-law and favorite, the eventual murder of his wife, whom he idolizes, is consistent and determined; his mind is filled with the horror of the deed, but borne to the execution of it by the impulse of an extravagant and fantastic delicacy: John, who is actuated solely by the desire of removing his rival in the crown, not only fears to communicate his purpose to Hubert, though he perceives him to be "A fellow by the hand of nature mark'd, Quoted, and sign'd to do a deed of shame"; but after he has sounded him, and found him ready to execute whatever he can propose, he only hints at the deed. Sforza enlarges on the cruelty and atrocity of his design; John is afraid to utter *his*, in the view of the sun: nay the sanguinary Richard hesitates in proposing the murder of his nephews to Buckingham. In this instance then Massinger may seem to deviate from nature, for

[22. Iohn. Come hether, Hubert. O my gentle Hubert]

ambition is stronger than love, yet Sforza decides with more promptness and confidence than either of Shakespeare's characters. We must consider, however, that timidity and irresolution are characteristics of John, and that Richard's hesitation appears to be assumed, only in order to transfer the guilt and odium of the action to Buckingham.'—(pp. xcviii, xcix.).—J. Monck Mason, in his edition of Massinger, 1779, is, I think, the first to call attention to the similarity of situation in *King John* and in *The Duke of Milan;* he leaves, however, the comparison to the judgment of the reader. It is more than likely that Ferriar acted on this hint—his *Essay* did not appear until six years later. The following remarks by Davies (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 51) refer to this note by Mason; and not to Ferriar's analysis. Davies's work and Ferriar's are dated the same year, 1785.—ED.]: 'The scene in Massinger's *Duke of Milan* is well conceived and highly finished; but the lightning itself is not brighter or quicker in its flash, nor more astonishing in its effects, than the sublime and penetrating strokes of Shakespeare. In Massinger, eloquent language and unbroken periods give easy assistance to the speaker, and calm and undisturbed pleasure to the hearer. In Shakespeare, the abrupt hints, half-spoken meanings, hesitating pauses, passionate interruptions, and guilty looks require the utmost skill of the actor, while they alarm and terrify the spectator. From Colley Cibber's long experience and perfect knowledge of the stage, we might have expected that he would have considered this scene as a sacred thing, and have given consequence to his *Papal Tyranny* by transcribing it whole and untouched. But Colley's confidence in his abilities was extreme; and he has not only mixed his cold crudities and prosaic offals with the rich food of Shakespeare, but has presumed to alter the œconomy of the scene by superfluous incident: for John desires Hubert to draw the curtain, that he may unfold his meaning to him in the dark; and Hubert exacts an exculpatory warrant from him to put Arthur to death. In this latter management he has borrowed from Massinger. Francisco demands from Sforza a writing, signed by him, to warrant the putting Marcelia to death.—[In this last addition Cibber is, to some extent, justified by the fact that Hubert shows such an instrument to Arthur; and later confronts John with this warrant under John's hand and seal.—ED.]—GIFFORD, in his edition of Jonson, vol. i, p. 81, compares this scene also with *Every Man in his Humour*, Act III, sc. i, where the jealous Kitely, by hints and insinuations, persuades Cash to spy upon Mrs Kitely, but tells him that all his doings must be 'Lock'd up in silence, midnight, buried here.'—[To me the resemblance is not so striking, as the objects to be attained are quite dissimilar. Gifford's vaulting ambition to enthrone Jonson by the side of Shakespeare at times o'erleaps itself; this is a case in point.—ED.]—CORSON (*Introduction to Sh.*, p. 173): John is now forced, by circumstances resulting from the capture of Arthur, to play a losing game within his own kingdom. His fears as to the young and interesting captive, whose misfortune wins the sympathies of the courtiers and the people, drive him to measures for his own safety, which deprive him of all chance of safety. He passes, irresistibly, into the power of an avenging fate. The dramatic situation at this stage of the play is in Shakespeare's best tragic manner. The moral baseness of John, which seals his doom, may be said to be gathered up, and exhibited in its extreme intensity in the scene with Hubert, in which he intimates to Hubert his wish to have the little Prince put out of the way; and in IV, ii, where he accuses the aptness of the instrument as the cause of the suggestion. I would call special

We owe thee much : within this wall of fleſh
There is a ſoule counts thee her Creditor,
And with aduantage meanes to pay thy loue:
And my good friend, thy voluntary oath
Liues in this boſome, deerely cheriſhed.
Giue me thy hand, I had a thing to ſay,
But I will fit it with ſome better tune.

23. *much:*] *much!* Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils.
26. *And*] *And,* F_4 et seq.
27. *cheriſhed*] *cherishèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.
28. *hand,*] *hand.*— Cap. et seq.
ſay,] *say*— Rowe ii. et seq.
29. *tune*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Sta. Del. *time* Pope et cet.

attention to the last nineteen verses of John's long speech, III, ii, beginning 'If the midnight bell.' The thought keeps on the wing through all these nineteen verses. There is a moral significance in the suspended construction of the language. The mind of the dastard king hovers over the subject of the ungodly act and dares not alight upon it; and the verse, in its uncadenced movement, admirably registers the speaker's state of mind.

28. **I had a thing to say**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 53): The several actors of John in this scene had their different and appropriate shares of merit. Quin's voice and manner of acting were well adapted to the situation and business of it. His solemn and articulate whisperings were like soft notes in music, which summon our deepest attention; but, whether the action did not correspond with the words, or the look did not assist the speech and action, the effect was not perfectly produced. If ever Garrick's quick intelligence of eye and varied action failed him, it was here. Through the whole scene his art was too visible and glaring; his inclination and fear were not equally suspended; the hesitations of a man big with murder and death were not happily and sublimely expressed. Of Mossop, justice requires me to say, that he was nearer, in feeling the throes of a guilty mind, and in conveying them to his auditors, than either Quin or Garrick. . . . [Thomas] Sheridan in this scene bore away the palm from all competitors.

29. **better tune**] MALONE, accepting Pope's reading as a legitimate correction, says: 'The same mistake has happened in *Twelfth Night*, II, iii, 122: "Out o' time, sir: ye lie."' [This was corrected by Theobald to read *tune;* but has not been unanimously accepted as an assured correction.] Malone also instances the line in *Macbeth*, IV, iii, 235, where the reverse mistake occurs in the Folio: 'This time goes manly,' corrected by Rowe to 'this tune,' and almost universally followed.—KNIGHT: We are by no means sure that Pope's change was called for. The 'tune' with which John expresses his willingness 'to fit' the thing he had to say is a bribe—he now only gives flattery and a promise. 'The *time*' for saying 'the thing' is discussed in the subsequent portion of John's speech.—COLLIER: As the improvement is manifest, we may reasonably infer that *time* was Shakespeare's word.—STAUNTON: Pope's alteration is perhaps not necessary, for these words were often used, of old, as synonymes.—R. G. WHITE, in reply to the foregoing note by Staunton, exclaims: 'No, never; except by those who had the ears of Midas, as is shown by numberless passages, among them the following from Lyly's comedy of that name (IV, i.), in which the two words are carefully distin-

By heauen *Hubert*, I am almoſt aſham'd
To ſay what good reſpect I haue of thee.
Hub. I am much bounden to your Maieſty.
Iohn. Good friend,thou haſt no cauſe to ſay ſo yet,
But thou ſhalt haue:and creepe time nere ſo ſlow,
Yet it ſhall come,for me to doe thee good.
I had a thing to ſay, but let it goe:
The Sunne is in the heauen, and the proud day,
Attended with the pleaſures of the world,
Is all too wanton, and too full of gawdes
To giue me audience: If the mid-night bell
Did with his yron tongue,and brazen mouth

30. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe.
I am] *I'm* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
33. *ſo yet,*] *so—yet—* Pope. *so yet—* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *so yet.* Rlfe.
34. *haue:*] *have—* Pope,+.
36–57. Mnemonic Pope, Warb.
36. *ſay,*] *say—* Rowe et seq.
37. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
38. *pleaſures*] *pleasure* F_4, Rowe i.
39. *gawdes*] *gawdes.* F_2F_3. *gawds,* F_4, Rowe, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Fle.
40. *audience:*] *audience.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Fle. Rlfe.

---

guished: "We all say that Apollo hath shewn himselfe both a god & of musicke the god: Pan himselfe a rude satyre, neither keeping measure, nor time; his piping as farre out of tune, as his body out of forme." The music of Shakespeare's day sounds antiquated to our ears; but the art was much more thoroughly cultivated then than now; and in matters of time and tune and counterpoint our Elizabethan forefathers were in need of no lesson that we could give.'

33. **Iohn. Good friend,** etc.] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL): It is impossible for words to express, or imagination to paint, a finer representation of dubious cruelty, fearful to express itself, than this address of John's to Hubert exhibits; the hesitative circumlocution, with which he winds about his gloomy purpose, is highly natural and the imagery exquisite. To do this scene justice requires more judgment than powers: a jealous eye, deep tone of voice, and cautious delivery are the outlines of what should be.

34. **creepe time nere so slow**] ABBOTT (§ 52): There is probably here a confusion of two constructions: (1) 'And though time creep so slow, as it never crept before,' and (2) 'And though time never crept so slow, as in the case I am supposing.' These two are combined into, 'And though time creep—(how shall I describe it? though it crept) never so slow.' Construction (2) is illustrated by: 'Never so weary, never so in woe.'—*Mid. N. Dream*, III, ii, 442.

39. **gawdes**] WRIGHT: That is, *trifling ornaments, toys.* See *Mid. N. Dream*, IV, i, 172: 'As the remembrance of an idle gawd, Which in my childhood I did dote upon.' And compare: 'The gaudy blabbing and remorseful day.'—*2 Henry VI:* IV, i, 1.

Sound on into the drowzie race of night: 42

42. *Sound on into*] *Sound one unto* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Mal. Steev. Var. '03, '13, Dono. Neils. *Sound on unto* Var. '73, '78, '85, Rann. *Sounden unto* Rann conj. *Sound one into* Var. '21, Dyce, Sta. Huds. ii, Words. Craig. *Sound: On! unto* Del. conj. *Sound not into* Wetherell (N. & Q., 18 Aug., 1866). *Sound on to mark* Moberly conj. *sound dong into.* Bulloch. *Sound only to* Vaughan.

42. *race*] *ear* Dyce, Sta. Wh. Hunter, Clarke, John, M. Smith, Huds. ii, Cam. ii, Words. Dono. Neils. *maze* M. Wheeler (Ath., 25 Oct., 1873). *face* Bulloch. *vast* Page conj.

42. Sound on into . . . race of night] THEOBALD: I do not think that 'sound on' gives here that idea of solemnity and horror which, 'tis plain, our Poet intended to impress by this fine description; and which my emendation ['Sound *one unto*'] conveys, i. e., If it were the still part of the night, or *One* of the clock in the morning, when the sound of the bell strikes upon the ear with the most awe and terror. And it is very usual with our Shakespeare in other passages to express the horror of the midnight bell. So in *Othello:* 'Silence that dreadful bell, it frights the isle.' —II, iii, 175; *Macbeth:* '—what's the business, That such an hideous trumpet calls to parley The sleepers of the house.'—II, iii, 86. And sometimes, for the solemnity, he is used to add the circumstance of the particular hour: 'The iron tongue of midnight hath toll'd twelue.'—V, i, 370; 'The bell then beating one.'—*Hamlet*, I, i, 39.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 130): The readings 'on' and 'into' are mistakes certainly either of a printer or copyist, for in that reading is neither English nor sense: 'on' was never us'd for *repeatedly*, nor 'into' for *unto;* which is the sense they must have if the place's sense be contended for; nor, admitting that they might be so taken, does the sense they present express the speaker's intention, which confessedly is—to paint the dead time of night; but 'on' or repeatedly may as well be seven as twelve, implying no certain number. But besides expressing the night's deadest season, Shakespeare had a further intention; namely, to affect the ear by some word that should give it sensation of awe and solemnity: now *o'* (the excellent emendation of the third modern) acts upon it remarkably in the way he intended; and so the sound of it does in the clock's striking, greatly beyond a sound that's repeated; every stroke beyond *one* lessening more and more the effect of it, till at twelve we feel nothing. Of 'unto' no defending is requisite.—MALONE: The instances that are found in the original editions of our Author's plays in which 'on' is printed instead of *one* are so numerous that there cannot, in my apprehension, be the smallest doubt that *one* is the true reading in this line.—[Malone, in corroboration of this note, quotes six passages as printed in the Folio wherein *one* is printed 'on'; the most striking of these is that from the *Two Gentlemen,* to which he refers, but does not quote in full: 'Sir, your glove. . . . Not mine; my gloves are on. . . . Why, then, this may be yours, for this is but one.'—II, i, 1, 2.—In reference to Theobald's second change, *unto* for 'into,' Malone considers it to have been too hastily adopted, and produces two other examples in Shakespeare wherein these words are apparently used in the same sense: 'Which to reduce into our former favour.'—*Henry V:* V, ii, 63; '—gleaning all the land's wealth into one.'—*Henry VIII:* III, ii, 284. 'Here,' says Malone, 'we should now certainly write "*unto* one." Independently of what has now been stated, "into" ought to be restored. So Marlowe, *Edward II*, 1598, "I'll thunder such a peal into his ears," [ed. Dyce, ii, p. 206]. So also Bishop Hall, in his *Heaven upon Earth:* "These courses are not incident into an almighty power," etc.'—

[42. Sound on into the drowzie race of night]

STEEVENS: I should suppose the meaning of 'Sound on' to be this: 'If the midnight bell, by repeated strokes, was to hasten away the race of beings who are busy at that hour, or quicken night itself in its progress'; the morning bell (that is, the bell that strikes *one*) could not, with strict propriety, be made the agent; for the bell has ceased to be in the service of night when it proclaims the arrival of day. 'Sound on' may also have a peculiar propriety, because, by the repetition of the strokes at *twelve*, it gives a much more forcible warning than when it only strikes *one*. Such was once my opinion concerning the old reading; but, on reconsideration, its propriety cannot appear more doubtful to anyone than to myself. It is too late to talk of hastening the night when the arrival of the morning is announced; and I am afraid that the repeated strokes have less of solemnity than the single notice, as they take from the horror and awful silence here described as so propitious to the dreadful purposes of the king. Though the hour of *one* be not the natural midnight, it is yet the most solemn moment of the poetical one; and Shakespeare himself has chosen to introduce his Ghost in *Hamlet:* 'The bell then beating one.' Shakespeare may be restored into obscurity. I retain Theobald's correction; for though 'thundering a peal *into* a man's *ears*' is good English, I do not perceive that such an expression as 'sounding one into a drowsy race' is countenanced by any example hitherto produced.—KNIGHT: Shakespeare, it appears to us, has made the idea of time precise enough by the 'midnight bell'; and the addition of 'one' is a contradiction or a pleonasm, to which form of words he was not given. 'The midnight bell' sounding on, into (or unto) the drowsy march, race, of night, seems to us far more poetical than precisely determining the hour, which was already determined by the word 'midnight.' But *was* the 'midnight bell' the bell of a clock? Was it not rather the bell which called the monks to their 'morning lauds,' and which, according to the regulations of Dunstan, was to be rung before every office. In Dunstan's *Concord of Rules*, quoted by Fosbrooke, the hours for the first services of the day are thus stated: 'Mattins and Lauds, midnight. Prime, 6 A. M.' It is added, 'if the office of Lauds be finished by daybreak, as is fit, let them begin Prime without ringing; if not, let them wait for day-light, and, ringing the bell, assemble for Prime.'—[Knight also calls attention to the fact that in *Hamlet*, in the line already quoted by Theobald, the spelling is '*one* (not *on*) both in the early Quartos and in the Folio of 1623.'—ED.]—COLLIER: We prefer the old reading on all accounts. Many of the commentators would read *one* instead of 'on,' which is contradicted by the 'midnight bell' in a line just preceding. There is more plausibility for reading *ear* instead of 'race,' recollecting that of old *ear* was spelt *eare*, and the words might possibly be mistaken by the printer; but still 'race,' in the sense of *course* or *passage*, conveys a finer meaning: the midnight bell, with its twelve times repeated strokes, may be very poetically said to 'sound on into the drowsy race of night'; one sound produced by the 'iron tongue' driving the other 'on,' or *forward*, until the whole number was complete, and the prolonged vibration of the last blow on the bell only left to fill the empty space of darkness.—[Collier's MS. Corrector changes 'race' to *eare*, on which DYCE (*Notes*, etc., p. 87) says: 'Whether the emendation *ear* originated with the MS. Corrector, or whether he derived it from some prompter's copy, I feel assured that it is the Poet's word. The same correction occurred, long ago, to myself; it occurred also to Mr Collier, while he was editing the play; and (as appears from his note) he would have inserted it in the text had not his better

[42. Sound on into the drowzie race of night]

judgment been overpowered by a superstitious reverence for the Folio. But, if the MS. Corrector considered "on" to be an adverb (and we are uncertain how he understood it—"on" and *one* being so often spelt alike), my conviction would still remain unshaken, that the recent editors, by printing "on" have greatly impaired the grandeur and poetry of the passage. As to the "*contradiction*" which the recent editors object to in "the *midnight* bell sounding *one*," I can only say that . . . even prose writers occasionally employ very inaccurate language in speaking of the hours of darkness; e. g., "It happened that betweene twelve and one a clocke at midnight, there blew a mighty storme of winde against the house," &c.—*The Famous History of Doctor Faustus*, sig. R 3, ed. 1648. "We marched slowly on because of the carriages we had with us, and came to Freynstat about one a clocke in the night perfectly undiscover'd."—Defoe, *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, First ed. p. 119.'—COLLIER refused to accept such testimony in favour of *one* as synonymous with midnight, and concludes his note on this line in his ed. ii. with this answer to Dyce: 'When Defoe speaks of "one o'clock in the night" he is not so simple as to call it *midnight*, but merely "night," as in truth it was.'—DYCE, in his ed. ii, replies in a note unworthy of any editor, accusing Collier of again being at his 'old trick of misrepresentation and concealment' in that he had given but *one* of the quotations, and that one not that germane to the subject; therewith repeating the passage from *Doctor Faustus*. Another melancholy example of two eminent editors descending to petty recriminations, the details of which the reader may with ease be spared.—ED.]—JOSEPH HUNTER (ii, 11) [with the reading, 'Sound one into the drowsy race of night']: We have the incongruity (1) of the midnight bell striking the hour of one in the morning; (2) of the hammer of a clock striking on the outside of a bell, being presented to the mind by the 'iron tongue and brazen mouth,' in which on a little reflection we cannot but perceive that it was the pendulous clapper, not the hammer striking on the outside of the bell, that must have been in the Poet's mind; and (3) of men steeped in sleep being described by such a poet as Shakespeare by the phrase 'the drowsy race of night.' Any of these, if due attention were given to the passage, would have been sufficient to show that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark. . . . Now the Poet certainly had not in his thoughts the striking of a clock at all; and the intervention of this idea has the effect of marring in a very extraordinary degree the beauty and grandeur of the conception. . . . 'This is not a fit scene,' says King John, 'for audience of the thing I was about to say: "the sun is in the heavens." Transfer yourself to a scene of the night and darkness, a place where you hear the great bell of a church tolling in the depth of midnight, and imagine that you are pacing the churchyard in the dark midnight amidst the graves of the many dead, and where spirits are sometimes said to wander. Think of yourself as a man much injured by the world, and as given up to an habitual melancholy.' The mere striking of the church clock, whether once, or with twelve times repeated strokes, is a weak, puerile, incongruous conception; but the continuous tolling of the bell at midnight, which was what Shakespeare meant, adds greatly to the impressiveness of a night scene; and this especially when we recollect on what occasions it was that the church-bell would be heard 'sounding on' in the darkness of midnight. It might be as a passing-bell, a soul just then taking its flight; but it is more probable that the Poet had in his mind the tolling at a midnight funeral and that the full conception of the passage is this: That Hubert is to be transported in thought

[42. Sound on into the drowzie race of night]

to the grave-ground at the foot of some lonely tower, from which is heard the heavy tones of the bell tolling through the darkness of night. . . . In such a scene there was everything to feed melancholy, and put the mind of Hubert into a frame favourable to the King's purposes;—everything to stir up in his mind thoughts which the sun should not look upon. This then, I conceive, to be the true explanation of the passage. 'Sound on' is the common phrase in Shakespeare for continuous or repeated blasts of a trumpet, just as here it is for the continuous or repeated strokes of the bell-clapper. 'Into the drowsy race of night,' if it required any justification, as meaning the step or course of night, would receive it by comparison with the two following passages: 'And chide the cripple tardy-gaited night, Who, like a foul and ugly witch, doth limp So tediously away.'—*Henry V:* IV, *Chorus*, l. 20; 'This palpable gross play hath well beguiled The heavy gait of night.' —*Mid. N. Dream*, V, i, 374. Shakespeare also, it may be observed, has shown elsewhere that he was sensible to the use which might be made of the deep tones of the funeral bell. Thus, in *2 Henry IV:* 'And his tongue Sounds ever after as a sullen bell Remembered tolling a departed friend,' [I, i, 102]; and in *Sonnet* lxxi: 'No longer mourn for me when I am dead Than you shall hear the surly sullen bell Give warning to the world.'—STAUNTON: What is meant by 'the drowsy race'? I at one time conjectured that 'race' was a misprint, by transposition of the letters, for *carr*, or *carre*, and that the 'Sound on' might be applicable to 'Night's black chariot': 'All drowsy night who in a *car* of jet By steeds of iron grey . . . drawn through the sky.'—Browne's *Britannia's Pastorals*, Bk ii, song 1. I am now, however, firmly assured that it is a corruption of *eare*, a word which occurred to me many years ago, as it did to Dyce, Collier, and no doubt to a hundred people besides.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 301): As this line has been frittered away by the editors into 'Sound *one unto* the drowsy race of night,' it seems plausible to read with Collier's MS. Corrector '*ear* of night.' But all the changes are alike uncalled for. Let anyone who has listened to a church clock striking twelve at midnight, and seeming as if it would never complete its solemn task, say whether 'Sound on into the drowsy race of night' does not bring up his sensations more vividly than 'Sound *one* into the drowsy race of night' or 'Sound *one* unto the drowsy race of night.' The line as it stands in the original is one of the most suggestive in all Shakespeare's works.—[White, in his edition which appeared five years later, in his note on this line says, however, 'As "race," even in its sense of *course* or *passage*, has but the remotest possible connection with the context, and as "the iron *tongue* and brazen *mouth*" suggest, if they do not require "the *ear* of night" to receive their sounds, it seems that this reading which occurred independently to Collier and Dyce, and was found in the former's corrected Folio, should be received. "On" of the Folio may be either *on* the adverb, or *one*. . . . I think the former much to be preferred.'—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 6): 'Race' is undoubtedly wrong. I believe that Shakespeare wrote, 'Sound one into the drowsy *eare* of night'; but that *eare* in his MS. was by a slip of the pen written *care*, or—which is more probable—was so read by the printer, who, seeing this was nonsense, corrected it to *race* which seemed to offer something like a meaning. (The words 'strike one' [Qu. sound one?], by the way, remind me of *1 Henry VI:* I, ii, 41: 'I think . . . Their arms are set like clocks, still to strike on'; read *one*. I am not sure whether this is my own emendation, or a 'periwig'; I do not, however, find any note on this point in the *Variorum* [of 1821].—[To the lovers of Elia—

[42. Sound on into the drowzie race of night]

and who does not belong to that happy band—Walker's playful allusion to a 'periwig' needs no explanation.—ED.]—KEIGHTLEY (*Exp.*, p 223): As Shakespeare had read in the *Faerie Queene*, of Night: 'To run her timely *race*' (I, v, 45), the attempted corrections of 'race' are all superfluous. So also is Warburton's [Theobald's?] reading of *one* for 'on'; 'Sound on' is keep sounding.—W. L. R. CATES (*Athenæum*, 12 July, 1873): Among the meanings of the word 'race' I find 'swift current,' 'rapid tideway,' examples of which we have in the local designations, 'Pentland Race' and 'Race of Alderney.' I have found no hint in any edition of Shakespeare, nor in any glossary to his plays of this meaning. . . . The question then is, Has Shakespeare in this single instance made use of the word in this sense? The passage in which the phrase 'race of night' occurs is one of the most powerful delineations which Shakespeare has given us of the workings of conscience in a guilty man. . . . John, full of his dark desire and intent, sees about him 'the proud day attended with the pleasures of the world, and feels that this is no fitting environment or audience for such word as he has to say. Awed and silent for very shame in the presence of the sun, he fancies he should be brave in the dark. In instantaneous contrast to daylight and the populous world, imagination depicts the night, the vast environing dark, still and dread, but also full of life and movement; not enfolding the earth like a cloak, but sweeping on and around it like a mighty current. The sense of solitude and security from unwelcome listeners is immeasurably intensified by the one tone of the midnight bell, which goes pealing forth, far-penetrating, into the dull inattentive night-stream flowing over him. Such significance I find in this famous line. So magnificent the imaginative conception which it seems to me Shakespeare, with his omnipotence of wit, his unique mastery of phrase, has condensed for us into so tiny a point, so brief an expression, 'the drowsy race of night.' . . . In illustration of the epithet 'drowsy', as applied to the celestial movement, it is, perhaps, worth while to cite a couplet from the Earl of Stirling, a contemporary of Shakespeare, who in his *Domesday* writes: 'The heavenly as growne now less strong Doe seeme more slacke as weary of their race.'—[There is here, I think, a slight slip; Cates meant this couplet as an illustration of the word 'race' as applied to 'the celestial movement.' The word 'drowsy' only appears by implication. Fine as is this interpretation with its image of the onward sweep of night and darkness, there is, to me at least, an insuperable objection, inasmuch as the adjective 'drowsy' conveys but one idea, that of slow or sluggish movement, while 'race,' as Cates takes it, can but mean a swift onward rush. The adjective and noun neutralise each other.—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The old spelling of *eare* may very easily have been mistaken by the Folio printer for 'race.' There is something so contradictory in the words 'drowsy race' that we cannot believe them to be right; whereas Shakespeare further on has the very expression—'vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man,' [III, iii, 114]; in which passage, moreover, the Folio prints 'ear' with a final *e*.—BAILEY (ii, 245) may also be placed in the number of those commentators who propose to read *ear* for 'race'; he admits that when writing his note he was unaware that he had been anticipated by Dyce; he also rejects the change *one* for 'on,' since 'To sound *on* into the drowsy ear of night' implies continuous action, which is needed if the mind is to be brought into the proper tone desired by King John; while 'for a clock to strike *one* seems utterly insufficient to produce the required mood.'—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: *One* is the poetical midnight hour. 'The bell then beating one' are the words in which

If this fame were a Church-yard where we ſtand, 43
And thou poſſeſſed with a thouſand wrongs:

44. *poſſeſſed*] *possessèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.

Bernardo tells the moment of the appearance of Hamlet's ghost. 'On' was often written for *one;* but 'race' is obviously a corruption, and it seems almost certain that Shakespeare wrote *eare.*—FLEAY: *Ear* [for 'race'] is very plausible, but the old reading being intelligible, I do not disturb it. With either reading 'drowsy' logically, though not grammatically, belongs to 'night,' by the usual Shakespearean inversion; and surely the clock striking twelve may be said to strike on into the course or current of the slow night. Compare 'The clocks do toll, And the third hour of drowsy morning name,' *Henry V, Prologue,* 16; also *2 Henry VI:* IV, i, 5 (by Marlowe), where the jades drag the night with drowsy wings; and *Much Ado,* V, iii, 27: 'The drowsy east.' On the other hand, see III, iii, 114.—WRIGHT: It is not improbable that 'race' is a misprint for *ear,* as Walker suggested, and this would be in keeping with 'tongue' and 'mouth' just before.—MARSHALL: It is beside the question to show that, because *one* was often printed 'on,' and even pronounced so, therefore it is, necessarily, so misprinted in this case. Nor does it follow that because *eare,* as the Folio prints *ear,* might easily be mistaken for 'race,' that it was so mistaken here. If the sense absolutely required *ear,* we should not hesitate to adopt it; but is not the sense weakened by such a change? On the other hand, it must be granted that no exactly similar use of 'race' can be found in Shakespeare. In *Sonnet* li, ll. 10, 11 we have: 'Therefore desire, of perfect'st love being made, Shall neigh—no dull flesh—in his fiery race.' But that is the only passage I can find in which 'race' is used at all in the sense of *course,* and that is not very satisfactory, as one wants the same use of the word as in 'mill-race,' where it signifies a *swift stream;* and here being qualified by the epithet 'drowsy,' the very paradoxical use of the word would of itself be forcible. But it may be that 'race' here means *disposition, nature,* as in 'But thy vile race, Though thou didst learn, had that in 't which good natures Could not abide to be with.'—*Temp.,* I, ii, 358–360. And in 'And now I give my sensual race the rein.'—*Meas. for Meas.,* II, iv, 160. Or by 'drowsy race of night' Shakespeare might have meant the sleeping people and animals. The first meaning of the word given above, viz.: *course* (as of a stream), is decidedly the one to be preferred; in which case we need not take 'into' to mean *unto,* as most of the commentators do; nor, indeed, if *ear* be adopted, would any other than the ordinary sense of the preposition be required. —MOORE SMITH: 'Nothing satisfactory can be made [of the Folio reading]. It seems best to consider, with Walker, that 'race' was a misprint for *eare.*—DEIGHTON: Though 'drowsy' belongs more properly to 'night' than to 'race,' if that reading be retained, it seems to me unlikely that Shakespeare should have closely coupled two words so antagonistic in sense.—Miss PORTER: This line is a marvel of impressionistic feeling. Lend yourself to it and you hear, half deaf with slumber while you hear, the midnight bell sound on and fall into the drowsy vast, and streaming course of night. You hate to be disturbed from it to note that recent modern editors, as well as old eighteenth century ones, have been so dull to its fine suggestion as to change 'on' into *one,* and then been led by their own crazy meddling to wonder if 'into' should be *unto,* and finally to put out 'race'—the master touch—for *ear.*

Or if that ſurly ſpirit melancholy
Had bak'd thy bloud,and made it heauy,thicke,
Which elſe runnes tickling vp and downe the veines,
Making that idiot laughter keepe mens eyes,
And ſtraine their cheekes to idle merriment,
A paſſion hatefull to my purpoſes:
Or if that thou couldſt ſee me without eyes,
Heare me without thine eares, and make reply
Without a tongue, vſing conceit alone,
Without eyes, eares,and harmefull ſound of words:
Then, in deſpight of brooded watchfull day,

45. *ſpirit melancholy*] *Spirit, Melancholly*, F_4, Rowe et seq.

46. *heauy, thicke,*] *heavy-thick* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Walker. *heavy, thick;* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Ktly.

47–50. *Which...purpoſes:*] Ff, Rowe, +, Cam.+, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Neils. In parentheses Cap. et cet.

47. *tickling*] *trickling* Rowe i. *tingling* Coll. iii. (MS.).

48. *idiot laughter*] *idiot, laughter*, Cap. et seq.

48. *keepe*] *steap* Long MS. ap. Cam. *peep* Mason conj. Sta. conj (withdrawn). *peak* Bulloch.

50. *A paſſion...purposes:*] In parentheses Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

55. *brooded watchfull*] *broad-ey'd watchful* Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Coll. ii, iii, Wh. ii, Craig. *the broad watchful* Coll. MS. *brooded-watchful* Mason conj. Del. Dono. *broad and watchful* Mitford. conj. Del. conj. *proud and wasteful* Bulloch. *proud, watchful* Herr. *bruited watchful* Vaughan (withdrawn).

45. **surly spirit melancholy**] MOBERLY: Here, as usual, described by Shakespeare with singularly graphic touches. It is physical, he thinks, the result of a dull circulation of the blood, as unlike as possible to the tingling life and vigour of that which marks cheery youth.—[Nashe (*Terrors of the Night*) says: 'None of these spirits of the ayre or the fire haue so much predominance in the night as the spirits of the earth and water; for they feeding on foggie-braind melancholly, engender thereof many uncouth terrible monsters. This much obserue by the way, that the grossest part of our blood is the melancholy humour, which in the spleene congealed whose office is to disperse it, with his thicke steaming fennie vapours casteth a mist ouer the spirit, and cleane bemasketh the phantasie. And euen as slime and durt in a standing puddle, engender toads and frogs, and many vnsightly creatures, so this slimie melancholy humor still thickning as it stands still, engendreth many mishapen obiects in our imaginations.'—ed. Grosart, p. 232.—ED.]

46. **bak'd thy bloud**] F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Cens.*, ii, 161): To us it appears that melancholy is a cold chilling disposition of mind; 'bak'd' furnishes an idea of heat, therefore we would substitute *caked*, as more consonant to the meaning.

47. **tickling . . . veines**] Neither Rowe's change nor that of Collier's MS. Corrector seem necessary here; compare Spenser, *Muiopotmos*, 1590: 'Who, seeing him, with secret ioy therefore Did tickle inwardly in euerie vaine.'—ll. 393, 394.—ED.

48. **keepe mens eyes**] MOBERLY: That is, *inhabit men's eyes;* as a 'keeping room' means *a room to live in.* [Or, in the old-fashioned phrase, to keep one's bed.—ED.]

55. **brooded watchfull day**] STEEVENS: Mr Pope's alteration [see *Text. Notes*],

[55. Then, in despight of brooded watchfull day]

however elegant, may be unnecessary. All animals while 'brooded,' i. e., 'with a brood of young ones under their protection,' are remarkably vigilant. The King says of Hamlet: '—there's something in his soul O'er which his melancholy sits on brood.'—[III, i, 173]. In Holland's translation of Pliny's *Natural History*, a *broodie* hen is the term for a hen that sits on eggs (ed. 1601, p. 301). Milton also, *L'Allegro*, desires Melancholy to 'Find out some uncouth cell Where brooding darkness spreads his jealous wings,' plainly alluding to the watchfulness of fowls while they are sitting.—MALONE: 'Brooded,' I apprehend, is here used, with our Author's usual license, for *brooding;* i. e., day, who is as vigilant, as ready with open eye to mark what is done in his presence, as an animal at brood. Shakespeare appears to have been so fond of domestic and familiar images that one cannot help being surprised that Mr Pope, in revising these plays, should have gained so little knowledge of his manner as to suppose any corruption here in the text.—[BOSWELL quotes as parallel usages of the word 'brood': 'See how he broods the boy.'—*Bonduca*, IV, ii. (p. 66, ed. Dyce); and: 'This fellow broods his master.' —*Woman's Prize*, I, i. (p. 104, ed. Dyce), but in both of these passages 'brood' clearly means *cherishes*, *guards*, and not, as Steevens and Malone interpret, *watchful* or *vigilant*.—ED.]—COLLIER (ed. ii.): We cannot resist Pope's alteration, *broad-eyed*—the epithet is so happy and so like Shakespeare. The MS. corrector saw that 'brooded' must be wrong, and perhaps gives us the custom in his day, converting 'brooded' into *the brood*. 'Brooded' has surely nothing to do with brooding chickens.—J. MITFORD (*Gentleman's Maga.*, Aug., 1844): This is acknowledged not to be a very satisfactory reading. We have thought that the Poet wrote 'crowded,' with the same meaning as in the former part of the speech—'The proud day . . . Is all too wanton and too full of gauds.' Pope's emendation of 'broad-eyed' is elegant, and in the same play we have 'wall-eyed' and 'eyeless night,' yet we should prefer reading, 'Then in despite of broad and watchful day.'—HALLIWELL quotes Cotgrave: *Accouvé:* Brooded, set close on, [crowded over; also, covered, hidden, overshadowed]. He also notes that *broody* is the MS correction 'of one of the old annotated Folios.'—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: 'Brooded' means having a brood, or brooding; day being regarded as having a watchful eye, like that of a brooding bird.—MOBERLY considers that to change a word so palpably in Shakespeare's manner as 'brooded' is 'quite unallowable.' He compares, for this construction, 'the ravined salt-sea shark'; 'the jeering and disdained contempt,' wherein 'ravined' means 'full of ravin,' and 'disdained,' 'full of disdain,' so 'brooded' must be 'full of brooding.'—WRIGHT: 'Brooded' is an instance of an adjective formed from a substantive by means of the participial suffix *-ed*. It is derived from the substantive 'brood' and not from the verb, and signifies *having a brood* to watch over; and it is, therefore, almost equivalent to *brooding* or *sitting on brood*. . . . Compare: 'Thus ornament is but the guiled shore To a most dangerous sea,' *Mer. of Ven.*, III, ii, 97, 'guiled' signifying *full of guile, deceitful*. So also: 'Unto the weary and all-watched night.—*Henry V:* IV, prol., l. 38. [Wright also quotes the passage containing the words 'disdained contempt,' *1 Henry IV:* I, iii, 183, given by Moberly.—For other examples see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 374.—ED.]—MOORE SMITH: Day (i. e., the sun) is thought of as looking down on the world with the watchfulness of a brooding parent-bird. The word 'brooded' is not part of a verb, but an adjective formed by adding the suffix *-ed* to the noun 'brood.' So 'brooded' is equivalent to *pos-*

I would into thy bofome poure my thoughts:
But (ah) I will not, yet I loue thee well,
And by my troth I thinke thou lou'ſt me well.
Hub. So well, that what you bid me vndertake,
Though that my death were adiunct to my Act,
By heauen I would doe it.
Iohn. Doe not I know thou wouldſt?
Good *Hubert, Hubert, Hubert* throw thine eye
On yon young boy: Ile tell thee what my friend,

56. *thoughts:*] *thoughts.* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Dono. Neils.

57. *But (ah)*] *But, ah,* Rowe, Cap. Var. '78, 85, Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce ii, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils. *But ah,* Pope,+, Sta. Fle. *But ah!* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Craig.

not, yet] Ff, Rowe i. *not! yet* Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils. *not. Yet* Ktly. *not—yet* Rowe ii. et cet.

60. *Though*] *Tho'* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73.

61. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).

I would doe it] *I'd do* Pope. *I' do 't* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

64. *yon*] *yond'* Coll. Sing. ii, Huds.
boy:] *boy.* Ktly, Del. Dono. Neils.
what] *what,* F$_4$.

---

sessed of a brood, as landed gentry are: gentry possessed of land.—IVOR JOHN: Even though 'brooded' be equivalent to *brooding,* as Wright points out, it does not seem an apt epithet for 'day' in this connection. Cotgrave's [definition of *Accouvé,* brooded, etc., see foregoing note by Halliwell], vouching for the form of the word in *-ed,* but proving the inapplicability of the meaning. The day cannot be proud, wanton and full of gawds, attended with the pleasures of the world, watchful and at the same time brooded. Perhaps the Mason-Delius reading is the least objectionable, taking 'brooded' to be an epithet applied to 'watchful,' the day being as watchful as a sitting bird; but even this is far from satisfactory.

63. **Hubert, Hubert, Hubert**] MOBERLY: Passionately; John pretending that Hubert's loyal profession had wrung from him a secret which he had been firmly resolved against disclosing, but could hold in no longer.—[Moberly is, perhaps, right; but dramatically would it not be more effective to make a slight hesitating pause, accompanied by a furtive glance at Arthur, between each repetition of the name? MOORE SMITH notes (*Introd.,* p. xliii.) that H. Beerbohm Tree, when he produced the play in 1899, introduced a good deal of new 'business' in this scene; and just before this line, 'Arthur innocently picked up the crown from the ground and put it on his head.'—ED.]

64. **Ile tell thee what,** etc.] BOADEN (*Life of Kemble,* i, 133): In *King John* the critics said Kemble was too artificial and too cold. In the great scene with Hubert they found him too solemn and monotonous. The most cold-blooded, hesitating, creeping villainy that ever abused the gift of speech found in Mr Kemble the only powers competent to give it utterance. And if I were to select a scene, in the whole compass of the drama, more appropriated to him than any other, I should, I think, fix upon this noiseless horror, this muttered suggestion of slaughterous thought, on which the midnight bell alone was fitted to break, by one solitary undulating sound, that added to the gloom.

He is a very ſerpent in my way,
And whereſoere this foot of mine doth tread,
He lies before me: doſt thou vnderſtand me?
Thou art his keeper.
Hub. And Ile keepe him ſo,
That he ſhall not offend your Maieſty.
Iohn. Death.
Hub. My Lord.
Iohn. A Graue.
Hub. He ſhall not liue.
Iohn. Enough.
I could be merry now, *Hubert*, I loue thee.
Well, Ile not ſay what I intend for thee:
Remember: Madam, Fare you well,
Ile ſend thoſe powers o're to your Maieſty.

66. *whereſoere*] *whereſoe're* F_4.
67. *me:*] *me.* Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Rlfe, Dono. Neils.
69. *Ile*] *I will* Var. '03, '13, '21, Sing. Ktly, Huds.
70, 71. *That he...Death.*] As one line Walker, Dyce ii, iii, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils.
71–75. *Death...Enough.*] One line Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Dyce i, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Sta. Huds. i, Del. Craig.
71. *Death.*] *Death!* Var. '73.
72. *My Lord.*] Ff, Del. *My Lord?* Rowe et cet.
73. *Graue.*] *grave!* Var. '73.
75. *Enough.*] *Enough!* Coll. ii.
76. *now,*] Ff. *now:* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Sta. Fle. *now.* Rowe et cet.
78, 79. *Remember...Ile ſend*] One line Fle.
78. *Remember:*] Ff, Rowe i. *Remember:*— Rowe ii,+ (—Var. '73). *Remember.*— Cap. et cet.
well] *well.* [Returning to the Queen. Pope,+.
79. *powers*] *pow'rs* Pope.+ (—Var. '73).
o're] *over* Fle.

---

65. **serpent in my way**] CARTER (p. 210) compares: 'Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder by the path, byting the horse heeles, so that his rider shall fall backward.'—*Genesis*, xlix, 17 (*Genevan Vers.*).

66. **this foot of mine**] Compare, for this construction, III, i, 235; or see ABBOTT, § 239.

77. **Ile not say**] MOBERLY: What he intended was doubtless, in reality, to make Hubert do the crime, and then bear the blame when the act was questioned.

78. **Remember**] VISCHER (*Vorträge*, iv, 37): This is a scene wherein we recognize Shakespeare completely. If at times a doubt of the genuineness of this play arises, here it must be silenced. Here, for the first time, Shakespeare develops that secret power, peculiar to him alone, the faculty of giving the spirit of murder with its whisper and veiled words, the instigation to murder, whose fearful character becomes the more fearful through this very quietness. Moreover, the symbolism, 'If this were a churchyard,' and calling laughter 'an idiot,' is thoroughly Shakespearean.

Ele. My bleſſing goe with thee. 80
Iohn. For *England* Coſen, goe.
Hubert ſhall be your man, attend on you
With al true duetie: On toward *Callice*, hoa.
Exeunt. 84

[*Scene IV.*]
Scæna Tertia.

Enter France, Dolphin, Pandulpho, Attendants. 2

Fra. So by a roaring Tempeſt on the flood,
A whole Armado of conuicted ſaile 4

80. *thee.*] *thee!* Theob. et seq.
81. *goe.*] Om. Steev. Var. '03, '13, Sing. i, Words.
82. *attend*] *to attend* F_3F_4, Rowe. *t' attend* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *to tend* Coll. iii.
83. *al*] F_1.
duetie:] *duty.*— Cap. et seq.
Callice] Ff, Rowe i, Ktly. *Calais* Rowe ii. et cet.
hoa.] *ho!* Theob. et seq.
1. Scæna Tertia] Ff. SCENE III. Rowe. SCENE V. Pope. SCENE VI. Han. Warb. Johns. SCENE II. Dono. SCENE IV. Cap. et cet.
The French Court. Theob.+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann. The French King's Tent. Mal. et seq.
2. France, Dolphin,] King Philip, Lewis, Rowe et seq.
Pandulpho,] Pandupho, Ff. Pandulph, Cap. et seq.
3–5. Fra. *So...fellowſhip.*] Om. Dono.
4. *Armado*] *Armada* Johns. Var. '73.
conuicted] *collected* Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann. *convented* Mason, Sing. ii, Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *conflicted* Ktly. *consorted* Id. conj. *connected* Mal. conj. (withdrawn), Del. *convected* Dyce conj. Fle. R. M. Spence (N. & Q., April, 1894). *convoyed* Cartwright. *convexed* Bulloch. *compacted* Vaughan. *combined* Spedding. *conjointed* Orger.

81. **For England**] MALONE: King John, after he had taken Arthur prisoner, sent him to the town of Falaise, in Normandy, under the care of Hubert, his Chamberlain; from whence he was removed to Rouen, and delivered to the custody of Robert de Veypont. Here he was secretly put to death.

3. **a roaring Tempest**] GREY (i, 289): Shakespeare does not allude to any tempest that then happened, but to the defeat of the French fleet (prepared to invade the dominions of the Earl of Flanders) in the Scheld, by the Earl of Salisbury, brother to King John, in the year 1213. In which 300 ships, laden with provisions, arms, and other valuable things, were taken; and above 100 more sunk, and burnt; and the rest destroyed by their own hands for fear of being taken by the enemy. Which put an end to King Philip's purpose of invading England.

4. **A whole Armado**] WARBURTON: This similitude, as little as it makes for the purpose in hand, was, I do not question, a very taking one when the play was first represented; which was a winter or two at most after the Spanish invasion in 1588. It was in reference likewise to that glorious period that Shakespeare concludes his play in that triumphant manner: 'This England never did, nor never shall Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror.' But the whole play abounds with touches relative to the then posture of affairs.—JOHNSON: This play, as far as I

Is ſcattered and diſ-ioyn'd from fellowſhip.
Pand. Courage and comfort,all ſhall yet goe well.
Fra. What can goe well,when we haue runne ſo ill?
Are we not beaten? Is not *Angiers* loſt?

5. *diſ-ioyned*] *diſioyned* Ff. *disjoin'd* 6. *comfort,*] *comfort!* Cap. et seq. Rowe et seq.

---

can discover, was not played till a long time after the defeat of the *armado*. The old play, I think, wants this simile. The commentator should not have affirmed what he can only guess.—PYE (p. 145): As a common observer of what passes every day, Johnson should have known that after eight years (for Malone gives this play as written in 1596) that event could not have become uninteresting, which is now highly interesting after the lapse of more than two centuries.—STEEVENS: 'Armado' is a Spanish word signifying a *fleet of war*. The *armado* in 1588 was called so by way of distinction. [Compare Burton, *Anat. of Melan.*, 'Better a metropolitan city were sackt, a royal army overcome, an invincible armado sunk, . . . then her little finger should ake.'—Pt, 3, Sec. 2, Mem. 4, Subsec. 1.—ED.]

4. conuicted] MALONE: That is, *overpowered, baffled, destroyed*. To 'convict' and to *convince* were in our Author's time synonymous. See Minsheu's *Dictionary*, 1617: 'To convict, or convince, *á Lat.* convictus, overcome.' Also Florio's *World of Words*, 1598: *Convitto*. Vanquished, convicted, convinced.' [MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. vb. 7) quotes the present line as the earliest example of this use of 'convicted.'—ED.]—J. MONCK MASON (*Comments*, ed. 1807, p. 553) proposes *convented* in preference to the Folio reading, since, although 'convicted' may mean *vanquished*, that was not the fate of this particular armado. [To DYCE (ed. ii.) I am indebted for calling attention to this note which does not appear in any other edition of Mason's *Comments*. Neither Collier, whose MS. Corrector reads *convented*, nor Singer, who so reads in his ed. ii, refer to Mason. Collier, after lauding the reading, says: 'There is no need, therefore, to strain after a meaning for "convicted," if, as we are assured, it was not the word of the Poet.'—Singer, without referring to Collier's MS. Corrector, rejects the Folio reading on the ground that, 'convicted,' signifying *vanquished, overcome*, 'is a very unusual meaning, even would it serve the purpose.' Of Dyce's conjecture, *convected*, he remarks, 'it is doubtful if such a word existed,' wherein he is quite borne out by the *N. E. D.* In support of the reading *convented*, Singer quotes *Coriol.*: 'We are convented upon a pleasing treaty.'—II, ii, 59.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: See Cooper's *Thesaurus*, 1573, '*Convictus*, vanquished; overcome; convicted.' The manifest allusion to the fate of the Spanish Armada, which was convicted or conquered quite as much by tempest as by its English enemy, sustains the old text. The reading of Collier's Folio is appropriate and plausible, but nothing more. [In his earlier work, *Shakespeare's Scholar*, p. 302, White characterises Collier's MS. correction as 'doubtless the right word.'—ED.]—DYCE (ed. ii.) characterises the Folio reading, 'though it formerly meant *vanquished, overpowered*,' as here 'utterly improper.'—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: We have an impression that convicted may be used here by Shakespeare to express *condemned, doomed to perdition*.—WRIGHT: That is, *beaten, discomfited*. The reference is probably to the great Spanish Armada, which after being harassed and beaten by the English fleet was dispersed by a violent storm.

Arthur tane priſoner? diuers deere friends ſlaine?
And bloudy *England* into *England* gone,
Ore-bearing interruption ſpight of *France*?
Dol. What he hath won, that hath he fortified:
So hot a ſpeed, with ſuch aduice diſpos'd,
Such temperate order in ſo fierce a cauſe,
Doth want example: who hath read,or heard
Of any kindred-action like to this?
Fra. Well could I beare that *England*had this praiſe,
So we could finde ſome patterne of our ſhame:
Enter Conſtance.
Looke who comes heere? a graue vnto a ſoule,
Holding th'eternall ſpirit againſt her will,
In the vilde priſon of afflicted breath:

9. *priſoner*] *pris'ner* Pope,+(— Var. '73).
12–18. Dol. *What...ſhame:*] Om. Dono.
14. *temperate*] *temp'rate* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
cauſe] *course* Warb. Han. Johns. Cap. Var. '73, Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
15. *example:*] *example.* Coll. Wh. i, Sta. Del. Fle. Neils.
16. *kindred-action*] *kindred action* Theob. et seq.
18. *ſhame:*] *shame.* Rowe et seq.
19. Enter Conſtance.] Enter Lady Constance, her *Hair* dishevel'd. Cap. After l. 22 Dyce, Huds. ii, Words. After l. 21 Sta.
20. *Looke*] *Look!* Sing. ii, Huds.
21. *th'eternall*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. ii, Wh. Fle. *the eternal* Cap. et cet.
ſpirit] *sprite* Fle.
againſt] *'gainst* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
22. *vilde*] *vild* Fle. *vile* Ff. et cet.
breath:] *breath.* Var. '73, Coll. Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Dono. Neils. Craig.

14. **cause**] WARBURTON in making his change interprets *course* as here meaning *march.*—CAPELL, while accepting as self-evident the change, takes exception to this interpretation since the 'obvious sense of it is—a course in lists, a knight's course, putting it figuratively. We had the same metaphor higher in a line of King Philip's, l. 7.'—STEEVENS: [Warburton's] change is needless. A 'fierce cause' is a cause conducted with precipitation. 'Fierce wretchedness,' in *Timon*, IV, ii, 30, is *hasty, sudden misery.*—DELIUS also considers Warburton's change unnecessary, since it is the very temperateness of the order and the matter in hand which carry all before them in their fierce onrush.

18. **So we . . . our shame**] MOBERLY: That is, If there could be found any precedent for shame like ours; if it were not far worse than anything in our fathers' days.

20–22. **a graue vnto a soule . . . afflicted breath**] FARMER: I think we should read 'afflicted *earth.*' The passage seems to have been copied from Sir Thomas More: 'If the body be to the soule a prison, how strait a prison maketh he the body, that stuffeth it with riff-raff, that the soule can have no room to stirre itself —but is, as it were, enclosed not in a prison, but in a grave.'—MALONE: There is surely no need of change. 'The vile prison of afflicted breath' is the body, the prison in which the *distressed soul* is confined. We have the same image in

I prethee Lady goe away with me. 23
Con. Lo; now: now ſee the iſſue of your peace.

24. *Lo; now*:] Ff. *Lo, now;* Rowe. *Lo now;* Pope, Han. *Lo, now,* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Huds. i. *Lo now,* Coll. Del. Dono. *Lo, now!* Cap. et cet.

24. *now ſee*] *I see* Mrs Siddons (Campbell i, 221). *you see* Marshall conj.

3 Henry VI: 'Now my soul's palace is become her prison.'—[II, i, 74]. Again, more appositely, in *Lucrece:* 'That blow did bail it [the soul] from the deep unrest Of that polluted prison where it breath'd.'—[l. 1726]. Again, in Sir John Davies, *Nosce Teipsum:* 'Yet in the body's prison so she lies, As through the body's windows she must look.'—[ed. Arber, p. 151].—STEEVENS: Perhaps the old reading is justifiable. So, in *Meas. for Meas.:* 'To be imprison'd in the viewless winds.'—[III, i, 124].—J. MONCK MASON: It appears from the amendment proposed by Farmer, and by the quotation adduced by Steevens in support of the old reading, that they both consider this passage in the same light, and suppose that King Philip intended to say 'that breath was the prison of the soul'; but I think they have mistaken the sense of it; and that by 'the vile prison of afflicted breath' he means the same vile prison in which the breath is confined; that is, the body. King John says to Hubert, speaking of what passed in his own mind, 'Nay, in the body of this fleshly land, This kingdom, this confine of blood and breath,' etc., IV, ii, 255. And Hubert says, in the following scene: 'If I . . . Be guilty of the stealing that sweet breath Which was embounded in this beauteous clay,' IV, iii, 145. It is evident that in this last passage the breath is considered as *embounded* in the body; but I will not venture to assert that the same inference may, with equal certainty, be drawn from the former.—ANDERS (p. 274): Compare what Plato says, in his *Cratylus,* 400: 'For some say that the body is the grave of the soul which may be thought to be buried in our present life; or again the index of the soul, because the soul gives indications to the body; probably the Orphic poets were the inventors of the name and they were under the impression that the soul is suffering the punishment of sin, and that the body is an enclosure or prison in which the soul is incarcerated, kept safe, as the name σῶμα implies, until the penalty is paid.'—['The thought,' adds Anders, 'had no doubt become a commonplace.'—That it was at least common is clearly shown by BAYLEY, who, under the heading *Classicisms,* p. 181, has collected fourteen examples, including the present passage, wherein this thought in varying phrases occurs, and the number might doubtless be extended. In a foot-note Bayley remarks that 'These views were very contrary to the theology of the time, and even of current creeds.'—As regards the 'prison of afflicted breath,' Mason's interpretation is also that of the present ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 50) raises an objection to Malone's and Mason's explanation, since 'the prisoner here is not simply "the soul," but the *spirit,* and therefore that the breath of the mortal being might not inaptly be described as the prison of that "spirit." As to "afflicted breath" it is best explained by "Absent thee from felicity awhile And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain."—*Hamlet,* V, ii, 358.'—[Is not 'eternal spirit' merely a synonym for the *soul?* The next words, 'against *her* will,' seem to show this; 'soul' is always feminine. Compare the quotation from Davies, *ante.*—ED.]

24. **the issue of your peace**] BUCKNILL (*Mad Folk,* etc., p. 279): Constance taunts King Philip with his and her own calamities as the result of his peace,

Fra. Patience good Lady, comfort gentle *Conſtance.*
Con. No, I defie all Counſell, all redreſſe,
But that which ends all counſell, true Redreſſe:
Death, death, O amiable, louely death,
Thou odoriferous ſtench: found rottenneſſe,
Ariſe forth from the couch of laſting night,
Thou hate and terror to proſperitie,
And I will kiſſe thy deteſtable bones,

25. *Lady, comfort*] Ff. *Lady; comfort,* Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Dono. *Lady! comfort,* Cap. et cet.

26. *all*] *and* Warb. Johns.

28. *Death, death,*] *Death; death,* Pope, Han. *Death, death;* Theob.+, Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii. *Death, Death!* Var. '73, Hal. *Death, death:*— Var. '78, '85, Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Words. *Death, death.*— Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig.

louely death,] *lovely death!* Pope et seq.

29. *Thou...rottenneſſe*] Om. Pope, Han.

29. *ſtench...rottenneſſe,*] *stench!...rottenness!* Cap. et seq.

30. *forth from*] *from forth* Coll. MS.

the] *thy* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *this* Grey.

32. *deteſtable bones,*] *detestable bones;* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cap. *bones detestable;* Han. *détestable bones;* Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *detestable bones* Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils.

32–35. *bones, ... browes, ... wormes, ... duſt,*] *bones...brows...wormes...dust*] Cam. +, Neils.

---

whereas they were, in reality, the issue of her war. This is the only point on which her quick intellect ever trips. She shows no signs of bending, though her spirit is wounded unto death. Her invincible pride rejects all comfort, all solace. The charnel-house ideas of her invocation to death is poetic delirium, the frenzy of imagination; Juliet's imagination, embracing the same ideas, is feeble and prosaic compared with this horror.

26. defie] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. vb[1] 5.): To set at nought; to reject, renounce, despise, disdain, revolt at. [SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. vb. 2.) furnishes many examples of this use of the word.]

28. O amiable, louely death] ROSE (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1880, p. 18): One is apt to take Constance as a passionate, single-minded woman; and much of the expression of her grief might be held to be merely conventional. Such lines as 28 and 29, of course, remind one at once of Juliet's rhetoric. But if we continue the scene, and examine particularly the famous lines, 'Grief fills the room up of my absent child, Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me,' we shall find that Constance's intellect is keenly analysing herself; that, intense as her sorrow is, she thinks about it quite as much as she feels; and that there is little danger of its breaking the o'erfraught heart, as does the speechless grief of more massive characters.

29. Thou . . . rottennesse] IVOR JOHN: The man who could pen certain passages in *The Dunciad* rejected this line!

31. hate and terror to prosperitie] CARTER (p. 210) quotes as a probable source of this: 'O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee to a man that liveth at rest in his possessions, unto the man that hath nothing to vex him, and that hath prosperitie in all things.'—*Ecclesiastes*, xli, 1 (*Genevan Vers.*).

And put my eye-balls in thy vaultie browes,
And ring theſe fingers with thy houſhold wormes,
And ſtop this gap of breath with fulſome duſt,
And be a Carrion Monſter like thy ſelfe;
Come, grin on me, and I will thinke thou ſmil'ſt,
And buſſe thee as thy wife: Miſeries Loue,
O come to me.

Fra. O faire affliction, peace.

Con. No, no, I will not, hauing breath to cry:
O that my tongue were in the thunders mouth,
Then with a paſſion would I ſhake the world,
And rowze from ſleepe that fell Anatomy
Which cannot heare a Ladies feeble voyce,

36. *thy ſelfe;*] *thy self.* Rowe, Neils.
37. *me,*] *me!* Ktly.
ſmil'ſt] *smilest* Cam. Glo. Cla.
38. *buſſe*] *kiss* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
wife:] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Fle. *wife.* Coll. ii, Ktly, Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils. *wife!* Var. '73 et cet.
Miſeries Loue,] *Misery's love!* Rowe ii. *thou love of Misery!* Pope.
39. *O...me.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *O...me!* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *O!...me.* Craig. *O,...me!* Cap. et cet.
40. *peace.*] *peace!* Coll. et seq.
41. *cry:*] *cry.* Ktly, Neils.
42. *O*] *O!* Coll. Huds. Craig.
mouth,] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Coll. *mouth!* Cap. et cet.
43. *a paſſion*] *what passion* Coll. MS.
would I] *I would* Ff, Rowe,+.

---

35. fulsome] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 5): Offensive to the senses generally; physically disgusting, foul, or loathsome. [The present line quoted.]

38. busse] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 131), objecting to the 'delicacy' of the former editors in changing 'buss' to *kiss*, says: '"Buss" is a picked word, purposely chosen to suit the thing she would kiss, and to paint the greediness with which she would do it.'—STEEVENS, while not decrying the delicacy of the former editors in rejecting this 'vulgar' word, quotes, in proof of its former usage in no such sense, a passage from Drayton's *Barons' Wars* and from *Faerie Queene*, also from Stanyhurst's translation of *Virgil*. To this last Douce (i, 403), very properly, takes exception, since: 'The singular vulgarity of Stanyhurst's language cannot with propriety be used to exemplify the undegraded use of any word whatever.'—WRIGHT agrees with Capell that as '"buss" is used of coarse and wanton kissing,' it 'is in keeping with the rest of Constance's exaggerated and hysterical language'; as an excellent example of the difference between 'buss' and *kiss*, Wright quotes: 'Yond towers, whose wanton tops do buss the clouds, Must kiss their own feet.'—*Tro. & Cress.*, IV, v, 220.

38. Miseries] WRIGHT: The accent on this word is the same as in 'From which lingering penance Of such misery doth she cut me off.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, IV, i, 272.

38. Miseries Loue] MALONE: Thou, death, who art *courted* by *misery* to come to his relief, O come to me. So before: 'Thou hate and terror to prosperity.'

Which fcornes a moderne Inuocation. 46
Pand. Lady, you vtter madneſſe, and not ſorrow.

46. *Which*] *And* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). Han. *mother's* Heath (Revisal), Knt, *moderne*] *modest* Rowe ii, Pope, Huds. ii. *widows* Coll. ii. (MS.).

46. Which . . . Inuocation] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XX.): Mr Lloyd writes to us with reference to this speech of Constance: 'I think the two last lines are a first and second draught, the latter intended to replace the former, and both printed together by mistake.'

46. moderne] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 4): Every-day, ordinary, commonplace. [The present line quoted; also: 'Full of wise saws and modern instances.'—*As You Like It*, II, vii, 156.]—KNIGHT remarks that if 'modern' be retained in the text, its only meaning must be *trite, common*. 'But,' he adds, 'the sentence is weak, and a slight change would make it powerful. We may read "a *mother's* invocation" with little violence to the text; *moder's* (the old spelling) might have been easily mistaken for "modern."'—HUDSON, in reference to Knight's change, says: 'It must be owned that "modern" seems very tame, and that *mother's* lifts the verse into poetry at once; nevertheless the change seems scarcely admissible.'—[Hudson admits it, however, to the text of his ed. ii.]—DYCE (*Remarks*, p. 93): Mr Knight's alteration is one of the rashest ever attempted by an editor. He had apparently forgotten the following passage in *Romeo & Juliet*, 'Why follow'd not, when she said—Tybalt's dead, Thy father, or thy mother, nay, or both, Which *modern* lamentation might have mov'd?'—III, ii, 118.—[Heath should take his proper share; Dyce's condemnation is too much for one editor. See *Text. Notes.* ED.]—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 206), in justification of the MS. Corrector's reading, says: 'When we bear in mind that *m* and *w* were often mistaken by the old compositors in this volume, the misprint [*widow's*] will not be thought so extraordinary. Such an emendation could hardly have had its source in the fancy, or even the ingenuity, of the old corrector.'—R. G. WHITE: Heath, who suggested 'a *mother's* invocation,' and Collier's MS. Corrector, who reads '*widow's* invocation,' forgot that Constance calls on impartial Death, who, although he might be represented as deaf to a feeble call or to gentle tones, would listen to a mother or a widow as quickly as to a maiden or a wife, and answer '*aequo* pede.'—[Neither the Heath-Knight suggestion nor Collier's MS. correction is, to me, quite satisfactory. Even Lloyd's surmise as regards the whole line, plausible as it may at first appear, does not quite carry conviction. In each case the verb 'scorns' is taken as referring to Death; but does it not refer to the 'feeble voice' to which it is directly joined by the relative? Constance has just before begged that her 'tongue were in the thunder's mouth,' and now refers to her voice as feeble and scorning anything commonplace or ordinary. It hardly seems Shakespearean to make Constance exclaim that the 'fell Anatomy,' Death, will not listen to, or be moved by, an ordinary invocation.—ED.]

47. Lady, you vtter . . . sorrow] BROOKE (p. 233): Not a ray of pity for the fate of the child crosses the mind of the Churchman. There is nothing in his mind but the supremacy of Rome. . . . He is just as dead to all human suffering when he hears Constance crying out her woe for her lost son. Philip is sorry for her. Pandulph is as hard as a stone. Not only public morality, but the tenderest ties of humanity, are thus represented as despised by the Church, when her interests are endangered. Fancy how Englishmen followed all this—men who had

Con. Thou art holy to belye me ſo, 48
I am not mad: this haire I teare is mine,

48. *art holy*] F_2F_3. *art unholy* Var. '73, '78, '85, Rann. Sta. Huds. ii, Dono. *art not holy* F_4 et cet. 49. *mad:*] *mad;*— Var. '85. *mad.* Neils.

heard of the pitiless massacre of St Bartholomew's Day, of the cruelties of Spain in the Low Countries, of the blessing the Pope had given to the ravishing soldiery of the Armada, of the treacherous work in England. No play of Shakespeare appealed more strongly than this to the national heart and honour, and the national wrath with Rome. As I read it, I seem to hear Shakespeare's own passion beating in its verse. It may even be that it was owing to his sympathy with England's wrath with Roman pretension and treachery, that he chose in the case of this play not to follow the Chronicles, but to adopt as his source a play in which the facts of history could be manipulated as he pleased. He had thus a free hand so to modify and change events that they should be used to express his opinions and those of his hearers on the questions of his own day. Some explanation at least resembling this must be given of his reckless, apparently unnecessary violation of historical fact.—BOWDEN (p. 127): The old play makes Pandulph a hypocrite and a Macchiavellian simply because he is a Catholic prelate. In Shakespeare he appears as an experienced, far-sighted statesman, but also as a ghostly father, full of sympathy for the afflicted. He grieves for Arthur's capture and pities Constance, whose maternal, beautiful, and pathetic appeal proves that she saw in him a spiritual consoler, and not a mere cold-hearted, calculating politician: 'And, Father Cardinal, I have heard you say That we shall see and know our friends in Heaven.' [This is not, at least avowedly, an answer to Brooke; but is an independent estimate of the character of Shakespeare's Pandulph.—ED.]

49. **I am not mad**] WORDSWORTH (*Sh's Knowledge & Use of Bible*, p. 321): The striking sublimity with which Paul, when brought before Festus, replied to the Governor's exclamation that 'he was beside himself,' by the simple denial, 'I am not mad, O noble Festus,' *Acts*, xxvi, 25, was not likely to be lost upon our Poet's imagination. In both *Hamlet*, III, iv, 139, and *King John* it is copied with good effect.—BUCKNILL (*Mad Folk*, etc., p. 280): [Pandulph's accusation] rouses that eloquent defence of her reason, in which she repeats the test of madness which Lear applies to himself, the recognition of personal identity, and in which she expresses the same idea of madness as a refuge from sorrow, which Gloucester does. Angrily as Constance rejects the idea of madness, yet she is mad; the very type of acute reasoning mania. In real life the intellect would scarcely be so consistent and consecutive in its operations; but in real life neither sane nor insane people talk blank verse, and express even their deepest emotions in the magnificent imagery which great poet's use. The raving of maniacal frenzy, in which the emotions are exclusively involved, would be represented by short and broken sentences, in which every link in the idea-chain would not be expressed, and which would therefore represent, more or less, the features of incoherence. The Poet fills up these chasms in the sense, and clothes the whole in the glowing language of excited intellectual power; and thus we have in Constance the representation of a frenzied woman, speaking with more arrangement of ideas than frenzy really permits.—VON FRIESEN (ii, 202): In this passage antithesis is so frequent, and phantasy shows in so high a strain the voluntary abandonment to grief, that it

My name is *Conſtance*, I was *Geffreyes* wife,
Yong *Arthur* is my ſonne, and he is loſt:
I am not mad, I would to heauen I were,
For then 'tis like I ſhould forget my ſelfe:
O, if I could, what griefe ſhould I forget?
Preach ſome Philoſophy to make me mad,
And thou ſhalt be Canoniz'd (Cardinall.)
For, being not mad, but ſenſible of greefe,
My reaſonable part produces reaſon
How I may be deliuer'd of theſe woes,
And teaches mee to kill or hang my ſelfe:
If I were mad, I ſhould forget my ſonne,
Or madly thinke a babe of clowts were he;
I am not mad: too well, too well I feele
The different plague of each calamitie.
Fra. Binde vp thoſe treſſes: O what loue I note
In the faire multitude of thoſe her haires;

50. Geffreyes] Geffrey's F_4.
51. *loſt:*] *lost!* Pope,+, Wh. i, Huds. i, Del. Rlfe, Dono. Craig. *lost.* Sta. Ktly, Fle. Neils.
52. *mad,*] *mad;*— Cap. et seq.
were,] *were!* Theob. et seq.
53. *my ſelfe:*] *my self.* Rowe,+ (— Var. '73).
55–62. In margin Pope, Han.
56. *And thou...(Cardinall.)*] *And Cardinal thou* Pope, Han. Dono.
Canoniz'd] *canóniz'd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *canónizèd* Dono.
(Cardinall.)] Ff. *cardinal;* Rowe, Cap. Hal. Wh. i, Huds. Cam.+, Del. Words. Neils. Craig. *cardinal.* Theob. et cet.
60. *my ſelfe:*] *my self,* Rowe,+, Ktly.
62. *he;*] *he.* Coll. Sta. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Del. Fle. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig.
64. *different*] *diff'rent* Theob. Warb. Johns.
65–80. *Binde vp...a priſoner.*] In margin Pope, Han.
65. *treſſes: O*] *tresses. O!* Coll. Ktly, Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Del. Huds. ii, Dono. Neils. Craig. *tresses.—O,* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Rlfe, Words.
66. *haires;*] *hairs!* Cap. et seq.

---

would hardly surprise me did certain critics bring upon it the charge of overlading. Nevertheless, I think, that for the most part it may be justified, since it makes the most lifelike impression of that frenzy in which, we later learn, Constance dies. Above all, it is not in the placing together of contradictions in the most fantastic manner, but rather in her utter denial of the accusation that she is mad, wherein lie the most sharply marked symptoms of maniacal frenzy. I do not assert that the self-destroying passion of Constance has to serve as a motive through the necessity of a tragic fate for herself and her son. We can assuredly say: This woman must have compassed her own and Prince Arthur's downfall in the maintainance of the rights of her son, if she had not been left faithless by France.

65. **Binde vp those tresses**] JOHNSON: It was necessary that Constance should be interrupted, because a passion so violent cannot be borne long. I wish the other speeches had been equally happy; but they only serve to show how difficult it is to maintain the pathetic long.

Where but by chance a filuer drop hath falne,
Euen to that drop ten thouſand wiery fiends
Doe glew themſelues in ſociable griefe,
Like true, inſeparable, faithfull loues,
Sticking together in calamitie.
Con. To *England*, if you will.

67. *hath*] *had* Orger.
falne] *fall'n* Rowe,+, Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii. *fallen* Cap. et cet.
68. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Fle.
68. *fiends*] *friends* Rowe ii. et seq.
70. *loues*] *lovers* Coll. ii. (MS.).
72. *will.*] *will.*— Theob.+. *will.* [Giving some of her hairs to the wind. Rann.

68. wiery] HENLEY: In *The Instructions to the Commissioners for the Choice of a Wife for Prince Arthur* it is directed 'to note the eye-browes' of the young Queen of Naples (who, after the death of Arthur, was married to Henry VIII. and divorced by him for the sake of Anne Bullen). They answer: 'Her browes are of a browne heare, very small, like a wyre of heare.' Thus also Gascoigne: 'First for hir head, the heeres were not of gold, But of some other metall farre more fine, Whereof eache crinet seemed to behold, Like glistring wiers against the sunne that shine.' —[*Dan Bartholomew of Bathe*, ed. Cunliffe, ii, p. 97. Compare also: 'And round about the same her yellow heare, Having through stirring loosd their wonted band, Like to a golden border did appeare, Framed in goldsmithes forge with cunning hand: Yet goldsmithes cunning could not understand To frame such subtile wire, so shinie cleare; For it did glister like the golden sand.'—Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, IV, vi, 20. Again, Ibid., *Epithalamion:* 'Her long loose yellow locks lyke golden wyre,' l. 154; and for several other examples see, if needful, Todd's note on this last passage in his edition of Spenser, vol. viii, p. 195.—ED.]—PYE (p. 145), in reference to the foregoing note by Henley, says: 'This is the kind of note there is no reading with patience. First the fact is false: it was Catherine of Arragon and not the Queen of Naples to whom Arthur and Henry VIII. were successively married. Henry VII. wanted *himself* to marry the young Queen of Naples after Catherine was wedded to his son, as the very document quoted by the critic might have shown him, for it commences: "First aftre the presentation and delyverance of suche lettres as they shall have with them to be delyvred to the said quenes from the Ladie Catheryn, Princesse of Wales," &c. To this must be added the gross blunder of confounding the single hair which was often compared by the poets of that age to a golden wire, with that wiry form of the eye-brow, which, together with red locks and high forehead, was esteemed beautiful by our barbarian ancestors.'

68. fiends] Miss PORTER: The writhing of hair that is dishevelled, its responsiveness to the wearer's woful gestures, and the association with the snake-locks that coiled in anguish around the heads of the Furies are behind the picture here of these 'wiery fiends.' They were thickened together, tear-glued, making the disarray of grief more noticeable. The change to *friends* has long held the text, but it lays too much stress on the sticking together part of the imagery. *Fiends* can stick together as well as 'friends,' and much more appropriately in this case.

72. To England, if you will] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 131): This is spoken tearing some of her hair, and giving it to the winds. But why bear it to England? that John might seize on it, as he had on her son, and wreak his spite upon both. The

[72. Con. To England, if you will]

'tearing' and the 'liberty,' too, that she talks of soon after, preceded her entry; as may be gathered from l. 65. [That Constance here apostrophizes her hair, which she madly tears from its bonds, is likewise the view of both STAUNTON and MOBERLY.]—MALONE: Neither the French king nor Pandulph has said a word of England since the entry of Constance. Perhaps, therefore, in despair, she means to address the absent King John: 'Take my son to England, if you will; now that he is in your power, I have no prospect of seeing him again. It is, therefore, of no consequence to me where he is.'—DELIUS: Her thoughts direct themselves whither her son has been taken, and in the summons to put her hair in order she recognises a summons to hold herself ready for a journey.—C. &. M. COWDEN CLARKE: To our minds this is one of those incoherent but wanderingly-connected speeches which persons in Constance's condition of mind (and even people who are only absent of mind) will frequently make. To our thinking, these words of hers are, in fact, a reply to what King Philip says on her entrance —'I prythee, lady, go away with me.' At the time of their utterance her thoughts are too much engrossed to notice them; but afterwards—with that curious operation of the memory's ear which gives the echo of a speech addressed to an absent-minded person many minutes subsequent to its sound—they recur to her, and she answers them with apparent irrelevancy. This seems to be indicated by King Philip's repeating his former words by way of rejoinder—'Bind up your hairs'; as if he would recall her to the point now at issue. It appears to us that this interpretation of her speech adds another point of characteristic delineation to the many admirable touches with which the Poet has drawn a mind bordering on frenzy in this powerfully affecting scene. [That these words are in answer to Philip's first greeting is likewise MARSHALL's interpretation.—ED.]—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: I take the sense to be—I will to England, if you will allow me.—FLEAY: An answer to Philip's speech: 'Say this fine speech about faithful love, etc., to England, that is, to John.' Compare *Rich. II:* II, iii, 70: 'My answer is to Lancaster' (is only given to the name of Lancaster).—WRIGHT: Constance here replies to Philip's invitation in l. 23. Possibly ll. 24–72 may have been added to the original draft of the play, or Constance, after the first outburst of her distraction, relapses into apathy and gives herself up to Philip's guidance.—W. W. LLOYD (*N. & Q.*, 1886; VII, ii, 84) takes exception to the foregoing interpretation by Wright; and in particular to the tentative suggestion that ll. 24–72 are an addition, since these 'include reference to the action, "this hair I tear is mine," which is indispensable to explain both Philip's injunction and her reply.' 'In any case,' continues Lloyd, 'Constance was not so distracted that she could construe the French king's words as an invitation to "go away with" him "to England." As Shakespeare did not write nonsense, the text must be corrupt, whether we are able to restore it or not. The case does not appear to me to be desperate. In the response of Constance, "Yes, that I will," I recognise an echo to the words "if you will," now wrongly assigned to herself, and which consequently and naturally are to be given to King Philip. The problem, then, is narrowed to divining the phrase which reader or typographer was guilty of transforming into "To England." Several plausible readings occur to me, but I give to this the palm of highest probability: "Like true, inseparable, faithful loves, Sticking together in calamity. [*to Constance*]. To end—an if you will bind up your hairs. *Const.* Yes, that I will; and wherefore will I do it."'—J. S. HALY (*N. & Q.*, 1886; VII, ii, 305):

Fra. Binde vp your haires.
Con. Yes that I will: and wherefore will I do it?
I tore them from their bonds, and cride aloud,
O, that theſe hands could ſo redeeme my ſonne,
As they haue giuen theſe hayres their libertie:
But now I enuie at their libertie,
And will againe commit them to their bonds,
Becauſe my poore childe is a priſoner.
And Father Cardinall, I haue heard you ſay

74. *will:*] *will.* Sta. Fle.
76. *O,*] *O!* Huds.
77. *giuen*] *giv'n* Pope,+, Fle. *libertie:*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Huds. *liberty.* Fle. *liberty!* Theob. et cet.
80. *priſoner.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Knt, Sta. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *prisoner,* Theob. Warb. Johns. *prisoner.*—Cap. et cet.
81. *And*] *Oh* Pope, Han. *Ah!* Anon. ap. Cam.

Is it not natural that Constance, who thus apostrophizes her son, 'My boy, my Arthur, my fair son! My life, my joy, my food, my all the world!' should exclaim in her anguish: 'To England, if you will!' knowing him to be a prisoner in his uncle's power in that country? The exclamation needs no explanation by any commentator.—Br. NICHOLSON (*N. & Q.*, 1887; VII, iii, 511): This exclamation has been more than boldly changed. Indeed, one might say that never has a passage so subtilely and yet so naturally introduced been so utterly spoilt by trying to amend it instead of thinking over the circumstances and the context. . . . The widowed mother and her only child had been inseparable. Arthur has been her idol, the more so that she has indulged in all but certain day-dreams, and in loving thoughts of his future happy and glorious career. . . . Her sole thought, her sole talk, is now of him and his fate, her curses and her prayers for revenge. 'She dies in a' despairing frenzy. This scene is an example of it; and Philip shows that he knows what is coming by his words on her approach. After one futile attempt, he at last says, 'Lady, you utter madness,' but her only reply is a raving outburst of grief. Then he goes on another tack, and, as he thinks, a sure one. He praises the beauty of the hair she is destroying. She at first only hears sounds without sense. Suddenly, however, these meaningless sounds seem to her to refer to her one abiding thought. Placing her own construction on them, she catches at—'Like true, inseparable, faithful loves, Sticking together in calamity.' 'Yes,' she says—if I may add her unexpressed thoughts to her spoken words—'Yes, to England if you will; be the consequences or prison or death, we will still be "inseparable and faithful in our loves, clinging together in our calamities" and in our death. My Arthur, let us see one another, let us live together once more, till together we seek the mercy of God.'—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) agrees in part with Clarke that these words are given in answer to Philip's invitation; but, so far from being an abstracted reply, are an exhortation to Philip 'to take her with him to England in a further campaign for the rights of Arthur, who has been carried thither.'

78. **enuie at**] WRIGHT compares: 'Against this man, whose honesty the devil And his disciples only envy at.'—*Henry VIII:* V, iii, 112.

81. **And . . . heard you say**] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL): Though Constance's

That we ſhall ſee and know our friends in heauen:
If that be true, I ſhall ſee my boy againe;
For ſince the birth of *Caine*, the firſt male-childe
To him that did but yeſterday ſuſpire,
There was not ſuch a gracious creature borne:
But now will Canker-ſorrow eat my bud,
And chaſe the natiue beauty from his cheeke,
And he will looke as hollow as a Ghoſt,
As dim and meager as an Agues fitte,
And ſo hee'll dye: and riſing ſo againe,
When I ſhall meet him in the Court of heauen
I ſhall not know him: therefore neuer, neuer

82, 92. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
83. *true*] Om. Pope. Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap.
I ſhall ſee] *I'll see* Walker (Vers.). *'shall see* Ibid., Fle. *then never shall I see* Kinnear. *I shall* Vaughan.
againe;] *again.* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
84. *male-childe*] Ff, Rowe, Theob.+, Cap. Varr. Mal. *male child* Pope et cet.
86. *borne:*] Ff, Rann, Sing. i, Hal. *born.* Rowe et cet.
87. *Canker-ſorrow*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. i, Sing. ii, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils. *canker sorrow* Theob. ii. et cet.
90. *Agues fitte*] *ague-fit* Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
93. *him:*] *him.* Ktly.

grief before the battle appears very powerful to sympathizing passions, yet upon the loss of her son there is a tincture of despair, mingled with such an increase of sorrow, that the scene grows rather too trying for refined sensations. The actress who performs this part has here occasion for uncommon expression of grief; her features should be the living type of sorrow, and her voice capable of breaking harmoniously into the style of expression which a flood of anguish occasions.—MOBERLY: In these last words of Constance she casts aside, like Romeo, all fanciful expressions, and speaks the simplest language of a mother's sorrow.—IVOR JOHN: The slight irregularity of this line has led to its being suspected, and its contradiction of ll. 93, 94 appears to confirm the suspicion. All [the changes proposed] merely set the rhythm right. . . . Constance first takes comfort from the thought that she will see and know her son in heaven. But then comes the thought 'sorrow will so alter him that I may meet him in the court of heaven and not know him, therefore I shall never see him more.'—[The contradiction is, of course, intentional. It is her 'pretty Arthur' that she will not see, since he will be altered by sorrow from long imprisonment.—ED.]

85. **suspire**] That is, *breathe.* This is evidently derived from the Italian *sospirare*, to sigh. It occurs but in one other passage in Shakespeare: 'Did he suspire, that light and weightless down Perforce must move.'—*2 Henry IV:* IV, v, 33. SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) explains 'suspire' in the present passage: 'to be born, to come into life,' which seems hardly necessary. 'Suspirations,' *Hamlet* I, ii, 79, is perhaps a word of Shakespeare's own coining.—ROBERTSON (*Baconian Heresy*, p. 351) gives several examples wherein 'suspire' and 'suspires' are used in the sense, a *sigh*, or *sighs;* which looks as though this were the regular form of the noun from the verb.—ED.

Muſt I behold my pretty *Arthur* more.
Pand. You hold too heynous a reſpect of greefe.
Conſt. He talkes to me, that neuer had a ſonne.
Fra. You are as fond of greefe, as of your childe.
Con. Greefe fils the roome vp of my abſent childe:

95. *heynous*] *hainous* F_3F_4. 98–100. Mnemonic Pope.

94. my pretty Arthur] Mrs GRIFFITH (p. 180): There is something very tender and affecting in her making use of the epithet 'pretty' in this line. It has a better effect there than *dearest, angel*, or even *lovely* (though this last has a more comprehensive sense) would have had in that place. I must beg to refer to the reader's own taste for the justness of this observation; for I own I cannot explain why it strikes me in this manner myself.

95. heynous] That is, *hateful, wicked.*

96. He talkes . . . had a sonne] STEEVENS: To the same purpose Macduff observes: 'He has no children.'—*Macbeth*, IV, iii, 216. This thought occurs also in *3 Henry VI:* ['You have no children, butchers! if you had, The thought of them would have stirred up remorse.'—V, v, 63].

97. fond of greefe] IVOR JOHN: One may suspect a play upon 'fond' here. You are as fond of (or you are as foolish owing to) grief, as you are fond of your child. Constance, of course, only sees one meaning.

98–105. Greefe fils the roome . . . you doe] MALONE (*Chron. Order; Var. 1821*, vol. ii, p. 353): It is observable that our Author's son, Hamnet, died in August, 1596. That a man of such sensibility, and of so amiable a disposition. should have lost his only son, who had attained the age of twelve years, without being greatly affected by it, will not be easily credited. The pathetic lamentations which he has written for Lady Constance on the death of Arthur may perhaps add some probability to the supposition that this tragedy was written at or soon after that period.—[BRANDES (i, 160) also considers that Shakespeare's heart 'found an outlet for its own sorrows in transfusing them into the heart of Constance. See also, note by Brandes, IV, i, 111.—ED.]—WRIGHT (*Clarendon Sh., Preface*, p. iv): Without insisting upon the circumstance that the grief of Constance is not for the death but for the imprisonment of her child, I would ask, is it absolutely necessary to suppose that the lines, however tender and beautiful, in which this grief is described, could only have been written by one who was smarting under the recent loss of his own son? If it be not, then it is possible, as for other reasons it appears probable, that the play may belong to an earlier period than 1596. But even if we adopt Malone's suggestion that there is in this passage a direct reference to Shakespeare's personal sorrow, it is easy to suppose that the lines III, iii, 95–105 may have been added to the original draft of the play.—J. KNIGHT (*Harper's Maga.*, May 1903, p. 830): [Malone's] conjecture is plausible enough, and in the case of a lesser man might have ample justification. Where, it might be asked, but in personal sufferings could a writer find expressions so poignant and so pathetic as the answer of Constance to the rebuke of King Philip. No less pertinently, however, it may be asked, whence but from personal knowledge and experience did Shakespeare draw his insight into the ambitious, turbulent, defeated, and despairing soul of Lady Macbeth, the tortured heart of Othello, and the flickering brain of Lear? Whence, indeed, came the in-

Lies in his bed, walkes vp and downe with me,
Puts on his pretty lookes, repeats his words,
Remembets me of all his gracious parts,
Stuffes out his vacant garments with his forme;
Then, haue I reaſon to be fond of griefe?
Fareyouwell: had you ſuch a loſſe as I,

101. *Remembets*] F1.
103. *Then, haue*] *Then have* Rowe, Pope,+, Dyce, Wh. Cam. ii.
103. *griefe?*] Ff, Cam. i,+, Neils. *grief.* Rowe et cet.
104. *Fareyouwell*] *Färe you well* Ktly.

spiration that made him the greatest of creators and the most dramatic of poets? It is unduly to limit his powers and perceptions, and to reduce him to the level of those of his age over whom, great as they are, he towers, to assume such antecedent experience to be indispensable. In the present case neither the *post hoc* nor the *propter hoc* is to be denied. In favor of the theory that Shakespeare was animated by his loss to deal with the fate of Arthur, it may be advanced that he abandoned the all but completed record of the Wars of York and Lancaster, with which until that time in his historical plays he had alone concerned himself, and transferred his attention to an earlier epoch, with which he had shown no intention to deal.

98. **Greefe fils the roome**] Mrs GRIFFITH compares for this thought: 'Mon deuil me plait, et doit toujours me plaire: Il me tient lieu de celui que je pleurs.'—[MALONE (*Var.*, 1778), without reference to Mrs Griffith, supplies the author of these lines, Maynard, and corrects the last word 'pleurs,' which should be *plains*, shown by the word 'crains' with which it rhymes in a preceding couplet. Mrs Griffith was quoting from memory.—ED.]—BUCKNILL (*Mad Folk*, etc., p. 283): Constance's last words indicate a state of hallucination. Grief represents her son's voice and figure to her senses. Or, if this be not taken literally, it at least represents one manner in which hallucination is produced. An absorbing emotion constantly directs the attention to one idea-image. This creation of the mind at length becomes accepted by the sense as a reality, and the hallucination of insanity exists. This differs, however, in its origin and its significance, from the form of hallucination arising from some abnormal state of the nerves of sense merely, which may exist, as it did in Ben Jonson and Nicolai, without any deviation from a sound state of mental health. If the lively representation of Arthur's presence be not intended to convey the idea of actual hallucination, it at least expresses the complete dominion which an absorbing emotion attains over the attention and mental conception.—[The following extract from an unsigned article, entitled *The Pathetic Element in Literature*, in *The Spectator*, 18 August, 1883, p. 1055, is interesting, as it bears psychologically upon the present passage. In describing the characteristic of pathos the author says that 'it must always be associated with a certain dumbness; it is the appeal that is made to us, whether in life, or in some representation of life, by a sorrow that reveals itself unconsciously. . . . The indispensable condition is that the reader should look at the sorrow from afar.' 'Pathos, if we have rightly described it, is not pre-eminently the characteristic of any first-rate genius. To find a writer whose productions it characterises, we must turn to some shy, reserved nature, with whom it is not merely a dramatic effect, but, what is a very different thing, an actual outcome of the character. And we do not, accordingly, find much of it in Shakespeare, in pro-

I could giue better comfort then you doe. 105
I will not keepe this forme vpon my head,

106. *head*,] Ff, Rowe, Coll. i, Hal. Wh. Huds. i, Del. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *head*, [Tearing off her head-cloaths. Pope,+. *head*, [throwing away her head-dress. Cap. Var. '78. *head*. [tearing her hair. Coll. ii. (MS.). *head*, [Dishevelling her hair. Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words. *head*. [looses her hair again. Dent. MS. ap. Hal. *head*, [Tearing off her head-dress. Var. '85 et cet.

---

portion to the wealth of every kind which we find in his works. But we may take from him specimens of the wealth in which he is poorest, and one scene from *King John*, which will occur to every reader as an apparent refutation of the limitations we have given to the scope of Pathos, affords, in fact, a good illustration of our meaning. The lament of Constance for Arthur is the specimen of pathos, perhaps, most universally appreciated, and it is undeniable that she cannot be called dumb; we have known her lament in dramatic representation made extremely clamorous, and though such a conception seemed to us very injurious to the beauty of the situation, it certainly did not destroy its tear-compelling power. But no small part of the wonderful power of the picture seems to us to consist of the dumbness of Arthur,—the slightness and faintness of the sketch, the truth, in a certain sense, of his own words,—"Good, my mother, peace! I am not worth this coil that's made for me." And in the case of Constance herself, our sympathy is solely with *the mother*. It is the purely human feeling—nay, it is the one emotion we share with the creatures below humanity—that is made interesting. If the reader imagines how an artist of lesser genius would have treated the grief of a bereaved mother, he will see that it is touched with wonderful temperance, though with such great impressiveness. The few lines beginning, "Grief fills the place up of my absent child," touch on the anguish of every bereaved heart; they open a vista for every reader to some remembered longing, they put before us the sorrow that belongs not to rich or poor, high or low, wise or foolish, but to all. And yet how few they are, how soon we turn to other things, how little is Shakespeare engrossed with that pathetic image! He gives us an indirect glance at it, and hurries on to the interests of a nation. It is interesting, in the case of the only dramatist who can be named on the same page with Shakespeare, to observe how the pathos of this indirect glance fades away, when it becomes direct. Antigone seems to us the grandest female figure in dramatic literature, but the only time she is brought forward in a pathetic light is in her first appearance as an unconscious child. Pathos cannot combine with the full diapason of tragic power; those flute-like notes are lost in any flood of harmony, their melody is soon over, but for the moment it must be heard alone.'

105. **I could giue better comfort**] JOHNSON: This is a sentiment which great sorrow always dictates. Whoever cannot help himself casts his eyes on others for assistance, and often mistakes their inability for coldness.

106. **I will not keepe this forme**] COLLIER: Constance perhaps wore no head-dress but her hair, as we may gather from the preceding part of the scene, and when she says, 'I will not keep this form upon my head,' she begins again to disorder her hair, which she had previously knit up at the words: 'But now I envy at their liberty,' &c. [Delius, Verplanck, Wright, and Herford also thus interpret this line.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh. Key*, p. 607): With what skill is augmented the impression of Constance's agony of grief and incipient frenzy, when

When there is ſuch diſorder in my witte:
O Lord, my boy, my *Arthur*, my faire ſonne,
My life, my ioy, my food, my all the world:
My widow-comfort, and my ſorrowes cure. *Exit.*

108. *O Lord,*] *O Lord!* Cap. et seq. 108, 110. *ſonne,...cure.*] *ſon!...cure!* Rowe ii. et seq. 109. *world:*] Ff, Fle. *world,* Rowe, Pope, Han. Coll. Wh. i. *world!* Theob. et cet.

she is made to tear off her head-dress, unable to bear the sense of heat upon her brain, with the words: 'I will not keep this form upon my head.' [Thus Rolfe also understands the line.]

108–110. **O Lord . . . my sorrowes cure**] Mrs GRIFFITH (p. 181): These last three lines are almost suffocating. I believe no woman with a mother's feeling could ever be able to pronounce them articulately, even in representation.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 55): Constance was Mrs Cibber's most perfect character. When going off the stage, in this scene, she uttered the words: 'O Lord! my boy!' with such an emphatical scream of agony as will never be forgotten by those who heard her. [The Mrs Cibber, of whom Davies here speaks, is Mrs Theophilus Cibber, Colley Cibber's daughter-in-law.—ED.]—BOADEN (*Life of Mrs Siddons*, vol. ii, 61): Constance is too impassioned for *hope:* she sees the future in the instant: Arthur in the power of her enemy is already dead to her; and it is in *another* world that, worn down with early sorrow, she fears she shall not know him. Her prophetic soul has disposed of him in *this*. She, therefore, does not linger in expectation, but expires of frenzy, before his own rashness, rather than his uncle's violence, has ended her pretty Arthur. In the exit of Constance, the sharp shrillness of the organ itself will do something for an actress not highly intellectual:—however vehement in her exclamations, Constance has meaning in her language; this was truly given by Mrs Siddons, and not an inarticulate *yell*, the grief of merely savage nature. [As] Constance she wore a *black* body and train of satin, and a petticoat of white, disposed in certainly the most tasteful forms of that day. The true actress is in everything an artist; the genius before us dishevelled even her hair with graceful wildness.—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 25): These final words form the highest point of this difficult rôle and also its greatest effect. Moreover, that which Constance has to exhibit in this scene is the most artistically difficult task in the whole play. Here by intonation and acting the actress must give suitable outward expression to the most moving and passionate words of poetry, to go to the very furthest limit of æsthetic license and possibility without overstepping that boundary, to indicate the shadow of approaching madness, without showing madness itself. All this demands great ability and great exercise of art. Constance's exit must be the very personification of despair; there must be suggested to us that after this there is nothing left for her but madness and death.

110. **Exit**] KNIGHT (*Studies*, p. 204): Are we to believe that Shakespeare intended that our hearts should sustain this laceration, and that the effects should pass away when Constance quits the stage? . . . Was there to be no unity of feeling to sustain and elevate the action to the end? . . . No, no. The remembrance of Constance can never be separated from the after-scenes in which Arthur appears; and, at the very last, when the poison has done its work upon the guilty king, we

Fra. I feare ſome out-rage, and Ile follow her. *Exit.*
Dol. There's nothing in this world can make me ioy,
Life is as tedious as a twice-told tale,
Vexing the dull eare of a drowſie man;
And bitter ſhame hath ſpoyl'd the ſweet words taſte,

111. SCENE VI. Pope. SCENE VII. Han. Warb.
112. *ioy,*] Ff, Rowe ii, Pope. *joy.* Rowe i, Ktly, Dono. Neils. *joy;* Theob. et cet.
113, 114. Mnemonic Pope, Warb.
114–120. *Vexing...euill.*] Om. Dono.
115. *And*] *A* Rowe ii,+ (—Var. '73). *the ſweet*] *that sweet* Del. conj. *words*] Ff, Rowe, Mal. Coll. i, Fle. *world's* Pope, Coll. (MS.) et cet.

can scarcely help believing that the spirit of Constance hovers over him, and that the echo of the mother's cries is even more insupportable than the 'burn'd bosom' and the 'parched lips,' which neither 'his kingdom's rivers' nor the 'bleak winds' of the north can 'comfort with cold.'

112–116. **There's nothing . . . but shame and bitternesse**] JOHNSON: The young prince feels his defeat with more sensibility than his father. Shame operates most strongly in the earlier years; and when can disgrace be less welcome than when a man is going to his bride?—Mrs GRIFFITH (p. 182): This may be a just image of life, to those who have exhausted its variety, and palled their senses with its pleasures. The speech might not have ill become his father, old Philip, then labouring under disappointed hopes and baffled wishes; who had just then suffered the mortification of having lost a battle in the heart of his own dominions, and whose mistaken faith in heaven had obliged him to break faith on earth, without effect too; but it was certainly rather too premature a sentence to have proceeded from the lips of a young prince, who had been but just married to the woman he loved. Such an impropriety in the character of a speaker hurts the effect of a thought or sentiment.

113. **Life . . . as a twice-told tale**] MALONE: Our Author here and in another play seems to have had the 90th *Psalm* in his thoughts: 'For when thou art angry, all our days are gone, we bring our years to an end, as it were a tale that is told.' So again in *Macbeth:* 'Life's but a walking shadow;— . . . it is a tale Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, Signifying nothing.'—[V, v, 24.—On the foregoing I am almost disposed to echo the words of Pye on a former remark by Henley, that 'This is one of those notes there is no reading with patience.' Beyond the fact that the words 'tale' and 'told' occur there is no similarity whatever; the thought is wholly different in each case. The Dauphin's observation is perfectly plain; the Psalmist, Moses, says when life is over it is like a story that is finished; or, perhaps, the count of our years is like an enumeration completed, as in 'Every shepherd tells his tale,' i. e., counts over the number of his sheep. Macbeth, on the other hand, likens life to a mere jumble of words uttered without meaning or sequence by an idiot. Malone is not often so lacking in perspicacity as here. —ED.]

115. **sweet words taste**] MALONE: The 'sweet word' is *life;* which, says the speaker, is no longer sweet, yielding now nothing but shame and bitterness. Pope's reading is plausible, but unnecessary.—STEEVENS: I prefer Pope's reading, which is sufficiently justified by the passage in *Hamlet:* 'How weary, stale, flat, and

That it yeelds nought but ſhame and bitterneſſe.
Pand. Before the curing of a ſtrong diſeaſe,
Euen in the inſtant of repaire and health,
The fit is ſtrongeſt: Euils that take leaue
On their departure, moſt of all ſhew euill:
What haue you loſt by loſing of this day?
Dol. All daies of glory, ioy, and happineſſe.
Pan. If you had won it, certainely you had.
No, no: when Fortune meanes to men moſt good,
Shee lookes vpon them with a threatning eye:
'Tis ſtrange to thinke how much King *Iohn* hath loſt

116. *ſhame*] *grief* Cartwright.
118. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Pope,+, Fle.
119, 120. *Euils ... leaue ... departure,*] *evils...leave,...departure,* F$_4$, Rowe,+. *evils,...leave,...departure* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta. Ktly, Huds. i. *evils...leave,...departure* Var. '73, Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Del. Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig.
120. *euill:*] *evil.* Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Rlfe, Craig.
123. *had won*] *have won* Var. '03, '13, '21.
125. *threatning*] Ff. *threat'ning* Rowe, Pope,+, Mal. Neils. *threatening* Var. '73 et cet.
eye:] *eye.* Rowe et seq.

---

unprofitable Seem to me all the uses of this world.' Our present rage for *restoration* from ancient copies may induce some of our readers to exclaim, with Virgil's Shepherd: 'Claudite jam rivos, pueri, sat prata biberunt.'—DYCE (*Remarks*, p. 94): Malone's explanation is sheer foolishness. The misprint of 'word' for *world* is one of the most common errors not only in early, but in modern books.—DELIUS: In view of the first part of the Dauphin's speech, as well as the latter part, Pope's correction seems very probable. If we retain the older reading, 'word's,' it must refer to life; moreover, it is not usual for Shakespeare to express himself so obscurely; he would have said with plainer reference '*that* sweet word's taste.'—WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 121): Certainly 'sweet *world's* taste.'—R. G. WHITE considers Pope's correction as 'being almost obvious'; and adds 'If we accept "word" as referring to "life," still we cannot say of the *word* "life" that "it yields naught but shame and bitterness."'—The CAMBRIDGE EDD. assign to S. Walker the conjecture '*bitter gall*' for 'bitter shame,' but Walker's note (*Crit.*, i, 281) refers obviously to the next line. After quoting both lines he says: 'Something is wanting that shall class with *bitterness* (l. 116); possibly *gall*.'—This would be hardly worth noting were it not that MOBERLY, misled by the Cambridge text note, says that such a change is quite unnecessary, as, indeed, it certainly would be, and is, moreover, a reading which Walker did not propose.—ED.

117–120. **Before the curing . . . shew euill]** BUCKNILL (*Med. Knowledge*, etc., p. 134): This passage unquestionably refers to the medical doctrine of crises which was universally prevalent in Shakespeare's time. ['Perhaps also,' adds MOBERLY, 'to *Matthew*, xvii, where the evil spirit, being on the point of defeat, tears his victim as he comes out.'—CARTER (p. 211) likewise refers to this incident as related in *Mark*, ix, 26, as being 'remotely parallel' to the present passage.—ED.]

121. **this day]** For this use of 'day,' equivalent to *battle*, compare I, ii, 415; and for other examples see SCHMIDT (*Lex.* s. v. day, 3.).

In this which he accounts ſo clearely wonne:
Are not you grieu'd that *Arthur* is his priſoner?
Dol. As heartily as he is glad he hath him.
Pan. Your minde is all as youthfull as your blood.
Now heare me ſpeake with a propheticke ſpirit:
For euen the breath of what I meane to ſpeake,
Shall blow each duſt, each ſtraw, each little rub
Out of the path which ſhall directly lead
Thy foote to Englands Throne. And therefore marke:
Iohn hath ſeiz'd *Arthur*, and it cannot be,
That whiles warme life playes in that infants veines,
The miſ-plac'd-*Iohn* ſhould entertaine an houre,
One minute, nay one quiet breath of reſt.

127. *wonne:*] *won.* Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. Del. Dono. Neils. Craig. *won!* Ktly.
132. *euen*] *ev'n* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
135. *Throne.*] Ff, Rowe, Sta. Fle. *throne:* Pope et cet.
marke:] Ff, Sta. Fle. *mark.* Rowe et cet.
137. *whiles*] *whilst* Rowe,+.
138. *miſ-plac'd*-Iohn] *miſplac'd*-John F_3F_4. *misplac'd John* Rowe et seq.
an] *one* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
139. *One*] *A* Rowe,+.
reſt.] *rest:* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Words.

---

130. Your minde is all as youthfull] MOBERLY: That is, You think sentimentally, as a child does, about 'piteous' events. Think of them as a man and a politician should; think how they affect the objects which you are pursuing. A wise man should cope with the world by using the vices of the wicked—that is, of mankind at large. In governments nothing should be regarded but the interests of the ruler. Statecraft is one thing, morality another. High political ends must be attained without force and fraud if possible; if not, with them. This doctrine, which is that of the Italian Renaissance and of Macchiavelli, its high-priest, is what Shakespeare wishes to exhibit in Pandulph. It should be added that Macchiavelli's name, as well as his system, had become a by-word in England in Shakespeare's time. 'Am I Machiavel?' asks the host in the *Merry Wives;* and Marlowe, in the Prologue to the *Jew of Malta*, makes his ghost speak thus: 'I count religion but a childish toy, And hold there is no sin but ignorance.'

133. each dust] For this use of 'dust' in the sense of a *grain of dust*, compare IV, i, 102.

133. rub] CRAIGIE (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2a.): An obstacle or impediment by which a bowl is hindered in, or diverted from, its proper course; also, the fact of a bowl meeting with such impediment.

138. an houre] COLLIER (ed. ii.): In the next line we have 'one minute' and 'one quiet breath,' and even without the authority of the corr. Fol. we should feel confident that we ought here to read '*one* hour' and not 'an hour,' as it has constantly been printed.

A Scepter ſnatch'd with an vnruly hand,
Muſt be as boyſterouſly maintain'd as gain'd.
And he that ſtands vpon a ſlipp'ry place,
Makes nice of no vilde hold to ſtay him vp:
That *Iohn* may ſtand, then *Arthur* needs muſt fall,
So be it, for it cannot be but ſo.

Dol. But what ſhall I gaine by yong *Arthurs* fall?

Pan. You, in the right of Lady *Blanch* your wife,

141. *boyſterouſly*] *boyst'rously* Rowe, +, Cap.
gain'd.] *gain'd:* Cap. et seq.
142, 143. Mnemonic Warb.
142. *ſlipp'ry*] Ff, Wh. ii. *slippery* Rowe et cet.
143. *vilde*] *vile* F_4. *vild* Fle.
143. *vp:*] *up.* Rowe,+, Rlfe, Neils.
144. *ſtand, then*] *stand then,* Han. Rann, Fle. *stand then* Knt. *stand, then,* Coll. ii, Dono.
145. *it,*] *it!* Ktly.
be but] *but be* Han.

140–143. A Scepter snatch'd . . . to stay him vp] CUNLIFFE (p. 68): This passage is not unlike Seneca, *Hercules Furens*, 345–9:

> 'rapta sed trepida manu
> sceptra obtinentur. omnis in ferro est salus.
> quod civibus tenere te invitis scias,
> strictus tuetur ensis. alieno in loco
> haud stabile regnum est.'

If the reader decides that the resemblance is so close as to imply direct connection, the conclusion may be drawn that Shakespeare used the original, and not the translation, which gives quite a different rendering of the text:

> '—but got with fearful hand
> My sceptors are obtaynd: in sword doth all my safety stand.
> What thee thou wotst agaynst the will of cytesyns to get,
> The bright drawne sword must it defend: in forrayne countrey set
> No stable kingdome is.'

The Shakespearean 'maintain' is more correct than the professed translation; Pierrot shows that *obtinentur* = *retinentur, servantur*. The Shakespearean version of *trepida manu* is more doubtful, but it is supported by some authorities. Pierrot quotes a paraphrase which runs: 'Qui genus iactat suum, aliena laudat; at qui sceptrum rapuit, ei laborandum et vigilandum est, ut vi partum vi retineat.' [This should, I think, be '*raptum* vi retineat' to correspond with *rapuit* in the first part of the sentence; 'partum' could only figuratively mean *acquire*, through *pario*, to beget.—ED.]

147. in the right of Lady Blanch] WARNER (p. 39): [In this scene] the historical facts are tangled together in absolute confusion. The struggle of the kings glides poetically into a plot arranged between the pope's legate and the young French prince Lewis, for the latter to enter England with an army and seize the throne on behalf of Blanch, his wife, the niece of John. This is based in the play upon the disturbed relations between John and his English barons on account

May then make all the claime that *Arthur* did.
Dol. And looſe it, life and all, as *Arthur* did.
Pan. How green you are, and freſh in this old world?
Iohn layes you plots: the times conſpire with you,
For he that ſteepes his ſafetie in true blood,
Shall finde but bloodie ſafety, and vntrue.
This Act ſo euilly borne ſhall coole the hearts
Of all his people, and freeze vp their zeale,
That none ſo ſmall aduantage ſhall ſtep forth
To checke his reigne, but they will cheriſh it.
No naturall exhalation in the skie,

149. *looſe*] *loſe* Ff.
150. *you are*] *are you* Sing. i.
151. *you plots*] *your plots* Mal. conj.
154–164. Mnemonic Warb.
156–164. *That*...Iohn.] Om. Dono.
156. *none*] *no* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
157. *reigne*] *rein* Cap. conj.

of the imprisonment of Arthur. The situation was really this: At the request of the Pope, and to enforce his nomination of Langton, Philip had prepared an immense army for the invasion of England. The English Barons were discontented with John's arbitrary, vacillating, and selfish policy. The English clergy almos to a man were arrayed against John because of his stubborn fight over the See of Canterbury, and the mass of the people were restless and frightened because of the withdrawal of religious functions and, in that superstitious age, were looking for trouble and disaster, finding strange omens and auguries in earth, sea, and sky. Agitators, taking advantage of this unsettled state of affairs, pushed their own disaffections industriously, and John was looked upon by all classes as the cause of their woes. . . . The passage (ll. 147–164) is well worth remembering as indicative of the worldly-wise policy of the Roman See of that day in dealing with its enemies.

151. **Iohn layes you plots**] MALONE: That is, lays plots which must be serviceable to you. Perhaps our Author wrote '*your* plots.' John is doing your business.—STEEVENS: The old reading is undoubtedly the true one.—[In support of this Steevens quotes two examples of the ethical dative; of which the present passage is also manifestly an example; see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 220.—ED.]

152. **true blood**] JOHNSON: That is, the blood of him that has the *just* claim.—RITSON (*Remarks*, etc., p. 83): The expression seems to mean no more than *innocent blood* in general.—MOBERLY: Here Pandulph comes far short of Machiavelli, who holds it better to kill men's fathers than to take their money, since they forget the one, but not the other. The Poet, in fact, has now got away from Italian morals to those of England, where all men's hearts had gone from Richard III. when they heard of his nephew's murder; or of Scotland, which rose with power against those who had thought the blowing up of Darnley a trifle, the consequences of which they might risk.

154. **so euilly borne**] COLLIER: It may be doubted whether we ought to understand 'so evilly borne' as it is printed in the old copies, in the sense of having an evil *birth*, or merely as *ill borne* by John's subjects. The last is consistent with what is said afterwards, but seems to afford a poorer sense.

No ſcope of Nature, no diſtemper'd day,
No common winde, no cuſtomed euent, 160

159. *ſcope*] Ff, Rowe, Knt, Coll. i, Sta. Hal. Cam. Glo. Cla. Rlfe, Del. Fle. Neils. Craig. *shape* Han. *scape* Pope Coll. (MS.) et cet.
160. *cuſtomed*] *customèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.

159. scope of Nature] WARBURTON, with the certainty that Pope's reading is the true one, remarks: 'The Author very finely calls a "monstrous birth" an "*escape* of nature," as if it were produced while she was busy elsewhere, or intent upon some other thing.'—MALONE: The word 'abortives,' l. 163, referring apparently to these 'scapes of nature,' confirms Pope's emendation.—KNIGHT: The 'scope of nature'—the ordinary course of nature—appears to us to convey the Poet's meaning much better [than *scape*]. An escape of nature is a prodigy; Shakespeare says, the commonest things will be called 'abortives.' A 'scope' is what is seen—according to its derivation—as a phenomenon is what appears. They are the same thing.—DELIUS: The 'scope of nature' here means that which is natural and customary, which shall now be construed by the common people as strange and unusual on account of John's crimes. *Scape* of nature, meaning an error or misstep of nature, seems hardly to suit with what has gone before. [C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE decide in favor of the Folio, for substantially the same reasons.—ED.]—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (ed. i, *Note* XXI.): As Pope's correction, however ingenious and plausible, cannot be pronounced certain, we, in accordance with our general rule, retain the reading of the Folio. 'Scope of Nature' may mean anything which lies within the limits of Nature's power.—W. A. WRIGHT (Ibid., ed. ii.): The context shows it to be the true reading.—DOUCE (i, 404), in answer to Malone's note, says: 'The speaker's design is to show that all the *common effects of nature* which he mentions would be *perverted* by the people; but an *escape* of nature would be very *properly* deemed *an abortive*. The original reading is, therefore, correct; nor could an apter word have been selected. Thus in *1 Henry IV*: "And curbs himself even of his natural scope," III, i, 171.'—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v scope. 3) interprets the meaning of the word in the present phrase 'no scope of nature' as 'no effect produced within the regular limits of nature'; and characterises Pope's change as 'preposterous.'—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: That is, No ordinary indication of nature.—HUDSON (ed. ii.): '*Scape* of Nature' may well mean any irregularity in the course of things, or any event which, though natural, is uncommon enough to excite particular notice, such as a 'distemper'd day' or an 'exhalation in the sky.' So the Poet has ''scapes of wit' for *sallies*, *flights*, or *frolics* of wit. And so Nature may be said to have her frolics, sometimes merry, and sometimes mad; her weather, for instance, sometimes plays very wild pranks. It is observable that in the text we have a sort of climax proceeding from things less common to things more and more common.—ROLFE: '*Scape*' is obviously wrong, as it could refer only to a prodigy or something out of the ordinary course of nature; while the context enumerates only *common* and *customed* phenomena, which the people imagine to be *prodigies and signs*.—WRIGHT: That is, no circumstance within the limits of nature's operations, no natural effect.—MARSHALL: It is difficult to see how any editor could read the passage, and yet print *scape* in the text. 'Scope' is exactly the word required, signifying 'the sphere in which the proper action of any force lies,' and so, any '*usual* operation or effect' produced by nature.—[The excellent reasons given by the Cambridge Edd. for their rejec-

But they will plucke away his naturall cauſe,
And call them Meteors, prodigies, and ſignes,
Abbortiues, preſages, and tongues of heauen,
Plainly denouncing vengeance vpon *Iohn*.
Dol. May be he will not touch yong *Arthurs* life,
But hold himſelfe ſafe in his priſonment.
Pan. O Sir, when he ſhall heare of your approach,
If that yong *Arthur* be not gone alreadie,
Euen at that newes he dies: and then the hearts
Of all his people ſhall reuolt from him,
And kiſſe the lippes of vnacquainted change,
And picke ſtrong matter of reuolt, and wrath
Out of the bloody fingers ends of *Iohn*.
Me thinkes I ſee this hurley all on foot;
And O, what better matter breeds for you,
Then I haue nam'd. The Baſtard *Falconbridge*
Is now in England ranſacking the Church,
Offending Charity: If but a dozen French
Were there in Armes, they would be as a Call
To traine ten thouſand Engliſh to their ſide;

161. *his*] *its* Pope,+.
naturall] *nat'ral* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
163. *preſages*] *présages* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce. Huds. ii, Words.
preſages, and] *and presages* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
heauen] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
169. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Fle.
that] *this* F_4, Rowe,+.
171–173. *And*...Iohn] Om. Dono.
174. *foot;*] *foot.* Fle.
175. *O*] *lo!* Mason.
176. *nam'd.*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i, Fle. Craig. *nam'd?* Han. Dono. *nam'd!*— Theob. et cet.
Falconbridge] F_2, Fle. Faulconbridge F_3F_4 et cet.
178. *Charity:*] *charity.* Rowe,+, Sta. Ktly, Fle. Neils.
a dozen] *twelve* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

---

tion of Pope's change and the retention of the Folio text are quite sufficient in the opinion of the present ED.]

172, 173. **And . . . fingers ends of Iohn**] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 121): I know not whether the following from *Gammer Gurton's Needle* throws any light on this passage: 'I picke not this geare (hear'st thou) out of my finger's endes.'—V, ii, Dodsley, ii, p. 74—i. e., I suppose, *it is not my own fancy or invention.* [IVOR JOHN also quotes this line in illustration of the present passage.]

178. **Charity**] IVOR JOHN: That is, in the wider sense of *good-will*, as in the phrase, 'Faith, Hope, and Charity.'

179, 180. **a Call To traine**] MALONE: The image is taken from the manner in which birds are sometimes caught; one being placed to draw others to the net, by his note or 'call.'—RUSHTON (*N. & Q.*, IV, xi, 72) compares: 'Birds are trayned

Or, as a little ſnow, tumbled about,
Anon becomes a Mountaine. O noble Dolphine,
Go with me to the King, 'tis wonderfull,
What may be wrought out of their diſcontent,
Now that their ſoules are topfull of offence,
For England go; I will whet on the King.
Dol. Strong reaſons makes ſtrange actions:let vs go,
If you ſay I, the King will not ſay no. *Exennt.*

181. *Or*] *Ev'n* Han.
182. *O*] Om. Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Walker (Crit., iii, 121).
Dolphine,] *Dolphin,* F_3F_4. *dauphin!* Coll. Huds. *Dolphin!* Ktly. *Dauphin,* Rowe et cet.
183. *King,*] *king.* Coll. Ktly, Huds. Del. Dono. Neils. Craig. *king:*— Dyce, Hal. Words. *King!* Wh. i.
184. *diſcontent,*] *discontent.* Rowe,+, Ktly.
185. *topfull*] *top full* F_3F_4. *top-full* Pope,+ Varr. Mal.
offence,] *offence.* Knt, Sta. Cam. +, Del. Coll. iii, Fle. Dono. Neils. Craig.
187. *reaſons*] *reason* Rowe,+.
makes] *make* Cap. et seq.
ſtrange] Mal. Var. '21, Knt, Coll. Sing. ii, Sta. Hal. Wh. i, Huds. i, Fle. *strong* Ff. et cet.
188. Exennt.] F_1.

---

with a sweet call, but caught with a broade nette.'—Lyly, *Euphues and his England,* [ed. Bond, ii, 155].

187. **Strong . . . strange**] MALONE: The editor of the Second Folio for 'strange' substituted *strong;* and the two words so nearly resemble each other that they might certainly have been easily confounded. But, in the present instance, I see no reason for departing from the reading of the original copy, which is perfectly intelligible.—STEEVENS: The repetition, in the Second Folio, is perfectly in our Author's manner, and is countenanced by the following passage in *Henry V:* 'Think we King Harry strong, And, princes, look, you strongly arm to meet him.'—[II, iv, 48].—KNIGHT: The First Folio reading gives us a deep observation instead of an epigrammatic one. Strong reasons make, that is, justify, a large deviation from common courses.—HALLIWELL: Although the repetition [in F_2] is in Shakespeare's manner, and could be countenanced by the production of many examples, there is no reason for disturbing the original reading of the First Folio, which is the only real authority for the text of this play.—WRIGHT considers the Folio reading, 'strange,' a misprint for *strong.*

Actus Quartus, Scæna prima.

Enter Hubert and Executioners.

Hub. Heate me theſe Irons hot, and looke thou ſtand 3

1. Quartus] Quintus Ff.
ACT III, SCENE III. Dono. Changes to England. A Prison, Pope,+. A Room in a Castle, Sta. Cam.+, Coll. iii, Fle. Neils. Northampton. A room in the Castle. Cap. et cet. (Dover... Hal. Canterbury... Wh. i.)
2. Executioners] Ff, Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils. certain Officers of the Castle. Cap. two Attendants. Mal. et cet.
3. *thou*] *you* Rowe, Pope, Han. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.

1. Scæna prima] MALONE: As has already been stated, Arthur was first confined at Falaise, and afterwards at Rouen, in Normandy, where he was put to death. Our Author has deviated in this particular, from the history, and brought King John's nephew to England; but there is no circumstance, either in the original play, or in this of Shakespeare, to point out the particular castle in which he is supposed to be confined. The castle of Northampton has been mentioned, in some editions, as the place, merely because, in the first Act, King John *seems* to have been in that town. In the old copy there is nowhere any notice of place.—HALLIWELL: Any attribution of place must be historically erroneous; but as John was at Dover when the Dauphin had been invited to England by the Barons, and he then appointed Hubert de Burgh constable of the Castle, it seems most natural to accept that locality as the scene of this portion of the drama.—R. G. WHITE: King John's whereabouts, which is also Arthur's as far as the play is concerned (for Hubert passes quickly from one to the other), is determined by the fact that the coronation spoken of in the next scene as having just taken place (in the old play it takes place before the audience), and which is immediately followed by Arthur's death, is the last of the four by which John sought to prop his tottering title. This ceremony, as well as its predecessor, took place at Canterbury, where are still visible the remains of a castle of the Norman period, in which Arthur may be supposed to have been confined, if we must consider the material probabilities. If, then, Northampton be an acceptable locality, Canterbury is preferable because it will answer the purpose better than any other.—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 2): In this scene the dialogue between Arthur and Hubert should be arranged to occupy not the full stage; but, on the other hand, it must on no account be too shallow. Tragic and passionate scenes are always injured in their effect by too shallow a stage.

3. **Heate me these Irons**] MOBERLY: The notion of disabling for the Crown by inflicting blindness comes from early times in France, as when Louis le Débonnaire blinded his nephew Bernard, who had rebelled against him. Yet it was not unknown in England; witness the case of William, Earl of Cornwall, half-brother to the Conqueror, who was taken by Henry I. at Tenchebray, and blinded as a punishment for his rebellion.—SNIDER (ii, 308): There is here a question about the character of Hubert. Did he intend to put out the young prince's eyes, and then yield to the piteous entreaties of the latter? Or was the whole transaction designed by him in order to 'fill these dogged spies with false reports?' Hubert afterwards

Within the Arras : when I ſtrike my foot
Vpon the boſome of the ground, ruſh forth
And binde the boy, which you ſhall finde with me
Faſt to the chaire : be heedfull : hence, and watch.
Exec. I hope your warrant will beare out the deed.
Hub. Vncleanly ſcruples feare not you : looke too't.
Yong Lad come forth ; I haue to ſay with you.
Enter Arthur.

4. *Arras:*] *arras.* Neils.
6. *me*] *me,* F_4.
7. *chaire:*] *chair.* Johns. Var. '73, Wh. i, Ktly, Neils.
heedfull:] *heedful.* Coll. Huds. Del. Dono. Neils. Craig. *heedful!* Ktly.
watch.] *watch!* Han. Ktly.
8. Exec.] 1. O. Cap. First Exec. Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils. 1. Attend. Mal. et cet.
deed.] *deed!* Rowe.
9. *Vncleanly*] *Unmanly* Grey, Marshall. *Unseemly* Elze (Athen., June 22, 1867).
9. *ſcruples*] F_2F_3. *ſcruples,* F_4, Rowe i, *scruple!* Var. '85, Rann. *scruples:* Coll. Wh. i, Dono. *scruples.* Fle. *scruples!* Rowe ii. et cet.
too't.] *to't.* F_3F_4 et seq.
[Exeunt Officers. Cap. Exeunt Executioners. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils. Exeunt Attendants. Mal. et cet.

says repeatedly that he never entertained the thought of murdering the child, and we must accept his statement or consider him guilty of prevarication. To burn out the eyes, and to kill, are not the same thing; perhaps Hubert intended to do the former, but not the latter. In this manner all his declarations and acts may be reconciled. The question has two sides; still, it comports best with the whole text to consider him a man of noble instincts under a rude exterior, whom even Arthur loved, though his jailer. The King has simply made a mistake in judging of Hubert's character by his rough appearance—a mistake which Hubert resents both in deed and in word.

9. Vncleanly . . . you:] A. SCHMIDT (*Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 355) points these words with an exclamation point after 'you,' remarking that 'fear' is here transitive, as often in Shakespeare.—MOORE SMITH agrees with Schmidt as regards the punctuation of the Folio and that this line therefore is to be interpreted: 'Let no unbecoming scruples frighten you.'—'This,' remarks IVOR JOHN, 'is rather forcing the construction, and Rowe's reading is much to be preferred, especially as the Fourth Folio supports it.'

11. Enter Arthur] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL): Though it must be allowed this scene is finely written, yet the circumstance of it conveys so much of horror that it rather strains humanity too far; the pleading of the young prince is simply natural, and meltingly persuasive; its effect upon Hubert must greatly please humane feeling, and release it from a very painful rack.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 63): Cibber, [in his *Papal Tyranny,*] has done less injury to Shakespeare, in this scene, than in any other of the play. Nay, it must be confessed, he has heightened the anguish of Hubert by a very fine and affecting incident. This man, after giving a solemn promise to his royal master that he would put his nephew to death, instantly prepares to accomplish the deed; but, as he is going about it, he hears the prince putting up his prayers to heaven for him. To hear the innocent victim praying for his slaughterer staggers his resolution, and throws him into an agony.—

Ar. Good morrow *Hubert.*
Hub. Good morrow, little Prince.
Ar. As little Prince, hauing ſo great a Title
To be more Prince, as may be : you are ſad.
Hub. Indeed I haue beene merrier.
Art. 'Mercie on me:
Me thinkes no body ſhould be ſad but I:
Yet I remember, when I was in France,
Yong Gentlemen would be as ſad as night
Onely for wantonneſſe : by my Chriſtendome,

13. *Good*] Om. Pope, Han.
14, 15. *hauing...Prince,*] Ff, Rowe, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Neils. In parentheses Pope et cet.
15. *be: you*] *be. You* Rowe et seq.
17. *'Mercie*] F_2. *'Mercy* Wh. i, Fle. *Mercy* F_3F_4 et cet.
me:] *me!* Pope et seq.
19. *France*] *Fance* F_2.
21. *wantonneſſe:*] *wantonness.* Pope et seq.

DUPORT (i, 189): This is the sole and only scene of the play which bears the imprint of a great genius. Shall I say that it is fortunate that the bad taste of Shakespeare softens the effect? If it were throughout as strong, as pathetic as in certain parts, it would be difficult to endure the horror. The simple reading makes one shudder; what must it be then in representation? Are there not certain spectacles too violent for the human soul which are quite unfit for its entertainment, and which art should spare it? Is there any people so barbarous as to take pleasure in seeing a young child whos eyes are to be burned out with red hot irons, and who implores for mercy? At the same time, although Shakespeare has scattered admirable features through this scene, wherein the sublime and natural surpass any other part, we must assure the reader that beyond those passages which we shall now quote all the rest goes to the opposite extreme, and seems to pass the limit of what is false and preposterous. [The passages which Duport thus selects are as follows: ll. 18–28; 44–67; 80–136.—ED.]

12, 13, 18. See note by HILGERS, I, i, 25.

20, 21. **sad . . . Onely for wantonnesse**] STEEVENS: It should seem that this affectation had found its way into England, as it is ridiculed by Ben Jonson in the character of Master Stephen, in *Every Man in his Humour*, 1601. [See Gifford's Jonson i, 66.] Again, in *Questions concernyng Conie-hood*, 1595: 'That coniehood which proceeds of melancholy, is, when in feastings appointed for merriment, this kind of conie-man sits like Mopsus or Corydon, blockish, never laughing, . . . which he doth to this end that the guests might mutter how this deep melancholy argueth great learning in him.' Again in Lyly: *Midas*, 1592: 'melancholy is the crest of courtiers, and now every base companion, being in his muble fubles, says he is melancholy,' [ed. Bond, iii, 155].—MALONE: I doubt whether our Author had any authority for attributing this species of affectation to the French. He generally ascribes the manners of England to all other countries.

21. **by my Christendome**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Christendom, 1. b.): Equivalent to *As I am a Christian!* [The present line quoted.—MALONE and KNIGHT interpret 'Christendom' as here meaning *christening* or *baptism*, of which sense

So I were out of priſon, and kept Sheepe
I ſhould be as merry as the day is long:
And ſo I would be heere, but that I doubt
My Vnckle practiſes more harme to me:
He is affraid of me, and I of him:
Is it my fault, that I was *Geffreyes* ſonne?
No in deede is't not: and I would to heauen
I were your ſonne, ſo you would loue me, Hubert:
Hub. If I talke to him, with his innocent prate
He will awake my mercie, which lies dead:
Therefore I will be ſodaine, and diſpatch.
Ar. Are you ſicke Hubert? you looke pale to day,
Inſooth I would you were a little ſicke,
That I might ſit all night, and watch with you.
I warrant I loue you more then you do me.
Hub. His words do take poſſeſſion of my boſome.
Reade heere yong *Arthnr.* How now fooliſh rheume?
Turning diſpitious torture out of doore?

23. *I ſhould*] *I would* Var. '21. *'Should* Fle.
be as] *be as as* F_2. *be* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '85, Coll. ii. (MS.), Dyce ii, iii, Wh. ii, Words. Neils.
long:] *long.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
25. *me:*] *me.* Rowe,+, Ktly.
26. *him:*] *him.* Pope,+, Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Del. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig.
28. *No in deede*] *Indeed* Pope, Han. *Indeed,* Theob. Warb. Johns. *No, indeed* Sta. *No, indeed,* Cap. et cet.
is't] *it's* F_2F_3. *it is* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *is it* Var. '73.
heauen] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
29. *Hubert:*] F_1.
30, 32. [Aside. Rowe et seq.
32. *ſodaine*] *ſudden* F_4.
36. *I warrant*] *Alas,* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *I warr'nt* Vaughan, Fle.
36. *you do me*] *you me* Vaughan.
37. Hub.] Hub. [Aside] Cap. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Cam.+, Del. Huds. ii, Neils. Craig.
38. Two lines, ending Arthnr... *rheume?* Rowe ii,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.
38. Arthnr] F_1.
38–41. *How...teares.*] Aside Rowe ii. et seq.
38. *How now*] *How, how* Cap. (corrected in Errata).
38, 39. *rheume?...doore?*] Ff, Rowe i, Fle. *rheume,...door!* Rowe ii,+, Dono. *rheum!...door?* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Coll. Sta. Huds. i, Wh. i. *rheum!... door!* Mal. et cet.
39. *diſpitious*] Ff, Rowe. *dis-piteous* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *dispiteous* Johns. et cet. *this piteous* Long MS. ap. Cam.
torture] *nature* Han. Warb.

Murray gives several examples s. v. 4. But it is plainly here used as a petty oath or asseveration.—ED.]

28. **No in deede**] MOORE SMITH: Editors are wrong in putting a comma after 'indeed.' If it did not introduce the sentence following, there would be no reason for the inversion 'is't.' Compare the German constructions, with which our older English was in harmony: Gewiss! es ist so, and Gewiss ist es so.

39. **Turning . . . out of doore**] MOBERLY: That tears should 'drive away

I muſt be breefe, leaſt reſolution drop
Out at mine eyes, in tender womaniſh teares.
Can you not reade it? Is it not faire writ?
Ar. Too fairely *Hubert*, for ſo foule effect,
Muſt you with hot Irons, burne out both mine eyes?
Hub. Yong Boy, I muſt.
Art. And will you?

40. *leaſt*] *leſt* F_4.
42. *faire*] *fairly* Ktly.
43. *effect*] *a fact* Malone conj. (withdrawn).
44. *hot*] Om. Pope,+ (—Var. '73).

torture' is not supposable as an abbreviation for driving away the resolution to torture. Some alteration, therefore, seems necessary. [See *Text. Notes.*—The COWDEN CLARKES (*Sh. Key*, pp. 312–325) among the many examples of words elliptically used quote the present line wherein 'torture' is given for *purpose to torture.*—ED.]

39. dispitious] WRIGHT: That is, *pitiless*. Compare Chaucer's description of the Parson: 'He was to sinful men not dispitious' (*Cant. Tales, Prol.*, l. 518). This, however, may be the old French *despiteux*, spiteful, or angry. But Spenser uses 'dispiteous' in the sense of pitiless: 'Spurring so hote with rage dispiteous,' *Faerie Queene*, I, ii, 15. See also Ibid., II, vii, 62. Again, in Hall's *Chronicle* (Richard III, fol. 4*a*): 'Shortly shut vp in prison and priuely slaine and murthered by the cruell ambicion of their vnnatural vncle and his dispiteous tourmentours.'

43. effect] WRIGHT: That is, *meaning, purpose*. See *As You Like It*, IV, iii, 35: 'Such Ethiope words, blacker in their effect Than in their countenance.'—IVOR JOHN compares also: 'Do not look upon me Lest with this piteous action you convert My stern effects.'—*Hamlet*, III, iv, 129.

44. Must you . . . both mine eyes] HALLIWELL: The words of the royal warrant for this act of cruelty are given at length in the old play, the incidents of which are here closely followed by Shakespeare, who has, however, committed an oversight in making Hubert, in the next scene, produce the king's warrant for the absolute murder of Arthur, as well as mentioning that he had previously shown such a document to a friend of the Earl of Pembroke. The error was evidently occasioned by the omission of Hubert's statement to the king, in the old play, that Arthur had died from the effects of the operation he pretended he had performed on his eyes. In the third Act both the king and Hubert evidently contemplated the death of Arthur, not merely a mutilation of his person. It is said that, by the ancient laws of Germany, the sovereignty of a kingdom could not be exercised by a person deprived of the sense of sight.—[For this incident the author of *The Troublesome Raigne* is partly indebted to Holinshed: '—it was reported that King John, through persuasion of his councellors, appointed certeine persons to go vnto Falais, where Arthur was kept in prison, vnder the charge of Hubert de Burgh, and there to put out the yoong gentlemans eies. But through such resistance as he made against one of the tormentors that came to execute the kings commandement (for the other rather forsook their prince and countrie, than they would consent to obeie the kings authoritie heerein) and such lamentable words as he vttered, Hubert de Burgh did preserue him from that iniurie' (vol. iii, p. 165, col. 2).—ED.]

Hub. And I will.
Art. Haue you the heart? When your head did but ake,
I knit my hand-kercher about your browes
(The beſt I had, a Princeſſe wrought it me)
And I did neuer aske it you againe:
And with my hand, at midnight held your head;
And like the watchfull minutes, to the houre,
Still and anon cheer'd vp the heauy time;
Saying, what lacke you? and where lies your greefe?
Or what good loue may I performe for you?

49. *hand-kercher*] Ff, Knt, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig. *handkerchief* Rowe et cet.
51. *againe:*] *again.* Sta.
53. *And*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Cam.+, Words. Neils. Craig. *And,* Theob. et cet.
53. *watchfull minutes, to*] *watchful minutes to* Pope et seq. *minutes, watchful* Del. conj.

48. Haue you the heart] SKOTTOWE (i, 132): Few scenes of deeper pathos occur in Shakespeare than the triumph of humanity over sternness in the breast of Hubert, and the glory is due to Shakespeare only. The pleadings of Arthur, in the old play, are the reasonings of an adult, harsh, quaint, and cold. Shakespeare has converted the young man into a child, and artfully invested his supplications with the beautiful simplicity of infantine innocence. [See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne*, ll. 51–75, p. 501.] CORSON (*Introduction to Sh.*, p. 174): The loveliness of Arthur is the most fully exhibited in the scene with Hubert, where he entreats Hubert to spare his eyes. The pathos of the situation is pushed to the verge of the painful. The highest art was demanded here to keep the treatment of the subject within the domain of the beautiful. And it is so kept. From this point to the end of the play there are no new movements. King John is now in a current which he cannot stem, and will be swept helplessly along to the bitter end.

49. hand-kercher] R. G. WHITE: Handkerchiefs were scarce in Shakespeare's time, and unknown in King John's.

53. watchfull minutes, to the houre] RANN: The minutes in a clock, which relieve by marking how much of a tedious hour is gone, or to come.—DELIUS: As the minutes, which are ever growing in their continuous onward march, watch for the hour, so Arthur watched ever and anon the time which so wearily stretched out for the sick Hubert. But perhaps Shakespeare's construction is '*minutes watchful* to the hour.'—ELZE (*Jahrbuch*, xi, 284): Arthur clearly means to say: 'Just as the watchful minutes cheer up the long, slow hour, so did I cheer up the heavy time by my repeated, sympathising questions.' It seems, therefore, that we should read: 'And, like the watchful minutes *do* the hour, Still and anon,' etc.—WRIGHT: That is, the minutes which watch, or are watchful to, the hour. For this position of the adjective compare: 'To this unworthy husband of his wife.'—*All's Well*, III, iv, 30.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. watchful, 3.) interprets 'to the hour' in this passage as meaning 'till the hour is full.'—'A sense,' remarks Deighton, 'which I do not think the words will bear.'

56. loue may I performe] MARSHALL: For a similar instance of the use of the

Many a poore mans ſonne would haue lyen ſtill,
And nere haue ſpoke a louing word to you:
But you, at your ſicke ſeruice had a Prince:
Nay, you may thinke my loue was craftie loue,
And call it cunning. Do, and if you will,
If heauen be pleas'd that you muſt vſe me ill,
Why then you muſt. Will you put out mine eyes?
Theſe eyes, that neuer did, nor neuer ſhall
So much as frowne on you.
Hub. I haue ſworne to do it:
And with hot Irons muſt I burne them out.
Ar. Ah, none but in this Iron Age, would do it:
The Iron of it ſelfe, though heate red hot,

57. *lyen*] F_2F_3. *lien* Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Fle. Words. Neils. *lain* F_4 et cet.

58. *nere*] *ne're* Ff. *ne'er* Rowe.

59. *ſicke ſeruice*] *sick-service* Del. Dono. Craig.

Prince:] *Prince.* Pope et seq.

61. *cunning.*] *cunning:* Cap. Varr. Rann, Coll. Cam.+, Huds. *cunning;* Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Sta. Ktly, Fle. *cunning:*— Dyce, Hal. Words.

and if] *an if* Theob. et seq.

62. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe +.

62. *muſt*] *will* Var. '21, Coll. Wh. i.

63. *muſt.*] Ff, Rowe, Ktly, Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *must*— Pope,+. *must.*— Var. '73 et cet.

64. *nor*] *and* Pope, Han.

66. *I haue*] *I've* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Huds. ii. *I ha'* Fle.

68–75. In margin Pope, Han.

68. *do it:*] Ff, Fle. *do it.* Rowe i, Theob. Warb. Johns. Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. Dono. *do it;* Rowe ii, Pope, Han. *do it!* Cap. et cet.

---

word 'love' in this sense, i. e., *act of love*, compare: 'But if I cannot win you to this love.'—*Pericles*, II, iv, 49.

57. **lyen**] WRIGHT: The participle of *lie*, also found in the form *lain*. In *Hamlet*, V, i, 90, 'This skull has lain in the earth three and twenty years,' the First Folio reads *laine*; the first quartos, *lyen*. In the Authorised Version of 1611, *layen* only occurs in *John*, xx, 12. In the other passages where modern editions have *lain* it was originally 'lien' or 'lyen.'—Miss PORTER: The two-syllabled form of *lain* is used here, perhaps, for the music of the line. The inversion beginning the verse is certain, and that the placing of a stress is thus avoided seems scarcely less so. The regularity of the lines following and the one before make the irregularity of this one, which is guided by the oratorical sense, the more effective.

59. **at your sicke seruice**] IVOR JOHN: That is, at your service when you were sick. Compare 'true defense,' IV, iii, 89. [John conjectures that the words 'sick service' should be hyphenated; but in this he is anticipated by Delius.—ED.]

60. **craftie loue**] C. C. CLARKE (*Sh's Char.*, p. 329): This honest disclaiming of cunning, as being the basest of injurious imputations, comes with artistical contrast and relief to the main spirit of the play—the spirit of craft and treachery.

69. **heate red hot**] For this form of the participle Malone compares, 'He commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heat.'—*Daniel*, iii, 19. [WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, pp. 324–343) gives numerous other

Approaching neere theſe eyes, would drinke my teares,
And quench this fierie indignation,
Euen in the matter of mine innocence:
Nay, after that, conſume away in ruſt,

71. *this*] Ff, Var. '78, '85, Mal. Coll. i, Del. Fle. Craig. *its* Rowe ii,+. *his* Cap. et cet.
71. *fierie*] *firy* Mal. Steev. Var. '21.
72. *matter*] *water* Long MS. ap. Cam. Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words.

examples of this formation in verbs ending in *d* and *t*. See also, if needful, ABBOTT, § 342.]

71. **this fierie indignation**] STEEVENS: This phrase is from the New Testament: '—a certain fearful looking-for of judgment, and fiery indignation.' ['But,' answers WRIGHT, 'the phrase did not appear in any of the English versions before that of 1611, and therefore Shakespeare could not have borrowed it from this source.'—ED.]—MALONE: 'This fiery indignation' might mean, the indignation *thus* produced by the iron being made red hot for such an inhuman purpose.—COLLIER: Unnecessarily altered in modern editions to '*his* fiery indignation.' 'This' refers to the iron 'heat red-hot' of a preceding line: that was the fiery indignation which was to be quenched.—DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 94): As usual Mr Collier patronises a mere misprint. If the iron had been on the stage (*and as yet the attendants have not brought it in*), the reading 'this' might, perhaps, have been tolerated.—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 220) quotes this line, among others, as an example wherein, in the Folio and the early editions of Shakespeare's *Poems*, 'this' and *his* have supplanted one another. For a second example in this play Walker quotes: 'Thinking this voyce an armed Englishman.'—V, ii, 151.—[Walker is doubtless right as regards other passages, notably: 'It were a shame to let his land by lease,' *Richard II:* II, i, Fol., p. 29, col. 1; and, '—won to this shamefull lust The will of my most seeming vertuous Queene,' *Hamlet*, I, v (Fol., p. 257, col. 2); but the present passage is not, I think, an example of such a reversal. Malone's and Collier's interpretations are quite satisfactory at least to the present ED.]

72. **the matter of mine innocence**] W. W. [WILLIAMS] (*Parthenon*, 16 August, 1862): The hot iron might be figuratively described as likely to drink the tears of Arthur; but how could it be said to be quenchable in the 'matter' of his 'innocence'? And how could the matter of his innocence cause the iron to consume away in rust? It would seem that we have not the true words of the Author in this place; but if we may suppose that 'matter' was misprinted for *water*, and read, 'Even in the *water* of mine innocence,' the metaphor is not only just and intelligible, but continues the imagery of the previous lines, and accounts for assumed subsequent consumption by rust. The reasonableness of this very simple alteration will, I think, be at once admitted. [In confirmation of his change Williams quotes: 'Trust not those cunning waters of his eyes, For villainy is not without such rheum; And he, long traded in it, makes it seem Like rivers of remorse and innocency.'—IV, iii, 115–118. 'A comparison,' adds Williams, 'of the two passages is almost conclusive.'—DYCE evidently found it so; and unhesitatingly adopted Williams' suggestion in his ed. ii.]—Miss PORTER: If Williams' conjecture were merely a question of misprinting *m* for *w*, it would be twice as persuasive as it is, but there is also the double *t* to account for.

But for containing fire to harme mine eye:
Are you more ſtubborne hard, then hammer'd Iron?
And if an Angell ſhould haue come to me,
And told me *Hubert* ſhould put out mine eyes,
I would not haue beleeu'd him : no tongue but *Huberts*.

74. *eye:*] Ff, Rowe i. *eyes.* Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *eye.* Rowe ii. et cet.

75. *ſtubborne hard*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. Theob. i. *stubborn-hard* Theob ii. et cet.

76. *And if*] Ff, Rowe, Fle. Rann. *Oh if* Pope. *Oh! if* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *An if* Cap. et cet.

78. *him:*] Om. Steev. Var. '03, '13. *him.* Knt.

no tongue but Huberts] *a tongue, but Hubert's* Pope, Han. Johns. *no tongue but Hubert's*— Steev. conj. Walker conj. Knt, Sta. Words. —*no tongue but Hubert's.* Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils.

76. **And if an Angell . . . to me**] BIRCH (p. 259): There is no religion put in the mouth of the child, except in the way of reproach: 'If heaven be pleased that you must use me ill, Why then you must.' It was unnecessary for the child after this doubt of the will of heaven, to state that if an angel should have come to him and told him that Hubert would put out his eyes, he would have believed no tongue but Hubert's—meaning, that in the only way which Providence has taken to show his special will to mankind, he would not have believed; he would rather trust to man. How different from the case in the Bible, where Abraham, when told to sacrifice his son, prepares accordingly; but Shakespeare puts in the mouth of the boy that he would not believe in God; under these circumstances he would not trust the issue to God, but only to man. The issue is, the moral of Shakespeare—that natural feeling prevails, and, in spite of his oath, Hubert does not fulfil his religious obligations.—WORDSWORTH (*Sh's Knowledge & Use of Bible*, p. 322) compares this line with St Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians*, i, 8: 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed,' 'which,' he says, 'appears to have been present to the mind of Shakespeare.'—COTTON (p. 152) also makes the same comparison.

77. **Hubert should**] ABBOTT (§ 326): Here, since the Elizabethans could say 'Hubert *shall*,' they can also say 'he told me Hubert *should*.'

78. **I would not . . . but Huberts**] WARBURTON: Shakespeare, I am persuaded, wrote: 'I would not have believed a tongue '*bate* Hubert'; i. e., *abate, disparage.* The blunder seems to have arisen thus, *bate* signifies *except, saving;* so the transcribers, taking it in this sense, substituted the more usual word 'but' in its place. My alteration greatly improves the sense, as implying a tenderness of affection for Hubert; the common reading, only an opinion of Hubert's veracity; whereas the point here was to win upon Hubert's passions, which could not be better than by showing affection towards him.—[Unfortunately—or perhaps *fortunately*—for Warburton's absurd suggestion there is not to be found a single example of *abate* or *'bate* with the meaning *disparage.*—ED.]—JOHNSON, misled by Warburton into asserting that this line as Pope altered it is the original text, says: 'I do not see why the old reading may not stand. Theobald's alteration, as we find, injures the measure, and Warburton's corrupts the language, and neither can be said much to mend the sense.'—[Theobald's 'alteration' is, however, actually the Folio reading.—ED.]—STEEVENS: Shakespeare probably meant this line to be broken

Hub. Come forth : Do as I bid you do.
Art. O ſaue me *Hubert*, ſaue me : my eyes are out
Euen with the fierce l ookes of theſe bloody men.
Hub. Giue me the Iron I ſay, and binde him heere.

79. *forth:*] *forth! Come forth!* Dono. *forth:*] *forth.* [Re-enter Officers with a cord, the Irons, etc. Cap. *forth.* [Stamps. Re-enter Attendants with cords, irons. Mal. et seq. *you do.*] *you* Mal. *do.*] *do.* [Stamps, and the men enter. Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.
80. Hubert, *ſaue me:*] *Hubert, save me!* Rowe ii. et seq. *me: my eyes are*] *my eyes ere they* Herr conj.
81. *Euen*] *Ev'n* Pope,+, Fle.
82. *Iron*] *irons* Anon. ap. Cam.

off imperfectly; 'no tongue but Hubert's—.' The old reading is, however, sense. [Thus this note appears in the several Variorum editions; but in his own edition, 1793, Steevens abandons this suggestion and for this note substitutes the following: 'The transcriber, not understanding the power of the two negatives, "not" and "no" (which are usually employed not to affirm, but to deny more forcibly), intruded the redundant pronoun "him."'—KNIGHT remarks that the double negative is here justifiable, but that the omission of 'him' injures the line. His pointing of the line is a modification of Steevens's first suggestion. He leaves the line unfinished; but places a full stop after 'him.'—ED.]—WRIGHT: That is, I would have believed no tongue but Hubert's; or, no tongue but Hubert's would have made me believe it.—MARSHALL: There seems no reason to alter the text; the extra syllable in this case strengthens the dramatic force of the line, the word 'him' being necessary to emphasize the fact that Arthur would not have believed even an angel; he might have meant to exclaim: 'No tongue but Hubert's could convince me that Hubert was capable of such cruelty.'—[See note by HILGERS, I, i, 25.]

82. **Giue me the Iron**] OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 17, foot-note): The most celebrated portrayer of the part of Arthur, on the German stage, was Goethe's sweetheart, Christina Louisa Neumann, whose memory he has honored in his well-known poem *Euphrosyne*. She acted the part of Arthur for the first time when fourteen years old, in the year 1792; Goethe himself had arranged *King John* for the Weimar Theatre, from Eschenburg's or Wieland's translation, and coached Christina most carefully in the rôle, to a reminiscence of this he has devoted one of the loveliest parts of his Ode. [See *Appendix: Actors: Neumann*, p. 672.] According to Genast's *Memoirs* this has special reference to an occurrence at the last dress rehearsal. The young actress did not manifest sufficient terror at the glowing iron; Goethe, out of patience at this, snatched the iron from the hand of the actor of Hubert and rushed upon the child with such a terrible glance that she, horror-stricken and shuddering, sank fainting to the ground.—RALEIGH (p. 125): To his audience Shakespeare must have seemed notable for restraint; they were inured to horrors; and he gave them no hangings, and no deaths by slow torture. *Titus Andronicus* may be left out of the account as a work of youthful bravado. But the blinding of Gloucester on the stage, though casuistry has been ready to defend it, cannot be excused. This is the chief of his offences; in comparison with this the bringing in of the hot irons, in *King John*, and the murder of Macduff's young son, in *Macbeth*, are venial transgressions, which may be happily slurred over in the acting.

Art. Alas, what neede you be ſo boiſtrous rough? 83
I will not ſtruggle, I will ſtand ſtone ſtill:
For heauen ſake *Hubert* let me not be bound: 85
Nay heare me *Hubert*, driue theſe men away,
And I will ſit as quiet as a Lambe.
I will not ſtirre, nor winch, nor ſpeake a word,
Nor looke vpon the Iron angerly:
Thruſt but theſe men away, and Ile forgiue you, 90
What euer torment you do put me too.
Hub. Go ſtand within: let me alone with him.
Exec. I am beſt pleas'd to be from ſuch a deede. 93

83. *boiſtrous rough*] *boiſterous rough* F_3F_4. *boist'rous rough* Pope, Han. Var. '73. *boist'rous-rough* Theob. et cet.

84. *ſtone ſtill:*] *stone-still.* Rowe et seq. (*stone-still:* Cap.).

85. *heauen ſake*] Ff, Cam.+. *Heav'n sake* Rowe, Pope, Theob. i, Han. Fle. *heav'n's sake* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. *heaven' sake* Cap. *heaven-sake* Dyce, Words. Huds. ii. *heaven's sake* Var. '73 et cet.

bound:] Ff, Rowe i. *bound.* Rowe ii, +, Coll. Del. Wh. i, Dono. *bound!* Cap. et cet.

86. Hubert,] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Cam.+, Neils. *Hubert*— Johns. *Hubert:* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Craig. *Hubert!* Cap. et cet.

88. *winch*] Cap. Fle. *wince* Ff. et cet.

89. *angerly*] *angrily* Pope,+.

91. *too*] *to* F_3F_4.

93. Exec.] Ff, Rowe,+. 1. O. Cap. First Exec. Cam.+. 1. Attend. Mal. et cet.

I...deede.] Aside. Hal.

deede.] Ff, Rowe. *deed* [Exit. Pope Exeunt. Theob.+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.. Exeunt Officers. Cap. Exeunt Executioners Cam.+. Neils. Exeunt Attendants. Mal. et cet.

---

84. **struggle . . . stand stone still**] DAWSON is in doubt as to this alliteration being intentional; I should be loath to say that we may detect in Shakespeare's verse what was not apparent to his ear. The sibilant effect of the repeated *st* of these words is almost a shriek of fear; and note also how the predominance of monosyllables in the line lends itself to hasty, almost breathless, utterance.—ED.

88. **winch**] WRIGHT: Spelt 'winch' in the Folios and all the quartos in *Hamlet*, III, ii, 252: 'Let the galled jade winch,' except the quartos of 1603. Cotgrave has: '*Guincher:* To wrigle, writhe, winche a toeside.' And Palsgrave (*Lesclarcissement de Langue Francoyse*) gives: 'I wynche, as a horse dothe. *Je regymbe.*' [In my copy of Cotgrave the word after 'writhe' is plainly *wrinch;* but under *Regimber* Cotgrave has: 'To winse, kicke, spurne, strike back with the feet.'—ED.]

92. **let me alone with him**] WRIGHT: That is, leave me to deal with him alone. So *Twelfth Night*, II, iii, 145: 'For Monsieur Malvolio, let me alone with him.'

93. **I am best pleas'd**, etc.] HALLIWELL: This line is no doubt spoken aside, for it would hardly be intended it should be uttered in the hearing of Hubert. Arthur judges of his kindness of heart from his compassionate looks. [It is, I think, more likely that Shakespeare with his infinite attention to details of character, intended this line to be spoken by the same *Executioner* as uttered the hope that Hubert's warrant would bear out the deed. There is the same compunction shown by both *Attendants*, in the older play, due, possibly, to Holinshed (see Note, l. 44). In the present scene the other *Executioner* is doubtless intended to be a

Art. Alas, I then haue chid away my friend,
He hath a ſterne looke, but a gentle heart:
Let him come backe, that his compaſſion may
Giue life to yours.
Hub. Come (Boy) prepare your ſelfe.
Art. Is there no remedie?
Hub. None, but to loſe your eyes.
Art. O heauen: that there were but a moth in yours,
A graine, a duſt, a gnat, a wandering haire,
Any annoyance in that precious ſenſe:
Then feeling what ſmall things are boyſterous there,
Your vilde intent muſt needs ſeeme horrible.
Hub. Is this your promise? Go too, hold your toong.
Art. *Hubert*, the vtterance of a brace of tongues,

94. *chid*] *chide* Rowe i.
100. *but to loſe*] *but lose* Vaughan.
101. *heauen:*] *Heav'n*, Rowe, Fle. *heav'n!* Pope,+. *heaven*, Cam.+. *heaven!*— Cap. et cet.
moth] Ff, Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Rann. Mal. Del. Fle. *mote* Mal. conj. Steev. et cet.
102. *wandering*] F_2, Knt, Coll. Dyce, Del. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. Fle. Words. Dono. Neils. *wandring* or *wand'ring* F_3F_4 et cet.
103. *ſenſe:*] Ff, Rowe, Pope.+. *sense.* Coll. *sense!* Cap. et cet.
104. *boyſterous*] *boistrous* or *boist'rous* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Hal. Sta. Ktly.
105. *vilde*] *vild* F_3, Del. Fle. *vile* F_4.
106. *Go too,*] *Go to*, Pope et seq.
toong.] *tongue* Ff. *tongue.*— Theob.+.
107, 108. In margin Pope, Han.

glowering, taciturn man without compassion or pity. Arthur's words, 'I *then* have chid away my friend,' show that he, at least, hears the words spoken.—ED.]

93. **from such a deede**] For other examples of 'from' in the sense of *away from*, *apart from*, used without a verb of motion, see ABBOTT, § 158.

101. **a moth**] UPTON (ed. ii, 252): Undoubtedly the true reading is, a *mote*, *Matthew*, vii, 3. *Hamlet:* 'A moth it is to trouble the mind's eye.'—[I, i, 112, p. 5, Grigg's Facsimile Qto, 1604]. The Anglo-Saxon version of St Matthew's gospel uses this very word *mot:* meaning what we call *chaff*, or *short straw*, and so 'tis now used in the West of England; but in other parts commonly for *atoms*. So Chaucer: 'As thicke as motes in the sonne-beem.'—*Wife of Bath's Tale*, [ed. Skeat, l. 868].—MALONE also compares: '—they are in the aire, like *atomi in sole*, mothes in the sonne.' Lodge, *Wits Miserie and the World's Madnesse: Preface*, [ed. Grosart, p. 5].—[Both DYER and Miss PHIPSON quote the present passage as an example of the mention of the insect moth; but the two words are quite distinct. In *Matthew*, vi, 19, Genevan Version, the insect is meant, as, 'Lay not vp treasures for your selues vpon the earth, where the moth and canker corrupt, & where theeues dig through and stealc.'—ED.]

107, 108. **a brace of tongues . . . a paire of eyes**] VAUGHAN (i, 58): This seems an error, for 'the pleading for a pair of eyes Must needs want utterance of a brace of tongues.' But we may so understand the construction without changing the written order of the words; the subject of 'must needs want' stands last, and the

Muſt needes want pleading for a paire of eyes:
Let me not hold my tongue : let me not *Hubert*,
Or *Hubert*, if you will cut out my tongue,
So I may keepe mine eyes. O ſpare mine eyes,
Though to no vſe, but ſtill to looke on you.
Loe, by my troth, the Inſtrument is cold,
And would not harme me.
Hub. I can heate it, Boy.
Art. No, in good ſooth : the fire is dead with griefe,

109. Hubert,] Ktly. *Hubert!* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt. *Hubert:* Coll. Dyce, Sta. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. Words. Dono. Craig. *Hubert.* Fle.
110. *will cut*] *will, cut* F_4 et seq.
111. *O...eyes,*] Ff, Rowe. *O...eyes!* Pope,+. *O!...eyes;* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. *Oh,...eyes* Ktly. *O,...eyes;* Cap. et cet.
112. *you.*] *you!* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Hal. Sta. Cam.+, Words. Neils.
113. *Loe,*] *Lo!* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Craig.
116. *griefe,*] *grief.* Pope, Han.

object of it first.—Wright explains 'want pleading' as here equivalent to *insufficient to plead.* Ivor John, that 'want' has here the force of *fall short in;* either of these interpretations show that Vaughan's inversion is quite unnecessary.—'A speech,' says Miss PORTER, 'which shows us how desperately the boy was pleading now, and how words, fast as they came, could not come fast enough to suit his intensity.' —ED.

110. cut out my tongue] JOHNSON: This is according to nature. We imagine no evil so great as that which is near us.

111. O spare mine eyes] BRANDES (i, 168): Arthur's entreaties to the rugged Hubert to spare his eyes must have represented in Shakespeare's thought the prayers of his little Hamnet to be suffered still to see the light of day, or rather Shakespeare's own appeal to Death to spare the child—prayers and appeals which were all in vain. [See note by Malone, III, iii, 98–105; the adverse opinions to Malone's hypothesis there expressed may well be extended to include the foregoing remarks by Brandes.—ED.]

116–127. No, in good sooth . . . doth tarre him on.] KREYSSIG (i, 392): This scene has always been accepted as a masterpiece of the Poet, and when acted with but a small amount of art never fails of its effect on the stage. The fresh, pure, and richly endowed youthfulness of the boy is revealed to us in all its fulness. Then, suddenly, the fearful danger menacing him awakens all the slumbering craft of his spirit, and the naïve expression of his childish prayers rises to the glowing beauty of an irresistible flow of eloquence through the terrible seriousness of the situation. At the same time we cannot quite suppress the thought that we have before us one of those places which, in this play, calls to mind the weakness of the early Shakespearean dramas—a certain abundance of images, at times over-subtle, even degenerating into bombast. It is certainly natural and touching if, to sweet flattery and moving appeals, there be united innocent cunning and irresistible prayers; but would even a richly gifted man, not to mention a simple child, in such a situation have both leisure and imagination to play with similitudes? Is it natural that the child, overcome with the fear of death,

Being create for comfort, to be vs'd 117
In vndeferued extreames : See elſe your ſelfe,
There is no malice in this burning cole, 119

117. *Being...comfort,*] In parentheses Wh. i.
create] *create.*' Fle.

119. *in this burning*] *burning in this* Grey conj. Huds. ii.

should speak in highly poetic figures of the blush of shame of the glowing iron; that he would compare the sparks to the dog that would bite his own master, and the dead coals to the repentent sinner mourning in ashes? The Poet must, and assuredly should, idealise the natural expression of emotional effects, and temper the flow of poetry by beauty; but that which is natural to lamentation at unhappy occurrences (one recalls Richard II. and Constance) would be by no means suitable to the half-frantic anxiety which seeks to avert an impending misfortune.—[This somewhat captious criticism evoked dissentient opinions from both THÜMMEL (*Jahrbuch*, x, p. 6) and BULTHAUPT (p. 85), their main point of contention being that realism is one thing and dramatic poetry another; the poet's fantasy must not be bound by the rules which govern prose composition, and that to make Arthur here speak in the ordinary language of the day would rob the whole passage of its beauty and effect. Both of Kreyssig's critics rather allowed their pens and thoughts on this subject a little too free a rein and entered upon a discussion of what constituted the real office of the Poet and the realm of æsthetic criticism; as this is a question not related to the present passage further than as an answer to Kreyssig, their remarks need not be given in full.—ED.]—BRANDES (i, 175): The taste of the age must indeed have pressed strongly upon Shakespeare's spirit to prevent him from feeling the impossibility of these quibbles upon the lips of a child imploring, in deadly fear, that his eyes may be spared to him.—RALEIGH (p. 222): In Shakespeare's mature work elaborated figures of this kind [ll. 123–127] do not occur. His thought presses on from metaphor to metaphor, any one of them more than good enough for a workaday poet; he strings them together and passes them rapidly before the eye, each of them bringing its glint of color and suggestion. His so-called mixed metaphors are not mixed, but successive; the sense of mixture is produced by a rapidity of thought in the writer which baffles the slower reader, and buries him under the missiles he fails to catch.

116–118. **fire is dead . . . vndeserued extreames**] JOHNSON: The sense is, *the fire* being created not to hurt, but *to comfort, is dead with grief for* finding itself *used* in acts of cruelty, which, being innocent, I have *not deserved.*—DELIUS dissents from this interpretation; referring 'undeserv'd extremes' to the iron, which being created for comfort does not deserve to be used for acts of violence; and is therefore dead from grief.—Johnson's interpretation has gained no adherents; the majority of opinion is in agreement with the more rational interpretation of Delius.

119. **malice in this burning cole**] GREY (i, 293): This line, I think, should be read thus: 'There is no malice *burning in this* coal.' No malice in a burning coal is certainly absurd.—MONCK MASON (*Comments*, p. 158): Dr Grey's remark is an hypercriticism; the coal was still burning; for Hubert says 'he could revive it with his breath'; but it had lost for a time its power of injuring by the abatement of its heat.—BOSWELL: Yet in defence of Dr Grey's remark it may be said that Arthur

The breath of heauen, hath blowne his ſpirit out,
And ſtrew'd repentant aſhes on his head.
Hub. But with my breath I can reuiue it Boy.
Art. And if you do, you will but make it bluſh,
And glow with ſhame of your proceedings, *Hubert:*
Nay, it perchance will ſparkle in your eyes:
And, like a dogge that is compell'd to fight,
Snatch at his Maſter that doth tarre him on.
All things that you ſhould vſe to do me wrong
Deny their office : onely you do lacke
That mercie, which fierce fire, and Iron extends,

120. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+, Fle.
120, 121. *his*] *its* Pope,+.
123–127. In margin Pope, Han.
123. *And if*] *An if* Cap. Del. Sta. Walker, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Dono. Neils. Craig.
127. *Snatch*] *Snatcht* F_3.
tarre] *set* Rowe.
129. *office*] *office'* Fle.
130. *extends*] *extend* Pope,+, Hal. Huds. ii.

imagined 'that the coal was no longer burning,' although Hubert tells him afterwards 'that it was not so far extinguished but that he could revive it with his breath.'—HALLIWELL: The original text may be retained, a great exactitude of expression being often thought unnecessary by Shakespeare, who here intends Arthur to exclaim, even the burning coal itself, the coal that was but erewhile glowing, is extinguished by the breath of heaven; the burning coal bears no malice, because it is extinguished.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh's Scholar*, p. 302) made the same conjectural change as Grey, and for the like reason; adding in parentheses that he found he was anticipated. Later, in his own edition, he merely refers to Grey's change as 'very plausible,' and in conclusion says: 'But we are not warranted in holding a writer of the Elizabethan age to the same exactness of expression which we may reasonably expect from one of the so-called Augustan age of Queen Anne.' —IVOR JOHN characterises Grey's suggestion as 'a most logical and practical emendation, for there *would* be malice in a *burning* coal. The next few lines, however, rather take away the point of the new reading, for it becomes evident that the coal was still alight although covered with ashes, and could be revived by blowing upon it.'

121. **repentant ashes on his head**] CARTER (p. 212) quotes the present line as an example of a 'reference to the ceremonial manner of Jewish repentance,' quoting *Job*, xlii, 6: 'Repent in dust and ashes'; *Luke*, x, 13: 'They had a great while agone repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.'—[The strewing of ashes on the head was originally a sign of mourning with the Jews; and by a transference, as a penitent was meant to show sorrow for his sins, this symbol of mourning was adopted.—ED.]

127. **tarre**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. Tar, v^2, 1.): To irritate, vex, provoke. Now only in *tar on* (Shaks. *tarre on*), to incite, hound on. [The present line quoted; also *Hamlet*, II, ii, 370: 'The nation holds it no sin to tarre them to controversy'; and *Tro. & Cress.*, I, iii, 392: 'Pride alone must tarre the mastiffs, as 'twere their bone.'—[For the derivation of this word see Murray, as above, prefatory note.—ED.]

130. **extends**] That is, *uses, shows*. Compare: 'To buy his favour I extend

Creatures of note for mercy, lacking vſes. 131
Hub. Well, ſee to liue : I will not touch thine eye,

131. *mercy, lacking*] *mercy-lacking* Pope et seq.
132. *ſee to liue*] *live to see* or *live and see* Elze (Ath., 29 June, 1867).
132. *eye*] Ff, Rowe, Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann. Cam.+, Neils. *eyes* Steev. et cet.

---

this friendship.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, I, iii, 169. [For other examples wherein 'a plural subject expressing but one idea is followed by a verb in the singular,' WRIGHT cites I, ii, 181; III, i, 34, 225; III, ii, 13.—ED.]

131. **Creatures**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 1.): Anything created; a created being, animate or inanimate; a product of creative action. [The present line quoted; also, among many earlier examples: 'These thy gyftes and creatures of bread and wyne,' 1548–9 (Mar.), *Bk Com. Prayer*, 128b.—ED.]

132. **see to liue**] RODERICK (ap. EDWARDS, p. 254): Read, 'See, *and* live.' For though there is nothing said as yet in this scene about killing him; yet it is plain from Hubert's next speech that the king intended his death should follow his blindness.—[HERR also proposes this change of 'to' to *and*, apparently unaware that he is therein anticipated.—ED.]—HEATH (p. 228): The sense is, Well, I grant you your sight, that you may hereafter have the means of preserving your life. Mr Roderick's correction therefore is quite unnecessary. For though the King might intend that Arthur's death should follow his blindness, yet it is plain, from Hubert's own declaration of the purport of his oath at the beginning of this scene, that the King had not yet communicated this his intention to him, and that he speaks of it only from rational conjecture.—[This latter statement shows a singular lapse of memory on Heath's part. Is it actually possible that any ordinary reader of the play could *forget* the scene between John and Hubert?—ED.]—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 132) remarks that this is misinterpreted both by Roderick and Heath. 'The only force of that sentence,' he continues, 'is this: "*Well*, take you thought how *to live*," adding, by implication, in the words that follow,—and think no more of your eyes, they are safe enough; *see to do this or that* is often us'd in this manner, and with great propriety here.'—STEEVENS: 'See to live' means only Continue to enjoy the means of life.—MALONE: I believe the Author meant: 'Well, live, and live with the means of seeing,' that is, 'with your eyes uninjured.'—DELIUS: That is, 'See in order to live.' Inasmuch as life is at first only actual through the sense of sight.—IVOR JOHN: The meaning is evidently 'live and keep thy sight'; but I cannot help thinking that here we have another clue to the thoughts of Hubert, as in l. 100 above. He has promised John that Arthur shall not 'live' and continually has the death of Arthur in his mind. In putting out Arthur's eyes it seems to me that he originally intended to kill the Prince, and that in the phrase 'see to live' we have an admission of that. What would make Hubert choose the peculiar punishment of putting out Arthur's eyes when he had promised to kill him, unless in so doing he meant to kill?—[The confusion between the actual murder of Arthur and his blinding was doubtless evident to Shakespeare—if it be noticed by us, how much more present must it have been to him. In *The Troublesome Raigne* his only hint for the masterly scene between John and Hubert is the following:

For all the Treaſure that thine Vnckle owes,
Yet am I ſworne, and I did purpoſe, Boy,
With this ſame very Iron, to burne them out.
Art. O now you looke like *Hubert*. All this while
You were diſguis'd.
Hub. Peace : no more. Adieu,
Your Vnckle muſt not know but you are dead.
Ile fill theſe dogged Spies with falſe reports:

133. *owes*] *owns* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
136. Hubert. *All*] Ff, Rowe,+, Fle. *Hubert: all* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Dono. Craig. *Hubert! all* Cap. et cet.
137. *diſguis'd*] *disguisèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words.
138. *Peace:...Adieu,*] *Peace!...Adieu.* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Craig.
139, 140. *dead....reports:*] Ff, Rowe, +, Fle. *dead....reports.* Var. '73. *dead: ...reports*, Var. '85. *dead:...reports;* Coll. i, Dyce, Hal. Sta. Wh. Huds. Cam.+, Words. Craig. *dead:...reports.* Cap. et cet.
140. *dogged*] *doggèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

'Hubert de Burgh, take Arthur here to thee,
Be he thy prisoner. Hubert, keep him safe!
For on his life doth hang thy Sovereign's crown;
But in his death consists thy Sovereign's bliss:
Then Hubert, as thou shortly hear'st from me,
So use the prisoner I have given in charge.'—Pt i, sc. ix.

Then, in scene xii, Hubert having received the promised instructions as to the blinding of Arthur, we are thus made to understand that John, although desiring Arthur's death, decides to spare his nephew's life, while rendering him incapable of reigning. Shakespeare, on the other hand, has left us in no doubt as to John's intention that Arthur be killed, but retains the alternative also. We could ill spare the scene between Hubert and John; and the slight confusion here is but a small price to pay for it. In the older play Hubert says to Arthur that he will tell the King that the torture inflicted had a fatal termination; which is probably to what the 'false reports' in l. 140 refers; Shakespeare's King John may have hoped for such an ending, but there is nothing in his later instructions to Hubert to show this. Malone's interpretation of this line, since it does not involve any change of the text, seems the most satisfactory.—ED.]

132. **thine eye**] Compare *Troublesome Raigne*, 'Cheer thee, young lord! thou shalt not lose an eye,' scene xii, l. 130. Steevens's change is, perhaps, unnecessary (see *Text. Notes*). Notice, also, that here, in the next line, and in l. 143 below 'thine' and 'thee' are used by Hubert in addressing Arthur for the first time; up to this point 'you' and 'yours' are used by him uniformly. Arthur does not, however, abandon the more formal 'you,' showing thus the almost filial relation. See ABBOTT, § 231, for numerous examples.—ED.

139. **but you are dead**] WRIGHT: That is, that you are not dead. So in *Rom. & Jul.*, V, iii, 132: 'My master knows not but I am gone hence.'

140. **dogged**] That is, currish, churlish, morose. MOBERLY interprets this as, 'These spies set on to dog me'; but this is, I think, unnecessary. Compare: 'Now

And, pretty childe, ſleepe, doubtleſſe, and ſecure,
That *Hubert* for the wealth of all the world,
Will not offend thee.
Art. O heauen! I thanke you *Hubert.*
Hub. Silence, no more ; go cloſely in with mee,
Much danger do I vndergo for thee. *Exeunt*

Scena Secunda.

Enter Iohn, Pembroke, Salisbury, and other Lordes.
Iohn. Heere once againe we ſit : once againſt crown'd
And look'd vpon, I hope, with chearefull eyes.
Pem. This once again (but that your Highnes pleas'd)
Was once ſuperfluous : you were Crown'd before,

141, 142. *ſecure,*...Hubert] *secure... Hubert,* Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Fle. Words. Dono. Neils. Craig.

1. Scena Secunda] ACT IV, SCENE I. Dono.

The Court of England. Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. Dover: A Room of State in the Castle. Hal. King John's Palace. Cam.+, Neils. Northampton: A Room of State in the Castle. Dono. The Same. A Room of State in the Palace. Cap. et cet.

2. Enter...Lordes.] Ff, Rowe, Pope, +, Var. '78, '85, Cam.+. Flourish. Enter King John, crown'd; the Lords Pembroke, Salisbury, and others attending. King takes his state. Cap. et cet.

3. *once...crown'd*] *crown'd once again* Pope, Han.

againſt] *again* F_3F_4.

for the bare-pickt bone of Maiesty Doth dogged warre bristle his angry crest.'—IV, iii, 158.—ED.

141. doubtlesse, and secure] That is, free from fear and care. We have had 'doubt' in the sense of *fear* in l. 24 above, and for 'secure' compare *Henry V:* IV, chor. 17: 'Proud of their numbers and secure in soul.'

145. closely] That is, *privately, secretly.* Compare: 'Meaning to keep her closely at my cell.'—*Rom. & Jul.*, V, iii, 255.

6. you were Crown'd before] STEEVENS calls attention to the fact that this was John's fourth coronation.—MALONE gives the date of the second coronation at Canterbury, 1201, and of the third as April, 1202, after the murder of Arthur; 'probably with a view of confirming his title to the throne, his competitor no longer standing in his way.'—As a point merely of historic interest it may be noted that both of Malone's dates are wrong. The following dates are taken from Roger of Wendover: John's first coronation was May 27, 1199 (vol. ii, p. 181); the second, 8th October, 1200 (ii, 193); the third was on Easter Day (March 25), 1201 (ii, 201); the fourth on 14th April, 1202 (ii, p. 205); which last, as Malone shows, is the historic date of the present scene. There is still some confusion here. BOSWELL-STONE (p. 60, foot-note) says that on April 14, 1202, according to John's *Itinerary,* he was at Orival near Rouen; and therefore the date of his *last* coronation must have been that given above as the *third.*—ED.

And that high Royalty was nere pluck'd off:
The faiths of men, nere ſtained with reuolt:
Freſh expectation troubled not the Land
With any long'd-for-change, or better State.
Sal. Therefore, to be poſſeſs'd with double pompe,
To guard a Title, that was rich before;
To gilde refined Gold, to paint the Lilly;
To throw a perfume on the Violet,
To ſmooth the yce, or adde another hew
Vnto the Raine-bow; or with Taper-light
To ſeeke the beauteous eye of heauen to garniſh,

8. *ſtained*] *stainèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Dono.
10. *long'd-for-change*] *long'd-for change* F_4.
12. *guard*] *gard* Hal. Fle.
13–17. Mnemonic Warb.
13. *refined*] *refinèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
17. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.

9. Fresh expectation . . . Land] DEIGHTON: No newly excited craving disturbed the minds of your subjects with a desire for change and for improvement of condition. There is a superfluity here of expectation; and a sort of confusion between, 'Expectation of change or improvement of condition did not agitate the land' and 'Change or improvement of condition was not longed for by the land, so as to disturb it.'

10. any long'd-for-change] VAUGHAN (i, 60): 'Long'd for' is not the epithet to 'change' merely, as 'better' is the epithet to 'state'; but the verse must be understood as if written thus, 'with any long'd-for change, any longed-for better state,' and may be punctuated thus: 'With any long'd-for change, or better state.' This interpretation is confirmed by a passage in Holinshed: 'being allured either for desire of change, or else for desire to see a reformation,' &c., A. D. 1405. Otherwise we might not unwarrantably read: '. . . change *to* better state.'

12. guard] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. vb., 7): To ornament (a garment, etc.) with a [border or trimming]; to trim as with braid, lace, velvet, etc. [Under the figurative use of this word, Bradley quotes the present line. Compare also: 'Give him a livery More guarded than his fellows.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, II, ii, 164.]

16, 17. with Taper-light . . . to garnish] BULLEN compares Marston: 'Set tapers to bright day, it ill befits.'—*What You Will*, II, i, 245 (*Wks*, ii, 354). The date of Marston's play is fully ten years after *King John*, and this may, therefore, be a reminiscence. The thought is, however, almost a general observation on doing that which is superfluous, and seems only another way of putting the common expression To burn daylight. On the other hand, the word 'taper' occurring in both lines seems significant of an attempt to copy Shakespeare's words.—ED.

17. eye of heauen] BAYLEY, under the heading *The Sun—an Eye* (pp. 260, 261), has collected twenty passages from various authors ranging from 1590 through 1624, wherein this figure occurs. The palm for priority in the list must be divided seemingly between Spenser and Greene; in *The Faerie Queene* the sun is called 'The great eye of heaven' (I, canto iii, v. 4), and in Greene's *Neuer Too Late*, 'Heaven's secret, searching eye' (ed. Grosart, p. 69). Both of these appeared in 1590.—ED.

Is waſtefull, and ridiculous exceſſe.
Pem. But that your Royall pleaſure muſt be done,
This acte, is as an ancient tale new told,
And, in the laſt repeating, troubleſome,
Being vrged at a time vnſeaſonable.

20. *new told*] *new-told* Han. Del. Dyce ii, iii, Words.
21. *And,...repeating,*] *And...repeating* F_3F_4, Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Neils. Craig.
22. *vrged*] *urgèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

20. **an ancient tale new told**] MALONE and STEEVENS both call attention, somewhat needlessly, to the close resemblance of this with the words of the Dauphin, III, iii, 113, 114: 'Life is as tedious as a twice told tale Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man.' Steevens ascribes this inadvertence to the asserted fact that Shakespeare was not 'a diligent examiner of his own compositions.'—ED.

21. **in the last repeating, troublesome**] VAUGHAN (i, 60): This is liable to misconstruction, and is printed to enforce a misconstruction. The line is here made to apply directly to 'this act' of coronation, whereas the Author intended to describe by it directly the telling of an old story over again, when it is troublesome to its hearers. 'Repeating' is a word by which Shakespeare constantly designates verbal recitation. . . . The right construction of the line is certainly either this: 'This is like an old story told to us over again just when it is troublesome, through being forced upon us unseasonably'; or this: 'This act is, inasmuch as it is forced upon us unseasonably, like an old story told over again, and troublesome in its repetition.' I strongly incline to the former of these, partly because Shakespeare has already made use of the same simile in [III, iii, 113, 114], where 'vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man' corresponds to 'being urged at a time unseasonable' here, and where 'as a twice-told tale' corresponds to 'an ancient tale new told' here. [Either one of Vaughan's constructions seem, to me at least, to rob Pembroke's speech of all point. To enlarge upon the fact that a twice-told tale is troublesome in its last repeating, when he wishes to impress the king with the risk of arousing the people by a repetition of the coronation, is quite irrelevant. What Pembroke says may be thus paraphrased: 'This act (the coronation) is like a twice-told tale, and being brought forward at an unseasonable time, will, by its unnecessary repetition, cause disturbance.' Salisbury certainly so understands it; his speech is an amplification not only of his foregoing words, but of Pembroke's interruption. In justice to Vaughan it must, however, be said that Shakespeare's use of the verb *repeat* is mainly confined to discourse; but that the gerund is here used figuratively is, I think, apparent. In the foregoing paraphrase it will be noticed that the adjective 'troublesome' has been interpreted as *causing disturbance*, not in the sense of *full of tumult*, or *trouble*, as in the title of the older play, *The Troublesome Raigne of John*. An 'act' can hardly be said to be *full of disturbance* though it often may be the cause of it. Compare: 'God knows, my son, By what by-paths and indirect crook'd ways I met this crown; and I myself know well How troublesome it sat upon my head.'—*2 Henry IV:* IV, v, 184–187. Vaughan has strangely misunderstood this causative use of the adjective in applying it to the repetition of the twice-told tale.—ED.]

Sal. In this the Anticke, and well noted face
Of plaine old forme, is much disfigured,
And like a ſhifted winde vnto a ſaile,
It makes the courſe of thoughts to fetch about,
Startles, and frights conſideration:
Makes ſound opinion ſicke, and truth ſuſpected,
For putting on ſo new a faſhion'd robe.
Pem. When Workemen ſtriue to do better then wel,

23–29. Mnemonic Warb.
23. *Anticke*] Ff, Rowe. *antic* Fle. *antique* Pope et cet.
well noted] *well-noted* Pope et seq.
24. *old forme*] *Old-form* Ktly.
24. *disfigured*] *disfigurèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
27. *conſideration*] *consideratiön* Fle. Words.
28. *ſuſpected*] *suspect* Anon. ap. Cam.
30. *to do better*] *to better do* Sta. conj.

25, 26. **shifted winde . . . course . . . fetch about**] WHALL (p. 71): A sudden 'shift' of wind often makes it necessary for a sailing ship to 'fetch about.' 'Course' is here the nautical word for a ship's course or a line of direction on which she sails. As to 'fetch about,' a sailing-ship cannot, of course, sail dead against the wind; she can at the best sail only six points of the compass from the wind. For example, if it is wished to sail north and the wind is north, the nearest point to that course upon which the ship can sail is one tack W. N. W., on the other tack E. N. E. Now if, for example, the wind should shift to N. N. W., it would be of advantage (if the ship had been previously sailing W. N. W.) to 'fetch about' (or in more modern language 'go about') on the other tack, when she would 'head' or be able to sail N. E., or two points nearer her desired course (north) than she would on the other tack. [Whall, who signs himself 'Master Mariner' in his *Introduction* (p. 6), queries as to whether Shakespeare may not have been among those 'pressed' for service in the fleet shortly after his arrival in London, and thus, during those seven dark years of his life, have acquired his intimate knowledge of sea-terms. 'Words and phrases,' says Whall, 'of an extremely technical and professional nature are scattered through [the plays], and a mistake in their use is never made. Could a mere "land-lubber" have steered clear of error in the use of such terms?'—ED.]

29. **new a fashion'd robe**] WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 129) compares, for this construction, 'So rare a wonder'd father, and a wise, Makes this place a paradise.'—*Tempest*, IV, i, 123. [For several other examples, see ABBOTT, § 422.]—MOORE SMITH: The sense is clearly 'a robe of so new a fashion.' The construction is not obvious, even after comparing 'so rare a wondered father and a wise' and 'so fair an offer'd chain.'—*Com. of Errors*, III, ii, 186. We might at first consider 'so new a fashion'd' to be an adjective formed by adding the suffix *-ed* to the phrase 'so new a fashion.' But such an adjective would require to be preceded by another *a*. It seems better to consider the phrases as cases of displacement of the indefinite article, so that they are = 'a so new-fashioned robe'; 'a father admired and wise in so rare a degree'; 'a chain so fairly or courteously offered.' *Fashion'd, wonder'd, offer'd* would then be past participles. We might, perhaps, illustrate the displacement of the article by the displacement of *my* in the phrases 'Good my lord,' &c.

30, 31. **When Workemen . . . couetousnesse**] THEOBALD: That is, not by their

They do confound their skill in couetouſneſſe,
And oftentimes excuſing of a fault,
Doth make the fault the worſe by th'excuſe:
As patches ſet vpon a little breach,
Diſcredite more in hiding of the fault,
Then did the fault before it was ſo patch'd.
Sal. To this effect, before you were new crown'd
We breath'd our Councell: but it pleas'd your Highnes
To ouer-beare it, and we are all well pleas'd,
Since all, and euery part of what we would

31. *couetousneſſe*] *covetize* Cap. conj.
35, 36. *fault...fault*] *flaw...flaw* Warb. Cap.
37. *new crown'd*] *new-crown'd* Pope et seq.
38. *Councell*] *counſel* F_3F_4.
39. *it*] *'t* Anon. ap. Cam. Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
and we are] *yet we're* Pope, Han. *and we're* Theob. Warb. Johns.

---

avarice, but in an eager emulation, an intense desire of excelling, as in: 'But if it be a sin to covet honour, I am the most offending soul alive.'—*Henry V:* IV, iii, 28. [Hanmer, Warburton, and Johnson accept this explanation without comment.—ED.]—CAPELL (I, pt i, p. 132): The latter part of this maxim has an explanation in three moderns; but not that they demand, for that (methinks) were as follows, '*in* that covetousness or coveting of theirs to do better than well.' But why are the words before not explained? they more want it; for 'confound' is ambiguous, meaning oftest—perplex, but sometimes—destroy or bring to nothing, and that's the sense it has here. [Compare, 'Which in a moment doth confound and kill All pure effects.'—*Lucrece*, l. 250.]—MALONE compares: 'Were it not sinful then, striving to mend, To mar the subject that before was well?'—*Sonnet*, ciii; and: 'Striving to better, oft we mar what's well,'—*Lear*, I, iv, 369.—HUDSON: Lord Bacon, in like manner, attributes the failure of certain men to the love, not of *excellence*, but of *excelling*. The text is a fine commentary on the elaborate artificialness which springs far more from ambition than from inspiration, and which the poet too often exemplifies in his own pages.—WRIGHT, endowing Capell's purposes with words, paraphrases thus: 'They destroy what they have done skilfully by their eager desire to improve it.'—ED.

30. **do better then wel**] STAUNTON'S proposed reversal of the first two words, on the ground that the phrase is 'painfully dissonant,' evoked from Fleay the comment that 'Metrical critics will not learn that a trochee in place of an iambic in English always indicates a precedent pause, in this line at the word "do." So Landor objected to Milton's magnificent line: "Not difficult if thou—hearken to me," saying that "no authority could reconcile" his ears to it. De Quincy castigated him deservedly. See De Quincy's *Works*, xii, 193.'

34, 35. **patches . . . Discredite . . . the fault**] M. MASON (*Com. on Beaumont & Fletcher*, p. 36): Sergeant Bettlesworth used to say that to have a hole in his stocking was an accident which might happen to any man, but that a darn was deliberate poverty.

35. **fault**] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 3.): A defect, imperfection, blameable quality or feature.

Doth make a ſtand, at what your Highneſſe will. 41
Ioh. Some reaſons of this double Corronation
I haue poſſeſt you with, and thinke them ſtrong.
And more, more ſtrong, then leſſer is my feare 44

41. *Doth*] *Do* Rowe ii. *Must* Pope, +, Var. '78.
will] *wills* Ktly.
44. *then leſſer is my feare*] *then leſſe is my feare* F_2F_3. *then leſs is my fear* F_4, Rowe i. *the less that is my fear*, Rowe ii. (*the lesser is my fear*) Pope,+, Hal. (*then lesser is my fear*) Cap. *than lesser is my fear* Coll. i, Del. i, Wh. *thus lessening my fear* Coll. MS. *than lesser, in my fear* Ktly. *then lesser is my fear*, Cam. Glo. Cla. Coll. iii. *when lesser is my fear*, Tyrwhitt, Var. '78 et cet.

41. **Doth**] MALONE: (*Var.*, 1785): The change [*must*, see *Text. Notes*], I suppose, was made because it was thought 'all' required a plural verb; but 'all' here signifies *the whole*. Since *the whole*, and each particular part, of our wishes, *doth* make a stand, &c. The old reading therefore may remain.

43. **possest you with**] WRIGHT: That is, informed you of. 'Possess' in this sense is generally followed by 'of.' So in *Mer. of Ven.*, IV, i, 35: 'I have possessed your grace of what I purpose.' And *Coriol.*, II, i, 145: 'Is the senate possessed of this.' [SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. 5) quotes the present line as the only example of 'possess' followed by 'with.'—ED.]

44. **more strong, then lesser is my feare**] JOHNSON, without reference to the original text, 'attempts' (the word is Steevens's) to explain Pope's rearrangement thus: 'I have told you some reasons, in my opinion *strong*, and shall tell more, *yet stronger;* for the stronger my reasons are, the less is my fear of your disapprobation. This seems to be the meaning.'—CAPELL (I, pt i, p. 132): [The change of 'then' to *the* is] changing for changing's sake, for nothing is gained by it unless a weaker expression: 'then' is—in that case—If I shall endue you (or possess you) with more, and more strong, reasons, *then* you may hold my fear to be lesser, and rather prudence than fear.—COLLIER (ed. i.): The First Folio has 'then' for *than*, the commonest mode of printing the word in Shakespeare's time; but the commentators not adverting to this circumstance do not seem to have understood the passage, and printed 'when lesser is my fear,' putting it in parentheses; the meaning, however, seems to be, that the king will hereafter give his lords reasons 'stronger than his fear was lesser'; the comparative 'lesser' is put for the positive *little*, because the Poet had used 'more strong' in the preceding part of the line.—DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 95), in reference to this note by Collier, says: 'Such a portentous reading, and such a super-astute explanation, were perhaps never before exhibited in any critical edition of an author either ancient or modern,—and all because Mr Collier would not alter "then" to *when*,—the latter word being as certainly the right lection here as it is in ["And then, that Harry Bolingbroke, and he," *2 Henry IV:* IV, i, 119], where he has not scrupled to substitute it for "that" of the old copy.'—COLLIER in his ed. ii. entirely abandoned his reasonable explanation and accepted Tyrwhitt's change, remarking: 'It may be doubted whether this expresses exactly what the Poet intended, but at all events it is recommended by the fact that it deviates as little as possible from the old text.'—[Collier felt evidently that some 'deviation' was necessary since his MS. Corrector had given a rather violent change, which Collier does not strongly defend or recommend.—ED.]—ANON. (*Blackwood's Mag.*, Sept., 1853, p. 305): 'When lesser

[44. And more, more strong, then lesser is my feare]

is my fear' is the common reading; but why the king should give them more and stronger reasons for his double coronation, when his fears were diminished, is not at all apparent. The strength of his fears should rather have led him at once to state his reasons explicitly. Collier's MS. correction is: '*thus lessening* my fear.' But how the *communication* of his stronger reasons should have the effect of lessening the king's fear is a riddle still darker than the other. The possession of these reasons might lessen the usurper's fears; but surely the mere utterance of them could make no difference. If the MS. Corrector had written 'thus lessening *your* fears,' there would have been some sense in the emendation; and if a new reading be required, this is the one which we venture to suggest.—KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*, i, 258): We have great doubts about '*thus lessening*,' and think that Theobald's [Qu. Popes?] reading, '*the lesser* is my fear,' is quite as good, if 'then lesser is my fear,' read parenthetically, does not give a clear meaning.—DELIUS (ed. i.): That is, some reasons, which he considers strong, he has already communicated to the Lords, and more reasons, yet stronger than his fear, which occasioned his second coronation, he will yet communicate to them. Shakespeare here introduces 'lesser,' as he uses the similar negative *not* in a comparative sentence, where it seems almost pleonastic.—[In his ed. ii. Delius adopts Tyrwhitt's reading, omitting any paraphrase of the sentence.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: 'More strong than lesser is my fear,' i. e., reasons stronger than my fear is less, or as strong as my fear is little. This sense of the original text appears so plain to me as not to admit of a moment's doubt about it. Since English was a language we have been in the constant habit of thus comparing the degree of two things, conditions, or affections entirely different in kind. [With Tyrwhitt's reading] no reasons can be found why John should postpone giving the reasons for his double coronation until his fears diminished.—PERRING (p. 196): The king tells the peers that he has 'more' reasons and 'more strong' reasons for his double coronation than he has yet disclosed; and it would not be unreasonable to expect him to add that his fears had diminished in consequence. But I am not at all sure that this is what he says. Men timid and irresolute, who have been agitated by fears, are not so easily reasoned out of their fears. The king was full of fearful foreboding. I understand him to say that *his reasons are stronger than his fears are less*, which is another way of saying that his fears were not lessened in proportion as his reasons were numerous and weighty. The utmost had been done, but the terror had not passed. This avowal might have been merely the outcome of a heart conscious of its own guilt, but I think that it was rather prompted by the suspicious attitude of the peers towards him, to whom he thus conveys a hint that he is not ignorant of their disaffection. As a slight confirmation of this interpretation it is noticeable that, in the short remainder of his speech, the king expresses himself as willing to agree to such measures of reform as they should deem expedient.—WRIGHT: That is, more strong in proportion as my fear is less. There appears to be no reason for departing from the original reading, regarding 'then' as equivalent to *than*.—HERFORD: More reasons, even stronger than in proportion to my diminished fear; that is, the superior cogency of his new arguments, far from indicating a greater anxiety, would even exceed the measure of his relief. Tyrwhitt's *when* is very plausible.—MOORE SMITH remarks, in corroboration of Tyrwhitt's *when*, that 'a clear meaning is at once given to "meantime" in the next line, which is otherwise strangely vague.'—IVOR JOHN: If we keep the reading of the Folio, we must take

I ſhall indue you with : Meane time, but aske
What you would haue reform'd. that is not well,
And well ſhall you perceiue, how willingly
I will both heare, and grant you your requeſts.
Pem. Then I, as one that am the tongue of theſe
To ſound the purpoſes of all their hearts,

49–53. *as...ſtudies,*] —*as...studies*— Neils.

'then' as equivalent to *than*, understanding the line to mean: 'More reasons, more strong in proportion as my fear is less.' Although Shakespeare in *King John* seems to have written several passages where the meaning is not obvious at first glance, he has not set such another puzzle as this. Tyrwhitt's conjecture is very plausible, but has the great objection of making John admit that he was in great fear, which is not at all probable. The true reading must be one in which John makes little of his fear; and none of the proposed readings make this point.—MARSHALL rejects the various proposed emendations and the original text, adopting as the most probable reading, 'more strong than less—so is my fear—' which he explains thus: 'reasons more strong than less (strong)—so I fear—than those I have given you already.' 'But,' says Marshall, 'the reading of F_1 may be correct, and it may mean: "And *more* reasons *more strong* than those I have already given you I shall give you at some future time—then *my fear* will be *less* that you will continue to disapprove of my being crowned." I cannot make any other possible sense of the passage as it stands in the Folio. The emendation adopted does little violence to the text, "then" might easily be miswritten or misprinted for *than;* and "lesser" for *less so*. John's desire seems to be to impress on the lords that he had very important and serious reasons, which he could not just then reveal, for the step he had taken.'—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) and DEIGHTON read with Tyrwhitt; the former says: 'John seems to mean that when his fear of Arthur's claim has been allayed (he is expecting a report from Hubert) he will explain to them why he felt his original tenure of the crown to have been inadequate.'—DEIGHTON: And more reasons of even greater weight I shall communicate to you, when my fears are less than they now are. [Tyrwhitt's needless change is, of course, susceptible of either of these interpretations; but, as both the Anonymous writer in Blackwood and White have shown, there is no logical reason why John should hesitate to *tell* his reasons until his fears were less. White's elucidation of the passage is certainly convincing that any emendation is unnecessary when such a clear meaning may be obtained from the original text.—ED.]

49, 50. **Pem. Then I . . . their hearts**] COURTENAY (i, 23): I do not find that any of the *English* lords interfered, as in the play, on behalf of Arthur. One sentence from Holinshed, in which he speaks of the Prince's death in England as well as France, is the only authority for the interest excited *in England*, of which Shakespeare has drawn a picturesque description. [Let it not be forgotten that Courtenay's object, as stated in his *Preface*, is to see 'what were Shakespeare's authorities for his history, and how far has he departed from them?'—ED.]

50. **sound the purposes**] JOHNSON: That is, to *declare*, to *publish* the desires of all those. [WRIGHT compares: 'For now against himself he sounds this doom.'—*Lucrece*, l. 717.]

Both for my ſelfe, and them : but chiefe of all
Your ſafety : for the which, my ſelfe and them
Bend their beſt ſtudies, heartily requeſt
Th'infranchiſement of *Arthur*, whoſe reſtraint
Doth moue the murmuring lips of diſcontent
To breake into this dangerous argument.
If what in reſt you haue, in right you hold,

51–53. *Both...ſtudies,*] In parentheses Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
but...ſtudies,] In parentheses Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Sta. Hal. Wh. i.
52. *them*] *they* Pope,+, Ktly.
54. *Th'*] F_2F_3, Wh. i. *The* F_4, Rowe et cet.
56. *argument.*] F_2, Coll. iii. *argument;* Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *argument:*— Coll. i, ii, Sing. ii, Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. *argument*, F_3F_4 et cet.
57. *If...hold*] In parentheses Fle.
in reſt] *in wrest* Steev. conj. *in rent* Anon. ap. Cam. *in trust* Elze conj. *interest* Herr.
in right] *unright* Cartwright conj. John Hunter conj. Vaughan conj. *by right* Elze conj.

52. **my selfe and them**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: Such grammatical licenses were allowable in Shakespeare's time; and moreover, in the present passage, 'them' is probably given for the sake of the repetition of 'myself and them' in the speech. These kinds of repetitions are much used by Shakespeare, and very markedly so in the present play; they give much energy to his style, and have peculiarly emphatic effect.—WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 279) questions the possibility of Shakespeare's having written so ungrammatically, adding that we should 'surely read *they*.' (See *Text. Notes.*)—To this the CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXIII.) reply: 'The construction is evidently incorrect, but it may be explained by supposing that the offending word "them," following so closely upon "my self," was suggested to the writer by the analogous pronoun *themselves*.'—ABBOTT (§ 214) offers substantially the same grammatical explanation, giving the present passage as the only example wherein 'them' is thus used for *they*.—IVOR JOHN, in addition to the foregoing explanation, suggests that: 'the printer's eye caught the "myself and them" of the preceding line and repeated it; or that Shakespeare repeated his own phrase without being sensible of the grammatical error.'

54, 55. **Arthur, whose restraint . . . lips of discontent**] WARNER (p. 30): The reader of the play must infer that this twelve-year-old boy was the central figure of human and political interest in the England of that day. He was nothing of the kind. He was of very small importance in the actual shuffling of the cards. But he offered dramatic material of considerable value, and Shakespeare used him, as the older dramatist did, without reference to the chronicles and with no attempt at preserving the real perspective of history. Thus the assumed position of Arthur, as an abused and oppressed rightful claimant to the throne, is connected, on no legitimate grounds whatever, with the quarrel between the Pope and King John; and also with the revolts of the Barons. All the critics note the importance attributed by the play to Arthur's movements, but not all of them point out the gross anachronism thus involved.

57. **If what . . . you hold**] MALONE (*Sup. Observ.*, i, 170): The argument, I think, requires that we should read: '—in right you hold *not*.' The word '*not*'

[57. If what in rest you haue, in right you hold]

might have dropped out at the press. If this was not the case, and the old reading be the true one, there ought to be a note of interrogation after the word 'exercise,' l. 62; so that the meaning might be—If you are entitled to what you now quietly possess, why then should your fears move you? &c.—[Inasmuch as Malone did not repeat this conjecture in his own edition a few years later it may be considered as withdrawn.—ED.]—STEEVENS: Perhaps we should read: 'If what in *wrest* you have,' etc., i. e., if what you possess by an act of seizure or violence, &c. So again, 'The imminent decay of wrested pomp.'—IV, iii, 164.—HENLEY: The emendation proposed by Steevens is its own voucher. If 'then' and 'should,' ll. 58, 59, change places and a mark of interrogation be placed after 'exercise,' . 62, the full sense of the passage will be restored. [See *Text. Notes.*]—RITSON: Steevens's reading, *wrest*, is better than his explanation. If adopted, the meaning must be—'If what you possess, or have in your hand, or grasp.'—DOUCE (i, 405) in reference to Steevens's conjecture says: 'But surely "the murmuring lips of discontent" would not insinuate that John was an usurper; because the subsequent words, "in right you hold," would then be contradictory. One could not say: "if, being an usurper, you reign by right." The construction may therefore be more simple: If the power you now possess in *quiet* be held by right, why should your fears, &c.'—KNIGHT characterises Steevens's conjecture, with its meaning violence, as 'pure nonsense,' and likewise disagrees with Malone and Douce that 'rest' here means *quietly*. 'The whole scene,' continues Knight, 'shows that John did not hold his power in perfect tranquillity. "Rest" is, we take it, here employed to mean a fixed position. To "set up a rest" is a term with which every reader of our old dramatic poets must be familiar. Some have thought that the expression was derived from the manner of fixing the harquebuss—a gun so heavy that the soldier, taking up his position, fixed a rest in the ground to enable him to level his piece. But, from a number of examples given by Reed in his edition of Dodsley's *Old Plays*, we find the same expression used in the game of Primero, in which game, as far as we may judge, the term seems to imply that the player at a particular point of the game makes a decided stand upon the chances he fancies he has secured. In a tale told of Henry VIII. [Harington's *Nugae Antiquae*, ed. 1804, i, p. 223] (quoted by Reed [vol. x, p. 310]) we have "The Kinge, 55 eldest hand sets up all restes, and discarded flush." The king was satisfied with his position, and "threw his 55 on the boord open, with great lafter, supposing the game (as yt was) in a manner sewer." The analogy in the speech of Pembroke is pretty close: "If what in rest you have in right you hold."'—J. MITFORD (*Gentleman's Maga.*, Aug., 1844): Steevens's conjecture of *wrest* seems approved by his fellow commentators; but we prefer 'rest,' and interpret it, *undisputed peace and possession*. We question whether 'what you have in wrest' is an allowable construction of language. [See III, iii, 55.]—STAUNTON, apparently unaware that he was substantially anticipated by Malone, proposes to read: 'If what in rest you have, *not* right you hold'; and in 'forcible' corroboration of this reading quotes the parallel passage in the older play: 'We crave my lord Essex, to please the commons with The libertie of Lady Constance sonne: Whose durance darkeneth your highnesse right, As if you kept him prisoner, to the end Your selfe were doubtfull of the thing you have.'—FLEAY: I formerly read *unright*, with Staunton's approval; but no change is needed. This dangerous argument, as to why, if what you hold is rightly held, your fears should induce you to imprison Arthur; for fear implies injustice.—WRIGHT: 'In

Why then your feares, which (as they ſay) attend 58
The ſteppes of wrong, ſhould moue you to mew vp

58, 59. *then ... ſhould*] *should ... then* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Coll. ii. (MS.), Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. *then...should not* Ktly. *then,... should they* Herr.

58. *your*] *no* Lettsom ap. Dyce ii.

58, 59. *which...wrong,*] ᶠFf, Rowe, Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Sta. Wh. i. In parentheses Pope et cet.

58. *which (as...ſay)*] (*which as...ſay*) F_3F_4.

---

rest,' that is, in quiet possession. Steevens's [proposed reading] is inconsistent with what follows, 'in right you hold.'—KINNEAR (p. 200): The sense indicates that 'rest' is a misprint; *rule* gives the required meaning, and 'rest' may easily have been a misprint for it. 'Your fears—which attend the steps of wrong' is not language which Pembroke would have addressed to John, and is not consistent with the courtesy of the rest of the speech. [Kinnear explains that to *have in rule* is simply another expression of *you rule;* as in: 'who hast the memory of Hermione in honour,' *Winter's Tale*, V, i, 50, which is equivalent to, *who honourest the memory.*—ED.]—MOORE SMITH:. That is, *you possess in peace.* Compare *Troublesome Raigne:* 'to supplant the foemen to my right and your rest,' [pt i, sc. ii, l. 195, *Appendix*, p. 485]. Unless there is some reference to the use of the word 'rest' in the game of *primero*, for 'the cards on which one stands to win.'—IVOR JOHN: 'Rest' can have nothing to do with the game of *primero*, where it stood for the limiting stake, and it seems best to take it, with Wright, as meaning *peace, security.* [In order that a clear meaning may be obtained from this and the following lines John opines that a negative sense must be given to these words, either as Malone and Staunton suggest or the words 'in right' be read 'unright' as proposed by three commentators independently.—ED.]—PAGE (p. 116): Lines 57–62 form a noun-sentence, in apposition with 'argument.' The people ask, argumentatively, supposing your possession of the crown is just, why in that case you should imprison Arthur. The emendations proposed by various editors are unnecessary.

58, 59. **Why then . . . should moue**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 132), referring to Pope's reversal of 'then' and 'should,' says: 'This has grammar to urge for it, and may be right; but, not seeing how such a change could well happen, the editor rather chooses to think the argument was left purposely unconcluded, as expressing the speaker's modesty and fear of wounding too deeply. His attention to his king at this time is strongly mark'd in another line, 65; where he sets his request in a new light, and, instead of asking himself *Arthur's enfranchisement*, asks that he may have it to say the king had *bid* him request it, and so make the act his. The custom of asking and granting suits at these seasons [coronations] was once general, and is still in use in the east.'—STEEVENS: Perhaps this question is elliptically expressed, and means: 'Why then *is it that* your fears should move you,' etc.—COLLIER (ed. ii.) unhesitatingly adopted the transposition of these two words, chiefly on the authority of the MS. Corrector.—Singer (ed. ii.), without any mention of this, proposed the same reversal as a help 'to the *lucidus ordo*'; and Collier, justly indignant, accuses him 'merely of a neglect to notice it.'—[But then Collier never mentions that such had been the reading of Pope and his followers, and that this reading was also proposed by Henley in Steevens's edition—ED.]—R. G.

Your tender kinſman, and to choake his dayes
With barbarous ignorance, and deny his youth
The rich aduantage of good exerciſe,
That the times enemies may not haue this
To grace occaſions : let it be our ſuite,
That you haue bid vs aske his libertie,

62. *exerciſe,*] Ff, Rowe. *exercise:* Cap. Var. '78, '85. *exercise.* Sta. Ktly, Lettsom, Fle. Neils. *exercise?* Pope et cet.

63. *times*] *time's* Pope et seq.

64. *let it be*] *let be* Vaughan.

65. *you*] *you'd* Ktly.

aske his] *ask, his* Han. Johns. Rann, Huds. ii, Words. Dono.

WHITE: This [Pope's transposition] is, of course, the sense of the passage; and I, at first, thought it was the true reading; but subsequent reflection has convinced me of the purity of the original text. It is as if the sentence were written, 'Why, then, should your fears,' &c., and for the exigencies of verse the verb is transferred to the next line. Similar constructions are not rare in our old dramatists.—KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor*, p. 224): As it is plain, from what went before, that they ['your fears'] should not have that effect, editors have made a transposition of 'then' and 'should.' It seems to me, however, that here, as in so many other places, the printer omitted the negative after 'should.' I do not perfectly understand 'rest' in l. 57, but it may be tranquillity, tranquil undisturbed possession, a sense it bears in Scripture. See *Psalm* xcv, 11, ['Unto whom I sware in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest'].—WRIGHT: The argument or enquiry takes the form of an indirect question. The people ask, says Pembroke, why your fears should move you to mew up your tender knisman, etc.—MARSHALL, whose paraphrase of the argument is substantially the same as Wright's, considers that not only is the sense of the text clear enough without any alteration, but even queries whether 'the transposition of "then" and "should"' does not 'weaken the sentence rather than make it any clearer?'

59. **to mew vp**] WRIGHT: That is, to confine as in a mew or coop, to coop up, imprison. Compare: 'This day should Clarence closely be mew'd up.'—*Richard III:* I, i, 38. A mew was a cage for hawks.

62. **exercise**] PERCY: In the middle ages the whole education of princes and noble youths consisted in martial exercises, &c. These could not be easily had in prison, where mental improvements might have been afforded as well as anywhere else; but this sort of education never entered into the thoughts of our active, warlike, but illiterate nobility. [Wright compares: 'My father charged you in his will to give me good education: you have trained me like a peasant, obscuring and hiding from me all gentleman-like qualities. The spirit of my father grows strong in me, and I will no longer endure it: therefore allow me such exercises as may become a gentleman, or give me the poor allotery my father left me by testament.'—*As You Like It*, I, i, 76 et seq.]

63, 64. **times enemies . . . grace occasions**] WRIGHT: [Do not] give a fair opportunity for attack to those who are opposed to the present condition of things.

65. See note by CAPELL, ll. 58, 59, *ante.*

Which for our goods, we do no further aske,
Then, whereupon our weale on you depending,
Counts it your weale : he haue his liberty.

Enter Hubert.

Iohn, Let it be ſo : I do commit his youth
To your direction : *Hubert*, what newes with you?

Pem. This is the man ſhould do the bloody deed:
He ſhew'd his warrant to a friend of mine,
The image of a wicked heynous fault
Liues in his eye : that cloſe aſpect of his,
Do ſhew the mood of a much troubled breſt,
And I do fearefully beleeue 'tis done,
What we ſo fear'd he had a charge to do.

Sal. The colour of the King doth come, and go
Betweene his purpoſe and his conſcience,

66–68. *Which...liberty*] Om. Dono.

66. *goods*] *good* Pope,+.

further] *farther* Coll. Sing. ii, Wh. i, Ktly.

67. *Then,...weale on...*] Ff, Rowe. *Than...weal* (*on...* Cap. *Than weal, on...* Pope et cet.

you] *your* Var. '85, Var. '21. *yours* Coll. iii. (MS.).

68. *weale: he...his*] *weal he...his* Rowe ii, Coll. Dyce, Sta. Wh. i, Ktly, Cam. +, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig. *weal that he have* Pope,+.

69. Enter Hubert.] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. After *direction*, l. 71, Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words. After l. 70, Johns. et cet.

71. *direction:*] *direction.* Rowe ii. et seq.

you?] *you?* [The king goes aside with Hubert. Han. *you?* [taking him apart. Cap. Sta. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *you?* [Hubert whispers the King. Coll. Del. Wh. i, Dono. [Aside to Hubert, Ktly.

73. *mine,*] *mine.* Pope,+, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. Dono. Neils.

75. *aſpect*] *aspéct* Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Sta. Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

76. *Do*] F_2F_3. *Doth* Dyce i, Sta. Hal. Fle.

77. *'tis*] *is* Vaughan.

80. *conſcience*] *consciënce* Fle.

---

67. **Then, whereupon, etc.**] HERFORD: That is (we ask his liberty no further) than the commonwealth counts it your advantage. 'Whereupon' has no distinct meaning; it is apparently suggested by 'depending.'

69. **Enter Hubert**] ROSE (*Macmillan's Maga.*, Nov., 1878, p. 75): Whoever will read this entire scene as it stands in Shakespeare [and in *The Troublesome Raigne*] cannot fail to find how very much he has improved it in neatness of construction, in probability, in effectiveness, and even in brevity, though he has doubled the dignity and philosophic fulness of nearly all the chief speeches. And throughout the Second Part (which begins with Arthur's death) his alterations are at least as important and successful.

78. **What we so fear'd**] For other examples of 'what' used relatively, see ABBOTT, § 252.

80. **Betweene . . . conscience**] JOHNSON: That is, between his consciousness of his guilt and his *design* to conceal it by fair professions.—MALONE: Rather,

Like Heralds 'twixt two dreadfull battailes ſet:
His paſsion is ſo ripe, it needs muſt breake.
Pem. And when it breakes, I feare will iſſue thence
The foule corruption of a ſweet childes death.

81–84. *Like...death.*] Om. Dono. Wh. i, Huds. ii. *set.* Neils.
81. *ſet:*] *sent:* Theob. Han. Warb. 84. *childes*] *child's* F_4.

---

between the criminal act that he *planned* and commanded to be executed and the reproaches of his conscience consequent on the execution of it. So in *Coriol.*: 'It is a purposed thing and grows by plot.'—[III, i, 38]. We have nearly the same expressions afterwards: 'Nay, in the body of this fleshly land . . . Hostility, and civil tumult reigns Between my conscience and my cousin's death,' [ll. 255–258 below].—M. MASON: The purpose of the King, which Salisbury alludes to, is that of putting Arthur to death, which he considers as not yet accomplished, and therefore supposes that there might still be a conflict in the King's mind—'Between his purpose and his conscience.' So, when Salisbury sees the dead body of Arthur, he says: 'It is the shameful work of Hubert's hand The practice and the purpose of the king.'—WRIGHT agrees with Malone in the interpretation of this line; and remarks that 'Johnson's explanation is out of keeping with the figure of the two heralds, who represent conflicting forces.'

81. **Heralds . . . set**] THEOBALD, in justification of his change, *sent*, says: 'Heralds are not planted in the midst betwixt two lines of battle; though they, and trumpets, are often sent over from party to party, to propose terms, demand a parley, &c.'—JOHNSON: 'Set' is not *fixed*, but only *placed;* heralds must be *set* between battles in order to be *sent* between them.—R. G. WHITE: It is strange that both [Theobald and Johnson] should miss the point of the question, which has nothing to do with what was the custom (though that is correctly represented by the corrected text), but with the obvious truth, that the King's color, *coming and going*, could not be compared to anything *set*.—ARROWSMITH (*The Editor* of *N. & Q.*, &c., p. 6), commenting on the notes of Theobald and Johnson, says: 'The Shakespeare scholar need not be told that the participle "set" agrees not with "heralds," but with "battles," or that "battles set" is a common phrase for *armies in array*.'—DYCE (ed. ii.): I cannot but differ from Mr Arrowsmith. I no more believe that here 'set' agrees with 'battles' than I believe that 'set' agrees with 'battles' in the following of *Henry V:* 'The French are bravely in their battles set.'—IV, iii, 69.—WRIGHT: 'Set' refers to 'battles' and not to 'heralds,' and there is therefore no necessity with Theobald to change it to *sent*. [The consensus of opinion is in favor of Arrowsmith's explanation.—ED.]

82. **passion**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. III, 6. *c*): A fit or mood marked by stress of feeling, or abandonment to emotion; a transport of excited feeling; an outburst of feeling. [Compare III, iii, 43.]

83. **when it breakes**] JOHNSON: This is but an indelicate metaphor, taken from an imposthumated tumour. [In this Shakespeare is, however, not the only offender. Robertson (p. 450) notes that 'Ben Jonson, in his *English Grammar*, quotes from Sir John Cheke the sentence: "Sedition is an aposteam, which, when it breaketh inwardly, putteth the state in great danger of recovery; and corrupteth the whole commonwealth with the rotten fury that it hath putrified with."'—ED.]

Iohn. We cannot hold mortalities ſtrong hand.
Good Lords, although my will to giue, is liuing,
The ſuite which you demand is gone, and dead.
He tels vs *Arthur* is deceas'd to night.
Sal. Indeed we fear'd his ſickneſſe was paſt cure.
Pem. Indeed we heard how neere his death he was,
Before the childe himſelfe felt he was ſicke :
This muſt be anſwer'd either heere, or hence.
Ioh. Why do you bend ſuch ſolemne browes on me?
Thinke you I beare the Sheeres of deſtiny ?
Haue I commandement on the pulſe of life?
Sal. It is apparant foule-play, and'tis ſhame
That Greatneſſe ſhould ſo groſſely offer it;
So thriue it in your game, and ſo farewell.

85. *hand.*] *hand:*— [turning to the Lords. Cap. [coming forward. Sta. Fle. *hand:*— Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Craig. Words.
91. *ſicke:*] *sick.* Rowe,+, Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Rlfe, Dono. Neils.
96. *foule-play*] *foul play* Cap. Sta. Cam. i,+, Dono. Neils. Craig. *fóul-play* Fle.
98. *game,*] Ff, Rowe,+. *game;* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i. *game!* Cap. et cet.
farewell.] *farewell!* Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.

88. **He tels vs Arthur is deceas'd**] OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, etc., i, 10): In this scene wherein John manifests grief for the death of Arthur, and later, joy at his preservation, the actor must, above all, avoid the indication of veritable grief or joy. It is political success or failure alone that influences John. He mourns Arthur's death only because it drives the nobles into revolt; against them even, he moves but weakly. He rejoices over Arthur's preservation only because he sees therein a means of allaying that uprising which has spread to the people, threatening the throne, which he had thought to strengthen by the second coronation.

92. **This must be answer'd**] KNIGHT (*Studies*, p. 205): This is as knell in John's ears. Throughout this scene the king is prostrate before his nobles;—it is the prostration of guilt without the energy that too often accompanies it. Contrast the scene with the unconquerable intellectual activity of Richard III, who never winces at reproach, seeing only the success of his crimes and not the crimes themselves—as, for example, his answer in the scene where his mother and the widow of Edward upbraid him with his murders:

> 'A flourish, trumpets, strike alarum, drums!
> Let not the heavens hear these tell-tale women
> Rail on the Lord's anointed.'—IV, iv, 148.

93. **bend**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. III, 21): To direct, turn, or incline (the eyes or ears) in the direction of anything seen or heard. [Wright compares: 'See, how the ugly witch doth bend her brows!'—*1 Henry VI:* V, iii, 34.]

97. **grossely offer it**] WRIGHT: That is, clumsily attempt it. So in *1 Henry IV:* 'A mighty and a fearful head they are, If promises be kept on every hand, As ever offer'd foul play in a state.'—III, ii, 69.

98. **So thriue it in your game**] CAPELL (I, pt ii; p. 133): Salisbury's wish, or

Pem. Stay yet (Lord Salisbury) Ile go with thee,
And finde th'inheritance of this poore childe,
His little kingdome of a forced graue.
That blood which ow'd the bredth of all this Ile,
Three foot of it doth hold; bad world the while:
This muſt not be thus borne, this will breake out
To all our forrowes, and ere long I doubt. *Exeunt*
Io. They burn in indignation : I repent: *Enter Meſ.*

101. *forced*] *forcèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
102. *ow'd*] *own'd* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns.
bredth] Ff. *breath* Rowe, Var. '03, '13, '21. *breadth* Pope et cet.
Ile] *Iſle* F_3F_4.
103. *hold;*] *hold*. Sing. ii, Sta. Ktly, Fle. Dono.
while:] Ff, Rowe, Fle. *while.* Coll. i, ii, Wh. i. *while!* Pope et cet.
104. *borne,*] *borne*. Neils.
105. Exeunt] Exeunt Lords. Cap. et seq.
106. Enter Meſ.] Enter Messenger. Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Neils. after *death*, l. 108 Johns et cet.
SCENE III. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. A Room in the Palace, Kemble (after l. 108).
106–108. Aside. Rowe ii, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Cap.

---

his imprecation rather, has a briefness in its expression that makes it dark: the sense is: '*So thrive it* with you *in your game* as your game deserves!' *game* is—play, the cards John had to manage. [Ivor John explains these words as meaning: May the rest of your policy thrive in the same unskilful manner.—And Moore Smith, May it have the success its clumsy execution deserves.—ED.]

101. **a forced graue**] VAUGHAN (i, 64): There is an equivocation in these words. 'A forced grave' means first and simply, according to the style of Shakespeare's age, 'a tomb carefully and artificially raised.' So, 'Under this forced mount they make a little hollow vawt, and leave a hole open where they may go down,' North's Plutarch, *Numa*, p. 68. The second meaning in the equivocation is 'a grave into which he is brought by violent means,' and will be at the present day much more obvious to the reader than is the direct and simple signification of the words. [SCHMIDT (*Lex.*), s. v. force, 3, gives numerous examples of this word used in the sense of *to bring about by violence*.—ED.]

103. **bad world the while**] WRIGHT compares *Richard III:* III, vi, 10: 'Here's a good world the while! why who's so gross, That seeth not this palpable device?' [The meaning is sufficiently apparent in both places: The present time is a bad time.—ED.]

106. **I repent**] SNIDER (ii, 309): A great change is now to be observed in the King. He becomes suspicious in mind and dilatory in action; he is plotting to secure the title which springs from birth, and he gives the nation over to discord from within, and to invasion from without. He has done a great wrong; guilt destroys his mental repose and undermines his mental activity. His opposition to the Church has also turned into an abuse; he plunders it for money, instead of resisting its political encroachments. The struggle, both with Arthur and with Rome, has been pushed beyond the limit of right into the realm of violation. Such is generally the case with the conqueror; he knows no bounds, and he ends by subverting in victory the very principle which he fought to establish. The psycho-

There is no ſure foundation ſet on blood:
No certaine life atchieu'd by others death:
A fearefull eye thou haſt. Where is that blood,
That I haue ſeene inhabite in thoſe cheekes?
So foule a skie, cleeres not without a ſtorme,
Poure downe thy weather: how goes all in France?
Meſ. From France to England, neuer ſuch a powre

109. *haſt.*] Ff, Knt, Del. Sta. Fle. Dono. Neils. *hast;* Rowe et cet.
[To the Messenger. Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
112. *weather:*] *weather.* Johns. Var. 73, Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Sta. Wh. i, Fle. Huds. ii, Rlfe, Dono. Neils.
113. *England,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *England*— Cap. *England.* Roderick, Johns et cet.

logical change and the political change exactly correspond—one reflects the other. [The nobles in revolting] fall, however, into as deep a violation as the king—they become assailants of the nation. . . . Their wrong is manifest—they would sacrifice the independence of their country to their moral indignation. Conscience now turns against nationality, as, in the case of the French King, it turned against the Church. This is the most modern of all collisions to be found in Shakespeare, for it belongs, in its full development, to our own times; it gives an expression of the conflict between the individual sense of duty and the authority of institutions. But in the scope and intensity it has in the present age, it does not belong to the Shakespearean world.

112. **thy weather**] WRIGHT: That is, *thy tempest.* Compare: 'They are louder than the weather or our office.'—*Tempest,* I, i, 40. And *Winter's Tale:* 'Both roaring louder than the sea or weather.'—III, iii, 104.

113. **From France to England . . . a powre**] RODERICK (ap. EDWARDS, p. 254): The meaning is, that 'There never was such a power levied by France, for any foreign preparation; as this, wherewith they are at present ready to invade us.' But the construction, as it stands, will scarcely bear this. With the alteration of the pointing all proceeds easily. 'How *goes* all in France?' (says the King). 'From France to England' (answers the Messenger), i. e., All *in* France goes from France *to* England—and then goes on describing the formidable power designed for the invasion: as if every man in France were engaged in it. This may perhaps be called a poor conceit; but, I doubt, it is but too likely that Shakespeare intended it.—[Johnson follows Roderick's proposed pointing and gives substantially the same explanation, without assigning either of these to another. Johnson's edition and Edwards's volume, in which Roderick's *Remarks* appear, bear the same date, but, inasmuch as Johnson in his *Preface* refers to *The Canons of Criticism,* it is but just to credit Roderick with the priority of this change which has been almost universally adopted.—ED.]—CAPELL (I, pt ii; p. 133): The full junction that moderns make of these words that follow [England] destroys every appearance of sense and consistency. The Folio's [punctuation] directs in part to the present disjunction [see *Text. Notes*], and serves a little to authorise it; its explication is this: The Messenger enters frighted and hastily; hence the imperfection of his answer's beginning, which tended (as we may think) to tell his king the particulars of the 'power' that was coming; but, instead of proceeding, launches suddenly into the ensuing assertion, in a persuasion that what he meant

For any forraigne preparation,
Was leuied in the body of a land.
The Copie of your ſpeede is learn'd by them:
For when you ſhould be told they do prepare,
The tydings comes, that they are all arriu'd.
Ioh. Oh where hath our Intelligence bin drunke?
Where hath it ſlept? Where is my Mothers *care*?

114. *forraigne*] *foreign* F_4.
preparation] *preparatiõn* Fle.
118. *comes*] F_2F_3, Del. Cam.+, Fle. Dono. Neils. Craig. *come* F_4, Rowe et cet.
120. *Where is*] *Where was* Lettsom (ap. Dyce ii.).
care] *ear* Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *care* Ff. et cet.

to set forth were better done in that way.—[Capell refers to Roderick's proposed change with disapproval, and to his explanation as 'a most unlikely interpreting of the words.'—ED.]—PYE (p. 147): This seems to me the sense of the passage. The king enquires about France; the messenger replies, Turn your thoughts from France to England; for thither is the war now transferred, which was the object of his enquiry, the French being already landed.

119, 120. **Intelligence . . . drunke . . . slept**] MALONE compares: 'Was the hope drunk Wherein you dress'd yourself? hath it slept since?'—*Macbeth*, I, vii, 35.

120. **Where is my Mothers care**] WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 3), before having examined the Folio text, and therefore not knowing that there was any doubt about the word 'eare' or *care*, said: '*Care* is prosaic and un-Shakespearean. Shakespeare wrote *eare*'; and thereupon produced many examples from other authors wherein the word *care* was evidently a misprint for *eare*.—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXIV.): We are inclined to believe that [the first letter of this word] is a broken 'e' and not a broken 'c,' and in this we are supported by the opinion of Sir F. Madden and Mr Hamilton. Mr Staunton informs us that in Lord Ellesmere's Folio it is more like a defective Italic *e* than any other letter, but in the two copies of F_1 before us it is certainly Roman, whether 'c' or 'e.' On the other hand, Mr Charles Wright is in favour of an italic *c*. Under these circumstances we have left 'care' in the text.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: We think that 'care' accords better [than 'ear'] with the previous word 'intelligence,' while the Messenger's word 'ear' is sufficiently suggested by the king's words, 'And she not hear of it?'—DYCE (ed. i.), in reference to Walker's conjecture *ear*, says, briefly: 'I cannot agree with him.' [In his ed. ii. Dyce, without reference to his former opinion, remarks that 'This reading ['ear'] (which the context plainly requires) is, in fact, that of the Folio, where, however, the word, at first sight, looks like 'care.'—ED.]—J. HUNTER: It is probable from the context that *eare* was Shakespeare's word. [Hunter, however, retains 'care' in his text.]—WRIGHT: From the messenger's answer [the Folio reading] would seem to have been 'eare'; but 'her ear,' l. 123, may have been suggested by the nearer 'hear' of the King's speech, and not by the more distant word, whether it were 'care' or 'eare.'—[The importance of Walker's list of examples wherein the word *care* or *cares* has been evidently misprinted for *eare* or *eares* is not to be lightly gainsaid, though I am not prepared to concur with him in his remark that the expression 'Where is my mother's care' is 'un-Shakespearean'; unusual it certainly is, but not more so than many others. There is, however, a

That ſuch an Army could be drawne in France,
And ſhe not heare of it?
Meſ. My Liege, her eare
Is ſtopt with duſt : the firſt of Aprill di'de
Your noble mother; and as I heare, my Lord,
The Lady *Conſtance* in a frenzie di'de

121. *could*] *ſhould* F_4, Rowe,+.
124. *Aprill*] *Apill* F_2.
124, 126. *di'de*] *dy'd* F_3F_4.
125. *Your*] *you* Rowe ii. (misprint).
126. *frenzie*] *frenize* F_2.

curious corroboration of the view that the letter here in question is a *c* and not an *e*. In l. 64, Act II, sc. i. occurs the word 'marches'; in V, ii, 139 the word 'sawcinesse,' and the fourth letter in both these words is unmistakably the same damaged type as was used here for the first letter; there can be no doubt in the words 'marches' and 'sawcinesse' as to the letter intended, and I am therefore of the opinion that the word here is 'care' and not *eare;* the broken letter is an Italic *c* with the head slightly injured; were it an *e* there would surely remain some trace of the broken loop. It is, moreover, of a different Italic font than that used commonly in the Folio for proper nouns. This, unfortunately, cannot be shown in the present reprint of the Folio, but the curious student may notice it, if in a copy of the Folio comparison be made between this damaged type and the *c*, for example, in *Constance*, line 126 just below. Furthermore, a comparison of this broken letter in the three words shows a marked deterioration. In 'marches' it is practically unbroken; in the present line it is imperfect, and in 'sawcinesse' it is so far gone that it was evidently cast aside after this. It is a fact sufficiently well known that certain errors of the press were corrected while a volume was printing; thus variations are found in copies of the Folio. A damaged type is sometimes replaced by one that is perfect. In the hope that such might have occurred in the present case I have examined nineteen copies of the First Folio, but in no case could I perceive that there has been any substitution; an additional proof, possibly, that the printers considered the word 'care' in agreement with their copy; had the Author's word been *eare* it is quite likely that the damaged type would have called their attention to this evident misprint, and it thus might have been corrected. Even without this small corroboration that the word is not *eare*, the rest of the sentence seems to require some such word as 'care.' For John to ask, Where is my mother's ear that she did not hear of this? is almost tautological.—ED.]

124. **the first of Aprill di'de**] BOSWELL STONE (p. 61): Historic time vanishes when, after John's Barons have departed, he is informed by a messenger that the French 'are all arriv'd': news which transports us from 1202 to 1216. But when, after brief questions, John is apprized of his mother's death on the first of April, we are borne back to 1204, in which year 'queene Elinor, the mother of King John, departed this life, consumed rather through sorow and anguish of mind than of any other naturall infirmitie' (Holinshed, iii, 167). Perhaps Shakespeare chose April 1 for the day because a celestial appearance—of such sort as was believed to forbode the departure of great persons—is mentioned under the same year, and on the same page, which contains the record of her decease.

126. **Constance in a frenzie di'de**] BUCKNELL (*Mad Folk*, etc., p. 284): The

Three dayes before: but this from Rumors tongue
I idely heard: if true, or falſe I know not.
Iohn. With-hold thy ſpeed, dreadfull Occaſion:
O make a league with me, 'till I haue pleas'd
My diſcontented Peeres. What? Mother dead?
How wildely then walkes my Eſtate in France?

127. *before:*] *before!* Hal. *before.* Ktly, Rlfe.
128. *idely*] *idlely* Theob. ii, Warb. *idly* Han. et seq.
129–131. *With-hold ... Peeres.*] Om. Bell.
129. *Occaſion*] *occasiön* Fle.
131. *Peeres.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. Dono. Craig. *peers!* Cap. et cet.
What?] *My* Pope, Han. *What, my* Bell. *What,* Wh. i, Ktly.
132. *France?*] *France!* Coll. Sing. ii, Dyce, Del. Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. Words. Dono. Neils. Craig.

frightful spectacle of acute mania pursuing its course to a fatal end was no fit subject for dramatic representation. Shakespeare exhibited the growing horror to the extreme limit which decent regard to human weakness permitted, and then mercifully drew the veil. The spectacle of sleepless nights and restless days, of fierce raving and desperate outrage until exhausted nature sinks, this he could not well exhibit to the public gaze. In one short line he tells the end. This concealment of the horrors of furious mania, although their existence is indicated, has its parallel in the treatment of the death of the Queen in *Cymbeline.* The strong mind of this bad woman, one who 'bears down all with her brain,' is lost in maniacal frenzy, brought on by the disappointment of her schemes. The horror of the desperate bed is withheld. Its termination only is recorded with the frenzied confession of her wickedness.

127. **Three dayes before**] FRENCH (p. 20): The Lady Constance died at Nantes in the year 1201, August 31, therefore long before the death of Queen Elinor, although in the play the events are described as taking place close together.

128. **idely**] WRIGHT: That is, *carelessly,* without taking interest in it, or troubling to make further enquiry. Compare: 'As in a theatre, the eyes of men After a well-graced actor leaves the stage, Are idly bent on him that enters next.'—*Richard II:* V, ii, 25. [See V, i, 77.]

129. **Occasion**] WRIGHT: That is, the course of events which were following each other in rapid succession. Compare: 'We see which way the stream of time doth run, And are enforced from our most quiet there By the rough torrent of occasion.'—*2 Henry IV:* IV, i, 72. See also the present play, I, ii, 87.—IVOR JOHN: Perhaps we may best render 'occasion' by *hour of trial.*

131. **discontented**] MOBERLY: Pronounce (as in 'heat' for *heated*), 'My discontent peers. What! my mother dead!'

131, 132. **What? Mother dead? . . . in France**] FLETCHER (p. 37): The nature of the moral tie between Elinor and John—a bond much more of common interest than affection—contrasts finely, throughout the piece, with the mutual tenderness between Constance and her son. The 'little prince' desires not greatness at all; and his mother desires it only for his sake. Elinor and John love power equally for its own sake; but as for personal affection, the mother-queen loves the greatness of her son chiefly for the sway which it secures to herself; while John betrays no spark of filial, any more than he does of any other, attachment. He loves everybody, even his royal mother, just after the fashion that he so vehemently

Vnder whoſe conduct came thoſe powres of France, 133

133. *came*] *come* Han. Coll. ii. (MS.), Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii. Words. 133. *France,*] *France?* F_4.

protests he *loves* Hubert—that is, exactly so far as he can *use* them. Thus, in his exclamation upon hearing of Elinor's death, we find the language not of affection, but of sheer self-interest. Elinor, indeed, is shown here, as in history, to have been John's political genius, infusing such spirit and sagacity as had found their way into his councils; and accordingly, in the course of righteous retribution which forms the sequel of the play, the death of Elinor by the hand of heaven is made by the dramatist to follow immediately upon that brought upon Constance by maternal anguish and despair. 'My mother dead!' is the exclamation we find John still repeating [l. 189]. Feeling the sole stay of his mean and cowardly spirit to be thus struck from him at the moment when he needed it the most, we find his resolution thenceforward utterly paralysed; we see him staggering on from one personal and political meanness to another; abandoning wholly to his 'valiant kinsman Faulconbridge' 'the ordering of this present time'; and dying at last, in spite of all that kinsman's eloquent exhortations, not like a brother of Cœur-de-Lion, with harness on his back, but like a craven plunderer of monastic treasuries, with poison in his stomach.—STUBBS (*Memoriale Walteri Coventriae*, vol. ii, *Preface*, p. xxviii.): The strength of John at the beginning of his reign consisted chiefly in the support of four persons: his mother Elinor, who maintained by prestige and intrigue his hold on the continent; Hubert Walter, Geoffrey Fitz-Peter, and William Marshall, who, as the chief officers in church and state, continued the régime of Henry II. in England. Their support was strong enough not merely to obtain his succession, but to keep up his position for many years, notwithstanding his neglect of their advice and the many acts of tyranny and folly which they strove in vain to counteract. And it is important to note that just as the position of the Angevin dynasty in France collapses on the death of Elinor, so in England the death of Hubert Walter marks the break-up of friendly relations between the king and the church, and the death of Geoffrey Fitz-Peter the final rupture with the baronage; after which the very existence of the royal line depends for years on the adhesion of William Marshall and on the political influence of a new agency, the direct interference of the Popes.

132. **wildely . . . walkes**] STEEVENS: So in one of the *Paston Letters*, vol. iii, p. 99: 'The country of Norfolk and Suffolk stand right wildly.'—[MARSHALL, in reference to this example, says: 'But for this instance of a similar use of the word we might be tempted to think 'wildly' a mistake for *vildly*, i. e., *vilely*.']—MALONE: That is, how ill my affairs go in France.—The verb to 'walk' is used with great license by old writers. It often means to *go*. So, in the Continuation of Hardyng's *Chronicle*, 1543: 'Evil words walke far.' Again, in Fenner's *Compter's Commonwealth*, 1618: 'The keeper admiring he could not hear his prisoner's tongue walk all this while.' [We need not seek so far afield for examples of 'walk' in the sense of *move;* compare: 'Affairs that walk, As they say spirits do, at midnight, have In them a wilder nature than the business That seeks dispatch by day.'—*Henry VIII:* V, i, 13. And: '—those dancing chips O'er whom thy fingers walk with gentle gait.'—*Sonnet* CXXVIII, l. 11.—ED.]—COLLIER (ed. ii.), in corroboration of the justice of the MS. correction, *come*, says: 'John is speaking of present danger from a present leader.'

That thou for truth giu'ſt out are landed heere?
Meſ. Vnder the Dolphin.
Enter Baſtard and Peter of Pomfret.
Ioh. Thou haſt made me giddy
With theſe ill tydings: Now? What ſayes the world
To your proceedings? Do not ſeeke to ſtuffe
My head with more ill newes: for it is full.
Baſt. But if you be a-feard to heare the worſt,
Then let the worſt vn-heard, fall on your head.
Iohn. Beare with me Coſen, for I was amaz'd
Vnder the tide; but now I breath againe
Aloft the flood, and can giue audience

135. *Dolphin*] Ff, Fle *Dolphin's* Ktly. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
136. Enter...Pomfret.] After *tydings*, l. 138. Johns. Var. '73, Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Craig. After *world*, l. 138 Coll. iii.
Baſtard] Faulconbridge Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, '78, '85, Rann. Richard Dono.
and...Pomfret.] Om. Bell.
138. *tydings:*] *tidings*. Rowe ii. et seq.
Now?] Ff, Fle. *Now*, Rowe et cet.
141. *a-feard*] *afraid* F_4, Rowe,+. *afeard* F_2F_3, Cap. et cet.
142. *worſt vn-heard,*] Ff. *worst unheard* Rowe,+, Cam.+, Neils. *worst, unheard*, Cap. et cet.
144. *breath*] Ff, Rowe, Theob. ii, Warb. Cap. *breathe* Pope et cet.

136. **Peter of Pomfret**] LLOYD (*Critical Essay*, ap. SINGER, ii, p. 336): The introduction of Peter of Pomfret, and the indication of the popular agitation and uneasiness with which he is connected, could not be spared in a play that is to be introductory to the histories in several of which popular commotion was to play so large a part. We may recognize in these delusions the seed-bed of the wild and foolish sects, as in the indicated position of the clergy, the confiscation and plunder, that came on with the better consequences of the reformation. In this earliest play and remotest action it was easy to indicate without offence the necessity for harmonising the influences of Church and State, so far at least that they might work if not together, not in opposition.—DOUCE: This man was a hermit in great repute with the common people. Notwithstanding the event is said to have fallen out as he prophesied, the poor fellow was inhumanly dragged at horses' tails through the streets of Warham, and, together with his son, who appears to have been even more innocent than his father, hanged afterwards upon a gibbet.—GREY: Speed (*History of Great Britain*, p. 499) observes that Peter the Hermit was suborned by the Pope's Legate, the French king, and the Barons for this purpose.—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 29): On the entrance of the Prophet of Pomfret, I have introduced, by means of an added stage-direction, a crowd of attendants and the people, which is really a shortened restoration of a scene with the people, contained in the older play, but of which Shakespeare did not make use. It seemed to me that it would be effective thus to give a visible embodiment of the anger and alarm described by Hubert and the Bastard. The bloody judgment of the Prophet drives the rabble frightened and dismayed from the presence of the King. [Kemble omits the character of Peter of Pomfret.—ED.]

145. **Aloft**] WRIGHT: Johnson in his Dictionary gives an instance of 'aloft'

To any tongue, ſpeake it of what it will.
Baſt. How I haue ſped among the Clergy men,
The ſummes I haue collected ſhall expreſſe:
But as I trauail'd hither through the land,
I finde the people ſtrangely fantaſied,
Poſſeſt with rumors, full of idle dreames,
Not knowing what they feare, but full of feare.
And here's a Prophet that I brought with me
From forth the ſtreets of Pomfret, whom I found
With many hundreds treading on his heeles:
To whom he ſung in rude harſh ſounding rimes,
That ere the next Aſcenſion day at noone,
Your Highnes ſhould deliuer vp your Crowne.
Iohn. Thou idle Dreamer, wherefore didſt thou ſo?
Pet. Fore-knowing that the truth will fall out ſo.
Iohn. *Hubert*, away with him : impriſon him,
And on that day at noone, whereon he ſayes
I ſhall yeeld vp my Crowne, let him be hang'd.
Deliuer him to ſafety, and returne,
For I muſt vſe thee. O my gentle Coſen,
Hear'ſt thou the newes abroad, who are arriu'd?
Baſt. The *French* (my Lord) mens mouths are ful of it:
Beſides I met Lord *Bigot*, and Lord *Salisburie*

147. *Clergy men*] F_2F_3. *Clergy-men* F_4, Rowe, Pope, Theob. i, Han. Cam. Glo. Cla. *clergymen* Theob. ii. et cet.
148. *expreſſe:*] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Wh. i, Huds. *express*. Pope et cet.
149. *trauail'd*] *travel'd* F_4.
151. *Poſſeſt*] *Possess'd* Cap. et seq.
153–165. *And here's...vſe thee*] Om. Bell.
156. *harſh ſounding*] *harsh-sounding* Pope et seq.
156. *rimes*] *rhymes* Steev. et seq.
159. *thou ſo*] *thou say so* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann.
162. *whereon*] *whereof* Neils.
165. [Exit Hubert with Peter. Theob. et seq.
167. French (*my Lord*)] *French, my Lord;* Rowe et seq.
168. Bigot] *Essex* Bell.

---

as a preposition from Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Bk iii. (l. 576): 'Aloft the vulgar constellations thick,' but it is a misprint, either of his own or of the edition which he followed, for 'A loof.'—[MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. aloft. B.) gives, besides the present line, three other examples of 'aloft' used as a preposition: '1509, Hawes *Past. Pl.*, xxxviii, iii, Alofte the basse toure foure ymages stode. 1600, Chapman, *Iliad*, xix, 93: They bear her still aloft mens heads. 1613, Campion, in Arber's *Garner*, III, 279: Aloft the trees . . . Our silent harps we pensive hung.'

164. **Deliuer him to safety**] JOHNSON: That is, give him into safe custody.

168. **Lord Bigot**] WRIGHT: He is called in the old play Richard, earle of Bigot, and in Holinshed Richard, earle de Bigot. Whether this is an error for Roger Bigod. Earl of Norfolf. it is difficult to sav. [See *Dram. Personæ*. o. *Bigot*.]

With eyes as red as new enkindled fire,
And others more, going to ſeeke the graue
Of *Arthur*, whom they ſay is kill'd to night, on your ſuggeſtion.
Iohn. Gentle kinſman, go
And thruſt thy ſelfe into their Companies,
I haue a way to winne their loues againe:
Bring them before me.
Baſt. I will ſeeke them out.
Iohn. Nay, but make haſte: the better foote before.
O, let me haue no ſubiect enemies,
When aduerſe Forreyners affright my Townes
With dreadfull pompe of ſtout inuaſion.
Be Mercurie, ſet feathers to thy heeles,
And flye (like thought) from them, to me againe.

169. *With...fire,*] In parentheses Cap. Var. '78, '85, Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce i, Sta. Hal.

new enkindled] *new-enkindled* Pope et seq.

171. *whom*] Ff, Rowe, Del. Hal. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *who* Pope et cet.

As two lines, ending *night... ſuggeſtion* Rowe ii. et seq.

173. *Companies,*] *company.* Pope, Han. *company:* Theob. Warb. Johns. *companies:* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Sta. Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Words. *companies.* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig.

177–180. *the better...inuaſion*] Om. Bell.

178. *O,*] *O!* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. i, Craig.

ſubiect] *ſubiects* Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han.

179. *Forreyners*] *Foreigners* F_4.

180. *inuaſion.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. i, Dono. Craig. *invasiön.* Fle. *invasion!* Cap. et cet.

---

171. **whom they say**] ABBOTT (§ 410) quotes as a similar confusion of two constructions with *whom:* 'Young Ferdinand whom they suppose is drown'd.'—*Tempest*, III, iii, 92. The two constructions being: 'Ferdinand *who*, they suppose, *is drowned*'; and 'whom they suppose *to be drowned.*' That the idiom may be thus explained Abbott shows by a passage in *Matthew*, xvi, 13, where all the versions, except Wickliffe's, have: 'Whom do men say that I, the son of man, am?' Wickliffe has 'Whom seien men to be mannes sone.'

171. **suggestion**] That is, *secret incitement, temptation.* Compare III, i, 227; and for other examples see, if needful, SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v. 2.).

174. **a way to winne their loues**] Miss PORTER: What was this? See also ll. 130, 131. Another hint at the granting of the Charter as a concession serving his present need? [From John's behaviour to Hubert it is, I think, more likely that his method of winning back the Peers was to consist in laying all the blame for Arthur's death on Hubert.—ED.]

177. **the better foote before**] WRIGHT compares: 'Come on, my lords, the better foot before.'—*Titus Andronicus*, II, iii, 192. [MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) quotes the latter line as the earliest example of this use of the phrase. It does not, however, follow that the author (I am loath to accuse Shakespeare) of that unpleasant tragedy is the originator of the expression.—ED.]

Baſt. The ſpirit of the time ſhall teach me ſpeed.*Exit*
Iohn. Spoke like a ſprightfull Noble Gentleman.
Go after him : for he perhaps ſhall neede
Some Meſſenger betwixt me, and the Peeres,
And be thou hee.
Meſ. With all my heart, my Liege.
Iohn. My mother dead?
Enter Hubert.
Hub. My Lord, they ſay fiue Moones were ſeene to night:
Foure fixed, and the fift did whirle about
The other foure, in wondrous motion.
Ioh. Fiue Moones?
Hub. Old men, and Beldames,in the ſtreets
Do propheſie vpon it dangerouſly :

184–188. Iohn. *Spoke...Liege.*] Om. Bell.
188. [Exit. Rowe et seq.
190. SCENE IV. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
190. Enter...] Re-enter... Cap. et seq.
192. *fixed*] *fixèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
fift] *fifth* F_3F_4.

189. **My mother dead**] MOBERLY: Some real sorrow seems intended; not merely regret that his mother's politic wisdom is now lost to him. [See note by FLETCHER, l. 131, *ante*.]

191. **fiue Moones were seene tonight**] GREY (i, 297): This incident is mentioned by few of our historians. I have met with it nowhere but in Matthew of Westminster and Polydore Vergil, with a small alteration. [Besides the early chroniclers mentioned by Grey, this incident of the five moons is related by Roger of Wendover who wrote in 1235 (vol. ii, 200); by Grafton, 1569 (vol. i, 231); and by Holinshed, 1577 (vol. iii, 163). In the older play the five moons appear above. —ED.]

195–212. **Old men . . . of Arthurs death**] MARSHALL: This powerful description, so vivid in all its details, reads like the result of personal observation. Could Shakespeare have observed such signs of popular excitement after the execution of Mary Queen of Scots? In the old play there is no parallel to this passage, the hint for which may have been taken from Holinshed: 'For the space of fifteene daies this rumour incessentlie run through both the realmes of England and France, and there was ringing for him through townes and villages, as it had beene for his funerals' (vol. ii, p. 286).

196. **propheſie**] WRIGHT: 'Prophesy' in this passage appears to be used not so much in the sense of foretelling future events predicted by this phenomenon as in that of commenting upon and expounding the phenomenon itself, making it the text of a dangerous discourse. Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying* was not the liberty of predicting future events, but of expounding scripture. The religious exercise known by this name is described by Bacon in *Considerations touching the Edification and Pacification of the Church of England* (Letters and Life, ed. Spedding, iii, 119).

Yong *Arthurs* death is common in their mouths,
And when they talke of him, they ſhake their heads,
And whiſper one another in the eare.
And he that ſpeakes, doth gripe the hearers wriſt,
Whilſt he that heares, makes fearefull action
With wrinkled browes, with nods, with rolling eyes.
I ſaw a Smith ſtand with his hammer (thus)
The whilſt his Iron did on the Anuile coole,
With open mouth ſwallowing a Taylors newes,
Who with his Sheeres, and Meaſure in his hand,
Standing on ſlippers, which his nimble haſte
Had falſely thruſt vpon contrary feete,

198–212. Mnemonic Pope, Warb. et cet.
207, 208. *which...feete,*] Ff, Rowe,+, Cam.+, Neils. In parentheses, Cap.
208. *contrary*] *contráry* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

200, 202. **And he that speakes . . . with rolling eyes**] MALONE: This description may be compared with a spirited passage in *Edward III:* 'Our men with open mouths and staring eyes Look on each other, as they did attend Each others words, and yet no creature speaks; A tongue ty'd fear hath made a midnight hour, And speeches sleep through all the waking regions,' [IV, v; ed. Collier, p. 80].

207, 208. **slippers . . . vpon contrary feete**] BOSWELL: The following notes afford a curious specimen of the difficulties which may arise from the fluctuations of fashion. What has called forth the antiquarian knowledge of so many learned commentators is again become the common practice at this day.—JOHNSON: I know not how the commentators understand this important passage, which, in Dr Warburton's edition, is marked as eminently beautiful, and, on the whole, not without justice. But Shakespeare seems to have confounded the man's shoes with his gloves. He that is affrighted or hurried may put his hand into the wrong glove, but either shoe will equally admit either foot. The Author seems to be disturbed by the disorder which he describes.—[THEOBALD, in a letter to Warburton dated Jan. 6, 1729, remarked on this same fact of having 'shoes or slippers particular for one foot, and not the other,' but omitted all reference to this in his edition. (See Nichols, ii, 392.) Johnson's note called forth a veritable shower of references selected by Steevens, Tollet, and Malone to show that in Shakespeare's time shoes were shaped as the ancient sandals for the right and left foot. These quotations occupy a page and a half in the Variorum of 1821; but do not, I think, need to be given the same amount of space here. The very fact of Shakespeare's mentioning 'contrary feet' seems sufficient proof of the fashion. Malone in concluding his note says: 'It should be remembered that tailors generally work barefooted; a circumstance which Shakespeare probably had in his thoughts when he wrote this passage. I believe the word "contrary," in his time, was frequently accented on the second syllable, and that it was intended to be so here. So Spenser, "That with the wind contrary courses sew."—*Faerie Queene*' (Bk IV, cant. ix, verse 26). As regards 'contrary' used as an adjective, Malone is quite right; but the noun, 'the contrary,' is uniformly accented on the first syllable.—IVOR JOHN cogently remarks that 'Johnson's curious note would never have been written

Told of a many thouſand warlike French,
That were embattailed, and rank'd in Kent.
Another leane, vnwaſh'd Artificer,
Cuts off his tale, and talkes of *Arthurs* death.
Io. Why ſeek'ſt thou to poſſeſſe me with theſe feares?
Why vrgeſt thou ſo oft yong *Arthurs* death?
Thy hand hath murdred him : I had a mighty cauſe
To wiſh him dead, but thou hadſt none to kill him.
H. No had (my Lord?) why, did you not prouoke me?

209. *Told*] *He told* Long MS. ap. Cam. ii.

210. *embattailed*] *embatteled* F_4, Rowe, +, Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Var. '03, '13, Knt, Del. Huds. i. *embattailéd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

215. *murdred*] F_2, Fle. Neils. *murdered* F_3F_4. *murther'd* Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Rlfe. *murder'd* Cap. et cet.

215, 216. *I had...kill him.*] Two lines, the first ending *dead*, Dono.

215. *I had*] *I'd* Vaughan, Words.

215. *a mighty cauſe*] *a cause* Pope, + (—Var. '73). *mighty cause* Steev. Var. '03, '13, Walker (Crit., i, 37), Words.

217. H.] Hub. Rowe et seq.

No had] *Had none* Rowe ii,+, Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Coll. i, Del. i, Huds. i, Dono. *None had* Knt. *No cause* Del. conj. (withdrawn), Cartwright.

why,] *why* F_4, Rowe i.

you not] *not you* Var. '78, '85, Rann.

---

if he had tried to suggest a reason why Shakespeare should have alluded to an obvious impossibility'—We may also say that his note would have been modified had Johnson consulted any work on the history of fashions or of costume; but we need not further continue this discussion *à propos des bottes*.—ED.]

209. **a many**] WRIGHT: So in *Henry V:* IV, i, 127: 'So should he be sure to be ransomed, and a many poor men's lives saved.' [Compare also I, i, 193; see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 87.]

210. **embattailed**] WRIGHT: That is, set in order of battle. See *Henry V:* IV, ii, 14, where the first Folio has: 'The English are embattail'd, you French Peeres.'

217. **No had (my Lord?)**] COLLIER (ed. i.): 'No had' may have been misprinted for '*None* had'; but it is more likely that Hubert took up and repeated the King's words.—ARROWSMITH (*N. & Q.*, 1853; I, vii, 520) produced a number of examples of this mode of speech, *no did, no will, no had;* it is, however, not necessary to give all of these; but two or three are sufficient to prove, as Arrowsmith wished, that here the Folio is quite right and those who wished to amend it wrong: '—the whole world Yields not a workman that can frame the like. *Fort.* No does?'—*Old Fortunatus* (*Old Eng. Plays*, ed. Dilke, iii, p. 140). 'I am an elde fellowe of fifty wynter and more, And yet in all my lyfe I knewe not this before. *Person.* No dyd, why sayest thou so, upon thyselfe thou lyest.'—*John Bon and Mast. Person*, [Percy Soc. Pub., vol. xxx, p. 15]. '*Chedsey.* Christ said, "Take, eat, this is my body"; and not "Take ye, eat yea." *Philpot.* No did, master doctor?'—Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. vii, p. 637, Catley's edition. '*Careless.* No, forsooth; I do not know any such, nor have I heard of him that I wot of. *Martin.* No have, forsooth: and it is even he that hath written against this faith.'

Iohn. It is the curſe of Kings, to be attended 218

218–224. Mnemonic Warb.

—Ibid., p. 665. [COLLIER (ed. ii.), evidently influenced by these examples, restored the Folio text without referring to Arrowsmith; but instancing a somewhat similar form: 'No hath not?'—*As You Like It*, I, iii, 93.—ED.]—WRIGHT, in addition to those examples collected by Arrowsmith, quotes Peele's *Edward I:* 'Q. Elinor . . . You will not leave? let be I say. *Longsh.* I must be better chid. *Q. Elin.* No will?'—ed. Dyce (1861), p. 392.

218. **It is the curse of Kings**, etc.] WARBURTON: This plainly hints at Davison's case in the affair of Mary Queen of Scots, and so must have been inserted long after the first representation.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 134) is inclined to subscribe to the truth of the first part of Warburton's remark that there is here a reference to Davison's case. 'But where,' continues Capell, 'the remarker goes on "and so must have been inserted long after the first representation,"—this he must have pen'd in his sleep; For how do these speeches prove themselves an after-insertion, when the business alluded to was prior by four years to even the *first* representation, as he calls it, meaning play? which play if he had known, he would not have dreamt of a second made out of it by insertions and patches, as his words indicate.' [The 'play' to which Capell here refers is, of course, *The Troublesome Raigne.*—ED.]—MALONE: It is extremely probable that our Author meant to pay his court to Elizabeth by this covert apology for her conduct to Mary. The Queen of Scots was beheaded in 1587, some years, I believe, before he had produced any play on the stage.—DOUCE (i, 406): It may be doubled whether any such apology [as Malone suggests] would be thought necessary during the life of Elizabeth. May it not rather allude to the death of the Earl of Essex? If this conjecture be well founded, it will serve to ascertain the date of the composition of the play, and to show that Meres had mistaken the older piece for Shakespeare's.—KNIGHT: If Shakespeare had been the idiot that these critics would represent him to have been, Elizabeth would very soon have told him to keep to his stage, and not meddle with matters out of his sphere; for, unquestionably, the excuse which John attempts to make, could it have been interpreted into an excuse for Elizabeth, would have precisely the same effect with regard to Elizabeth which it produces with regard to John—it would have made men despise as well as hate the one as the other. [Knight characterizes Douce's note in regard to Essex as 'utterly worthless.'—ED.]—W. W. LLOYD (ap. SINGER, ii, p. 389): Doubtless we may be more familiar now, from the revelation of private documents, with the detailed meanness and cruelty of the Queen's highness than even her contemporaries; but still so much was notorious at the time from Davison's defense, of the cajolery brought to bear upon him and his treacherous requital, that it seems impossible that the royal villainy of John could ever have been exhibited upon the stage without receiving its application from every beholder. The application is salient even in the earlier play, but in Shakespeare's elaboration it is ten times more so.—COURTENAY (i, 19): This scene was apparently suggested by a passage from Holinshed: 'Hubert de Burgh did preserve him [Arthur] from that injury. . . . For he considered that King John had resolved upon this point only in his heat and fury . . . and that afterwards, upon better advisement, he would both repent himself so to have commanded and give them small thanks that would see it put in execution,' [vol. iii, p. 165]. And this is the only passage which leads me to believe that Shakespeare

[218. Iohn. It is the curse of Kings, to be attended]

did not *entirely* rely upon the old play. That piece describes John as repenting vehemently; but there is nothing upon which these fine touches [ll. 218 et seq.] can have been founded. As Holinshed affords a sufficient foundation for [this passage and ll. 241–251], it is doubtless unnecessary to have recourse to any courtier-like or political motive in the poet. But from the unbounded love of flattery and personal attention which characterized our celebrated Queen, I attribute much probability to this opinion of the critics [Warburton and Malone].—F. VICTOR HUGO (iii, 465): If this reference to the execution of the Queen of Scots was on a firm foundation, it would aid us in clearing up some obscure corners in Shakespeare's play. If the death of Arthur was, in the Poet's thought, but the symbol of the death of Mary Stuart, King John should be regarded as the personification of Elizabeth. Then all the incidents of the drama will be no more than allusions to contemporary events. Pandulph excommunicating John will be the Pope launching his bull of anathema against Elizabeth. The absurd Duke of Austria killed by the sympathetic Bastard will be Philip II. conquered by the English people. King Philip of France, alternately upholding and deserting the cause of Arthur, will be Henri III., upholding and abandoning successively the cause of Mary Stuart. The alliance proposed between the Dauphin and Blanche of Castile will be the projected match between the Duc d'Anjou, brother of Henri III. and Elizabeth. The revolt of Pembroke and Salisbury, making common cause with a stranger to punish the murderer of Arthur, will be, by allegory, the rebellion of the Duke of Suffolk and the Earl of Northumberland allying themselves with the catholics to deliver Mary Stuart. Finally, the invaders, chased from the country by the Bastard, will be the Armada conquered by the English nation; and the magnificent apostrophe with which the piece terminates will be the cry of victory uttered by the patriotic Poet.—Rev. JOHN HUNTER: The murder of Thomas à Becket may also be referred to, [as well as the execution of the Queen of Scots].—MOBERLY also quotes as an example the behaviour of Fitzurse and his companions on Henry's rash exclamation against Becket. Continuing, Moberly says: '"To understand a law on a hint of authority" seems a strange expression for understanding a command upon a hint. "Law" or "a law" is in Shakespeare always a rule of some generality; indeed, his legal instinct would hinder his using the word to express the mere will of the sovereign. If the text is correct, Shakespeare may perhaps have been thinking of those who "establish mischief for a law" (*Psalm* xciv, 20). But the passage looks more as if there had been interpolation, the original connection being: "And on the winking of authority To know the meaning, when perchance it frowns More upon humour than advised respect." And the addition might be accounted for by supposing that the play was written in 1595 or 1596, but that the interpolated words were afterwards added in allusion to the death of Essex (against the queen's will) in 1601. Such was the popularity of this unfortunate nobleman, that every time Elizabeth sent him on an expedition whole sheets of new songs in his honour were sung about the streets.' As to the question of there being here a reference to Elizabeth's behaviour to Davison after the execution of the Queen of Scots, Moberly replies: 'Certainly, *if* Shakespeare was in a position to know such intimate and secret history; but only on that condition.'—DEIGHTON, in answer to Warburton and Malone, says: 'But surely Elizabeth could not even pretend to pretend that the execution of Mary was not a deliberate act on her part.' [Courtenay's quotations from Holinshed and his con-

By ſlaues, that take their humors for a warrant,
To breake within the bloody houſe of life,
And on the winking of Authoritie
To vnderſtand a Law; to know the meaning
Of dangerous Maieſty, when perchance it frownes
More vpon humor, then aduis'd reſpect.
Hub. Heere is your hand and Seale for what I did.
Ioh. Oh, when the laſt accompt twixt heauen & earth

220. *within*] Om. Ff, Rowe. *into* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
225. [The King snatches the warrant out of Hubert's hands. Hal.
226. *Oh,*] *O!* Coll. Del. Huds. i, Craig.
226. *accompt*] F_2, Fle. *account* F_3F_4, Rowe et cet.
heauen] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).

clusion that we need not here suppose any direct reference to the secret court-history of Shakespeare's day are quite sufficient. Moberly's objection on the ground of Shakespeare's lack of knowledge of such history applies equally, I think, to the case of Essex.—ED.]

220. **the bloody house of life**] DELIUS compares: 'Most sacriligious murther hath broke ope The Lord's anointed temple, and stole thence The life of the building.'—*Macbeth*, II, iii, 72–74.—WRIGHT: That is, the house of life which thereby becomes bloody. For this proleptic use of the adjective, see *Macbeth*, III, iv, 76: 'Ere humane statute purged the gentle weal,' that is, purged the commonwealth and made it gentle.—MOORE SMITH: I see no reason for thinking with Wright that 'bloody' is here proleptic. 'The bloody house of life' is surely the house of life which is full of blood until it is broken into and the blood spilt. Compare: 'this confine of blood and breath,' l. 256.

221, 222. **And on the winking . . . a Law**] IVOR JOHN: That is, when one in authority winks, to interpret it as a command.

223. **dangerous**] DEIGHTON: 'Dangerous' seems here to mean, when in a state of fury. [No blame could attach to any minister or attendant who followed out commands given by the king in a state of fury. 'Dangerous' has here, perhaps, the older meaning as given by Murray: 'Difficult or awkward to deal with, haughty, arrogant; the opposite of affable,' and of this use he gives several examples, as: 'He was to synful man naught despitous Ne of his speche daungerous ne digne.'—Chaucer, Prologue, l. 517.

224. **More vpon humor . . . respect**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: That is, more on account of captiousness and ill-temper than from deliberate consideration or motive. [Compare: '—'tis worse than murder To do upon respect such violent outrage.'—*King Lear*, II, iv, 22.]

225. **Heere is . . . I did**] DEIGHTON: For this and the following speeches, compare the dialogue between Bolingbroke and Exton, *Richard II:* V, vi, 34–52.

226. **Ioh. Oh, when the last accompt**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 70) [At this line] Garrick snatched the warrant from Hubert's hand, and grasping it hard, in an agony of despair and horror, he threw his eyes to heaven, as if self-convicted of murder, and standing before the great judge of the quick and dead to answer for the infringement of the divine command.

226. **the last accompt twixt heauen & earth**] WORDSWORTH (*Sh's Knowledge*

Is to be made, then ſhall this hand and Seale 227
Witneſſe againſt vs to damnation.
How oft the ſight of meanes to do ill deeds,
Make deeds ill done? Had'ſt not thou beene by, 230

228. *damnation.*] Ff, Rowe,+ (—Var. '73), Coll. Del. Huds. i, Dono. Craig. *damnatiõn.* Fle. *damnation!* Cap. et cet.

229–232. Mnemonic Warb.

230. *Make*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Dyce, Cam.+, Words. John, Marsh. Neils. *Makes* Theob. et cet.

deeds ill done] *ill deeds done* Cap. conj. Knt, Dyce, Sta. Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Hal. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Words. Craig. *deeds ill-done* Fle.

230. *Had'ſt*] *for hadst* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *Hadest* Cap. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Ktly, Fle. *O hadst* Cartwright.

not thou] *thou not* Sta. Fle. *thou not then* Lettsom, Huds. ii.

---

and Use of Bible, p. 302): It was to be expected that the circumstances of the judgement day, as they are revealed to us in Scripture, would make a deep and lasting impression upon a mind like Shakespeare's. Accordingly, when he desires to give more than ordinary effect to deep passion, to indignation and horror at crime committed, or to affliction and distress at calamity incurred, he has recourse to images which are associated with the final doom—the sounding of the last trump, the discomfiture of creation, the dissolution of the heavens and the earth. (See *Lear*, V, iii, 263; *Macbeth*, II, iii, 83; *Rom. & Jul.*, II, iii, 67; *2 Henry VI:* V, ii, 40–43; *Hamlet*, III, iv, 48–51.)

230. **Make**] MARSHALL: Some editors alter 'make' to *makes*, but unnecessarily; the plural is suggested by 'means' in the previous line. [Or, perhaps, by 'deeds,' the word directly preceding the verb.—ED.]

230. **deeds ill done**] KNIGHT: We have ventured upon a transposition [see *Text. Notes*]. The original might apply to good deeds unskilfully performed.—COLLIER (ed. i.) says that the Rev. H. Barry suggests the transposition, adopted by Knight, for which there may be some ground; but the words as they stand in the Folios 'are very intelligible, whether the adjective be put before or after the substantive; "ill" is here not an adverb, but agrees with "deeds."'—[The MS. Corrector is, however, with Collier more potent than either the Reverend Barry or Knight, and on his authority Collier (ed. ii.) adopts the transposition, remarking that although the original is intelligible, the reversal of the adjective was merely an error of the press.—ED.]—DYCE: With Mr Knight and Mr Collier's MS. Corrector, I have made a transposition, which is obviously necessary, not so much because, as Mr Knight says, the old reading 'might apply to good deeds unskilfully performed,' as because in such passages the order of the words which are emphatically repeated is rarely, if ever, changed.—R. G. WHITE also adopts the transposition, but, as he admits, with some hesitation, in spite of the sanction given it by Collier's MS. Corrector and Dyce; in answer to the latter's note White says: 'But it should be observed that writers before the middle of the seventeenth century take a much greater latitude than we do now in the placing of adverbs (as well as adjectives), and often place them before the verb when they intend to qualify the substantive which is the subject of the predication; so in this case, "a deed ill done" may have been put for "an ill deed done."'—[A somewhat singular lapse of memory on White's part, especially as the text was directly before him, reading 'deedes ill' and not '*a deed*,' as he quotes it.—ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 69): The phrase

A fellow by the hand of Nature mark'd,
Quoted, and ſign'd to do a deede of ſhame,
This murther had not come into my minde.
But taking note of thy abhorr'd Aſpect,
Finding thee fit for bloody villanie:
Apt, liable to be employ'd in danger,

234. *Aſpect*] *aspéct* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt i, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

'makes ill deeds done' might have fairly answered the purpose here; but its substitution for 'makes deeds ill done' is officious. 'Ill done' is a mere epithet describing the quality of 'deeds,' just as if the Poet had written 'ill done deeds,' and it is the equivalent of 'ill' in the line above. 'Makes' means 'brings into existence'; and the whole aphorism is: 'How often does the sight of means to do evil deeds, produce evil deeds.'—IVOR JOHN: It is tempting to read 'Make ill deeds done' with Knight. But the Folios are unanimous, and it seems to me that their reading is undoubtedly right, meaning: 'How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds makes deeds done which it were ill to do'—in fact, 'ill' is a proleptic adjective.—MARSHALL: The transposition is absolutely necessary not only to the sense but also to the force of the passage, which is weakened if the 'ill deeds' are not repeated in the same order as that in which they occurred before. We may compare with this passage the following in Beaumont and Fletcher's *A King and no King*, III, iii: '*Arb.* If there were no such instruments as thou, We kings could never act such wicked deeds.'—Works, vol. i, p. 66. The whole scene between Arbaces and Bessus may be read and compared with this, certainly not to Shakespeare's disadvantage. The break, caused by the deficient syllable in the middle of this line, is very dramatic, and is not to be 'corrected' by the weak device of printing *hadest* instead of 'hadst.' The actor naturally supplies the hiatus by a half groan, half sigh. [I do not know to what edition of Beaumont and Fletcher Marshall's reference (vol. i, p. 66) applies; but in Dyce's edition, vol. ii, p. 297, there is given a note by the editor of the edition of 1778, George Colman, calling attention to the similarity of thought and situation in these two plays.—DAWSON also suggests that the missing syllable of this line be supplied by a '*gesture*' or 'inarticulate cry.' —ED.]

232. Quoted] WRIGHT: That is, *noted;* from the notes or marks in the side (*coté*) or margin of a book. Cotgrave (*Fr. Dict.*) has: '*Quoter.* To quote or note in the margent, to note by the way.' Compare: 'He's quoted for a most perfidious slave.'—*All's Well*, V, iii, 305.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 112) asserts that 'quoted,' as used frequently by Shakespeare, is 'a playhouse word. The characters, who are to be called by the prompter's boy to be ready for the scene, are quoted by him in the margin of the play.'—[A most alluring explanation of the present passage and a metaphor quite in Shakespeare's manner. Nature the universal prompter of mankind assigning and calling each man to play his part on the world's stage. It has additional force, moreover, coming from one who was himself an actor, thoroughly conversant with theatrical slang. Whether the word was a survival from the time of Shakespeare it is impossible to say. MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. quote) does not record any such restricted meaning among the many senses of this word.—ED.]

I faintly broke with thee of *Arthurs* death:
And thou, to be endeered to a King,
Made it no conſcience to deſtroy a Prince.
Hub. My Lord.
Ioh. Had'ſt thou but ſhooke thy head, or made a pauſe
When I ſpake darkely, what I purpoſed:
Or turn'd an eye of doubt vpon my face;
As bid me tell my tale in expreſſe words:

238. *endeered*] *endearèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
239. *Made*] *Mad'st* Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Rann.
240. *My Lord.*] *My Lord*— Rowe ii. et seq.
241–246. Mnemonic Warb.
242. *purpoſed*] *purposèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
244. *As*] *Or* Pope,+, Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann. *And* Mal. Var. '21, Sing. i, Ktly, Dyce ii, iii, Words.
expreſſe] *express* Fle. Huds. ii.

---

239. **Made it no conscience**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. conscience, IV, 11): *To make* (*a*) *conscience*, to make it a matter of conscience, to have scruples about, to scruple. 1579, Lyly *Euphues* (Arber), 92: 'Thou hast thought it no conscience to betray me.' 1586, *Let., Earle of Leycester*, 25: 'Therefore have we little reason to trust her in that, whereof she maketh so small a conscience.'

241. **Had'st thou but shooke thy head, etc.**] JOHNSON: There are many touches of nature in this conference of John with Hubert. A man engaged in wickedness would keep the profit to himself, and transfer the guilt to his accomplice. These reproaches, vented against Hubert, are not the words of art or policy, but the eruptions of a mind swelling with consciousness of a crime, and desirous of discharging its misery on another. This account of the timidity of guilt is drawn *ab ipsis recessibus mentis*, from the intimate knowledge of mankind, particularly that line in which he says, that *to have bid him tell his tale* in *express words*, would have *struck him dumb:* nothing is more certain than that bad men use all the arts of fallacy upon themselves, palliate their actions to their own minds by gentle terms, and hide themselves from their own detection in ambiguities and subterfuges.

244. **As bid me tell**] M. MASON: That is, such an eye of doubt as bid me tell my tale, etc. [Both DOUCE and COLLIER likewise so interpret this phrase. The former taking the words 'an eye of doubt' as elliptical.—ED.]—MALONE, in support of his reading *And*, says: 'As we have here "As" printed instead of *And*, so *vice versa*, in *Henry V*, 4to 1600, we find *And* misprinted for "As": "And in this glorious and well foughten field We kept together in our chivalry."'—STEEVENS: In the present instance 'as' seems to mean *as if*. 'Had you' (says the king speaking elliptically) 'turned an eye of doubt on my face, *as if* to bid me tell my tale in express words.' [SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) furnishes numerous examples of 'as' with this meaning. This passage he considers, however, an example of the use of 'as' wherein the correlative is omitted, and for a like usage quotes: 'This is a strange thing as ere I looked on.'—*Tempest*, V, i, 289.—ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 70): The whole tenour of John's complaint is this: that Hubert might without speaking a word, and by the mere significance of manner, look, and gesture, have diverted him from his purpose. He commences: 'Hadst thou *but* shook thy head.' Now the word *and*, proposed by Malone, and *or*, proposed by Pope, both imply the necessity of

Deepe ſhame had ſtruck me dumbe, made me break off, 245
And thoſe thy feares, might haue wrought feares in me.
But, thou didſt vnderſtand me by my ſignes,
And didſt in ſignes againe parley with ſinne, 248

248. *with ſinne*] *with sign* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *with me* Cartwright.

Hubert's speaking as well as of gesticulating, and therefore vitiate the passage. All amendment, too, is based on an erroneous appreciation of the word 'as.' 'As' here signifies *which*, a vulgar expression now, but certainly not more than a proper manner of speaking and writing in Shakespeare's time. Thus, in *Cymbeline*, 'those arts they have as I Could put into them.'—V, v, 338. And again in *Jul. Cæs.*, 'I have not from your eyes that gentleness And show of love as I was wont to have.'—I, ii, 33.—WRIGHT rejects both Pope's and Malone's change for the same reason as does Vaughan, that it was a hint in look or manner, without words, which would have turned John from his purpose.—ABBOTT (§ 280) quotes both the examples given by Vaughan as examples of the use of 'as' in the sense *such as*, and adds thereto: 'With that ceremonious affection as you were wont.'—*Lear*, I, iv, 63. [ABBOTT'S is, I think, the more obvious interpretation.—ED.]—L. CAMPBELL (p. 108): No one who has tried to realise the speech, even in dramatic recitation, can fail to see that a fine point is missed, or rather spoiled, by the reading: '*And* turned an eye of doubt upon my face.'

246. those thy feares] For this construction, compare V, i, 6; and *Macbeth*, II, ii, 61: 'No, this my hand will rather The multitudinous seas incarnadine.'

248. signes . . . with sinne] COLLIER (ed. ii.): There can be no reasonable doubt that *sign* was the Poet's word, and not 'sin.' The king parley'd by signs with Hubert, and Hubert answered in signs the signs of the king; so the German editor: 'Doch du verstandst aus meinen Zeichen mich, Und pflogst durch Zeichen mit dem Zeichen Rath.'—[The translation from which Collier quotes is that of Schlegel-Tieck's, 5th ed. (1853), which was issued shortly after the appearance of Collier's *Notes and Emendations* in order to incorporate many of the MS. Corrector's changes. In the subsequent editions the editors returned, however, to the original translation: 'mit der Sünde Rath,' and it is, therefore, the 5th edition only wherein the lines appear as Collier gives them: 'mit dem Zeichen Rath.' In III, iii, 46 for 'modern' Collier's MS. Corrector reads *widow's*, and in the Schlegel-Tieck, 5th ed., the word 'schwache' is changed to the archaic word for *wittwe*, *wittib*. I instance this merely as another example. While this is a matter of very minor importance, from Collier's note it might be supposed that the German translator was furnishing corroborative evidence of the necessary change of 'sin' to *sign*, whereas it is quite the other way round.—ED.]—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 91): Although [the MS. correction] is specious, the reading of the old copy is perfectly intelligible, and in some respects preferable, and must not be disturbed for a fanciful conjecture.—KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*, i, 258): We take leave to doubt: 'parley with *sign*' is conveyed by the previous 'my signs' and 'signs again.' *Sin* expresses the real or assumed self-condemnation of John—the vile deed of which he could not speak without deep shame. John had not hesitated before to speak of ill deeds, and of the murder of which he spake darkly.—LETTSOM (ap. DYCE, ii.): The MS. Corrector's '*sign*' is not English. Collier and Mommsen both applaud it; yet the one explains it, and the other translates it, as if the conjecture

Yea, without ſtop, didſt let thy heart conſent,
And conſequently, thy rude hand to acte
The deed, which both our tongues held vilde to name.
Out of my ſight, and neuer ſee me more:
My Nobles leaue me, and my State is braued,
Euen at my gates, with rankes of forraigne powres;
Nay, in the body of this fleſhly Land,

251. *vilde*] *vild* F_2F_3, Del. Fle. *vile* F_4 et cet.

name.] *name*— Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Mal. Rann, Steev. Varr. Sing. Hal. Ktly, Dyce, Words.

252. *more:*] *more!* Pope et seq.

254. *forraigne powres*] *foreign pow'rs* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. *foreign powers* F_4 et cet.

255. [Laying his hand upon his breast, Long MS. ap. Cam.

had been '*signs*,' not '*sign*.' '*Signs*' is probably Shakespeare's word.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: 'Sin' accords perfectly with 'the deed' mentioned three lines further on; and there is sufficient consonance between 'sin' and 'signs' to afford the kind of verbal play in iteration that Shakespeare loves to indulge in, and which he has so abundantly indulged in in this particular drama.—MARSHALL characterises the MS. Corrector's change as 'a very foolish and needless alteration.' 'It is difficult,' he continues, 'to imagine a weaker piece of tautology than such a line would furnish; and, in any case, we should have to read *signs*, as Lettsom observes, to make any sense of it. John is complaining that Hubert seemed immediately to comprehend his purpose, though only hinted at in *signs;* and that he did not even delay his consent, much less remonstrate with the proposer of the crime. That he *parleyed with sin* was, in fact, the essence of Hubert's offence.'

250. consequently] WRIGHT: That is, *in consequence, accordingly*. Compare *Twelfth Night:* 'And consequently sets down the manner how.'—III, iv, 79.

250. thy rude hand to acte] VAUGHAN (i, 71): 'To act' is slightly but not fatally irregular after 'let.' If he 'let his heart consent,' he also let his hand act, not 'to act.' But 'to' is sometimes thus prefixed to a second infinitive mood, where it has not preceded the first, in Shakespeare and in other writers of his time. On the other hand, *too* is often spelt 'to' in the oldest copies. *Too* combines with 'consequently' to represent the overt act as an additional step in crime. It is quite uncertain, therefore, whether the Poet would now have written his verses as the text prints, or thus: 'And consequently thy rude hand *too* act.' [Vaughan has, possibly, misunderstood the construction here. There is no irregularity if we take the infinitive 'to act' as directly dependent on the verb 'consent' and not on 'let'; thus: Thou didst let thy heart, and in consequence thy hand, consent to act. Even without this involved construction justification of the infinitive after 'let' may be found. ABBOTT (§ 349) says: '*To* is inserted after "let" both in the sense of to "suffer" and in that of "hinder"'; giving as examples: 'And let no quarrel nor no brawl to come.'—*Twelfth Night*, V, i, 364; and 'If nothing lets to make us happy both.'—*Ibid.*, 256. Vaughan's assertion that '*too* is often spelt "to" in the oldest copies' is difficult either to refute utterly or prove conclusively. The erratic spelling of the early compositors is an unsound foundation whereon to build. In justice to Vaughan it may be said, however, that *one* example occurs in the present play: 'and reason to he should,' V, ii, 136.—ED.]

This kingdome, this Confine of blood, and breathe
Hoſtilitie, and ciuill tumult reignes
Betweene my conſcience, and my Coſins death.
Hub. Arme you againſt your other enemies:
Ile make a peace betweene your ſoule, and you.
Yong *Arthur* is aliue : This hand of mine
Is yet a maiden, and an innocent hand.
Not painted with the Crimſon ſpots of blood,
Within this boſome, neuer entred yet
The dreadfull motion of a murderous thought,

256. *breathe*] *breath*, F_4.
257. *reignes*] *reign* Han. Huds. ii.
259. *enemies:*] *enemies?* F_3. *enemies*, F_4, Rowe.
261. *Yong...aliue*] Transposed to follow l. 269 Bell, Kemble.
262, 263. *hand....blood,*] *hand,...blood:* Ff, Rowe. Cap. *hand,...blood.* Pope et cet.
265. *murderous*] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Dyce, Del. Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig. *murd'rers* Warb. Han. *murtherous* Wh. i, Rlfe. *murd'rous* Pope et cet.

256. **This kingdome**] For references and allusions to the body of man as a microcosm, or world in little, see *Julius Cæsar*, II, i, 75, 76, this edition.

258. **Betweene . . . death**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: This and l. 80 above serve to illustrate each other.—DEIGHTON: That is, there is civil war between my conscience and the desire for my cousin's death. [Deighton is possibly right; at the same time, it seems a rather violent prolepsis to use 'death' for *desire* for a person's death. Is not the conflict to which the king here refers that between conscience and the crime itself?—ED.]

261. **Yong Arthur is aliue**] MARSHALL: These words Charles Kean, with an eye to dramatic effect, transferred to the end of the speech, thus making the question of John in l. 270 ('Doth Arthur live?') an echo of the words immediately preceding. The alteration is certainly one fitted for the stage; but there is not the slightest ground for adopting it in the text. [This transposition is not, however, original with Charles Kean. It occurs also in Bell's ed., which was printed from the prompt copies of the time of Garrick. Kemble also adopted this reading long before Kean.—ED.]

264, 265. **Within this bosome . . . murderous thought**] WARBURTON: Nothing can be falser than what Hubert says in his own vindication; for we find, from Act IV, sc. i, 'the motion of a murd'rous thought had entered into him,' and that very deeply; and it was with difficulty that the tears, the entreaties, and the innocence of Arthur had diverted and suppressed it. Nor is the expression in this reading at all exact, it not being the necessary quality of 'a murd'rous thought' to be 'dreadful,' affrighting, or terrible. For it being commonly excited by the flattering views of interest, pleasure, or revenge, the mind is often too much taken up with those ideas to attend, steadily, to the consequences. We must conclude, therefore, that Shakespeare wrote, 'a *murderer's* thought.' And this makes Hubert speak truth, as the Poet intended he should. He had not committed the murder, and consequently the *motion of a murderer's thought had never entered his bosom.* And in this reading the epithet 'dreadful' is admirably just and in nature. For after the perpetration of the fact, the appetites, that hurried their owner

And you haue ſlander'd Nature in my forme,
Which howſoeuer rude exteriorly,
Is yet the couer of a fayrer minde,
Then to be butcher of an innocent childe.
Iohn. Doth *Arthur* liue? O haſt thee to the Peeres,
Throw this report on their incenſ^{e}d rage,
And make them tame to their obedience.
Forgiue the Comment that my paſſion made

269. *an innocent*] *a guiltless* Pope, Han.
270. *O*] *Ol* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Craig.
haſt] *haſte* F_3F_4.
271. *incenſ^{e}d*] *incensèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
272. *obedience.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Dono. Craig. *obedience!* Cap. et cet.

to it, lose their force; and nothing succeeds, to take possession of the mind, but a dreadful consciousness, that torments the murderer without respite or intermission.—JOHNSON: I do not see anything in this change worth the vehemence with which it is recommended. Read the line either way, the sense is nearly the same, nor does Hubert tell truth in either reading when he charges John with slandering his form. He that could once intend to burn out the eyes of a captive prince, had a *mind* not too *fair* for the *rudest form.*—HEATH (p. 229): According to Warburton's reading and interpretation, the sense of the passage would amount to this: I have not committed the murder. But is this the natural sense of the words? or, would any reader, whose mind had not been prepossessed by the subtleties of Warburton's reasoning, ever have understood them so? I appeal to the reader himself, whether the obvious meaning, even of this reading, be not, I have never entertained even a thought of murder; which is precisely the meaning too of the common reading, for the thought of a premeditated murder is attended with its terrors too before the actual commission. And in saying this also Hubert would equally speak the truth. For it is evident from the first scene of this Act that Hubert had no intention to murder Arthur, but only to burn out his eyes; an operation which, however shocking, numerous examples in history, and the established practice of the Persian court under the late monarchy, sufficiently prove may be performed with safety to life.—F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Censor*, ii, 163): Hubert's exculpation of himself comes favourably from the actor, but has more plausibility than truth; for his assertion of a mind free from the taint of any murderous thought is contradicted by the readiness with which he understood and coincided with John's meaning; to have rendered him truly amiable some passages might have been added to signify that he only undertook the horrid charge to save young Arthur; at present he is only left a very dubious or rather culpable character.

265. motion] That is, *impulse;* compare, 'But from the inward motion to deliver.'—I, i, 222.

267. exteriorly] For other examples of this formation see ABBOTT, § 447.

268, 269. a fayrer minde, Then to be] WRIGHT: That is, a mind too fair to be, &c. [ABBOTT (§ 390) interprets the construction here: 'Than (that which is fit) to be,' &c.]

270. Doth Arthur liue] See note by OECHELHAÜSER, l. 88 above.

Vpon thy feature, for my rage was blinde,
And foule immaginarie eyes of blood
Preſented thee more hideous then thou art.
Oh, anſwer not; but to my Cloſſet bring
The angry Lords, with all expedient haſt,
I coniure thee but ſlowly: run more faſt. *Exeunt.*

Scœna Tertia.

Enter Arthur on the walles.

Ar. The Wall is high, and yet will I leape downe.

275. *foule immaginarie*] *foul-imaginary* Walker, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words.
278. *haſt,*] F_2F_4. *haſte.* F_3, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Del. Coll. ii, Ktly, Cam.+, Dono. Neils. Craig. *haſtel* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words. *haste:* Han. et cet.
279. *coniure*] *cónjure* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

1. Scœna Tertia.] SCENE v. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
A Prison. Rowe. A Street before a Prison. Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. Northampton before the Castle. Dono. The Same. Before the Castle. Cap. et cet.
2. walles.] walls, disguised. Theob. +, Cap. walls, Arthur disguised as a ship-boy. Words.

275. foule immaginarie] VERPLANCK: One of the most frequent confusions of shades of meaning, in our old poets, which strikes the modern reader, is that of the active and passive significations, as *delighted* and *delightful;* as here 'imaginary eyes' for *imagining* or *image-forming* eyes.

279. I coniure thee] WRIGHT: That is, I solemnly adjure thee. The accent is on the first syllable, as in *Macbeth,* 'I conjure you, by that which you profess.'—IV, i, 50.

3. yet will I leape downe] MALONE: Our Author has here followed the old play. In what manner Arthur was deprived of his life is not ascertained. Matthew Paris, relating the event, uses the word *evanuit;* and, indeed, as King Philip afterwards publicly accused King John of putting his nephew to death, without either mentioning the manner of it, or his accomplices, we may conclude that it was conducted with impenetrable secrecy. The French historians, however, say that John, coming in a boat during the night-time to the Castle of Rouen, where the young prince was confined, ordered him to be brought forth, and having stabbed him, while supplicating for mercy, the king fastened a stone to the dead body and threw it into the Seine, in order to give some colour to a report, which he afterwards caused to be spread, that the prince, attempting to escape out of a window of the tower of the castle, fell into the river and was drowned.—[Since Shakespeare here follows the older play, any discussion as to historic accuracy on his part is quite superfluous. The blame, if any, lies with his predecessor, in thus making King John vicariously the destroyer of his nephew. For an interesting summing up of the evidence in the case against John, see Miss Norgate's *John Lackland,* pp. 90–93.—ED.]—OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen,* i, 29): This leap of

Good ground be pittifull, and hurt me not:
There's few or none do know me, if they did,
This Ship-boyes ſemblance hath diſguis'd me quite.
I am afraide, and yet Ile venture it.
If I get downe, and do not breake my limbes,
Ile finde a thouſand ſhifts to get away;
As good to dye, and go; as dye, and ſtay.
Oh me, my Vnckles ſpirit is in theſe ſtones,
Heauen take my ſoule, and England keep my bones. *Dies*

4. *not:*] *not!* Pope et seq.
5. *me, if*] *me; if* Cap. et seq.
10. [Leaps down. Rowe et seq. Leaps down, and is sore wounded. Cap.
11. *Oh me,*] *Oh me!* Pope et seq.
ſpirit] *sprite* Fle.
11. *ſtones,*] *stones!* Cap. *stones*— Sing. Coll. Dyce, Sta. Hal. Wh. i, Huds. Words. *stones.* Ktly.
12. *Heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+, Fle.
keep] *take* Rowe ii.
bones.] *bones!* Theob. et seq.

Arthur into the depths involves a difficulty. It should not be required of the actress to leap from such a height on to the open stage that the fall would be probably fatal. It must, therefore, be the best expedient to have Arthur jump from a wall at the side scene or, better, from a terrace, toward the back of the stage, and then after uttering a piercing cry, to stagger out on the stage, there sinking down, perhaps hidden partly by a set-piece so that the lords do not at once notice the body.

6. **Ship-boyes semblance**] MARSHALL: From what source Shakespeare got the idea of disguising Arthur as a ship-boy is not known. [It is not *known;* but it may be surmised, without the risk of a very serious error, that here Shakespeare felt he might trust to his own imagination and fancy.—ED.]

10. **dye, and go**] This alternative is, of course, an impossibility; but what boy, or man either, would stop to consider grammatical accuracy when about to make a leap for life or death.—ED.

11, 12. **Oh me . . . my bones**] VERPLANCK: In the old *King John*, after his fall, Arthur speaks thus: 'Comfort my mother; shield her from despair When she shall hear my tragic overthrow.' This fond recurrence of the dying youth to his mother is natural and affecting; and I can only account for Shakespeare's throwing it aside, upon the same reason that in *Lear* he has purposely avoided one or two touching incidents of the old play, as thoughts preoccupied by his predecessors, whose works he had taken for the groundwork of his plot, while it was his aim to give a new and original poetical character to the familiar plot.—KNIGHT (*Studies*, p. 206): If any other recollection were wanting, these simple words would make us feel that John was as surely the murderer of Arthur, when the terrors of the boy drove him to an inconsiderate attempt to escape from his prison, as if the assassin, as some have represented, rode with him in the dim twilight by the side of a cliff that overhung the sea, and suddenly hurled the victim from his horse into the engulfing wave; or as if the king tempted him to descend from his prison at Rouen at the midnight hour, and, instead of giving him freedom, stifled his prayers for pity in the waters of the Seine.—RUSHTON (*Sh's Testamentary Lang.*, p. 5) quotes the second of these lines in illustration of a form used in wills of Shakespeare's time, called the Bequest of Soul and Body. Rushton gives as

Enter Pembroke, Salisbury, & Bigot.

Sal. Lords, I will meet him at S. *Edmondsbury*,
It is our safetie, and we muſt embrace
This gentle offer of the perillous time.
Pem. Who brought that Letter from the Cardinall?
Sal. The Count *Meloone*, a Noble Lord of France,
Whoſe priuate with me of the Dolphines loue,

13. Bigot] Essex Bell.
14. *S.*] *Saint* F_2. St F_3F_4.
18. Meloone] Melloone Ff, Ktly, Fle. *Chatillon* Bell. *Melum* Rowe et cet.
19. *with me*] *missive* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *witness* Spedding.
Dolphines] *Dolphin's* F_4, Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin's* Rowe et cet.

an interesting example of this the following from Shakespeare's own will: 'ffirst I comend my soule into the handes of God my Creator . . . and my bodye to the earth whereof yt ys made.'—[It can hardly, I think, be doubted that Rushton is right in thus seeing an allusion to this preliminary bequest, which is, in fact, to be found in the wills of testators long before the time of Shakespeare; for many examples see *Earliest English Wills* (Early English Text Soc., No 78; ed. Furnivall). —ED.]

14. him] That is, the Dauphin. See l. 122.

19. Whose priuate with me] POPE: That is, whose private account of the Dauphin's affection to our cause is much more ample than the letters.—DELIUS, as an example of a similar use of 'private' as a substantive, quotes: 'Nor must I be unmindful of my private.'—Jonson, *Catiline*, III, ii. MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. II. 4) quotes this line from *Catiline* in illustration of 'private' used in the sense of 'A private or personal matter,' as also in Unton, *Correspondence*, 1592, ed. Roxb., 289: 'I will no longer hold your Lordship with this my privatt.' Murray quotes this present line as the only example of 'private' in the sense given above by Pope.—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 208): The notes upon this passage have all referred to the word 'private,' when the blunder lies in 'with me': 'Whose private *missive*,' etc., is the way in which the MS. Corrector says that line should have been printed. This correction seems to imply resort to some original, such as that which the printer of the Folio, 1623, had misread.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 91): It is very improbable that the words 'with me' should have been a misprint for *missive*! Every one familiar with the diplomatic correspondence of the reign of Elizabeth would at once recognise this as a common form of expression for the *oral communication* confided to a trustworthy messenger who carried despatches; and some of the numerous volumes of State Papers of that time would no doubt furnish the express words of the Poet. Allusions to this *private* oral communication are perpetual. 'Haynes' Burleigh Papers' afford many examples. Thus in minutes of Queen Elizabeth's letters to Lord Scrope and others: 'Of which matters we have somewhat more largely imparted our mind to this bearer,' p. 571. 'As for all other things, we remit you to the declaration of our mind by Sir P. Carew,' 'The present time giveth us occasion to send unto you our trusty servant Thomas Warcop, this bearer, to th' intent that you may at good length be better *informed* by him,—then conveniently is to be now don *by writing*,' p. 555. The words of the Folio must still, therefore, continue to 'be taken as the true text' until we have better 'authority' than that of the Corrector for interference.—ANON. (*Black-*

Is much more generall, then theſe lines import.
Big. To morrow morning let vs meete him then.
Sal. Or rather then ſet forward, for 'twill be
Two long dayes iourney (Lords) or ere we meete.
Enter Baſtard.
Baſt. Once more to day well met, diſtemper'd Lords,
The King by me requeſts your preſence ſtraight.
Sal. The king hath diſpoſſeſt himſelfe of vs,
We will not lyne his thin-beſtained cloake

20. *generall, then theſe*] *than these gen'ral* Han.
23. *meete*] *meet him* Ktly.
24. Baſtard.] Faulconbridge. Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. Richard. Words. Dono.
26. *ſtraight*] *ſtrait* F_3, Pope,+.
28, 29. *lyne...nor*] Om. Bell.
28. *thin-beſtained*] Ff. *thin, bestained* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Sta. Ktly. *sin-bestained* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Sing. ii, Huds. ii. *thin bestainèd* Dyce, Fle. Words. *thick bestained* Cartwright. *thin bestained* Rowe et cet.

---

wood's Maga., Sept., 1853, p. 305): We confess that we prefer the MS. Corrector's line, 'Whose private *missive*,' to the ordinary reading. But we are not prepared to say the latter is unintelligible, or that it is not in accordance with the diplomatic phraseology of the time.—R. G. WHITE: There is no doubt that the MS. Corrector's change is a mere modernization, and that 'private' was used in Shakespeare's time and by Shakespeare himself as a noun, or as an adjective absolute, the idea of the noun which we would use it merely to qualify being included in it. For instance: 'Go off; I discard you: let me enjoy my private' (i. e., my privacy).—*Twelfth Night*, III, iv, 100. See also, 'noblemen brought up in delicate,' Peele, *Battle of Alcazar*, ed. Dyce, ii, p. 128.—STAUNTON: That is, *secret despatch.* [In his *Corrigenda* Staunton substitutes for this interpretation, *confidential parley.*—ED.]—IVOR JOHN: 'Private' is here equivalent to private communication either by letter from the Dauphin or in conversation with Melun, more probably the latter.

23. **or ere**] SKEAT (*Dict.*, s. v.): The use of *or* for *ere* is not uncommon; see 'or ever I had seen that day.'—*Hamlet* I, ii, 183. Particularly in the phrase *or ere*, *Tempest*, 'I would Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere It should the good ship so have swallowed.'—I, ii, 10–12; *Macbeth*, IV, iii, 173: 'Dying or ere they sicken.' The forms *or*, *er*, *ar* occur as exact equivalents in the same passage in the three texts of *Piers Plowman*, C. viii, 66, B. v, 459, A. v, 232. All are from A. S. *ær*, *ere*, or from its equivalents in various English dialects. It is probable that *or ere* arose as a reduplicated expression, in which *ere* repeats and explains *or;* later this was confused with *or e'er;* whence *or ever*. [See also V, vi, 51.]

25. **distemper'd**] WRIGHT: That is, disordered by passion, ill-humoured. Compare *Tempest*, IV, i, 145: 'Never till this day Saw I him touch'd with anger so distemper'd.'

28. **lyne**] WRIGHT: 'Line' is used figuratively, in the sense of *strengthen from within*, in *Henry V:* II, iv, 7: 'To line and new repair our towns of war.' And in *Macbeth*, I, iii, 112: 'Or did line the rebel With hidden help and vantage.'

28. **thin-bestained cloake**] COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 208) considers the hyphen here as conclusive proof that the MS. Corrector's reading, '*sin*-bestained,' is 'the

With our pure Honors: nor attend the foote
That leaues the print of blood where ere it walkes.
Returne, and tell him ſo: we know the worſt.
Baſt. What ere you thinke, good words I thinke were beſt.
Sal. Our greefes, and not our manners reaſon now.
Baſt. But there is little reaſon in your greefe.
Therefore 'twere reaſon you had manners now.

29. *nor*] *We'll not* Kemble. 31. *ſo:*] *so.* Neils.

genuine text'; 'a fine compound,' he adds, 'the use of which is amply justified by the crimes of which the revolted lords consider John guilty.'—ANON. (*Blackwood's Maga.*, Sept., 1853, p. 306): 'Sin-bestained' is plausible. But there is also a propriety in the use of the word 'thin.' The king's cloak (that is, his authority) was *thin* because not lined and strengthened with the power and honours of his nobles. The text ought not to be altered. [KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*, p. 259) and VAUGHAN (i, p. 73) reject the MS. correction for substantially the same reasons as the foregoing.—ED.]—DYCE: Though it be true that the Folio has 'thin-bestained,' it is equally certain that *the MS. Corrector's alteration does not receive the slightest support from the words being so hyphened;* for the Folio exhibits numerous passages in which, contrary to modern usage, the hyphen is employed; e. g., elsewhere in the present play: 'who hath read or heard Of any kindred-action like to this,' III, iii, 15, 16; 'The mis-plac'd-John should entertaine an houre,' III, iii, 138; 'A cockred-silken wanton braue our fields,' V, i, 75.—SINGER (*Sh. Vindicated*, p. 92): '*Sin*-bestained' is doubtless a good and probable conjectural emendation.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 304): 'Thin bestained' is most probably a misprint for '*sin* bestained, as the corrector in Collier's folio conjectures. [In his own edition a few years later White speaks of this correction as 'plausible, but unnecessary.'—ED.]—MOBERLY decides against the MS. correction, since '"thin" means *easily seen through*, and therefore requiring to be lined, as in *Henry VIII:* "(Flatteries) are too thin and bare To hide offences."—V, iii, 125.'—MASSEY (p. 598): I believe that *Sonnet* lxxii. illustrates this line and comparatively proves 'thin bestained' to be the wrong reading:

> 'Ah wherefore with infection should he live,
> And with his presence grace impiety,
> That sin by him advantage should achieve,
> And lace itself with his society?'

Here sin lacing or decorating itself assuredly suggests that the cloak to be, or not to be, lined 'with our pure honors' was *sin*-bestained, not 'thin bestained.' The cloak might require new lining, either because it was very thin, or much soiled, but Shakespeare would hardly have put forth such a double reason for a single lining. Lastly, '*our pure* honours' necessarily implies '*his sin* bestained cloak.'—IVOR JOHN: 'Thin' and 'bestained' offer two distinct ideas, and 'thin' is absolutely necessary because it carries out the idea of 'line.'

33. **greefes**] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. sb. 2b.): A wrong or injury which is the subject of formal complaint or demand for redress. [Compare *1 Henry IV:* 'The King hath sent to know The nature of your griefs.'—IV, iii, 42.]

Pem. Sir, ſir, impatience hath his priuiledge.
Baſt. 'Tis true, to hurt his maſter, no mans elſe.
Sal. This is the priſon : What is he lyes heere?
*P.*Oh death, made proud with pure & princely beuty,
The earth had not a hole to hide this deede.
Sal. Murther, as hating what himſelfe hath done,
Doth lay it open to vrge on reuenge.
Big. Or when he doom'd this Beautie to a graue,
Found it too precious Princely, for a graue.
Sal. Sir *Richard*, what thinke you? you haue beheld,
Or haue you read, or heard, or could you thinke?
Or do you almoſt thinke, although you ſee,
That you do ſee? Could thought, without this obiect
Forme ſuch another? This is the very top,

36. *his*] *its* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Sing. i, Coll. ii.
37. *his*] *its* Pope,+.
mans] *man's* Knt. *man* Ff. et cet.
38. [Seeing Arth. Pope et seq. (subs.).
39. *Oh death,*] *Oh Death!* Coll. Wh. i, Huds. i.
beuty,] F_1F_2. *beauty,* F_3F_4, Coll. i, ii, Wh. i, Huds. i. *beauty!*— Johns. Var. '73. *beauty!* Pope et cet.
40. *had*] *hath* Coll. ii.
43. *a*] *the* Rowe ii,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.
43. *graue*] *glaive* Han.
44. *precious Princely,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *precious, princely* Johns. Var. '73. *precious-princely* Cap. et cet.
45–49. *Sir...another?*] Om. Bell.
you haue . . . another?] Om. Dono.
45. *you haue*] F_2, Knt, Fle. *haue you* F_3F_4, Rowe et cet.
48. *That*] *What* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
49. *This is*] *'tis* Pope,+ (—Var. '73). *This'* Walker (Vers., 85).

37. **no mans else**] COLLIER: This is another though a trifling instance of the advantage of referring to two different copies of the First Folio. That belonging to Lord Francis Egerton reads 'no mans else,' but that of the Duke of Devonshire is corrected to 'no man else,' which is certainly right. The error must have been discovered while the sheet was going through the press, and corrected before any more copies were worked off.—[Collier is quite correct as to variations in copies of the Folio due to corrections while the work was printing; but this, I think, is not an instance. In Lee's admirable facsimile of the Devonshire copy there may still be seen, on close examination, the remains of the top of the *s* in 'no mans'; the letter seems to have slipped out of alignment. In my copy the *s* is actually below the other letters and is slightly imperfect, although still visible.—ED.]

45. **you haue beheld**] KNIGHT: We retain the original text which appears to mean, You see—or have you only read or heard? Your senses must be so startled that you may doubt 'you have beheld.'—VAUGHAN (i, 74) agrees with Knight in retaining the Folio text; and suggests that '"That you do see" may be *that which you do see*—the relative "that," not the conjunction; or, on the other hand, it may mean do you not with difficulty think that you see, although you do really see?' For the use of 'almost,' l. 47, Vaughan compares 'Would you imagine or almost believe, Were't not that by great preservation We live to tell it you.'—*Richard III:* III, v, 45.

The heighth, the Creſt : or Creſt vnto the Creſt
Of murthers Armes: This is the bloodieſt ſhame,
The wildeſt Sauagery, the vildeſt ſtroke
That euer wall-ey'd wrath, or ſtaring rage
Preſented to the teares of ſoft remorſe.
Pem. All murthers paſt, do ſtand excus'd in this:
And this ſo ſole, and ſo vnmatcheable,
Shall giue a holineſſe, a puritie,
To the yet vnbegotten ſinne of times;

52. *vildeſt*] F_2F_3, Del. Fle. *vileſt* F_4 et cet.
55–60. Pem. *All...ſpectacle.*] Om. Dono.
58. *yet vnbegotten*] Ff, Rowe, Coll. Dyce, Wh. i, Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *yet-unbegotten* Pope et cet.
58. *ſinne of times*] *sins of Time* Pope, +, Cap. Varr. Rann, Sing. Huds. Words. *sin of time* Var. '03, '13. *sin of Time's* Ktly.

53. wall-ey'd] WRIGHT: That is, with glaring eyes. The word properly describes an eye in which the iris is discoloured or wanting in colour. This gives it a fierce expression, like the glaring look of a man in a rage. See *Titus Andronicus*, V, i, 44:

> 'Say, wall-eyed slave, whither would'st thou convey
> This growing image of thy fiend-like face?'

Huloet, in his *Abcedarium*, 1552, has, 'Whaule-eyed. Glauciolus.' And in the old Latin English Dictionary called Bibliotheca Eliotæ or Eliotis Librarie, edited by Cooper in 1548, we find, 'Glauciolus, a horse with a wall eye.' Compare Holland's translation of Pliny (1601), Bk xi, c. 37, vol. i, p. 334, 'Augustus Cæsar of famous memorie, had red (*glauci*) eies like to some horses: and indeed wall-eied he was, for the white thereof was much bigger than in other men.' In Spenser a wall-eye is a mark of jealousy. See *Faerie Queene*, i, 4, § 24:

> 'And next to him rode lustifull Lechery,
> Vpon a bearded Gote, whose rugged heare,
> And whally eies (the signe of gelosy,)
> Was like the person selfe, whom he did beare.'

And Marston, Insatiate Countess (Works, iii, 107, ed. Halliwell): 'And with wall-ey'd jelousie kept me from hope.' The word is probably connected with the Icelandic *vagl*, a disease called the beam in the eye, whence *vagl-eygr*, wall-eyed (Thomas Saga Erkibyskups, ed. Magnusson, i. 232).

58. sinne of times] MALONE: That is, *of all future times*. So in *Henry V:* 'By custom and the ordinance of times.'—II, iv, 83. Again in *Lucrece:* 'For now against himself he sounds this doom That through the length of times he stands disgraced,' l. 717.—STEEVENS, in support of Pope's reading, quotes, 'For who would bear the whips and scorns of time?'—*Hamlet*, III, i, 70; and from this play, 'I am not glad that such a sore of time.'—V, ii, 15.—R. G. WHITE (*Sh. Scholar*, p. 304): It is very plain to me that 'sin of times' is a misprint for '*sins* of *time*,' as Pope suggested. Pembroke says that all murders past stand excused in this; and this shall excuse all other crimes to be committed. 'Sin,' it is true,

And proue a deadly blood-ſhed, but a ieſt,
Exampled by this heynous ſpectacle.
Baſt. It is a damned, and a bloody worke,
The graceleſſe action of a heauy hand,
If that it be the worke of any hand.
Sal. If that it be the worke of any hand?
We had a kinde of light, what would enſue:
It is the ſhamefull worke of *Huberts* hand,
The practice, and the purpoſe of the king:
From whoſe obedience I forbid my ſoule,

59. *ieſt*] *Jeaſt* F_4.
61. *damned*] *damnèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
64. *hand?*] *hand*, Rowe i. *hand,*— Cap. *hand!* Ktly, Cam.+, Neils. Craig.
65. *enſue:*] *ensue.* Pope,+.

---

might be used collectively; but then at least we should read 'sin of *time*.' In lifting the matter the *s* was evidently transferred from one word to the other.—[In his edition White accepts the Folio text, remarking that 'Here "sin" is used abstractly; and "times" frequently occurs in our old authors, where we would use the singular form.'—Pope's reading he characterises as 'plausible.'—ED.]

61. **It is a damned . . . worke**] C. C. CLARKE (*Sh's Characters*, p. 333): The important and decided change that takes place in the character of Faulconbridge is when he first hears of the death of little Arthur, and at the same time hears it ascribed to John, to whom he himself is deeply indebted. His speeches after this event are still those of the courageous, high-spirited man, but they are distinctly those of the man of *moral* courage as contrasted with his previous *physical* courage. Like one of truly noble nature, he scorns to fall off from the patron to whom he owes so much; but the discovery of that patron's baseness and treachery acts like a talisman to unseal his eyes to the vainglory and wickedness of 'vaulting ambition' and low cupidity. He still cleaves to the cause of the king, and endeavors to screen him from the indignation of his revolting nobles; but he now discourses with a calm dignity totally unlike the rash impetuosity of Faulconbridge in the opening of the play. . . . The genius of the Poet is displayed in quelling the fiery spirit of the man only by the chilling mist of suspicion and misplaced confidence. This is a beautiful tribute to the character of Faulconbridge. The only time after this that his old impetuosity returns is when Salisbury threatens him—'Stand by, or I shall gall you, Faulconbridge!' Then he flares out. The staring fact of the death of the little Prince Arthur is before him, he cannot blink that; he is pushed to a corner and hedged in, and yet he evades the charge, with the object pointed at. How natural all this is; and how like a thorough and determined partisan! . . . With the exception of the explosion with the nobles (and this arose only from his valour being chafed), throughout this whole scene we discover working in him that divine maturer insight into the rottenness of contest and strife, which gradually takes the place of his young ambition and which finds words at length in that grand and solemn soliloquy—closing the scene—where he bids Hubert bear away the little dead Prince.

Kneeling before this ruine of ſweete life,
And breathing to his breathleſſe Excellence
The Incenſe of a Vow, a holy Vow:
Neuer to taſte the pleaſures of the world,
Neuer to be infected with delight,
Nor conuerſant with Eaſe, and Idleneſſe,
Till I haue ſet a glory to this hand,
By giuing it the worſhip of Reuenge.

70. *his*] *this* Rowe,+.
71. *Vow:*] *vow!* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
75. *hand,*] *hand,* [Laying hold on one of Arthur's. Rann. *head,* Farmer, Sing. Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Wh. i, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Rlfe, Words. Neils.

69. ruine of sweete life] WRIGHT compares young Clifford's speech addressing his father's dead body: 'Come, thou new ruin of old Clifford's house.'—*2 Henry VI:* V, ii, 61.

71. a holy Vow] JOHNSON: This is a copy of the vows made in the ages of superstition and chivalry.

75, 76. a glory to this hand . . . worship of Reuenge] JOHNSON: The 'worship' is the *dignity*, the *honour*. We still say *worshipful* of *magistrates*.—FARMER: I think it should be 'a glory to this *head*'—pointing to the dead Prince, and using the word 'worship' in its common acceptation. 'A glory' is a frequent term: 'Round a quaker's beaver cast a glory,' says Mr Pope, [*Epilogue to Satires*, Dialogue ii, verse 97]; the solemn confirmation of the other lords seems to require this sense. The late Mr Gray was much pleased with this correction.—[SINGER, misled possibly by Farmer's quotation, ascribes the change of 'hand' to *head* to Pope, and Staunton, misled by Singer, does likewise.—ED.]—TOLLET: The old reading seems right to me, and means 'till I have famed and renowned my own hand by giving it the honour of revenge for so foul a deed.' 'Glory' means *splendor* and magnificence in *Matthew*, vi, 29. So, in Markham's *Husbandry*, ed. 1631, p. 353: 'But if it be where the tide is scant, and doth no more but bring the river to a glory,' i. e., fills the banks without overflowing. So in I, ii, 465, 466: 'O two such silver currents when they join Do glorify the banks that bound them in.' A thought almost similar to the present occurs in Jonson's *Catiline*, who, Act IV, sc. iv, says to Cethegus: 'When we meet again we'll sacrifice to liberty. *Cet.* And revenge. That we may praise our hands once!' i. e., O! that we may set a *glory*, or procure honour and praise to our *hands*, which are the instruments of action.—M. MASON (*Comments*, 159): I believe, at repeating these lines, Salisbury should take hold of the *hand* of Arthur, to which he promises to pay the worship of revenge.—[Rann and Delius follow Mason in thus referring Salisbury's vow to the hand of Arthur, not his own.]—MALONE: I think the old reading the true one. In the next Act we have the following lines: 'I will not return Till my attempt so much be glorified.'—[V, ii, 115, 116]. The following passage in *Troilus & Cressida* is decisive in support of the old reading: 'Jove let Aeneas live, If to my sword his fate be not the glory, A thousand complete courses of the sun.'—[IV, i, 126].—KNIGHT (*Specimen*, etc., p. 10): Mark the perpetual opposition of 'hand' in the whole passage: 'The graceless action of a heavy hand'; 'It is the shameful work of Hubert's hand,' and then note the peculiar force of Salisbury's vow that he would never taste

[75, 76. a glory to this hand . . . worship of Reuenge]

delight or ease 'Till I have set a glory to *this hand* By giving it the worship of revenge.'—DYCE (ed. i.) is firmly on the side of Malone and Tollet in defense of the original text; but in his ed. ii. adopts Farmer's correction without comment; HUDSON (ed. i.) courageously remarks that 'It is difficult to see how [Farmer's] change betters the passage,' yet, under Dyce's influence, he also adopts the correction without mention of his former opinion.—R. G. WHITE, adopting Farmer's correction, says: 'The allusion is unmistakably to the halo round the heads of saints in old paintings. A glory could not be *set* to a hand; neither is "worship" applicable to that member. Tollet [forgets] that "revenge" could be no "worship" except to Arthur. The passages produced in support of the old reading show that "glory" and "worship" may be well used in such relations to each other as they bear in this passage, which no one ever doubted. The difficulty is in their relations to "hand."'—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: There is much grace in the idea of sainting the head of the little murdered Prince with the symbol of martyrdom. Nevertheless, the vow to dedicate his own 'hand' to the service of winning 'glory' by attaining vengeance, and giving it the honour or 'worship' of having fulfilled a so-esteemed sacred duty, is perfectly consistent with one of the practices of chivalrous times; therefore we believe the Folio word to be most probably right.—WRIGHT: [Salisbury means] his own hand, which is uplifted while he pronounces his vow. As the correction [*head*] had the approval of Gray it may perhaps be thought rash to pronounce it, however elegant, not only unnecessary but wrong. [It is more than passing strange to find so careful an editor as Wright assigning the correction to Pope. *Aliquando dormitat*, etc.—ED.]—VAUGHAN (i, 75): Prince Henry says of Hotspur: 'I shall make this Northern youth exchange His glorious deeds for my indignities,' [*1 Henry IV:* III, ii, 146]; 'He shall render every glory up, Yea, even the slightest worship of his time,' [*Ibid.*, l. 150]. The glory then described as 'set to the hand' is the renown appropriate to one great action which the hand has acheived, such as might be multiplied as its great deeds are accumulated. It is quite clear, too, that in the passage here quoted from *Henry IV.* the 'glory' and the 'worship' both belong to the person who performs the actions, and not to anyone for whose sake they are performed. The train of thought and the forms of expression are manifestly identical in both places. They occur again distinctly in this play, III, i, 107–110. In all three passages 'worship' is attributed to 'the hand' and in two of them 'glory' also. It may well be, therefore, to the hand of Salisbury, and not to the head of Arthur, that a glory is set and a worship given.—FLEAY, in support of the original and to show that a glory was not peculiar to the head in painting, says: 'In Didron's *Christian Iconography*, fig. 20, there is a hand in a cruciform nimbus; in fact, such representations are not uncommon. Is there any allusion to the "hand of glory," which was made of a hand of a man, strangled and thrown out on the highway, and was used to hold a candle made of fat of a strangled man, which deprived of motion any person it was held towards? But I cannot trace this superstition beyond the end of the seventeenth century.' [Is it superfluous to remind the reader of Barham's thrilling verses on the subject of *The Hand of Glory?* Fleay's query may, I think, be answered in the negative; such an allusion is quite beside the point.—ED.]—KINNEAR (p. 203): Salisbury, by dethroning John in the right of the dead Arthur, would, as it were, *crown* Arthur, and at least give him *the homage* of revenge; 'glory' is equivalent to *crown*. Compare: 'Thus have I yielded up into your hand

Pem.Big. Our ſoules religiouſly confirme thy words.
Enter Hubert
Hub. Lords, I am hot with haſte, in ſeeking you,
Arthur doth liue, the king hath ſent for you.
Sal. Oh he is bold, and bluſhes not at death,
Auant thou hatefull villain, get thee gone. (the Law?
Hu. I am no villaine. *Sal.* Muſt I rob
Baſt. Your ſword is bright ſir, put it vp againe.
Sal. Not till I ſheath it in a murtherers skin.
Hub. Stand backe Lord Salsbury, ſtand backe I ſay'
By heauen, I thinke my ſword's as ſharpe as yours.
I would not haue you (Lord) forget your ſelfe,
Nor tempt the danger of my true defence;
Leaſt I, by marking of your rage, forget

78. Hubert] Hubert, hastily. Cap.
SCENE VI. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
80. *liue,*] *live;* Cap. et seq.
81. *Oh*] *O!* Coll. Del. Ktly, Huds. Craig.
82. *villain,*] *villain!* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. i, Dono. Craig.
gone.] *gone!* Theob.+, Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt.
83. *Law?*] *Law.* F_2F_3.
83. [Drawing his sword. Pope et seq. (exc. Cap.).
86. *Stand backe...ſtand backe*] *Put up...put up* Bell.
86, 102. *Salsbury*] *Saliſbury* F_3F_4.
87. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+, Fle.
yours.] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Fle. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig. *yours:* Cap. et cet.
90. *of your*] *but your* Coll. MS.

The circle of my glory,' V, ii, 3; 'The lineal state and glory of the land,' V, vii, 111.—[It will thus be seen that Kinnear approves Farmer's reading. In neither passage quoted does it seem necessary to place so exact a meaning upon 'glory.'—ED.]—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*), following Farmer's correction, says the Folio reading 'may be explained by supposing that Salisbury lifts the hand of the dead Prince and swears by it to give it the "worship of revenge." . . . Shakespeare's strong predilection for playing upon words favors the Folio reading (ll. 62, 63, 66). But "glory," with its connotation of aureole, seems to call for *head.*'

84. **Your sword is bright**] MALONE: That is, lest it lose its brightness. So in *Othello*: 'Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust them.'—I, ii, 59.—PYE: But even in this passage Othello is not really anxious that the swords should not be rusted; and still less is Falconbridge so here. Othello speaks in contempt of those who draw their swords in a private broil, and Falconbridge means to say, in sovereign contempt to Salisbury, You have shown us your sword is bright, and now you may put it up again, for you shall not use it.

89. **my true defence**] JOHNSON: That is, *honest defence;* defence in a *good cause.*—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 80), while admitting that these words will bear the interpretation given them by Johnson, says: 'but I am of opinion that, in guarding himself against this attempt upon his life, Hubert rather intended to bring the Earl to a sense of his danger, in attacking one who was well skilled in fighting, a brave man and a soldier, able to defend himself by art and strength as well as courage. However, I am not wedded to my opinion.'

your Worth, your Greatneſſe, and Nobility.
Big. Out dunghill : dar'ſt thou braue a Nobleman?
Hub. Not for my life : But yet I dare defend
My innocent life againſt an Emperor.
Sal. Thou art a Murtherer.
Hub. Do not proue me ſo:
Yet I am none. Whoſe tongue ſo ere ſpeakes falſe,
Not truely ſpeakes : who ſpeakes not truly, Lies.
Pem. Cut him to peeces.
Baſt. Keepe the peace, I ſay.
Sal. Stand by, or I ſhall gaul you *Faulconbridge.*
Baſt. Thou wer't better gaul the diuell Salsbury.

94. *innocent life*] *innocent self* Dyce ii, iii. *innocence* Words.
96. *Do not*] *Do but* Ktly. *Do you* Id. conj.
97. *ſo ere*] *soever* Warb.
102. *Thou*] *Th'* Fle.
102, 107. *diuell*] *Devil* F_4.

92. dunghill] RUSHTON (*Sh. Illust. by Old Authors*, p. 64) beside the present line quotes, 'Out dunghill!'—*Lear*, IV, vi, 249, and says: 'Littleton thus describes the villein service to which Shakespeare may allude in these passages: "Tenure in villenage is most properly when a villein holdeth of his lord, to whom he is a villein, certain lands or tenements according to the custom of the mannor, or otherwise, at the will of the lord, and to do his lord villein service; as to carry and re-carry dung of his lord out of the city, or out of his lord's mannor, unto the land of his lord, and to spread the same upon the land, and such like."—Section 172.'—[There appears to be strong probability that Rushton is right in view of the fact that Salisbury has already called Hubert 'a villain,' which he indignantly denies. —WRIGHT says: 'The full form is "dunghill cur," as in: "Shall dunghill curs confront the Helicons."—*2 Henry IV:* V, iii, 108.' I rather think, however, that the whole phrase is, as in 'Base dunghill villain,' *2 Henry VI:* I, iii, 196. Coarse as the epithet undoubtedly now seems, it appears to have been a fairly common term of reproach with Shakespeare and his contemporaries.—ED.]

94. life] DYCE (ed. ii.) justifies his change 'life' to *self*, saying that the word 'life' was repeated in mistake from the foregoing 'life,' adding that this 'error is now for the first time corrected.'—Dyce has, however, up to the present time failed to convince any other editor—even Hudson, his unswerving follower—of the necessity for this change.—ED.

96. Do not proue me so] JOHNSON: Do not make me a murderer by compelling me to kill you; I am *hitherto* not a murderer.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 81): I rather believe 'Do not prove me so' is as much as to say, Do not bring me to a trial, or to proof of it; for the consequence will be, that yourself will be found a slanderer and a liar.—SINGER: Hubert means: 'Do not *provoke* me, or *try my patience* so.' This was a common acceptation of the word. 'To assay, to prove, to try, to tempt one to do evil.'—Baret: *Alvearie*, s. v. prove.

102–107. Thou wer't better . . . from hell] CORSON (*Cornell Review*, May, 1878, p. 364): Observe how the abruptness of strong feeling is subserved by the monosyllabic words in this passage. And a little further on [ll. 123–132], when the

If thou but frowne on me, or ſtirre thy foote,
Or teach thy haſtie ſpleene to do me ſhame,
Ile ſtrike thee dead. Put vp thy ſword betime,
Or Ile ſo maule you, and your toſting-Iron,
That you ſhall thinke the diuell is come from hell.
Big. What wilt thou do, renowned *Faulconbridge*?
Second a Villaine, and a Murtherer?
Hnb Lord *Bigot*, I am none.
Big. Who kill'd this Prince?

105. *thee*] *the* Warb. (misprint).
betime,] *betime*. F_4.
108. *wilt thou*] *will you* Rowe ii,+.
108. *renowned*] *renownèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
110. Hnb] F_1.

Bastard expresses to Hubert his suspicions, note the staccato effect of the monosyllabic words of which some of the clauses are entirely composed.

102. **Thou wer't better**] ABBOTT (§ 352): 'Thou wert better' represents an old impersonal idiom, 'Me were liefer,' i. e., 'it would be more pleasant to me; Me were loth; Him were better.' Very early, however, the personal construction is found side by side with the impersonal. The change seems to have arisen from an erroneous feeling that 'Me were better' was ungrammatical.

103–105. **If thou but . . . thee dead**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 82): In this Scene Garrick [as Faulconbridge], notwithstanding the animation of his countenance, and his great power of action, from the deficiency of person, amongst men who were of larger size than himself, rendered this spirited speech unimportant and inefficient. When Walker uttered these words he drew his sword, threw himself into a noble attitude, sternly knit his black brows, and gave a loud stamp with his foot; insomuch that, pleased with the player's commanding look and vehement action, the audience confirmed the energy of his conceptions by their approbation of applause.

105. **Ile strike thee dead**] MOBERLY: Shakespeare seems hardly to have kept in mind the relationship between Salisbury and Richard Plantaganet, as he also undervalues the position of Hubert de Burgh.

105, 106. **thee . . . thy . . . you . . . your**] DAWSON (*University Sh.*): The change from 'thou' to 'you' is difficult to explain, except as an oversight.—[SKEAT (*William of Palerne*, E. E. T. S., New Series, N°. I, *Introd.*, p. xlii.) says: '*Thou* is the language of a lord to a servant, of an equal to an equal, and expresses also companionship, love, permission, defiance, scorn, threatening; whilst (*ye* or *you*) is the language of a servant to a lord, and of compliment, and further expresses honour, submission, entreaty.'—ABBOTT (§ 235): In almost all cases where *thou* and *you* appear at first sight indiscriminately used, further considerations show some change of thought, or some influence of euphony to account for the change of pronoun.]

106. **tosting-Iron**] STEEVENS compares: 'I dare not fight, but I will wink and hold out mine iron. It is a simple one, but what though? it will toast cheese.'—*Henry V*: II, i, 7–9.

111. **Who kill'd this Prince**] OECHELHAÜSER (*Bühne-bearbeitung*, p. 110) gives the following stage-direction: 'Hubert sees the body of Arthur now for the first

Hub. 'Tis not an houre ſince I left him well:
I honour'd him, I lou'd him, and will weepe
My date of life out, for his ſweete liues loſſe.
Sal. Truſt not thoſe cunning waters of his eyes,
For villanie is not without ſuch rheume,
And he, long traded in it, makes it ſeeme
Like Riuers of remorſe and innocencie.
Away with me, all you whoſe ſoules abhorre
Th'vncleanly ſauours of a Slaughter-houſe,
For I am ſtifled with this ſmell of ſinne.
Big. Away, toward *Burie*, to the Dolphin there
*P.*There tel the king, he may inquire vs out.*Ex.Lords.*
*Ba.*Here's a good world:knew you of this faire work?
Beyond the infinite and boundleſſe reach of mercie,
(If thou didſt this deed of death) art ỹ damn'd *Hubert.*
Hub Do but heare me ſir.
Baſt. Ha? Ile tell thee what.
Thou'rt damn'd as blacke, nay nothing is ſo blacke,

116, 117. *rheume...it*] *a rheume...it* Warb. *rheums...them* Hal.
117, 118. Om. Bell.
117. *And he,*] *And he* F_3F_4, Rowe.
118. *innocencie*] *innocence* Pope,+.
120. *ſauours*] *ſauour* Ff, Rowe,+.
a] *this* Var. '85.
121. *this*] *the* F_4, Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
ſinne.] *sin!* Cap.
122. *Dolphin*] Ff, Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
124. SCENE VII. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
125, 126. As three lines, ending: *reach...death*)...Hubert. Pope et seq. (exc. Sta.).
126. *art ỹ*] *thou art* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *art thou* F_2, Rowe ii. et seq.
129. *as*] *so* Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann.
blacke,] *black*— Rowe ii. et seq.

time; and with an expression of deepest horror and compassion sinks down beside it, weeping.'

124. **Ba. Here's a good world]** OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 14): This scene, in the presence of Arthur's dead body, is the culminating point in the portrayal of the Bastard, and, moreover, brings us nearer to him in the aspect of humanity. It cannot be too strongly impressed upon the actor to allow the deepest commiseration for the unfortunate Prince, and moral horror at the deed to be clearly shown. Possibly, on the nearer view of the body and its situation, the absolute supposition of Hubert's guilt seems to him premature: 'If that it be the work of any hand,' he adds; he preserves Hubert from punishment before his crime is proved, and finally is convinced of his innocence.

129. **Thou'rt damn'd as blacke]** STAUNTON: Shakespeare had probably here in his mind the old religious plays of Coventry, some of which in his boyhood he might have seen, wherein the damned souls had their faces blackened. [Staunton subjoins a memorandum from Sharp's *Dissertation* wherein the amount paid to 'iii whyte sollys' and 'iii blake sollys' is recorded.—ED.]

Thou art more deepe damn'd then Prince Lucifer:
There is not yet ſo vgly a fiend of hell
As thou ſhalt be, if thou didſt kill this childe.
Hub. Vpon my ſoule.
Baſt. If thou didſt but conſent
To this moſt cruell Act: do but diſpaire,
And if thou want'ſt a Cord, the ſmalleſt thred
That euer Spider twiſted from her wombe
Will ſerue to ſtrangle thee: A ruſh will be a beame
To hang thee on. Or wouldſt thou drowne thy ſelfe,
Put but a little water in a ſpoone,
And it ſhall be as all the Ocean,
Enough to ſtifle ſuch a villaine vp.
I do ſuſpect thee very greeuouſly.

130. *Lucifer:*] *Lucifer.* Ff, Rowe,+.
133. *ſoule.*] *ſoul*— Pope et seq.
136. *thred*] *threed* F_4.
138. *Will...will be*] One line, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Ktly.
138. *ſerue to*] Om. Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
139. *on.*] *on:* Rowe et seq.
thy ſelfe] Om. Steev. conj.
141. *Ocean*] *oceän* Ktly, Fle.

131. There is not yet, etc.] STEEVENS: I remember once to have met with a book, printed in the time of Henry VIII. (which Shakespeare might possibly have seen), where we are told that the deformity of the condemned in the other world is exactly proportioned to the degrees of their guilt. The author of it observes how difficult it would be, on this account, to distinguish between Beelzebub and Judas Iscariot.—HALLIWELL: The allusion seems to be general. The hideous faces of the devils were familiar to all at this period from the paintings on the walls of churches. There was scarcely a church in England without a painting in some form of the Last Judgment, including figures of 'ugly fiends of hell.'

134. If thou didst but consent] MOBERLY: The Bastard's keen look sees that Hubert is speaking the truth. [Moberly calls attention, as did Clarke, I. 61, *ante*, to the change in the character of Richard from the selfishness and coarseness of the early scenes to this highly moral attitude here shown.]

136. if thou want'st, etc.] VAUGHAN (i, 76): In this address to a supposed murderer Shakespeare describes a popular belief of his own age, that persons guilty of such crimes contracted thereby for themselves and their offspring a constitutional debility incapable of resisting injuries which would not affect other men. It is tcld by the chroniclers that Humfrey Banaster, who betrayed his master, the Duke of Buckingham, lost 'his younger son by strangling and drowning in a small puddle.'—Holinshed, 1483, [iii, 744, a.—Vaughan's quotation is quite to the point, and the chronicler mentions the fact as an example of God's Judgment on Banaster, but this does not, I think, prove that such belief was general. Neither Brand nor Lean record any such superstition in regard to a murderer.—ED.]

142. to stifle . . . vp] WRIGHT: 'Up' has an intensive force, giving the idea of completion, as in, 'Why, universal plodding poisons up The nimble spirits in the arteries.'—*Love's Labour's*, IV, iii, 305. [For many other examples of this intensive use of 'up' see SCHMIDT (*Lex.*), s. v. 7.]

Hub. If I in act, conſent, or ſinne of thought,
Be guiltie of the ſtealing that ſweete breath
Which was embounded in this beauteous clay,
Let hell want paines enough to torture me:
I left him well.
Baſt. Go, beare him in thine armes:
I am amaz'd me thinkes, and looſe my way
Among the thornes, and dangers of this world.
How eaſie doſt thou take all *England* vp,
From forth this morcell of dead Royaltie?

147. *me:*] Ff. *me.* Rowe, Pope, Coll. Del. Cam.+, Fle. Dono. Neils. Craig. *me!* Theob. et cet.
149. *armes.*] *arms.* Rowe ii. et seq. Hubert takes up Arthur. Coll. ii. (MS.).
152–160. *How...peace:*] Om. Bell.
152, 153. *vp,...Royaltie?*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *up!...Royalty* Han. *up....royalty*, Fle. *up!...Royalty*, Theob. et cet.

144, 145. **If I in act . . . Be guiltie]** DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 84): This is a repetition of his impudent affirmation to the King: 'Within this bosom never enter'd yet The dreadful motion of a murderous thought.' Hubert's exculpation of himself renders his character odious. Shakespeare has drawn this man, in opposition to all record, in a worse light than he needed to have done. Colley Cibber, on the other hand, causes Falconbridge to stab Hubert, on the accusation of the Peers, and the sight of the dead body of Arthur, without further inquiry into his guilt; and Hubert, dying, owns the justice of his punishment; for, though he did not commit the murder, he declares that he once intended it. [With the actual character of Hubert de Burgh we need not concern ourselves any more than did Shakespeare, who found a character ready to his hand in the older play. The anonymous author must bear the blame for making Hubert a liar and time-server. —ED.]

151. **Among the thornes . . . of this world]** EATON (p. 20) compares 'Thorns and snares are in the way of the froward: he that doth keep his soul shall be far from them,' *Proverbs*, xxii, 5; and remarks that 'It is not strange that Falconbridge should be so lost' when we recall his 'ransacking the church, offending charity.'

152. OECHELHAÜSER (*Bühne-bearbeitung*) here has the following stage-direction: 'Hubert raises Arthur in his arms to carry him away, but even in the act lowers him again to the ground and kneels beside the body, weeping bitterly.'

152, 153. **How easie . . . England vp, . . . dead Royaltie?]** THEOBALD: But how did Hubert take England up, from forth the dead body of young Arthur? Most sagacious editors! The stupid pointing, which has prevail'd in all the copies, makes stark nonsense of the passage. My pointing [see *Text. Notes*] restores it to its genuine purity. Faulconbridge, seeing Hubert taking up the body of the dead Prince, makes two reflections: *How easily*, says he, *doſt thou take up all* England *in that burthen!* and then, That the life, right, and truth of the realm was fled to Heaven from out the breathless coarse of that slaughter'd Royalty.— CAPELL characterises the foregoing as 'a foolish and an insolent note,' at the same time remarking that any reader of sagacity could not 'have stood long' without seeing the necessity of correcting so obvious an error in punctuation.

The life, the right, and truth of all this Realme
Is fled to heauen : and *England* now is left
To tug and ſcamble, and to part by th'teeth
The vn-owed intereſt of proud ſwelling State:
Now for the bare-pickt bone of Maieſty,
Doth dogged warre 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 waites
As doth a Rauen on a ſicke-falne beaſt,
The iminent decay of wreſted pompe.

155. *Is*] *Are* Han.
heauen] *Heav'n* Rowe,+, Fle.
156. *ſcamble*] *scramble* Rowe,+, Craig.
th'] Ff, Rowe,+ Wh. Fle. *the* Cap. et cet.
157. *proud ſwelling*] *proud-swelling* Pope et seq. (exc. Coll.).
157. *State:*] *state.* Pope,+, Cap.
160. *peace:*] *peace.* Pope,+, Ktly, Neils.
163. *ſicke-falne*] F_2. *ſick-fallen* F_3F_4. *sick, fall'n* Pope,+, Cap. *sick-fall'n* Cap. et cet.
164. *wreſted*] *wasted* Anon. ap. Cam. *wretched* Schmidt (Lex.) conj.

154. the right . . . of all this Realme] MARSHALL: It is remarkable that, though so faithful and zealous a partisan of John's, the Bastard here clearly recognizes Arthur's right to the throne.

156. scamble] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v.): To struggle with others for money, fruit, sweetmeats, etc., lying on the ground or thrown to a crowd; hence to struggle in an indecorous and rapacious manner in order to obtain something. [The present line quoted.]

157. vn-owed interest] STEEVENS: That is, the interest which has no proper owner to claim it.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 85): I cannot think that Mr Steevens has hit the sense of 'unowed interest.' By England I understand John, who is often so termed by himself. In this speech, l. 152, Arthur, as rightful heir to the crown, is likewise called England. The king is now forced to fight and struggle for that dominion which he formerly enjoyed, but which he does not *owe* or possess.—MALONE: That is, the interest which is not, at this moment, legally *possessed* by any one, however rightfully entitled to it. On the death of Arthur the right to the English crown devolved to his sister, Eleanor. [I much prefer Davies' interpretation. It seems very unlikely that the Bastard should have the intimate knowledge of the succession to the crown implied in Malone's note.—ED.]

161. Powers from home] WRIGHT: That is, the French troops which had landed.

162. vast] WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 39) quotes this passage among many others wherein, he thinks, 'vast' is used in the Latin sense of *vastus*, i. e., *empty, waste.*

164. wrested pompe] JOHNSON: That is, *greatness obtained by violence.*—MALONE: Rather, greatness wrested from its possessor.—VAUGHAN (i, 77): Shakespeare's expression concerning King John, that he had the kingdom of England 'in wrest,' seems to indicate that 'wrested' does not apply to the crown as it would be violently taken from John, nor to the crown as it had been violently taken by him, but to the crown as now held by him through superior strength. King John has al-

Now happy he, whoſe cloake and center can
Hold out this tempeſt. Beare away that childe,
And follow me with ſpeed : Ile to the King:
A thouſand buſineſſes are briefe in hand,
And heauen it ſelfe doth frowne vpon the Land. *Exit.*

165. *center*] Ff, Rowe. *ceinture* Steev. conj. Craig. *ceinter* Del. *cincture* Pope et cet.
168. *in*] *at* Rowe,+.
169. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
Exit.] Ff. Exeunt; Hubert bearing out Arthur. Exeunt. Rowe et cet.

---

ready been spoken of as 'possessed with pomp.' Faulconbridge was too true to his benefactor to impute, in plain words, wrong-doing to him.—IVOR JOHN: One is tempted to paraphrase this as 'Usurpyd Power,' one of the 'characters' in Bale's *Kynge Johan*.—[Faulconbridge, as Marshall observes, l. 154, wavers in his allegiance, and this is, I think, a further carrying out of that very plain hint.—ED.]

165. center] HALLIWELL: One of the annotated Folios, of no authority, reads curiously, 'cloak and *bever*,' the annotator, not making any meaning out of the original text, boldly altering it to suit his own taste.—SCHMIDT (*Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 367) remarks upon Pope's reading *cincture*, which has been so generally accepted, and expresses surprise that readers have not taken offence at this unusual expression: 'Whether we take the girdle as a necessary part of the mantle or not, in either case the connection is strange. But of this Shakespeare is guiltless. The Folio reading means, whose cloak and heart (center) can hold out this tempest.' In support of this interpretation of 'centre' in the sense of innermost core of the body Schmidt quotes: 'Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth,' *Sonnet* cxlvi.; and 'Turn back, dull earth, and find thy centre out,' *Romeo & Juliet*, II, i, 2.—CORSON (*Cornell Review*, October, 1875), apparently unaware that he is anticipated by Schmidt, upholds the Folio reading, giving to it the same metaphorical meaning, *heart* or *soul*; his interpretation of the passage is a slight amplification of his predecessor, as thus: 'Such dire calamities will sweep over the land that they will not only act disastrously upon the outward circumstances of men's lives, but will penetrate to their inmost being, and happy he who can stand out against them.'—Miss PORTER likewise adopts this explanation of the original text; without reference, however, either to Schmidt or Corson.—ED.

168. briefe in hand] CAPELL: That is, are now in hand and ask brief dispatch.—R. WARNER (*Letter to Garrick*, p. 24) suggests that 'brief' is here used in a sense common in the South and West of England, viz.: *prevailing, abounding*.—T. WRIGHT (*Dial. Dict.*) gives several examples of this sense of the word, which is still in use. While it cannot be said that Warner is mistaken, yet it seems hardly in Shakespeare's manner to say tautologically 'a thousand businesses are *abounding*'; and it seems more logical to adopt Capell's explanation.—ED.

169. Exit] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL.): The Fourth Act, in point of acting merit, is undoubtedly better than either of the other three; having more regularity, and what may be called essential business.

Actus Quartus, Scæna prima.

Enter King Iohn and Pandolph, attendants.

K.Iohn. Thus haue I yeelded vp into your hand 3

1. Actus Quartus,] ACT V. Rowe. ACT IV, SCENE III. Dono.

The Court of England. Pope,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. Northampton. A Room in the Palace. Dyce. Bristol. A Room of State in the Castle. Hal. Canterbury: A Room in the Palace. Wh. i. King John's Palace. Cam.+, Neils. Interior of the Temple Church, Northampton, C. Kean. The Same. A Room in the Palace. Cap. et cet.

2. Enter...attendants.] Ff, Rowe,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. Cam.+. Enter King John, attended; Pandulph with the Crown; his Train and others. Enter King John, Pandulph with the Crown, and Attendants. Mal. et cet.

Pandolph,] Pandulph, Ff. Pandulpho, Johns. Var. '73.

3. *haue I*] *I have* Pope,+.

1. Scæna prima] HALLIWELL, in justification of his placing the locality of this scene at Bristol, says: 'The surrender of the crown by John to Pandulph, and his reception of it again as the Pope's vassal, took place on Ascension day, May 16th, 1213, at Dover, but it clearly appears, from the Bastard's first speech in the present scene, that such a locality cannot be intended, and it is necessary to amalgamate the incident of John's submission with the events that took place shortly before his death in 1216. John decamped from Dover on the approach of Louis, passing through Winchester to Bristol, where he was joined by the Legate. No approach to historical accuracy can here be attained, but the present selection of a place for this scene appears that which is most consistent with the whole narrative.'—FRENCH (p. 17, foot-note): The place where King John yielded up the circle of his glory to Cardinal Pandulph is said to be the Preceptory of the Knight's Templars, at Swingfield, five miles North of Folkestone, in Kent; of which some remains exist, though now used as a farm-house. [For the views of different Historians as to this act by John, see Sharon Turner, *Middle Ages*, vol. i, p. 414; Lingard, vol. ii, p. 331; Miss Norgate, p. 180.—ED.]

3. Thus haue I yeelded] BOAS (*Sh. & his Predecessors*, p. 243): It has attracted universal notice that Shakespeare passes very lightly over those misdeeds of the king which have given him so sinister a prominence in history. His extortions from clergy and laity are merely touched upon incidentally, and not the faintest allusion is made to the constitutional struggle which ended in the grant of the Great Charter. Startling as it sounds to modern ears, it is almost certain that Shakespeare had small knowledge of that document, and a very inadequate sense of its importance. A strong monarchical rule was the ideal of the Tudor period, and the power of the crown was limited not by strictly defined clauses, but by hearty popular sympathies in the sovereign. It was only under the Stuarts, when this communion of feeling between ruler and people ceased to exist, that the champions of national liberty were forced to entrench themselves behind their traditional rights, and drag again into prominence the parchment scrolls wherein these were embodied. Thus the significance of John's reign for Shakespeare lay far less in constitutional struggles than in foreign relations, and its supreme event was not the signing of the Charter, but the surrender of the English crown, when the

The Circle of my glory.
Pan. Take againe
From this my hand, as holding of the Pope
Your Soueraigne greatneſſe and authoritie.
Iohn. Now keep your holy word, go meet the *French*,
And from his holineſſe vſe all your power
To ſtop their marches 'fore we are enflam'd:
Our diſcontented Counties doe reuolt:

4. [Giving the Crown. Pope,+, Varr. Rann, Cam.+.
5. *Take*] *Take't* (Lettsom), Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. [giving back the Crown. Cap. Mal. et seq.
6. *From this*] *This from* Heath. *Pope*] Ff, Pope, Fle. *pope*, Rowe et cet.
7. *Your Soueraigne*] *Sovereign your* Rann.
8. *word,*] *word.* Ktly, Neils.
10–19. *To ſtop...enſues.*] Om. Bell.
10. *their*] *the* Warb.
10, 11. *we are ... doe*] *they have ... to* Moberly conj.
10. *enflam'd:*] *enflamed.* Rowe ii. et seq.

---

recreant king, eating all his brave words of an earlier date, resigned the symbol of royalty into the hands of Pandulph, to receive it back again as a vassal of the Pope. —OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, i, 11): In this scene wherein John kneels in submission to the Papal Legate, fear, at the approaching attack of France, and at the downfall of his greatness, robs him of all spirit, and all that decision which the earlier phase of his character indicated. With this breaking down of spirit the actor should also make manifest in representation a corresponding physical downfall in feature, bearing, and tone of voice, which will strengthen the effect of the play and facilitate its performance. This is a scene of moral suicide, which in every feature, inwardly and outwardly, must bring out the most marked contrast to John's earlier manly defiance of the Cardinal. Every speech of the King here shows the beginning of that sickness, almost helpless weakness, which in the succeeding short conversation with Hubert on the battle-field has actually broken out, and should here be clearly indicated.

3. haue I yeelded] PAGE: John here uses the singular as a private individual. After receiving the crown again from Pandulph he resumes the plural of majesty, 'we,' l. 10.

6. Pope] IVOR JOHN: By inserting a comma after 'Pope' 'sovereign greatness and authority' may be made object to 'take'; the meaning is thus preserved and the grammatical construction saved. [See *Text. Notes.*]

10. 'fore] M. MASON (*Comments*, p. 100): This cannot be right, for the nation was already as much inflamed as it could be, and so the king himself declares. We should read *for* instead of ''fore.'

11. Counties] STEEVENS: Perhaps 'counties' in the present instance do not mean the *divisions of a kingdom*, but *lords*, nobility, as in *Romeo & Juliet*, *Much Ado*, etc.—DELIUS also thus understands this word, since if we take 'counties' in its ordinary meaning, divisions of a kingdom, the contrast between the *nobility* and the revolting people is lost; to this WRIGHT replies: 'But "discontented counties" refers only to certain parts of the country which were actually in revolt while a spirit of disobedience affected the whole people.'—IVOR JOHN: I think the fact

Our people quarrell with obedience,
Swearing Allegiance, and the loue of ſoule
To ſtranger-bloud, to forren Royalty;
This inundation of miſtempred humor,
Reſts by you onely to be qualified.
Then pauſe not: for the preſent time's ſo ſicke,
That preſent medcine muſt be miniſtred,
Or ouerthrow incureable enſues.

13. *and the*] *and* Han. *and true* Vaughan.
14. *ſtranger-bloud*] *ſtranger blood* Theob. et seq.
forren] *forrain* F_3. *foreign* F_4.
Royalty;] *royalty*. Var. '73 et seq.
15–19. *This...enſues.*] Om. Dono.
15. *miſtempred*] F_2, Fle. Neils. *miſtempered* F_3F_4, Cam. ii. *distemper'd* Rowe, Pope, Han. *mistemper'd* Theob. et cet.
18. *medcine*] *med'cine* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *medicine* Theob. et cet.
miniſtred] Ff. *minist'red* Cap. Fle. Neils. *ministered* Rann. *minister'd* Mal. et cet.
19. *incureable*] *incurably* F_4, Rowe, Pope.

that there is no mention of the rebellion of the nobles (which at that time was the real danger, as Shakespeare knew), if this is supposed not to refer to them, decides the matter. John would never have omitted them from his list of troubles. —MOORE SMITH: Shakespeare has not elsewhere used this word of English nobles, though it is of frequent occurrence in plays whose scene is laid in Italy. The sense *shires* is further supported by the reference to Kent, l. 34 below, and (as Mr Worrall points out) by *Edward III:* I, i, 142: 'In every shire elect a several band,' which shows the important part played in military organization by the division into counties. On the other hand, it may be said that while there is no real distinction between 'our shires' and 'our people,' one would expect in this passage some reference to the revolted nobles, and the passage from *The Troublesome Raigne*, which would seem parallel to the one before us, is quite clear. [See *Appendix: Troublesome Raigne*, pt ii, ll. sc. ii, 124–127.—ED.]

13. loue of soule] RUSHTON (*Sh. Illust. by Old Authors*, pt ii, p. 3) quotes: 'For as the soule doth rule the earthly masse And all the service of the bodie frame, So love of soule doth love of bodie passe No lesse than perfect gold surmounts the meanest brasse.'—*Faerie Queene*, IV, ix, 2.—[SCHMIDT (*Lex.*, s. v.) gives several examples wherein the soul is referred to as 'the seat of real, not only professed, sentiments.']—MOORE SMITH: Were Schmidt's explanation not so satisfactory we might have conjectured here 'soul of love,' which is found in *Mid. N. Dream*, II, i, 182.

15, 16. mistempred humor . . . qualified] BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*) points out that there is here a reference to the physiological doctrine of humours: 'Upon the right blending of the four humours [blood, phlegm, melancholy, choler] depends one's physical and mental health. When one humour preponderates unduly (making an "inundation") it must be "qualified" (corrected, got back to its right proportion) before health can be restored.'—[In the present case it is, of course, the *blood* which preponderates.—ED.]

19. ouerthrow] VAUGHAN (i, 78) asserts that 'overthrow' in this line has been probably interpreted as *'irreparable defeat';* but that this is incorrect, since the word is here used as 'a purely medical expression, signifying *a glut of morbid and*

Pand. It was my breath that blew this Tempeſt vp,
Vpon your ſtubborne vſage of the Pope:
But ſince you are a gentle conuertite,
My tongue ſhall huſh againe this ſtorme of warre,
And make faire weather in your bluſtring land:
On this Aſcention day, remember well,
Vpon your oath of ſeruice to the Pope,
Goe I to make the *French* lay downe their Armes. *Exit*.
Iohn. Is this Aſcenſion day? did not the Prophet
Say, that before Aſcenſion day at noone,
My Crowne I ſhould giue off? euen ſo I haue:

24. *bluſtring*] Ff, Rowe,+, Wh. i, Neils. *blustering* Var. '73 et cet.
land:] *land.* Rowe ii. et seq.
25-32. *On this...voluntary.*] Om. Bell.
25. *Aſcention*] *Aſcenſion* F_2F_4.
27. Exit.] Exit Pandulph and Train. Cap.
28, 29. *Aſcenſion*] *Aſcention* F_3.
30. *euen*] *ev'n* Fle.

---

morbific humours,' quoting in support of this meaning: 'To make particular laws were to no purpose, but much like as one should give some easie medicine to purge an overthrowne bodie with all humours and diseases.'—North, *Plutarch* (ed. 1776), p. 35.—[I fail to see that Vaughan's interpretation is an improvement on that generally accepted; and I do not know from what source he derives his authority for his meaning of 'overthrow.'—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) does not include among the various senses of the word any example of its use as a purely medical term; s. v. *overthrown*, he quotes the passage from North's Plutarch (given by Vaughan) as an example of this word in the sense *overcome, vanquished*.—ED.]

22. conuertite] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. 2): A person converted to a religious life or to an approved course of action. [The present line quoted; also: 'Out of these convertites There is much matter to be heard and learn'd.'—*As You Like It*, V, iv, 190. This word, and its exact shade of meaning here intended, was the occasion for a series of notes by Steevens, Monck Mason, and Malone, whose remarks thereupon occupy nearly a page in the *Variorum* of 1821. The *N. E. D.*, it is true, admits meanings other than that given above; but the question then becomes philological rather than Shakespearean.—ED.]

25. Ascention day] WRIGHT: Ascension day in 1213 fell on May 23. The date of John's form of homage to the Pope was May 15, and Matthew Paris, in order apparently to make this a fulfilment of Peter of Pomfret's prophecy, calls it the eve of Ascension day. His date is a week wrong, but in the interpretation of prophecy this is a tolerably near approximation. During the whole of John's reign Ascension day never fell on May 16.

27. Goe I . . . their Armes] WARNER (p. 42): Shakespeare, following the older play, identifies the turning back of Philip from his attack upon England with the turning back of Lewis, who was summoned some years later by the English Nobles to their aid. As a matter of history, all of those scenes which, in the play, have to do with the papal interference against Prince Lewis, on behalf of John, were actually true as toward King Philip, after the submission of John.

I did ſuppoſe it ſhould be on conſtraint,
But (heau'n be thank'd) it is but voluntary.

Enter Baſtard.

Baſt. All Kent hath yeelded : nothing there holds out
But Douer Caſtle : London hath receiu'd
Like a kinde Hoſt, the Dolphin and his powers.
Your Nobles will not heare you, but are gone
To offer ſeruice to your enemy :
And wilde amazement hurries vp and downe
The little number of your doubtfull friends.

Iohn. Would not my Lords returne to me againe
After they heard yong *Arthur* was aliue?

32. *heau'n*] *heauen* Cap. et seq. (exc. Fle.).
33. Baſtard.] Faulconbridge. Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. Richard. Words. Dono.
36. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
37. *will*] *would* Var. '78.
39. *hurries*] *harries* Sta. conj.
40. *your*] Om. Ff.

31, 32. constraint . . . voluntary] The full text of John's charter of resignation is given by Roger of Wendover (ed. Giles, ii, 368, 369). It is perhaps interesting to compare the present passage with the following from the charter's preamble: '—we impelled by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and not by force or from fear of the interdict, but of our free will and consent, and by the general advice of our Barons, assign and grant to God and his holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to the holy church of Rome our mother, and to our lord Pope Innocent and his catholic successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom of Ireland, with all their rights and appurtenances, in remission of the sins of us and our whole race, as well for those living as for the dead; and henceforth we retain and hold those countries from him and the church of Rome as vicegerent, and this we declare in the presence of this learned man Pandulph, sub-deacon and familiar of our lord the Pope.'—There is no mention in Holinshed of the act being either voluntary or under compulsion; the older play omits all reference to this also. It is, perhaps, too much to say that Shakespeare was aware of the original text of the charter, but at all events he so thoroughly understood the craven nature of John that the words put in his mouth are true both to nature and history.—ED.

33. Enter Bastard] F. GENTLEMAN (ap. BELL): The fifth Act would begin much better here than with that dull, disgraceful circumstance of John's resigning his crown to Pandulph.

39. hurries vp and downe] DELIUS: 'Hurries' is here the intransitive verb, and 'up and down' a preposition.—DEIGHTON also considers 'up and down' as a preposition, comparing: 'Which else runs tickling up and down the veins.'—III, iii, 62.—WRIGHT, in reference to Delius's note, says: 'It is better to take "hurries" as transitive and "up and down" as an adverb.'—Which is the opinion likewise of the present ED.

41, 42. Would not . . . Arthur was aliue] MUNRO: (*Troublesome Raigne*, etc., *Introd.*, p. xxxiii.): The news of Arthur's actual death, together with the election of Lewis, forces John in *The Troublesome Reign* to submit to Pandulph; in Shake-

Baſt. They found him dead, and caſt into the ſtreets,
An empty Casket, where the Iewell of life
By ſome damn'd hand was rob'd, and tane away.
Iohn. That villaine *Hubert* told me he did liue.
Baſt. So on my ſoule he did, for ought he knew:
But wherefore doe you droope? why looke you ſad?
Be great in act, as you haue beene in thought:
Let not the world ſee feare and ſad diſtruſt
Gouerne the motion of a kinglye eye:
Be ſtirringas the time, be fire with fire,
Threaten the threatner, and out-face the brow
Of bragging horror: So ſhall inferior eyes
That borrow their behauiours from the great,
Grow great by your example, and put on
The dauntleſſe ſpirit of reſolution.

44. *Iewell of life*] *jewel, life,* Pope,+.
45. *tane*] *ta'en* Rowe et seq.
47. *So ... ſoule*] *So, ... soul,* Cap. et seq.
ought] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. i, Han. Cap. Words.
50–52. *ſad...be*] *blank...meet* Coll. MS.
53. *threatner*] *threatener* Coll. Dyce, Del. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. Fle. Words. Dono. Neils. Craig.
56. *Grow*] *Show* Herr.
56, 57. *and...reſolution.*] Om. Bell.
57. *ſpirit of reſolution*] *sprite of resolutiön* Fle. *spirit of resolutión* Words.

speare's play we pass with extraordinary swiftness from John having learnt that Arthur actually lives to John having just resigned his crown to Rome. Between these two scenes Arthur has died; but John does not know of it. John thus submits to Rome still thinking Arthur lives. This is so important and obvious a change that it cannot have been without design. The intention of the dramatist is fairly apparent. The news of Arthur's death smites John down; it paralyses his action; it is now that the intrepid and energetic Bastard comes forward with all the fire of Richard, and steps into John's place as leader; it is now that John begins his decline. The submission of the crown to Rome was but a step on the way, and it is not that step in the main which Shakespeare has in view. What to him is so dramatically important is the final catastrophe. The attempt on Arthur and the consequent secession of nobles drove John to surrender to Rome. Surrender to Rome proved unavailing. But the old John sending back Chatillon 'as lightning in the eyes of France,' and hurling defiance at France and Rome, could yet have risen as the Bastard objurgated him, 'to outface the brow of bragging horror.' To all the Bastard's exclamations of horror at compromise with the 'cock'red silken wanton' of France, John says but this: 'Have thou the ordering of the present time.' The news of the actual death of Arthur is carried over from the dramatically incidental resignation of the crown to the dramatically important death. The change is part of Shakespeare's attempt to reconcile the brave and aggressive John of the play's beginning with the weakling at its end. It links the death of Arthur with the death of John.

56, 57. **put on . . . of resolution**] MALONE: So in *Macbeth:* 'Let's briefly put on manly readiness.'—II, iii, 139.—[Malone is, I think, quite wrong; there is

Away, and gliſter like the god of warre
When he intendeth to become the field:
Shew boldneſſe and aſpiring confidence:
What, ſhall they ſeeke the Lion in his denne,
And fright him there? and make him tremble there?
Oh let it not be ſaid : forrage, and runne
To meet diſpleaſure farther from the dores,

58. *Away,*] *Away!* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Ktly, Huds. i, Dono. Craig.

60. *confidence:*] *confidence.* Rowe et seq.

61. *What,*] *What!* Coll. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. Craig.

61, 62. *denne,...there?*] *den?...there;* Cap. Var. '78, '85, Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. *den?...there?* Var. '73.

63. *Oh*] *O!* Coll. Del. Huds. Craig. *ſaid:*] Ff, Rowe, Cam.+. *said.* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. i, Fle. Dono. Craig. *said!* Pope et cet.

forrage,] *Courage!* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *forward!* Long MS. ap. Cam.

64. *farther*] *further* Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Coll. i, ii, Dyce, Del. Hal. Words.

---

no parallelism beyond the fact that the present line is a simile; the line in *Macbeth* refers to the putting on of actual clothing.—ED.]

59. become] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. vb, 9 c.): Of a person: To grace or adorn his surroundings, place or position, to occupy or wear with fitting grace. [Steevens compares: 'Such a sight as this Becomes the field, but here shows much amiss.'—*Hamlet*, V, ii, 413.]

63. forrage] JOHNSON: To forage is here used in its original sense, for to *range abroad.*—STAUNTON (*Addenda and Corrigenda*, p. lxvi.), in corroboration of Johnson's definition, remarks: 'Florio after explaining *Foragio* to mean fodder, &c., says it had anciently the sense of *Fuora*, which is *out, abroad, forth.*'—FLEAY: 'Forage' here means, seek for prey, as always in Shakespeare; and Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, III, i: 'Forage up and down.' [Fleay also quotes in illustration: 'And forage their country as they have done ours,' *Edward III:* IV, iii; and *Edward III:* II, i. (Shakespeare's part): 'The lion doth become his bloody jaws And grace his foragement by being wild When vassals fear his trembling at his feet'—I do not know from what text Fleay quotes this last; in Collier's ed. p. 31 the lines read: 'And grace his foragement, by being *mild* When vassal fear *lies* trembling at his feet.'—A trifling point, hardly worth the noting, were it not that Rolfe copies Fleay's misquotation and changes the last two words to '*their* feet.' —ED.]—HUDSON (ed. ii.): Collier's MS. Corrector substitutes *Courage* for 'Forage,' and, I suspect rightly, as, at the close of the scene, the speaker says: 'Away, then, with good courage!' The old text seems indeed to be sustained by several quotations showing that *lion* and *forage* were apt to be used together. So in *Henry V:* 'Smiling to behold his lion's whelp Forage in blood of French nobility.'—I, ii, 109. Also in Chapman's *Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois:* 'And looke how lyons close kept, fed by hand Lose quite th' innative fire of spirit and greatness That lions free breathe, forraging for prey.'—II, i. Still I am not sure that the argument from these passages will fairly cover the case in hand; as it is the spirit of resistance and defence, not of conquest, that Faulconbridge is trying to kindle in John.—MARSHALL, on the other hand, decides that 'these instances are quite sufficient to prove that the text is right, the word 'forage' having been suggested by the comparison of John to a lion in l. 61.

And grapple with him ere he come ſo nye.
Iohn. The Legat of the Pope hath beene with mee,
And I haue made a happy peace with him,
And he hath promis'd to diſmiſſe the Powers
Led by the Dolphin.
Baſt. Oh inglorious league:
Shall we vpon the footing of our land,
Send fayre-play-orders, and make comprimiſe,
Inſinuation, parley, and baſe truce
To Armes Inuaſiue? Shall a beardleſſe boy,
A cockred-ſilken wanton braue our fields,

65. *come*] *comes* Hal. Cam. i,+, Dono. Craig.
nye] *nigh* F_3F_4.
69. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
70. *league:*] *league!* Pope et seq.
72. *fayre-play-orders*] Ff, Rowe,+. *fair-play offers* Sing. ii, Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Wh. Ktly, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. *fair-play orders* Cap. et cet.
72. *comprimiſe*] *compromise* Rowe ii.
75. *cockred-ſilken*] *cockred, ſilken* Pope, Theob. i. *cocker'd, ſilken* Theob. ii, Han. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. Ktly. *cock'red ſilken* Fle. Neils. *cocker'd ſilken* Cap. et cet.

71. vpon the footing of our land] WRIGHT: That is, standing on our own soil. —DEIGHTON: Possibly the meaning is, when an enemy has set foot upon our shores; in *Henry V:* 'For he is footed in their land already,' II, iv, 143; *Richard II:* 'Who strongly hath set footing in this land,' II, ii, 48.

72. fayre-play-orders] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE, referring to the MS. Corrector's change, *offers*, retain the Folio reading, and suggest that 'orders' is here used in the sense, *arrangements, proposed measures*, since this word is used apparently with this meaning in 'Achievements, plots, orders, preventions, Excitements to the field, or speech for truce,' *Tro. & Cress.*, I, iii, 181; and in 'The Emperor's coming to the field of France To order peace between them,' *Henry V:* V, *chor.*, l. 39. They also call attention to the word 'order' in the next scene, l. 7, where it may be taken in this same sense.—[SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) quotes both these lines as examples of the word in the sense, *condition, stipulation*. The *N. E. D.* does not include this meaning among the several senses of the word 'order.'—MARSHALL adopts the meaning given by Schmidt, remarking that '"Fair-play" is here used more in the sense *friendly treatment* than in its strict sense of *fair* or *just dealing*.'—ED.]

75. cockred] SKEAT (*Dict.*): To pamper, indulge children. Of uncertain origin. Cotgrave says: '*coqueliner un enfant*, to dandle, cocker, fondle, pamper, make a wanton of a child.' [The words 'cocker' and 'wanton' seem to be closely allied; besides the present line Skeat quotes: 'Neuer had cockered us, nor made us so wanton.'—Sir T. More's Works, p. 337 d. See also next note by Wright.—ED.]

75. wanton] WRIGHT: That is, a person brought up in luxury and effeminacy. Compare: 'Which he, young wanton and effeminate boy.'—*Richard II:* V, iii, 10. And Lyly's *Euphues:* 'I am enforced to thinke that . . . thy parents made thee a wanton with too much cockering' (ed. Arber), p. 36.

75. braue] WRIGHT: '*Brave*' is here used in the ordinary sense of *defy*, with a side reference to the meaning of the adjective 'brave,' *showy, splendid;* as if 'to

And fleſh his ſpirit in a warre-like ſoyle,
Mocking the ayre with colours idlely ſpred,
And finde no checke? Let vs my Liege to Armes:
Perchance the Cardinall cannot make your peace;
Or if he doe, let it at leaſt be ſaid
They ſaw we had a purpoſe of defence.
Iohn. Haue thou the ordering of this preſent time.
Baſt. Away then with good courage: yet I know
Our Partie may well meet a prowder foe. *Exeunt.*

77. *idlely*] *idely* F_3F_4, Rowe, Pope, Theob. *idly* Han. et seq.
78. *Armes:*] *arms!* Ktly.
79. *cannot*] *can't* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Cap.
82. *ordering*] *ord'ring* Pope,+ (—Var. '73), Cap.
83. *courage:*] *courage!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words. Neils. Craig.

---

brave our fields' signified to display his finery in our fields It is quite in Shakespeare's manner to select his words with reference to the other meanings of which they are capable. For example, in *Hamlet*, III, i, 76, 'a bare bodkin' is a mere bodkin, but the epithet 'bare' is used in preference because it also might mean 'unsheathed.'

77. Mocking . . . idlely spred] JOHNSON compares: 'Where the Norweyan banners flout the sky And turn our people cold.'—*Macbeth*, I, ii, 49.—MALONE: From these two passages Gray seems to have formed the first stanza of his celebrated *Ode:* 'Ruin seize thee, ruthless king! Confusion on thy banners wait! Though fann'd by conquest's crimson wing They mock the air with idle state.'

77. idlely] WALKER (*Vers.*, p. 14) notes that this word is frequently so spelt in the Folio, 'even when pronounced as a dissyllable,' as here. His other examples of this form are: 'God helpe poor souls, how idlely doe they talke.'—*Com. of Errors*, IV, iv. (Folio, p. 96, col. 1); and 'Are idlely bent on him that enters next.'—*Richard II:* V, ii. (Folio, p. 42, col. 1). [See, IV, ii, 128: 'I idely heard.'—ED.]

83, 84. Away . . . a prowder foe] JOHNSON: Let us then away with courage; yet I so well know the faintness of our party, that I think it may easily happen that they shall encounter enemies who have more spirit than themselves.—STEEVENS: Dr Johnson is, I believe, mistaken. Faulconbridge means—for all their boasting, I know very well that our party is able to cope with one yet prouder and more confident of its strength than theirs. Faulconbridge would otherwise dispirit the king, whom he means to animate.—BOSWELL: 'Yet I know' is *still* I know.'—DOUCE (i, 408): It may be doubted whether Steevens has sufficiently simplified the meaning, which is: 'yet I know that our party is fully competent to engage a more *valiant* foe.' 'Prouder' has in this place the signification of the old French word *preux*.

Scœna Secunda.

Enter (*in Armes*) *Dolphin*, *Salisbury*, *Meloone*, *Pembroke*, *Bigot*, *Souldiers*.

Dol. My Lord *Melloone*, let this be coppied out,
And keepe it ſafe for our remembrance:
Returne the preſident to theſe Lords againe,
That hauing our faire order written downe,
Both they and we, peruſing ore theſe notes
May know wherefore we tooke the Sacrament,
And keepe our faithes firme and inuiolable.

Sal. Vpon our ſides it neuer ſhall be broken.
And Noble Dolphin, albeit we ſweare
A voluntary zeale, and an vn-urg'd Faith

1. Scœna Secunda.] SCENE II. Rowe et seq.

The Dauphin's Camp. Pope. The Dauphin's Camp, at St Edmundsbury. Theob.+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. Cam.+, Neils. A Plain in Suffolk. Cap. Near St Edmundsbury. The French Camp. Dyce, Hal. Coll. iii, Huds. ii, Words. Craig. Near St Edmundsbury. The Dauphin's Tent. Dono. A Plain near St Edmundsbury. Mal. et cet.

2. Enter...Dolphin,] Drums, &c. Enter Lewis, and Forces marching. Cap.

Dolphin,] Ff, Ktly. Louis, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii. Lewis, Rowe et cet.

2, 4. Meloone (Melloone),] Ff, Ktly. Chatillion, Bell, Kemble. Melun, Rowe et cet.

3. Souldiers.] and Others. Cap.

5. *remembrance*] *rememberance* Ktly, Fle.

6. *preſident*] *precedent* Johns. et seq.

9. *wherefore*] *wherefóre* Steev. Varr. Knt, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

12. *And*] *And*, F_4.

13. *and an*] *and* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Huds. ii, Words. Dono. *an* Cap. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Del. Fle. Craig.

1. Scœna Secunda] THEOBALD, in justification of his placing the locality of this scene as 'A Plain, near St Edmund's-Bury, says: 'In the preceding Act, where Salisbury has fixed to go over to the Dauphin, he says: "Lords, I will meet him at St Edmund's-Bury." And Count Melun, in this Act, says: "Upon the altar at St Edmund's-Bury . . . where we swore to you Dear amity." And it appears from *The Troublesome Raigne* that the interchange of vows between the Dauphin and the English barons was at St Edmund's-Bury.'

6. president] M. MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 160): That is, the rough draft of the treaty. So in *Richard III.* the Scrivener employed to engross the indictment of Lord Hastings says that 'it took him eleven hours to write it, and the precedent was full as long a-doing.'—[III, vi, 9, 10].

9 wherefore] Here accented on the second syllable; for other examples of this change of accent, see Walker (*Vers.*), ch. xi.

13. A voluntary . . . Faith] DAWSON notes that by reading 'unurgèd' this line becomes a regular Alexandrine, and there is thus no need to make any omissions for the sake of the metre.

To your proceedings: yet beleeue me Prince,
I am not glad that ſuch a ſore of Time
Should ſeeke a plaſter by contemn'd reuolt,
And heale the inueterate Canker of one wound,
By making many: Oh it grieues my ſoule,
That I muſt draw this mettle from my ſide
To be a widdow-maker: oh, and there
Where honourable reſcue, and defence
Cries out vpon the name of *Salisbury*.
But ſuch is the infection of the time,
That for the health and Phyſicke of our right,
We cannot deale but with the very hand
Of ſterne Iniuſtice,and confuſed wrong:

14. *me*] *me*, F_4.
15–18. *I am...many:*] Om. Bell.
16. *contemn'd*] *condemn'd* Cap. conj. Heath, Huds. ii.
17. *the inueterate*] *th' invet'rate* Pope, Theob. i, Han. *th' inveterate* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Fle. Words.
18. *many:*] Ff, Rowe, Cap. Varr. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i. *many!* Var. '85. *many.* Pope et cet.
19. *mettle*] *metal* Rowe ii.
20. *widdow-maker:*] *widow-maker!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. ii, Words. Neils.
22. *Cries*] *Cry* Han. Hal. Salisbury.] *Salisbury:* Var. '85, Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Sta. Huds. Fle. *Salisbury!* Dyce, Hal. Wh. Cam.+, Huds. Words. Neils.
26, 27. *confuſed...grieued*] *confuſèd... grievèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
26. *wrong:*] *wrongs.* Rowe ii. *wrong.* Pope et seq.

16. contemn'd reuolt] HEATH (p. 230): The epithet 'contemn'd' hath no propriety here; we should certainly read *condemn'd*, that is, which the general voice of mankind condemns, and which, therefore, Salisbury himself cannot help deploring.—WRIGHT: Compare: 'Frighting her pale-faced villages with war And ostentation of despised arms.'—*Richard II:* II, iii, 95.

22. Cries out vpon] WRIGHT: That is, exclaims against the name of Salisbury for being on the opposite side. So in *As You Like It*, II, vii, 70: 'Why, who cries out on pride That can therein tax any private party?' And *1 Henry IV:* IV, iii, 150: 'Cries out upon abuses.' Or 'cry out upon' may be equivalent to *cry upon* in the sense of *appeal to*, as in *As You Like It*, IV, iii, 150: 'And cried, in fainting, upon Rosalind.'—IVOR JOHN inclines to the second of these interpretations of 'cries out upon,' 'because it has more connection with what goes before. "It grieves my soul to draw my sword in order to become a widow maker, and that among those whom I ought to rescue and protect."'—DEIGHTON also accepts this interpretation, since the words 'honourable rescue and defence' show that 'cries out upon' is used not in the sense of *exclaims against*, but as meaning *calls for aid*.

24–26. That for . . . confused wrong] DEIGHTON: That is, to restore our right to a healthy condition, we have no other remedy but the unshrinking use of injury to our countrymen and anarchy in which right and wrong are confusedly mixed up; the play upon 'right' (that which is due) as opposed to 'wrong' (that which is not due, injustice) and of 'right' (that which is morally good) as opposed to 'wrong'

And is't not pitty, (oh my grieued friends) 27
That we, the ſonnes and children of this Iſle,
Was borne to ſee ſo ſad an houre as this,
Wherein we ſtep after a ſtranger, march 30

27. *friends*)] *friends!* Pope et seq.
29. *Was*] *Were* Ff.
ſad] *bad* Rowe ii.
30. *ſtep...march*] *march...step* Herr.
ſtranger, march] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Knt, Coll. Sing. ii, Sta. Ktly, Huds. Fle. Neils. *stranger-march* Han. Dyce, Wh. Huds. ii, Words. *stranger's march* Long MS. ap. Cam. *stranger monarch* Herr. *stranger march* Theob. et cet.

(that which is morally evil) makes the sentence difficult of explanation.—DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 100) sees in these lines the only hint, throughout the play, as to the true cause of the quarrel between John and his Barons, which was not the murder of Arthur, but John's resolution to break through his most solemn engagements, signed and sworn to in the Great Charter, manifested by his invading the estates of his nobles, this it was which drove them into the arms of France.—[Can we not almost see Shakespeare's gentle smile of tolerance, and hear his equally gentle comment: 'My lord, there was no such stuff in my thoughts.'—ED.]—BOWDEN (p. 157): In *King John* the nobles appear as deriving their rights not from the Great Charter, which the Poet ignores, but from common law and immemorial custom. The Barons are the King's Peers; his judges when he breaks the laws of Church or State, and the executors of their judgements, as far as they have the power. Thus they are represented in [this scene] as resisting the encroachments of the crown, and their rebellion, in alliance with the French king, is dictated by motives of religion, duty, and patriotism. But the Poet is careful to point out in this speech of Salisbury the evils entailed by even justifiable rebellion. The uncertainty of conscience as to what is lawful or not in rebellion, the 'healing one wound only by making many,' the necessity of fighting with one's own countrymen and forming alliances with their enemies, these are some of the evils of insurrection.

27. **grieued**] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 122) takes 'grieved' here as equivalent to the modern *aggrieved;* but this seems hardly necessary; Shakespeare's use of this word is almost universally in the sense *afflicted,* which it may well bear in this passage. —ED.

30. **a stranger, march**] THEOBALD: All the printed copies have mistakenly pointed this passage; but with submission to the former editors, the word 'stranger' is here an adjective in its usage, and to be coupled to 'march,' which is its substantive and no verb. So in *Richard II:* 'But tread the stranger paths of banishment.'—[I, iii, 143]. And so in *Rape of Lucrece:* 'But she, that never cop'd with stranger eyes,' [l. 99].—MALONE, without referring to Theobald's note, likewise takes 'stranger' as an adjective. His quotation is even more apposite than Theobald's, since it is from the preceding scene of this play: 'Swearing allegiance ... To stranger blood, to foreign royalty,' l. 14.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE 'feel' that 'stranger' taken as an adjective is very 'un-Shakespearean in effect.'—VAUGHAN (i, 80): This is harsh indeed; 'stranger march' with 'stranger' as an epithet to 'march' being more awkward by far than 'stranger blood' in the preceding scene; and to 'step after a stranger march,' being an expression which does not shape any appropriate image. Nor do I recall any passage in Shakespeare

Vpon her gentle boſom, and fill vp
Her Enemies rankes? I muſt withdraw, and weepe
Vpon the ſpot of this inforced cauſe,
To grace the Gentry of a Land remote,
And follow vnacquainted colours heere:
What heere? O Nation that thou couldſt remoue,
That *Neptunes* Armes who clippeth thee about,
Would beare thee from the knowledge of thy ſelfe,

32–42. Om. Bell.

32, 33. *I muſt...cauſe*] In parentheses Theob. et seq. (exc. Johns.).

32. *I muſt...weepe*] In parentheses Walker (Crit., iii, p. 122).

33–42. Om. Dono.

33. */ſpot of*] *spot, for* Pope. *thought of* Coll. MS., Wh. i. *spur of* Dyce i. (conj.), Walker, Dyce ii, iii, Coll. iii, Words. *spite of* Jervis conj. Vaughan conj. *sport of* Herr.

33. *inforced*] *enforcèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

35. *heere:*] *here!* Pope. *here?* Theob. et seq.

36. *remoue,*] *remove!* Pope et seq.

38. *Would...ſelfe*] Transposed to follow l. 11 above in Var. '21 (misprint). *thee from the*] *the from thee* F_4.

where 'march' means anything which a person in the army can 'step after.' If, too, Salisbury and the rest filled up the enemies ranks, they did not step after a march, but with it. [Vaughan, therefore, apparently unaware that he is restoring the Folio text, proposes that 'march' be here taken as a verb.—ED.]—WRIGHT: Theobald's alteration is unnecessary, and destroys the climax of the sentence.—MOBERLY: All this passage seems an expansion of some sentences on the revolt against John in the Homily against wilful rebellion, appointed in 1562, to be read in churches: 'Now, had Englishmen at that time known their duty to their prince, set forth in God's word, would a great many of the nobles and other Englishmen, natural subjects . . . have taken part against the King of England, and against Englishmen, with the French king and with Frenchmen? Would they have sworn fidelity to the Dolphin of France . . . and have stood under the dolphin's banner displayed against the King of England?'—[I am inclined to agree with WRIGHT that Theobald's change is unnecessary and that the Folio reading should stand.—ED.]

33. **the spot**] M. MASON: 'Spot' probably means *stain*, or *disgrace*.—MALONE compares: 'To look into the spots and stains of right.' [Here he was unfortunately trusting to his memory, which played him false; the line reads '*blots* and stains' in every edition. 'Spot' in the sense given by Mason occurs in V, vii, 110: 'To rest without a spot forevermore.'—ED.]—R. G. WHITE decides that the Folio reading is 'nonsense,' and therefore accepts the MS. Corrector's change, *thought*. 'The misprint,' he adds, 'is, perhaps, the result of the spelling *tho't*, which when the bow of the *h* was brought below the line might be easily mistaken for */ſpot*.'—WRIGHT: 'Upon' is used here, as in I, ii, 623, 'upon commodity,' and in IV, ii, 224: 'upon humour,' to express the ground of an action. 'Spot' is *stain, disgrace*.

37. **clippeth**] WRIGHT: That is, *embraceth* thee, *surroundeth* thee. Compare: 'Clipp'd in with the sea That chides the banks of England, Scotland, Wales.'—*1 Henry IV:* III, i, 44. And *Othello:* 'You elements that clip us round about.'—III, iii, 464.

38. **from the knowledge of thy selfe**] VAUGHAN (i, 83): This does not mean

And cripple thee vnto a Pagan ſhore,
Where theſe two Chriſtian Armies might combine
The bloud of malice, in a vaine of league,
And not to ſpend it ſo vn-neighbourly.

39. *cripple*] Ff, Rowe. *gripple* Steev. conj. Fle. Craig. *grapple* Pope et cet.
ſhore,] *shore!* Pope,+, Cap. *shore;* Var. '78 et seq.
41. *vaine*] *veine* or *vein* Ff.
42. *to ſpend*] *mis-spend* Han. *to-spend* Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce i, Sta. Hal. Huds. Fle. *forspend* Vaughan conj.

'bear thee to a distance from the knowledge of thyself,' but 'bear thee without thy knowing it,' in accordance with Shakespeare's frequent use of 'from.'

39, 40. cripple thee . . . combine] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 135): This wish of Salisbury's is not of easy conception; it has the appearance of satire on *Christian* nations, living under the gospel of peace, and yet engaging in enmities more embitter'd and frequent than a pagan world was acquainted with.—MALONE: Our Author seems to have been thinking on the wars carried on by Christian princes in the holy land against the Saracens, where the united armies of France and England might have laid their mutual animosities aside, and fought in the cause of Christ, instead of fighting against brethren and countrymen, as Salisbury and the other English noblemen who had joined the Dauphin were about to do.

39. cripple] STEEVENS: Perhaps our Author wrote *gripple*, a word used by Drayton, *Polyolbion*, Song I: 'That thrusts his gripple hand into her golden maw,' [l. 106.—WRIGHT observes that *gripple* is here used by Drayton, as an adjective, and also by Spenser as a noun, but by neither as a verb.—BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. gripple *vb*, quotes: 'I am glad that I have any occasion to gripple with this sinne, where it hath made so many spoyles.' H. Smith, *Sermon: Usury* i, 3 (1591), also: 'The distant corners of their gripled fleet.' Heywood: *If You Know not Me*, ii, (1607): Wks, i, 346.—ED.]

41. in a vaine] MOBERLY: That is, make the angry blood of both flow, as it were, in one vein of alliance for crusading purposes.

42. And not . . . vn-neighbourly] MALONE: This is one of many passages in which Shakespeare concludes a sentence without attending to the manner in which the former part is constructed.

42. And not to spend] STEEVENS: Shakespeare employs, in the present instance, a phraseology which he had used before in *The Merry Wives:* 'And fairy-like, to-pinch the unclean knight.'[—IV, iv, 57]. *To*, in composition with verbs, is common enough in ancient language. [Steevens's wanderings into the realm of philology are not, as a rule, fraught with success; and this is a melancholy example. In the first place Shakespeare can hardly be said to have used the phrase *before* in *The Merry Wives*, as this present play antedates that comedy by at least five years; and secondly, the line quoted by Steevens with the compound 'to-pinch,' is merely a conjecture by Tyrwhitt and therefore is not necessarily the language of Shakespeare. It is quite true that *to* is quite frequent in compounds with verbs, but rarely, if ever, except in the full form *all-to-*, meaning *completely* or *thoroughly*. Steevens, supplementing Tyrwhitt's note on the line from *Merry Wives*, gives a number of examples which might easily be increased. (For the etiology of this compound, see Eastwood & Wright: *Bibleword Book*, s. v. All-to). The line from

Dolph. A noble temper doſt thou ſhew in this,
And great affections wraſtling in thy boſome
Doth make an earth-quake of Nobility:
Oh, what a noble combat haſt fought
Between compulſion, and a braue reſpect:
Let me wipe off this honourable dewe,
That ſiluerly doth progreſſe on thy cheekes:

44. *affections*] *affection* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns.
wraſtling] F_2F_3, Fle. *wreſtling* F_4 et cet.
45. *Doth*] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Cam.+, Neils. *Do* Han. et cet.
Nobility:] *nobility.* Rowe et seq.
46–56. Om. Bell, Dono.
46. *haſt*] *haſt thou* F_4.
47. *compulſion*] *compassion* Han.
reſpect] *respect!* Pope et seq.
49. *cheekes:*] *cheeks.* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Neils. *cheeks*, Han.

Chaucer, quoted by Tyrwhitt, 'mouth and nose to-broke' (*Reeve's Tale*, 1169), is, however, not a case in point; 'to-broke' here is merely the past participle of the older English verb *to-breken*, to break in pieces.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: I am not sure that the construction is not 'where these two Christian armies might not combine to spend it so unneighborly';—'combine' being used transitively and intransitively according to the free style of Shakespeare's day.—WRIGHT: Where two infinitives follow an auxiliary verb, it is not uncommon for 'to' to be inserted before the second, though it is omitted before the first, as here, 'might combine . . . and not to spend.' So in the Prayer Book Version of *Psalm* lxxviii, 8: 'That they might put their trust in God: and not to forget the works of God, but to keep his commandments.' See I, ii, 143, IV, ii, 250, and below, line 145. It is therefore wrong to read 'to-spend' with Steevens.

45. Doth] WRIGHT remarks that Hanmer's change is unnecessary, since 'the nominative is the idea involved in the preceding clause,' as if it had been 'the wrestling of great affections.' See I, ii, 265, 267.

47. compulsion . . . braue respect] WARBURTON: This 'compulsion' was the necessity of a reformation in the state; which according to Salisbury's opinion (who, in his speech preceding, calls it an 'enforced cause') could only be procured by foreign arms; and the 'brave respect' was the love of his country.—CAPELL (I, pt ii; p. 136) opines that the foregoing note contains a specious sense of 'compulsion,' but that Hanmer's reading, *compassion* (which is also that of Halliwell's annotated third Folio), has much show of reason, since 'though it may be permitted to Salisbury to call his cause of revolt "an enforced cause," perhaps it should not be openly termed so by Lewis, whom it behov'd to speak fairer; *compassion* he might see, and admire, and give the praise we have seen to it; and his other terms after it, "brave respect," are better understood of Salisbury's *brave* resentment of John's ill-behaviour (in the business of the church, and of Arthur, and numbers more) and his brave acknowledgement of the better title of Lewis.' Capell also suggests that *compunction* might even be a reading more suitable than either 'compulsion' or *compassion*.—ED.

49. siluerly] ABBOTT (§ 447): *Ly*, found with a noun and yet not appearing to convey an adjectival meaning, represents *like*, of which it is a corruption. (Compare 'exteriorly,' IV, ii, 267.)

My heart hath melted at a Ladies teares,
Being an ordinary Inundation:
But this effuſion of ſuch manly drops,
This ſhowre, blowne vp by tempeſt of the ſoule,
Startles mine eyes, and makes me more amaz'd
Then had I ſeene the vaultie top of heauen
Figur'd quite ore wirh burning Meteors.
Lift vp thy brow (renowned *Salisburie*)
And with a great heart heaue away this ſtorme:
Commend theſe waters to thoſe baby-eyes
That neuer ſaw the giant-world enrag'd,
Nor met with Fortune, other then at feaſts,
Full warm of blood, of mirth, of goſſipping:
Come, come; for thou ſhalt thruſt thy hand as deepe
Into the purſe of rich proſperity

50–56. Mnemonic Warb.
50. *Ladies*] *lady's* Rowe.
51. *Inundation*] *inundatiõn* Fle.
54. *Startles*] *Startle* Rowe i.
55. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
56. *wirh*] F_1.
57. *renowned*] *renownèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
58. *ſtorme:*] *storm.* Pope,+.
59–62. Mnemonic Warb. Om. Bell. Dono.
59. *theſe...thoſe*] *those...these* Rann.
waters] *warres* F_2. *warrs* F_3. *Wars* F_4.
62. *Full warm of*] *Full-warm of* Pope, Theob. Warb. Johns. *Full of warm* Heath, Cam.+, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Rlfe, Words. Neils. Hertford, Marshall. *goſſipping:*] *goſſipping.* F_3F_4.

50. **My heart hath melted, etc.**] MINTO (p. 282): Bacon wondered why a woman's eye should be so gazed at when the beauties of the heavens were so little regarded. That wonder spoke the philosopher no less unmistakably than this present passage speaks the dramatist. Human passion affected him more than the grandest phenomena of inanimate nature.

53. **showre, blowne vp**] MALONE compares: 'This windy tempest, till it blow up rain Held back his sorrow's tide.'—*Lucrece*, l. 1788.—WRIGHT more appositely compares: 'See, see what showers arise, Blown with the windy tempest of my heart.' —*3 Henry VI:* II, v, 86.

62. **Full warm of blood**] HEATH (p. 230): As the adjective 'warm' hath in this construction equally a reference to 'mirth' and 'gossiping,' as well as to 'blood,' I should rather think the Poet wrote 'full *of warm* blood.'—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 136): The substantive to 'warm' is 'feasts,' and the line's sense—feasts in which the blood ran full high, and mirth and gossiping kept pace with the blood: no occasion then for a propos'd transposition of 'warm' and 'blood,' which only serves to make tame a line of spirit.—R. G. WHITE: That is, full warm *with* blood. [For many examples of this use of 'full' with adjectives for emphatic effect, see SCHMIDT, *Lex.*, s. v. full. 3.]

64. **the purse of rich prosperity**] MOBERLY: The mention of reward is an unfortunate argument to a man of Salisbury's temper; and, feeling his mistake, the Dauphin instantly takes another tone more persuasive.

As *Lewis* himſelfe : ſo (Nobles) ſhall you all, 65
That knit your ſinewes to the ſtrength of mine.
Enter Pandulpho.
And euen there, methinkes an Angell ſpake, 68

65. *himſelfe:*] *himself.* Rowe.
SCENE III. Pope, Theob .Warb. Johns.
67. Enter Pandulpho] Ff, Rowe. Enter Pandulph. Pope,+, Dyce, Cam. +, Fle. He sees Pandulph coming at a distance. Han. Enter Pandulph with his retinue. Hal. Enter Pandulph attended. Cap. et cet. (after l. 68, Hal. Cam.+, Fle. After l. 72 Dyce, Sta. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words.).
68. Om. Bell.
ſpake,] *spake!* Theob. Johns. *speeds;* Han. Warb.

---

68. an Angell spake] JOHNSON thinks Hanmer's reading, *speeds*, unnecessary since: 'The Dauphin does not yet hear the legate indeed, nor pretend to hear him; but seeing him advance, and concluding that he comes to animate and authorise him with the power of the church, he cries out, "at the sight of this holy man, I am encouraged as *by the voice of an angel.*"'—MALONE: Rather, *In what I have now said*, an angel spake; for see the holy legate approaches, to give warrant from *heaven*, and the name of *right* to our cause.—[DELIUS agrees with Malone in thus interpreting these words.]—STEEVENS: This thought is far from a new one. Thus, in Gower, *De Confessione Amantis:* 'Hem thought it sowned in her ere As though that it an angell were,' [ed. Macauley (*E. E. T. Soc.*), liber viii, ll. 781, 782; but the context shows that these lines are not parallel to the present passage. Thus: 'Singende he harpeth forth withal That as a vois celestial Hem thoghte,' etc. It is the voice of the singer that is compared to that of an angel; not his propitious message. Compare: 'Amongst all these fair entising objects, which procure love, and bewitch the soul of man, there is none so moving, so forcible as profit; and that which carrieth with it a shew of commodity. . . . Tell him good tydings in this kinde, there spoke an angel, a blessed hour that brings in gain.'—Burton, *Anat. of Melancholy*, Part 2, Sec. 1, Mem. 2, subsec. 1.—ED.]—BIRCH (p. 260), with characteristic contempt for any evidence of religious sentiment in Shakespeare, says: 'The irony of this remark may be well understood, when the legate comes to command the French forces to withdraw, John having made his peace with heaven. Shakespeare before had introduced Chatillon, as a miracle, to bring news—the reverse of the expectation of Philip and Constance [I, ii, 54].—Shakespeare must have had in these instances his usual design of particularly ridiculing these special interpositions, as they were thought, or claimed to be, of providential agency. Lewis does not care for his faith when it stands in the way of his interest. The "warrant from the hand of heaven," the honoured messenger of advantage, is rudely handled when he comes on a different errand.'—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXVI.): None of the interpretations of this line hitherto suggested are at all satisfactory. Surely the close proximity of 'purse,' 'nobles,' and 'angel' shows that Shakespeare has here yielded to the fascination of a *jeu de mots*, which he was unable to resist, however unsuitable the occasion might be. The Dauphin, we may suppose, speaks 'aside,' with an accent and gesture which mark his contempt for the mercenary allies whom he intends to get rid of as soon as may be. —[DR WRIGHT in the CLARENDON ed., some years later, adheres to the opinion that there is here intended a play on the words 'noble' and 'angel'; saying in con-

[68. And euen there, methinkes an Angell spake]

clusion: 'It must be remembered that an angel was the fee for a lawyer's opinion, from which, perhaps, "there spake an angel," which occurs in the play of *Sir Thomas More*, I, i, 176, as a proverbial expression of approval, may have had its origin.'—It is pleasant to note that Wright does not repeat the remark in regard to the 'mercenary nobles'; Moberly's view of the case is far more just; see his note l. 64, *ante*.—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE (unwilling to accept Malone's interpretation) 'think this phrase is the Dauphin's comment on hearing the trumpet sound that announces the approach of the "holy legate," bringing "warrant from the hand of heaven."' And further remark that, 'There is no stage-direction in the Folio, either here or afterwards, when Faulconbridge enters. . . . But we think that, in both instances, the lines are intended to call attention to the sounding of the trumpet which precedes a stage entrance of importance, especially on the battle-field; and nothing would be more poetically and dramatically probable than that the trumpet-call which heralded the approach of the "holy legate" should suggest the idea of an angel's proclamation.'—VAUGHAN (i, 85): Either Malone's interpretation is correct, or we should read: 'And even there methinks an angel *shapes*.' '*Shapes*' then would mean 'in confirmation of all this, even at yonder spot an angel presents itself in the material and actual form and presence of an angel. For look where the holy legate is coming as an ambassador from God to warrant our league and actions.' 'There' refers to a spot pointed to, and 'where' to the same spot. [In corroboration of the use of *shape* in the sense *assume a form* Vaughan quotes: 'Their dear loss The more of you 'twas felt, the more it shaped Unto my end in stealing them.'—*Cymbeline*, V, v, 346. It seems hardly necessary to remark that 'shaped' here means *to be suited, to square*, and not to *assume a form*.—ED.]—MOBERLY: The allusion is probably to *Acts*, xxiii, 9: 'But if an angel or a spirit hath spoken to him, let us not be fighters against God.'—[Compare also: 'Then came there a voyce from heauen, saying, I haue both glorified it, and will glorifie it againe. Then saide the people that stoode by and heard, that it was thunder: others saide An Angel spake to him.'—*St John*, xii, 28, 29 (*Genevan Vers.*).]—ORGER (p. 15): I can hardly be persuaded to admit the Cambridge Editors' suggested explanation of this line as a jocose *aside*. It seems entirely out of place in Lewis's mouth; but after the pathetic expressions of grief given forth by Salisbury, it would not be unsuitable to him. He sees the legate coming to give the English nobles 'warrant from the hand of heaven'; and the opportune coincidence of his approach with Lewis's assurances warns him to declare that Lewis had spoken like an angel in the words of comfort he had uttered. [Orger therefore would arrange these lines, 68–72, as a reply by Salisbury.]—HERR (p. 34) agrees with the Cambridge Edd. that there is a play on words here between the two meanings of the word 'angel'; but as this does not explain how an angel 'there spake' on the entrance of Pandulph, Herr suggests that the line run 'there, methinks, an angel *shakes*,' since we must remember that John had said 'see thou shake the bags Of hoarding abbots: imprison'd angels Set thou at liberty,' and the emended line will thus mean: 'even there an angel is shaken out from the purse of prosperity—look where the holy legate quickly comes.' 'Before "*shakes*" an ellipse occurs and the line must be understood to read, "an angel is *out shaken*" —from "the purse of rich prosperity."'—MARSHALL contributes still another example of the use of this expression: '. . . the bloud-hound Securitie wil smel out ready money for you instantly. *Sir Petronell*. There spake an angel.' Marston:

Looke where the holy Legate comes apace,
To giue vs warrant from the hand of heauen,
And on our actions ſet the name of right
With holy breath.
Pand. Haile noble Prince of *France*:
The next is this: King *Iohn* hath reconcil'd
Himſelfe to *Rome*, his ſpirit is come in,
That ſo ſtood out againſt the holy Church,
The great Metropolis and Sea of Rome:
Therefore thy threatning Colours now winde vp,
And tame the ſauage ſpirit of wilde warre,
That like a Lion foſtered vp at hand,
It may lie gently at the foot of peace,
And be no further harmefull then in ſhewe.
Dol. Your Grace ſhall pardon me, I will not backe:

70. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+.
72. SCENE III. Enter Pandulph. Han.
74. *is*] *in* Rowe ii. (misprint).
77. *The*] *That* Rowe ii, Pope.
Sea] *See* F_4.
Rome:] *Rome.* Pope,+, Del. Dono. Craig.
78. *threatning*] *threatening* Cam.+, Neils. Craig.
80. *foſtered vp*] *foster'd-up* Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words. *fost'red up* Fle.
82. Om. Dono.
further] *farther* Coll. Wh. i.

Eastward Hoe, II, i. (ed. Pearson, iii, p. 31). Marshall pertinently calls attention to the frequent connection of the phrase with the mention of money, or well-known names of coins, as here. [All of which gives warrant from the hand of Shakespeare that the text here is in no need of any change. Hanmer's *speeds*, Vaughan's *shapes*, Herr's obscure and extravagant alteration, *shakes*, are alike to be rejected. That the Dauphin's use of these words refers to the trumpet announcing the approach of Pandulph, as suggested by the Clarkes, seems the most probable explanation, at least to the present ED.]

74. **The next**] IVOR JOHN: I can find no Shakespearean warrant for this peculiar use of 'next.' Did Shakespeare write *news*, as he did in scores of similar situations? [Compare, perhaps, 'For Humphrey being dead as he shall be And Henry put apart, the next for me.'—*2 Henry VI:* III, i, 383. SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) interprets 'the next' in this latter passage, *what follows, the rest;* and thus it may also be taken in the present line.—ED.]

83. **shall pardon me**] WRIGHT: That is, must pardon me. Compare: 'Your grace shall understand that at the receipt of your letter I am very sick.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, IV, i, 149. [For other examples of this use of 'shall' see, if needful, ABBOTT, § 315.]

83. **I will not backe**] SNIDER (ii, 314): The Dauphin from the obedient son of the Church becomes, in a breath, its most refractory child. What is the matter? His political interest now conflicts with religious authority, and he, in his turn, has come to refuse subordination to Rome; he is just where John was before. The Dauphin has no conscience; the Church is employed by him simply as an

I am too high-borne to be proportied
To be a ſecondary at controll,
Or vſefull ſeruing-man, and Inſtrument
To any Soueraigne State throughout the world.
Your breath firſt kindled the dead coale of warres,
Betweene this chaſtiz'd kingdome and my ſelfe,
And brought in matter that ſhould feed this fire;
And now 'tis farre too huge to be blowne out
With that ſame weake winde, which enkindled it:
You taught me how to know the face of right,
Acquainted me with intereſt to this Land,
Yea, thruſt this enterprize into my heart,

85-87. Om. Bell.
88. *coale of warres*] *coal of war* Pope, +, Ktly. *coals of war* Cap. conj. Huds. ii, Craig.
89. *chaſtiz'd*] *châstis'd* Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
90. *fire;*] *fire.* Pope,+ (—Var. '73).
92. *it:*] *it.* Pope et seq.
94. *intereſt to*] *int'rest to* Pope, Theob. Warb. *my int'rest in* Han.

instrument. But Pandulph is truly a comic figure; here his deep policy has swallowed itself. The State which he invoked to subject State to Church very naturally refuses to be subjected itself. This is just the old struggle over again—the Legate is exactly where he began. Such is the outcome of the political authority of the Church; it shows indeed a comic retribution. When the end is supposed to be gained it is simply lost. Pandulph vanishes and Lewis declares for battle.

84. proportied] WRIGHT: That is, treated as a property, or instrument for a particular purpose, to be thrown aside as soon as used, like a thing with no will of its own. The word is derived from the technical sense of the word 'property' as used in the theater. Compare: 'They have propertied me.'—*Twelfth Night*, IV, ii, 99.

88. warres] WRIGHT: 'Wars' and *war* are used interchangeably by Shakespeare. We find 'at war' in *Jul. Cæs.*, I, ii, 46, and 'at wars' in *2 Henry IV:* III, i, 60; 'go to war' in *Tro. & Cress.*, II, iii, 145; 'go to wars' in *Much Ado*, I, i, 307; 'make war' in *Macbeth*, II, iv, 18, and 'make wars' in *Coriol.*, I, iv, 40.

94. interest to this Land] MALONE: This was the phraseology of Shakespeare's time. So in *1 Henry IV:* 'He hath more worthy interest to the state.'—[III, ii, 98]. Again, in Dugdale's *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, ii, p. 927: '—in 4 Rich. II, he had a release from Rose the daughter and heir of Sir John de Arden before specified, of all her interest to the manor of Pedimore.' [Had Malone said that this was the *legal* phraseology of Shakespeare's time he would have been more correct. The present passage and that from *1 Henry IV.* are the only two wherein the noun 'interest' is thus used. In all the other instances the phrase is 'interest *in*.' 'Interest to' doubtless arose from confusion with the older word *interess*, right, or legal claim, which is thus explained by Coke: '*Interesse* . . . in legall understanding extendeth to Estates, Rights and Titles, that a man hath of, in, to, or out of Lands, for he is truly said to have an interest in them.'—*On Littleton*,

And come ye now to tell me *Iohn* hath made
His peace with *Rome*? what is that peace to me?
I (by the honour of my marriage bed)
After yong *Arthur*, claime this Land for mine,
And now it is halfe conquer'd, muſt I backe,
Becauſe that *Iohn* hath made his peace with *Rome*?
Am I *Romes* ſlaue? What penny hath *Rome* borne?
What men prouided? What munition ſent
To vnder-prop this Action? Is't not I
That vnder-goe this charge? Who elſe but I,
And ſuch as to my claime are liable,
Sweat in this buſineſſe, and maintaine this warre?
Haue I not heard theſe Iſlanders ſhout out
Viue le Roy, as I haue bank'd their Townes?

96. *ye*] *you* Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Sta. Huds. i, Fle. Craig.
98. *marriage bed*] *Marriage-bed* F_4.
102–112. *Am I...Set?*] Om. Bell.
102, 103. *borne?...prouided?*] *borne,... provided*, Theob. et seq.

345 b. It is not difficult to see that *interess to* easily might become, from similarity of sound, 'interest to.'—ED.]

96. ye] ABBOTT (§ 236): In the original form of the language 'ye' is nominative, *you* accusative. This distinction, however, though observed in our version of the Bible, was disregarded by Elizabethan authors, and 'ye' seems to be generally used in questions, entreaties, and rhetorical appeals. Ben Jonson says: 'The second person plural is for reverence sake to some singular thing.' Compare: 'Therein, ye gods, you make the weak most strong.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 91.

98, 99. I . . . claime this Land for mine] RITSON (*Remarks*, p. 84): It is possible that Shakespeare imagined the Dauphin to have the right he pretended. But even supposing Eleanor of Britain [Arthur's sister] out of the question, John, and his son Henry, had a better title than Blanch, who was only that king's sister's daughter; unless, indeed, he might be said to have forfeited all right, by his unnatural cruelty to his nephew . . . yet still even on that idea, would young Henry's title remain unimpeached; for neither then, nor in our Author's time, was it understood that the personal misconduct of the ancestor could, in any case, bar the succession of the innocent issue.

106. liable] WRIGHT: That is, ready to recognise my claim. [Wright compares 'And all that we upon this side the sea . . . Find liable to our crown and dignity, I, ii, 512–514, where 'liable' clearly means *subject* or *subservient to*, as, I think, it does also in the present line.—ED.]

109. Viue le Roy] WALKER (*Vers.*, p. 3): In French speeches or phrases, such as occasionally occur in Shakespeare, the final *e*, now mute, is usually sounded.

109. as I haue bank'd their Townes] STEEVENS: This may mean, 'throw up entrenchments before them.' The old play [*The Troublesome Raigne*], however, leaves this interpretation extremely disputable. It appears from thence that these salutations were given to the Dauphin as he *sailed along the banks* of the river. This, I suppose, Shakespeare called *banking* the towns.

[109. Viue le Roy, as I haue bank'd their Townes?]

'—from the hollow holes of Thamesis
Echo apace replied, *Vive le roy!*
From thence along the wanton rolling glade,
To Troynovant, your fair metropolis.'

[Pt ii, sc. iii, ll. 173–176, *Appendix*, p. 522.]

We still say to *coast* and to *flank;* and to 'bank' has no less of propriety, though it is not reconciled to us by modern usage.—COLLIER: It is doubtful in what sense we are to take 'bank'd'; whether Lewis means to say that he has thrown up embankments before the towns, or whether he uses 'bank'd' in reference to the towns on the shores of the Thames.—STAUNTON: This is supposed to mean, *sail'd along beside their towns upon the river's banks;* but from the context it seems more probably an allusion to card-playing; and by 'bank'd their towns' is meant, *won their towns, put them in bank* or *rest.*—[KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor*, p. 225) opines that this latter interpretation is preferable to that offered by Steevens; but to Shakespeare's use of 'banked' in this technical gaming sense there is an insuperable objection.—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) does not record any example of such, earlier than the nineteenth century. Under the meaning *coasted* Murray quotes the present line as the only example.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: I suspect a corruption here, though unable to suggest an emendation.—HALLIWELL: That is, thrown up intrenchments before. This seems to be the meaning, but in the Dauphin's speech in the old play, which is addressed to the Baron's, Echo is described as replying *Vive le Roy* 'from the hollow holes of Thamesis,' the writer perhaps forgetting that Rochester, the town there alluded to, was not situated on the Thames, but on the banks of the Medway. The Dauphin landed, besieged, and reduced the castle of Rochester, and hastened his march to the capital. It is this progress which is here alluded to.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: It is probable that the sentence includes reference to all these varied meanings [Steevens's, Staunton's, and Halliwell's] according to Shakespeare's mode of combining several significations in one comprehensive expression.—VAUGHAN (*i*, 85) characterises the interpretation by Steevens as 'farfetched' even supported by the quotation from the older play. 'It is possible,' says Vaughan, 'that the reading itself, "bank'd," may be wrong, and that it should be "*banged* their towns": "*banged*" is *battered*. *Othello:* "The desperate tempest hath so bang'd the Turks," II, i, 22.' He adheres, however, to the original text with the meaning, throw up entrenchments.—ORGER (p. 16) pertinently observes that this interpretation of 'bank'd,' 'or "cast a bank against them," as in *Isaiah*, xxxvii, 33, is alike contrary to the idea of the expedition of the march, and the alacrity of the inhabitants to accept relief from the dominion of their native king.' —It may, however, be noted that in the passage from Isaiah the word 'bank' appears for the first time in the Authorised Version; in the Genevan and earlier versions the phrase reads: 'cast a mount against'; this cannot, therefore, be taken as an example of such use of the word *bank*. Orger's objection is equally applicable to Vaughan's *bang'd* with its idea of a hostile action. In conclusion Orger says: '"Bank'd" may be more plausibly interpreted, Come by sea to the banks on which their towns stood, as "bank" is used in connection with the "sea" as well as "rivers." But as he is apparently speaking of his march, and "banking their towns" would in either case be a very forced expression, I would suggest *warned*, in the sense of *summon*, as it seems to be used in *Jul. Cæs.*, "They mean to warn us in Philippi here," and read: "as I have warned their towns."'—WRIGHT is in

Haue I not heere the beſt Cards for the game
To winne this eaſie match, plaid for a Crowne?
And ſhall I now giue ore the yeelded Set?
No, no, on my ſoule it neuer ſhall be ſaid.
Pand. You looke but on the out-ſide of this worke.
Dol. Out-ſide or in-ſide, I will not returne
Till my attempt ſo much be glorified,
As to my ample hope was promiſed,
Before I drew this gallant head of warre,
And cull'd theſe fiery ſpirits from the world
To out-looke Conqueſt, and to winne renowne
Euen in the iawes of danger, and of death:
What luſty Trumpet thus doth ſummon vs?

Enter Baſtard.

Baſt. According to the faire-play of the world,
Let me haue audience: I am ſent to ſpeake:
My holy Lord of Millane, from the King
I come to learne how you haue dealt for him:

111. *plaid*] *play'd* F_4, Johns. et seq.
113. *No, no*] *No,* Pope,+, Steev. Var. '03, '13, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. Dono. Neils.
neuer ſhall] *ſhall never* F_4, Rowe.
115. *Out-ſide or in-ſide*] *I care not* Bell.
116–121. Om. Bell.
116, 117. *glorified, ... promiſed,*] Ff, Rowe,+. *glorified,...promised* Coll. Del. Sta. Huds. i, Fle. *glorified...promiſèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *glorified...promised,* Hal. Ktly. *glorify'd... promised* Cap. et cet.
119. *fiery*] *firy* Mal. Steev.
121. [Trumpet sounds. Rowe et seq. (Trumpet within. Cap.).
123. SCENE IV. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
Enter Baſtard] Ff, Rowe, Pope. Enter Faulconbridge. Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. Enter Bastard attended. Cap. et cet. (Faulconbridge... Var. '78, '85, Rann. Richard...Words. Dono.
124. *faire-play*] *fair play* Pope,+, Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Coll. Del. Sta. Wh. Ktly, Cam. i,+, Dono. Craig.
125. *audience:*] *audience.* Johns. Var. '73, Knt, Neils.
125–127. *ſpeake:...King I come*] Ff, Sing. *speak,...king: I come,* Theob. Warb. *speak,...king: I come* Johns. Var. '73, I. John. *speak....king I come,* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Rlfe, Dono. *speak....king, I come,* Sta. *speak.... king I come* Ktly, Huds. i. *speak,... king. I come,* Wh. ii, Neils. *speak:... king I come,* Rowe et cet.
127. *you haue*] *you* Rann.

---

accord with Steevens that this word refers to the Dauphin's sailing along the rivers, and that the passage is based on that from the older play.—IVOR JOHN: I am inclined to suspect the text, the more so because it does not seem likely that the French went to attack many towns by sailing up rivers, although the corresponding passage of *The Troublesome Raigne* refers to sailing up the Thames. We might suggest *hail'd.*

113. **No, no, on my soule**] LETTSOM (ap. DYCE) suggests that this be 'No, on my soul,' but, as will be seen in the Text. Notes, he is anticipated by Pope; Mason and Steevens also make the same conjecture.—ED.

125–127. **I am sent . . . to learne**] As may be seen in the *Text. Notes* opinion

And, as you anſwer, I doe know the ſcope
And warrant limited vnto my tongue.
Pand. The *Dolphin* is too wilfull oppoſite
And will not temporize with my intreaties:
He flatly ſaies, heell not lay downe his Armes.
Baſt. By all the bloud that euer fury breath'd,
The youth ſaies well. Now heare our *Engliſh* King,
For thus his Royaltie doth ſpeake in me:
He is prepar'd, and reaſon to he ſhould,
This apiſh and vnmannerly approach,
This harneſs'd Maske, and vnaduiſed Reuell,
This vn-heard ſawcineſſe and boyiſh Troopes,

130. Dolphin] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
wilfull oppoſite] F_2F_3, Knt. *wilful, oppoſite*, F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *wilful-opposite* Theob. et cet.
132. *flatly*] *flately* F_2.
134. *well.*] *well:* Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt.
135. *me:*] *me.* Cap. et seq.
136–140. Om. Dono.
136. *to*] *too* Ff.
136. *ſhould,*] Ff. *should.* Rowe,+, Ktly. *should:* Cap. et cet.
138. *vnaduiſed*] *unadviséd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
139. *vn-heard*] *unheard* Ff, Rowe, Warb. Coll. i, Ktly. *unhear'd* Pope, Han. *unhair'd* Theob. et cet.
and] *of* Coll. ii. (MS.).
Troopes] *troop* Cap. conj. Huds. ii, Words.

---

is divided as to the correct pointing of these lines.—CAPELL declares that Theobald's punctuation quite destroys the force of the Bastard's speech; but this seems rather too severe a stricture; since, apart from the fact that with this pointing we obtain an awkward construction, 'I am sent from the king,' the general sense is quite the same as that conveyed by the Folio's text, 'I am sent: From the king I come to learn,' etc.—IVOR JOHN also thinks Theobald's comma after 'king' unnecessary; the arrangement he proposes and adopts as being nearer that of the Folio is, however, that of Johnson and the *Variorum* of '73.—ED.

129. limited] WRIGHT: That is, *appointed.* Compare: 'For 'tis my limited service.'—*Macbeth,* II, iii, 56.

131. temporize] WRIGHT: That is, *come to terms, compromise.* So, in *Coriol.,* IV, vi, 17: 'All's well; and might have been much better, if He could have temporized.'

131. intreaties] WALKER (*Crit.,* ii, 1): The double ending in this play grates on my ear. Read, surely, *entreates;* the mistake was easy. And so, perhaps, *Richard III:* 'I am not made of stone But penetrable to your kind entreaties.'—III, vii, 225. [Corroboration of Walker s conjecture is found in the fact that in this line from *Richard III.* the quarto reading is *intreats,* while the Folio reading is 'entreaties.' Walker gives numerous examples of *entreats* used for 'entreaties.' —ED.]

139. vn-heard] THEOBALD: 'Unheard' is an epithet of very little force or meaning here; besides, let us observe how it is coupled. Faulconbridge is sneering at the Dauphin's invasion as an unadvised enterprise, savouring of youth and in-

The King doth ſmile at, and is well prepar'd 140
To whip this dwarfiſh warre, this Pigmy Armes
From out the circle of his Territories. 142

141. *this*] *these* Rowe et seq. Vaughan conj. (withdrawn).
Pigmy Armes] *pigmy swarm* 142. *out*] *ont* F_2.

discretion; the result of childishness and unthinking rashness; and he seems altogether to dwell on this character of it by calling his preparation 'boyish troops,' 'dwarfish war,' 'pigmy arms,' etc., which, according to my emendation, sort very well with *unhair'd*, i. e., *unbearded* sauciness. So before Faulconbridge says: 'shall a beardless boy, A cockred, silken wanton brave our fields,' V, i, 74. So in *Macbeth:* 'And many unrough youths that even now Protest their first of manhood,' V, ii, 10.—MALONE, in support of Theobald's change, remarks that '*hair* was formerly written *hear*.'—COLLIER (ed. i.), rejecting Theobald's change as needless, accepted the Folio text, explaining that 'un-heard' was here used in the sense *unheard of*.—DYCE (*Remarks*, etc., p. 95) says: 'To me it is so evident from the context that *unhair'd* (i. e., beardless) is the true reading, that I should hardly blame any editor who omitted to state that the word happens to be misspelt in the Folios. Malone's remark might be confirmed by many passages besides the following: "But die their heare with sundry subtill slights," Epilogue to Gascoigne's *Steele Glasse*.'—WRIGHT also quotes: 'Staring with hollow eies and stiff vpstanding heares.'—*Faerie Queene*, II, ix, 13.—COLLIER (ed. ii.), evidently feeling the force of Dyce's remark, acknowledges the propriety of *unhair'd* and accepts it as the true reading, although his MS. Corrector is silent on this point.—INGLEBY (*Still Lion*, p. 22): Theobald, who must have been ignorant of the fact that 'unheard' was merely *unhair'd* under an earlier orthography, proposed *unhair'd* as an emendation. This is merely an example of those orthographies, so fertile in confusion and mistake, which coincide where they should diverge, and diverge where they should coincide.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) prefers the unchanged text taken in the sense *unprecedented, unheard of;* although he quotes the present line as the only instance of this use.—VAUGHAN (i, 87) proposes *unread*, i. e., having had no instruction, as a reading preferable to Theobald's, since 'boys are not unhaired,' and unlearned is 'peculiarly applicable to "boyish troops."' Vaughan offers the following ingenious history of the depravation: 'the word *unread* by a common slip of type-composing became *uneard*, and *uneard* was mistakenly corrected "unheard."' In his first edition Vaughan proposed '*unfear'd* sauciness *in* boyish troops'; but as he did not repeat this in his ed. ii. it may be regarded as withdrawn.—Miss C. PORTER: Theobald's emendation has received an astonishing vogue, when 'unheard' or *unheard of* is so pertinent and unforced.—[Though the date of the Folio is somewhat late for the archaic spelling 'unheard' for *unhair'd*, yet the latter epithet is here so appropriate that until there can be produced another example of 'unheard' in the sense given by Schmidt, we must, I think, accept Theobald's restoration.—ED.]

139. and] COLLIER (ed. ii.): The genitive case which the Corrector introduces [see *Text. Notes*] is clearly necessary, for the Bastard was speaking of the 'sauciness' *of* the boyish troops of France; and it not infrequently happened that the compositor blundered by confounding the abbreviation for 'and' with the preposition *of*.

That hand which had the ſtrength, euen at your dore,
To cudgell you, and make you take the hatch,
To diue like Buckets in concealed Welles,
To crowch in litter of your ſtable plankes,
To lye like pawnes, lock'd vp in cheſts and truncks,
To hug with ſwine, to ſeeke ſweet ſafety out
In vaults and priſons, and to thrill and ſhake,
Euen at the crying of your Nations crow,

145–152. Om. Bell.
145–147. Om. Dono.
145. *concealed*] *concealèd* Dyce, Huds. ii, Fle. Words.
148. *hug*] *herd* Rowe ii,+ (—Var. '73).
150. *crying...crow*] *crowing...cock* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.), Huds. ii, Words. *crying... cock* Ktly. *cawing...crow* Cartwright.
your] *our* Rowe ii,+ (—Var. '73).

144. **take the hatch**] STEEVENS: That is, *to leap* the hatch. To *take a hedge* or a *ditch* is the hunter's phrase.—MALONE: So in Massinger's *Fatal Dowry:* 'I look about and neigh, take hedge and ditch,' [IV, i.].—WRIGHT: Compare, 'Dogs leap the hatch, and all are fled.'—*Lear*, III, vi, 76. So in the present play, 'o'er the hatch,' I, i, 180, is used figuratively for an irregular mode of entering.

145. **concealed Welles**] MALONE: I believe our Author, with his accustomed license, used 'concealed' for *concealing;* wells that afforded *concealment* and protection to those who took refuge there.—STEEVENS: 'Concealed wells' are wells in concealed or *obscure* situations; viz.: in places *secured from public notice.*

147. **pawnes**] That is, *pledges.*

150. **the crying of your Nations crow**] MALONE justly reprehends the change of 'your' to *our* (which, by the way, he assigns to Pope, who is therein blameless), for the reason that 'the Bastard is speaking of John's achievements in *France.*'—DOUCE: That is, at the crowing of a cock, '*your* nation's crow'; *gallus* meaning both a cock and a Frenchman [an inhabitant of Gallia].—Z. GREY acknowledges, in his Preface, indebtedness to the Reverend Mr Smith of Harleston for various notes contributed. On the present line Mr Smith speaks as follows: 'As King Richard I, brother to King John, had been called the *scare-crow* of the Saracens . . . Shakespeare might, by poetical license, style King John the *scare-crow* of the French, from the signal victory he gained over them at the battle near Poictou.' Smith therefore proposes to read: 'the crying of your nation's *scare-crow*'; 'voice' in the next line is thus 'the sound of King John's name'; he justifies this reading by a quotation from *1 Henry VI.* in reference to Talbot: 'Here, said they, is the terror of the French, The scare-crow, that affrights our children so.'—I, iv, 42.—[The lines are apposite to Smith's argument, but whether the epithet, *scare-crow*, is as applicable to King John as to Talbot is open to grave doubt; of course the Bastard might so represent the case which is in Smith's favour; but that Shakespeare—I say it with reluctance—knew of John's military success at Poictou and therefore thus spoke of him here as 'the nation's scarecrow,' is hardly credible.—ED.]—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 211): Douce's suspicion is fully confirmed by the emendation [of the MS. Corrector] 'the *crowing* of your nation's *cock.*' There can, we apprehend, be no dispute that this must be the true text.—SINGER (ed. ii.) pays no attention to the MS. Corrector's suggestion, but, following Douce's lead,

[150. Euen at the crying of your Nations crow]

remarks that '"Crow" is here a metonymy *cock*.'—COLLIER (ed. ii.), justly indignant at this slight on his MS. Corrector, exclaims: 'It is certainly the first time it was ever stated that a "crow" was another name for a *cock*, or a *cock* for a "crow." Neither did we ever hear before that either a cock or a crow *cried*.'—[To this last Singer might have answered that Collier could have heard of just such an ornithological fact had he turned to Ariel's Song in *The Tempest:* '—I hear The strain of strutting chanticleer Cry, Cock-diddle-dow.'—I, ii, 383. It is somewhat hazardous to limit any poet as to what terms he is to use in describing a sound. Faulconbridge in l. 174 below is made to speak of the war-drum as 'crying out'; which is certainly more exaggerated than thus describing the sound of the cock or the crow.—ED.]—DYCE (*Remarks*, p. 96): Except those explanatory of customs, dress, &c., the notes of Douce are nearly worthless. Would Shakespeare (or any other writer) employ such an expression as 'the crying of the crow [of a cock]?'—HALLIWELL: [The MS. Corrector's reading is] a violent alteration for which there is not the shadow of authority. . . . The original text is perfectly intelligible,—to make you so afraid of the Englishmen, that you thrill and shake, even at the simple caw of your crow, mistaking it for his voice.—R. G. WHITE, retaining the Folio text, admits though that he is not satisfied with the passage, either with Malone's or with Douce's explanation; and is half disposed, were it not for the violence of the alteration, to accept the reading of Collier's MS. Corrector.—Br. NICHOLSON (*N. & Q.*, 1867, III, xi, 251): The lines previous to this may well stand for a boastful account of the dismay of the French, and devastation of their country, as set before us in the historic and patriotic play of *Edward III.*; and this line itself refers to that account of the winning of the battle of Crecy, which, in the same play, is transferred to that of Poictiers. Those birds that are there first spoken of as 'ravens' that, with the accompanying darkness, 'dismayed' the French soldiery, and made them 'let fall their arms, And stand like metamorphosed images Bloodless and pale, still gazing on another,' are spoken of thuswise a few lines further down by *Artois:* 'The amazed French Are quite distract with gazing on the crows'; and the Prince, 'What need we fight and sweat, and keep a coil, When railing crows outscold our adversaries?' As evidencing also in some degree the immediate source of the allusions, I would add that 'your nation's crow' seems to have been suggested by the remembrance of the French king's word about a dozen lines below the last quotation, when, with reference to another part of the prophecy, he says: 'Myself: What with recalling of the prophecy, And that our native stones from English arms Rebel against us, find myself attainted With strong surprise of weak and yielding fear.'—Act IV, sc. vi. Nowhere else in his histories does Shakespeare anachronise after this fashion, and hence I believe that he here appropriated a remarkable incident on which he had formerly written and dilated. Indeed, from this and other reasons, I cannot but believe that *Edward III.* was one of those plays which at an early period of his life was altered by him; and in relation to his other works, he seems to have considered it as a nursery garden, whence he could transplant and graft such seedlings of his genius as first appeared there.—KEIGHTLEY (*N. & Q.*, 1867, III, xii, 61): The reading of Collier's MS. Corrector is poor. I believe the real word to have been *crower*, a word no doubt of the Poet's coinage, like many others, but in strict accordance with analogy. The Bastard, we may see, has been using the most insulting and disparaging language to the French, and what was more natural than that he should con-

Thinking this voyce an armed Engliſhman. 151

151. *this*] *his* Rowe,+, Steev. Varr. Sing. Dyce, Wh. Ktly, Cam.+, Huds. Coll. iii, Words. Neils. Marshall. 151. *armed*] *armèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

temptuously term the bird that was regarded as their emblem the 'crower'? We may observe that *s* has been effaced at the end of the following line, and so *r* or *er* may have been effaced here. [It is unpleasant to agree with a criticism as harsh as that by Dyce in regard to the notes of Douce; but, in the present instance at least, I am disposed to think that it is justified. Collier's MS. Corrector falls under the same condemnation; and but little more can be said in defence of the remarks of various editors accepting Douce's explanation that Faulconbridge is here speaking contemptuously of the French, personified by their national emblem, the cock. Excellent antiquarian as was Douce, he has, I fear, spoken too hastily, and without a sufficiently careful examination of the facts in regard to the national emblem of France. Chéruel (*Dictionnaire Historique*, s. v. Coq) says: 'The cock was not used as the symbol of France until towards the close of the seventeenth century. Up to that time it figures only upon the spires of churches to symbolise the vigliance which should distinguish the ministers of God. One of the first monuments whereon the cock figures as an emblem of France is a medal of 1679, which bears the legend: "Gallus protector sub umbra alarum." Those who were the enemies of France made use of this emblem especially. For example, in 1706, on the defeat of the French at Ramillies, there was portrayed the figure of a cock allowing itself to be caught by a fish-hook, on which it was hurling itself eagerly. Another medal shows the Gallic Cock fleeing before the Belgian Lion, with this legend: "Nunc tu, Galle, fugis, dum leo belga fremit." . . . Up to the time of the Revolution the symbol of the cock was above all else satirical. It never appears on the medals struck by order of Louis XIV.; the Academy of Inscriptions never employs it as a national emblem. It was not adopted as a symbol of France until 1792.' Chéruel (s. v. *Armes de France*) says: 'Louis le Jeune [1137–1180] replaced the bees [national symbol of the earlier race] by the Fleur de lis, which remained the national emblem until the time of the Revolution. . . . Bonaparte becoming Emperor then substituted for the gallic cock the eagle, and on his imperial mantle sewed the bees. The restoration brought back the fleur de lis. In 1830 the gallic cock again became the national emblem; in 1852 it was replaced by the eagle.' (See also Larousse, *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique*, s. v. *coq gaulois*.)—Douce was at work upon his *Illustrations to Shakespeare* prior to 1807; at that time the cock was well known as the national emblem of France. This it was, perhaps, which misled him into thinking that it was of sufficient antiquity to be known to Shakespeare, but the dates show this to be impossible. As I began this note with the remark that it was unpleasant to agree in condemnation of Douce, so it is equally unpleasant to destroy faith in an explanation which has been accepted by a number of the editors, and which, up to the present time, has been unquestioned. I may add that Nicholson's suggestion that we have in this line a reminiscence of an incident in the play of *Edward III.* is eminently satisfactory, and with this explanation a change of text is quite needless.—ED.]

151. this voyce] DYCE: The Folio has 'this,' wrongly I believe. The misprint 'this' for *his* is frequent; so, earlier in the present play, the Folio has: 'And quench *this* fierie indignation.'—IV, i, 71.—FLEAY: Various editors read *his* for 'this'

Shall that victorious hand be feebled heere,
That in your Chambers gaue you chaſticement?
No : know the gallant Monarch is in Armes,
And like an Eagle, o're his ayerie towres,
To fowſſe annoyance that comes neere his Neſt;
And you degenerate, you ingrate Reuolts,
you bloudy Nero's, ripping vp the wombe
Of your deere Mother-England: bluſh for ſhame:
For your owne Ladies, and pale-viſag'd Maides,
Like *Amazons*, come tripping after drummes:
Their thimbles into armed Gantlets change,

154. *No: know*] *No, no,* Lettsom (ap. Dyce ii.).
155. *ayerie towres*] *ayery tower* F_4, Rowe i. *aiery tow'rs* Rowe ii,+. *aiery towers* Cap. et seq.
156. *fowſſe*] *fouſe* F_4.
157. *Reuolts*] *revolters* Pope, Han.
159. *your*] *our* Wh. i.
159. *ſhame:*] *shame.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
160–164. Om. Bell.
160. *and*] *the* Ktly.
162. *armed*] *armèd* Dyce, Ple. Huds. ii, Words.
change] *chang'd* Dyce, Coll. ii. (MS.), Huds. ii, Words.

here, and in I, i, 154; I, ii, 106; IV, i, 71. 'A common misprint,' they say; but surely it is more likely that we misunderstand the grammar of Shakespeare than that all these misprints should occur in one play.—MARSHALL: The change ['this' to *his*] is demanded more by the ear than by the understanding; the alliteration 'Thinking this' being very cacophonous, though it might make sense.

155. ayerie] That is, the nest of an eagle. Steevens compares, 'Our aiery buildeth in the cedar's top.'—*Richard III:* I, iii, 264.

155. towres] WRIGHT: That is, rises in its flight in circles till it gets to a favourable height for swooping down upon and striking its prey. Compare 'Which, like a falcon towering in the skies, Coucheth the fowl below.'—*Lucrece,* l. 506.

156. sowsse] WRIGHT: That is, to swoop upon or strike, is also a term of falconry. So, in Spenser, *Faerie Queene,* I, v, 8, of the fight of a griffin and a dragon: 'With hideous horror both together smight, And souce so sore, that they heavens affray.'

157. Reuolts] WRIGHT: That is, *rebels, deserters.* Compare *Cymb.*: 'This way, the Romans Must or for Britons slay us, or receive us For barbarous and unnatural revolts.'—IV, iv, 6. See also V, iv, 10 below.

158. bloudy Nero's] WRIGHT: The hideous story of Nero's barbarity is told in Higden's *Polychronicon* (ed. Lumby), iv, 395.—IVOR JOHN: It is also referred to in *The Troublesome Raigne* [*Philip (to his mother)*: 'And here, by Heaven's eternal lamps, I swear; As cursed Nero with his mother did, So I with you, if you resolve me not,' Pt i, sc. i, ll. 364–366], and again in *Hamlet,* III, ii, 412.

162. change] HALLIWELL: Dyce reads *chang'd,* which is perhaps an unnecessary deviation from the original text. The construction seems to be,—your own ladies, and pale visag'd maids, like Amazons come tripping after drums; they change their thimbles into armed gauntlets. [It is to be remembered that many forms of the early thimble were open at the end, thus the resemblance to an 'armed gauntlet' was not so unlike.—ED.]

Their Needl's to Lances, and their gentle hearts 163
To fierce and bloody inclination.
Dol. There end thy braue, and turn thy face in peace, 165

163. *Their*] Om. Pope, Han.
Needl's] *Needles* F_3F_4, Rowe,+, Cap. *neelds* Var. '78, '85, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. i, Knt, Del. Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. Craig. *neeles* Fle.
164. *inclination*] *inclinatiön* Fle. Words.
165. *There end*] *There; end* Coll. ii.

163. Needl's] STEEVENS: So, in *Mid. N. Dream:* 'Have with our neelds created both one flower.'—III, ii, 204.—[The original text in this last quotation is, however, 'needles.' *Neelds* is the reading adopted, for the sake of the metre, by Rann, Malone, and Steevens.]—MALONE remarks that this word was certainly, in the present line, intended to be so pronounced, as is evident from the spelling in the Folio.—ABBOTT (§ 465): 'Needle,' which in Gammer Garton rhymes with 'feele,' is often pronounced as a monosyllable. 'Deep clerks she dumbs, and with her need*le* composes,' *Pericles*, V, Gower, 5; 'I would they were in Afric both together; myself by with a needle that I might prick.'—*Cymb.*, I, i, 168; 'Or when she would with sharp need*le* wound.'—*Pericles*, IV, Gower 23. In the latter passage 'needle wound' is certainly harsh, though Gower does bespeak allowance for his verse. A. J. Ellis suggests *'ld* for 'would,' which removes the harshness. 'And grì | ping it | the nèed*le* | his fìn | ger pricks,' *R. of L.*, 319; 'Their nèed*les* | to làn | ces, ànd | their gènt | le hèarts.'—'To threàd | the pòst | ern òf | a smàll | need*les* eye.'—*Rich. II:* V, v, 17. 'Needles' seems harsh, and it would be more pleasing to modern readers to scan, 'the pòst | ern òf a | small neè | dles èye.' But this verse, in conjunction with *Per.*, IV, Gower 23, may indicate that 'needle' was pronounced as it was sometimes written, very much like *neeld*, and the *d* in *neeld*, as in *vild* (vile), may have been scarcely perceptible. [In a note on the line from *Mid. N. Dream*, quoted by Steevens above, the Editor, this edition, says: 'One instance of "needle" no one, I believe, has noticed, where it must be pronounced as a dissyllable. It occurs in *R. of L.*, within two lines, strangely enough, of the line cited by Abbott: "Lucretia's glove, wherein the needle sticks," l. 217. This proves, I think, that the word was pronounced by Shakespeare either as a monosyllable or as a dissyllable, according to the needs of his rhythm.'—Spenser, according to Osgood's *Concordance*, uses the word 'needle' six times; in each case the metre shows that it is to be taken as a dissyllable.—ED.]

165. There end thy braue] MINTO (p. 283): Mere warlike enthusiasm, the thirst for fighting and glory, is never more than a subordinate passion in Shakespeare's dramas. Its various moods—its hardy aspiration 'to pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon,' *1 Henry IV:* I, iii, 201; its eager revelling in the anticipated combat, *1 Henry IV:* IV, i, 111; its delight in the most deafening sounds of war; its contemptuous braving of the enemy [as here]—are rendered with the greatest spirit in the speeches of the hot-headed, 'wasp-stung, and impatient' Hotspur, and the strong, humorous soldier of fortune, Faulconbridge. When the warlike fit is on him, Hotspur is the very incarnation of the demon of war, the unmistakable son of Bellona: he speaks plain cannon-fire and breathes cannon-smoke; in his dreams he mutters words of encouragement to his horse, and his face is strained with phantom effort. But both Hotspur and the Bastard are exhibited to the audience rather as characters, or, as they were then called, 'humours,' than heroes. Hotspur's uncontrollable ardour is snubbed sarcastically

We grant thou canſt out-ſcold vs : Far thee well,
We hold our time too precious to be ſpent
With ſuch a brabler.
Pan. Giue me leaue to ſpeake.
Baſt. No, I will ſpeake.
Dol. We will attend to neyther:
Strike vp the drummes, and let the tongue of warre
Pleade for our intereſt, and our being heere.
Baſt. Indeede your drums being beaten, will cry out;
And ſo ſhall you, being beaten : Do but ſtart
An eccho with the clamor of thy drumme,
And euen at hand, a drumme is readie brac'd,
That ſhall reuerberate all, as lowd as thine.
Sound but another, and another ſhall
(As lowd as thine) rattle the Welkins eare,
And mocke the deepe mouth'd Thunder : for at hand
(Not truſting to this halting Lcgate heere,
Whom he hath vs'd rather for ſport, then neede)
Is warlike *Iohn* : and in his fore-head ſits
A bare-rib'd death, whoſe office is this day
To feaſt vpon whole thouſands of the French.
Dol. Strike vp our drummes, to finde this danger out.

166. *Far*] *fare* Ff.
168. *brabler*] *babler* Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Mal.
171. *neyther:*] *neither.* —Var. '73, Coll. Dyce, Del. Hal. Wh. Ktly, Cam. +, Huds. ii, Dono. Neils. Craig.
174. *out;*] *out?* F_4, Rowe i.
175. *beaten:*] *beaten.* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Sta. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds. i, Fle. Rlfe, Dono. Neils. Craig.
178. *all, as*] *all as* Pope et seq.
181. *Thunder:*] *thunder.* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb.
182. *Lcgate*] F_1.
185. *A bare-rib'd*] *Bare-ribbed* Anon. ap. Cam.

---

by his uncle and his father, and his fire-eating propensities generally are ridiculed by the more versatile Prince Harry. And similarly, when the Bastard, a more robust warrior than Percy, gives his bragging message to the King of France, he is called a scold, and contemptuously interrupted by the rattle of drums.

165. braue] WRIGHT: That is, *bravado, defiant speech.* Compare: 'This brave shall oft make thee to hide thy head.'—*Tro. & Cress.*, IV, iv, 139.

168. brabler] That is, *loud* or *quarrelsome talker.*—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) marks the verb *brabble* as of obscure origin.

184, 185. **in his fore-head sits A bare-rib'd death**] ROLFE compares: '—for within the hollow crown That rounds the mortal temples of a king Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits.' [But this is not, I think, a parallel; King Richard is moralising upon the precarious existence of a king.—ED.]

187. **Strike vp our drummes**] WRIGHT: 'Up' is here used emphatically, as in 'stifle . . . up,' IV, iii, 142. Compare *Richard III:* 'Strike up the drum,' IV,

Baſt. And thou ſhalt finde it (Dolphin) do not doubt 188
Exeunt.

Scæna Tertia.

Alarums. Enter Iohn and Hubert.

Iohn. How goes the day with vs? oh tell me *Hubert.*
Hub. Badly I feare; how fares your Maieſty?
Iohn. This Feauer that hath troubled me ſo long, 5
Lyes heauie on me: oh, my heart is ſicke.
Enter a Meſſenger. 7

188. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.

1. Scæna Tertia.] SCENE V. Pope, Han. Warb. ACT V, SC. I. Dono. SCENE III. Rowe et cet.
The Field of Battle. Pope,+, Varr. Rann, Cam.+, Neils. Near St Edmundsbury. A Field of Battle. Hal. The same. Field of Battle. Cap. et cet.

2. Alarums] Alarms F_4, Rowe,+. Loud Alarums. Cap.

3. *oh*] *O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Wh. i, Ktly, Huds.

4. *feare:*] *fear.* Coll. Sing. ii, Dyce, Del. Wh. Ktly, Cam.+, Huds. Words. Neils. Craig.

6. *oh,*] *O!* Coll. Sing. ii, Del. Ktly.
ſicke.] *sick!* Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt.

---

iv, 179, and *Coriol.*, IV, v, 230: 'You shall have the drum struck up this afternoon.' Compare also *Psalm* lxxxi, 3: 'Blow up the trumpet in the new moon.'

1. **Scæna Tertia**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscell.*, i, 103): These short scenes are of real importance, though often neglected by actors of some merit because not attended with expected applause. It was the great excellence of Garrick to hold in remembrance the character he played through all its various stages. No situation of it whatever was neglected by him. . . . In this dialogue with Hubert, Garrick's look, walk, and speech confessed the man broken with incessant anxiety and diseased both in body and in mind. Despair and death seemed to hover over him.

2. **Alarums**] BOSWELL STONE (p. 71): 'Alarums' may possibly represent the decisive battle of Lincoln fought on May 20, 1217, when the French and their English allies were defeated by William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke, who commanded the army of the boy-king, Henry III. If the general disregard of historic time in this play be remembered, such a conjecture is not affected by the qualification that it involves John's entry some seven months after the date which historians fix for his death. Allowing for altered circumstances and antedating, we may then suppose the 'great supply' [mentioned in l. 12] to be the reinforcements sent by Philip of France, about three months after the battle of Lincoln. These needful succours never reached Lewis.

5. **This Feauer . . . so long**] BUCKNILL (*Med. Knowledge of Sh.*, p. 135): King John is driven from the field of battle by illness, possibly by the accession of a fit of ague superinduced only by the breath of the Lincolnshire fens; since the fever, a common term for ague, has troubled him long.

Meſ. My Lord : your valiant kinſman *Falconbridge*,
Deſires your Maieſtie to leaue the field,
And ſend him word by me, which way you go.
Iohn. Tell him toward *Swinſted*, to the Abbey there.
Meſ. Be of good comfort: for the great ſupply
That was expected by the Dolphin heere,
Are wrack'd three nights ago on *Goodwin* ſands.
This newes was brought to *Richard* but euen now,

8. Falconbridge] Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. Faulconbridge Ff. et cet.
11, 19. Swinsted] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Fle. *Swineshead* Hal. *Swinstead* Theob. et cet.
12. *rhe*] F1.
13. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
14. *Are*] *Was* Cap. *Is* Hal.
wrack'd] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Wh. Sing. ii, Del. Sta. Fle. Rlfe, Craig. *wreck'd* Theob. ii. et cet.

11. Swinsted] REED (*Var.* '03): That is, Swineshead, as I am informed by the present Vicar of that place.—HALLIWELL: This is an error [for Swineshead] derived from the older play, and one which also occurs in ballads of the time; but it is as well to correct it, there being places of both names within twenty-five miles of each other, but at Swinstead there was no Abbey, and all the best authorities agree that King John rested at Swineshead where there was an Abbey founded for the Cistercians by Robert de Greslie in 1134. There are no remains of the building in existence.—[FRENCH (p. 4) says: 'Swineshead, on the eastern coast, is in the direct route from Lynn Regis to Sleaford, where John was taken ill, and Newark, where he died.'—ED.]—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXVII.): There can be no doubt that 'Swinstead' is an error for *Swineshead*, the place of King John's death. But as the mistake occurs in the old Quarto, which Shakespeare follows, we have not felt justified in removing it from the text.—[WRIGHT (*Clarendon Ed.*) notes that this same error is found in Rastell's *Chronicle* and Stow's *Annales* (1580).]

12–14. supply . . . Are wrack'd] MALONE: 'Supply' is here and in V, v, 16, used as a noun of multitude.—LETTSOM (ap. DYCE ii.): But Malone quite overlooks 'was' in the preceding line, which is incompatible with the plural 'Are'; and the words 'three nights ago,' which demand the aorist. I suspect that a line has been lost here.—[Lettsom's objection to Malone's remark is certainly well grounded and would be unanswerable were it not that, as Malone says, the word 'supply' is used again as a noun of multitude where this accident is reported to the Dauphin. These two passages are, moreover, the only examples of 'supply' thus used by Shakespeare.—ONIONS (*N. E. D.*, s. v. II, 5) gives but one example, and that from John Smith's *Discoveries and Accidents with the Second Supply in Virginia*, 1624: 'There we found the last supply were all sicke,' Bk III, ch. vi.—Capell's readings *was* for 'are' and *supplies* for 'supply,' in V, v, 16, may be accepted as an alternative to considering 'supply' used here in a sense so unusual. —ED.]

15. Richard] STEEVENS: That is, *Sir Richard Faulconbridge* [Qu. *Plantaganet?*]; and yet the King, a little before (Act III, sc. ii.), calls him by his original name of *Philip*.—MALONE: The King calls him familiarly by his old name of Philip, but the Messenger could not take the same liberty.—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The Messenger here uses the Christian name given in knighthood to Sir Richard Plan-

The French fight coldly, and retyre themſelues.
Iohn. Aye me, this tyrant Feauer burnes mee vp,
And will not let me welcome this good newes.
Set on toward *Swinſted:* to my Litter ſtraight,
Weakneſſe poſſeſſeth me, and I am faint. *Exeunt.*

Scena Quarta.

Enter Salisbury, Pembroke, and Bigot.

Sal. I did not thinke the King ſo ſtor'd with friends.
Pem. Vp once againe : put ſpirit in the French,
If they miſcarry : we miſcarry too.
Sal. That misbegotten diuell *Falconbridge,*
In ſpight of ſpight, alone vpholds the day.
Pem. They ſay King *Iohn* ſore ſick, hath left the field.
Enter Meloon wounded.
Mel. Lead me to the Reuolts of England heere.

17. *Aye me,*] Ff. *Ay me,* Rowe, Dyce ii, iii, Fle. Words. *Ay me!* Cap. Dyce i, Sta. Hal. Cam.+, Neils. Craig. *Ah me!* Pope et cet.
tyrant] *tyraot* F_2.
19. *ſtraight*] *ſtreight* F_4, Rowe. *strait* Pope,+.
1. Scena Quarta] SCENE VI. Pope. Han. Warb. Johns. Scene continued. Dono. SCENE IV. Rowe et cet.
The French Camp. Theob.+, Varr. Rann. Another part of the Battle-Field. Hal. Cam.+, Fle. Neils. The Same. Another part of the Same. Cap. et cet.
2. Enter...Bigot.] Alarums continued. Enter...and others. Cap. et seq.
6. *diuell*] *Devil,* F_4.
7. *ſpight of ſpight*] *spite of spite* Cap. et seq.
8. *ſore ſick*] *sore-sick* Dyce, Words.
9. Meloon] Ff, Ktly, Fle. Chatillion Bell. Kemble. Melun Rowe et cet.
wounded.] Ff, Rowe,+, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. led. Cap. and lead by Soldiers. Var. '73 et cet.

tagenet, although he has just called him by his former surname 'Faulconbridge.' It is as if the Poet wished to show that the renownedly brave man was known familiarly by both titles, and addressed or spoken of now by one and now by the other.

16. retyre themselues] WRIGHT: That is, *retreat.* 'Retire,' like *endeavor, remember,* and many other words, was once reflexive. Compare: 'Beseech you give me leave to retire myself.—*Coriol.*, I, iii, 30. [Also: 'He was not in the cities wofull fyre Consum'd, but did himselfe to safëty retyre.'—*Faerie Queene,* III, ix, 40.—ED.]

7. In spight of spight] MOBERLY: That is, in spite of all disaster. [Compare: 'In spight of spight in Hespera I golden fruit would pull.'—Warner, *Albion's England,* VII, xxxvi. (ed. 1602, p. 172).—ED.]

10. Reuolts] See, V, ii, 157 above.

Sal. When we were happie, we had other names. 11
Pem. It is the Count *Meloone.*
Sal. Wounded to death.
Mel. Fly Noble Engliſh, you are bought and ſold,
Vnthred the rude eye of Rebellion, 15

12. Meloone] Ff, Ktly, Fle. *Chatil-lion* Bell. *Melun* Rowe et cet.
15. *Vnthred...eye*] *Unthreed...eye* F$_4$. *Untread...way* Theob. i, Wh. i. *Untread ...road-way* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *Un-thread...eye* Rowe et cet.
15. *rude eye of*] *eye of rude* Huds. ii.

14. you are bought and sold] MALONE: This expression seems to have been proverbial; intimating that foul play has been used. Compare *Richard III:* 'Jocky of Norfolk be not too bold, For Dickon, thy master, is bought and sold.'—V, iii, 304.—STEEVENS: It is used again in *1 Henry VI:* IV, iv, 13, ['Bought and sold Lord Talbot'], and in *Com. of Errors,* III, i, 72, ['It would make a man as mad as a buck, to be so bought and sold.'—To these WRIGHT adds one more example from Shakespeare: 'Thou art bought and sold among those of any wit, like a barbarian slave.'—*Tro. & Cress.,* II, i, 51.—ED.]

15. Vnthred the rude eye] THEOBALD: Tho' all the copies concur in this reading, how poor is the metaphor of unthreading the eye of a needle? And, besides, as there is no mention made of a needle, how remote and obscure is the allusion without it? The text, as I have restored it, is easy and natural [see *Text. Notes*]; and it is a mode of expression which our Author is everywhere fond of, to *tread* and *untread*, the *way*, *path*, *steps*, etc. So Salisbury says afterwards: 'We will untread the steps of damned flight,' l. 56; 'But tread the stranger paths of banishment,' *Rich. II:* I, iii, 143; 'Where is the horse that doth untread again His tedious measures,' *Mer. of Ven.,* II, vi, 10. And in *Venus & Adonis:* 'She treads the path that she untreads again,' l. 908.—CAPELL (II, pt ii, p. 137): We may allow of this metaphor's poorness and of its poor introduction with the third modern [Theobald], without admitting (with him) a necessity of pronouncing it spurious, and so proceeding to change: Shakespeare has some others that match it; and this too had been swallowed, if *untread* had not invited, and *way*, words of such a tempting affinity it blinds the eye of a critic and makes objections invisible: and yet there is one against the use of them here that is rather glaring; namely, that this identical metaphor (for 'steps' makes no difference) occurs in another speaker's mouth in this identical scene (l. 56). And this possibly it was that caused the choice of the present metaphor, which though not the fittest that might be, has a poetical air with it; and in the license of poetry is significant of—forego or lay aside the work of 'rebellion,' its 'rude' work; making rebellion a sampler, and them the workers on it; but not daring to approach the real metaphor nearer, by reason of its baseness, the Poet gives the instrument working a 'rude eye,' intimating thereby the work's coarseness; and bids 'unthread' the rude instrument, for—lay aside the rude work. [Capell has, inadvertently I think, quoted in support of the original text the identical line that Theobald gives in corroboration of the propriety of his own reading. Capell's interpretation is fantastic to say the least.—ED.]—JOHNSON: The metaphor is certainly harsh, but I do not think the passage corrupted.—RANN: That is, clear it from all film, that it may see the path back to duty; lay aside the rude work.—MASON (*Comments on Sh.,* p. 161): The word 'eye' induces

[15. Vnthred the rude eye of Rebellion]

me to think that, notwithstanding the harshness of the metaphor, the present reading is that of Shakespeare. Coriolanus says of the common people of Rome: 'Even when the navel of the state was touch'd They would not thread the gates.' —[III, i, 124.—STEEVENS also adduces this quotation in support of the Folio text; and adds thereto: 'Threading dark-eyed night.'—*Lear*, II, i, 121.—ED.]— MALONE: Some one, observing on this passage, has been idle enough to suppose that the 'eye' of 'rebellion' was used like the 'eye' of the *mind*, &c. Shakespeare's metaphor is of a much humbler kind. He was evidently thinking of the 'eye of a needle.' Undo (says Melun to the English nobles) what you have done; desert the rebellious project in which you have engaged. In *Coriol.* we have a kindred expression [III, i, 124]. Our Author is not always careful that the epithet which he applies to a figurative term should answer on both sides. 'Rude' is applicable to 'rebellion,' but not to 'eye.' He means, in fact, the eye of rude rebellion. [As none of Malone's predecessors even suggest a reference to the 'eye of the mind,' I strongly suspect that the 'idle observer' is Malone himself, who thus repudiates a view which on later consideration he found untenable.—ED.]—KNIGHT regards Theobald's change merely as a corruption of the passage, and a conversion of poetry into prose; as to Malone's calling the metaphor of the needle's eye humble, Knight says: 'Nothing, it appears to us, is humble in poetry that conveys an image forcibly and distinctly; and "the eye of a needle" by the application of the poet may become dignified. But the word "thread" perhaps metaphorically is used to convey the meaning of passing through anything intricate, narrow, difficult. "They would not thread the gates" and "One gains the thickets and one thrids the brake," in Dryden, have each the same meaning. The "rude eye" is the rough and dangerous passage of rebellion.'—[In support of Knight's remark in regard to the use of metaphors of humble seeming the following passage from Cary's translation of Dante may, perhaps, be of interest—

> 'They each one eyed us, as at eventide
> One eyes another under a new moon
> And towards us sharpened their sight, as keen
> As an old tailor at his needle's eye.'—*Hell*, Canto XV, ll. 17–20.—ED.]

—DELIUS: Perhaps 'the rude eye of rebellion' means only, the *dark outlet* of rebellion.—COLLIER (*Notes*, etc., p. 211): Theobald was not far wrong when he changed 'Unthread' to *unread*, 'eye' to *way;* but he missed the emendation of another word, which with the others, is thus altered by the MS. Corrector: '*Untread the road-way* of rebellion,' that is, return by the road you took when you rebelled against King John. In confirmation we may notice that Salisbury himself repeats nearly the same terms [l. 56]. To misprint *untread the roadway*, 'unthread the rude eye,' seems an excess of carelessness, which we cannot in any way explain. The fault must in this instance lie with the compositor.—[COLLIER (ed. ii.), remarking on the agreement of Theobald's reading with that of the MS. Corrector, says: 'Even if it were mere conjecture in both cases it would be singular that two authorities should tally so exactly, yet not be right. Besides, common sense is altogether in favour of the emendation; for with all our predilection for Shakespeare's figures of speech, where they are intelligently printed, how can any poetical meaning be made out of the old text; it can present no image but the degrading one of unthreading the eye of a needle, and what has a needle and thread to do with

[15. Vnthred the rude eye of Rebellion]

rebellion? In our opinion nothing can be clearer than that the MS. Corrector's emendation restores the genuine language of the Poet according to the dictates of ordinary reason. . . . We have no hesitation in placing this change in the text of Shakespeare, where, we apprehend, it must ever hereafter remain.'—It was such infelicitous and extravagant commendation as that contained in the final sentences, coupled with an equally unfortunate tone of dogmatism, that excited the more acrimonious remarks of Collier's opponents. In his third edition Collier, still retaining the MS. correction, omits all comment beyond remarking that such was the reading of his corrector; and that 'Theobald read: "*Untread* the *rude eye*," which is only half the necessary emendation: how was a *rude eye* to be *untrodden?*'—This is, of course, quite incorrect; but in justice to the editor we must remember that at this later period he was upwards of eighty-seven years old, and his former notes were written nearly forty years since.—ED.]—SINGER (*Sh. Vindicated*, etc., p. 93): Never was a more improbable conjecture, though Theobald had *stumbled on it*, and perhaps the Corrector derived it from him. To 'unthread the rude eye of rebellion' is merely a metaphor of to undo what you have done, and return to your allegiance to the king. It is impossible to consider it a typographical error, and of this Mr Collier seems to be conscious.—STAUNTON: That is, Retrace the difficult path upon which you have entered. Theobald proposed to read, '*untread* the rude *way*,' but to thread one's way through any intricacy is still an habitual figure, and to pass through the eye of a needle is an oriental metaphor for any troublesome undertaking, familiar to us all by the passage in *Matthew*, xix, which Shakespeare has himself paraphrased in *Richard II:* 'It is as hard to come, as for a camel To thread the postern of a needle's eye,' V, v, 17; [Staunton also quotes the lines from *Coriol.* given as an example by Mason]. Moreover, the original spelling is 'unthred,' and it is remarkable that in the Folio, *thread*, which occurs many times, is invariably spelt *thred*, whilst *tread* is always exhibited in its present form.—HALLIWELL: If Malone's last opinion be questioned [that this means the eye of rude rebellion], the expression 'rude eye' may be interpreted as the rough passage of rebellion. Shakespeare was fond of domestic and familiar metaphors. So, in the present play: 'Now for the bare-picked bone of majesty'; and again, 'Have I not here the best cards for the game.'—R. G. WHITE: At the utmost stretch of metaphor, what likeness can there be between rebellion and a needle!—[Theobald's correction] is justified by the want of sense in the original text, and by Salisbury's reply to Melun's exhortation. He answers: 'We do believe, . . . and we will untread the steps of damned flight'; and this damned flight which they were to untread was plainly not their retreat, but their desertion of their king, their course along the rude way of rebellion. . . . The mistaking of *waye* for 'eye' in old manuscript was very likely to occur, and the misconception of the line (for compositors do not put manuscript in type word by word) was, in my judgment, still further aided by the fact that *tread* and 'thread' were pronounced alike. [That the sound of *th* and *t* was in many words identical was shown first by White in his *Introduction* to *Much Ado About Nothing*, p. 226; the substance of his remarks, with Ellis's answer thereto, will be found in the note on II, iii, 60 of *Much Ado*, this edition. White is possibly right that in the present passage there is confusion between the two words owing to the similarity of sound of *th* and *t*. Survivals of this may be seen in *Thomas, Thames, thyme*. In concluding his note on the present line White characterises the MS. Corrector's change, *road-*

[15. Vnthred the rude eye of Rebellion]

way, as 'needless.'—ED.]—A. SCHMIDT (*Jahrbuch*, iii, p. 357) is not satisfied with either Theobald's reading or that of Collier's MS. Corrector, and approaches the problem of determining the true reading in a different manner: Since either the word 'unthread' or 'eye' is a misprint, but certainly not both, a comparison of other passages in plays of nearly the same period as *King John* will lead us to the result desired; thus: 'Must I do so? and must I ravel out My weaved-up folly,' *Richard II:* IV, i, 228; 'Ill-weaved ambition, how much art thou shrunk!' *1 Henry IV:* V, iv, 88; and even nearer yet to this line in *King John:* '—will you again unknit This churlish knot of all-abhorred war?'—*1 Henry IV:* V, i, 16. 'Unknit' here corresponds exactly to 'unthread' in *King John*, 'churlish' to 'rude,' and 'knot' should have a parallel in place of 'eye,' and what otherwise could that be but *tie?* especially since the Folio usually prints this word *tye*. 'There is,' adds Schmidt, 'but one objection to this emendation. Often as Shakespeare uses the word *tie* as a verb, it is found as a substantive in *Macbeth* only, namely, at III, i, 17.'—IBID. (*Lex.*, ed. ii, s. v. unthread), after quoting the present line, compares *Richard II:* V, v, 17, and *Lear*, II, i, 121, remarking in conclusion: 'The constant combination of the words *thread* and *eye* in all these passages is sufficient to refute the different emendations proposed by the commentators, not excepting that attempted in this *Lexicon*, sub. *eye*.'—[This inclusion of his own emendation among those to be refuted does not appear in the ed. i. of his *Lexicon*.—ED.]—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: That is, retrace the rough and contracted path of rebellious disaffection into which you have thrust yourselves. The metaphor has the more propriety, because to thread the eye of a needle is a process of some difficulty; while, to unthread a needle's eye is, on the contrary, one of the most easy tasks: therefore the proposal to 'unthread the rude eye of rebellion' appropriately metaphorises the intricate course they have taken in forsaking the English side and revolting to the French; and also the facile one they would take in withdrawing themselves from it and returning to their natural allegiance.—WRIGHT, following several of his predecessors, compares *Richard II:* V, v, 17; *Coriol.*, III, i, 124; *Lear*, II, i, 121, 'where there is again an allusion to the needle's eye. Hence to "unthread the rude eye of rebellion" is to withdraw from the difficult and hazardous undertaking in which they were engaged.'—VAUGHAN (i, 89): What Shakespeare was thinking *directly* about was a person passing back again on return through the entrance *gate* through which he had once entered. But this thought he indirectly expresses by a metaphor from the eye of a needle; and as he speaks elsewhere of the 'needle's eye' as a postern, so he now imagines the postern as a needle's eye, and calls the postern an eye accordingly. The return through the gate, therefore, is like the return of a thread through the needle's eye, which return necessarily 'unthreads' the needle. Therefore the return through the gate metaphorically unthreads the gate. 'Unthread' is unquestionably right. I do not, besides, see the necessity for understanding 'rude' to apply to 'rebellion' and not to 'eye,' as critics insist, for surely a gateway may be imagined as rudely and repulsively built.—BULLOCH (p. 135): The only error in the passage is a deficiency of a syllable to complete the rhythm, and essential to its meaning. By reading the line thus every want is satisfied: 'Unthread the rude eye of rebellion's *maze*.' There is here a reference to the Cretan labyrinth, when Theseus found his way out by the thread which he had unwinded to the farthest recesses, and thus retraced his steps. Both *labyrinth* and *maze* are found in Shakespeare. . . . The

And welcome home againe diſcarded faith,
Seeke out King *Iohn*, and fall before his feete:
For if the French be Lords of this loud day,
He meanes to recompence the paines you take,
By cutting off your heads: Thus hath he ſworne,

16. *faith,*] *faith.* Pope et seq.
18. *the French be Lords*] *the Prince be lord* Ktly. *the French be lord* Cam. Edd. conj. Hunter conj. Words. *that France be lord* Huds. ii. *French Lewis be lord* Dono.

language of the speaker is: '—since you English have entered into this maze of rebellion, your only safety is to retrace your way, and welcome your lawful King.' —[It is to be feared that but few will agree with Bulloch that this reading satisfies every want; it is not sufficiently clear why the 'eye of rebellion's *maze*' is more intelligible than the simple 'eye of rebellion.'—ED.]—MARSHALL: The expression seems rather a forced one, though the epithet 'rude' may bear the double sense of *rough*, as applied to rebellion, and of *rudely* or *coarsely made*, as applied to the 'eye' of a needle. Dr Charles Annandale suggests *unthreat*, i. e., deprive of threatening look or expression; but I cannot find any instance of such a word, nor of the analogous use of any verb compounded with *un*.—BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*): That is, You have been drawn into this rebellion like thread into the eye of a needle by Lewis's treachery; draw yourselves out again before his work is stitched up, for when he has used you he will cut you off.

18, 19. French . . . **He meanes**] MALONE: That is, the Frenchman; Lewis means, etc. See Melun's next speech: 'If Lewis, by your assistance win the day,' l. 43.—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 235): Palpably wrong. Did Shakespeare write: 'if *that France* be *lord*, etc.? or is a line lost? e. g., 'Seek out King John, and fall before his feet; [Confide not in the plighted faith of Lewis;] For, if,' etc.—KEIGHTLEY (*Expositor*, p. 226): Here 'He' can only refer to John, while it is evidently the Dolphin that is meant. I have therefore, as I find Mr Lloyd also has done, read *Prince* for 'French,' and *lord* for 'lords.' But as in this play *Prince* alone is never used of the Dolphin, it may be that a line is lost. It might have been something of this sort: 'And Fortune smile upon the Dolphin's arms.'—CAMBRIDGE EDD.: In support of the reading which we propose, *lord* for 'lords,' we would refer to *Henry V:* IV, iv, 80, where 'the French' is used in the singular; '*the French* might have a good prey of us if *he* knew of it.'—[WRIGHT, Clarendon ed., repeats this note substantially, only adding that if we retain the original text, '"He," meaning the Dauphin, comes in rather abruptly.'—ED.].—HALLIWELL: The word 'He' here refers to Lewis, by a common inaccuracy which makes the pronoun relate to what is understood by the context as a whole.—MOBERLY: Many attempts have been made by editors to get 'the Dauphin' into this passage; as if a man wounded as Melun was must necessarily complete his sentence.

18. this loud day] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: By the one little monosyllable 'loud' here how finely does the Poet set before our imagination the uproar of battle—the drums and tramplings, and trumpetings, and shoutings, and groanings of an engagement.

20. By cutting off your heads] BELDEN (*Tudor Sh.*): This treachery of Lewis comes as something of a surprise. In *The Troublesome Raigne* it is prepared for by an earlier scene in which Lewis, after confirming by oath the solemn agreement

And I with him, and many moe with mee,
Vpon the Altar at S. *Edmondsbury*,
Euen on that Altar, where we ſwore to you
Deere Amity, and euerlaſting loue.
Sal. May this be poſſible? May this be true?
Mel. Haue I not hideous death within my view,
Retaining but a quantity of life,

22. *S.*] *Saint* F_4. *St.* F_3F_4. Cap. Varr. Rann, Mal. Steev.
25. *poſſible?*] *possible!* Pope et seq. 27–29. Om. Dono.
true?] *true!* Theob. Warb. Johns.

with the English nobles referred to at the opening of V, ii. above, proceeds, as soon as he is left alone with his French followers, to swear on the altar at St Edmundsbury that '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.'

26. **Mel. Haue I not hideous death,** etc.] C. COWDEN CLARKE (*Sh's Characters*, p. 337): As an instance of the caution with which Shakespeare conducts and fills up the design in his dramas, and contrives to make even the most subordinate parts accord with the main outline, and constitute a portion and necessary adjunct to the consummated plot, may be noticed the introduction on the scene of the dying French lord, Melun—with the sublime lesson put into the mouth of a man, 'right in whose eyes are seen the cruel pangs of death.' At that solemnest moment of all the junctures in a man's life, it was especially fine in the Poet to place truth, and honour, and fidelity in contrast with dissimulation, fraud, and treachery. The dying speech of this French lord—one of the least important agents, be it observed, in the history—is scarcely to be exceeded in affect by any other in the play.—W. L. RUSHTON (*N. & Q.*, 1872, IV, x, 29): Shakespeare may have taken this sentiment from the following passage in Lyly's *Euphues:* 'When my lady came, and saw me so altered in a moneth, wasted to the harde bones, more lyke a ghoast then a lyving creature . . . she asked me whether the Italian were my messenger, or if he were, whether his embassage were true, which question I thus answered—"Lady to dissemble with the worlde, when I am departing from it, woulde profite me nothing with man, and hinder me much with God; to make my deathbed the place of deceipt, might hasten my death, and encrease my danger,"' [*Euphues and his England*, ed. Bond, ii, 73]. In these passages Shakespeare and Lyly express the same sentiment in similar language.—HEARD (p. 18): An exception to the rule rejecting hearsay evidence is allowed in the case of *dying declarations*. Shakespeare has put the principle on which this species of evidence is admitted into the mouth of the dying Melun. Evidence of this description is admissible only in the single instance of homicide, 'where the death of the deceased is the subject of the charge, and the circumstances of the death are the subject of the dying declaration.' One reason for thus restricting the admission of this species of evidence may be the experienced fact that implicit reliance cannot in all cases be placed on the declarations of a dying person; for his body may have survived the powers of his mind.

27. **a quantity**] WRIGHT: That is, a small portion, such as could be easily measured. Compare: 'Thou rag, thou quantity, thou remnant.'—*Tam. of Shrew*, IV, iii, 112.

Which bleeds away, euen as a forme of waxe
Reſolueth from his figure 'gainſt the fire?
What in the world ſhould make me now deceiue,
Since I muſt looſe the vſe of all deceite?
Why ſhould I then be falſe, ſince it is true
That I muſt dye heere, and liue hence, by Truth?
I ſay againe, if *Lewis* do win the day,
He is forſworne, if ere thoſe eyes of yours
Behold another day breake in the Eaſt:
But euen this night, whoſe blacke contagious breath
Already ſmoakes about the burning Creſt
Of the old, feeble, and day-wearied Sunne,
Euen this ill night, your breathing ſhall expire,
Paying the fine of rated Treachery,
Euen with a treacherous fine of all your liues:

29. *his*] *its* Pope,+.
32, 33. Om. Bell, Dono.
34, 43. Lewis] *Louis* Dyce, Hal. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Words.
34. *do win*] *win* Pope, Han.
36. *Eaſt:*] *east.* Theob. ii, Warb. Johns. Var. '73, Sta. Ktly, Fle.
37–39. *night,...Sunne,*] Ff. Rowe,+, Huds. i, Cam.+, Fle. Dono. Neils. *night,—...sun,—* Cap. et cet.
whoſe...Sunne] Om. Bell.
38. *Creſt*] *cresset* Anon. ap. Cam.
41–43. Om. Bell.
41. *rated*] *hated* Johns. conj.

28. a forme of waxe] STEEVENS: This is said in allusion to the images made by witches. Holinshed observes that it was alleged against dame Eleanor Cobham and her confederates 'that they had devised an image of wax representing the king, which by their sorcerie, by little and little consumed, intending thereby, in conclusion, to waste and destroy the king's person.'

33. liue hence, by Truth] That is, live hereafter by telling the truth. Compare, 'This must be answered either here, or hence.'—IV, ii, 92.

37. night . . . contagious] For this idea that the night air was dangerous to health, compare: 'What is Brutus sick And will he steal out of his wholesome bed To dare the vile contagion of the night.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, II, i, 263–265.—ED.

39. old, feeble, . . . Sunne] WALKER (*Crit.*, iii, 123) compares: '—when from high-most pitch, with weary car, Like feeble age, he reeleth from the day.'—*Sonnet* vii.

41. fine] WRIGHT: There is, of course, a play upon the two meanings of this word, *penalty* and *end*, as in *Hamlet*, V, i, 115, 'Is this the fine of his fines?'

41. rated Treachery] JOHNSON: It were easy to change 'rated' to *hated* for an easier meaning, but 'rated' suits better with 'fine.' The Dauphin has *rated* your treachery, and set upon it a *fine* which your lives must pay.—WRIGHT: That is, treachery which has been assessed at its value.—MOORE SMITH: Perhaps the word 'rated' implies the other sense, *rebuked, blamed.* Compare *Ant. & Cleo.*, I, iv, 34: 'to be chid, as we rate boys.'

42. Euen . . . your liues] In R. G. WHITE'S ed. ii. this line should be at the top of the page, but has been strangely misplaced to follow l. 50. A vagary of the

If *Lewis*, by your aſsiſtance win the day.
Commend me to one *Hubert*, with your King;
The loue of him, and this reſpect beſides
(For that my Grandſire was an Engliſhman)
Awakes my Conſcience to confeſſe all this.
In lieu whereof, I pray you beare me hence
From forth the noiſe and rumour of the Field;
Where I may thinke the remnant of my thoughts
In peace: and part this bodie and my ſoule
With contemplation, and deuout deſires.
Sal. We do beleeue thee, and beſhrew my ſoule,
But I do loue the fauour, and the forme
Of this moſt faire occaſion, by the which
We will vntread the ſteps of damned flight,
And like a bated and retired Flood,

45, 46. *him,...Engliſhman*)] Ff, Rowe, +, Ktly, Cam.+, Fle. Neils. Craig. *him,—...Englishman,—* Cap. et cet.

51. *peace:*] Ff. *peace;* Rowe, Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *peace,* Pope et cet.

53. *thee,*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. i, ii. *thee;* Var. '73, Wh. i, Huds. i, Coll. iii, Neils. *thee.*— Sta. *thee:* Cam.+, Craig. *thee,*— Cap. et cet.

56. *damned*] *damnèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

flight,] Ff, Rowe, Cam.+, Neils. *flight;* Pope et cet.

57. *retired*] *retiring* Han. *retirèd* Dyce, Fle. Words. Huds. ii.

compositor which makes Melun ask that he may think the remnant of his thoughts even with a treacherous fine of the lives of all the nobles.—ED.

46. **For . . . an Englishman**] MALONE first called attention to this line as taken bodily from *The Troublesome Raigne*, pt ii, sc. v, l. 28.—FRENCH (p. 18): It would be interesting to discover whether Shakespeare, following the old play, had any authority for deriving Melun from an English ancestor. Robert de Melun, Bishop of Hereford, A. D. 1163–1166, was one of the chief opponents of Thomas à Becket; he was called 'Episcopus Anglorum sapientissimus.'—MOBERLY: According to Holinshed Melun 'fell sick at London' and gave the warning to the English nobles without assigning any particular motive. *The Troublesome Raigne* adds that he wishes to free his soul from guilt, and the more so 'because his grandsire was an Englishman.' Shakespeare adds the love of Hubert as a still stronger inducement, probably because after these events Hubert was viewed as the model Englishman. —MARSHALL: It is difficult to conjecture why Shakespeare introduces this friendship of Melun for Hubert; perhaps he intended to have made some dramatic use of it, but forgot his intention.

49. **rumour**] WRIGHT: That is, a confused din. Compare *Jul. Cæs.*, II, iv, 18: 'I heard a bustling rumour, like a fray.' [These are the only passages wherein Shakespeare uses this word in this sense; elsewhere it has the present meaning, as in IV, ii, 127: '—but this from rumours tongue I idely heard.'

54. **But I do loue**] ABBOTT (§ 126): 'But' is not adversative, but means *if not* after 'beshrew me.' [Compare, 'Perdition catch my soul, But I do love thee!'—*Othello*, III, iii, 90.]

Leauing our rankneſſe and irregular courſe,
Stoope lowe within thoſe bounds we haue ore-look'd,
And calmely run on in obedience
Euen to our Ocean, to our great King *Iohn*.
My arme ſhall giue thee helpe to beare thee hence,
For I do ſee the cruell pangs of death
Right in thine eye. Away, my friends, new flight,

58. *rankneſſe*] *bankless* Cap. conj.
59. *ore-look'd*] *o'erleaped* Meredith.
60. *obedience*] *due obedience* Bell.
64. *Right in thine eye*] *Right in thine eyes* Pope. *Pight in thine eyes* Han. *Pight in thine eye* Warb. *Fight in thine eye* Cap. *Bright in thine eye* Coll. ii, iii. (MS.). *Fright in thine eye* Anon. ap. Coll. *Light in thine eye* Knt. conj. (Stratford Sh.). *Riot in thine eye* Brae. *Light on thine eye* Moberly conj.
64. *my friends,*] *my friends!* Cap. et seq.
new flight] *and fly* Pope, Han.

58. ranknesse] MALONE: 'Rank,' as applied to water, here signifies *exuberant, ready to overflow;* as applied to the actions of the speaker and his party it signifies *inordinate.* So in *Ven. & Ad.*, 'Rain added to a river that is rank Perforce will force it overflow the bank,' [l. 71].

59. bounds we haue ore-look'd] Compare: 'Like a proud river peering ore his bounds.'—II, i, 25.

61. our Ocean . . . our great King Iohn] SIMPSON (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1874, p. 432): King John is owned, even by his mother, to have possession, but no right. And Faulconbridge after Arthur's death, whose title he always opposed, says: 'The life, the right, the truth of all this realm is fled to Heaven.' The rebellion of the nobles, justified morally, is only condemned politically as unpatriotic: a treason not against the king, but against the country; which they not only ravaged by war, but delivered over to the foreigner. Salisbury, in the exaggeration of his new loyalty, says: 'We will . . . calmly run on in obedience Even to our Ocean, to our great King John.' The expression is strong, but it is, after all, only the natural term of the metaphor of the overflowing river. The position of the royal power must be judged by the facts, not by a doubtful word. The 'right' of King John being expressly denied, we can hardly find a 'divine right' in a poetical bye-word. [The title of Simpson's article is *The Politics of Shakespeare's Historical Plays;* the foregoing is from the section dealing with the Tenure of the Crown.—ED.]

64. Right in thine eye] STEEVENS: 'Right' signifies *immediate.* It is now obsolete.—HEATH (p. 131): If Hanmer's correction [*pight*] be admitted, it seems to require that 'pangs,' too, in l. 63 should be altered to *phangs* or *fangs.* For pangs *pight*, or pitched, in an eye seems to be but an inconsistent metaphor. But I can see no necessity for altering the old reading, 'Right in thine eye,' or as Pope gives it, 'in thine *eyes*,' that is, full, or plainly, in thine eyes.—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 138): What sense or what fitness others may discover in 'Right' (or in '*Pight*,' which is its Oxford amendment) is unknown to the editor; this he is sure of—that neither the one nor the other has poetry; and therefore thinks himself justified in its present easy correction by a word that has both [see *Text. Notes*].—COLLIER (*Notes & Emendations*, p. 212): '*Bright*' appears, from the MS. Corrector's insertion of the necessary letter in the margin, to be the word in reference to the remarkable brilliancy of the eyes of many persons just before death. Editors guessed at

And happie newneſſe, that intends old right. *Exeunt* 65

65. In margin Pope, Han. 65. Exeunt] Exeunt, leading off Melun. Theob. et seq.

almost every word but the right one.—SINGER (*Sh. Vind.*, p. 94): The MS. Corrector's change is plausible, but not necessary. The old text is perfectly intelligible. —KNIGHT (*Stratford Sh.*): This substitution of *Bright* for 'Right' is, we venture to say, the one grain of wheat in the long catalogue of MS. corrections of *King John*, and ought to be introduced in every edition.—DYCE, after quoting the foregoing opinions of Singer and Knight, says: 'For my own part, I am convinced that [the MS. Corrector's change] is utterly wrong; and, in confirmation of my opinion, I could cite the authority of an eminent living physician [Dr Elliotson, as Dyce admits in his ed. ii.]. Mr Collier tells us that "Bright" is to be understood "in reference to the remarkable brilliancy of the eyes of many persons just before death"; but if that lighting up of the eyes ever occurs, it is only when comparative tranquillity precedes dissolution—not during "the pangs of death"; and most assuredly it is never to be witnessed in those persons who, like Melun, are dying of wounds—*of exhaustion from loss of blood*—in which case the eye, immediately before death, becomes glazed and colourless.'—[BUCKNILL (*Sh's Medical Knowledge*, p. 136) corroborates Elliotson's opinion that death from hæmorrhage causes a dimness of the eye; but says, on the other hand, that the eye would be bright under 'cruel pangs.'—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: That is, *directly* (which is only dirightly) or immediately. A right course is a straight course; and a straight course, or line is the shortest, nearest, or most immediate course between any two points, either to physical or mental perception. [Referring to Steevens's remark that 'right' in the sense of *immediate* 'is now obsolete,' White adds: 'But it has survived in America, and is in constant and common use in the phrase "Right away," for "on the instant," "immediately," which our somewhat overweening cousins sneer at as an Americanism.']—ELZE (*Athenæum*, 22 June, 1867): I think the compositor anticipated 'right' from the following line, and am convinced that the true reading is '*Writhing* thine eye.'—FLEAY: That is, *not pretended, veritable.*—HUDSON (ed. ii.): Capell reads '*Fight* in thine eye'; and the same occurred to me before I knew that anyone had hit upon it. I have hardly any doubt that so we ought to read; for the image or idea of death-pangs combating in the eye, and striving to quench its native fire, is good sense and good poetry too.—VAUGHAN (i, 91): The Poet is here probably alluding to the sign of death described by Pliny, who after saying that the eye gives token of dissolution 'most of all,' adds: 'so long as the patient's eye is so clear that a man may see himself in the apple of it, we are not to despair of life' (Holland's translation). Now 'right in thine eye' is a precise equivalent to 'in the apple of thine eye,' and is therefore the true reading.—[Holland's translation did not appear until 1601; therefore this could not have been the source of Shakespeare's knowledge on this subject at the time of the composition of the present play.—ED.]—WRIGHT: That 'Right' is a possible misprint for *Riot* [see *Text. Notes*] is certain, from the fact that in the first edition of the *Globe Shakespeare* 'riotous' was misprinted *righteous* in *Rich. III:* II, i, 100.

65. **happie newnesse**] JOHNSON: That is, happy innovation, that purposed the restoration of the ancient rightful government.—RITSON (*Remarks*, etc., p. 84): What 'rightful government'? Does the good old constitutionalist [Johnson] sup-

Scena Quinta.

Enter Dolphin, and his Traine.

Dol. The Sun of heauen (me thought) was loth to ſet;
But ſtaid, and made the Weſterne Welkin bluſh,
When Engliſh meaſure backward their owne ground

1–26. Om. Bell.

1. Scena Quinta.] Ff. SCENE VII. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. Night comes on; retreat sounded. Dono. A different part of the French Camp. Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. The French Camp. Cam.+, Neils. The Same. The French Camp. Cap. et cet.

2. Dolphin,] Ff. Louis, Dyce, Hal. Wh. i. Lewis, Rowe et cet.

3. *me thought*] *methought* F_4.

4. *ſtaid*] Ff, Rowe,+, Var. '78, '85, Rann. *stay'd* Cap. et cet.

5. *Engliſh*] Ff, Rowe i, Coll. Wh. i, Cam.+, Huds. i, Fle. *th' English* Rowe ii,+, Huds. ii, Words. *the English* Cap. et cet.

meaſure] Ff, Rowe, Cam.+, Fle. *measur'd* Pope et cet.

pose it to have been John, a murderer and a villain, one who had not the least right to the possession of the crown, and whom it would have been praiseworthy in any man or set of men to have put to death?

1. Scena Quinta] E. B. WARNER (p. 47): The Play brings the army of Lewis to a halt, after some large successes, by the submission of John to the Roman see. As we know, however, this interference of the Pope had been against the army of Philip. While the events of the last scenes of the play therefore are very fairly accurate, they are so turned out of their order in time, as well as twisted as to the relations of the prime actors, that there is not room for the smallest pretense to suppose that Shakespeare ever consulted history at all in the construction of this play.

3. The Sun . . . was loth to set] CARTER (p. 216): Compare the Scripture reference to the victory of Joshua: 'And the Sunne abode, and the moone stood still, untill the people avenged themselves upon their enemies: (is not this written in the booke of Jasher). So the Sunne abode in the middes of the heaven, and hasted not to goe downe for a whole day.'—*Joshua*, x, 13 (*Geneva Vers.*).

5. measure] WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 61) quotes this line as an instance wherein the final *d* and final *e* are confounded in the Folio text; which confusion, remarks Walker, arises 'in some instances perhaps from the juxtaposition of *d* and *e* in the compositor's case; but far oftener—as is evident from the frequency of the erratum—from something in the old method of writing the final *e* or *d*, and which those who are versed in Elizabethan MSS may perhaps be able to explain.'—LETTSOM, Walker's editor, subjoins this foot-note: 'Walker's sagacity, in default of positive knowledge, has led him to the truth. The *e*, with the last upstroke prolonged and terminated with a loop, might easily be taken for *d*. It is frequently found so written.' [Other examples of this confusion given by Walker are as follows: 'To vs the imagine [for *imagin'd*] Voyce of Heauen itselfe,' *2 Henry IV:* IV, ii, p. 92, col. 2; 'Mine eyes Were not in fault, for she was beautifull: Mine eares that heare [for *heard*] her flattery,' *Cymb.*, V, v, p. 395, col. 2.—ED.]—WRIGHT, who retains the Folio text, remarks, 'there are instances of this change from the past to the present.' See *Winters Tale*, V, ii, 83: 'She lifted the princess from the earth, and so locks her in embracing as if she would pin her to her heart.'—[Walker's is a more satisfactory explanation, at least to the present ED.]—MOBERLY:

In faint Retire : Oh brauely came we off, 6
When with a volley of our needleſſe ſhot,
After ſuch bloody toile, we bid good night.
And woon'd our tott'ring colours clearly vp, 9

9. *woon'd*] *wound* Rowe ii. et seq.
¶ *tott'ring*] Ff, Rowe. Neils. *tatter'd* Pope,+, Cap. Varr. Rann. Steev. Var. '03, '13, Coll. MS. *tottering* Sing. Knt, Sta. Ktly, Fle. Cam. ii, Craig. *tatt'ring* Wh. ii. *tattering* Mal. et cet.
9. *clearly*] *chearly* Rann conj. *closely* Coll. MS. *cleanly* Cam. Edd. conj.

As 'backward' is not wanted along with 'in faint retire,' perhaps Shakespeare wrote 'To see the English measure their own ground In faint retire.'—VAUGHAN (i, 91): I cannot quite approve [Rowe's and Pope's alterations]. The sentence is partly an historical statement of fact and partly an explanation of the fact. The western welkin blushes, 'when English measure backward their own ground,' in sympathy with the discomfiture of the most western race and kingdom, and it did so on this occasion. The general and indefinite word 'English' and the present tense 'measure' seem to me appropriate to the double meaning which is conveyed.

9. tott'ring] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. tottered): Originally a variant of *tattered*, and used in that sense (cf. Norwegian dialect *totra*, rag); subsequently associated with *totter v.*, to swing to and fro, and more or less assimilated in sense. 1596: *1 Henry IV:* IV, ii, 37: 'A hundred and fiftie totter'd prodigalls, lately come from swine-keeping.' [Steevens furnished several other examples of this form of the word. Shakespeare uses the words *tatters* and *tattered* in several other passages, but with the exception of the present passage and that from *1 Henry IV*, already quoted, the spelling, in the Folio, is in the modern form.—Rolfe notes, however, that in *Rich. II:* III, iii, 52, the 1st and 2nd Quartos have 'tottered,' while the Folios read *tattered*.—ED.]—MALONE, adopting Pope's reading, *tatter'd*, says, in justification, that Shakespeare uses the active and passive participles 'very indiscriminately.'—On this point see ABBOTT, § 372.—STEEVENS, also reading with Pope, remarks: 'Of *tattering* (which would obviously mean *tearing to tatters*) our Author's works afford no parallel.—KNIGHT, after remarking that *tattering* was originally the same as 'tottering,' adds, 'But "tottering," in our present meaning *unsteady*, may be received without difficulty.'—SINGER: It is obvious that *tatter'd* cannot be the right word, for how could their *tatter'd* colours be *clearly wound up?* The Dauphin means to put the best face on a drawn battle, and says: 'Our colours which were tottering, and like to have gone down in the action, were fairly furled up at its close without disaster. Though not lords of the field, we were the last to quit it.' 'To *tottre*,' says Baret, 'nutare, vacillare, see shake and wagge.'—STAUNTON: To *totter* signified to *hang* or droop; and the 'tottering' or *drooping* colours, after a hard fight, contrast becomingly with the *spreading, waving* colours of an army advancing to battle.—FLEAY: That is, waving. Compare *Spanish Tragedy*, sc. vi, 'A man hanging and tottering and tottering, As you know the wind will wave a man.' Most editors say it means tattered (!).

9. clearly] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 138): The only sense 'clearly' can have is, entirely or totally, leaving nothing unwound; but why should that be thought of by Lewis? or, if thought of, why expressed so imperfectly? The near resemblance it bears to *chearly* or cheerfully, the great apparent fitness of that word, and the other's unfitness, all determine the editor to think *chearly* should be advanced to the text, removing it from its first designed station—the conjectural readings.—

Laſt in the field, and almoſt Lords of it.

Enter a Meſſenger.

Meſ. Where is my Prince, the Dolphin?

Dol. Heere : what newes?

Meſ. The Count *Meloone* is ſlaine: The Engliſh Lords
By his perſwaſion, are againe falne off,
And your ſupply, which you haue wiſh'd ſo long,
Are caſt away, and ſunke on *Goodwin* ſands.

Dol. Ah fowle, ſhrew'd newes. Beſhrew thy very hart:
I did not thinke to be ſo ſad to night
As this hath made me. Who was he that ſaid
King *Iohn* did flie an houre or two before
The ſtumbling night did part our wearie powres?

Meſ. Who euer ſpoke it, it is true my Lord.

Dol. Well : keepe good quarter, & good care to night,
The day ſhall not be vp ſo ſoone as I,
To try the faire aduenture of to morrow. *Exeunt*

12. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. i, Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.

14. *The*] *My lord, the* Cap. conj. Meloone] F_2, Ktly, Fle. Melloone F_3F_4. *Melun* Rowe et cet.

15. *againe*] *at length* Ff, Rowe, Pope, Han. *falne*] *faln* F_4, Cap. *fall'n* Rowe, + (—Var. '73), Cam.+, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Words. Craig. *fallen* Var. '73 et cet.

16. *ſupply*] *ſupplies* Cap. Var. '73, '78, Rann, Coll. iii.

16. *long*] *long for* Ktly.

17. *Are*] *Is* Hal.

18. *fowle, ſhrew'd*] *foule ſhrew'd* Ff, Rowe. *foul, shrewd* Theob. Warb. Johns. *foul-shrewd* Huds. ii. *foul shrewd* Pope, et cet. *newes.*[*news!* Theob. et seq. *hart:*] Ff, Rowe,+, Fle. *heart!* Cap. et cet.

19. *ſo ſad*] *sad* Theob. ii, Warb.

22. *powres*] *powers* F_3.

COLLIER (*Notes & Emendations*, etc., p. 212): We are not prepared to say that we like *closely* [the MS. corrector's change] better than 'clearly,' the latter, perhaps, indicating the winding up of the colours without obstruction from the enemy.—[MOORE SMITH makes the same suggestion for a meaning of 'clearly.'—ED.]—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXIX.): *Clearly* [see *Text. Notes*] is equivalent to *neatly*, and seems to be appropriate as antithetical to 'tottering' or *tattering*. [DR WRIGHT in the Clarendon ed. remarks on this earlier conjectural reading that *cleanly* does not give a sense different from that of the original text.—ED.]—FLEAY: That is, *completely*. Compare *Arden of Feversham*, IV, i: 'Well, seeing 'tis done clearly, let it pass.' Here also 'clearly' means completely. Cf. also *Twelfth Night*, V, i, 289.—KINNEAR (p. 205): That is, *sine macula*, unstained by defeat.—DEIGHTON: If we knew what 'clearly' meant, we should be nearer knowing what 'tottering' means. If 'tottering' is equivalent to 'tattered,' it is active participle for the passive.

24. **keepe good quarter**] STEEVENS: That is, keep in your allotted posts or stations.—WRIGHT: Guard carefully the posts assigned to you. Compare *1 Henry VI:* II, i, 63: 'Had all your quarters been as safely kept As that whereof I had the government.'

Scena Sexta.

Enter Baſtard and Hubert, ſeuerally.

Hub. Whoſe there? Speake hoa, ſpeake quickely, or I ſhoote.

Baſt. A friend. What art thou?

Hub. Of the part of England.

Baſt. Whether doeſt thou go?

Hub. What's that to thee?
Why may not I demand of thine affaires,
As well as thou of mine?

Baſt. *Hubert*, I thinke.

1. Scena Sexta.] Ff. SCENE VIII. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. SCENE II. Dono. SCENE VI. Rowe et cet.
Swinstead. Plains leading to the Abbey. Cap. An open place in the neighborhood of Swinstead Abbey. Theob. et cet. (Swineshead... Hal.).
2. Baſtard] Faulconbridge Theob. Varr. Rann. Richard Words. Dono.
feuerally.] meeting. Cap. Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Knt, Huds.
3. *Whoſe...hoa,*] One line Fle.
Whoſe] *Who's* F_4.
3. *Speake hoa,*] *Speak, hoa,* F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Speak, ho.* Fle. *Speak, ho!* Theob. et cet.
6–9. Om. Bell.
6. *Whether*] *And whither* Pope,+. *Whither* F_4, Rowe et cet.
7, 8. *What's...demand*] Ff, Rowe,+, Sta. One line Cap. et cet.
8, 9. *Why ... mine?*] Bast. *Why ... mine?* Lloyd, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Wh. ii, Words. Neils.
8. *not I*] *I not* Var. '78, '85, Rann.
10. Baſt.] Om. Lloyd, Dyce ii, iii, Huds. ii, Wh. ii, Words. Neils.

4. **A friend. What art thou?**] DAWSON: The line begun by the Bastard can be equally well completed by Hubert's reply, or by the Bastard's second question. Perhaps they were to be said together by the two actors, the Bastard asking his second question without heeding Hubert's reply. 'Whither dost thou go' seems too trochaic for the beginning of a line.

5. **Of the part of England**] That is, of the English side, or party.

7–10. **Hub. What's that . . . Bast. Hubert . . . thinke**] W. W. LLOYD recommended the following redistribution of these speeches; which Dyce accepts in his ed. ii. 'as absolutely necessary': '*Hub.* What's that to thee? *Bast.* Why may not I demand Of thine affairs, as well as thou of mine? Hubert I think?'—Marshall likewise follows this suggested redistribution.—ELZE (*Notes*, 1st series, p. 64): If we bear in mind that throughout the play the Bastard is hot-headed, aggressive and over-bearing, whereas Hubert is of a sedate temperament and generally stands on his defence, it will seem quite natural that it is not the latter but the former who opens the dialogue with the impetuous question: 'Who's there? Speak hoa!' to which he immediately adds a threat. It speaks greatly in favour of this supposition that in the stage-direction the name of the Bastard is placed first. I feel therefore convinced that the verses should be distributed as follows:

Bast. Who's there? Speak, ho! speak quickly, or I shoot.
Hub. A friend.

Hub. Thou haſt a perfect thought: 11
I will vpon all hazards well beleeue
Thou art my friend, that know'ſt my tongue ſo well:
Who art thou?
Baſt. Who thou wilt: and if thou pleaſe 15
Thou maiſt be-friend me ſo much, as to thinke
I come one way of the *Plantagenets*.
Hub. Vnkinde remembrance: thou, & endles night, 18

11–19. *Thou haſt...ſhame*] Om. Bell.
15. *and*] Ff, Rowe,+, Del. Wh. i, Cam.+, Fle. Words. Dono. Neils. *an* Cap. et cet.
18. *endles*] *endleſs* F_4, Rowe, Pope, Coll. i, Del. Hal. Ktly, Dono. *eyeless* Theob. et cet.

Bast. What art thou?
Hub. Of the part of England.—
Whither dost thou go?
Bast. What's that to thee?
Hub. Why may not I demand
Of thine affairs, as well as thou of mine?
Bast. Hubert, I think.
Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought.

—VAUGHAN (i, 93): Half a line is wanted here after 'Whether dost thou go?' spoken by the Bastard. Further, Hubert first refuses to answer a question himself, and then immediately proceeds to expostulate with the Bastard as if for refusing to answer, whereas the Bastard himself has given no refusal, nor showed any reluctance to be questioned. I would give the dialogue thus:

Bast. A friend: what art thou?
Hub. Of the part of England.
Whither dost thou go?
Bast. What is that to thee?
Hub. 'What is that to thee'?—Why may I not demand
Of thine affairs—as well as thou of mine?
Bast. Hubert, I think.
Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought.

18. Vnkinde remembrance] WRIGHT: Hubert reproaches his own want of memory, which, together with the darkness, prevented him from recognising his friend.

18. endles] THEOBALD: Why 'endless night'? Hubert means no more than that the dulness of his recollection, and the darkness of the night, had disgraced him in his not knowing Faulconbridge by the tone of his voice. Our Author certainly wrote *eyeless*.—WARBURTON: We should read *eyeless*. So Pindar calls the moon *the eye of night*. ['The Moon with radiant orb, Eve's radiant eye displayed.'—*Ode* III, Strophe ii.; trans. A. Moore.—ED.]—STEEVENS: This epithet ['eyeless'] I find in Markham's *English Arcadia*, 1607: 'O eyeless night, the portraiture of death!' Again, in Gower, *Confessione Amantis*, lib. v, fol. 102, b.: 'The daie made ende, and loste his sight, And comen was the darke night, The whiche all the daies eie blent,' [ed. Macaulay (*E. E. T. Soc.*), liber v, ll. 3465, 3466, where l. 3465 reads 'loste his lyht.'—COLLIER, in his edition of *Edward III*,

[18. Hub. Vnkinde remembrance : thou, & endles night]

included in his Shakespeare, ed. iii, compares, with this present passage in *King John*, the following, 'Masking as 'twere, the beauteous burning sun, Leaving no hope to us but sullen dark And eyeless terror of all ending night.'—IV, iv, 7–9.—ED.]—MALONE: With Pindar our Author had certainly no acquaintance; but, I believe, the correction *eyeless* is right. Shakespeare has, however, twice applied the epithet 'endless' to *night* in *Rich. II:* 'Then thus I turn me from my country's light To dwell in solemn shades of endless night,' [I, iii, 177]. Again: 'My oil-dry'd lamp—Shall be extinct with age and endless night,' [Ibid., l. 222]. But in the latter of these passages a natural, and in the former a kind of civil, *death* is alluded to. In the present passage the epithet 'endless' is inadmissible because, if understood literally, it is false. On the other hand, *eyeless* is peculiarly applicable. The emendation is also supported by our Author's *Rape of Lucrece:* 'Poor grooms are sightless night; kings, glorious day,' [l. 1013].—COLLIER: [Theobald's alteration] is quite unnecessary, and perverts the sense of the Poet. Hubert is referring to the length of the night, and 'endless' could not well have been a misprint for *eyeless*.—[COLLIER in both his ed. ii. and ed. iii. follows Theobald, partly on the strength of his MS. Corrector's concurrence with that reading.—ED.]—WALKER (*Crit.*, ii, 66) includes this word 'endles' among those wherein there has occurred a confusion between the final *d* and *e* in the Folio; thus the word here should be, he avers, *eieles*.—VERPLANCK: 'Endless night' seems a natural expression of impatience at the long and tedious night.—JOHN HUNTER: '*Eyeless* night,' that is, night that prevents vision. Another example of metonymy, like 'the stumbling night.'—FLEAY: '*Eyeless*,' that is, *blinding*. So the editors explain. I think rather, night without starlight: the stars being the night's eyes, as the sun is the day's. The misprint is in itself worth notice: in *Rom. & Jul.* we have *fire and fury* for *fire-eyed fury;* and in *Timon, wappened widow* for *wap-eyed widow;* in *Mer. of Ven. endless* for *cureless*.—SCHMIDT (*Lex.*) explains 'endless' as here meaning *extremely dark;* on this Wright comments: 'If this were the meaning of "endless" there would be no need for change; otherwise it is a mere otiose epithet.'—Miss PORTER: A night that seems unending, in sadness, and hopelessness, as well as darkness. It expresses Hubert's feeling rather than fact or figure. Hence Theobald's change is not so fit, however rational. It is, moreover, a thoroughly natural expression where mere naturalness is suitable. [This last sentence refers to the Folio reading, not to Theobald's.—ED.]—MARSHALL: In favour of the reading of the Folio it may be said that 'endless' is not here so commonplace an epithet as at first sight might appear. Hubert had been watching by the king all night; and to him the night might well seem *endless*, anxious as he was for the day. That the night was unusually dark we gather from lines 23 and 27 below, and from the circumstance that Faulconbridge tells Hubert that he had lost half his power in crossing the flats of the Wash. One circumstance may be worth noting; and that is in seven other passages in the Folio in which 'endless' occurs it is invariably spelt *endlesse*. Remembering Shakespeare's fondness for the fancy of calling the stars '*night's candles*,' *Mer. of Ven.*, V, i, 220, and *Rom. & Jul.*, III, v, 9, one is almost tempted to suggest that he might here have coined a word, and written 'candleless night.'—DANIEL (p. 47) has made the same conjecture, though somewhat abbreviated, *cand'less*, which IVOR JOHN characterises as a 'hideous word'; there will be few, I think, who will gainsay him in that.—JOHN asks: 'Is there here a reminiscence on anyone's part (Shakespeare, copyist, or

Haue done me ſhame : Braue Soldier, pardon me,
That any accent breaking from thy tongue,
Should ſcape the true acquaintance of mine eare.
Baſt. Come, come : ſans complement, What newes abroad?
Hub. Why heere walke I, in the black brow of night
To finde you out.
Baſt. Brcefe then : and what's the newes?
Hub. O my ſweet ſir, newes fitting to the night,
Blacke, fearefull, comfortleſſe, and horrible.
Baſt. Shew me the very wound of this ill newes,
I am no woman, Ile not ſwound at it.
Hub. The King I feare is poyſon'd by a Monke,

25. *Brcefe*] F_1.
26. *fitting*] *fitted* Johns. Varr. Rann.
29. *ſwound*] Fle. Craig. *swoond* Del. *ſwoon* F_4 et cet.
30. *Monke,*] *monk.* Johns. Neils. *monk:* Cap. et seq.

printer) of the "endless night" of Gaunt's speech in *Rich. II:* I, iii, 222?'—[In spite of Marshall's able defence of 'endless' as here used, the objections of Theobald and Malone that it is inapplicable, as descriptive of profound darkness, are well grounded. But is it to the darkness that Hubert here refers? Faulconbridge recognises Hubert by his voice, not by sight, and Hubert says that unkind remembrance and endless night prevented him from recognising the *voice* of Faulconbridge; again there was no question of sight; in his next speech Hubert says that he has started out under the black brow of night to find Faulconbridge; it seems hardly likely then that he would admit his inability to recognise him for whom he was searching simply because it was dark. As Shakespeare has twice used the words 'endless night' as a euphemism for *death*, I incline to think that they are here used in the same sense, and that Hubert thus refers to the death of the King; it was anxiety, together with his unkind memory, that made him unable to recognise the voice of his friend. His use of a descriptive phrase rather than the plain word *death* is quite in agreement with what he says later: that his object in coming out was to acquaint Faulconbridge in order that he might thus better prepare him for bad news which otherwise might have come to him unexpectedly. Theobald's emendation *eyeless*, while it has ample justification from other examples, is, I think, unnecessary.—ED.]

23, 24. **Why heere . . . you out**] Rev. JOHN HUNTER: I walk abroad to find you out with your night darkened visage.—FLEAY: As we say, in the face of day. What can J. Hunter mean? [Compare: '—this disturbed sky Is not to walk in.'—*Jul. Cæs.*, I, iii, 39.]

30. **poyson'd by a Monke**] MALONE: Not one of the historians who wrote within sixty years after the death of King John mentions this very improbable story. Thomas Wykes is the first who relates it in his Chronicle as a *report*. According to the best accounts John died at Newark, of a fever. [Malone gives in outline the story as related by Holinshed; but Grafton was, I think, the source of the incident as in the older play; the unpleasant nature of the poison, and the method of its procuring, are mentioned by Grafton only: 'And in the same selfe

I left him almoſt ſpeechleſſe, and broke out 31
To acquaint you with this euill, that you might

32. *To*] *T'* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. 32–34. *that...of this*] Om. Bell. Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

yere [1216], King Iohn came to Swinestedes Abbey, not farre from Lyncolne, he rested there two dayes, where as certayne wryters report that he was most trayterously poysoned, by a Monke of the same Abbey being of the order of Saint Barnard, called Simon Swynested, and as Caxton sayth in his booke called *fructus temporarum* and *Polichronicon* also sayth the same, the aforesayd Monke named Simon, hearyng the king upon an occasion to talke of breade, should say that if he lived a yere lenger, he would make that lofe of breade beyng then of the value of one halfe penny woorth twelve pence, meanyng that he woulde so persecute his rebellious people, that he would not leave one of them to be the owner of a plough. The Monke heeryng the king thus speake, conceyued of the king a very euill opinion, insomuch the Monke went to his Abbot shewyng him the whole matter, and what he was mynded to do. He alleged for himselfe the prophesie of Cayphas, saiyng: it is better that one man dye, then all the people should perishe. I am well content, sayth he, to die and to become a martyr, so that I may utterly destroy this Tyraunt. With that the Abbot wept for gladnesse, and much commended his feruant zeale as he toke it. The Monke then beyng absolued of his Abbot for doyng of this act aforehande, went secretly into a Gardeyne vpon the backesyde, and findyng there a most venemous toade, he so pricked him, and pressed him with his penne knife, that he made him vomit all the poyson that was within him. This done, he conueyed it into a cup of wine, and with a smilyng and flatteryng countenance he sayd thus to the king, if it shall lyke your Princely Maiestie, here is such a Cup of Wine as ye neuer dranke before in all your life tyme, I trust this wassall shall make all England glad. And with that he dranke a great draught, the king pledging him. The Monke anone after went to the Farmory [infirmary], and there dyed, his guttes gushing out of his belly, and had continually from thence forth three Monkes to sing Masses for his soule, confirmed by their generall Chapter. The king within shorte space after, feeling great griefe in hys body, asked for Simon the Monke, and aunswere was made that he was departed this lyfe: Then God haue mercy vpon me (sayd the king) I suspected as muche. With that he commaunded his Chariot to be brought, for he was not able to ryde. So went he from thence to Slaford Castell, and from thence to Newarke vpon Trent, and there within lesse then three dayes he dyed, when he had reigned xvij. yeres. vj. monethes and odde dayes, and was honourably buryed at Worcester, with all his armed men attendyng vpon the buryell.'—Grafton's *Chronicle*, i, 246.—CHESNEY (p. 137): Shakespeare does not appear to have kept close to the symptomatology, for the king had been sick a time before this poisoning should have happened; in V, iii, whilst on the field of battle, the king was made to exclaim: 'Ah me! this tyrant fever burns me up, and will not let me welcome this good news.' If the Monk had been using treachery toward the king, then he certainly had been using 'poison to work a great time after,' because even prior to the facts last stated as to the condition of King John on the battlefield, the complaint is made by him—'this fever that hath troubled me so long lies heavy on me: O! my heart is sick.'

32–34. that you might . . . of this] MALONE: That you might be able to pre-

The better arme you to the ſodaine time,
Then if you had at leiſure knowne of this.
Baſt. How did he take it? Who did taſte to him?
Hub. A Monke I tell you, à reſolued villaine
Whoſe Bowels ſodainly burſt out: The King

33. *ſodaine*] *ſudden* F_4.
34. *at leiſure...of*] *at my leisure...o'* Herr.
35–38. *How...recouer.*] Om. Dono.
36. *reſolued*] *resolvèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
37. *ſodainly*] *ſuddenly* Ff.

pare instantly for the sudden revolution in affairs which the king's death will occasion in a better manner than you could have done if you had not known of it till the event had actually happened, and the kingdom was reduced to a state of composure and quiet.—M. MASON (*Additional Comments*, p. 36): It appears to me that 'at leisure' means *less speedily*, after some delay. I do not clearly comprehend Malone's explanation; the death of the king was not likely to reduce the kingdom to a state of composure and quiet whilst there was a hostile army in the heart of it.—VAUGHAN (i, 94): 'At leisure' applies to Hubert's leisure and not to the kingdom's quiet [as explained by Malone]. The purport of the line is 'than if I had not made so much haste to inform you of this.' The last two lines are, however, faulty in expression. 'The better . . . than' is not a phrase that we could use now. Possibly we should read 'Then better arm you,' etc. This word *then* is one key to the meaning of 'at leisure,'—'that you might better arm yourself against the exigencies of the moment, through my breaking out in this way to tell you, than you could through my taking my leisure to tell you.'—WRIGHT explains 'the sudden time' as 'the emergency which has suddenly come upon us'; and 'at leisure' as 'if the news had come in a leisurely manner and not in this hot haste.' [This seems the more logical explanation; for other examples of 'to' in the sense *with a view to*, as in 'to the sudden time,' see ABBOTT, § 186.—ED.]

34. **at leisure knowne of this**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 138): 'Knowing a thing at leisure' can have no other sense than to know it by preparation, preparedly; now a *better armour* is none against the first impressions of grief or 'ill news' than preparation; and yet the words of this line import a better, and in doing so, are repugnant to the drift of all that proceeds. Perhaps it may be apparent by this time that some corruption has happen'd; and the way it has happen'd may have occurr'd to a prepar'd critic, and one who carries in mind the corruptions of other places: *less* and 'leisure' concurring caus'd a dropping of *less;* and the line (whose first words were 'Than had you') coming so disfigur'd to press, was patch'd by a transposition, and *if*, instead of this its very certain amendment (as we are bold to pronounce)—'Than had you at *less* leisure known of this': meaning, as said before,—when you were less prepar'd.

35. **Who did taste to him?**] That is, who acted as taster for him?

36. **resolued**] WRIGHT: That is, *resolute*, determined. Compare *Rich. III:* iii, 340: 'How now, my hardy, stout resolved mates!'

37. **Whose Bowels sodainly burst out**] BUCKNILL (*Med. Knowledge of Sh.*, p. 137): The ideas which prevailed in Shakespeare's time on the subject of poisons, both among the ignorant and learned, were strangely chimerical; the description of this death by poison is, however, as accurate as it is fearful; the only point of error

Yet ſpeakes, and peraduenture may recouer.
Baſt. Who didſt thou leaue to tend his Maieſty?
Hub. Why know you not? The Lords are all come backe,
And brought Prince *Henry* in their companie,
At whoſe requeſt the king hath pardon'd them,
And they are all about his Maieſtie.
Baſt. With-hold thine indignation, mighty heauen,
And tempt vs not to beare aboue our power.

39. *Who*] *Whom* Han. Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. Craig.
40, 41. *not?...companie,*] *not,...company?* Mal. conj. *not...company?* Sta. Dyce ii, iii, Words. Neils. *not?...company?* Fle.
44. *heauen,*] *Heav'n,* Rowe. *heav'n!* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns.
45. *power.*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. i, ii. *power!* Cap. et cet.

being in Hubert's description of the poison upon the monk 'whose bowels suddenly burst out.' No poison known to modern science would produce such an effect. It is, however, quite consistent with the old opinion, both medical and general, which attributed to poison swelling and bursting of the body as one of its effects. [See l. 30 above, note and extract from Grafton's *Chronicle;* this symptom is not mentioned in the older play.—ED.]—MOYES (p. 54): There is some internal evidence to show that arsenic was the poison administered to King John. The Monk who poisoned him acted the part of taster and died immediately. 'The bowels suddenly burst out' is not an unlikely popular description of the severe diarrhœa which is a frequent symptom of arsenical poisoning, especially as this is often accompanied by discharges of blood.—[In Moson's translation of Wirtzung's *Praxis Medicinæ Universalis,* 1598, Part 7, ch. 4: among the symptoms of poisoning by cantharides is mentioned in particular 'there avoydeth the scrapings of the bowels, like to them that haue the bloudie Flixe,' p. 695.—See also notes by Moyes, and Wainwright, V, vii, 45.—ED.]—UPTON (p. 134, foot-note), in order to exhibit some of Shakespeare's 'rants about kings, which border on blasphemy,' quotes 'Most sacriligious murther hath broke ope The Lord's anointed temple,' *Macbeth,* II, iii, 72, and the present passage; upon this latter he remarks: 'So 'tis written of Judas, *Acts,* i, 18: "He fell headlong and burst asunder." You see,' adds Upton, 'he has Christ in view whenever he speaks of kings, and this was the court language: I wish it never went further.'—MOBERLY: It is strange that Shakespeare should make the Monk's 'bowels burst out' when nothing of the kind happened to John. There may have been some notion of a specially divine punishment upon a regicide.

40. Why know you not?] HALLIWELL: Sense would sanction a comma after the word 'not,' but the punctuation of the Folio more clearly expresses Hubert's astonishment at the Bastard not being acquainted with that which he proceeds to mention. [See *Text. Notes.*]

45. tempt vs . . . our power] CARTER (p. 216) compares: 'God is faithful which wil not suffer you to be tempted above that you are able, but will even give the issue with the tentation that ye may be able to beare it.'—*1 Corinthians,* x, 13 (*Geneva Vers.*).—[HALLIWELL and JOHN HUNTER likewise refer to this passage from *1 Corinthians,* but quote it as in the Authorised Version. 'Tempt' in both

Ile tell thee *Hubert*, halfe my power this night
Paſſing theſe Flats, are taken by the Tide,
Theſe Lincolne-Waſhes haue deuoured them,
My ſelfe, well mounted, hardly haue eſcap'd.
Away before : Conduct me to the king,
I doubt he will be dead, or ere I come. *Exeunt*

Scena Septima.

Enter Prince Henry, Salisburie, and Bigot.

Hen. It is too late, the life of all his blood

46–49. *Ile tell...eſcap'd*] Om. Bell.
46. *power*] *pow'rs* Pope,+ (*powers* Var. 73').
48. *deuoured*] *devourèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
49. *hardly*] Om. Ff, Rowe.
50. *before:*] Ff, Rowe,+, Coll. Wh. Cam.+, Neils. *before*, Fle. Craig. *before!* Cap. et cet.

1. Scena Septima.] SCENE IX. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns. SCENE III. Dono. SCENE VII. Rowe et cet.
Changes to Swinsted. Pope. Changes to the Orchard in Swinstead Abbey. Theob.+. The Same. The Abbey-Garden. Cap. The Garden of Swineshead Abbey. Hal. The Orchard in Swinestead Abbey. Var. '78 et cet.

cases is used in the sense of 'to *induce*, or *call upon*.' Compare: 'Who from my cabin tempted me to walk Upon the hatches.'—*Richard III:* I, iv, 12.—ED.]

46. halfe my power] WRIGHT: 'Thus the countrie being wasted on each hand, the king hasted forward till he came to Wellstreme sands, where passing the washes he lost a great part of his armie, with horses and carriages.'—Holinshed, iii, 194.

51. I doubt] Compare IV, i, 24.

51. or ere] See IV, ii, 23, and note.

1. **Scena Septima**] OECHELHAÜSER (*Einführungen*, etc., i, 30): This scene I have laid in the court-yard of the Abbey of Swinstead, enclosed on the back and sides by the passage-way of the cloisters. The door through which Hubert goes out, when the Bastard meets him, may be placed on the side at either the first or second entrance. Access to the court-yard from the cloisters is at the back through the row of columns. The care and regard for the dying king; the grief of the son at the separation, and its reflection by the remaining bystanders; the gracious greeting of the heir to the throne by the lords,—all this must be well carried out, in order to elevate the scene and produce a worthy ending to the tragedy. ['The grey light of dawn' is Oechelhaüser's direction for the lighting of this scene in his stage-arrangement.—ED.]

2. **Prince Henry**] See *Dram. Person.*, 3; note by FRENCH.

3. **life of all his blood**] BUCKNILL (*Med. Knowledge of Sh.*, p. 137): The life of the blood, the cerebral localization of the mental functions, the cessation of bodily pain at a certain stage of the operation of corrosive poison, when death, 'having preyed upon the outward parts, leaves them insensible' [see *Text. Notes*, l. 20], the confused throng of thoughts which characterise some forms of delirium, all these points of physiological observation are wonderfully conceived and expressed.

Is touch'd, corruptibly : and his pure braine
(Which ſome ſuppoſe the ſoules fraile dwelling houſe) 5

4. *corruptibly*] *corruptedly* Cap. *corruptlively* Rann conj. 4. *pure*] *poor* Wh. i, Huds. ii. *sore* Herr. *hurt* Vaughan conj. 5. *ſoules*] *Soul's* F$_4$.

4. corruptibly] WRIGHT: That is, so as to cause it to corrupt. [As another example of this use of an adjective in *-ible* with an active meaning Malone quotes: 'The Romans plausibly did give consent,' *Lucrece*, l. 1854, that is, with acclamations.—To this Wright adds: 'For we no longer are defensible,' *Henry V:* III, iii, 50, where 'defensible' means capable of making defense.—ED.]

4. his pure braine] HALLIWELL: 'Th' infectious drinke fumde up into his head, And through the veines into the heart it spread, Distempering the pure unspotted braine, That doth in man his memorie maintaine.'—Deloney, *The Lamentable Death of King John*, [see *Appendix*, p. 706. Deloney's *Strange Histories* were first published in 1607; it is therefore probable that he had here in mind the present passage in *King John* which had appeared nearly ten years previously.—ED.]—R. G. WHITE: The original has '*pore*,' which although it was the commonest spelling of 'poor' in the Folio and in other books of the time, and represents the old pronunciation of that word (which is still preserved in some parts of the United States), has hitherto been printed in all modern editions, without comment, 'pure'; though what 'his pure brain' could mean here who shall tell? It will be seen that there is no similarity between this passage and 'a halting sonnet of his own pure brain,' *Much Ado*, V, iv, 87 (where 'pure' means *unaided*, and 'of his own pure brain' what children call 'all out of his own head'); or 'that's pure' as used by an English rustic for *that's good*.—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXX.), referring to the foregoing note by White, say: 'In all the copies [of the Folio] known to us the reading is "pure."'—[Were an answer needed to White's question as to what 'his pure brain' might here mean, Dr Wright's interpretation is more than sufficient, that is, 'his brain otherwise clear and undisturbed.'—STAUNTON (*Athenæum*, 29 March, 1873, p. 407) compares: 'Whereof ingrateful man with liquorish draughts And morsels unctuous greases his pure mind, That from it all consideration slips.' —*Timon*, IV, iii, 195. As to White's assertion that the common spelling of the word 'poor' in the Folio is *pore*, I think I may say, from a fairly extensive examination of the text of that volume, that it is doubtful if a single example of such spelling could be found; this word is, with but a few exceptions, either spelt *poore* or *poor*. It is, of course, impossible now to say whence White derived his information on this point.—ED.]—KINNEAR (p. 205): That is, *even his very brain*, not only is the life of all his blood touched corruptibly, but *even his brain* itself, the dwelling-house of the soul.

5. the soules fraile dwelling house] The actual seat or dwelling place of the soul in man was one of those subjects upon which the ancient philosophers expended much speculation. It was, however, early recognised that the soul was two-fold in its nature; that is, the intellectual or rational faculty and the sensible or vital spirit. Each of these, mutually dependent on the other, controlled every movement of the body or emotion of the mind. The following extract from Holland's Plutarch's *Morals*, 1603, gives a comprehensive review of the earlier opinions on this subject: 'Plato and Democritus place it [the Soule] in the head throughout: Strato betweene the two eie browes: Erisistratus in the membrane or kell that enfoldeth

[5. (Which some suppose the soules fraile dwelling house)]

the braine, and it he called *Epicranis:* Herophilus within the ventricle or concavitie of the braine, which also is the basis or foundation of it: Parmenides over all the brest, and with him accordeth Epicurus: the Stoicks all with one voice hold it in the whole heart, or else in the spirit about the heart: Diogenes in the cavitie of the great arterie of the heart, which is full of vitall spirit: Empedocles in the consistence or masse of bloud: others in the very necke of the heart: some in the tunickle that lappeth the heart: and others againe in the midriffe: some of our moderne philosophers hold, that it taketh up & occupieth all the space from the head downward to the Diaphragma or midriffe above said: Pythagoras supposeth that the vitall part of the Soule is about the heart, but the reason and the intellectual or spirituall part, about the head.'—*Opinions of Philosophers*, Bk iv, ch. v, p. 834.—That the brain was regarded as the seat of the reasonable soul by anatomists and surgeons, at least as late as 1548, we learn from Thomas Vicary's *Anatomie*, the earliest book on that subject in English; in Chapter III. he says: 'Because the head of man is the habitation or dwelling place of the reasonable soule of man, therefore, with the grace of God, I shal fyrst speake of the Anatomie of the head' (ed. Furnivall, *E. E. Text Soc.*, New series, l. iii, p. 24).—In a later work, with which Shakespeare is supposed to have been well acquainted—*Batman uppon Bartholome, De Proprietatibus Rerum*, 1582, after a long discussion on the properties of the soul, the reasonable soul, and the sensible soul, which need not be here repeated—the writer says: 'In the head all the wits be seene, and therefore in a manner it presenteth the person of the soule, that counsaileth and ruleth the bodie.'—Bk V, ch. 2, p. 35. Montaigne (Apology for Raymond de Sebonde) is thus translated by Florio: 'But to returne unto our soule, where Plato hath seated reason in the braine; anger in the heart; lust in the liver; it is verie likely, that it was rather an interpretation of the soules motions, then any division or separation he ment to make of it, as of a soule into many members. And the likeliest of their opinion is, that it is alwaies a soule, which by hir rationall facultie, remembreth hir selfe, comprehendeth, judgeth, desireth, and exerciseth all hir other functions, by divers instruments of the bodie, as the Pilote ruleth and directeth his ship according to the experience he hath of it; now stretching, haling, or loosing a cable, sometimes hoysing the Main-yard, removing an oare, or stirring the Rudder, causing several effects with one onely power: And that she abideth in the braine, appeareth by this, that the hurts and accidens, which touch that part, doe presently offend the faculties of the soule, whence she may without inconvenience descend and glide through other parts of the bodie, as the Sunne spreadeth his light, and infuseth his power from heaven, and therewith filleth the whole world.'—*Essayes* (ed. iii.), Bk ii, p. 307.—W. C. Hazlitt (*Shakespeare*, p. 267), on the present passage, says: 'This strikes me as a most extraordinary proof of the Poet's insight, standing in place of advanced scientific knowledge, since he here clearly announces his own hypothesis couched (as usual) in general terms, as to the identity of the soul with the brain, although he did not go so far as to trace that of the brain with the blood; nor was it necessary for him as a dramatist to do so.'—When consistency of character demands it the words which Shakespeare places in the mouths of his people do not necessarily reflect his own opinions; but in the present case this is merely an abstract observation, and characteristic to Prince Henry no more than to Salisbury or Bigot. Nevertheless I cannot agree with Hazlitt; the words '*which some suppose*' seem to point to doubt in the belief that the brain was the soul's

Doth by the idle Comments that it makes,
Fore-tell the ending of mortality.

Enter Pembroke.

Pem. His Highneſſe yet doth ſpeak, & holds beleefe,
That being brought into the open ayre,
It would allay the burning qualitie
Of that fell poiſon which aſſayleth him.

Hen. Let him be brought into the Orchard heere:
Doth he ſtill rage?

Pem. He is more patient
Then when you left him; euen now he ſung.

Hen. Oh vanity of ſickneſſe: fierce extreames
In their continuance, will not feele themſelues.
Death hauing praide vpon the outward parts
Leaues them inuiſible, and his feige is now

12. *which*] *that* Rann.
14. Exit B. Capell. Exit Bigot. Mal. et seq.
16–32. Om. Bell.
16–24. Om. Dono.
17. *ſickneſſe:*] *sickness!* Rowe ii. et seq.
18. *feele*] *fell* Rowe ii. *breed* Herr.
19. *praide*] *prei'd* F_2. *prey'd* F_3F_4.
20. *them inuiſible, and his ſeige*] *them inuiſible, and hir ſiege* F_2. *them inuiſible, and her ſiege* F_3F_4, Rowe i. *them; invisible his siege* Pope, Theob. Var. '78, '85. *them insensible; his siege* Han. Warb. Johns. *them insensible: and his siege* Cap. Var. '73. Steev. Var. '03, '13. Sing. Sta. Wh. Dyce ii, iii, Huds. Coll. iii, Rlfe, Words. Neils. Craig. (*...and's siege* Walker). *them invisible; and his siege* Mal. Var. '21, Knt, Coll. i, ii, Dyce i, Del. Hal. Ktly, Cam. i, Glo. Cla. Fle. Perring. *them invisited: and his siege* Coll. MS. *them, and his invisible, siege* Mitford (Gent. Maga., Aug., 1844). *them ill-visited, and his siege* Ingleby (N. & Q., Ap., 1853). *them; and, invisible, his siege* Herr.

dwelling house. Compare, 'the bloody house of life,' IV, ii, 120, which is likewise an abstract observation, and seems to point to the belief that the body was the seat of the soul and the vital spirit. The question is, however, too intrinsicate to be resolved in a note on a single line, and therefore—in the words of the translator of Bartholomeus—'thus much on the soul's dwelling house sufficeth.'—ED.

18. **In their continuance**] MALONE: I suspect our Author wrote, 'In *thy* continuance.' In his *Sonnets* the two words are frequently confounded. If the text be right, 'continuance' means *continuity*. Bacon uses the word in that sense. —SINGER (ed. ii.): So Baret, 'If the disease be of any continuance, if it be an old and settled disease.'

18. **will not feele**] That is, customarily do not feel; compare: 'Being ireful on the lion he will venture.'—*Ven. & Ad.*, l. 628.

18. **will not feele themselues**] KINNEAR (p. 206): That is, pain of extreme violence, when continued, *is wont* to lose sensation—ceases to be felt. Compare for the *insensibility* produced by faintness: 'Who [the heart], overcome by doubt and bloodless fear, With cold-pale weakness numbs each feeling part.'—*Ven. & Ad.*, l. 891.

20. **Leaues them inuisible**] CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 139): Nor is this amendment [*insensible*, see *Text. Notes*] less certain, for the stop of old editions is here; and its

[20. Leaues them inuisible, and his seige is now]

displacing by some moderns [Pope and Theobald], together with their omission of 'and' after 'invisible,' leaves as great an exception as that they meant to remove: Death's 'siege' is as visible in the 'mind' as the limbs, being seen in its 'fantasies'; some of which argue more than a siege,—an approaching conquest. It were needless to observe in behalf of *insensible* that the progress of most deaths is as this description sets forth, being a thing too notorious.—M. MASON (*Comments*, etc., p. 161): As the word 'invisible' has no sense in this passage, I have no doubt but the modern editors are right in reading *insensible* [see *Text. Notes*], which agrees with the two preceding lines. The lines are evidently intended as a paraphrase, and confirmation of the first two. I cannot conceive why death should be more invisible when he attacks the mind than when he attacks the body; as it is through the organs of the body that he attacks the mind.—MALONE: 'Invisible' is here used adverbially. Death having glutted himself with the ravage of the almost wasted body, and knowing that the disease with which he has assailed it is mortal, before its dissolution, proceeds, from mere satiety, to attack the mind, leaving the body *invisibly;* that is, in such a secret manner that the eye cannot precisely mark his progress, or see when his attack on the vital powers has ended and that on the mind begins; or, in other words, at what particular moment reason ceases to perform its function and the understanding, *in consequence of a corroding and mortal malady*, begins to be disturbed. Our Poet, in his *Ven. & Ad.*, calls Death 'invisible commander,' [l. 1004]. Henry is here only pursuing the same train of thought which we find in his first speech in this scene. Our Author has, in many other passages in his plays, used adjectives adverbially. So in *All's Well:* 'Is it not meant damnable in us.'—IV, iii, 31. Again in *1 Henry IV:* '—ten times more dishonourable ragged than an old faced ancient.'—IV, ii, 33. [For many more examples see ABBOTT, § 1.]—STEEVENS: As 'invisible' and 'insensible' are not words of exactest consonance, the legitimacy of this emendation has been disputed. It yet remains in my text, for the sake of those who discover no light through the ancient reading. Perhaps (I speak without confidence) our Author wrote *invincible*, which, in sound, so nearly resembles 'invisible' that an inattentive compositor might have substituted the one for the other. All our modern editors (Mr Malone excepted) agree that *invincible*, in *2 Henry IV:* III, ii, 337, was a misprint for *invisible:* ['His dimensions to any thick sight were invincible'], and so (*vice versa*) 'invisible' may here have usurped the place of *invincible.* If my supposition be admitted, the Prince must design to say that Death had battered the royal outworks, but, seeing they were *invincible*, quitted them, and directed his force against the mind. In the present instance the King of Terrors is described as a besieger, who, failing in his attempt to storm the bulwark, proceeded to undermine the citadel. Why else did he change his mode and object of attack?—The Spanish ordnance sufficiently preyed on the ramparts of Gibraltar, but still left them *impregnable.* The same metaphor, though not continued so far, occurs again in *Timon:* '—Nature To whom all sores lay siege.'—[IV, iii, 6]. Again, in *All's Well:* '—and yet my heart Will not confess he owes the malady That doth my life besiege.'—II, i, 10.—[It is somewhat difficult of belief that Steevens is here seriously offering these two passages in corroboration of an emendation in which he had no confidence; the rest of his long note leaves, however, no doubt that behind his mask of sobriety he is actually indulging in a malicious grin; he refuses acquiescence in Malone's explanation of the adverbial use of the adjective for the

[20. Leaues them inuisible, and his seige is now]

reasons that his two examples occur 'in light and familiar dialogue, or where the regular full-grown adverb was unfavourable to rhyme or meter'; 'or they might be typographical imperfections.'—Steevens then grudgingly admits that adjectives employed adverbially 'are sometimes met with in the language of Shakespeare,' yet such must not be so considered when 'it might operate equivocally and provoke a smile, as on the present occasion.' Then throwing aside his serious mask completely Steevens concludes: 'That Death, therefore, "left the outward parts of the King *invisible*" could not, in my judgment, have been an expression hazarded by our Poet in his most careless moment of composition. Besides, if the outward part (i. e., the body) of the expiring monarch was in plain, familiar, and unqualified terms, pronounced to be *invisible*, how could those who pretended to have just *seen* it expect to be believed? and would not an audience initiated in the mystery of adverbial adjectives, on hearing such an account of the royal carcase, have exclaimed, like the Governor of Tillbury Fort, in *The Critic:* '—thou canst not see [it], Because it is not yet in sight.'—Malone, it is needless to say, did not take any notice of this complete perversion of his view of the meaning of the adjective 'visible' in the present passage; he had concluded his note with a remark in regard to the poet Gray's having made Death a Queen instead of a King in one of his poems, possibly led thereto by Rowe's reading of this line 'her siege,' therein following the Folios. In defence of Gray's thus making death feminine Steevens contributed a note occupying an entire page of the *Variorum*, fairly bristling with classical quotations and lines from obscure writers. As this belongs, however, to a discussion of the text of Gray and not Shakespeare, it must be relegated to the task of repetition by some future editor of Gray.—ED.]—KNIGHT: The meaning of 'invisible' is, we take it, unlooked at, disregarded.—J. MITFORD (*Gentleman's Maga.*, Aug., 1844): The commentators reject 'invisible' as without meaning, and insert *insensible*, adding five long passages of commentary; notwithstanding which we are not at all convinced that they had any right to turn Shakespeare's good steed out of the stall, to put in their own sorry gelding. We have in our copy inserted the following reading as most likely to be true: 'Death, having preyed upon the outward parts, Leaves them, and his invisible siege is now.' The first rule of a good surgeon is never to amputate when he can reset the limb, and thus restore it to its primitive state; but the editors of Shakespeare are too often like those quack dentists who draw a sound natural tooth to insert a false one of their own.—COLLIER: Malone's interpretation renders the alteration made by some editors, of 'invisible' to *insensible* or *invincible*, quite unnecessary.—SINGER (ed. ii.): Guided by the context, 'will not feel themselves,' I cannot but think Hanmer's emendation a necessary and happy one. [Singer quotes Knight's interpretation in italics and with an exclamation point; which mode of printing was, presumably, supposed by Dyce and Singer to signify the holding up of the hands in amazement.—ED.]—COLLIER (*Notes & Emendations*, p. 212): There is no doubt that 'invisible' is wrong, and the MS. Corrector converts it into *unvisited*, which may, we think, be adopted without hesitation—death has abandoned the King's external form, and has laid siege to his understanding.—[COLLIER (ed. ii.) hesitates, however, to depart from the original; and quotes in support of it: 'These cowards invisibly assail his soul, And threaten conquest of our sovereign.' *Tamburlaine*, pt ii, V, iii, Quarto, 1606. 'Nevertheless,' adds Collier, 'it is to be observed that in the earliest edition of *Tamburlaine*, 1590, the word is *invincibly*.'—ED.]—SINGER

Againſt the winde, the which he prickes and wounds
With many legions of ſtrange fantaſies, 22

21. *winde*] *mind* Rowe ii. et seq.

(*Sh. Vindicated*, p. 95): That 'invisible' and *unvisited* would be absurd and senseless in this passage who can doubt? The correction of it to *insensible* is so obvious, so near to the form of the old word, and affords such excellent sense, that few, I think, would for a moment entertain the MS. Corrector's *unvisited*. It may be observed that 'that last hold' is the last place where *sensation* remains.—DYCE characterises the reading of the MS. Corrector as 'next to nonsense.'—KNIGHT (*New Lamps*, etc., p. 13): If death had abandoned the outward parts, how can they be called *unvisited*? [A hit; a palpable hit!—ED.]—HALLIWELL: The Folio text is probably correct. A transposition of the term 'invisible' to *after* the word 'siege,' placing a semicolon after 'them,' would fulfil the conditions of sense and metre.—STAUNTON: Notwithstanding Malone's defence of 'invisible,' it appears to be without sense in this passage. Hanmer's emendation is in some degree verified by the corresponding passage in the earlier play:

> 'Power after power forsake their proper power,
> Onely the heart impugnes with faint resist.'
> [*Troublesome Raigne*, pt ii, sc. viii, l. 52.]

—C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The context seems to us to prove Hanmer's emendation to be the right word; while 'invisible' affords to us no sense whatever.—VERPLANCK: To me it seems evident that 'invisible' for *insensible* was an error of the press or, more probably, of the copyist of the manuscript used by the Folio editors.—FLEAY: I have inserted a comma after 'them,' which makes the sense of the passage clear. It is death that is visibly acting while preying on the body, but invisible when he attacks the mind. Compare *Knack to Know a Knave*, sc. xiii, 'But I'll prevent him; follow me, *invisible*.'—WRIGHT agrees with Malone that the subject of 'invisible' is 'Death' and not 'the outward parts.'—MARSHALL regards Hanmer's emendation as very plausible; but, without reference to Malone's note, suggests that 'invisible' may here refer adverbially to Death. [Malone's explanation of the adverbial use of 'invisible' is, to me, the solution of the difficulty. Hanmer's emendation has in its favor but little more than that of the MS. Corrector or of Steevens. That Death did not leave the King's body *insensible* is very clearly shown by his agony of burning sensation; and to say that Death left the body *unvisited* after telling of the effects of that visitation seems nothing less than a plain contradiction. On the other hand, it is not strictly correct to say that the attack of Death on the body is perceptible while that on the mind is imperceptible, since in each case the effect is outwardly made known, either by contortions of the body or the ravings of delirium.—ED.]

22. **many legions of strange fantasies**] BUCKNILL (*Medical Knowledge*, etc., p. 138): The supervention of delirium, upon the cessation of pain in the outward parts, was noted and expressed by Hippocrates in the sixth aphorism, section 2: 'Persons who have a painful affection of any part of the body, and are in a great measure insensible of pain, are disordered in intellect.' When John is brought into the Orchard, the throng and press of strange fantasies have ceased to confound themselves. He does not rage as he has done before, but expresses himself

Which in their throng, and preſſe to that laſt hold,
Counfound themſelues. 'Tis ſtrange ỳ death ſhold ſing:
I am the Symet to this pale faint Swan,
Who chaunts a dolefull hymne to his owne death,

24. *y*] *that* Ff.
ſing:] Ff, Rowe, Pope, Theob. *sing!* Cap. Sta. *sing.* Johns. et cet.
25. *Symet*] *cygnet* Rowe ii. et seq.
Swan] *swain* Johns. (misprint).

again sensible of suffering, in similes of terrible power. It would perhaps, however, have been more consistent with the strict probability of the course of events if the cessation of what may be called traumatic delirium, and the restoration of painful sensation, had not been represented; for when death, having preyed upon the outward parts, lays his siege against the mind, the delirium generally continues to the end. [See note by CHESNEY, l. 42 below.]—MOYES (p. 24): That Shakespeare had closely observed the wanderings of the mind in illness is evident when we study the death-bed scenes of King John and Falstaff. The delirium [of John] is acute and in keeping with the circumstances; contrast it with the wandering of Falstaff's mind at the close of his life, as described by Dame Quickly, *Henry V:* II, iii, but note the difference between the delirium of King John and that of old Sir John, who, dying in advanced life and of a long-standing ailment, 'fumbled with the sheets, played with flowers, and smiled upon his fingers' ends.' The gravity of the symptom is recognised in each case. 'It is too late,' says Prince Henry; 'I knew there was but one way,' says Dame Quickly.

23. **throng, and presse to that last hold**] JOHNSON: That is, in their tumult and hurry of resorting to the last tenable part.—[MALONE compares: 'That many maz'd considerings did throng And press'd in, with this caution.'—*Henry VIII:* II, iv, 185, but this is not, I think, strictly speaking, a parallel; in the present passage the words 'throng' and 'press' are nouns, in that from *Henry VIII.* they are verbs.—ED.]

25, 26. **Swan, . . . chaunts . . . to his owne death**] Shakespeare refers to this poetical idea of the song of the dying swan in three other passages: 'And now this pale swan in her watery nest Begins the sad dirge of her certain ending,' *Rape of Lucrece,* l. 1611; 'I will play the swan, And die in music,' *Othello,* V, ii, 247; 'Then if he lose, he makes a swan-like end Fading in music,' *Mer. of Ven.,* III, ii, 44; and in the doubtful poem, *Phœnix & Turtle,* 'the death-divining swan,' l. 15.—The source of the fable is well given in the following from Sir Thomas Browne's delightful work, *Pseudodoxia:* 'And first, from great antiquity, and before the melody of Syrens, the musical note of swans hath been commended, and that they sing most sweetly before their death: for thus we read in Plato, that from the opinion of *Metempsychosis,* or transmigration of the souls of men into the bodies of beasts most suitable unto their human condition, after his death Orpheus the musician became a swan; thus was it the bird of Apollo, the god of music, by the Greeks; and an hieroglyphick of music among the Egyptians, from whom the Greeks derived the conception;—hath been the affirmation of many Latins, and hath not wanted assertors almost from every nation. All which notwithstanding, we find this relation doubtfully received by Ælian, as an hearsay account by Bellonius, as a false one by Pliny, expressly refuted by Myndius in *Athenæus,* and severely rejected by Scaliger. Authors also that countenance it, speak not satis-

[25, 26. Swan, Who chaunts a dolefull hymne to his owne death]

factorily of it: some affirming they sing not till they die; some that they sing yet die not. Some speak generally, as though this note were in all; some but particularly, as though it were only in some; some in places remote, and where we can have no trial of it; others in places where every experience can refute it as Aldrovandus upon relation delivered concerning the music of the swans on the river of Thames near London. . . . When, therefore, we consider the dissension of authors, the falsity of relations, the indisposition of the organs, and the unmusical note of all we ever beheld or heard of, if generally taken, and comprehending all swans, or of all places, we cannot assent thereto. Surely he that is bit with a *tarantula*, shall never be cured by this music; and with the same hopes we expect to hear the harmony of the spheres' (Book iii, ch. xxvii, § 1).—WILLUGHBY (Bk iii, § ii, p. 357), after describing the general appearance of the wild swan, says: 'The Wind-pipe reflected in form of a trumpet seems to be so contrived and formed by nature for modulating the voice. Hence what the Ancients have delivered concerning the singing of swans (if it be true, which I much doubt) seems chiefly to agree to this bird and not to the *tame Swan*. For my part, those stories of the Ancients concerning the singing of Swans, *viz.*: that those birds at other times, but especially when their death approaches, do with a most sweet and melodious modulation of their voice, sing their own *Nœnia* or funeral song, seemed to me always very unlikely and fabulous, and to have been therefore not undeservedly exploded by Scaliger and others. Howbeit, Aldrovandus, weighing on both sides the arguments and authorities of learned men, hath (he saith) observed them to be equal; wherefore to cast the scale, and establish the affirmative, he thinks that wonderful structure of the wind-pipe, by him first observed, is of weight sufficient. But this argument, though it be very specious and plausible, yet doth it not conclude the controversie. For we have observed in the wind-pipe of the Crane the like ingress into the cavity of the breast-bone, and reflection therein, or a more remarkable one; yet no man that I know of, ever commended the Crane for singing, or musical modulation of its voice. But if you ask me to what purpose then doth the wind-pipe enter into the breast-bone, and is in that manner reflected there? I must ingenuously confess, I do not certainly and fully know.'—HARTING (p. 203): The late Charles Waterton once had an opportunity, which rarely occurs, of seeing a swan die from natural causes. 'Although I gave no credence,' he says (*Essays on Natural History*, second series, p. 128), 'to the extravagant notion which antiquity had entertained of melody from the mouth of the dying swan, still I felt anxious to hear some plaintive sound or other, some soft inflection of the voice which might tend to justify that notion in a small degree. But I was disappointed. He nodded and then tried to recover himself, and then nodded again, and again held up his head; till, at last, quite enfeebled and worn out, his head fell gently on the grass, his wings became expanded a trifle or so, and he died whilst I was looking on. He never even uttered his wonted cry, nor so much as a sound to indicate what he felt within. The silence which this bird maintained to the last tends to show that the dying song of the swan is nothing but a fable, the origin of which is lost in the shades of antiquity.'—DYER (p. 157) quotes the following from Engel (*Musical Myths and Facts*, i, p. 89): 'Although our common swan does not produce sounds which might account for this tradition, it is a well-known fact that the wild swan, also called the "whistling swan," when on the wing emits a shrill tone, which, however harsh it may sound if heard near, produces a pleasant effect when emanating from a large flock when high

And from the organ-pipe of frailety ſings
His ſoule and body to their laſting reſt.
Sal. Be of good comfort (Prince) for you are borne
To ſet a forme vpon that indigeſt
Which he hath left ſo ſhapeleſſe, and ſo rude.
Iohn brought in.
Iohn. I marrie, now my ſoule hath elbow roome,

28. *to*] Om. Ff.
32. Iohn...in.] Enter Attendants, and Bigot, bringing in King John in a chair. Cap. et seq. (subs.).

in the air, it is heard in a variety of pitches of sound, increasing or diminishing in loudness according to the movement of the birds and to the current of air.'—[This is, however, merely slight corroborative evidence as to the swan singing at any time; it has but little to do with its chanting its own requiem. Let the originator of the fable be who it may. Is it not sufficient that Shakespeare was so attracted by the poetic idea that he was not content with but one recurrence to it?—ED.]

27. **frailety**] WALKER (*Vers.*, p. 158) compares for this spelling, *metri gratia:* 'Is't I would have my frailety so belide?'—Daniel, *Cleopatra*, I, i, ed. 1623, p. 430.

30. **a forme vpon that indigest**] MOBERLY: 'The death of John,' say Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ii, 3, 'saved the kingdom for his descendants. It removed the great stumbling-block, and reversed the papal policy as regarded the Charter. The sagacious and honest policy of the Earl of Pembroke . . . placed the country under a government which included all elements, and which, while it could not suppress all jealousies, found room for all energies.' How excellently Shakespeare sums this up in a few words.

30. **indigest**] MURRAY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. sbs. B.) quotes the present line as the only example of this word used as a noun in the sense of *a shapeless mass.*

31. **so shapelesse, and so rude**] WHALLEY: A description of the Chaos almost in the words of Ovid: 'Quem dixere Chaos, rudis indigestaque moles.'—*Metamorphosis*, i.—MALONE: 'Which Chaos hight, a huge rude heap: No sunne as yet with lightsome beames the shapeless world did view.'—Golding's Translation, 1587.

32. **Iohn brought in**] BOAS (*Sh. & his Predecessors*, p. 243): This scene would make a deeper impression were it in more organic connexion with what has gone before. In the old play, where so much prominence had been given to the attack upon the religious houses, the death of John at the hands of a monk was a dramatically fitting Nemesis. But one of the very few mistakes made by Shakespeare in working up older materials was that he here retained the original version of John's murder, while omitting all that had led up to it. We feel that the king's ignoble end should have had a more intimate relation to his design upon Arthur, or some other misdeed emphasized in the play.

33. **Iohn. I marrie, now**, etc.] DAVIES (*Dramatic Miscell.*, i, p. 113), in speaking of Garrick's acting in this scene, says: 'The agonies of a man expiring in a delirium were delineated with such wonderful expression in his countenance, that he impressed uncommon sensations, mixed with terror, on the admiring spectators, who could not refuse the loudest tribute of applause to his inimitable action. Every word of the melancholy news, uttered by Faulconbridge, seemed to touch the tender strings of life, till they were quite broken, and he expired before the unwelcome tale was finished.'—F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Censor*, ii, 166): We have now brought

It would not out at windowes, nor at doores,
There is ſo hot a ſummer in my boſome,
That all my bowels crumble vp to duſt:
I am a ſcribled forme drawne with a pen
Vpon a Parchment, and againſt this fire
Do I ſhrinke vp.
Hen. How fares your Maieſty?
Ioh. Poyſon'd, ill fare: dead, forſooke, caſt off,

34. *doores,*] *doors.* Pope et seq.
36. *duſt:*] *dust.* Johns. Var. '73.
38, 39. One line F_4, Rowe i.
41. *Poyſon'd*] *Poison'd!* Var. '73. *ill fare:*] *ill fair* F_4, Rowe i. *ill fate!* Pope. *ill fare!* Theob. Warb. Johns. *—ill-fare;—* Steev. Varr. *—ill fare—* Cam.+, Neils. *ill faring* Fle. *ill-fated* Daniel conj. *ill-fare;* Craig. *—ill fare;—* Cap. et cet.
41. *dead,*] *oh! dead* Han. *indeed* Anon. ap. Cam.
caſt off,] *cast off!* Var. '73.

royalty to the last thread of life, and are sorry to be under the necessity of observing that our Author has not displayed his usual force of genius in what the expiring monarch says; his speeches are too figurative for one in great pain, he resigns his breath too in a manner very unfavourable for stage action; though a most abandoned politician, not one pang of a guilty conscience is mentioned, which even in the midst of distraction seldom fails to show itself.

34. **It would not out at windowes**] MOBERLY: As the gypsies in *Guy Mannering* hold that no one can die with the door shut. [The passage to which Moberly refers is as follows: 'At once three or four men, ruffians in appearance and dress, rushed into the hut. "Meg, ye limb of Satan, how dare you leave the door open?" was the first salutation of the party. "And whoever heard of a door being barred when a man was in the dead-thraw?—how d'ye think the spirit was to get awa through bolts and bars like thae?"'—(Chap. XXVII, near end). On this the author has the following note: 'The popular idea that the protracted struggle between life and death is painfully prolonged by keeping the door of the apartment shut was received as certain by the superstitious eld of Scotland. But neither was it to be thrown wide open. To leave the door ajar was the plan adopted by the old crones who understood the mysteries of deathbeds and lykewakes. In that case there was room for the imprisoned spirit to escape; and yet an obstacle, we have been assured, was offered to the entrance of any frightful form which might otherwise intrude itself.' (See also Brand: *Popular Antiquities*, ed. Ellis, ii, 231.)—There is, possibly, a reference in the present line to this superstition; but if this were in the King's mind the simple opening of doors and windows would have satisfied him quite as well as being brought into the open air. The reasons given for his removal were that the cooler air would allay the heat of his fever.—ED.]

38. **Parchment . . . against . . . fire**] BAGLEY (p. 316) compares, *Alphonsus*, Chapman, 1654: 'Mine entrails shrink together like a scroll of burning parchment.'—IV, ii.

41. **Poyson'd**] CHESNEY (p. 158): The case of King John bears a much closer analogy to a case wherein the hand of nature has been instrumental in saturating the system with poison, than does it to one in which 'a villainous monk' had been the instrument. Miasmatic exhalations had no doubt wrought the evil in this case. To this must be added the fact that he had been sick before, as will be

And none of you will bid the winter come 42

42–47. Mnemonic Warb.

remembered by his language on the battlefield. In the most deadly forms of pernicious fever there is no symptom so horrible to the patient as this sense of burning heat; this is his agonising torment when he is pulseless and his skin is icy cold—nay his breath is even cold, and his surface as blue and lifeless as the body of him who already tenants the grave,—the thermometer showing at the same time a great reduction in the normal temperature of the patient's body, whilst the oppressive internal congestions make him clamor for air, air; bring him to the window, door,—into the yard, orchard, anywhere so that he may have air! and the exclamation often is, 'O! that I had a river of cold water running through me! I am burning up.' In all these malarial cases an unbearable *burning sensation* or pain in the stomach is one of the most distressing concomitants. Hence the exclamation: 'Bid the winter come to thrust his icy fingers in my maw.' . . . *He had been sick a time before his last severe illness*, and withal inhabited a marshy district, between the discharge of two considerable rivers—the Wash and the Humber, where the surface is so low that the ocean has in many places to be kept at bay by dikes. . . . Moors and fen-lands characterise Lincolnshire today, after all the efforts with money and labor to reclaim it from the sea; and when we go back to the twelfth century, we ought surely to find it as malarial as the Pontine marsh of Italy or the sloughs of our own Mississippi.—MOYES (p. 54): There is some internal evidence to show that arsenic was the poison administered to King John. . . . The delirium is a rare symptom, though one not unknown, occurring in three out of twenty-five cases analyzed by Dr Guy (*Forensic Medicine*, p. 447). The extreme debility, the thirst, the burning of the mouth and throat symptomatic of arsenical poisoning find their adequate literary expression in this passage.—WAINWRIGHT (p. 20): Here is a perfect description of arsenical poisoning.

41. Poyson'd, ill fare] THEOBALD, rejecting quite properly Pope's needless change (see *Text. Notes*), says: 'Considering how much our Author lov'd and has practised the jingle and play on words similar in sound, there is no question but he intended it here. So in *2 Henry VI:* "Sheriff farewell; and better than I fare." —[II, iv, 100]. And in *3 Henry VI:* "How now, fair lords? What fare? What news abroad."—[II, i, 95]. *Ill fate* both takes away the antithesis, and makes a very flat, insipid exclamation.'—CAPELL (I, pt ii, p. 139) describes Pope's change and Hanmer's supplementary syllable as 'wild corrections,' both corrections showing that 'neither [Pope nor Hanmer] had any conception of the length of that "fare," or of its beauty so lengthen'd: and yet the beauty is striking; and the lengthening has several parallels in words that still remain in some places even in their copies, notwithstanding the extraordinary diligence which they both of them us'd to root out all of the sort.'—MALONE, WALKER (*Vers.*, 139), and ABBOTT (§ 480) agree with Capell, whom, however, they do not quote, but STEEVENS, commenting on Malone's note, says: 'As this word ["fare"] has not concurring vowels in it, like *hour* or *fair*, nor was ever dissyllabically spelt (like *fier*) *faer*, I had rather suppose the present line imperfect than complete it by such unprecedented means.'—[The careful reader or actor need but repeat this line slowly to grasp at once the effect of a series of gasps produced by the skilful arrangement of labials and dentals—'Poison'd,' 'dead,' 'forsook,' 'cast off.' The lengthening of a monosyllable into a dissyllable may be necessary for the finger-counting metrists,

To thruſt his ycie fingers in my maw; 43

but seems quite unnecessary here and, as FLEAY remarks, is, moreover, very harsh.—ED.]

42–47. **bid the winter come . . . And comfort me with cold**] DAVIES (*Dram. Miscellanies* (i, 105): Mr Seward, in the Preface to his edition of Beaumont and Fletcher [p. xxxiv.], prefers the poisoning of Alphonso, in their play of *A Wife for a Month*, to [the present scene in *King John*]. The merit of that scene [Act IV, sc. iv.] is great; but the authors have surely said more than was necessary. It is true, their images correspond with the subject, and their lines in general are worked up to great perfection; but the situation would not admit of such diffusion, or such nice descriptions of heat and cold, with their several attributes. Shakespeare knew human nature better than these his imitators and envious rivals. He knew where to stop. Their heads were at work with fancy, while his heart was busy in its feelings. One speech of Alphonso, in the *Wife for a Month*, [compared with this] from Shakespeare's *King John*, will perhaps convince the reader that I do not wrong the celebrated dramatic twins:

'Give me more air, air, more air; blow, blow!
Open, thou eastern gate, and blow upon me!
Distil thy cold dews, O thou icy moon,
And, rivers, run through my afflicted spirit!
I am all fire, fire, fire! The raging dog-star
Reigns in my blood! Oh! which way shall I turn me!
Ætna and all his flames burn in my head.
Fling me into the Ocean, or I perish.
Dig, dig, dig, till the springs fly up;
The cold, cold springs, that I may leap into 'em,
And bathe my scorch'd limbs in their purling pleasures.
Or shoot me up into the higher region,
Where treasures of delicious snow are nourish'd
And banquets of sweet hail!'—[ed. Dyce, vol. ix, p. 364,

where he who so desires may read two more pages of similar wealth of imagery on the subject of cold, ice, and snow; after which, if he be not in agreement with Davies, he may at least subscribe to the critic's final remark, that 'This is not the language of a man in extreme pain.'—Steevens also calls attention to the imitation of the present scene by Beaumont and Fletcher.—ED.]

42, 43. **bid the winter . . . thrust his ycie fingers**] STEEVENS: Dekker, in *The Gull's Hornbook*, 1609, has the same thought: '—the morning . . . waxing cold, thrust his frosty fingers into thy bosome.'—[*Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, ii, 25]. Again, in a pamphlet entitled, *The Great Frost, Cold Doings in London*, 1608: 'The cold hand of winter is thrust into our bosoms.'—[*Social England Illustrated*, English Garner, new ed., p. 174.—WRIGHT pertinently remarks: 'Shakespeare was probably not the first to invent the phrase, and these examples are not necessarily imitations of the present passage.'—ED.]—MALONE quotes, as parallel in thought and expression, a passage from an old play entitled *Lust's Dominion*, printed in 1657, the authorship of which he assigns to Marlowe. The lines are as follows:

'O I am dull, and the cold hand of sleep
Hath thrust his icy fingers in my breast
And made a frost within me.'—[Hazlitt's Dodsley, vol. xiv, p. 136].

Nor let my kingdomes Riuers take their courſe
Through my burn'd boſome : nor intreat the North
To make his bleake windes kiſſe my parched lips,
And comfort me with cold. I do not aske you much.
I begge cold comfort : and you are ſo ſtraight
And ſo ingratefull, you deny me that.
Hen. Oh that there were ſome vertue in my teares,
That might releeue you.
Iohn. The ſalt in them is hot.
Within me is a hell, and there the poyſon

46. *parched*] *parchèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
47. *I...you*] *I ask not* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. *I do not ask* Vaughan.
48. *ſtraight*] *strait* Pope et seq.
49. *ingratefull*] *ungrateful* F_4, Rowe, +.
51. *you.*] *you!* Theob. et seq.
52. *in*] *of* Ff, Rowe,+, Cap. Varr. Rann.

—COLLIER on this replies that Malone was mistaken in attributing this play to Marlowe, as 'the historical portion of the incidents did not occur until five years after Marlowe's death.' Collier (*History of Dramatic Poetry*, iii, 96) gives reasons for attributing *Lust's Dominion* to Dekker, Haughton, and Day; he thus concludes his note on the present line: 'Shakespeare's *King John* was indisputably written before 1598, and *Lust's Dominion* was probably not produced until 1600; so that although the authors of that play may have copied Shakespeare, there can be no pretence for saying that he imitated them.'—MALONE also compares Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, 1591: 'O, poor Zabina, O my queen, my queen, Fetch me some water for my burning breast, To cool and comfort me with longer date.'—Pt i, Act V, sc. ii. (ed. Dyce, p. 103).—[Is it, however, necessary to seek further than the corresponding scene and passage in *The Troublesome Raigne* for the source of a poetic figure, which is, after all, not so complicated as to be beyond the compass of Shakespeare's inventive faculty. (See *Appendix, Troublesome Raigne*, p. 533. —ED.)]

48. cold comfort] WRIGHT: In *Rich. II.* Gaunt's death-scene is full of this trifling with words.—MARSHALL: For another instance of the use by Shakespeare of 'cold comfort,' in the same sense of *poor comfort*, as we use the phrase, see *Tam. of Shrew*, IV, i, 32: 'or shall I complain on thee to our mistress, whose hand, she being now at hand, thou shalt soon feel to thy cold comfort.'

48. straight] STEEVENS: That is, *narrow, avaricious;* an unusual sense of the word.—WRIGHT: Cotgrave has '*Chichement*, Miserably, niggardly, hardly couetously, with a strait, or a close hand.'—[STEEVENS is, perhaps, right in remarking that this is an unusual sense of this word—the present line is the only one wherein Shakespeare uses it with this meaning.—Bradley (*N. E. D.*, s. v. strait, III, 15) marks it as obsolete in this sense, and gives seven examples ranging from 1290 to 1628, among which the present line is quoted.—ED.]

53–55. Within me . . . blood] Compare Jonson: *Volpone*, 'But angry Cupid bolting from her eyes, Hath shot him self into me like a flame; Where, now, he flings about his burning heat, As in a furnace an ambitious fire, Whose

Is, as a fiend, confin'd to tyrannize,
On vnrepreeuable condemned blood.
Enter Baſtard.
Baſt. Oh, I am ſcalded with my violent motion
And ſpleene of ſpeede, to ſee your Maieſty.
Iohn. Oh Cozen, thou art come to ſet mine eye:
The tackle of my heart, is crack'd and burnt,
And all the ſhrowds wherewith my life ſhould faile,
Are turned to one thred, one little haire:
My heart hath one poore ſtring to ſtay it by,
Which holds but till thy newes be vttered,
And then all this thou ſeeſt, is but a clod,
And module of confounded royalty.
Baſt. The Dolphin is preparing hither-ward,

54. *Is, as a fiend,*] *Is as a fiend,* Pope, Han. Cap. *Is as a fiend* Cam.+, Dono. Neils. Craig.

55. *vnrepreeuable condemned*] *unreprievable condemnèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words. *unreprievable—condemned* Del. Ktly, Dono.

56. SCENE X. Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.

Baſtard.] Faulconbridge. Theob. Warb. Johns. Varr. Rann. Richard. Words. Dono.

59. *art*] *are* F_4.
eye] *eyes* Ktly.

62. *turned*] *turn'd* Johns. *turnèd* Walker, Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
thred] *threed* F_4.

64. *vttered*] *utterèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.

66. *module*] *model* Han. Coll. Dyce, Hal. Huds. ii, Words.

67. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.

---

vent is stopt. The fight is all within me.'—II, ii. (ed. Gifford, vol. iii, 221). —ED.

60, 61. **tackle . . . shrowds**] WRIGHT: Compare *3 Henry VI:* V, iv, 18, where the same nautical metaphor is found even in greater detail: 'The friends of France our shrouds and tacklings.'

66. **module**] BRADLEY (*N. E. D.*, s. v. module): The earliest uses in English seem to be based directly on Latin senses not found in French, and also to show confusion of the word with *model*, 2 c. A mere image or counterfeit. [The present line quoted; also: 'Come bring forth this counterfeit module,' *All's Well*, IV, iii, 114; and Du Bartas, II, iv, III *Schisme*, 492: 'This Childe (no Man, but Man's pale Module now).'—DYCE (ed. ii.) notes that the present passage and that from *All's Well*, quoted above, are the only two passage wherein the Folio has this form of the word; but in all other passages the word is spelt *model*.—Malone's remark that 'module' and *model* 'were only different modes of spelling the same word' seems, therefore, to be erroneous, due to lack of observation. He quotes as an example: 'Dear copy of my husband! Oh let me kiss thee! (*kissing picture*). How like him is this model?'—*The London Prodigal*, 1605. [This is, however, open to objection for two reasons: it is not a parallel example to this line in *King John*, and, secondly, it is not from *The London Prodigal*, but from *The Puritan Widow*, 1607, Act I, sc. i, ll. 134, 135.—ED.]

Where heauen he knowes how we ſhall anſwer him.
For in a night the beſt part of my powre,
As I vpon aduantage did remoue,
Were in the *Waſhes* all vnwarily,
Deuoured by the vnexpected flood.
Sal. You breath theſe dead newes in as dead an eare
My Liege, my Lord : but now a King, now thus.
Hen. Euen ſo muſt I run on, and euen ſo ſtop.

68. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73). *God* Words.
71. Waſhes *all*] Dyce, Hal. Cam.+, Words. Neils. Waſhes *all*, F_4, Rowe, Pope, Han. *Waſhes, all* Theob. et cet.
72. *Deuoured*] *devourèd* Dyce, Fle. Huds. ii, Words.
flood.] *flood.* [King sinks in his chair, and expires. Capell. *flood.* [The King dies. Rowe et cet.
73. *breath*] Ff, Rowe, Cap. *breathe* Pope et cet.
73. *eare*] *ear;* F_4 Rowe,+. *ear.* Var. '73 et seq.
74. *Liege, my Lord:...King,*] Ff, Rowe. *Liege! my Lord!—...king;* Cap. Dono. *Liege! my Lord!—...king,* Coll. Del. Wh. i, Huds. ii, Rlfe. *Liege! my Lord!... king,* Cam. Glo. Cla. Wh. ii, Neils. Craig. *liege, my lord....King,* Fle. *Liege! my Lord!—...King,*— Pope et cet.
75. *Euen...euen*] *Ev'n...ev'n* Pope, Theob. Han. Warb. Johns. Fle.

68. **heauen he knowes**] WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 215) quotes this line as an evident example of the change of the word 'God' to 'heauen' in conformity with the *Act to Restrain Abuses connected with the Stage*—James I. (1605–06), cap. 21.—ED.

69. **in a night**] For other examples of this construction, where 'a' is used for *one*, see ABBOTT, § 81.

70. **vpon aduantage**] WRIGHT: That is, seizing a favourable opportunity.

72. **vnexpected flood**] COLLIER (*Notes & Emend.*, p. 213): We are not told in any of the old copies when *he dies*, but those words are written [by the MS. Corrector] in the margin, just after the Bastard has concluded his statement of the loss of 'the best part of his power.'—[Do not Salisbury's words render any such stage-direction quite superfluous here?—OECHELHAÜSER'S stage business is as follows: 'The King suddenly starts up. Then slowly sinks back and dies. Prince Henry throws himself down beside the King, weeping. The Abbey bell is tolled slowly. The bystanders show themselves deeply moved.'—ED.]—BUCKNILL (*Mad Folk*, etc., p. 286): In all the deaths of all the plays, a long bill of mortality indeed, there is only one instance in which all the horrors of a bad end are laid bare, namely, in that of Cardinal Beaufort. In King John's death physical anguish alone is expressed, and this with such beauty and force of language as to veil the foul reality of death by a corrosive poison. [For an interesting and dramatic account of John's last hours and death, see Miss Norgate's *John Lackland*, pp. 281–286.]

74. **but now a King, now thus**] WRIGHT: Compare, 'And in a word, but even now worth this, And now worth nothing.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, I, i, 35.

75. **euen so stop**] MADDEN (p. 299, foot-note): The technical meaning of 'the stop,' as the end of a swift career [a swift gallop with a sudden stop] was often present to Shakespeare's mind. Read in this light, the word 'stop' acquires a new significance; as when Prince Henry says of a king's career: 'Even so must I run on, and even so stop.'

What ſurety of the world, what hope, what ſtay,
When this was now a King, and now is clay?
Baſt. Art thou gone ſo? I do but ſtay behinde,
To do the office for thee, of reuenge,
And then my ſoule ſhall waite on thee to heauen,
As it on earth hath bene thy ſeruant ſtill.
Now, now you Starres, that moue in your right ſpheres,
Where be your powres? Shew now your mended faiths,
And inſtantly returne with me againe.
To puſh deſtruction, and perpetuall ſhame
Out of the weake doore of our fainting Land:
Straight let vs ſeeke, or ſtraight we ſhall be ſought,
The Dolphine rages at our verie heeles.
Sal. It ſeemes you know not then ſo much as we,
The Cardinall *Pandulph* is within at reſt,
Who halfe an houre ſince came from the Dolphin,

76, 77. In margin Pope, Han.
80, 81. Om. Dono.
80. *heauen*] *Heav'n* Rowe,+ (—Var. '73).
82–107. Om. Bell.
82. *right*] *bright* Pope, Han. Warb. Johns.
87. *Straight...ſtraight*] *Strait...strait* Pope,+.
88. *Dolphine*] *Dolphin* F_3F_4, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.
91. *Dolphin*] Ff, Wh. Ktly, Fle. *Dauphin* Rowe et cet.

---

76. **stay**] C. & M. COWDEN CLARKE: The way in which Shakespeare uses the word 'stay' in this passage—to express 'a point of reliance,' 'an available support'—may serve to aid in illustrating his use of the word in 'Here's a stay,' I, ii, 379.

82, 83. **you Starres . . . your mended faiths**] DELIUS: The Barons but lately returned to their allegiance are stars which now circle in their proper paths.—DAWSON: You nobles that have returned to your allegiance give proof of your fidelity.—WRIGHT, taking the first part of this sentence as an apostrophe to the stars governing the King's destiny, interprets the 'mended faiths' as referring to 'John's fortune [which] had broken faith with him.'—PAGE likewise so takes it; but C. & M. CLARKE and DEIGHTON accept the interpretation of Delius; on Wright's note IVOR JOHN remarks: 'I cannot agree with Wright. . . . It seems to me quite evident that "Plantagenet" is talking to the nobles, "stars that *now* move in your right spheres (which you had left awhile) where are your men? Show your returned allegiance by marching with me upon the foe at once." Pope also misunderstood the passage, or he could never have read *bright* for "right."' [The concluding lines of the Bastard's speech show that Wright strangely misinterpreted this passage, and that the explanation of Delius and his followers is unquestionably correct.—ED.]

90. **Pandulph**] WRIGHT: Shakespeare's authority is still the old play. It was Cardinal Gualo, or Guala Bicchieri, who really interfered betweed John and his French invaders.

And brings from him ſuch offers of our peace,
As we with honor and reſpect may take,
With purpoſe preſently to leaue this warre.
Baſt. Hc will the rather do it, when he ſees
Our ſelues well ſinew'd to our defence.
Sal. Nay, 'tis in a manner done already,
For many carriages hee hath diſpatch'd
To the ſea ſide, and put his cauſe and quarrell
To the diſpoſing of the Cardinall,
With whom your ſelfe, my ſelfe, and other Lords,
If you thinke meete, this afternoone will poaſt
To conſummate this buſineſſe happily

92. *of our*] *of fair* Roderick.
96. *well ſinew'd*] *well-sinewed* Cap. *well sinewèd* Dyce, Fle. Words. Huds. ii. *our*] *our own* Coll. MS. Words.
97. *'tis*] Ff, Rowe, Sta. Neils. *it is* Pope et cet.
99. *ſea ſide*] *Sea-ſide* Ff. et seq.

98. **many carriages**] KNIGHT illustrates this line with an engraving from a MS. written at the close of the fourteenth century appearing in Markland's history of carriages in England (*Archæologia*, vol. xx.) wherein is shown a two-wheeled car, covered by an elaborate canopy, drawn by one horse, and containing but one passenger, presumably a royal personage.—HALLIWELL reproduces Knight's illustration and note, adding thereto a minute description by Fairholt of the royal *char*, which seems somewhat unnecessary with a picture before the reader. Now, with all deference to both Knight and Halliwell, it may be questioned why Salisbury should state that the dispatch of any number of such vehicles to the sea-side would be evidence that the Dauphin was abandoning his projected invasion. The term 'carriages' is, I think, used here not in the sense of a vehicle for passengers, or simply as baggage, as Moore Smith suggests, but in its technical sense as applied to the baggage and impedimenta of an army.—MURRAY (*N. E. D.*) under this head quotes, 1598. *Grenewey: Tacitus Annals*, I, xi, p. 21, ['after them followed the first legion:] the cariages inclosed in the middest.' And 1611, Speed: *Hist. Gt. Brit.*, IX, iv, 43: 'The King . . . had sent his maine Army to conduct the Carriages.' (The first of these extracts is, by the way, almost contemporaneous with the present play.) With this meaning of the word Salisbury says: The Dolphin has sent back much of his military equipment to the sea-side, and left the settlement of the terms of peace to the Cardinal.—ED.

99. **cause and quarrell**] RUSHTON (*Sh. & the Lex Scripta*, p. 93) compares: 'methinks I could not die anywhere so contented as in the king's company his cause being just and his quarrel honourable.'—*Henry V:* IV, i, 130, and thinks that since both Salisbury and King Henry connect the word 'quarrel' with the word 'cause,' that the former is used by both in its legal sense as given by Coke: '—as to this word queralus it is to be known that quarrels extend not only to actions as well real as personal . . . but also to causes of action and suits. . . . So that by release of all quarrels, not only actions depending in suit, but causes of action and suit also are released.'—*Coke on Littleton*, 292, a.

Baſt. Let it be ſo, and you my noble Prince,
With other Princes that may beſt be ſpar'd,
Shall waite vpon your Fathers Funerall.
Hen. At Worſter muſt his bodie be interr'd,
For ſo he will'd it.

104. *ſo,*] Ff, Rowe. *so;* Pope,+, Neils. *so.*— Coll. Del. Sta. Wh. i, Ktly, Fle. Rlfe, Dono. Craig. *so;*— Cap. et cet.
Prince] *lord* Cartwright.
105. *Princes*] *nobles* Elze (Athen., 22 June, 1867).
107. *At*] *As* Cap. (misprint).
Worſter] Worceſter F_3F_4.

105. Princes] WALKER (*Crit.*, i, 293): Scarcely right; for although Salisbury, Bigot, &c., are called 'princes' below, l. 124, and so *Henry V:* '—Brothers both Commend me to the princes in our camp,' IV, i, 24, the 'lords of England,' as they are called just below, l. 30, yet in the present passage the case is different. [This is given by Walker, among many other examples, where he suspects an error through the printer's having caught and repeated a word from a preceding line. —ED.]—CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXXI.): The error may be in the word 'prince,' for which it would be easier to suggest a substitute than for 'princes.' As an illustration of the facility with which such mistakes may be made we may mention that Sidney Walker himself, quoting this play, IV, iii, 48, 49, 'Could thought without this object Form such another?' wrote inadvertantly '*such* object.'—WRIGHT: If any change were made it would rather be that of 'Prince' [l. 104] to *King*.

107, 108. At Worster . . . For ſo he will'd it] '[King John] being then asked by the abbat of Croxton, where he would wish to be buried in case he should die, he answered, "To God and St. Wolston I commend my body and soul." After this, on the night next after St. Luke the Evangelist's day [October 19], he departed this life, having reigned eighteen years and a half; his body was dressed in royal robes and carried to Worcester, and was there buried honourably in the Cathedral church by the bishop of that place.'—Roger of Wendover, vol. ii, p. 378.—STEEVENS: A stone coffin, containing the body of King John, was discovered in the cathedral church of Worcester, July 17, 1797.—HALLIWELL: The original interment of King John took place before the altar of the Blessed Virgin in the Lady's Chapel, between the sepulchres of the Saints Oswald and Wulstan. The royal coffin when in this locality was probably let into the floor, the top of it being level with the pavement, the sculptured figure of the king, the effigy now on the tomb, being placed on the coffin as its covering. In the reign of Henry VIII. the king's sepulchre was removed from the Lady's Chapel to the upper end of the choir near the altar, when the coffin was placed on the pavement and a tomb erected over it to support the effigy. The memory of the ancient interment is preserved by the small statues of Oswald and Wulstan, each swinging a censer, which are placed in a recumbent position one on each side of the king's head. John holds a sceptre in his right hand, and in his left is a sword, the point of which enters the mouth of a lion which lies at his feet. The coffin was opened in the year 1797, and the body of the king was found on examination to have been interred in a dress like that represented on the effigy, excepting that on the skull in the coffin was found to be the celebrated monk's cowl in which, as a passport through the regions of purgatory, he is recorded to have been buried. The circumstance [of his willing his body to St Wulstan] is not men-

Baſt. Thither ſhall it then,
And happily may your ſweet ſelfe put on
The lineall ſtate, and glorie of the Land,
To whom with all ſubmiſsion on my knee,
I do bequeath my faithfull ſeruices
And true ſubiection euerlaſtingly.
Sal. And the like tender of our loue wee make
To reſt without a ſpot for euermore.
Hen. I haue a kinde ſoule, that would giue thankes,
And knowes not how to do it, but with teares.
Baſt. Oh let vs pay the time : but needfull woe,

111. *Land,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *land;* Fle. *land!* Theob. et cet.
112. *whom...ſubmiſsion...knee,*] Ff, Rowe, Pope. *whom,...submission... knee,* Theob. Warb. Johns. *whom... submission,...knee* Cam.+, Neils. *whom ...submission,...knee,* Han. et cet.
116. [kneeling too, with the other Lords. Cap. They kneel. Coll. ii.
117. *giue thankes*] Ff, Coll. Hal. *give thanks to you* Ktly. *fain give thanks* Cam. Edd. conj. *give you thanks* Rowe et cet.
118. *it, but*] *it but* F_3F_4, Rowe.
119. *time:*] *time* Rowe et seq.

---

tioned in the old play, and is questioned by Holinshed, but it is a fact that was derived by Shakespeare from some other source, for there is no doubt of its correctness.—[ROLFE notes that the effigy of King John 'is the earliest sculptured representation of an English monarch that remains in the country.'—Holinshed, alone among the chroniclers, mentions the monk's cowl as a part of King John's burial costume, and on this point thus comments: 'For the manner was at that time in such sort to burie their Nobles and great men, who were induced by the imaginations of monks and fond fansies of freers to beleeue, that the said cowle was an amulet or defensatiue to their soules from hell and hellish hags, how or in whatsoeuer sort they died; either in sorrow and repentence for sinne, or in blasphemie, outrage, impatiencie or desperation.'—vol. iii, p. 195, col. b 10.—ED.]

113. **bequeath**] RUSHTON (*Sh's Testamentary Language*, p. 23), in regard to this somewhat unusual use of this word, quotes from several of the old law-writers of Shakespeare's day, in order to show that during and after that time the words 'devise' and 'bequeath' were 'applied indifferently to both real and personal property.'—ED.

115. **And the like tender**] BOSWELL-STONE (p. 75): The revival of patriotic feeling, which placed Henry III. on the throne, is exhibited when Faulconbridge and Salisbury—the dramatic characters who severally represent the royalist and baronial parties—unite in proffering allegiance to their youthful sovereign. ['There is,' remarks Delius, 'here lacking a stage-direction, that the lords kneeling offer their allegiance to the young king.'—As though in answer to this, Oechelhaüser gives the following: 'All kneel in homage to the Prince, at the same time the rising sun shines forth.'—ED.].

119, 120. **Oh let vs . . . our greefes**] MALONE: Let us now indulge in sorrow, since there is abundant cause for it. England has been long in a scene of confusion and its calamities have anticipated our tears. By those which we now shed we

Since it hath beene before hand with our greefes.
This England neuer did, nor neuer ſhall
Lye at the proud foote of a Conqueror,
But when it firſt did helpe to wound it ſelfe.
Now, theſe her Princes are come home againe,
Come the three corners of the world in Armes,

120. *before hand*] *before-hand* Rowe ii. et seq.
121. *This*] *Thus* Han. Warb.
nor neuer ſhall] *and never shall* Pope, Han. In parentheses Var. '85, Rann, Mal. Steev. Varr. Sing. Ktly, Words.
125. *Armes,*] *arms!* Pope.

only *pay* her what is her due.—STEEVENS: I believe the plain meaning of the passage is this: As previously we have found sufficient cause for lamentation, let us not waste the present time in superfluous sorrow.—WRIGHT: Let us only indulge in such sorrow as is due to the occasion. [The order of words in the foregoing could but mean that they alone were to indulge, etc., but this is, I think, due to inadvertance; without doubt what Wright intended to say was, Let us indulge in such sorrow only as is due, etc.—ED.]—MOORE SMITH: Let us not pay more than necessary sorrow to the present occasion, since it has made us pay in advance.

121. **This**] HEATH (p. 232): I cannot see the least necessity for the alteration [by Hanmer, see *Text. Notes*]. Rather there is some impropriety in the particle *Thus*, as it implies a reference of similitude to something preceding, though in truth no such correspondence is to be found. I am not, however, ignorant that this reference may possibly be understood to be to the event which terminates the play.

124. **Now, these . . . home againe**] CAMBRIDGE EDD. (*Note* XXXII.): Mr Lloyd suspects that this line is spurious, 'A compliment to Steenie and Baby Charles, who came back from Madrid in the year that the first edition of *King John* was published, and thrust in by the editors, or perhaps by the actors, in place of a line of similar purport but less applicable.'

125. **the three corners of the world**] BARNARD: England in the Middle Ages was not regarded as an island, but rather as a kind of *alter orbis* with reference to the Continent; much as we look at Australia. . . . The meaning then may be, Europe, Asia, and Africa, *versus* England, the last being the fourth quarter, or 'corner' (compare perhaps I, ii, 32) of the globe. But it is possible Shakespeare may have had in his mind's eye some of the old maps which represent the Spanish peninsula as turning up at an acute angle to the west coast of France, and so enclosing the southern part of Ireland. The Scandinavian invasions of England, the Norman Conquest, and the attempt of the Spanish Armada, the three chief events since the Anglo-Saxon settlement of Britain, would thus seem to have come from the three countries which presented salient angles towards Britain, 'the three corners of the world.' They are defied, should they all again come and all at once. Or the notion of 'the three corners of the world' may have been suggested by the Pope, France, and Spain [as in the concluding lines of *The Troublesome Raigne*, see note by Steevens, below].—PAGE: That is, all the world. It is not clear why Shakespeare speaks of 'three corners.' In the Authorised Version [we find] 'He shall . . . gather together . . . the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.'—*Isaiah*, xi, 12. The four corners would mean east, west, north, south. Perhaps Shakespeare considered that England had no enemies to fear from the west, the ocean. [This

And we ſhall ſhocke them : Naught ſhall make vs rue,
If England to it ſelfe, do reſt but true. *Exeunt.* 127

126. *them:*] Ff, Rowe. *them!*— Theob. Warb. Johns. Var. '73. *them.* Pope et cet.

Naught] *Nought* Ff, Rowe.

127. Exeunt.] Exeunt, bearing in the body. Cap. Exeunt Omnes. Rowe,+, Varr. Rann.

---

line has been frequently quoted as parallel to the phrases 'the three nook'd world,' *Ant. & Cleo.*, IV, vi, 5, and the 'threefold world,' *Jul Cæs.*, IV, i, 13, but, beyond the fact that the words 'three' and 'world' are common to all three lines, there is, I think, no parallelism whatever. In the present case the difficulty is not so much in the word 'corner,' since its use for a remote region of the earth is fairly common; for example: 'All corners else o' the world Let liberty make use of,' *Tempest*, I, ii, 491; again: 'slander . . . whose breath rides on the posting winds and doth belie All corners of the world,' *Cymb.*, III, iv, 39; the most familiar is, doubtless: 'In his hand are all the corners of the earth,' *Psalm* xcv, 4 (Prayer-book). 'Corner' was, however, also used to designate the point from which the wind was blowing, for example: 'Sits the wind in that corner,' *Much Ado*, II, i, 332; 'Winds of all the corners kiss'd your sails,' *Cymb.*, III, iv, 28, and thus by an easy transition the four cardinal points became the four corners of the earth, as shown on maps and charts. Thus Morocco says of Portia: 'From the four corners of the earth they come to kiss this shrine.'—*Mer. of Ven.*, II, vii, 39. But what were specifically the four corners? And why does the Bastard refer to but three? A passage in the speech of Austria, I, ii. (though doubtfully cited by Barnard), gives, I think, in part an explanation. Austria there says to Arthur that he will not return to his home '—till that England . . . that utmost corner of the west Salute thee for her king' (ll. 29–32). Thus England was the furthermost Western corner of the world; possibly India was the corresponding Eastern, Africa was perhaps the Southern, and Norway or Scandinavia, the Northern. As Faulconbridge is uttering these words while in *one* corner, he refers naturally to the other three. With this disposition of the world it will be seen that Italy occupies almost a central position, therefore Morocco is quite right in saying that suitors for Portia come from all the *four* corners. In the passage from *Isaiah* quoted by Page, as he says, the 'four corners' mean simply north, south, east, and west. Faulconbridge means, Let the other three quarters of the world come in arms against us, we have naught to fear.—ED.]

126. **we shall shocke them**] MADDEN (p. 267): A horse of no ordinary power was needed to sustain the weight of a knight in full armour, in addition to the cumbrous furniture and heavy plates which the charger bore for his own protection. The Clydesdale of today approaches most nearly to the great war-horse of our ancestors, from which this noble animal has been developed by careful breeding through many generations. The High Almain or German horse was 'stronglie made and therefore more meete for the shocke, than to pass a cariere, or to make a swift manege, because they be verie grosse and heauie.' [Compare *1 Henry IV:* I, i, 12; *Henry V:* IV, viii, 114.—MOORE SMITH compares: 'my troupes are prest To answere Lewes with a lustie shocke.'—*The Troublesome Raigne*, Pt. ii, sc. iv, l. 81.]

127. **If England . . . but true**] STEEVENS: This sentiment seems borrowed from the conclusion of the old play: 'If England's peers and people join in one Nor Pope, nor France, nor Spain, can do them wrong.' Again in *3 Henry VI:* 'England is safe, if true within itself,' [IV, i, 40].—MALONE: Shakespeare's conclusion seems rather

[127. **If England to it selfe, do rest but true**]

to have been borrowed from these two lines of the old play: 'Let England live but true within itself, And all the world can never wrong her state.'—STEEVENS: 'Brother, brother, we may be both in the wrong.' This sentiment might originate from *A Discourse of Rebellion, drawne forth for to warne the Wanton Wiltes how to kepe their Heads on their Shoulders*, by T. Churchyard, 1570: 'O Britayne bloud, marke this at my desire—If that you sticke together as you ought This lytle yle may set the world at nought.'—REED shows that this sentiment may be traced still higher by quoting from Borde's *Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge* (temp. Henry VIII.): 'if they [the English] were true wythin themselves, they nede not to feare although al nacions were set against them.' [Reed also gives a couplet from *Fuimus Troes*, 1633, wherein this sentiment is also expressed, but the late date makes it likely that the writer had the present lines in mind. As Shakespeare is here evidently paraphrasing a line in *The Troublesome Raigne* it seems hardly a profitable task to seek the original author's inspiration.—ED.]—F. VICTOR HUGO (iii, 468): On reading the apostrophe, with which this play concludes, it is difficult not to see therein an allusion to contemporary events. In my opinion, this apostrophe was inspired by the threats of the Catholic coalition against heretic England. This opinion, which I am surprised at being the first to express, is completely confirmed by the concluding line of the older play.—GERVINUS (p. 371): In the opinion of the Poet, as well as of Faulconbridge, no foreign policy and no hostile sword should heal domestic wounds. Hearty unity with a natural enemy is of no value to him, and the national discontent at the league with foreign propaganda, though it may be formed even against tyranny and arbitrariness at home, is to him a sight full of ignominy and dishonour. A lesson grandly inculcated upon us Germans, who will have no state, nor politics, nor common nationality, nor public welfare until we understand how to apply to ourselves the conclusion of this play, which is at the same time the soul of it.—MOBERLY: The play ends by striking once more its key-note of patriotism and determined resistance to invasion, however formidable.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

THE TEXT

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF KING JOHN appeared for the first time in the Folio of 1623, where it occupies pp. 1–22 in the division of that volume containing the histories. On November 8, 1623, Jaggard & Blount placed on the Stationers' Registers a list of plays which 'were not formerly entered to other men' as the required entry of Shakespeare's collected works, but *King John* is missing from this list, and an exhaustive search of the Registers has thus far failed to bring to light any entry of Shakespeare's play. In regard to the omission from Jaggard & Blount's list Halliwell opines: 'Unless, as was probably the case, the omission was accidental there may either have been a previous entry of the play to some other publisher, although such entry is not now to be found in the register, or the copyright of *King John* belonged to one of the publishers whose general rights had been purchased by Jaggard & Blount.' The text as it has come to us is singularly free of corruptions. The most notable exception being Act I, i, 249, 250, for which, as yet, no entirely satisfactory emendation has been proposed. The heading *Actus Quartus, Scœna prima,* repeated as the heading to *Actus Quintus* is of minor importance.

LIST OF EMENDATIONS ADOPTED IN THE TEXT OF THE CAMBRIDGE EDITION

This list does not include Stage directions; divisions into metrical lines; mere punctuation, such as an ! into an ?; or changes of spelling. The Four Folios are considered as one text. The lines are numbered according to the Text in the present volume.

In the following passages—

Pope amends 'Could get me sir' . . . to *Could he get me? Sir.*—I, i, 250.
Rowe amends 'Ace' to *Ate.*—II, i, 67.
Theobald amends 'Alcides shooes' to *Alcides' shows.*—II, i, 154.
Theobald amends 'Angiers' to *Anjou.*—II, i, 162.
Capell amends 'Comfort yours' to *Confronts your.*—II, i, 231.
Tyrwhitt amends 'Kings of our feare' to *King'd of our fears.*—II, i, 392.
Theobald amends 'tast' to *task.*—III, i, 80.
Theobald amends 'cased' to *chafed.*—III, i, 195.
Dyce amends 'race' to *ear.*—III, iii, 42 (Cam. ii.).
Rowe amends 'fiends' to *friends.*—III, iv, 68.
Heath amends 'warm of' to *of warm.*—V, ii, 62.
Theobald amends 'vn-heard' to *unhair'd.*—V, ii, 139.
Theobald amends 'endles' to *eyeless.*—V, vi, 18.
Rowe amends 'Symet' to *cygnet.*—V, vii, 25.

DATE OF COMPOSITION

The following passage from Meres's *Palladis Tamia, Wits' Treasury*, 1598, has been often quoted, nevertheless it is here repeated, since it bears upon the present play: 'As *Plautus* and *Seneca* are accounted the best for comedy and tragedy among the Latines, so Shakespeare among ye English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage; for Comedy witness his *Gentlemen of Verona*, his *Errors*, his *Love's Labour's Lost*, his *Love's Labour's Wonne*, his *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and his *Merchant of Venice;* for Tragedy his *Richard the 2., Richard the 3., Henry the 4., King John, Titus Andronicus*, and his *Romeo and Juliet*' (Shakspere Allusion Book, pt i, 159). Malone, whose essay on the Chronological order of Shakespeare's Plays first appeared in the Variorum of 1778, assigns the date 1596 to *King John*, and places it fourteenth in his list, preceded by *Hamlet; Com. of Err.; Romeo and Juliet; Midsummer Night's Dream; Winter's Tale; Two Gentlemen; Locrine; Pericles; 3 Henry VI.; 2 Henry VI.; 1 Henry VI.; Love's Labour's; Titus Andronicus.* In his second revision, which appeared in the Variorum of 1785, the same date, 1596, is given to *King John*, but this play is placed as *twelfth* on the list, due simply to the fact that on consideration Malone entirely rejected the two plays, *Locrine*, No. 7, and *Pericles*, No. 6, the order of the others remaining unchanged. In his third and final revision, in his edition of 1790, *King John* still retains the date of 1596, but stands eleventh in the list, preceded by the same plays, but in slightly different order, *Titus Andronicus*, No. 1, being rejected. Malone adopted the date 1596 for three reasons: (1) As *King John* is mentioned by Meres in 1598, it could not have been written after that date; though he admits a possibility that Meres may have confused Shakespeare's play with its predecessor, *The Troublesome Raigne.* (2) The grief of Constance over the loss of Arthur may be the reflection of Shakespeare's own sorrow at the loss of his little son Hamnet who died in August, 1596 (see note on III, iv, 98–105). (3) The description by Chatillon of the English forces may have been suggested by the grand fleet which was sent against Spain in 1596 (see II, i, 74–79 and notes). An apparent quotation from *The Spanish Tragedy* (1586), at II, i, 147, 148, is used by Malone as a reason for assigning perhaps even an earlier date to *King John;* and as a limit in the opposite direction the line III, i, 25, 'Like a proud river peering o'er his bounds,' is seemingly imitated by Marston in the *Insatiate Countess*, 1603 (see note *ad loc. cit.*). Malone thus concludes: 'A speech spoken by the Bastard in the Second Act of this tragedy seems to have been formed on one in an old play entitled, *The Famous History of Captain Thomas Stukely.* Captain Stukely was killed in 1578. The drama of which he is the subject was not printed till 1605, but it is in black letter, and, I believe, had been exhibited at least fifteen years before.' (See II, i, 486 and note.)

HURDIS: *King John* is a play in the two first acts of which there are many scenes written in a strain of uncommon majesty, well sustained. The interview between John and Hubert, Act III, in which the death of Arthur is determined, that part of Act IV. which follows the second coronation of the King, and almost the whole of Act V. are finely conceived and well executed. This, together with the general correctness of the language, induces me to believe that it was of late composition.

COLERIDGE attempted a classification of the Plays in 1802; he placed *The Troublesome Raigne* in the First Epoch of Shakespeare's works, together with *The London Prodigal, Cromwell, Henry VI*, parts 1, 2 and 3, first ed., and *Edward III.* 'All

these,' he added, 'are transitional works, not his, yet of him.' In a second attempted classification, 1810, Coleridge placed all the Histories together in a group following the Comedies, and preceded by the four tragedies—*Macbeth*, *Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*. 'In order,' he said, 'to be able to show my reasons for rejecting some whole plays and very many scenes in others.' In a third and final attempt, 1819, Coleridge placed the present play second in the Second Epoch between *Richard II.* and *Henry VI.*

G. CHALMERS: The fact is, that there are many allusions in Shakespeare's *King John* to the events of 1596, and to some in 1597; though the commentators have not been very diligent to collect them. The Pope published a Bull against Elizabeth in 1596; and the Pope's Nuntio made some offers to Henry IV. against Queen Elizabeth (Camden in Kennet, ii, p. 601). The scene with Pandulph, the papal legate, which alludes to those offers, must, as Johnson remarks, have been, at the time it was written, during our struggles with poverty a very captivating scene. The contradictory, shifting policy of England and France, as represented in *King John*, forms an admirable parody on the adverse, friendly conduct of Elizabeth and Henry IV. (Camden in Kennet, ii, p. 595). Let the siege of Angiers, in *King John*, be compared with the loss and recapture of Amiens, in 1597, chiefly by the valour of the English reinforcements, under the gallant Baskerville. The altercations between the bastard, Falconbridge, and Austria, while the conduct of the Archduke Albert was so unpopular in England, must have afforded a rich repast to an English audience. There is a strong allusion, particularly in the last act, to the quarrel between Essex and Raleigh, which began at Calais, in 1596, and rose to a more remarkable height in 1597 (Camden in Kennet, ii, pp. 594, 597). Owing to the many piques among the great, occasioned by the selfish ambition of Essex, the concluding remark of Falconbridge must have been felt and applauded by the auditory: 'Nought shall make us rue, If England to itself do rest but true.' If to all those imitations we add the remark of Johnson, how much advantage Shakespeare constantly derived from facts then recent, and the passions then in motion, there can no doubt remain but that our Poet's *King John* must be fixed to the spring-time of 1598 as the true epoch of its original production.

DRAKE (*Sh. & His Times*, ii, 419) accepts 1598 as the date for this play, moved thereto by the arguments of Chalmers, which he considers of greater force than those of Malone for the earlier date. *King John* is sixteenth in Drake's Chronological Table, preceded by *Hamlet*, 1597, and followed by *All's Well*, 1598.

TIECK (Schlegel's Trans., 1830, vol. iii, p. 339): To all attentive readers of the Poet who are conversant with his language and have made a study of his works, there can be no question but that this play must be one of Shakespeare's later compositions, and could not have been written either in 1590 or 1591. His marvellous skill shows in every part; agility and fastidiousness with surety play with the most intricate turnings and expressions. The character of Faulconbridge alone proclaims the thorough master of his art, who dared to paint in the humor of this hero with so bold a brush. This tragedy could certainly not have been written before 1611; the same year when there appeared another edition of the older, remarkable play, *The Troublesome Raigne*, bearing on its title-page 'written by W. Sh.' This last is clearly one of Shakespeare's early compositions written certainly before 1589 or 1590.

KNIGHT: *King John* is one of the plays of Shakespeare enumerated by Francis Meres in 1598. We have carefully considered the reasons which have led Malone to fix the date of its composition as 1596, and Chalmers as 1598; and we cannot avoid regarding them as far from satisfactory. There can be no doubt that Shakespeare's *King John* is founded on a former play. We cannot understand how Coleridge, at any rate, should have supposed it possible that the two works could be produced by the same pen. We must, for our own part, hold to the opinion that the old *King John* was not either 'his or of him.' The date, then, of this older play of *King John*, 1591, and the mention of Shakespeare's play, by Meres, in 1598, allow us a range of seven years for the period of the production of this, the first in the order of History of Shakespeare's historical plays. Shakespeare's son Hamnet died in August, 1596, at the age of twelve. Hence the inspiration, according to Malone, of the deep pathos of the grief of Constance on the probable death of Arthur. We doubt this. The dramatic poetry of Shakespeare was built upon deeper and broader foundations than his own personal feelings and experiences. In the Sonnets, indeed, which are professedly a reflection of himself, we have, as far as we can judge, a key to as much of the character as he chose to disclose of the one man, Shakespeare; but in the plays his sense of individuality is entirely swallowed up in the perfectly distinct individuality of the manifold characters which he has painted. From the first to the last of his plays, as far as we can discover, we have no 'moods of his own mind'—nothing of that quality which gives so deep an interest to the poetry of Wordsworth and Byron—and which Byron, with all his genius, could not throw aside in dramatic composition. We are, for this reason, not disposed to regard the opinion of Malone upon this point as of much importance. The conjecture is, however, recommended by its accordance with our sympathies; and it stands, therefore, upon a different ground from that absurd notion that Shakespeare drew Lear's 'dog-hearted daughters' with such irresistible truth because he himself had felt the sharp sting of 'filial ingratitude.'

VERPLANCK: Meres mentions *King John* in his list of Shakespeare's works before 1598; but, indeed, that weighty evidence is hardly needed to authorize our assigning its production to that second, or—if we admit *Pericles* and *Andronicus* to be the Juvenile essays of his muse—to that third period of his literary progress, when, after the success of his first comedies, his style and versification gained a larger freedom, his characters a deeper stamp of truth and individuality, as well as a richer variety, and his exhibitions of emotion, passion, and suffering more minuteness and accuracy, as well as more vividness of painting; while the flowing lines, with a certain regularity of pause—the somewhat diffuse and perspicuous diction—still distinguish his manner quite as much from that of *Othello* and *Lear*, as it otherwise varies from that of the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. In these respects the contrast between the English Historical plays and the Roman tragedies is worthy of notice —the former being more assimilated, in their general poetic tone, to the *Merchant of Venice*, as the latter are to the great tragic master-pieces of the Author's zenith of power. Yet in both classes alike—the English and Roman histories—in *King John*, as in *Coriolanus*, we can trace the same overflowing creative mind which crowded *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* and *Lear* with character, passion, allusion, reason, poetry, until the language bent under the thought of weight and sentiment. In *King John* and its companions these characteristics of style are seen but occasionally, appearing as in their very rudiments; while in the later works they appear in a calmer and moderated exercise, rather as the effect of habit than of effort.

COLLIER (*Introduction*, p. 5): Upon the question, when *King John* was written by Shakespeare, we have no knowledge beyond the fact that Francis Meres introduces it into his list in 1598. We should be disposed to assign it to a date between 1596 and 1598, when the old *King John*, which was probably in a course of representation in 1591, had gone a little out of recollection, and when Meres would have had time to become acquainted with Shakespeare's drama from its popularity either at the Globe or Blackfriar's Theatres.

HUDSON (*Introduction*, p. 356): Divers attempts have been made to argue the date of the writing from allusions to contemporary matters; respecting which attempts we cannot stop, nor is it worth the while to say more than that they do not really amount to anything at all. Some of the German critics, on the other hand, seem altogether out, when, arguing from the internal evidence of style, structure of the verse, tone of thought, and peculiarity of dramatic logic, they refer *King John* to the same period of the Author's life with *The Tempest*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale*. In all these respects it strikes us rather as having something of an intermediate cast between *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *The Merchant of Venice*. We are persuaded, though we should be troubled to tell why, that it was written some time before the two parts of *King Henry IV*. The play, especially in the first three acts, has a certain smoothness and fluency of diction, a uniformity of pause, and a regularity of cadence; therewithal, the persons deliver themselves somewhat in the style of set speeches, rather as authors striving for effect, than as men and women stirred by the real passions and interests of life; there is something of a bookish grandiloquent tang in the dialogue, all of which smacks as if the Poet had here written more from what he had read in books, or heard at the theatre, than from what his most prying, quick, and apprehensive ear had overhead of the hitherto unwritten drama of actual and possible men. [Hudson is of the opinion that *Henry IV*. was written as early as 1593; it may, therefore, be inferred that he assigns a date of composition for the present play close to that of the first edition of *The Troublesome Raigne*.—ED.]

DELIUS: When the internal evidence of style and verse is considered *King John* belongs to the middle period of Shakespeare's career. Dividing the Histories into two groups, the first, consisting of the four-drama cycle *Henry VI*, Parts i, ii, and iii, and *Richard III*, the second group, also a four-drama cycle, consisting of *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, Parts i and ii, and *Henry V.*; then *King John* will lie between these two groups, but related to the latter cycle more closely than to the earlier, as is shown in this play by every distinguishing mark of Shakespeare's artistic development.

R. CARTWRIGHT (p. 183): *The Taming of the Shrew* was immediately followed by *King John*, composed most probably during the summer of 1596; whether it was finished or not before the death of Hamnet, in August, matters little; in Constance we have a picture of the maternal sufferings of Shakespeare's wife, anxiously watching the wasting figure of her only son; it may be reasonably inferred such is the case, since no editor pretends the play was produced before 1595, and in no other play has he painted maternal suffering so vividly and forcibly; and yet the anxiety and misery of Constance are in a measure imaginary; she sees in her mind's eye her son wasting away.

R. G. WHITE (*Introduction*, p. 15): Shakespeare's *King John* was produced be

tween 1591 and 1598; and its style of expression and tone of thought, which are marked by somewhat more of maturity than appears in *The Merchant of Venice*, for instance, while they are not yet those of Shakespeare's later period, indicate 1596 as about the date of its production. The Folio, the only source of the text, gives it in a state very nearly approaching purity.

HALLIWELL (*Introduction*, p. 336): *King John* was probably written after 1591, the date of the publication of *The Troublesome Raigne*, but still it is possible that Shakespeare may have used a play-house copy of that piece, so that a limit in that direction can hardly be determined with certainty. There are no allusions in the play itself that can be safely depended upon as arguments in the question respecting the date of its composition, with the exception perhaps of the reference, in the First Act, to a passage in the tragedy of *Solyman and Perseda*, which was entered on the books of the Stationers' Company in November, 1592, and was probably then in the commencement of its popularity.

STOKES (p. 43): The application of the different metrical tests supports as well the early date assumed for this play as the grouping of it with *Richard II.* and *Richard III.*; in addition to the 'feminine-ending test' and the 'weak-ending test,' the absence of prose in these three plays should be noted; while it may be added that there is a remarkable absence of 'classical allusions' in the three plays. The early date of the piece may be seen, too, from the occasional plays-upon-words and conceits in unsuitable places; from the antithetical answers; from the lengthy speeches (for example, the Bastard's soliloquies); and from a certain want of connection throughout. The play should be compared, too, with the two parts of the old *King John* in order to observe Shakespeare's discrimination and artistic taste; the side of the reign which he has not dramatised should be also noticed.

Professor J. K. INGRAM (*New Sh. Soc. Transactions*, 1874, p. 450) exhibits a table of the plays of Shakespeare arranged in order of the number of lines having light endings, such as the words, *am*, *art*, *been*, etc., and those having weak endings, such as the words, *and*, *as*, *at*, *but*, *by*, etc. 'From this Table,' says Ingram, 'the following results seem deducible: 1. During the first three-fourths (or thereabouts) of Shakespeare's poetic life he used the light endings very sparingly and the weak endings scarcely at all. 2. The last fourth (or thereabouts) is obviously and unmistakeably distinguished from the earlier stages by the very great increase in number of light endings, and, still more, by the first appearance in any appreciable number, and afterwards the steady growth of the weak endings. 3. Hence, in any discrimination of periods which is founded on metrical considerations, this last may be called the "weak-ending period."' Ingram's deductions have special reference to the dates of certain of the plays, and therefore need not here be repeated. In the Table *King John* is eighth in order, having seven light endings, and not any weak endings; standing between *Richard III*, with four light endings, not any weak endings, and *Mer. of Ven.*, with six light endings and one weak ending.

F. S. PULLING (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1879, p. 457), on a hint from Professor Ingram, has applied one other form of verse test as a solution of the problem of determining the true chronology of Shakespeare's plays, he says: 'My plan has been to distinguish between single-line and part-line speeches, as well as between those speeches which end with the end of a line, and those which end in the middle of a

line. This I have done with respect to twenty of the most important Plays, and the results obtained are, I think, interesting, and none the less so because they, in the main, tend decidedly to confirm the conclusions arrived at by means of the other tests.' Pulling entitles this the 'speech-ending test.' In his table *King John* stands fourth, preceded by *Richard II*, *Two Gentlemen*, and *Com. of Errors*, and preceding *Romeo and Juliet*.

WARD (ii, 101): Malone's circumstantial evidence [to fix the date of composition in 1596] is not overwhelming, and is by no means irreconcilable with the conclusion with which the tests of versification fairly agree, that the play belongs to the same period of Shakespeare's productivity as *Richard II*, and may be dated about the same time, probably rather earlier. The general looseness of texture observable in the construction of this play, and its great flow of oratorical speech, point to the same conclusion.

ULRICI (3d ed., ii, 221): Most critics do not place *King John* earlier than 1596–97. I, for my part, believe that it may have appeared some years earlier. It is true that it contains but few passages in rhyme (as the subject offered no occasion either for lyrical effusions or for the expression of calm contemplative reflection), but these rhymes are often just those very alternate rhymes which are always less frequently met with in Shakespeare's later works. The drama is also written wholly in verse, to the exclusion of all prose; but this circumstance I do not consider of any great importance, for in Shakespeare's tragedies and historical dramas (except in the comic scenes introduced) it is invariably only persons from the lower ranks who speak in prose, and such persons and such scenes do not occur in *King John*. Of greater weight, in my opinion, is the generally clear and regular flow of the language, which is still free from complicated similes and constructions, and also the regular, almost monotonous versification with its usually masculine endings. I am therefore inclined to assume that *King John* may have appeared in 1593–94, that is, in the interval after the completion of the earlier tetralogy of English histories, which comprises the three parts of *Henry VI.* and *Richard III*, but before the commencement of the later one, which includes *Richard II*, *Henry IV.* (1st and 2d parts), and *Henry V.*

FURNIVALL (*Leopold Sh., Introduction*, p. xli.): With this play of pathos and patriotism we open Shakspere's Second Period—looking on *Richard II.* as the last play in which rhyme plays a prominent part, we take the series of *Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* as the transition to the Second Period—and on opening it we are struck with a greater fulness of characterisation and power than we saw in the first-period plays. But the whole work of Shakspere is continuous. *King John* is very closely linked with *Richard III.* In both plays we have cruel uncles planning their nephews' murder, because the boys stand between them and the crown. In both we have distracted mothers overwhelmed with grief. In both we have prophecies of ruin and curses on the murderers, and in both the fulfilment of these. In both we have the Kingdom divided against itself, and the horrors of civil war. In both we have the same lesson of the danger of division taught to the discontented English parties of Shakspere's own day. *Richard III.* is the example of the misgovernment of a cruel tyrant; *King John*, of the misgovernment of a selfish coward. But in *John* we have the mother's pathetic lament for her child far developed above that of Queen Elizabeth's for her murdered innocents, and far more touching than the laments of

Queen Margaret and the Duchess of York, while the pathos of the stifled children's death is heightened in that of Arthur. The temptation scene of John and Hubert repeats that of Richard and Tyrrel. The Bastard's statement of his motives 'Gain, be my lord,' etc., is like that of Richard the Third's about his villainy. (The Bastard's speech on commodity may be compared with Lucrece's reproaches to opportunity.) Besides the boy's pleading for his life, besides his piteous death and the mother's cry for him, which comes home to every parent who has lost a child, we have in the play the spirit of Elizabethan England's defiance to the foreigner and the Pope. The rhetoric of the earlier historical plays is kept up in *King John*, and also Shakespere's power of creating situations, which he had possessed from the first.

FLEAY (*Introduction*, p. 9): The majority of critics fix the date of production in 1596—rightly. This is one of the plays mentioned in Mere's list published in 1598, but probably written not later than 1597. The older play on which it was founded was undoubtedly written with special reference to the attempted Spanish invasion of 1588, and it seems most likely that this play was in like manner written with a view to the second projected Spanish invasion of England in 1595. Hence all allusions in the older play would become equally applicable at the later date. Just as the earlier drama was produced in the year after the first invasion was attempted, so Shakespeare's History was in all likelihood written in the year after the second invasion was frustrated. This is confirmed by the singular appropriateness of the lines (II, i, 76–79) to the fleet sent against Spain in 1596. This fleet sailed 3d June, and returned, after the sacking of Cadiz and destruction of the Spanish fleet, on 8th August in that year. It is further confirmed by the likelihood that the laments of Constance for Arthur's death were inspired by Shakespeare's sorrow for his heir and only son, Hamnet, whom he lost on 12th August. Taking, then, August as one limit of date, the other can be found. Steevens quotes from the *Famous History of Thomas Stukeley* (V, i.):

> 'Why, here's a gallant, here's a king indeed.
> He speaks all Mars
> Tut, let me follow such a lad as this
> This is pure fier; every look he casts
> Flasheth like lightening: there's mettle in this boy;
> He brings a breath that sets our sails on fire
> Why, now, I see we shall have cuffs indeed.'

He compares this with II, i, 155–166, and rightly infers that one passage was imitated from the other, but is wrong in making Shakespeare the plagiarist. The copying is palpably on the side of the other writer. Now *Stukeley* was acted at the Rose by the Admirals Company for the first time on 11th December, 1596, and probably run in opposition to Shakespeare's *John*. We cannot, then, be far wrong in putting the date of *John* as about Simon and Jude's Day, 28th October, the usual commencement of the Winter season at the playhouses. If still further confirmation of the argument that *Stukeley* and *John* were rival plays be needed, it may be found in the fact that the older play of *John* had, about 1589, also a rival play on *Stukeley* run against it by another company. This play was called the *Battle of Alcazar*, and was written by G. Peele. It was not new when acted by Lord Strange's Company in 1591–2 (February 20th, Henslowe's Diary). When the Chamberlain's Company played Shakespeare's History, it was natural that the Admiral's Company should copy the enemy's tactics and produce a new *Stukeley*, to match

the new *King John*. A similar reprisal took place in regard to *Jeronymo* (see Marston's *Malcontent*, Induction). Thomas Stukeley, while harbored at Philip's Court, was complained of by Elizabeth as a rebel. He taught Philip how to make ships of war like the English, and projected an invasion of Ireland which came to nothing. Philip did, however, thereafter (in 1577) prepare to invade England with a large fleet. Hence the choice of this subject, as well as that of the reign of John, at times when armadas had been defeated in 1589 and 1598. As the Chamberlain's Company had incorporated or were formed from Lord Strange's in 1594, they would have the repertoire of the latter in their possession; and the play on Stukeley, called by Henslowe *Muley Morocco*, that is, *The Battle of Alcazar*, does not appear in connection with the other companies who acted at the Rose.

It seems more reasonable to infer that I, ii, 1–200 and III, ii, 1–10 were inserted hurriedly after the rest of the play had been written. This would also account for the confusion in the division into acts and scenes already noticed. A reference to the metrical table, which shows only two rhymes in the 200 lines in I, ii, and no rhyme in III, ii, confirms the conjecture; and we consider that the celebrated passage alluding to the English fleet of 1596 (lines 71–75) is also contained in I, ii. I feel little doubt that these subsequent insertions were made after Hamnet's death, and that the blunders of Philip for Richard and Lewis for Philip are to be attributed to the confusion caused by grief in Shakespeare's mind. None but those who have had to write compulsorily under similar bereavements can tell how errors do creep in at such times. That the errors remained uncorrected causes no difficulty; for this play was not printed during Shakespeare's life, and its probable revivals in 1611 and 1622 took place after his retirement from the theatre, according to the most probable chronology, which gives 1611 for the production of his last complete play; the two plays produced afterwards being finished by Fletcher. (See *Shakespearian Study*, in Collins' Series.) The excision of the character of Essex from this play may also have been made after August, 1596, and with the same want of care; which would account for his name being left in the prefix, I, i, 44.

DOWDEN (*Sh's Primer*, p. 90): As to the date of *King John*, all that we can assert with confidence is that it lies somewhere between the early histories, *Henry VI*, Parts I, II, and III, with *Richard III*, and the group of later histories, the trilogy consisting of *1* and *2 Henry IV*. and *Henry V*. Thus in the historical series it is brought close to *Richard II*. Neither play contains prose, but the treatment of Faulconbridge's part shows more approach to the alliance of a humorous or comic element with history (which becomes complete in *Henry IV*.) than does anything in the play of *Richard II*. *King John* and *Richard II*. have the common characteristics of containing very inferior dramatic work side by side with work of a high and difficult kind. The chief point of difference with respect to form is that *Richard II*. contains a much larger proportion of rhymed verse, and, on the whole, we shall perhaps not err in regarding *Richard II*. as the earlier of the two.

WRIGHT (Clarendon ed., *Introduction*, p. iii.): A point which is supposed to have some influence in determining the date of *King John* is the fancied resemblance of Faulconbridge's speech in II, i. to some lines in the old play of *Stukeley*, which, although not printed till 1605, is believed by Dyce to be the same as the play of *Stewtley*, mentioned in Henslowe's Diary as having been acted by the Lord Admiral's Company on the 11th of December, 1596. Anyone who reads the lines which Steevens thought might have been imitated by Shakespeare will be able to form an

opinion as to whether they have anything to do with the question before us. I think not. But in another speech of the Bastard's, I, i, 244, 'Knight, knight, good mother, Basilisco-like,' there is a distinct reference to the play of *Soliman and Perseda*, which was entered at Stationer's Hall, 29 November, 1592. Between this date, therefore, and 1598, when Meres wrote, the composition of *King John* must be placed, and if we may trust the evidences of style, language, and metre it is probable that we shall not be far wrong in placing it very near *Richard II*, perhaps rather before than after it, and therefore about the year 1593 or, at any rate, in the period 1593–4.

DAWSON (*Introduction*, p. v.): If with Malone, for example, it is maintained that *King John* must have been written about August 11th, 1596, because on that day Shakespeare's only son Hamnet was buried, two improbable assumptions are made: (1) that Shakespeare's finest lines in this and other plays could only be written from his own personal experience; and (2) that the plays appeared in print in the exact form in which they were first written. On the contrary, it seems much more probable that when the plays were now and again taken out of the repertoire to be acted, such changes were made as seemed appropriate, having special reference to passing events, than that they remained untouched from the time of writing to that of publication in the First Folio of 1623.

TEN BRINK (p. 80): The second period of Shakespeare's activity extends to the beginning of the seventeenth century, and one of the characteristics which at once distinguishes it from the first concentration. The Poet here limits his dramatic productions to two kinds—comedy and historical plays—and he carries both of these forms of art to the highest point of their development. The two works which stand at the head of this period—*The Taming of the Shrew* and *King John*—owe their elaboration only to Shakespeare, and not their rough outlines—a proof of his growing appreciation of art, as well as of his increased estimation in the world of letters. Both works show in a striking manner how the Poet, now in the plenitude of his youthful strength and manhood, delighted in moral worth in uncouth, nay, in coarse, forms. We meet characters of a more refined, more ideal type in *The Merchant of Venice*, whose central figure is the high-spirited Portia, with the sinister but imposing figure of Shylock as a contrast. But the thought which runs through the first two works—that it is not outward show and appearance, but genuine worth, that tells—is here again dwelt upon with great emphasis, and strikingly symbolized.

BOAS (*Sh. & his Predecessors*, p. 238): *King John* in its main object recalls *Richard III*, while the character of Constance anticipates that of *Richard II*. It resembles *Richard III*. also in the prominence given to rivalries of women, but the grouping is less studiously monumental, and the curious strophic balance of lamentation has disappeared. The blank verse is still overloaded with rhetoric, which has, however, lost the peculiar lurid tinge of the earlier play. Rhyme is almost entirely confined to the pithy rejoinders and epigrams of the Bastard, in whose person the element of popular humor enters for the first time an entirely Shakesperean historical play. There is as yet, however, no hint of the use of prose as the fittest vehicle for this humour. Thus the internal evidence stamps *King John* as a link between the earlier and later Histories, and it may be assigned to about the year 1595.

GOLLANCZ (*Temple Sh.*): From internal evidence *King John* belongs to the same

group as *Richard II.* and *Richard III*, especially in the characteristic absence of prose. The large amount of rhyme in *Richard II.* makes it, in all probability, anterior to *King John*. The play may safely be dated 1595.

GARNETT and GOSSE (*Illust. Hist. of English Lit.*, ii, 210): Critics have unanimously fixed the date of *King John* at from 1594 to 1596. We feel little doubt that it was produced in the summer of 1595. It is manifestly a celebration of Elizabeth's successful defence of her Kingdom against Pope and Spaniard, heightened by contrast with the failure of John, and combined with an earnest appeal to the writer's countrymen for patriotic service in the face of pressing danger. This danger can be nothing but the Spanish invasion, the dread of which kept the whole kingdom astir through the greater part of 1595, when the Spaniards actually did effect a landing in Cornwall.

HERFORD (*Eversley* ed.): The definite limits of the date of *King John* are as follows: (1) The older play upon which Shakespeare founded his History—*The Troublesome Reign of King John*—cannot be earlier than c. 1587, for its sounding rhetoric and facile blank verse as well as the explicit language of the preface proclaim it to have been inspired by Marlowe. It was printed in 1591. (2) Shakespeare's *King John* is mentioned by Francis Meres in 1598. But these wide limits admit of being considerably narrowed. Of the ten histories, six can be dated with some certainty. *2* and *3 Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* are fixed by Greene's diatribe to 1592–3; *1* and *2 Henry IV.* and *Henry V.* by the Essex allusion in *Henry V*, chorus v, to 1598–9. Far more clearly than *Richard II*, *King John* belongs to the interim between the first and second group of Histories. It has palpable links with both. The absence of prose, the rarity of rhyme, the approximation to tragedy, connect it with the earlier, Marlowesque group; the wealth of humor, the plastic characterisation, with the later *John* is modeled with a maturer touch than *Richard II*, but the tragedy of which he is the contriver has striking affinities of situation to that of Richard, and continually recalls it in spite of equally striking diversities of treatment. Constance is not Margaret, nor Arthur Edward, but they are new and poignant melodies upon the same motifs; the frenzied mother, the assassin uncle are still dominant and unexhausted themes. On the other hand, the character of Falconbridge links the play yet more closely to the great trilogy of *Henry V.* The madcap prince, who shows himself a master of war and of peace the moment the need arrives, is of the same mould as the blunt soldier 'one way Plantagenet,' whose motley covered the lion's heart of Cordelion; the mythical Bastard foreshadows the historical conqueror of Agincourt. He opens the circle of Histories founded upon humour and heroism, as John closes the cycle founded upon anguish and crime. These considerations tend to fix *King John* near the middle of the probable interval between the last of the earlier group and the first of the later—i. e., about 1595.

IVOR JOHN (*Introduction*): On general grounds (following what we might call the 'feeling' test) *Richard II.* and *King John* seem to be grouped together. Authorities unanimous in dating *Richard II.* about 1593–4 are now equally unanimous in dating *John* either immediately before or immediately after *Richard;* we have, therefore, to choose between a date nearer 1593 and a date nearer 1595. Nothing can guide us in our choice except a comparison of the plays in the hope of discovering signs of greater maturity in the treatment of one or the other. But even here we are handicapped: firstly, by the fact that Shakespeare deliberately chose to keep close to his 'source' in so many respects, and therefore did not allow his own

genius full play; and secondly, by the fact that, in any case, the plays were written within a very short time of one another. Comparison of the methods and characteristics of the two plays yields the following results: There is a greater consistency and unity in the treatment of Richard's character. He is, all through, the weak, sentimental poseur, whose weakness we pity, and whose poses we despise; but we sympathise with him in his misfortunes because they are brought about not by crime but by incompetence, not by deliberate malice but as a result of sentimental impotence. On the other hand, John is at one and the same time the swift and resolute warrior leaping fearlessly upon his enemy, the champion of his country against Papal aggression, and the vacillating coward far worse than the murderer of Arthur, toadying to Pandulph and detracting from our sympathy with his awful death by the childishness of his unkingly lamentations. John is neither the hero nor the villain of the piece, but an unpleasant mixture of both. Again, the characters in *Richard* appear to be drawn by a hand at once firmer and more subtle. We get to know Bolingbroke gradually and surely as the play progresses, every action and almost every word add little by little to our conception of his character, and that conception is only completed with the last scene of the last act. There is no parallel to this in *King John*. We know Faulconbridge as well at the end of the first scene as we do when we close the book. It may be said that every scene as a new revelation is not consistent, natural, and inevitable as it is in the case of Bolingbroke. These arguments and others of a similar kind that might be adduced make for the later date of *Richard*. As opposed to that view it may be held that the mixture of tragedy and comedy in the play brought about by Shakespeare's treatment of the character of the Bastard is a sign of more mature work; besides, the continual and fatiguing drop into rhyme in the earlier part of *Richard* and the uncalled-for puns and conceits in unwelcome places also seem to indicate that *Richard* was earlier than *John*, we find that the first and last are in favour of the earlier date of *Richard*, while the other two are against it. The tests, therefore, are at least not against the earlier date of *Richard II*. A comparison between two similar passages—*King John*, II, i, 23 et seq., and *Richard II:* II, i, 40 et seq.—may give a slight hint as to their order. Shakespeare never goes back, and in such cases the more elaborate and fuller passage is always the later. In this case the *Richard* passage is far more fully developed than that in *John;* this seems, therefore, to make for the later date of *Richard*. The definite truth, however, 'by our best eyes cannot be censured,' and we must, therefore, candidly date *John* with a hyphen, 1593–5.

LUCE (p. 181): Hamnet Shakespeare died on the 12th August, 1596, and some critics find a reflection of the Poet's loss in the lament of Constance for Arthur; but I should hesitate to allow such a conjecture to stand as evidence of date. More to our purpose is the evidence of style, of poetic dramatic power, which warrants us in assigning the play to a year not later than 1594; and this in spite of the usual inequalities of workmanship. The play certainly follows *Richard II*, and as certainly precedes the First Part of *Henry IV*, for which it prepares us by the humorous character of the Bastard, and by adhering less strictly to historical fact; though in this regard it follows the old play.

BROOKE (p. 227): The play of *The Life and Death of King John* was written in the years which saw the production of the historical dramas of *Henry VI*, *Richard II*, and *Richard III*, and its proper date is 1594. About the same date *The Mer-*

chant of Venice was written, in which Shakespeare turned from history to romance.

S. LEE (*Life of Sh.*): To 1594 must be assigned *King John*. Like the first and third parts of *Henry VI.* and *Richard II*, the play altogether eschews prose. Strained conceits and rhetorical extravagances which tend to rant and bombast are clear proofs of early composition.

SCHELLING (*Elizabethan Drama*, i, 271): Chronologists of Shakespeare are in doubt as to the order of *King John* and the two *Richards*. All we know is that all three must have followed the plays on *Henry VI*, and certainly preceded the trilogy on *Henry IV.* and *V*, and belated *Henry VIII*. Be the order of *John* and the *Richards* what it may, these plays have come close together, and they mark, however arranged, Shakespeare's gradual progress from mere apprenticeship to complete freedom in the practice of his art.

F. W. CLARKE (*Old Spelling Sh., Introduction*): The only point on which scholars now differ is as to whether the present play preceded or succeeded *King Richard II*. In the former case, it must be referred to 1593; in the latter, to 1595 or 1596. It seems to me that the latter supposition is more likely; in *King John* there are many affectations in the diction, it is true, but, on the whole, the verse is far more dramatic and rings truer than in the lyrical *Richard II*. The latter play shows throughout the influence of Marlowe. In *King John* Shakespeare seems more confident of his own powers, and strikes out on purer and bolder lines; it must also be remembered that the events of the reign of King Richard II. formed a far easier subject for dramatic treatment than those of King John. When the opportunity arises in the latter play, as in the famous scene between King John and Hubert, or in one between Hubert and Arthur, Shakespeare's grip on subtle dramatic characterization and true pathos unmarred by fanciful conceit is, to my mind, very greatly in excess of anything he shows in *King Richard II*. The vacillating John, now fiery and defiant, now weak, cowardly, and despairing, can hardly be said to exhibit a falling off from the portrait of Richard II, while Falconbridge's gradual development from a rough, untutored youth to a noble and true-hearted Englishman capable of sustaining the flagging courage of the King, and the gradual rise of his influence and authority, seem to indicate a progression compared with the undoubtedly fine but, in places, somewhat obscure treatment of Bolingbroke. I, therefore, place *King John* after *Richard II*, and suggest 1595–6; in view of Malone's allusions 1596 may be hazarded as the most probable.

RECAPITULATION:

1790	MALONE	1596
1792	HURDIS	late composition
1799	CHALMERS	1598
1817	DRAKE	
1830	TIECK	1611
1839	KNIGHT	between 1591 and 1598
1847	VERPLANCK	1598
1852	COLLIER	between 1596 and 1598
1856	HUDSON	about 1592

RECAPITULATION:

1857	DELIUS	1598
1862	CARTWRIGHT	1596
1865	R. G. WHITE	1596
1865	HALLIWELL	between 1593 and 1597
1865	STOKES	1597
1874	INGRAM	1597 or 1598
1875	WARD	1597
1876	ULRICI	1593
1877	FURNIVALL	1597
1878	FLEAY	1596
1878	DOWDEN	1598
1885	WRIGHT	1593 or 1594
1887	DAWSON	1596
1896	BOAS	1595
1901	GOLLANCZ	1595
1903	GARNETT AND GOSSE	1595
1904	HERFORD	1595
1907	IVOR JOHN	1593–1595
1907	LUCE	1594
1911	F. W. CLARKE	1596
1914	BROOKE	1594
1916	S. LEE	1594

SOURCE OF THE PLOT

STEEVENS: Hall, Holinshed, Stowe, etc., are closely followed not only in the conduct, but sometimes in the very expressions, throughout the following historical dramas: viz., *Macbeth*, this play, *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, two parts, *Henry V*, three parts, *Richard III*, and *Henry VIII*. A book called the *Historie of Lord Faulconbridge, bastard Son to Richard Cordelion*, was entered at Stationers' Hall, Nov. 29, 1614; but I have never met with it, and therefore know not whether it was the old black letter history, or a play upon the same subject.

MALONE: *The Historie of Lord Faulconbridge*, &c., is a prose narrative, in bl. l. The earliest edition that I have seen of it was printed in 1616. But by an entry on the Stationers' Register, 29th November, 1614, it appears that there had been an old edition of the tract entitled *The History of George W. Faulconbridge, the son of Richard Cordelion*, and that the copy had been assigned by (William) Barley to Thomas Beale. A book entitled *Richard Cur de Lion* was entered on the Stationers' books in 1558. A play called the *Funeral of Richard Cordelion* was written by Robert Wilson, Henry Chettle, Anthony Mundy, and Michael Drayton, and first exhibited in the year 1598. [I have given these two notes a place here, because they are included in the *Variorum* of 1821, among the *Preliminary Remarks* on this play; but I fear they have but little bearing on the present subject, the Source of the Plot of Shakespeare's *King John*.—ED.]

KNIGHT (*Introduction*): The *King John* of Shakespeare is not the *King John* of the Historians which Shakespeare had unquestionably studied; it is not the *King John* of his own imagination, casting off the trammels with a rigid adoption of the facts those Historians would have imposed upon him; but it is the *King John*, in the conduct of the story, in the juxta-position of the characters, and in the catastrophe—in the historical truth, and in the historical error—of the play which preceded him some few years. This, unquestionably, was not an accident. It was not what, in the vulgar sense of the word, is called a plagiarism. It was a submission of his own original powers of seizing upon the feelings and understanding of his audience, to the stronger power of habit in the same audience. The History of John had been familiar to them for almost half a century. The familiarity had grown out of the rudest days of the drama, and had been established in the period of its comparative refinement, which immediately preceded Shakespeare. Whoever really wishes thoroughly to understand the resources which Shakespeare possessed in the creation of characters, in the conduct of a story, and the employment of language will do well, again and again, to compare the old play of *King John* and the *King John* of our dramatist.

LLOYD (ap. SINGER, ed. ii.): I cannot satisfy myself that there is positive proof that Shakespeare applied to Holinshed's *Chronicle*, or any other, for assistance or suggestion. But even if he did, the merit will still remain with the earlier writer of inventing the main scheme of the dramatic digest of a disorderly period. He it was who recognized the effectiveness of making the murder of Arthur the very hinge and turning point between the high-spirited success of the commencement of the reign, and the disgrace and dejection that ensued; and he it was who gave such heightening emphasis to the indignation excited by the death of Arthur, as to place the selfish and heartless policy of the princes and legate in the most obvious and odious light; and who, lastly, had the clearness of sight to fix upon the assertion of national independence against invading Frenchmen and encroaching ecclesiastics as the true principle of dramatic action of time. Time and the Hour do not allow me to follow out all his footsteps, but I have seen enough to convince me that he diligently consulted not only Holinshed, but the more varied and remote authorities.

Confining, however, our attention to Holinshed, there might be some reason to suspect that he had been read carelessly in one chief matter, were not the artistic motive for the interpretation adopted so evident. The sympathy for Arthur was chiefly among his own subjects or allies in Poictou or Brittany, the Britans, as they are called by the Chronicler, and the term may have been applied too extensively. John, after the capture of Arthur, caused himself to be re-crowned and then returned to Normandy, where 'true it is great suit was made to him to have Arthur set at liberty, as well by the French King as by William de Riches, a valiant Baron of Poictou, and divers other noblemen of the Britans, who, when they could not prevail in their suit, they banded themselves together and joining in confederacy,' and so forth, p. 274. Presently after follows the account of the relenting of Hubert de Burgh, and the reluctance of the meaner instruments; and lower down the murmurs of John's own knights, not, however, in the pure disinterestedness of the play, but in apprehension that, if taken by the King of France, they would be 'made to taste of the like cup.' The nearest approach to this motive in the old play is in the words of Essex:

> 'What hope in us for mercy on a fault,
> When kinsman dies without impeach of cause.'

But this, perhaps, may be enough to assure us that it was in deliberate preference that the dramatist invented the nobler motive, or rather its unusual and exclusive force, and thus brought another group into happy composition with that supplied to him by the historian, of the lamenting and supplicant Arthur.

I think we must note it also as a happy error or equally happy thought of the first dramatist, to unite Austria and Lymoges into a single character, and thus concentrate the odium both of the imprisonment and death of Cœur-de-lion on the antagonist of Faulconbridge.

WRIGHT: The question of the authority followed by Shakespeare in this play is a very simple one. He took the old play on the same subject and rewrote it, keeping substantially the same plot, and adding only one character, that of James Gurney. There is no reason to suppose that, as in his other historical plays, he consulted the Chronicles at all. The older play is in two parts, the second beginning with the death of Arthur, Act IV, scene 3 of the present play, and having a separate title, 'The second part of the troublesome Raigne of King Iohn, conteining the death of Arthur Plantaginet, the landing of Lewes, and the poysoning of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey.' Shakespeare, as has been said, follows the plot of the old play substantially, but one scene in which the Bastard is represented as ransacking an abbey is omitted altogether, and the result is a well-developed historical drama instead of a politico-religious pamphlet. Some of the sentiment, however, still remains, and it is an instructive warning to those who would frame theories of the purpose of a play from internal evidence, that the passages to which Johnson pointed as containing undoubted references to the events of Shakespeare's own time, are just those which he took almost verbatim from the earlier work of his unknown predecessor.

The old play opens immediately after the coronation of John, which took place on Ascension day, 27 May, 1199, and ends with his death, 18 October, 1216. Between these two events the scenes do not follow in strict historic order, and Shakespeare has not attempted to make any change in this respect. The greatest disorder is found in the fourth act. If we place the time of the first act soon after John's coronation in 1199, Act II. and Act III, scene 1 belong to 1200, for the interview between John and the French King Philip, at which the marriage of Lewis and Blanch was agreed upon, was held on Ascension Day, 18 May, 1200. The second and third scenes of Act III. belong to 1202, when Arthur was taken prisoner at the Capture of Mirabeau on the 1st of August, and kept at Falaise. The first and third scenes of Act IV. follow the proper chronological order, the former belonging to 1202, and the latter to 1203, when, according to some accounts, Arthur was assasinated on the 3rd of April at Rouen. But the last scene of Act III. suddenly introduces Pandulph, whose visit did not take place till 1212, when he was sent by the Pope to France to depose John. He landed in England in 1213. In the second scene of Act IV. we are carried back again to 1202, when John was crowned a second time at Canterbury on the 14th of April, being Easter Day. The incident of the five moons which is brought into the same scene is placed by the chroniclers in December, 1200. Constance died in 1201, Elinor in 1204, and Peter of Pomfret flourished in 1212, and was put to death in 1213. All these events are referred to or made in the play to happen in Act IV, scene ii. In the third scene of Act IV. the same confusion prevails, and the death of Arthur (1203) is contemporary with the landing of Lewis at Stonar in the Isle of Thanet on the 20th of May, 1216. The fifth act opens with the surrender of the crown by John to the Papal legate, which really

happened on the 15th of May, 1231, but is made in the play to be contemporary with the French invasion. Act V, scene ii. is placed at Bury St. Edmunds, but there is no evidence that the Dauphin ever had a camp there, and the locality was probably suggested to the author of the older play by the fact that before the high altar of the Abbey the barons met in 1214. Melun's confession of the meditated treachery of Lewis was made on his death-bed in London and not on the battlefield (Holinshed, iii, 193). The remaining scenes do not violate the chronological order of events, but it is worth while to note, as showing how completely indifferent in the play Shakespeare was to historical consistency, that at the time of his father's death Prince Henry was only nine years old, having been born 1 October, 1207. On the other hand, Arthur is represented as much younger than he really was, for he was born 30 April, 1187, and was, therefore, twelve years old at the opening of the play and sixteen at the time of his death. Again, Hubert de Burgh, one of the most powerful nobles of his time and Chamberlain to the King, for whom he successfully defended Dover Castle against Lewis, appears in the play as a person of inferior rank who could be employed in a menial capacity. It is hardly necessary, however, to refer to these facts in order to prove that Shakespeare did not follow the Chronicles, for a very superficial comparison of the *Troublesome Raigne of King John* with the play before us will be sufficient to show that the latter is entirely taken from the former, and that to this cause and to this alone any departure from historical accuracy is due. The still earlier play of *Kynge Johan*, by Bishop Bale, which was edited for the Camden Society by the late Mr. Collier, has nothing whatever to do either with Shakespeare's work or that of his nearer predecessor. [As Shakespeare based his *King John* on *The Troublesome Raigne*, and therefore only indirectly on the Chronicles, I have thought it unnecessary to include here excerpts from Holinshed or Grafton. Such are merely illustrative of the ingenuity of the anonymous author of the older play in his use of historic material. See, if needful, BOSWELL-STONE, pp. 45–77.—ED.]

THE TROUBLESOME RAIGNE

MALONE: *The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England*, which is in two parts, and was printed at London for Sampson Clarke, 1591, has no author's name in the title-page. On its republication in 1611 the bookseller, for whom it was printed, inserted the letters *W. Sh.* in the title-page; and in order to conceal his fraud omitted the words—*publickly—in the honourable Cittie of London*, which he was aware would proclaim the play not to be Shakespeare's *King John;* the company to which he belonged having no *publick* theatre in London, that in Blackfriars being a private play-house, and the Globe, which was a public theatre, being situated in Southwark. He also, probably with the same view, omitted the lines addressed *to the Gentleman Readers*, which are prefixed to the first edition of the old play. Shakespeare's play being then probably often acted, and the other wholly laid aside, the word *lately* was substituted for the word *publickly:*—'as they were sundry times *lately* acted,' &c. Thomas Dewe, for whom a third edition was printed in 1622, was more daring. The two parts were then published, 'as they were sundry times

lately acted'; and the name of William Shakespeare inserted at length. 'By the Queen's Majesties players' was wisely omitted as not being very consistent with the word *lately*, Elizabeth being then dead nineteen years.

CAPELL (I, pt. i, p. 115): Shakespeare was the author alone of the *John* in two parts, whose second begins at Arthur's attempt to escape and his consequent death. From evidence of their date, and some other, we may pronounce them his first undisputed excursion into the regions of drama; and, as such, they are but a feeble performance, sprinkl'd with some quotations from classics, and, in the comedy part, with some monkish Latin; notwithstanding, they bear his marks in some places, and in the dying scene strongly; here are some of the lines that come from John in his agony, and the intelligent will see their author at once: 'Power after power forsake their proper power, only the hart impugnes with faint resist the fierce invade of him that conquers Kings: Phillip a chayre, and by and by a grave, my leggs disdaine the carriage of a King'; and these are follow'd by a thought that makes so noble a figure in his true *Henry 6*, part the second: for here the king is call'd on by Faulconbridge, when his speech is gone from him, in sign of pardoning his barons who kneel about him, to do what the other king asks of Beaufort—lift up his hand. We have mention'd an address in this *John;* it is titl'd—To the Gentlemen Readers, and begins thus: 'You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow Have entertained the Scythian Tamburlaine, And given applause unto an infidel: Vouchsafe to welcome (with like curtesie) A warlike Christian and your Countreyman.' *Tamburlaine*, which is given to Marlowe, appears in these lines the inciter of Shakespeare's *John;* and the latter, in his turn, was inciter as well of Marlowe as others to work up into plays the relations of English Chroniclers, this setting them the example. It was follow'd quickly after by Marlowe in a play on which our Edward the second is the subject; in it is one particular scene rising with such amazing disparity above the nonsense of all the others, and those of his *Tamburlaine*, that no reader whatever can persuade himself that they are all of one hand; the scene is that of the murder of this most wretched of princes; affects with such powerfulness, and is so much in the manner of our Author, that judges will not be fearful of thinking him an assistant. The play's appearance in print and (possibly) upon the stage was after the writer's death; who was cut off in '93, if not earlier, by a very signal mischance that is recorded in Wood and others. To return to this *John*. The story, and its form in some measure, pleas'd its Author so well, that in a while —and no long one—he took it up again; gave it quite a new dress, with much height'ning of character (the Bastard's, particularly), and another *John* started forth, in the shape he wears in the Folio, and in this copy: In which is less departure from the copy it follows than we are forc'd to in many plays; the main defect of that copy lying in its divisions as well of acts as of scenes, in both which it is egregiously faulty till you come to the fifth act; the third modern [Theobald] first adjusted them truly, that is—the acts; in scenes, he is deficient as usual; and directions that could be follow'd with reason, place included, and entries, and all of that sort—are the growth of neither ancients nor moderns.

L. TIECK (i, p. xvi.): *The Troublesome Raigne* is one of the youthful compositions of Shakespeare; it was printed with his name during his lifetime, and the construction, the characters, and, in fact, every feature so bears the impress of Shakespeare that it is ludicrous that the English critics, blind to this, wish to ascribe it either to

Green, or Marlowe, or any other, because in their opinion it is so utterly paltry and unworthy of the poet. [In his notes to Schlegel's translation (1830) Tieck prefaces his remarks on *King John* by saying that he can but repeat what he said in regard to the earlier play in his former work, and adds thereto: 'If we accept the older *King John* as the work of our Poet, it may easily happen that many things can be assigned to his great name far less worthy than this tragedy.'—ED.].

ULRICI (ed. i, p. 445): In general, I concur in opinion with Tieck. Only I cannot go so far with him as to assert that every line is stamped with the genius of Shakespeare. He may perhaps have remodelled an older work of some other writer to such an extent as might justify him in assuming for his labours the title of a new and original creation, or, what at this date was a common practice—a relic of that custom of the Middle Ages of transacting all the business of life by guilds and corporations—he may have laboured on it in conjunction with other pens. I derive support for my own view principally from the comic parts—the scenes between Faulconbridge and the Monks and Nuns. These are so low and rude that I can recognise in them little, if any, of Shakespeare's facetious grace. Had Shakespeare written such scenes he would at least have ennobled the indelicacy of them by wit and humour; but of these there is not the least vestige. The fountain of wit which has gushed forth so plenteously in *Locrine*, *Pericles*, and *Henry the Sixth*, seems quite dried up; the comic consists in the bare fact, and the fact itself is but a coarse libel on the truth. It is in vain to plead that the Poet had here allowed himself to be carried away by the prevailing national feeling, and has made a sacrifice to popular wit; for of the latter even it is hardly possible to speak in the present case; and besides, Shakespeare could always throw a poetic radiance over genuine vulgar wit—as is abundantly seen in the *Locrine*, *Pericles*, and others of his youthful productions. But how, then, it may be asked, did Shakespeare allow such scenes to stand when he revised the whole? Because it was exactly these scenes that were most likely to fall in with the popular humour of the time. Again, they are distinguished by short rhyming verses, and by a language of which there is not the most distant counterpart to be found in all the other dramas of Shakespeare. Besides the comic parts, perhaps the long scene before St. Edmund's Bury, and towards the end of the second part the scene between the Monk and the Abbot, which is very similar to those which we have already censured, are from a foreign hand. All the rest I look upon as Shakespeare's property. Some passages, e. g., that in the first part, where Faulconbridge prefers to be the bastard of the Lion-hearted Richard than the legitimate son of the old Faulconbridge; the scenes between Hubert and Prince Arthur; between John and the Prophet of Pomfret, Philip Faulconbridge, &c., as well as the several soliloquies of John, are so profoundly poetical, that it is absolutely impossible to say from whose hand they could come if not from Shakespeare's. The language and characterization, also, are in every respect worthy of him. Of the former, even Malone (*Reed's Sh.*, XIV, 285) allows that it possesses the closest resemblance with that of *Henry the Sixth*, and that both pieces must necessarily have had the same author. With him, it is true, this resemblance does but form a proof of the spuriousness of the work, while with us, who are thoroughly convinced of the genuineness of *Henry the Sixth*, it affords conclusive evidence to the contrary. Of the characters, those of John, of Faulconbridge, Hubert, and Arthur are distinguished as genuine Shakespearian designs, though in the rough outline and strong colouring we recognise an unpractised hand. The other characters also are ably drawn for a young poet without experience in the historical drama. Lastly, the

composition presents in all essential points the exact form that the subject afterwards received from his more practised hand in the later *King John*. I will only add the remark that if the older *King John* be, as I believe, in the main Shakespeare's property, then Meres, in his *Wit's Treasury*, must have meant this and not the later piece. His testimony, indeed, is adverse to the opinion of English critics; for if the older *King John* be throughout spurious, then we must date the later one as early as 1598; against which, however, diction, versification, characterization and composition, and many single passages furnish decisive evidence. The later, unquestioned *King John* did not probably appear before 1610 or 1611; to judge from the repeated reprints of the older plays in this year. The earlier piece may have been originally composed in 1597–8—by whom it is impossible to determine, since it lies before us in so changed a shape from its original. It was probably remodelled soon after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and may in its new form be looked upon as one of the many pieces with which the English stage celebrated the great national victory. That the young poet has here, as well as in *Titus Andronicus*, kept close to Marlowe's model, and that in this respect the present piece may be regarded as the transition to *Henry the Sixth*, must be clear to every one tolerably acquainted with Marlowe's style. As compared, however, with *Titus*, the youthful and extravagant ebullition of fancy appears greatly modified; the tragic does not travail in birth with the horrible; the characters, although harshly and roughly drawn, have much of human nature in their composition. The poet appears to have already discovered the faults of his model, and evidently has sought to avoid them; but, above all, he has everywhere displayed his usual high estimation of the truth and dignity of history, which are nowhere violated except in those scenes which we have already pronounced the property of another.

SCHLEGEL (ii, 258): It would be very instructive if it could be proved that several earlier attempts of works, afterwards written, proceeded from Shakespeare himself, and not from an unknown author. We should thus be enabled to trace his development as an artist. Of the older *King John*, in two parts (printed by Steevens among six old plays), this might probably be made out. That he sometimes came back to the same work is certain. We know with respect to *Hamlet*, for instance, that it was very gradually formed by him to its present perfect state. Whoever takes from Shakespeare a play early ascribed to him, and confessedly belonging to his time, is unquestionably bound to answer, with some degree of probability, this question, Who has then written it? Shakespeare's competitors in the dramatic walk are pretty well known, and if those of them who have acquired a considerable name, a Lyly, a Marlowe, a Heywood, are still so very far below him, we can hardly imagine that the author of a work which rises so high beyond theirs would have remained unknown.

SKOTTOWE (i, 127): The various events of John's confused reign are ill calculated for dramatic representation, in which the want of a leading interest is imperfectly supplied by a mere collection of incidents. The great fault of the old play is that it gives a very inadequate idea of what it professes to represent. If the reader be not previously acquainted with the history, he will in vain seek a knowledge of it from the progress of the scene. It is scarcely ever clear, for instance, whether the barons are in arms against the king in defense of their own liberties, or as the tools of Phillip and partisans of Lewis, and thus the supporters of the cause of the pope. Throughout the play, indeed, John's disagreement with his nobility, and their

extensive confederacy against him, for the protection of their independence, are kept too much out of sight; and of an event so important as the signature of Magna Charta there is a total neglect. With almost implicit fidelity Shakespeare copied the old play in its story and scenic arrangement of circumstances. He seldom corrects his author, but with him attributes the death of Richard the First to the Duke of Austria, and names that duke 'Lymoges.' Richard was, indeed, imprisoned on his return from Palestine by Leopold, Duke of Austria; but he met his death, several years afterwards, from the hand of Bertrand of Gouron, while besieging Vidomar, viscount of Limoges, in the castle of Chalus. Holinshed related that Arthur was imprisoned in Falaise, and afterwards at Rouen, and in this latter place he was supposed to be murdered; in the old play Arthur is confined somewhere in England, and there Shakespeare also confines him. Shakespeare has forcibly displayed the art, sophistry, insincerity, and ambition of the court of Rome; but it is singular that he has not, like the author of the old play, exhibited the depravity of the monastic orders, and the horrid tendency of papistical principles. . . . Shakespeare is the author of the best passages in John, Arthur, Constance, and Faulconbridge, though the stamp of each character remains unaltered from what he found it. He did not act fairly by himself; he adopted the plot of his predecessor in all its details, and his characters in their several groupings, and thus circumscribed his own power of improvement.

VERPLANCK (*Introduction*, p. 6): Shakespeare's entire and thorough rewriting of the chronicle drama affords a strong indication that Shakespeare had no claim to its dialogue or poetry, for this is a process which no author would unnecessarily apply to his own work, and it is one which we know with certainty that he was not in the habit of using in his enlargements and improvements, from those of *Love's Labour's Lost* to the more thorough rewriting of much of *Romeo and Juliet* and of *Hamlet*. This argument is the stronger from the consideration that there is much of the ordinary dialogue of the older play necessary for the conduct of the plot, unmarked by any special excellence or defect, which had it been written by him he would, of course, have preferred retaining, with such modifications only as might be required to adapt it to the new matter, instead of actually rewriting the whole as he appears to have done. I must add that there are some words of touching tenderness in the dying speech of Arthur in the old play [see note, Act IV, scene iii.] which, had the thought been originally his own, I cannot but think that he would have expanded and improved instead of throwing them aside, as the poetical property of another which he did not care to use; whilst the historical incidents and personages drawn from the old chronicles or from prior plays he might justly regard as the common property of every dramatist who might choose to employ them. My own impressions are, therefore, strongly in accordance with the opinions of the best English authorities (Farmer, Steevens, Knight, Collier, etc.) that Shakespeare had no hand whatever in the two parts of *The Troublesome Raigne*—which two parts, by the way, have themselves a contrast of manner that give reason to think that more than one author was employed in their preparation. Still, it is within the bounds of possibility that these may have been among Shakespeare's earlier essays in historic tragedy, and it is just to add that if such were the case it would not be at all discreditable to his genius, though the contemptuous remarks of some of the editors would give their readers a different impression. It does not furnish choice extracts such as those by which the taste of Charles Lamb has made some second rate Elizabethan dramatists familiar to modern readers, but as a whole it compares advantageously

enough with the dramas of its time; less extravagant in diction and imagery than many of them, it puts the historical personages and their actions as related by the more popular English Chroniclers on the scene with spirit and distinctness; whilst the Bastard, whether drawn from tradition or from the author's invention, is strongly marked as a courageous, active, ambitious soldier, and though a little 'robustious,' noisy, and ranting, yet not more so than the other dramatic military heroes of his time, who were generally expected to 'split the ears of the groundlings.'

KNIGHT (*Studies*, etc., p. 197): The old play of *The Troublesome Reign* was, in all likelihood, a vigorous graft upon the trunk of an older play, which 'occupies an intermediate place between moralities and historical plays,'—that of *Kynge Johan*, by John Bale, written probably in the reign of Edward VI. Shakspere, then, had to choose between forty years of stage tradition and the employment of new materials. He took, upon principle, what he found ready to his hand. But upon this theory, that *The Troublesome Reign* is by another poet, none of the transformations of classical or oriental fable, in which a new life is transfused into an old body, can equal this astonishing example of the life-conferring power of a genius such as Shakspere's. On the other hand, if *The Troublesome Reign* be a very early play by Shakspere himself and (we doubt this greatly), the undoubted *King John* offers the most marvellous example of the resources of a mature intellect, in the creation of characters, in the conduct of a story, and the employment of language, as compared with the crude efforts of an unformed mind. The contrast is so remarkable that we cannot believe in this theory, even with the whole body of German critics in its favour. Supposing Bale's 'pageant' of *Kynge Johan* to be written about the middle of the sixteenth century, it presents a more remarkable example even than 'Howleglas,' or 'Hick Scorner' (of which an account is given in Percy's agreeable 'Essay on the origin of the English Stage'), of the extremely low state of the drama only forty years before the time of Shakspere. Here is a play written by a bishop; and yet the dirty ribaldry which is put into the mouths of some characters is beyond all description, and quite impossible to be exhibited by any example in these pages. We say nothing of the almost utter absence of any poetical feeling —of the dull monotony of the versification—of the tediousness of the dialogue—of the inartificial conduct of the story. These matters were not greatly amended till a very short period before Shakspere came to 'reform them altogether.' Our object in mentioning this play is to show that the *King John* upon which Shakspere built was, in some degree, constructed upon the *Kynge Johan* of Bale; and that a traditionary *King John* had thus possessed the stage for nearly half a century before the period when Shakspere wrote his *King John*. There might without injury to this theory have been an intermediate play. That the *Kynge Johan* of the furious Protestant bishop was known to the writer of the *King John* of 1591 we have little doubt. Our space will not allow us to point out the internal evidences of this; but one minute but remarkable similarity may be mentioned. When John arrives at Swinstead Abbey, the monks, in both plays, invite him to their treacherous repast by the cry of 'Wassail.' In the play of Bale we have no incidents whatever beyond the contests between John and the pope—the surrender of the crown to Pandulph—and the poisoning of John by a monk at Swinstead Abbey. The action goes on very haltingly; but not so the wordy war of the speakers. A vocabulary of choice terms of abuse, familiarly used in the times of the Reformation, might be constructed out of this curious performance. Here the play of 1591 is wonderfully reformed; and we have a diversified action, in which the story of

Arthur and Constance, and the wars and truces in Anjou, are brought to relieve the exhibition of papal domination and monkish treachery. The intolerance of Bale against the Romish Church is the most fierce and rampant exhibition of passion that ever assumed the ill-assorted garb of religious zeal. In the *John* of 1591 we have none of this violence; but the writer has exhibited a scene of ribaldry, in the incident of Faulconbridge hunting out the 'angels' of the monks; for he makes him find a nun concealed in a holy man's chest. This, no doubt, would be a popular scene. Shakspere has not a word of it. Mr Campbell, to our surprise, thinks that Shakspere might have retained 'that scene in the old play where Faulconbridge, in fulfilling King John's injunction to plunder religious houses, finds a young smooth-skinned nun in a chest where the abbot's treasures were supposed to be deposited.' When did ever Shakspere lend his authority to fix a stigma upon large classes of mankind in deference to popular prejudice? One of the most remarkable characteristics of Shakspere's *John*, as opposed to the grossness of Bale and the ribaldry of his immediate predecessor, is the utter absence of all invective or sarcasm against the Romish church, apart from the attempt of the pope to extort a base submission from the English King. Here, indeed, we have his nationality in full power; but how different is that from fostering hatreds between two classes of one people!

GERVINUS (p. 353): To compare the older *King John* with Shakespeare's is a task which far more rewards the trouble than the comparison of *Henry VI.* with its original, because in *King John* the maturer poet revised a work at any rate as good in itself. The older *King John* is a rough but not a bad piece, from which the poet could have borrowed many happy poetical and historical features. It possesses the old stiffness and is intermingled with Latin passages according to the earlier custom, yet it is freer from the extravagances of the old school, from which these historical subjects in a great measure rescued us. The diffuseness in the second part is heavy, and here Shakespeare with excellent tact has remedied the evil by abridgement. The characters are designated in a manner suitable for our Poet's use, but they are far less sustained than his. For the mere sake of speaking, speeches are put in the lips of Faulconbridge which are inconsistent with his nature. Arthur, who once speaks in the childlike tone of his age, loses it again, and in the pathetic scene with Hubert is a precocious disputant. How far Shakespeare excelled his best contemporary poets in fine feeling is evinced by this older play if it be compared with his revised work. In another respect also the accurate comparison of the two works is of the greatest interest, if we would watch Shakespeare's depth in the treatment of his poetry, as it were, in the work and in the creation of itself. In many passages of the old play, where motives, delineation of character and actions, lay before him in ample prolixity, he has gathered the contents of whole scenes compactly into a single sentence or a single insinuation; he disdains superabundant perspicuity and leaves to the actor, the spectator, and the reader somewhat for his own mind to find out and to add. If we interpret as much out of such scanty hints as all penetrating commentators of Shakespeare feel themselves obliged to do, we prepare the way for an impression of unwarranted imputations of greater wisdom and fulness than the Poet intended. But these comparisons prove to us only too plainly that we can never go too far in truly fathoming this poet; that far rather we have to labour to find out what lies concealed in him; and that we have only to guard ourselves from interloping his sentiments with philosophical maxims and reflections which are foreign and remote to him as well as to his age.

R. G. WHITE (*Introduction*, p. 14): Although not even the germ of any thought, or scene, or character (except, perhaps, Queen Elinor) that gives Shakespeare's *King John* its value is to be found in *The Troublesome Reign*, that play is not without some poetical and dramatic merit, which, indeed, is considerable for a drama produced in its period of the Elizabethan era; and, what is far more important to the subject in hand, there is evidence in the former that the language of the latter was much in Shakespeare's mind, even if its text were not so constantly before his eyes, while he was writing the new play. Numerous instances of parallel passages in which the thought is similar and the words sometimes the same are cited in the notes, and will show the reader that Shakespeare worked with the old play in his head if not in his hand; nevertheless in no degree diminishing our admiration of the greatness and fecundity of the genius, which, having conceived by such a play as that, could bring forth such a play as this. *The Troublesome Reign* was first published in 1591, or it is perhaps better to say that that is the date of the earliest edition known. . . . It is not only inferior in every respect to his poorest and earliest work, but its merits, such as they are, are not at all like the merits of his acknowledged works at any period of his life. It is not only unequal, but its parts are dissimilar in style. It is chiefly in verse; but it contains specimens of nearly every variety of rhythm and rhyme known to English versifiers of the Elizabethan period; and the conclusion that, according to a common practice of the time, it is the production of more than one playwright—perhaps of three or four—must force itself upon the mind of every sufficiently observant reader who is familiar with our early dramatic literature. It was probably produced two or three years before the date of the first edition known; as at that date it was a new play, and in 1587–8 the English hatred of Rome and Spain was stimulated to renewed activity by the approach of the Armada. It has been conjectured with great probability that Greene, Peele, and Marlowe were concerned in the composition of this old History; and it is barely possible that Shakespeare, who seems to have begun his career as their humble co-laborer, contributed something to it, as like in style to what they wrote as he could make it.

VON FRIESEN (ii, 188): In spite of the distinguishing tone of this drama [*The Troublesome Raigne*], in contrast to others of a similar period, we are unable to detect the dramatic touch and the vivacity which are observed, invariably, in Shakespeare's early productions. The Poet seems to fall short in situations where details are wanted and too much inclined to rhetorical outbursts where restricted brevity would be more appropriate. His characters are suffering from a lack of individuality, a trait which is never found in Shakespeare's weakest poetical essays. The make-up of his various types of personages is often so grossly exaggerated as to come under the definition of brutal, as but rarely happens with Shakespeare, through his fine tact. In that same play we meet with crude situations, which are to be considered so much more foreign to Shakespeare's individuality on account of their absolute want of wit or humor. In making these comparisons we are also struck by the marked contrast existing between Shakespeare's tolerant views and the constant polemic against Catholicism and the papacy. We are able, however, to establish the approximate period of its publications, as the author bases his claim to its popularity on the reception given to Marlow's *Tambourlaine;* we may thus take it for granted that the play did not appear before the years 1587–8. We can hardly fail being surprised in reading of the part of a Christian warrior which the author ascribes to King John, who is supposed to have had to face many stormy events for

the sake of the true Christian belief and who had always shown opposition to the man of Rome. According to further investigations, the historical character of King John must have been sufficiently familiar to Shakespeare not to allow him to present him in the rôle in which he appears in this play. For instance, he never had the intention of describing the King's differences with the Court of Rome in a spirit of hatred and passion. No matter how little in reality King John is being shielded from the wiles of Rome, Shakespeare would not, even in his younger years, have put the brutal expressions in his mouth, wherein the older poet is altogether too liberal. I do not propose dwelling upon the by-play, depicting the antics of the bastard in a convent, showing on this occasion the most scurrilous and abnormal immoralities by monks and nuns. All those who insisted on crediting Shakespeare with this play, and particularly L. Tieck, agreed that this episode did not originate with him, but was undoubtedly to be considered as a joke, which had been deliberately interpolated. In spite of all these depreciating denunciations, which would lose most of their harsh and objectionable features, if Shakespeare was not regarded as the author, the piece possesses, nevertheless, a literary merit of considerable importance. The author must, at all events, have belonged to the most distinguished dramatists of his time, second only to Shakespeare himself. Many of the passages appearing in the play are undoubtedly from the pen of a true poet. Even if the sentiments of the author, drawn forth by enthusiasm for the glory and independence of his native land, are not fully deserving of the praise of Tieck, yet they are of greater literary value than any others of the same period, with the exception of Shakespeare's own histories. While I am in no way trying to impugn the memory of my late friend, I believe that his criticisms were dictated by his likes and dislikes to a greater extent than by an accurate consideration of the subject which was under investigation. Moreover, it does not seem likely that the animosity against the lame criticism of the preceding century has remained without leaving a marked influence. When considering the question from another standpoint, we may admit of the possibility of a less persistent opposition, if Marlowe's name had not been mentioned too hastily, in order to establish and settle the question of the authorship of this work. This very fact manifests a defect of the critical judgment which leads to lively opposition. The English treat the question relating to the identity of the real author of the old *King John* with indifference. If Shakespeare's right to the same could be assailed and contested in any positive and trustworthy manner we may be met with the suggestion advanced by Malone, who thinks of a possibility of ascribing its authorship to the combined work of R. Greene and G. Peele. As far as I am able to judge, we can hardly deny detecting the traces of the work of various men. At the same time I feel confident that Marlowe could not have been one of them. His claim relating to the favorable reception of his *Tambourlaine* in the prologue is not sufficient evidence in controverting other important factors. According to my way of thinking this introduction shows rather a negative than a positive character. Even if such was not the case, the succeeding expressions and the eulogies referring to the triumph of the English royal power and its independence of all papist influences, do in no way agree with Marlowe's opinions. On the other hand, we find many indications in the descriptive parts as well as in the mode of expression which point to Greene or Peele and not in the least to Marlowe. Dr Elze has advanced the supposition, in the introduction of his revised translation, that Shakespeare may possibly have contributed some additions or modifications to the work of Greene and Peele and may thus have acquired a certain claim to its authorship. This may also perhaps, as he states, lead

to the possible supposition of a cause accounting for the repeated controversies which were directed by Greene against Shakespeare. This view appeals to me particularly because it coincides with my own. Before accepting it, however, it ought to be subjected to a thorough test, though this may distract us from our real objective, as this question has already been sufficiently discussed. This may also explain L. Tieck's adherence to his opinion relating to Shakespeare's authorship of this old play, which he bases on the author's age. According to Francis Meres, in *Palladis Tamia, King John* was one of the best creations of Shakespeare (1598). Tieck did not mean, however, to admit of its appearance previous to the year 1611, and he thinks that the reference to it by Francis Meres relates to the old play only. I must admit that from external and internal signs I might also have been easily inclined to contradict the opinion of Malone and others, who place the date of its origin either in 1596 or 1597 if we did not find in both views abstracts too decided to allow us to regard Shakespeare's position to this as the next produced directly before the succeeding Histories. The contradicting feature contained therein is based before all on the difference of expression of either part. In the beginning of the action the language and the versification are marked by a similar tone of quiet formality, I might even call it a ceremonial pathos, resembling exactly his earlier histories. His punctuation is of a plain character and corresponds in most instances with the closing verse. The further the action proceeds, however, the more intricate the construction becomes, and we observe an increasing discrepancy between the closing verse and the general idea which may be involved. The difference, namely, in the first and second acts from the three following is so great that we may often be misled in thinking the composition of the separate parts to be of different periods. As a further instance of this we may observe a growing inclination towards the play of antithesis, and we find many passages reminding us of the Sonnets. The thoughts and metaphors partake of a character similar to that which is seen in these poems. Moreover, we may again observe in many places such a great similarity in the application of contrasting situations and characters as to induce the belief in the influence of an ordinary habit. This play also shows an apparent artistic procedure consisting in isolating, so to speak, the individuality of each of the players. Their impressions, their views, also the language which they use, and their mode of expression appear to be particularly under such influence. All this may guide us in the search of the real origin of the Drama. I also have to point out that this work is distinguished by a peculiar character. When judging the same from the standpoint of its composition we cannot help but observe how closely it follows the lines of a model which represents a type of nature which is unique. The grouping of the whole play as well as that of the personages who figure in it have undoubtedly been borrowed from the original. We may even discern thoughts and ideas which are taken from the same. Nevertheless, I have been unable to detect one expression or even one word which one might say that Shakespeare has borrowed from the older play. Yet more striking is it that, as regards the personages, although the likeness of these is used both in the older play and the later, one can hardly believe that the individual portraits shown in the older play have been only more completely drawn in the later piece. Much rather are they to be regarded as entirely new portraits, although bearing the same names and appearing in like situations. The object of the whole combination seems to have remained the same; it is, however, rendered in an entirely different manner, and thus it appears to be under the influence of motives which are altogether new. This furnishes sufficient cause in such instance to suppose that Shakespeare has written

according to an ideal which made an impression upon his phantasy and which induced him to produce his drama with all its imaginary attributes. We may perhaps consider the question from another side; this picture may have been suggested to him by an epic-historical representation or by a previous dramatical essay on the subject. Assuredly neither he nor his direct predecessor could have obtained his conception from the chronicle. While being conversant with the historical happenings of King John's reign, which lasted for a period of seventeen years, he undoubtedly made use of the same material as John Bale. This author as well as all the other literary men who devoted their attention to the turbulent reign of John were only concerned in representing or illustrating the resistance of the King to the Roman Curia. They took it for granted that their stand was as justifiable as it was praiseworthy considering the existing prejudices of the times. There is, however, hardly a sufficiently tragic motive on record in the final period of his life or the conditions which existed during that period. The difficulties which seem to justify the King's antagonism to Rome and which cast an unfavorable light upon the curia, appear to be due, according to the author, to the intrigues of the papists in inducing a rebellion among the barons. The fact that the King had to submit to abject humiliations in order to be granted a pardon, and his final undoing as a result of the priesthood's hatred does to a great extent deprive the whole of all the tragic features, even if the attempt of those authors should have been instigated, with the object of adding to the bad feeling against the papacy. The happenings which took place during King John's reign are of such a peculiar nature as not to be altogether suitable as material for a well-founded tragic picture; nevertheless Shakespeare succeeded in giving his work a fairly tragic color. Perhaps the common form of recording history on its prototype has been a hindering factor, for we can hardly deny that Shakespeare's drama does not possess such uniformity of action which we expect from a strictly historical tragedy and which we find in a striking form in *Richard III.* In taking everything into consideration, in attempting to establish the approximate time of the production of this piece, I find myself confronted with certain conditions, marked by strenuous deeds followed by brilliant results, and, on the other hand, by a series of weak and vacillating performances alternating again with efforts of a superior order. I may thus be justified in hesitating between two theories. It seems to me that the author has, in many instances, been under the impression or influence of the customs and habits of the earliest periods. At the same time he observes a tendency to resort to certain modifications and improvements which actually belong to a succeeding and more developed period. I would thus be inclined to say that this work by Shakespeare was produced between the period of *Richard III.* with *Romeo and Juliet* and that of *Richard II.* with *Henry IV*, in between and consequently close to the year 1595.

FLEAY (*Introduction*, p. 32): The older play was reprinted in 1611 with 'W. Sh.' on the title-page, and in 1622 with 'William Shakespeare' in full. The most probable reason for such reprints (or re-issues with new title-pages) of a not very popular play is that the bookseller endeavoured to get rid of copies under Shakespeare's name at times when his (unprinted) play was being performed. And there is confirmatory grounds for the likelihood of revivals at two dates in the contemporary events. The special political references in both plays are to fears of Spanish invasions dissipated, and hope restored by English successes as soon as the English people show themselves united; they also display strong hostility to the pope. Now, after Elizabeth's death to the date of the printing of the Folio, 1623, there

were two periods similar in hopes and fears to those already alluded to—namely, 1611 and 1622. In 1610 Prince Henry was made Prince of Wales, and negotiations were set on foot for a marriage between him and the Infanta of Spain. In the same year Henry IV. was assassinated by Ravaillac. In 1611 the negotiations for the marriage had been broken off; and the people were excited against Spain; still more against the Jesuits, on account of the assassination; against the pope as the supporter of both; and even in October, 1610, they had begun in Parliament their resistance to the encroachments of the Stuarts on the Public liberty. What fitter time for a revival of *King John*? In 1622 the match between Prince Charles and another Infanta was, after long negotiation, likely to be effected; but the English hated it and everything Spanish; they were enraged with the king for allowing his subjects (especially papists) to assist in the wars against the Palatine, for the anti-Puritan tendency of the court, and for the loss of his son-in-law's dominions. Moreover, in the event of the marriage negotiation not being successful, the likelihood of a new armada was already talked of (see *Epistolæ Ho Elianæ*). At these two dates, in fact, and these alone, were revivals of this play likely to take place. If these title-pages (of Q. 2 and Q. 3) are as truthful in other matters as they are false to the authorship, this play was acted (1) by Queen Elizabeth's players, (2) by Queen Anne's, (3) by Queen Henrietta's. This is possible, but not likely. Queen Anne's Company was formed from the Earl of Worcester's, not from Queen Elizabeth's; and no such transference is known for any other play. Probably the printer reproduced the old statement without regard to the change of meaning in the words 'Queen's Players.' As it was acted in the city, the company had not probably left their regular theatre (the Theatre in Shoreditch, which they probably left in 1589), and were acting at the inn yards, notably the Red Bull, in St. John Street. Date: Almost certainly 1589, after the Spanish Armada had been destroyed. In this year R. Greene was leaving the Queen's Theatre, and G. Peele was taking his place (see *Shakespeare Manual*, part ii, chap. xiii.). Note especially the final lines:

'If England's peers and people join in one,
Nor Pope, nor France, nor Spain can do them wrong.'

Authorship: Evidently this is a production of the pre-Shakespearean school; as evidently Marlowe had no share in it. None of his genius is recognisable; nor has it any of his metrical characteristics. The lines to the gentlemen readers also show that it was acted by a company in opposition to that with which Marlowe was connected (Admiral's or Pembroke's in 1589):

'You that with friendly grace and smoothed brow
Have entertain'd the Scythian Tamburlain,
And giv'n applause unto an infidel,
Vouchsafe to welcome with like courtesy
A warlike Christian, and your countryman.'

Yet in the British Museum Catalogue Marlowe is given as the probable author. The only playwrights known to be connected with Queen Elizabeth's Company were Lodge, Greene, and Peele, and the only year in which they were all engaged in writing for these men was 1589. Now, any one who compares sc. x,

'O tempus edax rerum,
Give children books, they tear 'em,
O vanities vanitatis,
In this waning aetatis,' etc.,

with Greene's *Friar Bacon*, sc. vii,

'And I with scientia
And great diligentia,
Will conjecture and charm
To keep you from harm,
That utrum horum mavis,
Your very great navis,' etc.,

will see that he was likely to be the author of this scene. Again, Scene iii. of the second part is manifestly by an author different from those of the bulk of the play. In this scene Lewis is monosyllabic, Lew's, in the other scenes dissyllabic; there are a number of characters introduced unnecessarily—Chester, Beauchamp, Clare, Percy, etc.—who do not occur elsewhere; two of whom, Rosse and Percy, are dramatis personæ in Greene's *James IV*, which dated 1589, this same year; and the metre is like Greene's; I therefore assign to him this scene also. It is noticeable that Shakespeare makes no use whatever of these scenes, though he does more or less of every other scene in the play. The rest of the play is by two writers, one of whom always spells Lewes, the other Lewis; one fonder of rhymes than the other; one alluding to Scripture narrative, the other not; one indulging in prose, and largely in Latin quotations, the other not; one allowing trisyllabic feet in his verse, the other not. I have no hesitation in assigning the prose, Lewis, rhyming, trisyllabic feet, Latinised parts to Peele, and the scriptural allusions to Lodge, the joint author of the *Looking-Glass for London*. But there is one objection, Lodge rhymes abundantly in his *Marius and Sylla*. This is due to difference of date, he does not do so in his part of the *Looking-Glass;* and in other plays I attribute to him in whole or part, such as *Fair Em, London Prodigal, Mucidorus, Taming of the Shrew, 1 Henry VI, Warning for Fair Women*, he varies much in this respect in different dates.

E. Rose (*Sh. as an Adapter;* Macmillan's Maga., Nov., 1878): The old 'chronicle' of *The Troublesome Raigne of King John* is clearly the work of a man of considerable, though uncultivated, power; and it is some proof of the estimation in which it was held that three editions of it were published, in 1591, 1611, and 1622. On the title-page of the third, the publisher had the impudence to place the name of Shakespeare, but that it was not by him must, I think, be evident to any man who has ever written a play or a poem. He has recast it more completely than anyone ever could—or would, with a first sketch often so powerful—recast his own work. Although each scene of Shakespeare follows a scene of the original, he has not throughout the whole play copied one line nearly word for word—at least, I have not remarked one, except a list of 'Volquesson, Touraine, Maine, Poiters, and Anjou, these five provinces'; and this though he constantly found speeches as good as this:

'. . . I am interdicted by the Pope,
All churches cursed, their doors are sealed up,
And for the pleasure of the Romish priest
The service of the Highest is neglected.
The multitude (a beast of many heads)
Do wish confusion to their sovereign.
The nobles, blinded with ambition's fumes,
Assemble powers to beat mine empire down,
And, more than this, elect a foreign king.
O England, wert thou ever miserable?

King John of England sees thee miserable.
John, 'tis thy sins that makes it miserable!
Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi' (Part II, sc. ii, ll. 120–132).

So entirely, indeed, had the dialogue been rewritten that one can hardly imagine Shakespeare to have known the original play except by seeing it acted, and perhaps quickly reading it through. How immensely he improved on even the best speeches of his predecessor may be seen from the quotations I shall make; while that predecessor's worst was mere schoolboy doggerel. Nor is his refined and polished versification a greater improvement than the clearness and depth of thought in his lines, which show not merely what men said and did, but the reason and the appropriateness of those deeds and speeches. The chief faults of the old play are these: It has no hero, there is not enough to bind the scenes together, and make an interesting whole of them. It is throughout filled with an anti-Romish spirit, violent and vulgar, and entirely out of place in a work of art, though no doubt adding much to the play's temporary popularity. The characters are mere rough outlines, wanting in fulness and consistency; and there is no one in the play, except here and there Falconbridge, in whom you can take much interest. The dialogue is rather dull, and lacking in variety and finish; and, finally, the play is much too long—its Second Part especially—and wants neatness and clearness of construction. It is characteristic of Shakespeare that, in remedying these faults, he does not for a moment depart from the lines the original author has laid down. He does not go to History for fresh facts to strengthen his plot; he absolutely adds no word of allusion to the Great Charter, which might, one would think, have been worked up into a grand scene. Indeed, the only alteration of fact that he makes is a perversion of history; Arthur was not a mere child, but a young man, as, if we may judge by his conversation with Hubert, the original makes him. The old play is divided into two parts, each of which is about the length of, and may have been split up into, five short acts. Although he has greatly extended almost every important scene, and has doubled the length of the two leading characters, Shakespeare has compressed these ten acts into five of reasonable length; arranged, with a curious instinct which seems prophetic, in almost exact accordance with modern scenic requirements; except as regards the last act. Acts I. and II. have but one scene apiece; Acts III. and IV. each three, of which the middle ones may well be flat or 'carpenter's' scenes; and even in the fifth act the scenery is not very difficult. It is a very noticeable difference between the two plays, that while in the elder we find no systematic division (excepting that into two rather unequal halves), in the later Shakespeare—who I believe always paid great attention to the construction of his acts—has made the inter-acts divide the story into five complete and symmetrical parts. Act I. gives us the French king's challenge and its acceptance by John, with the story of the bastard Philip and his brother. Act II. shows the commencement of hostilities, and the mutual attack upon Angiers; then the arrangement come to between the kings—the peace made on the marriage between Lewis and Blanch. In Act III. the influence of Rome breaks off this peace; there is a battle in which the French are defeated, and Constance mourns the loss of her son. Act IV. brings us back to England, and gives us the remainder of Arthur's story, and the revolt of the barons at his death. Act V. shows the advance of the French in England, with their allies the rebellious lords; the murder of the king; and the final mishap to the Dauphin's army, which causes him to offer terms of peace. In reconstructing the play the great want which struck Shakespeare seems to have been that of a strong central figure. He was attracted by the rough, powerful nature which he

could see the Bastard's must have been; almost like a modern dramatist 'writing up' a part for a star actor, he introduced Falconbridge wherever it was possible, gave him the end of every act (except the third), and created, from a rude and inconsistent sketch, a character as strong, as complete, and as original as he ever drew. Throughout a series of scenes, not otherwise very closely connected, this wonderfully real type of faulty, combative, not ignoble manhood is developed, a support and addition to the scenes in which he has least to say, a great power where he is prominent. This is the most striking example of his development of a character; but his treatment of Constance, Arthur, Hubert, Pandulph, and of some portions of the character of John himself is very noticeable. The entire wonderful scene in which Constance laments the loss of her child is founded upon the seven lines:

> 'My tongue is tuned to story forth mishap:
> When did I breathe to tell a pleasing tale?
> Must Constance speak? Let her tears prevent her talk.
> Must I discourse? Let Dido sigh, and say
> She weeps again to hear the wrack of Troy:
> Two words will serve, and then my tale is done—
> Elinor's proud brat hath robbed me of my son!' (Pt. I, sc. x, ll. 24–30).

The somewhat sinister wisdom of Pandulph is carefully and at length elaborated; and one of several indistinguishable barons (Salisbury) has been made chief spokesman of the revolt caused by the murder of Arthur. Hubert now stands out with a rough manhood which is very sympathetic; and many subtle touches are added to the King's character—of which more hereafter. I should like to remark three points in which Shakespeare, in compressing the original, has left matters a little less clear than he found them. In the first place, does it strike one why Falconbridge makes such a dead set at Austria, or Lymoges, as Shakespeare—repeating his predecessor's blunder—sometimes calls him? Are we not apt to fancy that it was chiefly because the bastard was a bullying sort of fellow, and saw that Austria was a coward? But in the old play it is at once and fully shown that he wanted to avenge the duke's cruelty to his father, Richard I.; Austria is indeed wearing the skin of the lion which Richard killed, and which gave him his famous surname. Then—it is a very minor matter—but one does not quite know why Falconbridge should be so much annoyed at the betrothal of Blanche to the Dauphin; nor why Blanche should have backed up Falconbridge in his apparently unjustifiable attack upon Austria. In the original we find that Elinor had half promised Blanche's hand to the Bastard, whom the lady gave up for Lewis with some reluctance. Lastly—and this is a good deal more important—Shakespeare does not at all explain why the monk poisoned King John. Has not one been rather startled, on seeing the play acted, by its sudden termination? 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 who is not shown to have had any motive whatever for his deed. It is as if the Gravedigger should suddenly brain Hamlet with his pick-axe, in the midst of their conversation, and decline to give any reason for his conduct. The author of *The Troublesome Raigne*, besides giving at length the scene of the ransacking the monasteries by the king's command, tells us in so many words that the murderous monk expected to be 'canonized for a holy saint' for poisoning the king that did 'contemn the pope' and 'never loved a friar,'

and shows us his conception of and preparation for the crime. Having tried to show how greatly Shakespeare improved the older play, even from the point of a modern stage-manager, I must explain why his example in this case seems to me, as I have said, a warning as well as a lesson to dramatists. What is it that has neutralised his efforts to make of *King John* a stage-play as successful and enduringly popular as, for example, *Richard III.*? It must be either the subject itself, or the way in which it has been dealt with in the original piece—which, in its broad outlines, he has not attempted to alter. The subject is perhaps not altogether a good one. The king's great crime is so dastardly, the leading cause of his misfortunes (his quarrel with Rome about Stephen Langton) is so undramatic, and his nature breaks down so entirely at the end—when even a villain like Richard III. fights nobly, and forces some sort of respect from the audience—that it may be that no poet could have made a strong play of the story of his life. As it is, in Acts I. and II. he is a non-entity. Falconbridge filling the first act, and nobody being very prominent in the second; in the third act Constance is supreme, and in the fourth Arthur; while even in the fifth the king is not of very great importance, his death-scene being much weakened in effect (however it may gain in refinement) by the removal of his violently remorseful and Protestant speeches. Indeed, it must be confessed that the omission from the play of the constant attacks on Popery, though an improvement from a purely literary point of view, destroys to a certain extent its raison d'etre, the spirit that helped to animate its old straggling mass, and, as has been pointed out, the motive of its denouement. The effort, too, to give the piece a hero in Falconbridge is a failure, because, as long experience teaches, you cannot force a character out of the position he would naturally occupy in a play. Falconbridge is properly little more than a chorus, a cynical critic of a wicked age—he might be entirely omitted without in the least degree altering the substance of the plot—and it is, therefore, impossible to make the story centre in him, as should every story in some one figure, or inseparably connected group of figures. Shakespeare has no doubt kept so closely to the lines of the older play because it was a favourite with his audience, and they had grown to accept its history as an absolute fact; but one can hardly help thinking that had he boldly thrown aside these trammels and taken John as his hero, his great central figure; had he analysed and built up before us the mass of power, craft, passion, and deviltry which made up the worst of the Plantagenets; had he dramatised the grand scene of the signing of the Charter, and shown vividly the gloom and horror which overhung the excommunicated land; had he painted John's last despairing struggles against rebels and invaders, as he has given us the fiery end of Macbeth's life—we might have had another Macbeth, another Richard, who would by his terrible personality have welded the play together, and carried us along breathless through his scenes of successive victory and defeat. That by this means something would be lost is true—Falconbridge, for example, would certainly be lessened—but the worth of a real work of art is greater than the worth of any part of it; and Constance and Hubert probably need not suffer, while the influence of the death of Arthur might very likely be made to penetrate more thoroughly the entire play. In *Macbeth*, *Henry V*, *Richard III*, *Coriolanus* everything is subordinated to the centre, the mainspring of the plot; in *King John* each act has a different hero. What could be more fatal to the interest of the whole? To some it may seem presumptuous thus to criticise Shakespeare; but is it not, indeed, the only way to make sure that one really appreciates him? Of such appreciation I wish my unsparing criticism of his work to be a proof; it is a poor faith that dares not listen to and seek out every accusation against its idol.

MOORE SMITH (*Introduction*, p. xxvi.): To these points of Mr Rose I would add one more or two. In Act II, sc. i. we are surprised that King John arrives in France as soon as Chatillon himself. Chatillon's explanation (l. 57, &c.) is that

> 'the adverse winds
> Whose leisure I have stay'd have given him time
> To land his legions all as soon as I.'

This may or may not be a more plausible explanation than that given in *The Troublesome Raigne*, where, on the dismissal of Chatillon, John gives a special order:

> 'Pembroke, conuey him safely on the sea
> But not in hast: for as we are aduisde,
> We meane to be in France as soone as he.'

Once more. There seems to me a good deal of obscurity in Shakespeare's play concerning the supposed warrant for Arthur's death. In Act III, sc. iii. the King hints to Hubert that he desires him to put Arthur to death, but he gives him no written warrant. In Act IV, sc. i, l. 6 we hear of a 'warrant,' which at l. 33 is shown to Arthur; but it is clear from Arthur's words at l. 39 that the warrant is not to kill the boy, but to put out his eyes. In act IV, sc. ii, l. 70 Pembroke speaks of a 'warrant' which Hubert had shown to a friend of his. This one would suppose to be the 'warrant' mentioned in the preceding scene, but here Pembroke evidently considers it a death-warrant (cf. l. 87). Then Hubert announces to John (ll. 206, 207) that Arthur is not blinded but dead, and adds, 'Here is your hand and seal for what I did.' John seems not to deny it, but goes on as if the only instigation which he had given Hubert to kill Arthur was the oral hint in Act III, sc. iii, ll. 227–232. In *The Troublesome Raigne* the whole story is clearer. Hubert's warrant to 'put out the eies of Arthur Plantaginet' is given in full.

After sparing the Prince, he comes to John and announces the presence of the lords:

> 'According to your Highnes strict command
> Young Arthurs eyes are blinded and extinct.'

When John replies (brutally enough),

> 'Why so, then he may feele the crowne but never see it.'

Hubert continues,

> 'Nor see nor feele, for of the extreams paine
> Within one houer gaue he vp the ghost.'

It is in consequence of this story that the lords leave the King in indignation. It is true that when John reproaches Hubert afterwards 'for killing him whom all the world laments,' Hubert replies:

> 'Why heres my Lord your Highnes hand and seale,
> Charging on liues regard to doo the deeds';

but this is clearly only the warrant for blinding the boy. I may add that in *The Troublesome Raigne* the rigour shown to Arthur, as well as John's second coronation, was a consequence of the fear excited in John's mind by the prophecy of Peter. In Shakespeare the prophecy came after Arthur's death, and the second coronation is left unaccounted for. Lastly, in Act IV, sc. iii, l. 11 Salisbury announces, with reference to the coming of the Dauphin, 'Lords, I will meet him at St. Edmunds-

bury'; and in Act V, sc. ii. we find as a matter of fact, according to our stage-directions, that the meeting is at that place. But why at St. Edmundsbury? In Shakespeare we see no reason. But in *The Troublesome Raigne*, as in Holinshed, we see that the Lords went to St. Edmundsbury disguised as Palmers on pilgrimage to a famous shrine, the better to cloak their rebellious designs from the King. Having considered the debt which Shakespeare in *King John* owes to the older play, we must now ask if there is any evidence that he is also indebted directly to Holinshed or any other authority. Mr Wright says, and perhaps with truth, 'There is no reason to suppose that he consulted the Chronicles at all.' At the same time there are one or two small points which tend in the other direction. In Act II, sc. i, l. 131 Constance casts a slur of unchasity on Queen Elinor. There is nothing corresponding to this in the old play, nor, Mr Boswell-Stone says, does Holinshed mention any such imputation on the Queen. It is a fact, however, that she had been divorced by Louis VII. of France in 1151, and Stow reports that 'she was defamed of adultery,' &c. Was this known to Shakespeare, or are Constance's words to be taken as mere stock-abuse? Probably the latter. In Act IV, sc. ii, l. 120 Queen Elinor is said to have died on 'the first of April.' This is not stated in the old play, nor, according to Mr Boswell-Stone, in Holinshed. Mr Stone thinks that Shakespeare may have chosen this date because Holinshed on the same page which records Elinor's death describes a 'bright fire' in the air which began 'on the first of April' (1204). If so, Shakespeare must at least have referred to Holinshed. But it is at least a curious coincidence that, according to the Annales de Waverleia (256), quoted by Mr Stone, Elinor did die on April 1, 1204. In Act V, sc. iii, l. 9 Shakespeare speaks of the 'great supply' that was wrecked on Goodwin Sands. The old play does not use the word 'supply' here, but Holinshed tells us that 'a new supplie of men was readie to come and aid Lewes.' As, however, in regard to the wreck, Shakespeare is distinctly following the old play and not Holinshed, who describes the ships as defeated and not wrecked, it is safest to think the use of the word 'supply' is here accidental. In Act V, sc. vii, l. 99 Shakespeare tells us that John had 'willed' to be buried at Worcester. The old play says merely:

> 'Meanwhile to Worster let vs bear the King
> And there interre his bodie, as beseemes.'

On the other hand, Holinshed says that John was buried at Worcester, 'not for that he had so appointed (as some write).' Was this version known to Shakespeare?

Moore Smith (*English Miscellany*, p. 335): I note two small instances in which Shakespeare, in *King John*, borrows something from *The Troublesome Raigne*, but uses it in another connexion than its original one. Both illustrate the fineness of feeling. In the old play the Bastard, in his anger at the marriage of Lewis and Blanch, threatens Lewis that he will cause his wife to be unfaithful to him:

> 'But let the froelicke Frenchman take no scorne
> If Philip front him with an English horne.'
> (Hazlitt's *Shakespeare's Library*, vol. v, p. 249.)

Shakespeare treats the marriage as one in which the audience are to feel a sympathetic interest; and in this connexion the Bastard's threat would be an outrage. But Shakespeare allows the Bastard to utter the same taunt to Austria (II, i, 292), for whom the audience have no sympathy whatever. In the old play the Bastard utters a horrible threat to his mother, to treat her as Nero treated Agrippina, unless

she will tell him the truth. This was too revolting for Shakespeare to keep in this connexion, but he used the same historical illustration for the conduct of the rebel lords towards England (V, ii, 152).

COLLIER (*History of Dram. Poetry*, iii, 73): *The Troublesome Reign of King John, King of England*, is in two parts, and bears the marks of more than one hand in its composition: the first part, and especially the earlier portion of it, is full of rhymes, while in the second part they comparatively seldom occur, which may be said to establish that the one was written nearer the date when rhyme was first discarded. The blank-verse of the second part is also a decided improvement upon that of the first part; it is less cumbrous and more varied, though still monotonous in its cadences. Malone, upon conjecture only, attributed the old *King John* to Greene or Peele, and some passages in the second part would do credit to either. In the opening of it is a beautiful simile, which Shakespeare might have used had he not been furnished, on the same occasion, with another from the abundant store of his own fancy; that which he employs has, perhaps, more novelty, but assuredly less grace, and both are equally appropriate. Arthur has thrown himself from the tower, and is found dead: Shakespeare calls his body

> 'An empty casket, where the jewel of life
> By some damn'd hand was robb'd and Ta'en away.'

The author of the second part of the old *King John* describes the dead body as a

> 'withered flower,
> Who in his life shin'd like the morning's blush,
> Cast out of door.'

Shakespeare may be said to have borrowed nothing from this piece beyond an important historical blunder, pointed out by Steevens (II, i, 8); as to his having 'preserved the greatest part of the conduct' of the elder production, both writers very much followed the chroniclers of the time.

SWINBURNE (p. 99): *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, weakest and most wooden of all wearisome chronicles that ever cumbered the boards, had in it for sole principle of life its power of congenial appeal to the same blatant and vulgar spirit of Protestantism which inspired it. In all the flat interminable morass of its tedious and tuneless verse I can find no blade or leaf of living poetic growth, no touch but one of nature and of pathos, where Arthur dying would fain send a last thought in search of his mother. From this play Shakespeare can have got neither hint nor help towards the execution of his own; the crude sketch of the Bastard as he brawls and swaggers through the long length of its scenes is hardly so much as the cast husk or chrysalid of the noble creature which was to arise and take shape for ever at the transfiguring touch of Shakespeare.

SYMONDS (p. 376): *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, in two parts, is, to all appearances, a piece of work posterior to Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, written in sustained but very rough blank verse, converting the prose chronicle bluntly into scenes, and indulging in but rare occasional diversions. A ribald episode in rhyme, introduced into the first part, and containing a coarse satire on monastic institutions, may be regarded as a farcial interlude rather than an integral portion of the play. When Shakespeare set his hand to *King John* he found the Bastard's part blocked

out with swaggering vigour in the elder chronicle, the cornless germ of Hubert's character, and a bare suggestion of the King's contrivance for his nephew's murder. In the evolution of our theatrical literature it is singularly interesting to notice the gradual development of this historical drama in its three stages. Bale's performance marks the emergence of the subject, still encumbered with the allegorical personifications and didactic purposes of the Morality. *The Troublesome Reign* exhibits a dull specimen of solid play-carpentry in the earliest and crudest age of blank-verse composition. *King John* is a masterpiece belonging to the second period of Shakespeare's maturity.

FURNIVALL (*Forewords* to Prætorius Facsimilie, pt. ii, p. xxxvi.): If Shakespere had not rewritten *The Troublesome Raigne*, I think the author of it would have got more credit for his work than he has yet obtained. As the case stands, almost all the Shakespere critics—save Mr W. Watkiss Lloyd—have felt bound to run down the old Playwright and run up Shakespere. They don't seem to have askt themselves what merit Shakespere saw in the old play, that he was content to write his own *King John* on his foregoer's lines (more or less), and go no further than *The Troublesome Raigne* for his material. They do not give the Playwright credit for having recognized before Shakespere, that—in Elizabethan days at least—comedy had to be mixt with history in order to get an effective historical play. They forget that if Shakespere had his first lesson of the kind in *The Contention* and *2 Henry VI*, it made so little impression upon him that after he wrote *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* without comic relief—and made his gardeners in the former play talk like philosophers—while after the *Troublesome Raigne* and *King John* he learnt to put Falstaffe and comedy into *Henry IV.* and *V.* They pass over the fact that Shakespere put his seal of approval on the old Playwright's invention of Falconbridge and his mother, &c., his alteration of Holinshed's characters of Arthur, of Limoges, &c., and his avoidance of Constance's re-marriages. They do not give the earlier dramatist credit for his keeping clear of one great blemish in Shakespere's play, the non-showing of the motive for the poisoning of John by the Swinstead monk. They are not as fair to the old playwright as Shakespere himself was. He evidently said to himself when he saw (or perchance read the MS. of) *The Troublesome Raigne:* 'This play has merit; it'll do for me; I can make a better thing of it; but the man who wrote it is no fool; he's given me all the material I want, and hints that I can develop; and I thank him for them.' Though it is quite true that no good play can be made of the historic John, who degraded himself from the representative of England's independence into the Pope's tool, from a man into a cur, yet it is clear that the old playwright made a very fair drama on the subject for his time. That scene xi. of Part I, when the Bastard finds the Nun lockt up in the prior's chest 'to hide her from lay men,' and then discovers 'Friar Lawrence' lockt up in the ancient Nun's chest, must have been a very telling one on the Elizabethan stage; you can fancy the audience's chuckles over it. So also must the Falconbridge incident, I, i, and the Bastard killing Limoges on the stage, Pt. I, sc. xi. have been thoroughly appreciated. Besides these scenes, the pathos of Arthur's death, the patriotism of the resistance to the Pope, and to John's oppressive taxation, the treachery of the French turning the nobles back to their allegiance, the final echo of the chronicler,

> 'Let England liue but true within it selfe,
> And all the world can neuer wrong her state. . . .
> If England's Peeres and people ioyne in one,
> Nor Pope, nor France, nor Spaine can doo them wrong'—

all these points must have appealed strongly to an audience of Elizabeth's time, to whom home strife, Armada threats, disputed succession to the throne, and Papal intrigues were matters of lifelong familiarity. And altogether, many as are the blemishes of *The Troublesome Raigne*, no fair-minded reader will deny or belittle its merits.

SCHELLING (*Chronicle Play*, p. 46): With *The Troublesome Raigne* we reach a typical specimen of the earlier Chronicle History before it was transformed by the genius of Marlowe and Shakespeare. That it was acted soon after the performance of *Tamburlaine* the prologue discloses. Hence unless the play antedate this prologue *The Troublesome Raigne* was first acted in the year of the Armada. Although *The Troublesome Raigne* adheres to epic sequence of event, the material of the chronicle is treated with some skill and much Freedom. Thus the dramatist suppresses, as did Shakespeare after him, the fact of the remarriage of Queen Constance, and assigns a motive, in his rapacious treatment of the clergy, for the poisoning of John in Swinstead Abbey, a point omitted by Shakespeare. *The Troublesome Raigne* retains the admixture of comic and serious material which characterized the two older specimens of its class and which descended to the regular drama from the earliest times. The clown is not a character of *The Troublesome Raigne*, and the step to the comedy of Shakespeare's *Henry IV.* becomes conceivable. Whether from reluctance to offer so great a relief to the dark picture of the unworthy tyrant John or from the example of Marlowe, Shakespeare reduced the comedy element of the older play to the single figure of the Bastard Faulconbridge, and ennobled that personage with a deeper and richer character than is his in *The Troublesome Raigne*. To accomplish this last Shakespeare was compelled to omit the finest scene of the older play, that between Philip and Lady Faulconbridge, in which the youth wrings from his reluctant mother a confession of her frailty and the certainty that his real father was King Richard Cordelion. Shakespeare also confined within bounds the staunch and boisterous Protestant spirit with which the earlier play is pervaded, a spirit which, in view of the contemporary struggle with Spain, assumes a political rather than a polemical bias. This spirit, which does not materially interfere with the general purpose of the play, suffices together with its improved style, the greater ease of its verse, its earnest attempt at consistency and clear outlining of character, to raise this play to a position distinctly above the two earlier productions of its class. It may not be too much to affirm that in the personages of *The Troublesome Raigne*, especially in the King and in Faulconbridge (to the vigorous characterization of which Shakespeare himself owes more than a hint), we have the earliest vital representation of an historical personage upon the English stage.

MUNRO (*Introduction*, p. xxi.): The older play has been called worthless; it is better than that. Dr F. S. Boas justly says of it, 'It contained the outlines, sketched with a good deal of vigour, of all the principal characters.' It is here—here alone, perhaps—that the author's merit lies. The great characters are all decisively limned by a strong though not delicate hand. John's brutal selfishness, Arthur's boyish gentleness, the Bastard's rough manliness, audacity, and capability, Pandulph's subtlety, and Elinor's masterful shrewdness, have definite beginnings in the old play. Had the author possessed more humanistic feeling, more sympathetic imagination, his art might have been better and his figures more replete with telling detail. He was obsessed by other ideals. Situations which a man with dramatic

instinct could (and did later) develop with tremendous human appeal, he neglects or abuses with theological allusions. But, like all the Elizabethan playwrights, he knew his business well enough to satisfy the needs of his theatre: he gives us three battles, disputes of monarchs, a coronation, prophecies and marvels, a betrothal, humour in a friary, plots rebellions, proclamations, the sufferings of the innocent, a death-scene, some bombast and satire, and much patriotic feeling. He was, indeed, for an age, and has crept into all time in the shadow of another. His standpoint is largely theological. He selected and constructed his plot as much for religious argument as the author of *Republica* had written for the opposite school. His intention was to depict John as the prophetic forerunner of Henry VIII.; to emphasize how much national solidarity was bound up with opposition to Rome; to portray corruption in the monasteries and faithlessness in the Papacy; and to show how John's pandering to priesthood had produced internecine strife and invasion. He was incited by the passionate national feeling which had seized hold of men: Drake had burst on Cadiz in 1587, and the Armada sailed in 1588. The lines 'to the Gentlemen Readers' strike the prevailing note: John is 'the warlike Christian,' who, 'for Christ's true faith . . . set himself against the man of Rome.' From the first John promises what Henry VIII. accomplished. 'I'll seize the lazy abbey-lubbers lands' he declares in the first scene; and later he replaces 'abbey-lubbers' by such contumelious phrases as 'the pope and his shavelings,' supported by approbrious references to 'trental obsequies, mass, and month's-mind.' He speaks of himself as 'in arms against the Romish Pride' (Sc. viii, l. 49). Although he honours the church and holy churchmen, and is eager for the service of the highest (Part I, sc. ii, l. 124), he scorns 'to be subject to the greatest prelate in the world' (Sc. v.); and designates as 'asses' those kings before him who had borne

'The Slavish weight of that controlling priest' (Sc. xii.).

He grieves that their devotion had led them into 'a thousand acts of shame.' His conception of kinghood is such that he repudiates the overlordship of any power in Christendom; and his intention is to the full, all that the Fidei Defensor of 1544 was to imply: 'As I am King, so will I reign next under God, Supreme Head both over spiritual and temporal' (Sc. v.). He satirizes the riches and idleness of the monks and friars; and the adventures of the bastard, his abettor, among the 'smooth-skin nuns' and 'Fausen friars' are depicted with coarse humour. John's position declares the author's intention. Here was the instrument, had it been worthy, which might have accomplished for England all that Henry VIII. accomplished. But John made one fatal blunder. The turning-point in the action, and the primary cause of John's failure, was the murder of, or the intent to murder, Arthur. It was this which caused the secession of nobles, and lent weight to the charges of Rome. Hauteur, usurpation, and disobedience put him without the pale of the Church; murder, without the pale of humanity. And it was the secession of the nobles which gave Lewis his chance, which made him the formidable tool of Pandulph, and indirectly entailed John's end. Lewis himself is made to dwell upon the necessity of the rebels in his campaign, and the impregnability of the island without them (Part II, sc. ix, ll. 25 and on). The logical climax, so far as this author was concerned, was the failure of John. Such a climax was the consistent outcome of his purpose. That, however, was already accomplished when John bared his head to Pandulph. Still, the 'Fall of Princes' conception of tragedy carries the play on to what should have been the dramatic climax, the death, when again the desire to present the first step in the prophetic mission of John, the accession of

Henry, spoils the dramatic effect even of this. The principal dramatic consequence of the attack of Arthur is obscured by the author; but he attempts to intensify the nemesis which overtakes John by relieving him of direct responsibility for the boy's death. Hubert disobeys his orders and the boy lives; and it seems as if all might yet go well. We leave John at the end of Part I. 'replete with bliss that Arthur lives.' But he had gone too far. The death of Arthur, and all that seemed frustrated through no virtue of John's, speedily follow. Heaven averts its face; sickness smites him; his mother dies; he is compelled dissemblingly and unavailingly to bow to the power he had rejected and insulted; his forces are lost in the Wash; and finally, in the war his folly has invited, he is poisoned at the abbey which has been ransacked by his orders. The author is anxious to emphasize that submission to Rome was John's greatest blunder (Pt. II, sc. viii, l. 95); and the Bastard describes his misfortune as 'the fruit of Popery' (Pt. II, sc. viii, l. 113). John came to recognize his own unworthiness, and declared his forerunnership—

> 'Thy sins are far too great to be the man
> T' abolish Pope and popery from thy realm:
> But in thy seat, if I may guess at all,
> A king shall reign that shall suppress them all' (Pt. II, sc. ii, ll. 169–172).

There is a touch of nobler regret in his last utterance—

> 'I am not he shall build the Lord a house
> Or root these locusts from the face of the earth;
> But if my dying heart deceive me not,
> From out these loins shall spring a kingly branch,
> Whose arms shall reach unto the gates of Rome,
> And with his feet tread down the strumpet's pride
> That sits upon the chair of Babylon.'

For the rest, the author always keeps his end in view: the easy Papal excommunication and dispensation; Papal fickleness; the treacherous swearing by Lewis on the altar; the definite connexion between the rebels and Pandulph and Lewis; the theological contention between Hubert and Arthur; the reviling of Rome by Lewis himself; John's utterances and the friary scenes; the appeal to Englishmen never to trust foreign rule, and the concluding words of the Bastard, are all designed to maintain the plea with which the author begins.

BROOKE (p. 227): The writer of *The Troublesome Raigne* used or misused the events of history as its writer pleased, and Shakespeare in his play took a similar licence. Why, being quite able, as in his other historical dramas, to follow history almost accurately, he chose in this drama to play pranks with facts, and in some cases without dramatic necessity, I can only conjecture, and, indeed, it does not make much matter. The real matter is the play itself, its presentation of human passions, and the probable insight it gives us into the personal patriotism of Shakespeare. It may be amusing to find out Shakespeare's deliberate errors, and we can discover them in every text-book on this drama, but when we read or see the play it is best, for the time, to assume that Shakespeare was right in his variations from the truth. History is one thing, and it is good, of course, to know the facts, but art is another thing, and, however she may choose to manipulate the facts, she is excused if her deviation from fact enables her to create new images of humanity and varied pictures of our life. If Shakespeare, for example, had followed historical

fact we should never have had the scene between Arthur and Hubert, or the wild magnificence of the grief of Constance, or Faulconbridge's steady loyalty to England when all seemed lost; and even one of these representations is more important in its truth to human nature, and in its influence of humanity, than any accurate knowledge of the facts about King John. I should have liked to have seen Shakespeare at work on *The Troublesome Raigne*, which he took as his original. It is not quite a bad play, but his humourous rage at its weakness, false passion, and blundering execution could only have been matched by the delight he had in reconceiving, re-forming, re-charactering the whole of it. It is told of Michael Angelo that his friends brought to him a huge block of marble, ten feet high, which some futile sculptor had begun to shape, and then, in despair, had the grace to surrender. The great artist saw beneath the rude block the noble statue of David which stood for so long in front of the palace of the Signoria at Florence. He sprang upon it with a chisel and mallet, in a fiery energy, and out of the formless marble emerged, as if at the voice of God, the young conqueror of the Philistine. With a like fire and fury of creative energy we may imagine Shakespeare hewing out his *King John* from the formless mass of *The Troublesome Raigne*. What joy was his as he felt, rising into speaking life beneath his hand, the terrible motherhood of Constance, the piteous childhood of Arthur, the growing manhood of Faulconbridge, the dignified statesmanship of Salisbury, and the strange figure, mingled of vile clay and gold, of the King whom he slew on so burning a couch because he had wronged England. There is no joy in the wide world to be for one moment compared to the joy of creation, and all men of creative genius know and have loved that lonely rapture.

THE

TROUBLESOME RAIGNE

of *John*, King of *England*, with the *discovery of King* Richard Cordelion's Base sone (vulgarly named, the Bastard Fawconbridge): *also the* death of King *John* at *Swinstead Abbey*.

As it was (sundry times) publicly acted by the Queen's Majesty's Players, in the honourable City of London.

[Device]

Imprinted at London for *Sampson Clarke, and are to be sold at his shop, on the backside* of the *Royall Exchange*.

1591.

TO THE GENTLEMEN READERS.

You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow
Have entertained the Scythian *Tamburlaine*,
And given applause unto an Infidel,
Vouchsafe to welcome, with like courtesy,
A warlike Christian and your countryman.
For Christ's true faith endur'd he many a storm,
And set himself against the Man of Rome,
Until base treason (by a damnèd wight)
Did all his former triumphs put to flight.
Accept of it, sweet Gentles, in good sort,
And think it was prepar'd for your disport.

THE TROUBLESOME RAIGNE OF KING JOHN

[SCENE i.]

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

Queene Elianor.

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 dismal hue,
Yet give me leave to joy, and joy you all,
That from this womb hath sprung a second hope,
A King that may, in rule and virtue both,
Succeed his brother in his Empery.

K. John. My gracious mother Queen, and barons all ;
Though far unworthy of so high a place
As is the throne of mighty *England's* king,
Yet, *John*, your Lord, contented uncontent,
Will, as he may, sustain the heavy yoke
Of pressing cares that hang upon a crown.
My Lord of *Pembrooke*, and Lord *Salsbury*,
Admit the Lord *Shatillion* to our presence,
That we may know what *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*,
By his ambassadors, requires of us.

Q. Elinor. Dare lay my hand, that *Elinor* can guess
Whereto this weighty embassade doth tend :
If of my nephew *Arthur* and his claim,
Then say, my son, I have not mist my aim.

Enter CHATILLION *and the two Earls.*

K. John. My Lord *Chatillion*, welcome into *England :*
How fares our brother *Philip*, King of *Fraunce ?*

Chat. His Highness, at my coming, was in health,
And will'd me to salute your Majesty,
And say the message he hath given in charge.

K. John. And spare not, man ; we are prepar'd to hear.

Chat. Philip, by the grace of God, most Christian King of *Fraunce*, having taken into his guardian and protection, *Arthur*, Duke of *Brittaine*, son and heir to *Jeffrey*, thine elder brother, requireth, in the behalf of the said *Arthur*, the Kingdom of *England*, with the Lordship of *Ireland*, *Poitiers*, *Aniow*, *Torain*, *Maine :* and I attend thine answer.

K. John. A small request : belike he makes account

That *England, Ireland, Poitiers, Aniow, Torain, Maine,*
Are nothing for a king to give at once.
I wonder what he means to leave for me.
Tell *Philip,* he may keep his lords at home
With greater honour than to send them thus
On embassades that not concern himself,
Or if they did, would yield but small return.
Chat. Is this thine answer?
K. John. It is; and too good an answer for so proud a message.
Chat. Then, King of *England* in my master's name,
And in Prince *Arthur,* Duke of *Brittaine's* name,
I do defy thee as an enemy,
And wish thee to prepare for bloody wars.
Q. Elinor. My Lord, that stands upon defiance thus,
Commend me to my nephew, tell the boy,
That I, Queen *Elianor* (his Grandmother)
Upon my blessing, charge him leave his arms,
Whereto his head-strong mother pricks him so.
Her pride we know, and know her for a dame
That will not stick to bring him to his end,
So she may bring herself to rule a realm.
Next, wish him to forsake the King of *Fraunce,*
And come to me, and to his uncle here.
And he shall want for nothing at our hands.
Chat. This shall I do; and thus I take my leave.
Iohn. Pembrooke, convey him safely to the sea,
But not in haste; for, as we are advis'd,
We mean to be in *Fraunce* as soon as he,
To fortify such towns as we possess
In *Aniou, Torain,* and in *Normandy* [*Exit Chatl.*]

Enter the Shrive, & whispers the Earl of Sals. in the ear.

Salisbury. Please it your Majesty, here is the Sheriff of *Northamptonshire,* with certain persons that of late committed a riot, and have appeal'd to your Majesty, beseeching your Highness, for special cause, to hear them.
John. Will them come near. And while we hear the cause,
Go, *Salsbury,* and make provision,
We mean with speed to pass the sea to *Fraunce.* [*Exit* SALISBURY.]
Say, Shrieve, what are these men? what have they done?
Or whereto tends the course of this appeal?
Shrieve. Please it your Majesty, these two brethren, unnaturally falling at odds about their father's living, have broken your Highness' 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 trial in their country to your Highness; and here I, *Thomas Newdigate,* Shrieve of *Northamptonshire,* do deliver them over to their trial.
K. John. My Lord of *Essex,* will the offenders to stand forth, and tell the cause of their quarrel.
Essex. Gentlemen, it is the King's pleasure that you discover your griefs; and doubt not but you shall have justice.

Philip. Please it your Majesty, the wrong is mine; yet will I abide all wrongs, before I once open my mouth to unrip the shameful slander of my parents, the dishonour of myself, and the wicked dealing of my brother, in this princely assembly.

Robert. Then, by my Prince his leave, shall *Robert* speak,
And tell your Majesty what right I have
To offer wrong, as he accounteth wrong.
My father, (not unknown unto your Grace,)
Receiv'd his spurs of knighthood in the field,
At kingly *Richard's* hands in *Palestine*,
Whenas the walls of *Acon* gave him way:
His name, Sir *Robert Fauconbridge* of *Mountbery*.
What by succession from his ancestors,
And warlike service under *England's* arms,
His living did amount to, at his death,
Two thousand marks revenue every year:
And this, my Lord, I challenge for my right,
As lawful heir to *Robert Fauconbridge*.

Philip. If first-born son be heir indubitate
By certain right of *Englands* ancient law,
How should myself make any other doubt
But I am heir to *Robert Fauconbridge?*

Iohn. Fond youth, to trouble these our princely ears,
Or make a question in so plain a case:
Speak! Is this man thine elder brother born?

Robert. Please it your Grace with patience for to hear;
I not deny but he mine elder is,
Mine elder brother too; yet in such sort,
As he can make no title to the land.

Iohn. A doubtful tale as ever I did hear;
Thy brother and thine elder, and no heir;
Explain this dark *Ænigma*.

Robert. I grant, my lord, he is my mother's son,
Base born, and base begot; no *Fauconbridge*.
Indeed, the world reputes him lawful heir;
My father in his life did count him so,
And here my mother stands, to prove him so:
But I, my lord, can prove, and do aver,
Both to my mother's shame and his reproach,
He is no heir, nor yet legitimate.
Then, gracious lord, let *Fauconbridge* enjoy
The living that belongs to *Fauconbridge*,
And let not him possess another's right.

Iohn. Prove this, the land is thine by *Englands* law.

Q. Elianor. Ungracious youth, to rip thy mother's shame,
The womb from whence thou did'st thy being take.
All honest ears abhor thy wickedness;
But gold, I see, doth beat down Nature's law.

Mother. My gracious lord,—and you, thrice reverend Dame,

That see the tears distilling from mine eyes,
And scalding sighs blown from a rented heart,
For honour and regard of womanhood,
Let me entreat to be commanded hence.
Let not these ears receive the hissing sound
Of such a viper, who, with poison'd words
Doth macerate the bowels of my soul.
Iohn. Lady, stand up, be patient for a while.
And fellow, say, whose bastard is thy brother ?
Philip. Not for myself, nor for my mother now,
But for the honour of so brave a man
Whom he accuseth with adultery,
Here I beseech your Grace, upon my knees,
To count him mad, and so dismiss us hence.
Robert. Nor mad, nor maz'd, but well advised, I
Charge thee, before this royal presence here
To be a bastard to King *Richard's* self,
Son to your Grace and brother to your Majesty.
Thus bluntly, and . . .
Elianor. Young man,
Thou needst not be ashamed of thy kin,
Nor of thy sire. But forward with thy proof.
Robert. The proof so plain, the argument so strong,
As that your Highness and these noble lords,
And all (save those that have no eyes to see)
Shall swear him to be bastard to the King.
First, when my father was Ambassador
In *Germany* unto the Emperor,
The King lay often at my father's house,
And all the realm suspected what befell :
And at my father's back-return again,
My mother was deliver'd, as 'tis said,
Six weeks before the account my father made.
But more than this : look but on *Philip's* face,
His features, actions, and his lineaments,
And all this princely presence shall confess
He is no other but King *Richard's* son.
Then, gracious lord, rest he King *Richard's* son,
And let me rest safe in my father's right,
That am his rightful son and only heir.
Iohn. Is this thy proof, and all thou hast to say ?
Robert. I have no more, nor need I greater proof.
Iohn. First, where thou saidst, in absence of thy sire,
My brother often lodged in his house :
And what of that, base groom, to slander him
That honour'd his Ambassador so much,
In absence of the man, to cheer the wife ?
This will not hold, proceed unto the next.
Q. Elinor. Thou say'st, she teem'd six weeks before her time.
Why, good Sir Squire, are you so cunning grown,

To make account of women's reckonings ?
Spit in your hand, and to your other proofs :
Many mischances hap in such affairs,
To make a woman come before her time.
Iohn. And where thou say'st, he looketh like the King
In action, feature and proportion :
Therein I hold with thee, for in my life
I never saw so lively counterfeit
Of *Richard Cordelion*, as in him.
Robert. Then, good my lord, be you indifferent judge,
And let me have my living and my right.
Q. Elinor. Nay, hear you, sir, you run 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 upon King *Richard* my son ; and so your brother was form'd in this fashion.
Robert. Madam, you wrong me thus to jest it out.
I crave my right. King *Iohn*, as thou art King,
So be thou just, and let me have my right.
Iohn. Why, foolish boy, thy proofs are frivolous,
Nor canst thou challenge anything thereby.
But thou shalt see how I will help thy claim ;
This is my doom, and this my doom shall stand
Irrevocable, as I am King of *England.*
For thou know'st not, we'll ask of them that know ;
His mother and himself shall end this strife ;
And as they say, so shall thy living pass.
Robert. My lord, herein I challenge you of wrong,
To give away my right, and put the doom
Unto themselves. Can there be likelihood
That she will loose,
Or he will give the living from himself ?
It may not be, my lord. Why should it be ?
Iohn. Lords, keep him back, and let him hear the doom !
Essex, First ask the mother thrice, who was his sire ?
Essex. Lady *Margaret*, widow of *Fauconbridge*, who was father to thy son *Philip ?*
Mother. Please it your Majesty, Sir *Robert Fauconbridge.*
Robert. This is right ; ask my fellow there if I be a thief.
Iohn. Ask *Philip* whose son he is.
Essex. Philip, who was thy father ?
Philip. Mass, my lord, and that's a question : and you had not taken some pains with her before, I should have desired you to ask my mother.
Iohn. Say, who was thy father ?
Philip. Faith, my lord, to answer you sure, he is my father that was nearest my mother, when I was gotten ; and him I think to be Sir *Robert Fauconbridge.*
Iohn. Essex, for fashion's sake demand again ;
And so an end to this contention.

Robert. Was ever man thus wrong'd as *Robert* is ?
Essex. *Philip*, speak, I say ; who was thy father ?
K. John. Young man, how now, what, art thou in a trance ?
Q. Elinor. *Philip*, awake ! The man is in a dream.
Philip. *Philippus, atavis edite Regibus.*
What say'st thou ; *Philip*, sprung of ancient Kings ?
Quo me rapit tempestas ?
What wind of honour blows this fury forth,
Or whence proceed these fumes of majesty ?
Methinks I hear a hollow echo sound,
That *Philip* is the son unto a King :
The whistling leaves upon the trembling trees,
Whistle in concert I am *Richard's* son ;
The bubbling murmur of the water's fall,
Records *Philippus Regis filius ;*
Birds in their flight make music with their wings,
Filling the air with glory of my birth ;
Birds, bubbles, leaves and mountains, echo, all
Ring in mine ears, that I am *Richard's* son.
Fond man, ah, whither art thou carried ?
How are thy thoughts yrapt in Honour's heaven ?
Forgetful what thou art, and whence thou cam'st ?
Thy father's land cannot maintain these thoughts ;
These thoughts are far unfitting *Fauconbridge ;*
And well they may ; for why this mounting mind
Doth soar too high to stoop to *Fauconbridge.*
Why, how now ? Knowest thou where thou art ?
And know'st thou who expects thine answer here ?
Wilt thou, upon a frantic madding vein,
Go lose thy land, and say thyself base-born ?
No, keep thy land, though *Richard* were thy sire :
Whate'er thou think'st, say thou art *Fauconbridge.*
Iohn. Speak, man, be sudden, who thy father was.
Philip. Please it your Majesty, *Sir Robert* . . .
Philip, that *Fauconbridge* cleaves to thy jaws :
It will not out : I cannot, for my life,
Say I am son unto a *Fauconbridge.*
Let land and living go ! 'tis Honour's fire
That makes me swear King *Richard* was my sire.
Base to a King, adds title of more state,
Than knight's begotten, though legitimate.
Please it your Grace, I am King *Richard's* son.
Robert. *Robert*, revive thy heart, let sorrow die !
His faltering tongue not suffers him to lie.
Mother. What headstrong fury doth enchant my son ?
Philip. *Philip* can not repent, for he hath done.
Iohn. Then, *Philip*, blame not me ; thyself hast lost
By wilfulness, thy living and thy land.
Robert, thou art the heir of *Fauconbridge.*
God give thee joy, greater than thy desert !

Q. Elianor. Why, how now, *Philip*, give away thine own ?
Philip. Madam, I am bold to make myself your nephew,
The poorest kinsman that your Highness hath ;
And with this proverb 'gin the world anew,
Help hands ; I have no lands; Honour is my desire ;
Let *Philip* live to show himself worthy so great a sire.
Elinor. *Philip*, I think thou knew'st thy grandam's mind :
But cheer thee, boy ! I will not see thee want.
As long as *Elinor* hath foot of land ;
Henceforth thou shalt be taken for my son,
And wait on me, and on thine uncle here,
Who shall give honour to thy noble mind.
K. John. *Philip*, kneel down, that thou may'st throughly know
How much thy resolution pleaseth us.
Rise up, Sir *Richard Plantagenet*, King *Richard's* son.
Philip. Grant, Heavens, that *Philip* once may show himself
Worthy the honour of *Plantagenet*,
Or basest glory of a bastard's name.
K. John. Now, Gentlemen, we will away to *Fraunce*,
To check the pride of *Arthur* and his mates.
Essex, thou shalt be ruler of my realm ;
And toward the main charges of my wars
I'll seize the lazy abbey-lubbers' lands
Into my hands, to pay my men of war.
The Pope and Popelings shall not grease themselves
With gold and groats that are the soldiers' due.
Thus, forward, lords ! let our command be done,
And march we forward mightily to *Fraunce*.
[*Exeunt.* *Manet* PHILIP *and his* MOTHER.
Philip. Madam, I beseech you, deign me so much leisure as the hearing of a matter that I long to impart to you.
Mother. What's the matter, *Philip ?* I think your suit in secret tends to some money matter, which you suppose burns in the bottom of my chest.
Philip. No, Madam, it is no such suit as to beg or borrow,
But such a suit as, might some other grant,
I would not now have troubled you withal.
Mother. A God's name let us hear it !
Philip. Then, Madam, thus : your ladyship sees well,
How that my scandal grows by means of you,
In that report hath rumour'd up and down,
I am a bastard, and no *Fauconbridge*.
This gross attaint so tilteth in my thoughts,
Maintaining combat to abridge my ease,
That field and town, and company alone,
Whatso I do, or wheresoe'er I am,
I cannot chase the slander from my thoughts.
If it be true, resolve me of my sire ;
For, pardon, Madam, if I think amiss.
Be *Philip Philip*, and no *Fauconbridge*,

His father doubtless was as brave a man. [*Kneels.*]
To you on knees, as sometime *Phaeton*,
Mistrusting silly *Merop* for his sire,
Straining a little bashful modesty,
I beg some instance whence I am extraught.
Mother. Yet more ado to haste me to my grave!
And wilt thou too become a mother's cross?
Must I accuse myself, to close with you,
Slander myself, to quiet your affects?
Thou mov'st me, *Philip*, with this idle talk,
Which I remit, in hope this mood will die.
Philip. Nay, lady mother, hear me further yet,
For strong conceit drives duty hence awhile:
Your husband *Fauconbridge* was father to that son
That carries marks of nature like the sire,
The son that blotteth you with wedlock's breach,
And holds my right, as lineal in descent
From him whose form was figur'd 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 challenge any mark of true descent?
My brother's mind is base, and too too dull
To mount where *Philip* lodgeth his affects;
And his external graces that you view,
Though I report it, counterpoise not mine:
His constitution, plain debility,
Requires the chair, and mine the seat of steel;
Nay, what is he, or what am I to him,
When anyone that knoweth how to carp,
Will scarcely judge us both one-country-born?
This, Madam, this, hath drove me from myself;
And here, by Heaven's eternal lamps, I swear;
As cursed *Nero* with his mother did,
So I with you, if you resolve me not.
Mother. Let mother's tears quench out thy anger's fire,
And urge no further what thou dost require.
Philip. Let son's entreaty sway the mother now.
Or else she dies: I'll not infringe my vow.
Mother. Unhappy task: must I recount my shame,
Blab my misdeeds, or, by concealing, die?
Some power strike me speechless for a time,
Or take from him awhile his hearing's use!
Why wish I so, unhappy as I am?
The fault is mine, and he the faulty fruit:
I blush, I faint; oh, would I might be mute!
Philip. Mother, be brief! I long to know my name.
Mother. And longing, die, to shroud thy mother's shame.
Philip. Come, Madam, come, you need not be so loth.
The shame is shared equal 'twixt us both.

Is't not a slackness in me, worthy blame,
To be so old, and cannot write my name ?
Good mother, resolve me !
Mother. Then, *Philip*, hear thy fortune and my grief,
My honour's loss, by purchase of thyself,
My shame, thy name, and husband's secret wrong,
All maim'd and stain'd by youth's unruly sway.
And when thou know'st from whence thou art extraught,
Or if thou knew'st what suits, what threats, what fears,
To move by love, or massacre by death,
To yield with love, or end by love's contempt,
The mightiness of him that courted me,
Who temper'd terror with his wanton talk,
That, something may extenuate the guilt.
But let it not advantage me so much ;
Upbraid me rather with the *Roman* dame
That shed her blood to wash away her shame.
Why stand I to expostulate the crime
With *pro et contra*, now the deed is done ?
When, to conclude, two words may tell the tale,
That *Philip's* father was a Prince's son,
Rich *England's* rule, world's only terror, he,
For honour's loss, left me with child of thee,
Whose son thou art. Then pardon me the rather,
For fair King *Richard* was thy noble father.
Philip. Then, *Robin Fauconbridge*, I wish thee joy,
My sire a King, and I a landless boy.
God's Lady-Mother, the world is in my debt,
There's something owing to *Plantagenet*.
Ay, marry, Sir, let me alone for game ;
I'll act some wonders, now I know my name.
By blessed *Mary*, I'll not sell that pride
For *England's* wealth, and the world beside.
Sit fast, the proudest of my father's foes !
Away, good mother ! there the comfort goes.

[*Exeunt.*

[SCENE ii.]

Enter PHILIP, *the French King, and* LEWIS, LIMOGES, CONSTANCE, *and her son* ARTHUR.

King. Now 'gin we broach the title of thy claim,
Young *Arthur*, in the *Albion* territories,
Scaring proud *Angiers* with a puissant siege.
Brave *Austria*, cause of *Cordelions* death,
Is also come to aid thee in thy wars ;
And all our forces join for *Arthur's* right.
And, but for causes of great consequence,
Pleading delay till news from *England* come,
Twice should not *Titan* hide him in the West,
To cool the fetlocks of his weary team,

Till I had, with an unresisted shock,
Controll'd the manage of proud *Angiers'* walls,
Or made a forfeit of my fame to Chance.
Constance. May be that *John*, in conscience, or in fear
To offer wrong where you impugn the ill,
Will send such calm conditions back to *Fraunce*,
As shall rebate the edge of fearful wars :
If so, forbearance is a deed well done.
Arthur. Ah, mother ; possession of a crown is much ;
And *John*, as I have heard reported of,
For present vantage would adventure far.
The world can witness, in his brother's time
He took upon him rule, and almost reign ;
Then it must follow, as a doubtful point,
That he'll resign the rule unto his nephew,
I rather think the menace of the world
Sounds in his ears as threats of no esteem ;
And sooner would he scorn *Europa's* power,
Than lose the smallest title he enjoys ;
For questionless, he is an Englishman.
Lewes. Why, are the English peerless in compare ?
Brave cavaliers as e'er that island bred,
Have liv'd and died, and dar'd and done enough,
Yet never grac'd their country for the cause.
England is *England*, yielding good and bad,
And *John* of *England* is as other *Johns*.
Trust me, young *Arthur*, if thou like my reed,
Praise thou the French that help thee in this need.
Limoges. The Englishman hath little cause, I trow,
To spend good speeches on so proud a foe.
Why, *Arthur* here's his spoil, that now is gone,
Who, when he liv'd, outrov'd his brother *John ;*
But hasty curs that lie so long to catch,
Come halting home, and meet their overmatch.
But news comes now, here's the Ambassador !

Enter CHATILLION.

K. Phili. And in good time, welcome my Lord *Chatillion.*
What news ? Will *John* accord to our command ?
Chatillion. Be I not brief to tell your Highness all,
He will approach, to interrupt my tale,
For one self bottom brought us both to *Fraunce.*
He, on his part, will try the chance of war ;
And if his words infer assured truth,
Will lose himself and all his followers,
Ere yield unto the least of your demands.
The mother-queen, she taketh on amain
'Gainst Lady *Constance*, counting her the cause
That doth effect this claim to *Albion*,
Conjúring *Arthur*, with a grandame's 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 sum, which briefly I have shown.
K. Phili. This bitter wind must nip somebody's spring ;
Sudden and brief ; why so, 'tis harvest weather.
But say, *Chatillion*, what persons of account are with him ?
Chatillion. Of *England*, Earl *Pembrooke* and *Salsbury*,
The only noted men of any name.
Next them, a bastard of the King's deceast,
A hardy, wild-head, tough and venturous,
With many other men of high resolve.
Then is there with them, *Elinor*, mother-queen,
And *Blanch*, her niece, daughter to the King of *Spaine :*
These are the prime birds of this hot adventure.

Enter JOHN *& his followers*, QUEEN, BASTARD, *Earls*, &c.

K. Philip. Me seemeth, *John*, an over-daring spirit
Effects some frenzy in thy rash approach,
Treading my confines with thy armed troops.
I rather lookt for some submiss reply
Touching the claim thy nephew *Arthur* makes
To that which thou unjustly dost usurp.
K. John. For that, *Chatillion* can discharge you all ;
I list not plead my title with my tongue,
Nor came I hither with intent of wrong
To *Fraunce* or thee, or any right of thine ;
But in defence and purchase of my right,
The town of *Angiers*, which thou dost begirt
In the behalf of Lady *Constance* son ;
Whereto, nor he nor she can lay just claim.
Constance. Yes (false intruder) if that just be just,
And headstrong usurpation put apart,
Arthur, my son, heir to thy elder brother,
Without ambiguous shadow of descent,
Is sovereign to the substance thou withhold'st.
Q. Elinor. Misgovern'd gossip, stain to this resort,
Occasion of these undecided jars,
I say, that know, to check thy vain suppose,
Thy son hath naught to do with that he claims :
For proofs whereof, I can infer a will
That bars the way he urgeth by descent.
Constance. A will indeed, a crabbed woman's will,
Wherein the Devil is an overseer,
And proud Dame *Elinor* sole executress.
More wills than so, on peril of my soul,
Were never made to hinder *Arthurs* right.
Arthur. But say there was, as sure there can be none,
The law intends such testaments as void,

Where right descent can no way be impeacht.
Q. Elinor. Peace, *Arthur*, peace, thy mother makes thee wings
To soar with peril after *Icarus;*
And trust me, youngling, for thy father's sake,
I pity much the hazard of thy youth.
Constance. Beshrew you else, how pitiful you are,
Ready to weep to hear him ask his own;
Sorrow betide such Grandames and such grief,
That minister a poison for pure love.
But who so blind, as cannot see this beam,
That you, forsooth, would keep your cousin down,
For fear his mother should be us'd too well?
Ay, there's the grief, confusion catch the brain
That hammers shifts to stop a prince's reign!
Q. Elinor. Impatient, frantic, common slanderer,
Immodest dame, unnurtur'd quarreller,
I tell thee, I, not envy to thy son,
But justice, makes me speak as I have done.
K. Philip. But here's no proof that shows your son a king.
K. John. What wants, my sword shall more at large set down.
Lewis. But that may break before the truth be known.
Bastard. Then this may hold till all his right be shown.
Limoges. Good words, sir sauce, your betters are in place.
Bastard. Not you, sir doughty with your lion's case.
Blanche. Ah, joy betide his soul, to whom that spoil belong'd.
Ah, *Richard*, how thy glory here is wrong'd!
Limoges. Methinks that *Richard's* pride and *Richard's* fall
Should be a precedent t'affright you all.
Bastard. What words are these: how do my sinews shake?
My father's foe clad in my father's spoil!
A thousand furies kindle with revenge
This heart, that choler keeps a consistory,
Scaring my inwards with a brand of hate.
How doth *Alecto* whisper in mine ears:
Delay not, *Philip*, kill the villain straight,
Disrobe him of the matchless monument,
Thy father's triumph o'er the savages.
Base herdgroom, coward, peasant, worse than a threshing slave,
What mak'st thou with the trophy of a King?
Sham'st thou not, coistril, loathsome dunghill swad,
To grace thy carcase with an ornament
Too precious for a monarch's coverture?
Scarce can I temper due obedience
Unto the presence of my Sovereign
From acting outrage on this trunk of hate:
But arm thee, traitor, wronger of renown
For by his soul I swear, my father's soul,
Twice will I not review the morning's rise
Till I have torn that trophy from thy back,
And split thy heart for wearing it so long.

Philip hath sworn, and if it be not done,
Let not the world repute me ***Richards*** son.
Limoges. Nay, soft, sir Bastard, hearts are not split so soon,
Let them rejoice that at the end do win.
And take this lesson at thy foeman's hand :
Pawn not thy life, to get thy father's skin.
Blanche. Well may the world speak of his knightly valour,
That wins this hide to wear a lady's favour.
Bastard. Ill may I thrive, and nothing brook with me,
If shortly I present it not to thee.
K. Philip. Lordings, forbear, for time is coming fast,
That deeds may try what words cannot determine,
And to the purpose, for the cause you come.
Meseemes you set right in chance of war,
Yielding no other reasons for your claim
But so and so, because it shall be so.
So wrong shall be suborn'd by trust of strength :
A tyrant's practice, to invest himself
Where weak resistance giveth wrong the way.
To check the which, in holy, lawful arms,
I, in the right of *Arthur*, *Geffreys* son,
Am come before this city of *Angiers*,
To bar all other false supposed claim,
From whence, or howsoe'er, the error springs ;
And in this quarrel, on my princely word,
I'll fight it out unto the latest man.
K. John. Know, King of *Fraunce*, I will not be commanded
By any power or prince in Christendom,
To yield an instance how I hold mine own,
More than to answer, that mine own is mine.
But wilt thou see me parley with the town,
And hear them offer me allegiance,
Fealty and homage, as true liege-men ought.
K. Philip. Summon them, I will not believe it till I see it ; and when I see it I'll soon change it. [*They summon the town : the Citizens appear upon the walls*
K. John. You men of *Angiers*, and, as I take it, my loyal subjects, I have summon'd you to the walls. To dispute on my right, were to think you doubtful therein, which I am persuaded you are not. In few words, our brother's son, backt with the King of *Fraunce*, have beleaguer'd your town 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, who keep you the town for ?
Citizen. For our lawful king.
K. John. I was no less persuaded : then, in God's name, open your gates, and let me enter.
Citizen. And it please your Highness, we control not your title, neither will we rashly admit your entrance : if you be lawful King, with all obedience we keep it to your use : if not King, our rashness were to be

impeach'd for yielding without more considerate trial: we answer not as men lawless, but to the behoof of him that proves lawful.

K. John. I shall not come in, then?

Citizen. No, my lord, till we know more.

K. Philip. Then hear me speak in the behalf of *Arthur*, son of *Geffrey*, elder brother to *John*, his title manifest, without contradiction, to the crown and kingdom of *England*, with *Angiers* and divers towns on this side the sea. Will you acknowledge him your liege lord, who speaketh in my word, to entertain you with all favours, as beseemeth a king to his subjects, or a friend to his well-willers; or stand to the peril of your contempt, when his title is proved by the sword.

Citizen. We answer as before: till you have proved one right, we acknowledge none right, he that tries himself our Sovereign, to him will we remain firm subjects; and for him, and in his right, we hold our town, as desirous to know the truth, as loath to subscribe before we know. More than this we cannot say; and more than this we dare not do.

K. Philip. Then, *John*, I defy thee in the name and behalf of *Arthur Plantagenet*, thy King and cousin, whose right and patrimony thou detainest, as I doubt not, ere the day end, in a set battle make thee confess; whereunto, with a zeal to right, I challenge thee.

K. John. I accept the challenge, and turn the defiance to thy throat. [*Exeunt.*]

[SCENE III.]

Excursions. The BASTARD *chaseth* LIMOGES, *the Austrich Duke, and maketh him leave the lion's skin.*

Bastard. And art thou gone, misfortune haunt thy steps,
And chill cold fear assail thy times of rest.
Morpheus, leave here thy silent ebon cave,
Besiege his thoughts with dismal fantasies
And ghastly objects of pale threatening *Mors*.
Affright him every minute with stern looks,
Let Shadow temper terror in his thoughts,
And let the terror make the coward mad;
And in his madness let him fear pursuit,
And so in frenzy let the peasant die.
Here is the ransom that allays his rage,
The first feehold that *Richard* left his son:
With which I shall surprise his living foes,
As *Hectors* statue did the fainting *Greeks*. [*Exit.*

[SCENE IV.]

Enter the KINGS' *Heralds, with Trumpets, to the walls of Angiers: they summon the town.*

Eng. Herald. *John*, by the grace of God, King of *England*, Lord of *Ireland*, *Anjou*, *Toraine*, &c., demandeth once again of you his subjects of *Angiers*, if you will quietly surrender up the town into his hands?

Fr. Herald. *Philip*, by the grace of God, King of *Fraunce*, demandeth in the behalf of *Arthur*, Duke of *Britaine*, if you will surrender up the town into his hands, to the use of the said *Arthur*.

Citizens. Heralds, go tell the two victorious princes,
That we, the poor inhabitants of *Angiers*,
Require a parley of their Majesties.
Heralds. We go.

Enter the Kings, QUEEN ELIANOR, BLAUNCH, BASTARD, LIMOGES, LEWES, *Castilean, Pembrooke, Salisbury; Constance, and Arthur, Duke of Britaine*
John. Herald, what answer do the townsmen send?
Philip. Will *Angiers* yield to *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*?
En. Her. The townsmen on the walls accept your Grace.
Fr. Her. And crave a parley of your Majesty.
K. John. You citizens of *Angiers*, have your eyes
Beheld the slaughter that our English bows
Have made upon the coward, fraudful French?
And have you wisely ponder'd therewithal
Your gain in yielding to the English king?
Philip. Their loss in yielding to the English king.
But, *John*, they saw from out their highest towers
The chevaliers of *Fraunce*, and crossbow shot,
Make lanes of slaughter'd bodies through thine host,
And are resolv'd to yield to *Arthurs* right.
John. Why, *Philip*, though thou brav'st it 'fore the walls,
Thy conscience knows that *John* hath won the field.
Philip. What'er my conscience knows, thy army feels
That *Philip* had the better of the day.
Bastard. *Philip* indeed hath got the lion's case,
Which here he holds to *Limoges'* disgrace.
Base Duke, to fly and leave such spoils behind!
But this thou knew'st of force to make me stay:
It far'd with thee as with the mariner
Spying the hugy whale, whose monstrous bulk
Doth bear the waves, like mountains, 'fore the wind,
That throws out empty vessels, so to stay
His fury, while the ship doth sail away.
Philip, 'tis thine and 'fore this princely presence,
Madame, I humbly lay it at your feet,
Being the first adventure I achiev'd,
And first exploit your Grace did me enjoin:
Yet many more I long to be enjoin'd.
Blaunch. *Philip*, I take it, and I thee command
To wear the same, as erst thy father did:
Therewith, receive this favour at my hands,
T'encourage thee to follow *Richard's* fame.
Arthur. Ye citizens of *Angiers*, are ye mute?
Arthur, or *John*, say which shall be your King?
First Citizen. We care not which, if once we knew the right;
But till we know, we will not yield our right.
Bastard. Might *Philip* counsel two so mighty 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 batter'd walls about their ears.
The town once won, then strive about the claim ;
For they are minded to delude you both.
Citizen. Kings, Princes, Lords and Knights, assembled here,
The citizens of *Angiers*, all by me
Entreat your Majesty to hear them speak ;
And as you like the motion they shall make,
So to account and follow their advice.
John. Philip. Speak on, we give thee leave.
Citizen. Then thus : whereas that young and lusty 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 oppress your subjects and your friends,
And fill the world with brawls and mutinies ;
But unto peace your forces should be knit,
To live in princely league and amity :
Do this, the gates of *Angiers* shall give way,
And stand wide open to your heart's content.
To make this peace a lasting bond of love,
Remains one only honourable means,
Which, by your pardon, I shall here display :
Lewes, the *Dolphin* and the heir of *Fraunce*,
A man of noted valour through the world,
Is yet unmarried : let him take to wife
The beauteous daughter of the King of *Spain*,
Niece to K. *John*, the lovely Lady *Blanche*,
Begotten on his sister *Elianor*.
With her in marriage, will her uncle give
Castles and towers, as fitteth such a match.
The kings thus join'd in league of perfect love,
They may so deal with *Arthur*, Duke of *Britaine*,
Who is but young, and yet unmeet to reign,
As he shall stand contented every way.
Thus have I boldly (for the common good)
Deliver'd what the city gave in charge ;
And as upon conditions you agree,
So shall we stand content to yield the town.
Arthur. A proper peace, if such a motion hold;
These kings bear arms for me, and for my right,
And they shall share my lands to make them friends.
Q. Elianor. Son *John*
Follow this motion, as thou lov'st thy mother ;
Make league with *Philip*, yield to anything :
Lewes shall have my niece ; and then be sure,
Arthur shall have small succour out of *Fraunce*.
K. John. Brother of *Fraunce*, you hear the citizens ;
Then tell me how you mean to deal herein.

Constance. Why *John*, what canst thou give unto thy niece,
That hast no foot of land but *Arthurs* right ?
Lewes. By'r Lady, citizens, I like your choice,
A lovely damsel is the Lady *Blanche*,
Worthy the heir of *Europe* for her fere.
Constance. What, Kings, why stand you gazing in a trance ?
Why, how now, lords ? Accursed citizens,
To fill and tickle their ambitious ears,
With hope of gain that springs from *Arthur's* loss.
Some dismal planet at thy birthday reign'd ;
For now I see the fall of all thy hopes.
K. Philip. Lady, and Duke of *Britaine*, know you both,
The King of *Fraunce* respects his honour more
Than to betray his friends and favourers.
Princess of *Spain*, could you affect my son.
If we, upon conditions could agree ?
Bastard. 'Swounds, Madam, take an English Gentleman :
Slave as I was, I thought to have mov'd the match.
Grandam, you made me half a promise once,
That Lady *Blanche* should bring me wealth enough,
And make me heir of store of English land.
Q. Elianor. Peace, *Philip*, I will look thee out a wife.
We must with policy compound this strife.
Bastard. If *Lewes* get her, well, I say no more :
But let the frolic Frenchman take no scorn,
If *Philip* front him with an English horn.
John. Lady,
What answer make you to the King of *Fraunce ?*
Can you affect the Dolphin for your lord ?
Blanche. I thank 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,
Lest, being too too forward in the cause,
It may be blemish to my modesty.
Q. Elianor. Son *John*, and worthy *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*,
Do you confer awhile about the dower,
And I will school my modest niece so well,
That she shall yield as soon as you have done.
Constance. Ay, there's the wretch that broacheth all this ill,
Why fly I not upon the beldame's face,
And with my nails pull forth her hateful eyes.
Arthur. Sweet mother : cease these hasty madding fits
For my sake, let my grandam have her will.
O, would she with her hands pull forth my heart,
I could afford it, to appease these broils.
But, mother, let us wisely wink at all,
Lest further harms ensue our hasty speech.
Philip. Brother of *England*, what dowry wilt thou give
Unto my son, in marriage with thy niece ?
John. First, *Philip* knows her dowry out of *Spain*

To be so great as may content a king :
But, more to mend and amplify the same,
I give in money thirty-thousand marks ;
For land, I leave it to thine own demand.
K. Philip. Then I demand *Volquesson*, *Torain*, *Main*,
Poitiers and *Anjou*, these five provinces,
Which thou, as King of *England*, hold'st in *Fraunce :*
Then shall our peace be soon concluded on.
Bastard. No less than five such provinces at once ?
John. Mother, what shall I do ? my brother got these lands
With much effusion of our English blood :
And shall I give it all away at once ?
Q. Elinor. John, give it him, so shalt thou live in peace,
And keep the residue sans jeopardy.
John. Philip, bring forth thy son, here is my niece ;
And here in marriage I do give with her,
From me and my successors, English kings,
Volquesson, *Poitiers*, *Anjou*, *Torain*, *Maine*,
And thirty thousand marks of stipend coin.
Now, citizens, how like you of this match ?
Citizen. We joy to see so sweet a peace begun.
Lewes. Lewes with *Blanch* shall ever live content.
But now, King *John*, what say you to the Duke ?
Father, speak as you may in his behalf.
Philip. King *John*, be good unto thy nephew here,
And give him somewhat that shall please thee best.
John. Arthur, although thou troublest *Englands* peace,
Yet here I give thee *Britaine* for thine own,
Together with the Earldom of *Richmond*,
And this rich city of *Angiers* withal.
Q. Elianor. And if thou seek to please thine uncle *John*,
Shalt see, my son, how I will make of thee.
John. Now everything is sorted to this end,
Let's in, and there prepare the marriage rites,
Which in Saint *Marys* chapel presently
Shall be performed ere this presence part.
[*Exeunt. Manent* CONSTANCE *and* ARTHUR.
Arthur. Madam, good cheer, these drooping languishments
Add no redress to salve our awkward haps.
If Heavens have concluded these events,
To small avail is bitter pensiveness :
Seasons will change ; and so our present grief
May change with them, and all to our relief.
Constance. Ah, boy, thy years, I see, are far too green
To look into the bottom of these cares ;
But I, who see the poise that weigheth down
Thy weal, my wish, and all the willing means
Wherewith thy fortune and thy fame should mount,
What joy, what ease, what rest can lodge in me,
With whom all hope and hap do disagree ?

Arthur. Yet ladies tears, and cares, and solemn shows,
Rather than helps, heap up more work for woes.
Constance. If any power will hear a widow's plaint,
That from a wounded soul implores revenge,
Send fell contagion to infect this clime,
This cursed country, where the traitors breathe,
Whose perjury, as proud *Briareus*,
Beleaguers all the sky with misbelief.
He promist, *Arthur*, and he sware it too,
To fence thy right, and check thy foemen's pride.
But now, black-spotted perjurer as he is,
He takes a truce with *El'nor's* damned brat,
And marries *Lewes* to her lovely niece,
Sharing thy fortune and thy birth-day's gift
Between these lovers: Ill betide the match
And as they shoulder thee from out thy own,
And triumph in a widow's tearful cares;
So Heavens cross them with a thriftless course.
Is all the blood yspilt on either part,
Closing the crannies of the thirsty earth,
Grown to a love-game and a bridal feast?
And must thy birthright bid the wedding-banns?
Poor helpless boy, hopeless and helpless too,
To whom misfortune seems no yoke at all,
Thy stay, thy state, thy imminent mishaps
Woundeth thy mother's thoughts with feeling care.
Why look'st thou pale? the colour flies thy face;
I trouble now the fountain of thy youth,
And make it muddy with my dole's discourse.
Go in with me, reply not, lovely boy;
We must obscure this moan with melody,
Lest worser wrack ensue our malcontent. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE V.]

Enter the King of ENGLAND, *the King of* FRAUNCE, ARTHUR, BASTARD, LEWES, LIMOGES, CONSTANCE, BLANCHE, CHATILLION, PEMBROOKE, SALISBURY, *and* ELIANOR.

John. This is the day, the long-desired day,
Wherein the realms of *England* and of *Fraunce*
Stand highly blessed in a lasting peace.
Thrice happy is the Bridegroom and the Bride,
From whose sweet bridal such a concord springs,
To make, of mortal foes, immortal friends.
Constance. Ungodly peace, made by anothers war.
Bastard. Unhappy peace, that ties thee from revenge.
Rouse thee, *Plantagenet*, live not to see
The butcher of the great *Plantagenet*.
Kings, Princes, and ye Peers of either realms,
Pardon my rashness, and forgive the zeal
That carries me in fury to a deed

Of high desert, of honour, and of arms.
A boon, O kings, a boon doth *Philip* beg,
Prostrate upon his knee; which knee shall cleave
Unto the superficies of the earth,
Till *Fraunce* and *England* grant this glorious boon.
John. Speak, *Philip*, *England* grants thee thy request.
Philip. And *Fraunce* confirms whate'er is in his power.
Bastard. Then, Duke, sit fast, I level at thy head,
Too base a ransom for my father's life.
Princes, I crave the combat with the Duke,
That braves it in dishonour of my sire.
Your words are past, nor can you now reverse
The princely promise that revives my soul,
Whereat, methinks I see his sinews shake.
This is the boon, dread lords, which, granted once,
Or life or death are pleasant to my soul,
Since I shall live and die in *Richards* right.
Limoges. Base bastard, misbegotten of a King,
To interrupt these holy nuptial rites
With brawls and tumults, to a Duke's disgrace;
Let it suffice, I scorn to join in fight
With one so far unequal to myself.
Bastard. A fine excuse, Kings, if you will be kings,
Then keep your words, and let us combat it.
John. *Philip*, we cannot force the Duke to fight,
Being a subject unto neither realm.
But tell me, *Austria*, if an English Duke
Should dare thee thus, would'st thou accept the challenge?
Limoges. Else let the world account the *Austrich* duke
The greatest coward living on the earth.
John. The cheer thee, *Philip*, *John* will keep his word.
Kneel down, In sight of *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*,
And all these princely lords assembled here,
I gird thee with the sword of *Normandy*,
And of that land I do invest thee Duke;
So shalt thou be, in living and in land,
Nothing inferior unto *Austria*.
Limoges. King *John*, I tell thee flatly to thy face,
Thou wrong'st mine honour; and that thou may'st see
How much I scorn thy new-made Duke and thee,
I flatly say, I will not be compell'd:
And so farewell, Sir Duke of Low Degree.
I'll find a time to match you for this gear. [*Exit.*
John. Stay, *Philip*, let him go! the honour's thine.
Bastard. I cannot live unless his life be mine.
Q. Elianor. Thy forwardness this day hath joy'd my soul,
And made me think my *Richard* lives in thee.
K. Philip. Lordings, let's in, and spend the wedding day
In masques and triumphs, letting quarrels cease.

Enter a CARDINAL from *Rome.*

Cardinal. Stay, King of *France*, I charge thee, join not hands
With him that stands accurst of God and men.
Know, *John*, that I, *Pandulph*, Cardinal of *Millaine*, and Legate from the See of *Rome*, demand of thee, in the name of our Holy Father the Pope *Innocent*, why thou dost—contrary to the laws of our Holy Mother, the Church, and our Holy Father, the Pope—disturb the quiet of the Church, and disannul the election of *Stephen Langhton*, whom his Holiness hath elected Archbishop of *Canterbury:* this, in his Holiness' name, I demand of thee?

John. And what hast thou, or the Pope thy master, to do, to demand of me how I employ mine own? Know, Sir Priest, as I honour the Church and holy churchmen, so I scorn to be subject to the greatest Prelate in the world. Tell thy Master so from me; and say, *John* of *England* said it, that never an Italian Priest of them all, shall either have tithe, toll, or polling penny out of *England;* but, as I am King, so will I reign next under God, Supreme Head both over spiritual and temporal. And he that contradicts me in this, I'll make him hop headless.

Philip. What, King *John*, know you what you say, thus to blaspheme against our Holy Father, the Pope?

John. Philip, though thou and all the Princes of Christendom suffer themselves to be abus'd by a Prelate's slavery, my mind is not of such base temper. If the Pope will be King in *England*, let him win it with the sword. I know no other title he can allege to mine inheritance.

Card. John, this is thine answer?

John. What then?

Card. Then I, *Pandulph* of *Padua*, Legate from the Apostolic See, do, in the name of Saint *Peter*, and his successor, our Holy Father, Pope *Innocent*, pronounce thee accursed, discharging every of thy subjects of all duty and fealty that they do owe to thee, and pardon and forgiveness of sin to those or them whatsoever which shall carry arms against thee, or murder thee: this I pronounce, and charge all good men to abhor thee as an excommunicate person.

John. So, Sir, the more the fox is curst, the better 'a fares: if God bless me and my land, let the Pope and his shavelings curse, and spare not.

Card. Furthermore, I charge thee, *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*, and all the Kings and Princes of Christendom, to make war upon this miscreant. And whereas thou hast made a league with him, and confirm'd it by oath, I do, in the name of our foresaid Father, the Pope, acquit thee of that oath as unlawful, being made with an heretic. How say'st thou, *Philip*, dost thou obey?

John. Brother of *Fraunce*, what say you to the Cardinal?

Philip. I say I am sorry for your Majesty, requesting you to submit yourself to the Church of *Rome.*

John. And what say you to our league, if I do not submit?

Philip. What should I say? I must obey the Pope.

John. Obey the Pope, and break your oath to God?

Philip. The Legate hath absolv'd me of mine oath:
Then yield to *Rome*, or I defy thee here.

John. Why, *Philip*, I defy the Pope and thee,
False as thou art, and perjur'd, King of *Fraunce*,

Unworthy man to be accounted King.
Giv'st thou thy sword into a prelate's hands?
Pandulph, where I, of abbots, monks and friars,
Have taken somewhat to maintain my wars,
Now will I take no more but all they have.
I'll rouse the lazy lubbers from their cells,
And in despite I'll send them to the Pope.
Mother, come you with me, and for the rest
That will not follow *John* in this attempt,
Confusion light upon their damned souls.
Come, Lords,
Fight for your King that fighteth for your good?
K. Philip. And are they gone? *Pandulph*, thyself shalt see
How *Fraunce* will fight for *Rome* and *Romish* rites.
Nobles, to arms! let him not pass the seas,
Let's take him captive, and in triumph lead
The King of *England* to the gates of *Rome*.
Arthur, bestir thee, man, and thou shalt see
What *Philip*, King of *Fraunce*, will do for thee.
Blanche. And will your Grace, upon your wedding-day,
Forsake your bride, and follow dreadful drums?
Nay, good my lord, stay you at home with me.
Lewes. Sweet-heart, content thee, and we shall agree.
K. Philip. Follow me, Lords! Lord Cardinal, lead the way!
Drums shall be music to this wedding-day. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE VI.]

Excursions. The BASTARD *pursues* AUSTRIA, *and kills him.*

Bastard. Thus hath King *Richards* son perform'd his vows,
And offer'd *Austrias* blood for sacrifice
Unto his father's everliving soul.
Brave *Cordelion*, now my heart doth say,
I have deserv'd, though not to be thy heir,
Yet as I am, thy base-begotten son,
A name as pleasing to thy *Philips* heart,
As to be call'd the Duke of *Normandy*.
Lie there a prey to every ravening fowl:
And as my father triumph'd in thy spoils,
And trod thine ensigns underneath his feet,
So do I tread upon thy cursed self,
And leave thy body to the fowls for food. [*Exit.*

[SCENE VII.]

Excursions. ARTHUR, CONSTANCE, LEWES, *having taken* QUEEN ELIANOR *prisoner.*

Constance. Thus hath the God of Kings, with conquering arm,
Disperst the foes to true succession.
Proud, and disturber of thy country's peace,
Constance doth live to tame thine insolence;
And on thy head will now avenged be

For all the mischiefs hatched in thy brain.
Q. Elinor. Contemptuous dame, unreverent Duchess, thou,
To brave so great a Queen as *Elianor.*
Base scold hast thou forgot that I was wife
And mother to three mighty English Kings ?
I charge thee, then ; and you forsooth, Sir Boy,
To set your grandmother at liberty,
And yield to *John*, your uncle and your King.
Constance. 'Tis not thy words, proud Queen, shall carry it.
Elianor. Nor yet thy threats, proud dame, shall daunt my mind.
Arthur. Sweet Grandam, and good Mother, leave these brawls !
Elianor. I'll find a time to triumph 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 Queen *Elianor.*
Though she be captive, use her like herself.
Sweet Grandam, bear with what my mother says.
Your Highness shall be used honourably.

Enter a MESSENGER

Mess. *Lewes* my lord, Duke *Arthur*, and the rest,
To arms in haste, King *John* rallies his men,
And 'gins the fight afresh ; and swears withal
To lose his life, or set his mother free.
Lewes. *Arthur*, away, 'tis time to look about.
Elianor. Why how now, dame ? What, is your courage cool'd ?
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.*

[SCENE VIII.]

Excursion. ELINOR *is rescued by* K. JOHN, *and* ARTHUR *is taken prisoner. Exeunt. Sound victory.*

[SCENE IX.]

Enter K. JOHN, Q. ELINOR, *and* ARTHUR *prisoner ;* BASTARD, PEMBROOKE, SALISBURY *and* HUBERT DE BURGH.

John. Thus right triúmphs, and *John* triúmphs in right.
Arthur, thou seest *Fraunce* cannot bolster thee :
Thy mother's pride hath brought thee to this fall.
But if at last, nephew, thou yield thyself
Into the guardance of thine uncle *John*,
Thou shalt be used as becomes a Prince.
Arthur. Uncle, my grandame taught her nephew this,
To bear captivity with patience.
Might hath prevail'd, not right, for I am King
Of *England*, though thou wear the diadem,
Elianor. Son *John*, soon shall we teach him to forget
These proud presumptions, and to know himself.

John. Mother, he never will forget his claim ;
I would he liv'd 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 laymen's lands.
Philip, I make thee chief in this affair.
Ransack the abbeys, cloisters, priories ;
Convert their coin unto my soldiers' use :
And whatsoe'er he be within my land,
That goes to *Rome* for justice and for law,
While he may have his right within the realm,
Let him be judg'd a traitor to the state,
And suffer as an enemy to *England*.
Mother, we leave you here beyond the seas,
As Regent of our Provinces in *Fraunce*,
While we to *England* take a speedy course,
And thank our God that gave us victory.
Hubert de Burgh, take *Arthur* here to thee ;
Be he thy prisoner. *Hubert*, keep him safe,
For on his life doth hang thy Sovereign's crown ;
But in his death consists thy Sovereign's bliss ;
Then *Hubert*, as thou shortly hear'st from me,
So use the prisoner I have given in charge.
Hubert. Frolic, young prince, though I your keeper be,
Yet shall your keeper live at your command.
Arthur. As please my God, so shall become of me.
Q. Elianor. My son, to *England* I will see thee shipt,
And pray to God to send thee safe ashore.
Bastard. Now wars are done, I long to be at home,
To dive into the monks' and abbots' bags,
To make some sport among the smooth-skin nuns,
And keep some revel with the fausen friars.
John. To *England*, lords, Each look unto your charge,
And arm yourselves against the Roman pride. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE X.]

Enter the KING OF FRAUNCE, LEWES *his son, and* CARDINAL PANDULPH, *Legate, and* CONSTANCE.

Philip. What, every man attacht with this mishap ?
Why frown you so, why droop ye, lords of *Fraunce ?*
Methinks it differs from a warlike mind
To lower it for a check or two of chance.
Had *Limoges* escap'd the Bastard's spite,
A little sorrow might have serv'd our loss.
Brave *Austria*, Heaven joys to have thee there.
Card. His soul is safe and free from Purgatory ;
Our Holy Father hath dispenst his sins ;
The blessed saints have heard our orisons,
And all are mediators for his soul.
And in the right of these most holy wars,

His Holiness free pardon doth pronounce
To all that follow you 'gainst English heretics,
Who stand accursed in our Mother Church.

Enter CONSTANCE *alone.*

Philip. To aggravate the measure of our grief,
All malcontent, comes *Constance* for her son.
Be brief, good madam, for your face imports
A tragic tale behind, that's yet untold.
Her passions stop the organ of her voice,
Deep sorrow throbbeth misbefall'n events.
Out with it, lady, that our act may end
A full catastrophe of sad laments.

Constance. My tongue is tun'd to story forth mishap.
When did I breathe to tell a pleasing tale?
Must *Constance* speak: Let tears prevent her talk.
Must I discourse? Let *Dido* sigh, and say,
She weeps again to hear the wrack of *Troy:*
Two words will serve, and then my tale is done:
El'nor's proud brat hath robb'd me of my son.

Lewes. Have patience, madam, this is chance of war:
He may be ransom'd; we revenge his wrong.

Constance. Be it ne'er so soon, I shall not live so long.

Philip. Despair not yet, come, *Constance,* go with me,
These clouds will fleet; the day will clear again. [*Exeunt.*

Card. Now, *Lewes,* thy fortune buds with happy spring;
Our Holy Father's prayers effecteth this.
Arthur is safe; let *John* alone with him;
Thy title next is fair'st to *England's* crown.
Now stir thy father to begin with *John;*
The Pope says Ay; and so is *Albion* thine.

Lewes. Thanks, my lord legate, for your good conceit;
'Tis best we follow, now the game is fair.
My father wants, to work him, your good words.

Card. A few will serve to forward him in this;
Those shall not want: but let's about it then. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE XI.]

Enter PHILIP *leading a* Friar, *charging him to show where the* Abbot's *gold lay.*

Philip. Come on, you fat Franciscans, dally no longer, but show me where the Abbot's treasure lies, or die.

Friar. Benedicamus Domini!
Was ever such an injury!
Sweet Saint *Withold,* of thy lenity,
Defend us from extremity,
And hear us for Saint *Charity,*
Oppressed with austerity.
In nomine Domini,
Make I my homily;
Gentle gentility,

Grieve not the clergy.
Philip. Grey-gown'd good-face, conjure ye, ne'er trust me for a groat,
If this waist-girdle hang thee not, that girdeth-in thy coat.
Now, bald and barefoot *Bungie* birds, when up the gallows climbing,
Say, *Philip*, he had words enough to put you down with ryming.
Friar. Ah, pardon ! *O parce !*
Saint *Fraunces*, for mercy,
Shall shield thee from night-spells
And dreaming of devils,
If thou wilt forgive me,
And nevermore grieve me :
With fasting and praying,
And 'Hail-Mary' saying,
From black purgatory,
A penance right sorry,
Friar *Thomas* will warn you ;
It never shall harm you.
Philip. Come, leave off your rabble !
Sirs, hang up this losel.
Friar. For Charity I beg his life, Saint *Frauncis'* chiefest friar,
The best in all our convent, sir, to keep a winter's fire.
Oh, strangle not the good old man, my hostess' oldest guest,
And I will bring you by and by unto the Prior's chest.
Philip. Ay, say'st thou so, and if thou wilt, the friar is at liberty ;
If not, as I am honest man, I'll hang you both for company.
Friar. Come hither, this is the chest, though simple to behold,
That wanteth not a thousand pound in silver and in gold.
Myself will warrant full so much ; I know the Abbot's store ;
I'll pawn my life there is no less, to have whate'er is more.
Philip. 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.
Break up the coffer, friar !
Friar. Oh, I am undone !
Fair *Alice* the nun
Hath took up her rest
In the Abbot's chest.
Sancte benedicite !
Pardon my simplicity.
Fie, *Alice !* Confession
Will not salve this transgression.
Philip. What have we here, a holy nun? so keep me, God, in health,
A smooth-fac'd nun, for aught I know, is all the Abbot's wealth.
Is this the nunnery's chastity ? Beshrew me, but I think
They go as oft to venery, as niggards to their drink.
Why, paltry friar, and pandar too, ye shameless shaven-crown,
Is this the chest that held a hoard, at least a thousand pound ?
And is the hoard a holy whore ? Well, be the hangman nimble,
He'll take the pain to pay you home, and teach you to dissemble.
Nun. O, spare the Friar *Anthony*, a better never was,
To sing a Dirige solemnly, or read a morning Mass.

If money be the means of this, I know an ancient nun,
That hath a hoard this seven years, did never see the sun ;
And that is yours : and what is ours, so favour now be shown,
You shall command as commonly as if it were your own.
Friar. Your honour excepted.
Nun. Ay, *Thomas*, I mean so.
Philip. From all, save from friars.
Nun. Good sir, do not think so.
Philip. I think, and see so : why, how cam'st thou here ?
Friar. To hide her from laymen.
Nun. 'Tis true, sir, for fear.
Philip. For fear of the laity : a pitiful dread,
When a nun flies for succour to a fat friar's bed !
But now for your ransom, my cloister-bred coney,
To the chest that you speak of, where lies so much money.
Nun. Fair sir, within this press, of plate and money is
The value of a thousand marks, and other things, by Gis.
Let us alone, and take it all ; 'tis yours, sir, now you know it.
Philip. Come on, sir Friar, pick the lock, this gear doth cotton handsome,
That covetousness so cunningly must pay the lecher's ransom.
What is in the hoard ?
Friar. Friar *Laurence*, my lord, now holy water help us,
Some witch or some devil is sent to delude us :
Haud credo Laurentius,
That thou should'st be pen'd thus,
In the press of a nun ;
We are all undone,
And brought to discredence,
If thou be Friar *Laurence.*
Friar. Amor vincit omnia, so *Cato* affirmeth ;
And therefore a friar, whose fancy soon burneth,
Because he is mortal and made of mould,
He omits what he ought, and doth more than he should.
Philip. How goes this gear : the friar's chest filled with a fausen nun ;
The nun again locks friar up, to keep him from the sun.
Belike the press is purgatory, or penance passing grievous,
The friar's chest a hell for nuns. How do these dolts deceive us ?
Is this the labour of their lives, to feed and live at ease ?
To revel so lasciviously as often as they please.
I'll mend the fault, or fault my aim, if I do miss amending ;
'Tis better burn the cloisters down, than leave them for offending.
But holy you, to you I speak, to you, religious devil,
Is this the press that holds the sum to quit you for your evil ?
Nun. I cry *peccavi, parce me*, good sir, I was beguil'd
Friar. Absolve, sir, for charity she would be reconcil'd.
Philip. And so I shall. Sirs, bind them fast, this is their absolution ;
Go hang them up for hurting them, haste them to execution.
Friar Laurence. O tempus edax rerum !
Give children books, they tear them.
O vanitas vanitatis,

In this waning *ætatis*,
At threescore well near,
To go to this gear,
To my conscience a clog,
To die like a dog.
Exaudi me, Domine,
Si vis me parcere
Si habeo veniam.
To go and fetch it,
I will despatch it,
A hundred pound sterling
For my life's sparing.

Enter PETER, *a Prophet, with* people.

Peter. Ho, who is here? Saint *Fraunces* be your speed,
Come in my flock, and follow me; your fortunes I will rede.
Come hither, boy, go, get thee home, and climb not overhigh:
For from aloft, thy fortune 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,
Bless thee, my boy, for in thy palm I see
A many troubles are ybent to dwell,
But thou shalt 'scape them all, and do full well.

Boy. I thank you, *Peter*. There's a cheese for your labour. My sister prays you to come home, and tell her how many husbands she shall have, and she'll give you a rib of bacon.

Peter. My masters, stay at the town's end for me, I'll come to you all anon: I must dispatch some business with a friar, and then I'll rede your fortunes.

Philip. 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.

Philip. Sir, I know you will be a dissembling knave, that deludes the people with blind prophecies: you are him I look for; you shall away with me. Bring away all the rabble, And you, friar *Laurence*, remember your ransome, a hundred pounds, and a pardon for yourself and the rest. Come on, Sir Prophet, you shall with me, to receive a prophet's reward.

[*Exeunt.*

[SCENE XII.]

Enter HUBERT DE BURGH, *with three* Men.

Hubert. My masters, I have showed you what warrant I have for this attempt; I perceive, by your heavy countenances, you had rather be otherwise employed; and for my own part, I would the King had made choice of some other executioner; only this is my comfort, that a King commands, whose precepts neglected or omitted, threateneth torture for the default. Therefore in brief, leave me, and be ready to attend the adventure; stay within that entry; and when you hear me cry, 'God save the King,' issue suddenly forth, lay hands on *Arthur*, set him in this chair,

wherein (once fast bound) leave him with me, to finish the rest.
Attendants. We go, though loth. [*Exeunt.*
Hubert. My lord, will it please your Honour to take the benefice of the fair evening ?

Enter ARTHUR *to* HUBERT DE BURGH.

Arthur. Gramercie, *Hubert*, for thy care of me !
In or to whom restraint is newly known,
The joy of walking is small benefit ;
Yet will I take thy offer with small thanks ;
I would not lose the pleasure of the eye.
But tell me, courteous keeper, if you can,
How long the King will have me tarry here.
Hubert. I know not, Prince ; but as I guess, not long.
God send you freedom, and *God save the King,* [*They issue forth.*]
Arthur. Why, how now, sirs, What may this outrage mean ?
Oh, help me, *Hubert*, gentle keeper, help,
God send this sudden mutinous approach
Tend not to reave a wretched guiltless life.
Hubert. So, sirs, depart, and leave the rest for me.
Arthur. Then, *Arthur*, yield, Death frowneth in thy face.
What meaneth this ? Good *Hubert*, plead the case.
Hubert. Patience, young lord, and listen words of woe,
Harmful and harsh, hell's horror to be heard ;
A dismal tale, fit for a fury's tongue.
I faint to tell ; deep sorrow is the sound.
Arthur. What, must I die ?
Hubert. No news of death, but tidings of more hate ;
A wrathful doom, and most unlucky fate :
Death's dish were dainty at so fell a feast ;
Be deaf, hear not, it's hell to tell the rest.
Arthur. Alas, thou wrong'st my youth with words of fear ;
'Tis hell, 'tis horror, not for one to hear :
What is it, man. If it must needs be done,
Act it, and end it, that the pain were gone.
Hubert. I will not chant such dolour with my tongue,
Yet must I act the outrage with my hand.
My heart, my head, and all my powers beside,
To aid the office, have at once denied.
Peruse this letter, lines of treble woe ;
Read o'er my charge, and pardon when you know.
Hubert, These are to command thee, as thou tend'rest our quiet in mind, and the estate of our person, that presently upon the receipt of our command, thou put out the eyes of *Arthur Plantagenet.*
Arthur. Ah, monstrous damned man,
His very breath infects the elements ;
Contagious venom dwelleth in his heart,
Effecting means to poison all the world.
Unreverent may I be to blame the heavens
Of great injustice, that the miscreant
Lives to oppress the innocents with wrong.

Ah, *Hubert*, makes he thee his instrument
To sound the trump that causeth hell triumph :
Heaven weeps ; the saints do shed celestial tears ;
They fear thy fall, and cite thee with remorse ;
They knock thy conscience, moving pity 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 deed.
This seal, the warrant of the body's bliss,
Ensureth Satan chieftain of thy soul :
Subscrbe not, *Hubert*, give not God's part away.
I speak not only for eyes' privilege,—
The chief exterior that I would enjoy,—
But for thy peril, far beyond my pain,
Thy sweet soul's loss, more than my eyes' vain lack ;
A cause internal, and eternal too.
Advise thee, *Hubert*, for the case is hard,
To lose salvation for a King's reward.
Hubert. My lord, a subject dwelling in the land
Is tied to execute the King's command.
Arthur. Yet God's commands, whose power reacheth further,
That no command should stand in force to murther.
Hubert. But that same Essence hath ordain'd a law,
A death for guilt, to keep the world in awe.
Arthur. I plead not guilty, treasonless and free.
Hubert. But that appeal, my lord, concerns not me.
Arthur. Why, thou art he that may'st omit the peril.
Hubert. Ay, if my sovereign would remit his quarrel.
Arthur. His quarrel is unhallow'd, false, and wrong.
Hubert. Then be the blame to whom it doth belong.
Arthur. Why, that's to thee, if thou, as they proceed,
Conclude their judgment with so vile a deed.
Hubert. Why, then, no execution can be lawful,
If judges' dooms must be reputed doubtful.
Arthur. Yes, where, in form of law, in place and time,
The offender is convicted of the crime.
Hubert. My lord, my lord, this long expostulation
Heaps up more grief, than promise of redress ;
For this I know, and so resolv'd I end,
That subjects' lives, on King's commands depend.
I must not reason why he is your foe,
But do his charge, since he commands it so.
Arthur. Then do thy charge, and charged be thy soul
With wrongful persecution done this day.
You rolling eyes, whose superficies yet
I do behold with eyes that Nature lent,
Send forth the terror of your mover's frown,
To wreak my wrong upon the murderers
That rob me of your fair reflecting view :
Let Hell to them (as earth they wish to me)

Be dark and direful guerdon for their guilt ;
And let the black tormentors of deep *Tartary*
Upbraid them with this damned enterprise,
Inflicting change of tortures on their souls.
Delay not, *Hubert*, my orisons are ended :
Begin, I pray thee ; reave me of my sight :
But, to perform a tragedy indeed,
Conclude the period with a mortal stab.
Constance, farewell. Tormentor, come away ;
Make my dispatch the tyrant's feasting day.
Hubert. I faint, I fear ; my conscience bids desist
Faint, did I say ? Fear was it that I named ?
My King commands ; that warrant sets me free ;
But God forbids ; and He commandeth kings,
That great Commander counterchecks my charge ;
He stays my hand ; He maketh soft my heart.
Go, cursed tools, your office is exempt.
Cheer thee, young lord, thou shalt not lose an eye,
Though I should purchase it with loss of life.
I'll to the King, and say his will is done,
And, of the langor, tell him thou art dead.
Go in with me ; for *Hubert* was not born
To blind those lamps that Nature polisht so.
Arthur. *Hubert*, if ever *Arthur* be in state,
Look for amends of this received gift.
I took my eyesight by thy curtesy ;
Thou lent'st them me ; I will not be ingrate.
But now procrastination may offend
The issue that thy kindness undertakes :
Depart we, *Hubert*, to prevent the worst. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE XIII.]

Enter KING JOHN, ESSEX, SALISBURY, PEMBROOKE.

John. Now, warlike followers, resteth aught undone
That may impeach us of fond oversight ?
The French have felt the temper of our swords ;
Cold terror keeps possession in their souls,
Checking their overdaring arrogance
For buckling with so great an overmatch,
The arch-proud titled Priest of *Italy*,
That calls himself Grand Vicar under God,
Is busied now with trental obsequies,
Mass and month's-mind, dirge, and I know not what,
To ease their souls in painful purgatory,
That have miscarried in these bloody wars.
Heard you not, lords, when first his Holiness
Had tidings of our small account of him,
How, with a taunt, vaunting upon his toes,
He urged a reason why the English ass
Disdain'd the blessed ordinance of Rome ?

The title (reverently might I infer,)
Became the kings that erst have borne the load,
The slavish weight of that controlling Priest,
Who, at his pleasure, temper'd them like wax,
To carry arms, on danger of his curse,
Banding their souls with warrants of his hand.
I grieve to think how kings in ages past
(Simply devoted to the See of *Rome*),
Have run into a thousand acts of shame.
But now, for confirmation of our state,
Sith we have prun'd the more than needful branch
That did oppress the true well-growing stock,
It resteth, we, throughout our territories,
Be reproclaimed and invested King.

Pembrook. My liege, that were to busy men with doubts.
Once were you crown'd, proclaim'd, and with applause
Your city streets have echo'd to the ear,
God save the King, God save our sovereign John,
Pardon my fear, my censure doth infer,
Your Highness not depos'd from regal state,
Would breed a mutiny in people's minds,
What it should mean, to have you crown'd again.

John. Pembrooke, perform What I have bid thee do,
Thou know'st not What induceth me to this,
Essex, go in, and lordings all, be gone
About this task, I will be crown'd anon.

Enter the BASTARD.

Philip, what news, how do the Abbots' chests ?
Are friars fatter than the nuns are fair ?
What cheer with churchmen ? had they gold, or no ?
Tell me, how hath thy office took effect ?

Philip. My lord, I have perform'd your Highness' charge ;
The ease-bred Abbots and the bare-foot friars,
The monks, the priors, and holy cloister'd nuns,
Are all in health, and were, my lord, in wealth,
Till I had tithed and toll'd their holy hoards.
I doubt not, when your Highness 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 trunks
Will make the Popelings excommunicate,
Curse, ban, and breathe out damned orisons
As thick as hailstones 'fore the spring's approach,
But yet as harmless and without effect,
As is the echo of a cannon's crack
Discharg'd against the battlements of heaven.
But what news else befel there, *Philip ?*

Bastard. Strange news, my lord : within your territories,
Near *Pomfret*, is a prophet new sprung up,
Whose divination volleys wonders forth :

To him the Commons throng with country gifts ;
He sets a date unto the beldame's death,
Prescribes how long the virgin's state shall last,
Distinguisheth the moving of the heavens,
Gives limits unto holy nuptial rites,
Foretelleth famine, aboundeth plenty forth.
Of fate, of fortune, life and death, he chats
With such assurance, scruples put apart,
As if he knew the certain dooms of Heaven,
Or kept a register of all the Destinies.
John. Thou tell'st me marvels ; would thou had'st brought the man.
We might have question'd him of things to come.
Bastard. My lord, I took a care of had-I-wist,
And brought the prophet with me to the court ;
He stays, my lord, but at the presence door :
Pleaseth your Highness, I will call him in.
John. Nay, stay awhile ; we'll have him here anon ;
A thing of weight is first to be perform'd.

Enter the Nobles, and crown KING JOHN, and *then cry 'God save the King!'*
John. Lordings, and friends, supporters of our state,
Admire not at this unaccustom'd course,
Nor in your thoughts blame not this deed of yours.
Once ere this time was I invested King,
Your fealty sworn as liegmen to our state :
Once since that time, ambitious weeds have sprung
To stain the beauty of our garden-plot ;
But Heavens, in our conduct,—rooting thence
The false intruders, breakers of world's peace,—
Have, to our joy, made sunshine chase the storm.
After the which, to try your constancy,
That now I see is worthy of your names,
We crav'd once more your helps for to invest us
Into the right that envy sought to wrack.
Once was I not depos'd, your former choice,
Now twice been crowned, and applauded King ?
Your cheered action to install me so,
Infers assured witness of your loves,
And binds me over, in a kingly care,
To render love with love, rewards of worth
To balance down requital to the full.
But thanks the while ; thanks, lordings, to you all :
Ask me and use me ; try me, and find me yours.
Essex. A boon, my lord, at vantage of your words,
We ask, to guerdon all our loyalties.
Pembrooke. We take the time your Highness bids us ask.
Please it you grant, you make your promise good,
With lesser loss than one superfluous hair
That not remember'd falleth from your head.
John. My word is pass'd ; receive your boon, my lords.

What may it be? Ask it, and it is yours.
Essex. We crave, my lord, to please the Commons with,
The liberty of Lady *Constance* son,
Whose durance darkeneth your Highness' right,
As if you kept him prisoner, to the end
Yourself were doubtful of the thing you have.
Dismiss him thence; your Highness needs not fear;
Twice by consent you are proclaim'd our King.
Pembrooke. This, if you grant, were all unto your good;
For simple people muse you keep him close.
John. Your words have searcht the centre of my thoughts,
Confirming warrant of your loyalties,
Dismiss your counsel; sway my state;
Let *John* do nothing but by your consents.
Why, how now, *Philip*, what ecstacy is this?
Why casts thou up thy eyes to heaven so? [*There the five moons appear.*
Bastard. See, see, my lord, strange apparitions,
Glancing mine eye to see the diadem
Placed by the bishops on your Highness' head,
From forth a gloomy cloud, which, curtain-like
Display'd itself, I suddenly espied
Five moons reflecting, as you see them now:
Even in the moment that the crown was plac'd,
Gan they appear, holding the course you see.
John. What might portend these apparitions,
Unusual signs, forerunners of event,
Presagers of strange terror to the world?
Believe me, Lords, the object fears me much.
Philip, thou told'st me of a wizard late:
Fetch in the man to descant of this show.
Pembrooke. The Heavens frown upon the sinful earth,
When, with prodigious unaccustom'd signs,
They spot their superficies with such wonder.
Essex. Before the ruins of *Jerusalem*,
Such meteors were the ensigns of His wrath
That hast'ned to destroy the faultful town.

Enter the BASTARD, *with the Prophet.*

John. Is this the man?
Bastard. It is, my lord.
John. Prophet of *Pomfret*, for so I hear thou art,
That calculat'st of many things to come;
Who, by a power replete with heavenly gift,
Can'st blab the counsel of thy Maker's Will:
If fame be true, or truth be wrong'd by thee,
Decide in cyphering, what these five moons
Portend this clime, if they presage at all.
Breathe out thy gift, and if I live to see
Thy divination take a true effect,
I'll honour thee above all earthly men.

Peter. The sky wherein these moons have residence,
Presenteth *Rome*, the great Metropolis,
Where sits the Pope in all his holy pomp,
Four of the moons present four provinces,
To wit, *Spain*, *Denmark*, *Germany*, and *France*,
That bear the yoke of proud commanding *Rome*,
And stand in fear to tempt the Prelate's curse.
The smallest moon that whirls about the rest,
Impatient of the place he holds with them,
Doth figure forth this Island, *Albion*,
Who 'gins to scorn the See and the State of *Rome*,
And seeks to shun the edicts of the Pope :
This shows the heaven ; and this, I do aver,
Is figur'd in these apparitions.
John. Why, then it seems the Heavens smile on us,
Giving applause for leaving of the Pope,
But, for they chance in our Meridian,
Do they effect no private growing ill
To be inflicted on us in this clime ?
Peter. The moons effect no more than what I said ;
But, on some other knowledge that I have
By my prescience, ere Ascension Day
Have brought the sun unto his usual height,
Of crown, estate and royal dignity,
Thou shalt be clean despoil'd and dispossest.
John. False dreamer, perish with thy witched news.
Villain, thou wound'st me with thy fallacies.
If it be true, die for thy tidings' price ;
If false, for fearing me with vain suppose.
Hence with the witch, hell's damned secretary :
Lock him up sure : for by my faith I swear,
True or not true, the wizard shall not live.
Before Ascension Day ? Who should be cause hereof ?
Cut off the cause, and then the effect will die.
Tut, tut, my mercy serves to maim myself ;
The root doth live, from whence these thorns spring up ;
Ay, and my promise pass'd for his delivery :
Frown friends, fail faith, the devil go withal ;
The brat shall die that terrifies me thus.
Pembrooke and *Essex*, I recall my grant ;
I will not buy your favours with my fear ;
Nay, murmur not, my will is law enough ;
I love you well ; but if I lov'd you better,
I would not buy it with my discontent.

Enter HUBERT.

How, now ? what news with thee ?
Hubert. According to your Highness' strict command,
Young *Arthur's* eyes are blinded and extinct.
John. Why, so ?
Then he may feel the crown, but never see it.

Hubert. Nor see nor feel; for, of the extreme pain,
Within one hour gave he up the ghost.
John. What is he dead?
Hubert. He is, my lord.
John. Then with him die my cares.
Essex. Now joy betide thy soul.
Pembrooke. And Heavens revenge thy death.
Essex. What have you done, my lord? Was ever heard
A deed of more inhuman consequence?
Your foes will curse, your friends will cry revenge.
Unkindly rage, more rough than northern wind,
To chip the beauty of so sweet a flower.
What hope in us for mercy on a fault,
When kinsman dies without impeach of cause,
As you have done, so come to cheer you with;
The guilt shall never be cast me in my teeth. [*Exeunt.*]
John. And are you gone? The devil be your guide:
Proud rebels as you are, to brave me so;
Saucy, uncivil, checkers of my will.
Your tongues give edge unto the fatal knife
That shall have passage through your traitorous throats.
But husht, breathe not bug's words too soon abroad,
Lest time prevent the issue of thy reach.
Arthur is dead; ay, there the corsie grows:
But while he liv'd, the danger was the more;
His death hath freed me from a thousand fears,
But it hath purchast me ten times ten thousand foes.
Why, all is one, such luck shall haunt his game,
To whom the devil owes an open shame:
His life, a foe that levell'd at my crown;
His death, a frame to pull my building down.
My thoughts harp still on quiet by his end,
Who, living, aimed shrewdly at my room:
But, to prevent that plea, twice was I crown'd;
Twice did my subjects swear me fealty,
And, in my conscience, lov'd me as their liege,
In whose defence they would have pawn'd their lives.
But now, they shun me as a serpent's sting,
A tragic tyrant, stern and pitiless,
And not a title follows after *John*,
But butcher, bloodsucker, and murderer,
What planet govern'd my nativity,
To bode me sovereign types of high estate,
So interlac'd with hellish discontent,
Wherein fell fury hath no interest?
Curst be the crown, chief author of my care,
Nay, curst my will, that made the crown my care:
Curst be my birthday, curst ten times the womb
That yielded me alive unto the world.
Art thou there, villain, furies haunt thee still,

For killing him whom all the world laments.
Hubert. Why, here's my lord, your Highness hand and seal,
Charging, on life's regard, to do the deed.
John. Ah, dull conceited peasant, know'st thou not,
It was a damned, execrable deed ?
Show'st me a seal ? Oh, villain ! both our souls
Have sold their freedom to the thrall of hell,
Under the warrant of that cursed seal.
Hence, villain, hang thyself, and say in hell,
That I am coming for a kingdom there.
Hubert. My lord, attend the happy tale I tell !
For Heaven's health, send Satan packing hence,
That instigates your Highness to despair.
If *Arthur's* death be dismal to be heard,
Bandy the news for rumours of untruth:
He lives, my lord, the sweetest youth alive ;
In health, with eyesight, not a hair amiss.
This heart took vigor from this forward hand,
Making it weak to execute your charge.
John. What lives he ? Then, sweet hope, come home again,
Chase hence despair, the purveyor for hell.
Hie, *Hubert*, tell these tidings to my lords,
That throb in passions for young *Arthurs* death.
Hence, *Hubert*, stay not till thou hast reveal'd
The wished news of *Arthurs* happy health.
I go myself, the joyfull'st man alive,
To story out this new supposed crime. [*Exeunt.*

The End of the First Part

THE

SECOND PART OF THE

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

As it was (sundry times) publicly acted by the Queen's Majesty's Players, in the honourable City of London.

[Device]

Imprinted at London for *Sampson Clarke*, *and are to be sold at his shop, on the back*-side of the *Royal Exchange*.

1591.

TO THE GENTLMEN READERS

The changeless purpose of determin'd Fate
  Gives period to our care, or heart's content,
When Heaven's fixt time for this or that hath end ;
  Nor can earth's pomp or policy prevent
The doom ordained in their secret will.
  Gentles we left King *John* replete with bliss
That *Arthur* liv'd, whom he supposed slain,
And *Hubert* posting to return those lords
Who deem'd him dead, and parted discontent.
Arthur himself begins our latter act,
Our act of outrage, desp'rate fury, death,
Wherein fond rashness murd'reth first a Prince,
And monkish falseness poisoneth last a King.
First scene shows *Arthurs* death in infancy,
And last concludes *Johns* fatal tragedy.

The second part of the troublesome Raigne of King John, containing the entraunce of Lewes the French Kings sonne: with the poysoning of King Iohn by a Monke.

[SCENE I.]

Enter young ARTHUR *on the walls.*

Now help, good hap, to further mine intent,
Cross not my youth with any more extremes,
I venture life, to gain my liberty ;
And if I die, worlds troubles have an end.
Fear 'gins dissuade the strength of my resolve ;
My hold will fail, 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 again to me :
Ill venture, sure ; 'tis but a leap for life.
[*He leaps, and bruising his bones, after he was from his traunce, speaks thus :*
Ho, who is nigh ? somebody take me up.
Where is my mother ? let me speak with her.
Who hurts me thus ? Speak, ho, where are you gone ?
Ah me, poor *Arthur*, I am here alone.
Why call'd I Mother ? how did I forget ?
My fall, my fall, hath kill'd my mother's son.
How will she weep at tidings of my death !
My death indeed, O God, my bones are burst.
Sweet Jesu, save my soul ; forgive my rash attempt ;
Comfort my mother ; shield her from despair
When she shall hear my tragic overthrow.
My heart controls the office of my tongue ;
My vital powers forsake my bruised trunk ;
I die, I die, Heaven take my fleeting soul,
And lady mother, all good hap to thee. [*He dies.*

Enter PENBROOKE, SALISBURY, ESSEX.

Essex. My lords of *Penbroke* and of *Salsbury*,
We must be careful in our policy
To undermine the keepers of this place,
Else shall we never find the Princes grave.
Penbrooke. My lord of *Essex*, take no care for that :
I warrant you it was not closely done.
But who is this ? Lo, lords, the wither'd flower,
Who, in his life, shin'd like the morning's blush,
Cast out o' door, denied his burial rite,
A prey for birds and beasts to gorge upon.
Salisbury. O ruthful spectacle, O damned deed;
My sinews shake ; my very heart doth bleed.

Essex. Leave childish tears, brave lords of *England.*
If waterfloods could fetch his life again,
My eyes should conduit forth a sea of tears ;
If sobs would help, or sorrows serve the turn,
My heart should volley out deep piercing plaints ;
But bootless were't to breathe as many sighs
As might eclipse the brightest summer's sun.
Here rests the help, a service to his ghost :
Let not the tyrant causer of this dole,
Live to triumph in ruthful massacres,
Give hand and heart, and Englishmen, to arms,
'Tis God's decree to wreak us of these harms.
Penbroke. The best advice. But who comes posting here.

Enter HUBERT.

Right noble lords, I speak unto you all :
The King entreats your soonest speed
To visit him, who, on your present want,
Did ban and curse his birth, himself, and me,
For executing of his strict command.
I saw his passion, and, at fittest time,
Assur'd him of his cousin's being safe,
Whom pity would not let me do to death.
He craves your company, my lords, in haste,
To whom I will conduct young *Arthur* straight,
Who is in health, under my custody.
Essex. In health, base villain, were't not I leave thy crime
To God's revenge, to whom revenge belongs,
Here should'st thou perish on my rapier's point.
Call'st thou this health ? such health betide thy friends,
And all that are of thy condition.
Hubert. My lords, but hear me speak ; and kill me then.
If here I left not this young Prince alive,—
Maugre the hasty edict of the King,
Who gave me charge to put out both his eyes,—
That God that gave me living to this hour,
Thunder revenge upon me in this place !
And as I tender'd him with earnest love,
So God love me, and then I shall be well.
Salsbury. Hence, traitor, hence ? thy counsel is herein. [*Exit* HUBERT.
Some in this place, appointed by the King,
Have thrown him from this lodging here above ;
And sure the murder hath been newly done,
For yet the body is not fully cold.
Essex. How say you, lords, shall we with speed dispatch,
Under our hands, a packet into *Fraunce,*
To bid the Dolphin enter with his force,
To claim the kingdom for his proper right,
His title maketh lawful strength thereto.
Besides, the Pope, on peril of his curse,

Hath barr'd us of obedience unto *John*.
This hateful murder, *Lewes* his true descent,
The holy charge that we receiv'd from *Rome*,
Are weighty reasons, if you like my rede,
To make us all persever in this deed.
Pembrooke. My lord of *Essex*, well have you advis'd :
I will accord to further you in this.
Salisbury. And *Salisbury* will not gainsay the same,
But aid that course as far forth as he can.
Essex. Then each of us send straight to his allies,
To win them to this famous enterprise ;
And let us all, yclad in palmer's weed,
The tenth of April, at Saint *Edmunds Bury*,
Meet to confer, and on the altar there
Swear secrecy, and aid to this advice.
Meanwhile, let us convey this body hence,
And give him burial, as befits his state,
Keeping his month's-mind and his obsequies,
With solemn intercession for his soul.
How say you lordings, are you all agreed ?
Pembrooke. The tenth of April, at Saint *Edmunds Bury :*
God letting not, I will not fail 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, signs of growing harms,
Strange prophecies of imminent mishaps,
Confound my wits, and dull my senses so,
That every object these mine eyes behold,
Seem instruments to bring me to my end.
Ascension Day is come. *John*, fear not then
The prodigies this pratling Prophet threats
'Tis come indeed : ah, were it fully past,
Then were I careless of a thousand fears,
The dial tells me it is twelve at noon :
Were twelve at midnight past, then might I vaunt
False seers prophecies of no import.
Could I as well, with this right hand of mine,
Remove the sun from our meridian,
Unto the moonstead circle of th' Antipodes,
As turn this steel from twelve to twelve again,
Then, *John*, the date of fatal prophecies
Should, with the Prophet's life together end.
But *Multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra.*
Peter, unsay thy foolish doting dream,
And, by the crown of *England*, here I swear,
To make thee great, and greatest of thy kin.
Peter. King *John*, although the time I have prescrib'd

Be but twelve hours remaining yet behind,
Yet do I know by inspiration,
Ere that fixt time be fully come about,
King *John* shall not be King as heretofore.
John. Vain buzzard, what mischance can chance so soon,
To set a King beside his regal seat?
My heart is good, my body passing strong,
My land in peace, my enemies subdu'd;
Only my barons storm at *Arthurs* death,
But *Arthur* lives. Ay, there the challenge grows.
Were he despatch'd unto his longest home,
Then were the King secure of thousand foes.
Hubert, what news with thee, where are my lords?
Hubert. Hard news, my lord: *Arthur*, the lovely Prince,
Seeking to escape over the castle walls,
Fell headlong down; and, in the cursed fall,
He brake his bones; and there before the gate
Your Barons found him dead, and breathless quite.
John. Is *Arthur* dead? then, *Hubert*, without more words, hang the Prophet.
Away with *Peter*. Villain, out of my sight,
I am deaf, be gone, let him not speak a word.
Now, *John*, thy fears are vanisht into smoke;
Arthur is dead; thou, guiltless of his death.
Sweet youth, but that I strived for a crown,
I could have well afforded to thine age
Long life, and happiness to thy content.

Enter the BASTARD.

John. Philip, what news with thee?
Bastard. The news 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 spite of prophecies.
But what's the tidings from the Popelings now.
What say the monks and priests to our proceedings?
Or where's the barons, that so suddenly
Did leave the King upon a false surmise?
Bastard. The prelates storm, and thirst for sharp revenge.
But, please your Majesty, were that the worst,
It little skill'd: a greater danger grows,
Which must be weeded out by careful speed,
Or all is lost, for all is levell'd at.
John. More frights and fears, whate'er thy tidings be,
I am prepar'd: then, *Philip*, quickly say,
Mean they to murder, or imprison me,
To give my crown away to *Rome* or *Fraunce;*
Or will they, each of them, become a king?
Worse than I think it is, it cannot be.

Bastard. Not worse, my lord, but every whit as bad.
The nobles have elected *Lewes* king,
In right of Lady *Blanche*, your niece, his wife ;
His landing is expected every hour,
The nobles, commons, clergy, all estates,
Incited chiefly by the *Cardinal*,
Pandulph, that lives here Legate for the Pope,
Thinks long to see their new-elected king.
And, for undoubted proof, see here, my liege,
Letters to me from your nobility,
To be a party in this action ;
Who, under show of feigned holiness,
Appoint their meeting at *Saint Edmunds Bury*,
There to consult, conspire, and conclude
The overthrow and downfall of your state.
John. Why, so it must be : One hour of content
Matcht with a month of passionate effects.
Why shines the sun to favour this consort ?
Why do the winds not break their brazen gates,
And scatter all these perjur'd complices,
With all their counsels and their damned drifts ?
But see the welkin rolleth gently on ;
There's not a louring cloud to frown on them ;
The heaven, the earth, the sun, the moon, 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 poison, strangle, murder in their steps
These traitors : oh that name is too good for them,
And death is easy. Is there nothing worse
To wreak me on this proud peace-breaking crew ?
What say'st thou, *Philip?* why assist'st thou not ?
Bastard. These curses, good my lord, fit not the season :
Help must descend from Heaven against this treason.
John. Nay, thou wilt prove a traitor with the rest,
Go, get thee to them, shame come to you all.
Bastard. I would be loth to leave your Highness thus ;
Yet you command, and I, though griev'd will go.
John. Ah, *Philip* whither goest thou, come again.
Bastard. My lord, these motions are as passions of a madman.
John. A madman, *Philip*, I am mad indeed ;
My heart is maz'd, 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-queen,
My only hope and comfort in distress,
Is dead, and *England* excommunicate,
And I am interdicted by the Pope ;
All churches curst, their doors are sealed up ;
And, for the pleasure of the Romish priest,

The service of the Highest is neglected.
The multitude, a beast of many heads,
Do wish confusion to their sovereign ;
The nobles, blinded with ambitious fumes,
Assemble powers to beat mine empire down,
And more than this, elect a foreign king.
O *England*, wert thou ever miserable,
King *John* of *England* sees thee miserable :
John, 'tis thy sins that makes it miserable,
Quicquid delirunt Reges, plectuntur Achivi.
Philip, as thou hast ever lov'd thy King,
So show it now : post to Saint *Edmunds Bury*,
Dissemble with the nobles ; know their drifts ;
Confound their devilish plots, and damn'd devices.
Though *John* be faulty, yet let subjects bear ;
He will amend, and right the people's wrongs.
A mother, though she were unnatural,
Is better than the kindest stepdame is :
Let never Englishman trust foreign rule.
Then, *Philip*, show thy fealty to thy King,
And 'mongst the nobles, plead thou for the King.
Bastard. I go, my lord.
See how he is distraught,
This is the cursed priest of *Italy*
Hath heapt these mischiefs on this hapless land.
Now, *Philip*, had'st thou *Tullys* eloquence,
Then might'st thou hope to plead with good success. [*Exit.*
John. And art thou gone ? success may follow thee :
Thus hast thou show'd thy kindness to thy King.
Sirrah, in haste go greet the Cardinal,
Pandulph, I mean, the Legate from the Pope.
Say that the King desires to speak with him.
Now, *John*, bethink thee how thou may'st resolve :
And if thou wilt continue *Englands* king,
Then cast about to keep thy diadem ;
For life and land, and all, is levell'd at
The Pope of *Rome*, 'tis he that is the cause ;
He curseth thee ; he sets thy subjects free
From due obedience to their sovereign :
He animates the nobles in their wars ;
He gives away the crown to *Philips* son,
And pardons all that seek to murder thee :
And thus blind zeal is still predominant.
Then, *John*, there is no way to keep thy crown,
But finely to dissemble with the Pope :
That hand that gave the wound, must give the salve
To cure the hurt, else quite incurable.
Thy sins are far too great to be the man
T' abolish Pope and popery from thy realm :
But in thy seat, if I may guess at all,

A king shall reign that shall surpass them all.
Peace, *John*, here comes the Legate of the Pope ;
Dissemble thou, and whatsoe'er thou say'st,
Yet with thy heart wish their confusion.

Enter PANDULPH.

Pandulph. Now *John*, unworthy man to breath on earth,
That dost oppugn against thy Mother Church,—
Why am I sent for to thy cursed self ?

John. Thou man of God, Vicegerent for the Pope,
The holy Vicar of St. *Peters* Church,
Upon my knees, I pardon crave of thee,
And do submit me to the see of *Rome ;*
And now, for penance of my high offence,
To take on me the holy cross of Christ,
And carry arms in holy christian wars.

Pandulph. No, *John*, thy crouching and dissembling thus
Cannot deceive the Legate of the Pope.
Say what thou wilt, I will not credit thee :
Thy crown and kingdom both are ta'en away,
And thou art curst without redemption.

John. Accurst indeed, to kneel to such a drudge,
And get no help with thy submission,
Unsheath thy sword, and slay the misproud priest
That thus triumphs o'er thee, a mighty king.
No, John, submit again, dissemble yet,
For priests and women must be flattered.
Yet, holy father, thou thyself dost know,
No time too late for sinners to repent.
Absolve me, then, and *John* doth swear to do
The uttermost, whatever thou demand'st.

Pandulph. John, Now I see thy hearty penitence,
I rue and pity thy distrest estate.
One way is left to reconcile thyself,
And only one, which I shall show to thee :
Thou must surrender to the see of *Rome*
Thy crown and diadem ; then shall the Pope
Defend thee from th' invasion of thy foes ;
And where his Holiness hath kindled *Fraunce*,
And set thy subjects' hearts at war with thee,
Then shall he curse thy foes, and beat them down
That seek the discontentment of the king.

K. John. From bad to worse, or I must lose my realm,
Or give my crown for penance unto *Rome*,
A misery more piercing than the darts
That break from burning exhalations' power.
What ? shall I give my crown with this right hand ?
No : with this hand defend thy crown and thee.
What news with thee.

Enter Messenger.

Please it your Majesty, there is descried on the coast of *Kent*, an hundred

sail of ships, which of all men is thought to be the French fleet, under the conduct of the Dolphin, so that it puts the country in a mutiny ; so they send to your Grace for succour.

John. How now, Lord Cardinal, what's your best advice,
These mutinies must be allay'd in time
By policy, or headstrong rage at least.
O *Iohn*, these troubles tire thy weari'd soul,
And, like to *Luna* in a sad eclipse,
So are thy thoughts and passions for this news.
Well may it be, when kings are grieved so,
The vulgar sort work princes' overthrow.

Pandulph. King *John*, for not effecting of thy plighted vow,
This strange annoyance happens to thy land :
But yet be reconcil'd unto the Church,
And nothing shall be grievous to thy state.

K. John. On, *Pandulph*, be it as thou hast decreed,
John will not spurn against thy sound advice.
Come, let's away, and with thy help, I trow,
My realm shall flourish, and my crown in peace. [*Exeunt.*]

[SCENE III.]

Enter the Nobles, PENBROOKE, ESSEX, CHESTER, BEWCHAMPE, CLARE, *with others.*

Penbrooke. Now, sweet *Saint Edmund*, holy saint in heaven,
Whose shrine is sacred, high esteem'd on earth,
Infuse a constant zeal in all our hearts
To prosecute this act of mickle weight,
Lord *Bewchampe*, say, what friends have you procur'd ?

Bewchampe. The Lord *FitzWater*, Lord *Percy* and Lord *Ross*,
Vow'd meeting here this day, th' eleventh hour.

Essex. Under the cloak of holy pilgrimage,
By that same hour, on warrant of their faith,
Philip Plantagenet, a bird of swiftest wing,
Lord *Eustace Vescy*, Lord *Cressy*, and Lord *Mowbrey*,
Appointed meeting at Saint *Edmunds* shrine.

Pembroke. Until their presence, I'll conceal my tale.
Sweet 'complices in holy Christian acts,
That venture for the purchase of renown,
Thrice welcome to the league of high resolve,
That pawn their bodies for their souls' regard.

Essex. Now wanteth but the rest to end this work.
In pilgrims habit comes our holy troop
A furlong hence, with swift unwonted pace :
Maybe they are the persons you expect.

Pembroke. With swift unwonted gait : see what a thing is zeal,
That spurs them on with fervence to this shrine,
Now joy come to them for their true intent,
And, in good time, here come the warmen all,
That sweat in body by the mind's disease :
Hap and heartsease, brave lordings, be your lot.

Enter the Bastard PHILIP, *&c.*

Amen, my lords, the like betide your luck,
And all that travail in a christian cause.
Essex. Cheerly replied, brave branch of kingly stock,
A right *Plantagenet* should reason so.
But silence, lords, attend our coming's cause,
The servile yoke that pained us with toil,
On strong instinct hath fram'd this conventicle,
To ease our necks of servitude's contempt.
Should I not name the foeman of our rest,
Which of you all, so barren in conceit,
As cannot level at the man I mean ?
But, lest enigmas shadow shining truth,
Plainly to paint, as truth requires no art,
Th' effect of this resort importeth this :
To root, and clean extirpate, tyrant *John.*
Tyrant, I say, appealing to the man,
If any here, that loves him ; and I ask,
What kinship, lenity, or Christian reign
Rules in the man, to bar this foul impeach ?
First, I infer the *Chesters* banishment,
For reprehending him in most unchristian crimes,
Was special notice of a tyrant's will.
But were this all, the devil should be sav'd ;
But this, the least of many thousand faults
That circumstance with leisure might display.
Our private wrongs, no parcel of my tale,
Which now in presence, but for some great cause
Might wish to him as to a mortal foe.
But shall I close the period with an act
Abhorring in the ears of Christian men,—
His cousin's death, that sweet unguilty child,
Untimely butcher'd by the tyrant's means,
Here is my proofs, as clear as gravel brook ;
And on the same, I further must infer,
That, who upholds a tyrant in his course,
Is culpable of all his damned guilt.
To show the which is yet to be describ'd.
My Lord of *Penbrooke*, show what is behind
Only, I say, that were there nothing else
To move us, but the Pope's most dreadful curse,
Whereof we are assured if we fail,
It were enough to instigate us all,
With earnestness of sp'rit, to seek a mean
To dispossess *John* of his regiment.
Penbrooke. Well hath my Lord of *Essex* told his tale,
Which I aver for most substantial truth.
And more to make the matter to our mind,
I say that *Lewes*, in challenge to his wife,
Hath title of an uncontrolled plea

To all that 'longeth to our English crown.
Short tale to make, the See Apostolic
Hath offer'd dispensation for the fault,
If any be, as trust me, none I know,
By planting *Lewes* in the usurper's room :
This is the cause of all our presence here,
That, on the holy altar, we protest
To aid the right of *Lewes* with goods and life,
Who, on our knowledge, is in arms for *England.*
What say you, lords ?
Salsbury. As *Pembrooke* saith, affirmeth *Salsbury :*
Fair *Lewes* of *Fraunce* that spoused Lady *Blanche,*
Hath title of uncontrolled strength
To *England* and what longeth to the crown :
In right whereof, as we are true inform'd,
The Prince is marching hitherward in arms.
Our purpose to conclude that with a word,
Is to invest him, as we may desire,
King of our country, in the tyrant's stead :
And so the warrant on the altar sworn ;
And so the intent for which we hither came.
Bastard. My lord of *Salsbury,* I cannot couch
My speeches with the needful words of art,
As doth beseem in such a weighty work :
But what my conscience and my duty will,
I purpose to impart.
For *Chester's* exile, blame his busy wit,
That meddled where his duty quite forbade :
For any private causes that you have,
Methink they should not mount to such a height,
As to depose a king, in their revenge.
For *Arthur's* death, King *John* was innocent :
He, desperate, was the deathsman to himself ;
Which you, to make a colour to your crime,
Injustly do impute to his default.
But where fell traitorism hath residence,
There wants no words to set despite on work.
I say 'tis shame, and worthy all reproof,
To wrest such petty wrongs, in terms of right,
Against a king anointed by the Lord.
Why, *Salsbury,* 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 lawful kings ?
What can he bless, or who regards his curse,
But such as give to man, and takes from God.
I speak it in the sight of God above :
There's not a man that dies in your belief,

But sells his soul perpetually to pain.
Aid *Lewes*, leave God, kill *John*, please hell,
Make havoc of the welfare of your souls,
For here I leave you, in the sight of heaven,
A troop of traitors, food for hellish fiends.
If you desist, then follow me as friends ;
If not then do your worst, as hateful traitors
For *Lewes* his right, alas, 'tis too too lame ;
A senseless claim, if truth be title's friend.
In brief, if this be cause of our resort,
Our pilgrimage is to the devil's shrine.
I came not, lords, to troop as traitors do,
Nor will I counsel in so bad a cause :
Please you return, we go again as friends ;
If not, I to my King, and you where traitors please. [*Exit.*

Percy. A hot young man, and so, my lords, proceed ;
Ay, let him go, and better lost than found.

Penbrooke. What say you, lords, will all the rest proceed,
Will you all with me, swear upon the altar
That you will to the death be aid to *Lewes*, And enemy to *John?*
Every man lay his hand by mine, in witness of his heart's accord. [*They do so.*]
Well, then, every man to arms to meet the King,
Who is already before *London.*

Messenger *Enter.*

What news, herald ?

Messenger. The right Christian prince, my master, *Lewes* of *Fraunce*, is at hand, coming to visit your honours, directed hither by the right honourable *Richard*, Earl of *Bigot*, to confer with your honours.

Penbrooke. How near is his Highness ?

Messenger. Ready to enter your presence. [*Exit.*

Enter LEWES, *Earl* BIGOT *with his troop.*

Lewes. Fair lords of *England*, *Lewes* salutes you all
As friends, and firm well-willers of his weal,
At whose request, from plenty-flowing *Fraunce*,
Crossing the ocean with a southern gale,
He is, in person, come at your commands,
To undertake, and gratify withal,
The fulness of your favours proffer'd him.
But, world's brave men, omitting promises
Till time be minister of more amends,
I must acquaint you with our fortune's course.
The heavens, dewing favours on my head,
Have, in their conduct, safe with victory,
Brought me along your well-manured bounds,
With small repulse, and little cross of chance,
Your city *Rochester*, with great applause,
By some divine instinct, laid arms aside ;
And, from the hollow holes of Thamesis,
Echo apace replied *Vive le roy*,

From thence, along the wanton rolling glade,
To *Troynovant* your fair *Metropolis*,
With luck came *Lewes*, to show his troops of *Fraunce*,
Waving our ensigns with the dallying winds,
The fearful object of fell frowning war ;
Where, after some assault, and small defence,
Heavens, may I say, and not my warlike troop,
Temper'd their hearts to take a friendly foe
Within the compass of their high-built walls,
Giving me title, as it seem'd they wish.
Thus Fortune, lords, acts to your forwardness
Means of content, in lieu of former grief :
And, may I live but to requite you all,
World's wish were mine, in dying noted yours.

Salisbury. Welcome the balm that closeth up our wounds,
The sovereign med'cine for our quick recure,
The anchor of our hope, the only prop
Whereon depends our lives, our lands, our weal,
Without the which, as sheep without their herd,
(Except a shepherd winking at the wolf),
We stray, we pine, we run to thousand harms.
No marvel, 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 Catholic consent.
I cannot name you, lordings, man by man,
But, like a stranger unacquainted yet,
In general I promise faithful love :
Lord *Bigot*, brought me to Saint *Edmund's* Shrine,
Giving me warrant of a Christian oath,
That this assembly came devoted here,
To swear, according as your packets show'd,
Homage and loyal service to ourself.
I need no doubt the surety of your wills ;
Since well I know, for many of your sakes,
The towns have yielded on their own accords ;
Yet, for a fashion, not for misbelief,
My eyes must witness, and these ears must hear
Your oath upon the holy altar sworn ;
And after, march, to end our coming's cause.

Salsbury. 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 Highness, swear with me
The sequel that myself shall utter here :—

I, *Thomas Plantagenet*, Earl of *Salisbury*, swear upon the altar, and by the holy Army of Saints, homage and allegiance to the right Christian Prince, *Lewes* of *Fraunce*, as true and rightful King to *England*, *Cornwall*, and *Wales*, and to their territories; in the defence whereof, I, upon the holy altar, swear all forwardness. [*All the English Lords swear.*

As the noble Earl hath sworn, so swear we all.
Lewes. I rest assured on your holy oath ;
And on this altar, in like sort I swear
Love to you all, and princely recompense,
To guerdon your good wills unto the full.
And since I am at this religious shrine,
My good well-willers, give us leave awhile
To use some orisons, ourselves apart,
To all the holy company of heaven,
That they will smile upon our purposes,
And bring them to a fortunate event.
Salsbury. We leave your Highness to your good intent.
[*Exeunt* LORDS *of England.*]
Lewes. Now, Viscount *Meloun*, what remains behind ?
Trust me, these traitors to their sovereign state
Are not to be believ'd in any sort.
Meloun. Indeed, my lord, they that infringe their oaths,
And play the rebels 'gainst their native king,
Will, for as little cause, revolt from you,
If ever opportunity incite them so :
For, onee forsworn, and never after sound,
There's no affiance after perjury.
Lewes. Well, *Meloun*, well ; let's smooth with them awhile,
Until we have as much as they can do ;
And when their virtue is exhaled dry,
I'll hang them for the guerdon of their help.
Meanwhile we'll use them as a precious poison
To undertake the issue of our hope.
French Lord. 'Tis policy, my lord, to bait our hooks
With merry smiles, and promise of much weight ;
But when your Highness needeth them no more,
'Tis good make sure work with them, lest indeed
They prove to you as to their natural King.
Meloun. Trust me, my lord, right well have you advis'd :
Venom for use, but never for a sport,
Is to be dalli'd with, lest it infect.
Were you install'd, as soon I hope you shall,
Be free from traitors, and dispatch them all.
Lewes. That so I mean, I swear before you all
On this same altar ; and, by heaven's power,
There's not an English traitor of them all,
John once dispatcht, and I, fair *England's* King,
Shall on his shoulders bear his head one day,
But I will crop it for their guilt's desert :
Nor shall their heirs enjoy their signories,
But perish by their parents' foul amiss.
This have I sworn ; and this will I perform,
If e'er I come unto the height I hope.
Lay down your hands, and swear the same with me !
[*The* FRENCH LORDS *swear.*

Why, so: now call them in, and speak them fair;
A smile of *France* will feed an English fool.
Bear them in hand as friends, for so they be;
But in the heart, like traitors, as they are.

Enter the ENGLISH LORDS.

Now, famous followers, chieftains of the world,
Have we solicited, with hearty prayer,
The Heaven in favour of our high attempt.
Leave we this place, and march we with our power
To rouse the tyrant from his chiefest hold:
And when our labours have a prosp'rous end,
Each man shall reap the fruit of his desert;
And so resolv'd, brave followers let us hence.

[SCENE IV.]

Enter KING JOHN, BASTARD, PANDULPH, *and a many priests with them.*

Thus, *John*, thou art absolv'd from all thy sins,
And freed by order from our Father's curse.
Receive thy crown again, with this proviso,
That thou remain true liegeman to the Pope,
And carry arms in right of holy *Rome*.

John. I hold the same as tenant to the Pope,
And thank your Holiness for your kindness shown.

Philip. A proper jest, when kings must stoop to friars,
Need hath no law, when friars must be kings.

Enter a Messenger.

Messenger. Please it your Majesty, the Prince of *Fraunce*,
With all the nobles of your Grace's land,
Are marching hitherwards in good array.
Where'er they set their foot, all places yield;
Thy land is theirs, and not a foot holds out
But *Dover* Castle, which is hard besieg'd.

Pandulph. Fear not, King *John*, thy kingdom is the Pope's;
And they shall know his Holiness hath power
To beat them soon from whence he hath to do.

Drums and trumpets. Enter LEWES, MELOUN, SALISBURY, ESSEX, PEMBROOKE, *and all the* Nobles *from Fraunce* and England.

Lewes. *Pandulph*, as gave his Holiness in charge,
So hath the *Dolphin* muster'd up his troops,
And won the greatest part of all this land.
But ill becomes your Grace, Lord Cardinal,
Thus to converse with *John* that is accurst.

Pandulph. *Lewes* of *France*, victorious conqueror,
Whose sword hath made this island quake for fear,
Thy forwardness to fight for holy *Rome*
Shall be remunerated to the full:
But know, my lord, King *John* is now absolv'd;
The Pope is pleas'd, the land is blest again;
And thou hast brought each thing to good effect.
It resteth then that thou withdraw thy powers,

And quietly return to *Fraunce* again :
For all is done, the Pope would wish thee do.
Lewes. But all's not done that *Lewes* came to do.
Why, *Pandulph*, hath King *Philip* sent his son,
And been at such excessive charge in wars,
To be dismist with words? King *John* shall know
England is mine, and he usurps my right.
Pandulph. *Lewes*, I charge thee and thy 'complices
Upon the pain of *Pandulph's* holy curse
That thou withdraw thy powers to *Fraunce* again,
And yield up *London* and the neighbour towns
That thou hast ta'en in *England* by the sword.
Meloun. Lord Cardinal, 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 Christendom ;
Now with a word to make them carry arms,
Then with a word to make them leave their arms.
This must not be. Prince *Lewes*, keep thine own,
Let Pope and Popelings curse their bellies full.
Bastard. My lord of *Meloun*, What title had the Prince
To England and the crown of *Albion*,
But such a title as the Pope confirm'd ?
The Prelate now lets fall his feigned claim ;
Lewes is but the agent for the Pope ;
Then must the Dauphin cease, sith he hath ceast :
But cease or no, it greatly matters not,
If you, my lords and barons of the land,
Will leave the French, and cleave unto your king.
For shame, ye peers of *England*, suffer not
Yourselves, your honours, and your land to fall ;
But with resolved thoughts beat back the French,
And free the land from yoke of servitude.
Salisbury. *Philip*, not so, Lord *Lewes* is our King ;
And we will follow him unto the death.
Pandulph. Then, in the name of *Innocent*, the Pope,
I curse the Prince and all that take his part,
And excommunicate the rebel peers
As traitors to the King and to the Pope.
Lewes. *Pandulph*, our swords shall bless ourselves again :
Prepare thee, John : Lords, follow me, your King. [*Exeunt.*]
K. John. Accursed *John*, the devil owes thee shame,
Resisting Rome, or yielding to the Pope, all's one.
The devil take the Pope, the peers, and *Fraunce*.
Shame be my share for yielding to the priest.
Pandulph. Comfort thyself, King *John*, the Cardinal goes,
Upon his curse to make them leave their arms. [*Exit.*
Bastard. Comfort, my lord, and curse the Cardinal,
Betake yourself to arms, My troops are prest
To answer *Lewes* with a lusty shock :

The English archers have their quivers full ;
Their bows are bent ; the pikes are prest to push :
Good cheer, my lord, King *Richard's* fortune hangs
Upon the plume of warlike *Philip's* helm.
Then let them know, his brother and his son
Are leaders of the Englishmen at arms.
K. John. *Philip*, I know not how to answer thee :
But let us hence, to answer *Lewes'* pride. [*Exeunt.*]

[SCENE V.]

Excursions. *Enter* MELOUN *with* English Lords.

Meloun. O, I am slain, Nobles, *Salsbury*, *Pembrooke*,
My soul is charg'd. Hear me : for what I say
Concerns the peers of England, and their state.
Listen, brave lords, a fearful mourning tale
To be deliver'd by a man of death.
Behold, these scars, the dole of bloody Mars,
Are harbingers from nature's common foe,
Citing this trunk to *Tellus'* prison house :
Life's charter, lordings, lasteth not an hour ;
And fearful thoughts, forerunners of my end,
Bids me give physic to a sickly soul.
O peers of *England*, know you what you do ?
There's but a hair that sunders you from harm ;
The hook is baited, and the train is made,
And simply you run doting to your deaths.
But lest I die, and leave my tale untold,
With silence slaughtering so brave a crew,
This I aver : if *Lewes* win the day,
There's not an Englishman that lifts his hand
Against King *John*, to plant the heir of *Fraunce*,
But is already damn'd to cruel death.
I heard it vow'd ; myself, amongst the rest,
Swore on the altar, aid to this edict.
Two causes, lords, makes me display this drift ;—
The greatest, for the freedom of my soul,
That longs to leave this mansion free from guilt ;
The other, on a natural instinct,
For that my grandsire was an Englishman.
Misdoubt not, lords, the truth of my discourse ;
No frenzy, nor no brainsick idle fit ;
But well advis'd, and wotting what I say,
Pronounce I here, before the face of Heaven,
That nothing is discover'd but a truth.
'Tis time to fly ; submit yourselves to *John*,
The smiles of *Fraunce* shade in the frowns of death ;
Lift up your swords, turn face against the French,
Expel the yoke that's framed for your necks.
Back, warmen, back, embowel not the clime,
Your seat, your nurse, your birthday's breathing-place,

That bred you, bears you, brought you up in arms.
Ah be not so ingrate, to dig your mother's grave ;
Preserve your lambs, and beat away the wolf,
My soul hath said, contrition's penitence
Lays hold on man's redemption for my sin.
Farewell, my lords, witness my faith when we are met in heaven,
And, for my kindness, give me grave-room here.
My soul doth fleet ; world's vanities, farewell.
Salsbury. Now joy betide thy soul, well-meaning man.
How, now, my lords, what cooling card is this,
A greater grief grows now, than erst hath been.
What counsel give you, shall we stay and die ?
Or shall we home, and kneel unto the King ?
Pembroke. My heart misgave this sad accursed news :
What have we done, Fie, lords, what frenzy mov'd
Our hearts to yield unto the pride of *Fraunce ?*
If we persever, we are sure to die ;
If we desist, small hope again of life.
Salsbury. Bear hence the body of this wretched man,
That made us wretched with his dying tale,
And stand not wailing on our present harms,
As women wont ; but seek our harm's redress.
As for myself, I will in haste be gone,
And kneel for pardon to our sovereign *John.*
Pembroke. Ay, there's the way ; let's rather kneel to him,
Than to the French that would confound us all. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE VI.]

Enter KING JOHN, *carried between* 2 Lords.

John. Set down, set down the load not worth your pain.
Fordone I am with deadly wounding grief :
Sickly and succourless, hopeless of any good,
The world hath weari'd me, and I have weari'd it :
It loathes I live ; I live, and loathe myself.
Who pities me ? To whom have I been kind ?
But to a few : a few will pity me.
Why die I not ? Death scorns so vilde a prey.
Why live I not ? Life hates so sad a prize
I sue to both, to be retain'd of either ;
But both are deaf ; I can be heard of neither.
Nor death nor life, yet life, and ne'er the near' ;
Ymixt with death, biding I wot not where.
Philip. How fares my lord, that he is carri'd thus ?
Not all the awkward fortunes yet befall'n
Made such impression of lament in me ;
Nor ever did my eye attaint 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 straight ;

If good, be mute; it doth but flatter me.
Philip. Such as it is, and heavy though it be
To glut the world with tragic elegies,
Once will I breathe, to aggravate the rest,
Another moan, to make the measure full.
The bravest bowman had not yet sent forth
Two arrows from the quiver at his side,
But that a rumour went throughout our camp,
That *John* was fled, the King had left the field.
At last the rumour scal'd these ears of mine,
Who rather chose, as sacrifice for *Mars*,
Than ignominious scandal by retire.
I cheer'd the troops, as did the prince of *Troy*
His weary followers 'gainst the Myrmidons,
Crying aloud, "Saint *George*, the day is ours."
But fear had captivated courage quite;
And, like the lamb before the greedy wolf,
So heartless fled our warmen from the field.
Short tale to make, myself amongst the rest,
Was fain to fly before the eager foe.
By this time, night had shadow'd all the earth,
With sable curtains of the blackest hue,
And fenced us from the fury of the French,
As *Io* from the jealous *Juno's* eye.
When in the morning our troops did gather head,
Passing the Washes with our carriages,
The impartial tide, deadly and inexorable,
Came raging in, with billows threat'ning death,
And swallow'd up the most of all our men.
Myself, upon a Galloway right free, well pac'd,
Outstript the floods that follow'd, wave by wave;
I so escaped, to tell this tragic tale.
K. John. Grief upon grief, yet none so great a grief
To end this life, and thereby rid my grief.
Was ever any so unfortunate,
The right idea of a cursed man,
As I, poor I, a triumph for despite,
My fever grows: what ague shakes me so?
How far to Swinsteed, tell me, do you know,
Present unto the Abbot, word of my repair.
My sickness rages, to tyrannize upon me:
I cannot live unless this fever leave me.
Philip. Good cheer, my lord, the Abbey is at hand:
Behold, my lord, the churchmen come to meet you.

Enter the ABBOT *and certain* Monks.

Abbot. All health and happiness to our sovereign lord the King,
John. Nor health nor happiness hath *John* at all.
Say, Abbot, am I welcome to thy house.
Abbot. Such welcome as our Abbey can afford,

Your Majesty shall be assured of.
Philip. The King, thou see'st, is weak, and very faint :
What victuals hast thou, to refresh his Grace.
Abbot. Good store, my lord : of that you need not fear,
For Lincolnshire, and these our Abbey grounds,
Were never fatter, nor in better plight.
John. Philip, thou never need'st to doubt of cates ;
Nor King nor lord is seated half so well
As are the Abbeys throughout all the land.
If any plot of ground do pass another,
The friars fasten on it straight :
But let us in, to taste of their repast.
It goes against my heart to feed with them,
Or be beholden to such Abbey grooms. [*Exeunt.*

Manet the MONK.

Monk. Is this the King that never lov'd a friar ?
Is this the man that doth contemn the Pope ?
Is this the man that robb'd the holy Church,
And yet will fly unto a friary ?
Is this the King that aims at Abbeys' lands ?
Is this the man whom all the world abhors,
And yet will fly unto a friary ?
Accurst be Swinsteed Abbey, Abbot, friars,
Monks, nuns, and clerks, and all that dwells therein,
If wicked *John* escape alive away.
Now, if that thou wilt look to merit heaven,
And be canoniz'd for a holy saint,
To please the world with a deserving work,
Be thou the man to set thy country free,
And murder him that seeks to murder thee.

[*Enter the* ABBOT.]

Abbot. Why are you not within, to cheer the King ?
He now begins to mend, and will to meat.
Monk. What if I say to strangle him in his sleep ?
Abbot. What, at thy *mumpsimus ?* Away,
And seek some means for to pastime the King.
Monk. I'll set a dudgeon dagger at his heart,
And with a mallet knock him on the head.
Abbot. Alas, what means this monk to murder me ?
'Dare lay my life he'll kill me for my place.
Monk. I'll poison him, and it shall ne'er be known ;
And then shall I be chiefest of my house.
Abbot. If I were dead, indeed he is the next ;
But I'll away, for why, the monk is mad,
And in his madness he will murder me.
Monk. My lord,
I cry your lordship mercy, I saw you not.
Abbot. Alas, good Thomas, do not murder me,
And thou shalt have my place, with thousand thanks.

Monk. I murder you, God shield from such a thought.
Abbot. If thou wilt needs, 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 beneficial to us all.
Abbot. Wilt thou not hurt me, holy monk, say on.
Monk. You know, my lord, the King is in our house.
Abbot. True.
Monk. You know likewise, the King abhors a friar.
Abbot. True.
Monk. And he that loves not a friar is our enemy.
Abbot. Thou say'st true.
Monk. Then the King is our enemy.
Abbot. True.
Monk. Why then should we not kill our enemy. And the King being our enemy, why then should we not kill the King.
Abbot. O blessed monk, I see God moves thy mind
To free this land from tyrant's slavery.
But who dare venture for to do this deed ?
Monk. Who dare ? Why, I, my lord, dare do the deed :
I'll free my country and the Church from foes,
And merit Heaven, by killing of a king.
Abbot. Thomas, kneel down, and if thou art resolv'd,
I will absolve thee here from all thy sins,
For why, the deed is meritorious.
Forward, and fear not, man, for every month,
Our friars shall sing a mass for *Thomas'* soul.
Monk. God and Saint *Francis* prosper my attempt !
For now, my lord, I go about my work. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE VII.]

Enter LEWES *and his* Army.

Lewes. Thus victory, in bloody laurel clad,
Follows the fortune of young *Lodowick.*
The Englishmen, as daunted at our sight,
Fall as the fowl before the eagle's eyes.
Only two crosses of contrary change
Do nip my heart, and vex me with unrest :
Lord *Melon's* death, the one part of my soul,
A braver man did never live in *Fraunce.*
The other grief, ay, that's a gall indeed,
To think that *Dover* Castle should hold out
'Gainst all assaults, and rest impregnable.
Ye warlike race of *Francus Hector's* son,
Triumph in conquest of that tyrant *John,*
The better half of *England* is our own ;
And towards the conquest of the other part,
We have the face of all the English lords.
What then remains, but overrun the land ?
Be resolute, my warlike followers,

And if good fortune serve as she begins,
The poorest peasant of the realm of *Fraunce*
Shall be a master o'er an English lord.

Enter a Messenger.

Lewes. Fellow, what news.

Messenger. Pleaseth your Grace, the Earl of *Salsbury*, *Penbrooke*, *Essex*, *Clare*, and *Arundel*, with all the barons that did fight for thee, are, on a sudden, fled with all their powers, to join with *John*, to drive thee back again.

Enter another Messenger.

Messenger. *Lewes*, my lord why stand'st thou in a maze,
Gather thy troops, hope not of help from *Fraunce;*
For all thy forces, being fifty sail,
Containing twenty thousand soldiers,
With victual and munition for the war
Putting from *Callis* in unlucky time,
Did cross the seas, and on the *Goodwin* Sands
The men, munition, and the ships are lost. [*Exit.*]

Enter another Messenger.

Lewes. More news? Say on.

Messenger. *John*, my lord, with all his scatter'd troops,
Flying the fury of your conquering sword,
As *Pharaoh* erst within the bloody sea,
So he and his, environ'd with the tide,
On *Lincoln* Washes all were overwhelm'd,
The barons fled, our forces cast away.

Lewes. Was ever heard such unexpected news?

Messenger. Yet, *Lodowick*, revive thy dying heart,
King *John* and all his forces are consum'd.
The less thou need'st the aid of English Earls;
The less thou need'st to grieve thy navy's wrack;
And follow time's advantage with success.

Lewes. Brave *Frenchmen*, arm'd with magnanimity,
March after *Lewes*, who will lead you on
To chase the barons' power that wants a head;
For *John* is drown'd, and I am *England's* king.
Though our munitions and our men be lost,
Philip of *Fraunce* will send us fresh supplies. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE VIII.]

Enter two FRIARS *laying a Cloth.*

Friar. Dispatch, dispatch, the King desires to eat. Would a might eat his last, for the love he bears to Churchmen.

Friar. I am of thy mind too; and so it should be, and we might be our own carvers. I marvel why they dine here in the orchard.

Friar. I know not, nor I care not. The King comes.

John. Come on, Lord *Abbot*, shall we sit together?

Abbot. Pleaseth your Grace, sit down.

John. Take your places, sirs, no pomp in penury; all beggars and

friends may come. Where necessity keeps the house, curtesy is barr'd the table. Sit down, *Philip!*

Bastard. 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 despite of her frown, as if your Highness were now in the highest type of dignity.

John. Come, no more ado, and you tell me much of dignity, you'll mar my appetite in a surfeit of sorrow. What cheer, Lord Abbot, methinks you frown like an host that knows his guest hath no money to pay the reckoning?

Abbot. No, my liege; if I frown at all, it is for I fear this cheer too homely to entertain so mighty a guest as your Majesty.

Bastard. I think rather, my Lord Abbot, you remember my last being here, when I went in progress for pouches: and the rancor of his heart breaks out in his countenance, to show he hath not forgot me.

Abbot. Not so, my lord, you, and the meanest follower of his Majesty, are heartily welcome to me.

Monk. Wassail, my liege, and, as a poor monk may say: Welcome to *Swinsted.*

John. Begin, monk, and report hereafter thou wast taster to a king.

Monk. As much health to your Highness as to my own heart.

John. I pledge thee, kind monk.

Monk. The merriest draught that ever was drunk in *England.* Am I not too bold with your Highness?

John. Not a whit; all friends and fellows for a time.

Monk. If the inwards of a toad be a compound of any proof: why, so: it works.

John. Stay, *Philip;* where's the monk?

Bastard. He is dead, my lord.

John. Then drink not, *Philip,* for a world of wealth.

Bastard. What cheer, my liege, your colour 'gins to change.

John. So doth my life. O, *Philip,* I am poison'd.
The monk, the devil, the poison 'gins to rage;
It will depose myself, a king, from reign.

Bastard. This Abbot hath an interest in this act.
At all adventures take thou that from me.
There lie thee, Abbot, Abbey-lubber, devil.
March with the monk unto the gates of hell.
How fares my lord?

John. Philip, some drink! Oh, for the frozen Alps,
To tumble on and cool this inward heat,
That rageth as the furnace sevenfold hot
To burn the holy three in *Babylon,*
Power after Power forsake their proper power;
Only the heart impugns with faint resist
The fierce invade of him that conquers kings.
Help, God, O, pain, Die, *John,* O, plague
Inflicted on thee for thy grievous sins.
Philip, a chair, and by and by a grave.
My legs disdain the carriage of a king.

Bastard. Ah, good my liege, with patience conquer grief,
And bear this pain with kingly fortitude.
John. Methinks I see a catalogue of sin
Wrote by a fiend in marble characters,
The least enough to lose my part in heaven.
Methinks the devil whispers in mine ears,
And tells me, 'tis in vain to hope for grace :
I must be damn'd for *Arthur's* sudden death.
I see, I see a thousand thousand men
Come to accuse me for my wrong on earth ;
And there is none so merciful a God
That will forgive the number of my sins.
How have I liv'd, but by another's loss ?
What have I lov'd, but wrack of others' weal ?
When have I vow'd and not infring'd mine oath ?
Where have I done a deed deserving well ?
How, what, when, and where, have I bestow'd a day
That tended not to some notorious ill.
My life, replete with rage and tyranny,
Craves little pity for so strange a death.
Or who will say that *John* deceast too soon ?
Who will not say he rather liv'd too long ?
Dishonor did attaint me in my life,
And shame attendeth *John* unto his death.
Why did I 'scape the fury of the French,
And di'd not by the temper of their swords ?
Shameless my life ; and shamefully it ends,
Scorn'd by my foes, disdained of my friends.
Bastard. Forgive the world and all your earthly foes,
And call on Christ, who is your latest friend.
John. My tongue doth falter. *Philip*, I tell thee, man,
Since *John* did yield unto the Priest of *Rome*,
Nor he nor his have prosp'red on the earth :
Curst are his blessings ; and his curse is bliss.
But in the spirit I cry unto my God,
As did the kingly prophet *Davvid* cry,
(Whose hands, as mine, with murder were attaint)
I am not he shall build the Lord a house,
Or root these locusts from the face of earth ;
But if my dying heart deceive me not,
From out these loins shall spring a kingly branch,
Whose arms shall reach unto the gates of *Rome*,
And with his feet tread down the strumpet's pride
That sits upon the chair of *Babylon*.
Philip, my heart-strings break ; the poison's flame
Hath overcome in me weak Nature's power ;
And in the faith of Jesu, *John* doth die.
Bastard. See how he strives for life, unhappy lord,
Whose bowels are divided in themselves.
This is the fruit of Popery, when true kings

Are slain and shoulder'd out by monks and friars.

Enter a Messenger.

Messenger. Please it your Grace, the barons of the land,
Which all this while bare arms against the King,
Conducted by the Legate of the Pope,
Together with the Prince, his Highness' son,
Do crave to be admitted to the presence of the King.
Bastard. Your son, my lord, young *Henry*, craves to see
Your Majesty, and brings with him, beside,
The barons that revolted from your Grace.
O piercing sight, he fumbleth in the mouth,
His speech doth fail: Lift up yourself, my lord,
And see the Prince, to comfort you in death.

Enter PANDULPH, *Young* HENRY, *the* BARONS *with daggers in their hands.*

Prince. Oh, let me see my father ere he die:
O uncle, were you here, and suffer'd him
To be thus poison'd by a damned monk?
Ah, he is dead, Father, sweet father, speak.
Bastard. His speech doth fail; he hasteth to his end.
Pandulph. Lords, give me leave to joy the dying King
With sight of these, his nobles, kneeling here
With daggers in their hands, who offer up
Their lives for ransom of their foul offence.
Then, good my lord, if you forgive them all,
Lift up your hand, in token you forgive.
Salisbury. We humbly thank your royal Majesty,
And vow to fight for *England* and her King.
And in the sight of *John*, our sovereign lord,
In spite of *Lewes* and the power of *Fraunce*,
Who hitherward are marching in all haste,
We crown young *Henry* in his father's stead.
Henry. Help, help, he dies. Ah, father, look on me.
Legate. King *John*, farewell, in token of thy faith,
Lift up thy hand, that we may witness here
Thou died'st the servant of our Saviour Christ.
Now joy betide thy soul: What noise is this:

Enter a Messenger.

Messenger. Help, lords, the Dolphin maketh hitherward
With ensigns of defiance in the wind;
And all our army standeth at a gaze,
Expecting what their leaders will command.
Bastard. Let's arm ourselves in young King *Henry's* right,
And beat the power of France to sea again.
Legate. Phillip, not so; but I will to the Prince,
And bring him face to face to parle with you.
Bastard. Lord *Salsbury*, yourself shall march with me;
So shall we bring these troubles to an end.
King. Sweet uncle, if thou love thy sovereign,
Let not a stone of *Swinsted* Abbey stand,

But pull the house about the friars' ears ;
For they have kill'd my father and my king. [*Exeunt.*

[SCENE IX.]

A parle sounded; LEWES, PANDULPH, SALSBURY, etc.

Pandulph. *Lewes* of *Fraunce*, young *Henry*, *England's* king,
Requires to know the reason of the claim
That thou canst make to anything of his.
King *John*, that did offend, is dead and gone,
See where his breathless trunk in presence lies,
And he, as heir apparent to the crown,
Is now succeeded in his father's room.
Henry. *Lewes*, what law of arms doth lead thee thus
To keep possession of my lawful right ?
Answer in fine, if thou wilt take a peace,
And make surrender of my right again,
Or try thy title with the dint of sword.
I tell thee, Dolphin, *Henry* fears thee not ;
For now the barons cleave unto their king ;
And what thou hast in *England*, they did get.
Lewis. *Henry* of *England*, now that *John* is dead,
That was the chiefest enemy to *Fraunce*,
I may the rather be induc'd to peace.
But *Salsbury*, and you barons of the realm,
This strange revolt agrees not with the oath
That you on *Bury* altar lately sware.
Salsbury. Nor did the oath your Highness there did take,
Agree with honour of the Prince of *Fraunce*.
Bastard. My lord, what answer make you to the King ?
Dolphin. Faith, *Philip*, this I say : it boots not me,
Nor any prince, nor power of Christendom,
To seek to win this island *Albion*,
Unless he have a party in the realm
By treason for to help in his wars.
The peers which were the party on my side,
Are fled from me ; then boots not me to fight ;
But on conditions, as mine honour wills,
I am contented so depart the realm.
Henry. On what conditions will your Highness yield ?
Lewis. That shall we think upon by more advice.
Bastard. Then, kings and princes, let these broils have end,
And at more leisure talk upon the league.
Meanwhile to *Worster* let us bear the King,
And there inter his body, as beseems.
But first, in sight of *Lewes*, heir of *France*,
Lords, take the crown, and set it on his head,
That by succession is our lawful king. [*They crown young* HENRY.
Thus *England's* peace begins in *Henry's* reign,
And bloody wars are clos'd with happy league.
Let *England* live but true within itself,

And all the world can never wrong her state.
Lewes, thou shalt be bravely shipt to *Fraunce*,
For never Frenchman got of English ground
The twentieth part that thou hast conquered.
Dolphin, thy hand, to *Worster* we will march,
Lords all, lay hands to bear your sovereign
With obsequies of honour to his grave :
If *England's* peers and people join in one,
Not Pope, nor *Fraunce*, nor *Spain* can do them wrong.

FINIS.

CIBBER'S *PAPAL TYRANNY IN THE REIGN OF KING JOHN*

DAVIES (*Dramatic Miscell.*, i, 2): Colley Cibber's *Papal Tyranny* he pretends was written to supply Shakespeare's deficiencies, but more especially the want of just resentment in a king of England when insulted by a pope's nuncio; and, his play being acted in 1744, when the nation was alarmed with the threats of an invasion by a popish pretender, the popular sentiments against the encroachments of papal influence met with applause. Colley's vanity so far transported him that, in his Dedication, he told Lord Chesterfield he had endeavoured to make his play more like one 'than what he found it in Shakespeare.' But Cibber lived long enough to see his *Papal Tyranny* entirely neglected, and, what must have been more mortifying to a man of his extreme vanity, the original play acted with great success. His bouncing, though well-meant, declamation against the insolent pretensions of papal power could not make amends for his mutilations of Shakespeare; and especially for his murdering two characters of our inimitable Poet, not inferior perhaps to any which came from his pen—Lady Constance and the Bastard Falconbridge. However, it is to Cibber, I believe, we owe the revival of this tragedy, which had lain dormant from the days of Shakespeare till 1736. The *Papal Tyranny* had been offered to Mr. Fleetwood, the manager of Drury Lane Theatre, about nine or ten years before it was acted. This was no sooner known to the public than Cibber was most severely attacked by the critics in the newspapers; Fielding wrote a farce upon the subject, which was played at the little theatre in the Haymarket, though I do not believe it is printed amongst his works. However, the parts in the *Papal Tyranny* were distributed, and a time fixed for its performance, but the clamour against the author, whose presumption was highly censured for daring to alter Shakespeare, increased to such a height that Colley, who had smarted more than once for dabbling in tragedy, went to the playhouse, and, without saying a word to anybody, took the play from the prompter's desk and marched off with it in his pocket. Pope, in his new edition of the Dunciad, which he had taken the pains to alter, in order to dethrone Theobald and place Cibber in his room, in the following line hints at the cautious conduct of the poet-laureate:

'King John in silence modestly expires.'—Dunc., Book 1.

[The satirical piece by Fielding to which Davies refers is evidently that noticed by Genest (iii, p. 157), as follows:]

The Historical Register for 1736—this piece, in 3 acts, was written by Fielding—it contains some very good political and theatrical strokes—Quidam was meant for Sir Robert Walpole—the scene lies in the playhouse—at the close of the 2d act Fielding alludes to the contention between Mrs Cibber and Mrs Clive for the part of Polly.

Enter *Pistol* (Theophilus Cibber) and Mob.

After a preface of about 14 lines he asks the mob if they wish his wife to play Polly.

(Mob hiss.)

'Thanks to the Town, that Hiss speaks their assent:
Such was the Hiss that spoke the great applause
Our mighty Father met with, when he brought

His Riddle on the stage; such was the Hiss
Welcom'd his Cæsar to the Ægyptian shore,
Such was the Hiss, in which great John should have expir'd:
But wherefore do I strive in vain to number
Those glorious Hisses, which from age to age
Our family has borne triumphant from the stage?'

In the next act Apollo is discovered—on which Medley, the Author, who seems to speak Fielding's own sentiments, says, 'You must know this is a Bastard of Apollo begotten on that beautiful Nymph Moria, who sold Oranges to Thespis' company, or rather cart-load of Comedians, and being a great Favourite of his Father's, the old Gentleman settled upon him the entire direction of all our Playhouses and poetical performances whatever.'

Apollo. Prompter.

Prompter. Sir.

Apollo. Is there anything to be done?

Prompter. Yes Sir, this play to be cast.

Apollo. Give it to me; the life and death of King John written by Shakespeare: Who can act the King?

Prompter. Pistol, Sir, he loves to act it behind the scenes.

Apollo. Here are a parcel of English Lords.

Prompter. Their parts are but of little consequence, I will take care to cast them.

Apollo. Do, but be sure to give them to actors who will mind their cues.

Enter Ground-Ivy. (Colly Cibber.)

Ground. What are you doing here?

Apollo. I am casting the parts in the tragedy of King John.

Ground. Then you are casting the parts in a Tragedy that will not do.

Apollo. How Sir. Was it not written by Shakespeare, one of the greatest Genius's that ever lived?

Ground. No Sir, Shakespeare was a pretty fellow, and said some things which only want a little of my licking to do well enough. King John, as now writ, will not do. But a word in your ear, I will make him do.

Apollo. How?

Ground. By alteration, Sir; it was a maxim of mine, when I was at the head of theatrical affairs, that no play, tho' ever so good, would do without alteration.

Sowrwit, a Critic, ridicules the idea of Ground-Ivy's altering Shakespeare; to which Medley makes the following admirable reply: 'As Shakespeare is already good enough for people of taste, he must be altered to the palates of those who have none; and if you will grant that, who can be properer to alter him for the worse.'

Sowrwit. I hope, sir, your Pistol is not intended to burlesque Shakespeare.

Medley. No, Sir, I have too great an honour for Shakespeare to think of burlesquing him; and to be sure of not burlesquing him I will never attempt to alter him, for fear of burlesquing him by accident, as perhaps some others have done.

Sowrwit. To what purpose was Mr Pistol introduced?

Medley. To no purpose at all, Sir; it's all in character, Sir, and plainly shows of what mighty consequence he is. And there ends my Article from the Theatre.

The whole concludes with, 'and you ladies, whether you be Shakespeare's Ladies, or Beaumont and Fletcher Ladies,' &c.—about this time some Ladies formed them-

selves into a society to support Shakespeare—others seem to have done the same by Fletcher; to this Fielding alludes. The Prologue to the *Independent Patriot* alludes to the Ladies' Subscription for the revival of Shakespeare's plays.

KILBOURNE (p. 93): Cibber apparently did not know that he was returning to the harsh anti-Romish spirit that characterized the old play that Shakespeare recast, and which, in recasting, he rejected. So badly is the play mangled that it may be said to be practically written afresh. Among the numerous changes, two stand out, the virtual disappearance of Faulconbridge and the enlargement of the character of Constance. By the former, one of Shakespeare's most individual and skilfully portrayed characters, whose words and actions constitute one of the best features of the play, is lost to us. To compensate for this deprivation, the latter change is made, which the author doubtless thought would be very acceptable to his audience. Probably this is one of the principal things that to Cibber's mind made the history 'more like a play.' That the woman element must be made an important one was, as we have seen, an article of the dramatic faith of the time. It may be noted in passing that our Author, in making Constance more prominent, has represented her as doing several things for which history affords no warrant, a practice which he adopts in many other cases. Anyone who reads this play will not long be uncertain as to the comparative excellence of Shakespeare and Cibber as playwrights and poets. But nothing will be gained by a further discussion of this mangling process. It is much worse than in the version of *Richard III*, and it is no wonder that the play quickly succumbed when brought into comparison with the original at a rival theatre. It is interesting and amusing to learn that the proprietor of Drury Lane Theatre advertised that he had put off the requested revival of Shakespeare's *King John* because Cibber had insinuated that this was likely to damage him, but that, 'finding from the bills that *Papal Tyranny* was not an alteration of *King John*, but a new tragedy on the same plan,' he would not delay the exhibition.

[*Papal Tyranny* is easily accessible in any edition of Cibber's Works. A reprint of it is therefore omitted here; but no apology is needed, I think, for giving at full length the following *Letter*, issued anonymously, shortly after the publication of Cibber's Tragedy. Apart from its trenchant criticism of Cibber's work, its great rarity makes a modern reprint of it interesting. Miss Charlotte Porter (*Folio Edition*) has given a number of extracts from this *Letter*, without comment.—ED.]

A | LETTER | TO | *Colley Cibber*, Esq; | ON HIS | TRANSFORMATION | OF | KING JOHN | *O thou Head of the Wrongheads!* | PROVOK'D HUSBAND | [Device] | LONDON: | Printed for M. COOPER, in *Pater-Noster-Row.* | M.DCC.XLV.

Dear Colley,

I should not have delay'd so long making you my acknowledgements for the great Pleasure I have receiv'd from your Transformation of *King John*, but that I was willing to see the Copy, that I might at the same time point out the particular passages that have afforded me, amongst the rest of his Majesty's good subjects, so much wonder and delight. I now have it, and in return for the pleasure it gave me, take the liberty to present you with my small fare, desireing you most earnestly to fall to—with what appetite you may. I am wonderfully delighted with the reasons you give the noble Earl, you dedicate your play to, for taking Shakespeare's *King John* in hand. Your words are, 'In all the Historical plays of Shakespeare there is scarce any fact that might better have employ'd his (Shakespeare's)

genius than the flaming contest between his insolent Hóliness and King John. This is so remarkable a passage in our histories that it seems surprizing our Shakespeare should have taken no more fire at it. It was this Coldness then, my Lord, that first incited me to inspirit his King John,' &c. Now, dear Colley, as I think it impossible you should have read Shakespeare's *King John* with any attention (perhaps from being so entirely employ'd with your own), I shall take the liberty, for your information, to transcribe some speeches of that king, which I believe will set the matter out of all doubt, and convince you of your mistake in charging King John with coldness.

'*K. John.* What earthly name, to interrogatories can task
the free breath of a sacred king?
Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy, and ridiculous
To charge me to an answer, as the Pope.
Tell him this tale, and from the mouth of England
Add thus much more, that no Italian Priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions:
But as we under heav'n are supreme head,
So under it, that great supremacy
Where we do reign we will alone uphold,
Without th' assistance of a mortal hand.
So tell the Pope, a l rev'rence set apart
To him and his usurped authority.'

'*K. John.* Tho' you, and all the kings of Christendom
Are led so grosly by this meddling priest,
Dreading the curse that money may buy out;
And by the merit of vile gold, dross, dust,
Purchase corrupted pardon of a man,
Who in that sale, sells pardon from himself:
Tho' you and all the rest so grossly led,
This juggling witch-craft with revenue cherish,
Yet I alone, alone do me oppose
Against the Pope, and count his friends my foes.'

'*K. John.* France, thou shalt rue this hour within this hour.'

'*K. John.* Cousin, go draw our puissance together.' (*Exit* Bast.
France, I am burn'd up with inflaming wrath,
A rage, whose heat hath this condition;
That nothing can allay, nothing but blood,
The blood, and dearest-valu'd blood of France.'

Shakespeare, indeed, did not make a whole play upon this single incident of John's quarrel with the Pope any more than he did upon that of Hotspur's Rage in his *Harry the Fourth.* He had too great Matters in hand to dwell longer or stronger upon either of these incidents. That great Work he has left you, and cruel in you it is to rate him for it. As to your endeavor to make it more a play than what you found it in Shakespeare, I heartily wish it may be thought you have done so by your noble patron, whose judgement, more candid than his taste, I am persuaded, will make the proper distinction. But of all Shakespeare's plays this is

that which sins most against the three Grand Unities of the Stage—Time, Place, and Action—and is, on that account, the less reducible to Rule. And if, dear Colley, the height of your ambition is to have done this, or something like this, your ambition rises no higher than your judgement. Lord have mercy upon both! I come now to point out the Particulars of your transformation, in which you have shewn the most surprising genius at alteration that any of that great poet's amenders ever yet produced. The editor of Shakespeare, in the character he gives him as a writer, says very justly: 'The genius that gives us the highest pleasure sometimes stands in need of our indulgence.' Whenever this happens with regard to Shakespeare I would willingly impute it to a Vice of his Times; we see complaisance enough in our own days paid to a bad taste. His clinches, false wit, and descending beneath himself seem to be a deference paid to reigning Barbarism. There is scarce a play of this great man in which he does not descend beneath himself, and pay this deference to the reigning barbarism of his times. In his gravest pieces, where he displays his most exalted genius, he as constantly throws in a vein of low humour, in complaisance to the low capacities of the coarse laughers of his days, whom, perhaps, it was as much his interest to keep in temper, by dividing himself to all tastes, as it is now of modern poets, who would succeed. But the case is widely different with his amenders, and he who attempts to reform Shakespeare has not the same Tye on him, and may act without this complaisance. Instead therefore of torturing Shakespeare into Rule and dramatick law, or making his plays more of plays than he made them, let his clinches, false wit, &c., be the objects of amendment; where a fine scene of Nature is interrupted by a low vein of humour, which by inciting the vulgar to laugh, draws off the attention of the sensible, let the shears be apply'd without mercy; where likewise a character has not been rais'd to the height it might reach by the poet's applying himself to some more favourite character in the play, let the alterer bend his care, and the success will be answerable, if his genius be equal to the task. An instance of improving or heightening a character we have in Edgar (in *King Lear*) as well as in Cordelia, between whom a Love Episode is not ill woven. Another yet stronger is in Catherine (in *Harry the Fifth*) whose character in Shakespeare is abominably low and obscene. The improvement of her's has naturally rais'd that of Harry. Other instances might be produced to shew where Shakespeare might admit, with great beauty and propriety, of strong alterations, nay, amendments. But, dear Colley, what have you done of all this? You have indeed purg'd Shakespeare of his low stuff, but have you not fill'd the place up with Flat? You have altered Characters, but have you amended one? That will presently be seen in the Examen of those of Falconbridge, Constance, Arthur, and King John! There is a wild greatness in some of Shakespeare's characters above the reach of common readers, of which one can better form to one's self an idea than convey description to another. Of this kind is the character of Falconbridge; never was character (for what it is) better drawn or stronger kept up to the last. Shakespeare seems to have taken as much pains in forming (as he calls him) this Mis-begotten Devil, as he did his and ev'ry Body's favourite Falstaff. His character, tho' an humourous one, has a certain dignity in it that well becomes the greatness of mind he discovers in his graver walk—as the following quotations will evidently shew:

'*Bast.* Ha! Majesty; how high thy glory towers,
When the rich blood of kings is set on fire!
Oh, now death line his dead chaps with steel;

The swords of soldiers are his teeth, his phangs;
And now he feasts, mouthing the flesh of men
In undetermin'd diff'rences of Kings.
Why stand these royal fronts amazed thus?
Cry havock, Kings, back to the stained field
You equal potents, fiery-kindled spirits!
Then let confusion of one part confirm
The other's peace; till then, blows, blood, and death.'

'*Bast.* By heav'n, these scroyles of Angiers flout you kings,
And stand securely on their battlements
As in a theatre, whence they gape and point
At your industrious scenes and acts of death.
You royal presences be ruled by me;
Do like the mutines of Jerusalem,
Be friends a while, and both conjointly bend
Your sharpest deeds of malice on this town,
By east and west let France and England mount
Their batt'ring cannon charged to the mouths,
Till their soul-fearing clamours have brawl'd down
The flinty ribs of this contemptuous city.
I'd play incessantly upon these jades;
Even till unfenced desolation
Leave them as naked as the vulgar air.
That done, dissever your united strengths,
And part our mingled colours once again,
Turn face to face, and bloody point to point.
Then in a moment fortune shall cull forth,
Out of one side her happy minion,
To whom in favour she shall give the day,
And kiss him with a glorious Victory.
How like you this wild counsel, mighty states?'

'*Bast.* And if thou hast the mettle of a King,
Being wrong'd as we are by this peevish town,
Turn thou the mouth of thy artillery,
As we will ours, against these fawcy walls;
And when that we have dash'd them to the ground,
Why then defie each other, and pell-mell
Make work upon ourselves for heav'n or hell.'

'*Bast.* Here's a stay,
That shakes the rotten carcas of old death,
Out of his rags. Here's a large mouth indeed,
That spits forth death, and mountains, rocks, and seas,
Talks as familiarly of roaring Lions,
As maids of thirteen do of puppy-dogs.
What cannoneer begot this lusty blood?
He speaks plain cannon-fire, and smoak and bounce,
He gives the bastinado with his tongue:
Our ears are cudgel'd; not a word of his

But buffets better than a fist of France;
Zounds, I was never so bethumpt with words
Since I first call'd my brother's father dad.'

'*Bast.* Mad world, mad kings, mad composition?
John to stop Arthur's title in the whole,
Hath willingly departed with a part:
And France, whose armour conscience buckled on,
Whom zeal and charity brought to the field,
As God's own soldier; rounded in the ear
With that same purpose-changer, that sly-devil,
That broker, that still breaks the pate of faith,
That daily break-vow, he that wins of all,
Of kings, of beggars, old men, young men, maids,
Who having no external thing to lose
But the word maid, cheats the poor maid of that;
That smooth'd fac'd gentleman, tickling commodity:
Commodity, the bias of the world,
The world, which of it self is poised well,
Made to run even, upon even ground;
Till this advantage, this vile-drawing bias,
This sway of motion, this commodity,
Makes it take head from all indifferency,
From all direction, purpose, course, intent.
And this same bias, this commodity,
This bawd, this broker, this all-changing word,
Clapt on the outward eye of fickle France,
Hath drawn him from his own determin'd aid,
From a resolv'd and honourable war,
To a most base and vile concluded peace.
And why rail I on this commodity?
But for because he hath not woo'd me yet:
Not that I have the power to clutch my hand,
When his fair angels would salute my palm;
But that my hand, as unattempted yet,
Like a poor beggar, raileth on the rich.
Well, while I am a beggar, I will rail,
And say there is no sin but to be rich:
And being rich, my virtue then shall be,
To say there is no vice, but beggary.
Since kings break faith upon commodity,
Gain be my lord, for I will worship thee.'

This character, dear Colley, was quite above your Reach; I am afraid you have, for that reason (excuse the expression, but you are not nice yourself in the use of words), gutted; preserving only to your Falconbridge the Name and Office of a Messenger and Letter-Carrier, without one single speech throughout the whole above the height of modern Common-place Tragedy. The only time that he makes any figure is in his Embassy to the Cardinal, and there the height of his wisdom goes no further than to suggest to the Cardinal that it was the mutual interest of the people and King John to agree upon Terms. But to quit this dis-

membring of character, and to proceed to downright murder. What in the name of wonder could induce you to treat Constance with so much barbarity? There is, dear Colley, in that Princess a stamp of heroism mixt with an inimitable sensibility of grief that would sit very ill in any mere representer of grief, however pathetick. For grief (which possibly you may not know) is but an accident, and not a constituent of character, and takes its colour from the natural frame of mind of the person; and according as such person is from temper, either shews itself outrageous and violent, or soft and pathetick. To prove that Constance is a character design'd to be outrageous and violent in grief, when Salisbury brings her the news of the peace concluded by the means of Lady Blanch between the Kings of England and France, she says:

> '*Const.* O, if thou teach me to believe this sorrow,
> Teach thou this sorrow how to make me die;
> And let belief and life encounter so,
> As doth the fury of two desp'rate men,
> Which in the very meeting, fall and die.
> Lewis wed Blanch! O boy, then where art thou?
> France friend with England! what becomes of me?
> Fellow begone, I cannot brook thy sight.'

The idea convey'd to the spectator by the most beautiful comparison of the fury of two desperate men, which in their very meeting fall and die, is a frame of mind in Constance that should make her *burst* the moment she believes the truth, and not *pathetically* whine under it. When young Arthur, who is mild in temperament, attempts to calm her,

> '*Arth.* I do beseech you, mother, be content.'

she replies with wonderful propriety of Character:

> '*Const.* If thou that bidst me be content, wert grim,
> Ugly, and slanderous to thy mother's womb,
> Full of unpleasing blots, and sightless stains,
> Lame, foolish, crooked, swart, prodigious,
> Patch'd with foul moles, and eye-offending marks;
> I would not care, I then would be content:
> For then I should not love thee: no, nor thou
> Become thy great birth, nor deserve a crown.'

Here breaks out all the pathos of the mother's tenderness, but still with the same greatness of passion, above the *wet eye* or *broken voice*—

> 'But thou art fair, and at thy birth, dear boy!
> Nature and Fortune join'd to make thee great.
> Of nature's gift thou may'st with lilies boast,
> And with the half-blown rose.'

Now rage again, Constance, still in all the turnings of thy temper *great, outrageous,* and *violent*:

> 'But fortune, oh!
> She is corrupted, chang'd, and won from thee,
> She adulterates hourly with thine uncle John

And with her golden hand hath pluckt on France
To tread down fair respect of sovereignty,
And made his majesty the bawd to theirs,
France is a bawd to fortune, and to John,
That strumpet Fortune, that usurping John!
Tell me, thou fellow, is not France forsworn?'

Not satisfy'd herself with railing, she goes on,

'Envenom him with words, or get thee gone,
And leave these woes alone, which I alone
Am bound to under-bear.'

In the next speech, agitated to a degree of frantick sorrow, she throws herself upon the ground, and on King Philip's saying that day should be kept as a holy day, she starts up in a fury,

'*Const.* A wicked day and not a holy day.
What hath this day deserv'd? what hath it done,
That it in golden letters should be set
Among the high tides in the kalendar?
Nay, rather turn this day out of the week,
This day of shame, oppression, perjury:
Or if it must stand still, let wives with child
Pray that their burthens may not fall this day,
Lest that their hopes prodigiously be crost:
Except this day, let seamen fear no wrack:
No bargains break, that are not this day made;
This day all things begun came to ill end,
Yea, faith itself to hollow falsehood chang'd.'

'*Const.* Arm, arm, ye heav'ns, against these perjur'd Kings:
A widow cries, be husband to me, heav'n!
Let not the hours of this ungodly day
Wear out the day in peace; but ere sun-set,
Set armed discord 'twixt these perjur'd Kings.
Hear me, oh hear me!
Aust. Lady Constance, peace.
Const. War, war, no peace; peace is to me a war:
O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame
That bloody spoil: Thou slave, thou wretch, thou coward,
Thou little valiant, great in villany:
Thou ever strong upon the stronger side;
Thou fortune's champion, that dost never fight
But when her humorous Ladyship is by
To teach thee safety; thou art perjur'd too,
And sooth'st up greatness. What a fool art thou,
A ramping fool, to brag, to stamp, and swear,
Upon my party; thou cold-blooded slave,
Hast thou not spoke like thunder on my side,
Been sworn my soldier, bidding me depend
Upon thy stars, thy fortune, and thy strength?

And dost thou now fall over to my foes?
Thou wear a Lion's hide? doff it for shame,
And hang a calve's-skin on those recreant limbs.'

After her son Arthur is taken prisoner she grows quite frantick in her grief, and utters such forcible passion that nothing but Shakespeare's genius could express it (or Mrs Cibber's act it):

'*Const.* No, I defie all counsel, all redress,
But that which ends all counsel, true redress,
Death; death, oh, amiable, lovely death!
Arise forth from thy couch of lasting night,
Thou hate and terror to prosperity,
And I will kiss thy detestable bones;
And put my eye-balls in thy vaulty brows,
And ring these fingers with thy household worms,
And stop this gap of breath with fulsom dust,
And be a carrion monster like thy self;
Come grin on me, and I will think thou smil'st,
And kiss thee as thy wife: thou Love of misery!
O come to me.'

When the Cardinal tells her she utters Madness and not sorrow, with how much energy does she convince everybody she is not mad, and make everybody wish for her own sake she was! Hear her words:

'*Const.* Thou art not holy to belie me so,
I am not mad; this hair I tear is mine;
My name is Constance, I was Geffrey's wife:
Young Arthur is my son, and he is lost:
I am not mad, I would to heaven I were.
For then, 'tis like, I should forget myself.
O if I could, what grief should I forget!
I am not mad; too well, too well I feel
The different plague of each calamity.
Oh father Cardinal, I have heard you say
That we shall see and know our friends in heav'n!
If that be so, I shall see my boy again.
For since the birth of Cain, the first male child,
To him that did but Yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.
But now will canker sorrow eat my bud,
And chase the native beauty from his cheek,
And he will look as hollow as a ghost,
As dim and meagre as an ague's fit,
And so he'll die; and rising so again,
When I shall meet him in the court of heav'n
I shall not know him; therefore, never, never
Must I behold my pretty Arthur more.'

Again, when he tells her she holds too heinous a respect of grief, how beautiful is her reply:

'*Const.* He talks to me, that never had a son.'

But what closes all, and rends the Heartstrings, is what follows:

> '*Const.* Grief fills the room up of my absent child;
> Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me;
> Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
> Remembers me of all his gracious parts;
> Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form,
> Then have I reason to be fond of grief.
> Fare you well; had you such a loss as I,
> I could give better comfort than you do.
> I will not keep this form upon my head,
> (*Tearing off her head-cloaths.*
> When there is such disorder in my wit.
> O Lord! my boy, my Arthur, my fair son!
> My life, my joy, my food, my all the world,
> My-widow, comfort, and my sorrow's cure!'

It is plain then from these quotations that Constance is a character of fire throughout! Great and impetuous in ev'ry thing! and masterly drawn! What reason, dear Colley, to alter this character? Was it above proof, that you was forc'd to lower it? Is it more palatable now you have? I cou'd almost be tempted in this place to pursue your Constance thro' the play in the same manner I have done Shakespeare's, but the quotations I shou'd be oblig'd to make wou'd not excuse me to the reader. It will therefore be sufficient for my purpose to take a sketch of her here and there as I find her in the play. In the first act she comes in with Philip for parade, but as soon as ever she hears of John's approach, desires leave to go out—because, forsooth,

> 'The sight of Royal treatment pay'd her mortal Foe,
> Is more than her afflicted Heart can bear!'

Pretty dear! well! King Philip very politely sends the Dauphin to squire her to his tent—King John and he parley and quarrel—Exeunt French and English severally; Trumpets sound to horse. In comes Constance again, telling us with wond'rous Penetration that the crown of England now hangs upon a Moment, viz., while Battle is fighting; for

> 'The wasting winds in audible perception
> Set all the terrors of the field before her.'

Then, Prophet like, the alarms ceasing, says,

> 'Now is our cause successful or abandon'd.'

At last she bethinks herself of her Boy, and in he comes most opportunely for her, and they prattle most sweetly—

> 'Oh say, my Boy! how could thy tender limbs
> Support the onsets of this dreadul day?
> *Arth.* O 'twas a gallant horse I rode! train'd up
> To war! had I known fear, he would have sham'd me!
> He curl'd his crest, and proudly paw'd the ground,
> And from his vocal nostrils neigh'd such fire,
> To mount him seem'd the transport of a throne.
> *Const.* My little soldier, how thy spirit charms me!'

But the two kings approaching, she wants to be gone again, and sigh her grief to heav'n. However, she is overpersuaded, and stays; what for? why to give a Soldier's advice, which in Shakespeare a soldier indeed gives. The Abbot, however (luckily for Angiers), turns the council of War by the happy simile of Solomon's judgement; John thinks the inference asks attention; and Constance gives up her plea:

> 'Hence to some lonely Cell (*says the good soul*) I will retire
> And meditate RESIGN'D the Ills that wait me.'

Away she goes, like

> 'The trembling turtle with her only young—
> *Shrinks* in her Nest, and *dreads impending* wrong.'

In the second act we have her again, but so trick'd, so adorn'd, dear Colley, so full of points and antitheses, so witty in her sorrow, so polite in her reproaches, that I shou'd wrong you if I did not let her speak for herself:

> '*Const.* A peace with England, and by France concluded!
> Affianc'd too! Blanch to the Dauphin married!
> And Arthur's ruin made her pompous dowry!
> Thou dost abuse my ear, it cannot be!
> I have a Monarch's oath to right my cause,
> And 'twere to wrong thy master, to believe thee!'

> '*Const.* My hopes! bid the lost wretch with broken limbs,
> Extended on the wheel, to hope for mercy!
> Hopes I have none!—'

> '*Const.* Content! to thy vile wrongs be patient! no;
> Were thou, in temper wayward, foul in feature,
> Deform'd, that ev'n thy birth disgrac'd thy mother!
> Yet, as my child, my heart would feel my usage!
> But as thou art the pride and triumph of my bed,
> As thou art fair, and at thy birth, dear boy,
> Nature and fortune both conspir'd to grace thee;
> For not the rose or lily, from the hand of nature,
> Can boast their beauties more compleat or fair!
> Nor has, among the realms of Europe, fortune
> Bequath'd a crown to blood or birth superior!
> As such when I behold thee, and behold
> Thee wrong'd, betray'd, abandon'd to the world;
> Then, then, to be content were criminal!
> And indolence that virtue would disclaim;
> No, no, my child! cruel, obdurate souls,
> They only, who could do these wrongs, might bear them:
> But human hearts, a helpless mother's heart,
> Must yield to nature, and deplore thy fortune!'

> '*Const.* You must! you dare! you shall! I will not go!
> Tell them, they've taught my sorrow to be proud:
> There is a dignity in suff'ring wrong,
> Which mean-soul'd perfidy can never reach!

Here, on this humble earth, build we our throne;
Here shall Calamity in judgement sit,
And call oppression to her sad tribunal.
Now let injurious France and England see,
How we are rais'd in majesty above them!
This is the throne, to which, or first or last,
The greatest kings must bow—Philip, I thank thee;
These are thy favours!—Such the faith of Princes!'

The erecting a tribunal for Calamity, and calling Oppression for judgement, are Colleycisms of the most sublime nature; Figures beyond any feeling of the heart. Constance's Court of Justice here is a *Coup de Maître*—a *Ne plus ultra* for a torn heart! We hear nothing more of her till the third act, when in she comes, but so defac'd, so mangled by thy barbarous hand! so inconsistent with herself! so very good natur'd in the first part of the scene that, seeing King Philip a little concerned for her, she tells him,

'I came to triumph o'er thy fate,
But my reproach, *suppress'd by thy contrition*,
Blends with *my own*, a sigh to *thy* misfortune.'

And so very angry and passionate in the latter that the Cardinal tells her she is mad—and in good faith I think so too, for I defy anybody to find out a reason why she should exclaim so much in the latter end of the scene and be so calm in the beginning. One would have imagin'd her son's being taken prisoner would have been uppermost in her thoughts or, rather, have left her no room for any else. However she cools again, and goes off with a wondrous pretty Comparison so very descriptive that that heart must be quite at ease that is capable of making it:

'So when her fawn the hunter's toils have *snar'd*,
The *bounding* doe forsakes the safer herd;
Wild o'er the fields to his vain help she flies,
And press'd by fear on *pointed* javelins dies.'

In the fifth act behold her attending her son's funeral, talking of rolling suns, darkness and eternal shades, and hateful beams; of blooming springs and autumn fruits, and dead flowers, and a thousand tropes and figures cull'd from the richest images of the most luxuriant fancy, with here and there (as in the former scene) a word retain'd of Shakespeare's, or new daub'd by thy plast'ring hand! At length the Abbot brings her to a little temper:

'Thy holy counsels, Father, have reliev'd me;
Misfortunes, now familiar to my sense,
Abate the terror—Now my peaceful heart,
With *tearless eyes*, shall wait him to the grave.'

But on Falconbridge's coming in with an account of King John's being poison'd and calling for a Confessor, she has another fling at him; but Falconbridge soon pacifies her by telling her that Hubert dying disavow'd the deed, and she has freedom of mind enough, in her grief, to distinguish between oppression and murder. King John dying penitent, she, like a good Christian, forgives him, and desiring them to forbear a while the obsequies of Arthur, promises in *a few hours to overtake him, and so goes off.*

And now, dear Colley,
Look here upon *this* picture, and on *this*—
The counterfeit presentment of two Constances!
See what grace is seated on this pattern! Have you eyes?
Could you on this fair mourner leave to gaze,
To look upon this whimp'rer! ha! Have you eyes?
You cannot call it fancy—At your age,
The heyday in the Muse is tame, it's humble,
And trails upon the judgement—And what judgement
(Thine, Colley, be alone in this excepted)
Wou'd step from this to this? what devil was't, &c.

But to proceed to other characters. I could have wish'd, dear Colley, you would have made Arthur one thing or t'other, a man or a boy, that we might have pity'd him as a young unfortunate hero, or wept for him as a helpless child. But this unaccountable mixture of man and boy, however beautiful in the conceit and fancy of it, nobody can bear! Hear him only, dear Colley, and then tell me if any child can talk such language:

'*Art.* O godlike Philip! now my more than father!
That I have life, was nature's gift (*indeed!*) from you
A greater, nobler blessing I receive,
That life with princely dignity supported!
But, if hereafter gracious heaven ordain
Your arms shall seat me on fair England's throne,
Then shall my thanks be worthy your acceptance;
An annual tribute shall confess the tenure!'

This speaker, dear Colley, is a man, a palpable man! but here is another curst mistake in the first setting out. How could you hope to recommend an English Prince to an English audience by making him become tributary to France? The very King of France is asham'd of it, and tells him,

'*King Phil.* Alas! thy youthful heart melts to concessions,
Which tho' 'twere laudable in thee to form,
Becomes not elder honours to receive.'

But he is not only a man, but a *polite, well-bred* one. Hear him and the Dauphin compliment a little:

'*Dauph.* Thus with a brother's love my breast receives him.
Art. So sweet a master, sir, will make me learn
The hardest task of danger with delight!
Dauph. Young Prince, if you advance as fast in war
As you are forward in *your* school of honour,
I sooner shall be found your *pupil* than your *tutor!*'

Mr Bayes has a scene like this between King *Phyz.* and King *Ush.*

'*1 King.* You must begin, *ma foy.*
2 King. Sweet Sir, *pardonez moy.*'

Like little Bayes you bring in none but well-bred persons, egad, but King Philip, tho' a Frenchman, thought there was enough of it:

'*King Phil.* Here break we off the greetings of our love.'

But you have made him not only a man in years and good breeding, but a man of council, capable of giving advice, for when King Philip sends his son off with Constance, he retains Arthur,

'*King Phil.* Prince Dauphin, you conduct the lady Constance
To our pavilion—Arthur may assist us.'

Here again by an unaccountable forgetfulness (which, however, all great genius's are liable to) you don't make him say a word during the conference, tho' King Philip kept him for no other earthly purpose. After the battle, indeed, you bring him in to talk of his horse's *vocal nostrils neighing fire*, and all that, and to tell his Mamma what a hairbreadth 'scape he had.

In the second act you begin to prepare the audience for that most surprizing return of Arthur into *childhood!* a change beyond what any pantomime ever yet exhibited, and that will make you famous to latest posterity. Arthur, in this act, at once forgets his youthful but manly ardour, his great pretensions, for the accomplishment of which he offered Philip to become tributary to him, his spirit shewn in battle.

('*Con.* My little soldier! how this spirit charms me!')

and like a young lad, well tutor'd by his Mamma, and taught to submit always to the will of heav'n, says,

'*Arth.* Since, 'tis the will of heav'n,
I do beseech you, madam—be content.'

But this mistake you was led into, dear Colley, by not understanding Shakespeare's idiom. Young Arthur there indeed says,

'I do beseech you, mother, be content.'

But he does not mean (as yours does) to bid her give up all her hopes and be content; but the poor child, seeing his mother in a great passion, is frightened at it, and desires her to be content, i. e., be calm, be pacify'd. But now comes the great, the wondrous event; when Hubert asks him for his golden tablets, the poor boy, frightened (for now the change is wrought) out of his wits, and thinking to appease him, cries out,

'*Arth.* Here, here;
O Hubert! I have a diamond on my finger too,
Take that; within I've other gems of value.
My little pray'r book is with precious stones
Beset, and clasp'd with gold—I'll give thee all.'

But if you won't take his own words for it, believe Hubert's,

'*Hub.* Think'st thou I came to rob thee of thy toys?'

Toys! for whom? a man or a boy? That is the question; for in the close of the same speech he is a man again, and treats very sensibly for his ransom:

'Nay more—my wretched mother (give me time
To write) will starve her state to save me.
Let me but live, &c., &c.'

But man, or boy, no matter; Hubert is moved after another speech or two.

> '*Hub.* I hear him talk too much; I must be speedy,
> Down foolish qualm, &c.'

Foolish indeed! for hang me, dear Colley, if he has uttered a Syllable hitherto that could move anybody (Hubert and yourself excepted). Well, Arthur's prayer at least finishes the Contest, Hubert is overcome, away go the daggers. Hubert and Arthur, whom we find again in the fifth act, doing what? Fathoming the mote with a line.

> '*Arth.* The mote beneath I've fathom'd with a line,
> And find its depth proportion'd to my stature.'

But as you have not ascertain'd the depth otherwise than by his stature, and have left us in the dark as to either, we can draw no positive inference as to his manhood or childhood from this circumstance, nor is it quite clear from his story whether he was a man grown or a boy. Shakespeare has a little rashly determined him the latter; but you, dear Colley, are for the safer side of the question, and have, therefore, widely made him both one and t'other. I should now, dear Colley, cast my eye upon King John, and observe in the same candid manner I have all along proceeded, wherein you have inspirited him; for as this was the first motive that induced you to meddle at all with him, so I don't question but this has been the *hic Labor*, the *hoc Opus*, with you. But I have looked into the scenes between him and King Philip, and between him and Pandulph, where this inspiriting quality ought to have been, according to your declaration, infused with a lavish hand, and can find nothing of it. I observe, indeed, you have considerably lengthened the scene; spun out the dialogue; made John declaim, argue, confute, puzzle the Cardinal himself with doctrine; but what of all that? where is the inspiriting? You have (to use a figure that may make me better understood) cut many different channels for the torrent of John's wrath to flow thro'; but then, unfortunately, by this very act, as it happens in Nature, you have lost the torrent; you have the same quantity of anger; but the quality is gone. Instead of collecting the rays to a point in order to burn, you spread them so they become quite lambent. You forget that by making your bottom too broad you make it flat. In short, dear Colley (for I know you love quaint Expressions), give me a dram of Shakespeare's Spirit by itself, and deal about, as largely as you please, of your own mixture: People's tastes will distinguish sufficiently between. I shall therefore forbear hunting any longer to find out this inspiriting Force you kindly intended to give King John; and shew him as you have painted him in a particular scene or two; wherein you have vary'd wonderfully, for the reasons better known to yourself, from the conduct of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's blunt, downright method of never formally preparing an audience for his most capital scenes is a kind of insolence that ought to be resented. To come full upon one, in this manner, and not give one time to resist him! To make one's heart, head, eyes tremble and shake with horror, agony, tenderness or whatever passion it is he pours upon our faculties is like ordering one to immediate execution without notice! One feels before one knows one is to feel! The effect almost precedes the act, at least keeps pace with it. Instances of this are frequent in this curst play of his. Constance plagues us in this manner, at every entrance. John does the same. He no sooner takes Arthur prisoner, and sends his cousin to England upon business of moment, but, in the very Field of Battle, on the spot, attacks Hubert at once, gives him no time

to pause, works him to his bloody purpose, and speeds for England for fresh business. This, dear Colley, you have wholly reform'd; you give us long notice beforehand of John's purpose and Hubert's fitness for it.

> 'K. *John*. If features err not, Hubert is the man:
> 'Tis true, he's slow, has not the courtier's quickness,
> Or half the hints we gave had fir'd his brain
> T' have done the deed, we tremble but to name!
> Some fitter time shall mould him to our purpose:
> Now actions, open to the day, demand us.'

And when you come to the scene itself you craftily qualify it in such a manner that if it was not for a few lines here and there of Shakespeare retain'd we shou'd see the whole scene without any great pain or terror. Nay, we might be tempted to smile almost at John's delicacy of not speaking by daylight, and at Hubert's complaisance in shutting the windows. It might put one in mind of that unaccountable modesty, so natural to a young bashful wench, who would do anything in the dark, but is afraid of the daylight! Yet methinks Hubert speaks plain enough where he says,

> '*Hub*. Then, sir, to ease your heart, I will be plain;
> I guess the secret that distresses you;
> Fear not to trust me, sir, I'll do the deed.'

Tho' he seems afterwards to be a little arch, and to have a mind to make John speak the thing plain.

> '*John*. Must I then speak it?
> *Hub*. Or how shall I be sure that I obey you?'

The shutting of the windows is quite your own invention, and wond'rous is the effect thereof. You took the hint no doubt from these words:

> 'The sun is in heav'n, and the proud day,
> Attended with the pleasures of the world,
> Is all too wanton, and too full of gawds
> To give me audience. If the midnight bell
> Did with his iron tongue and brazen mouth
> Sound on into the drowsy race of night;
> If this same were a church-yard where we stand,
> And thou possessed with a thousand wrongs;
> Or if that surly spirit, melancholy,
> Had bak'd thy blood and made it heavy thick,
> Which else runs tickling up and down the veins,
> Making the idiot, laughter, keep men's eyes,
> And strain their cheeks to idle merriment;
> (A passion hateful to my purposes)
> Or if that thou could'st see me without eyes,
> Hear me without thine ears, and make reply
> Without a tongue, using conceit alone,

Without eyes, ears, and harmful sounds of words;
Then in despight of broad-eyed watchful day,
I would into thy bosom pour my thoughts;'

improving by this surprising act, of shutting the windows upon King John's horror and gloom of mind, so finely described by Shakespeare. In the next scene between John and Hubert, on the Barons falling off and the distress brought on John by the supposed death of Arthur, you have observed pretty near the same method, and softening all the parts that were too strong in Shakespeare, and pouring in a good deal of cool descriptive declamation, have made the scene tolerable, which in Shakespeare had too great an effect. I must not take leave of John, for I cannot bear to see him on his death-bed, wishing

'To range and roll him in eternal snow,
With crowns of Icicles to cool his brain.'

However, I heartily thank you for making him penitential, and die with mercy and heaven in his mouth. A stave or two, or one of Pandulph's Requiems sung in his Pontificalibus, and set to soft musick, had graced his exit finely, and would have been new. I see nothing in the Cardinal's Character to take up your time with any longer; I can't help smiling though to see how Falconbridge and his eminence smoke each other at first sight, before they begin to treat.

'*Pandulph.* The humble bearing of this minister,
At length I see, bespeak an humble master.
Fal. This temper of his eminence, this form,
Of stately charity, foretells success.
He read from my humility, my errand,
And darted from his eyes a conscious triumph.'

These are the things, dear Colley, that speak the genius! that stamp the poet! this is the indelible mark! By this you have acquired the laurel that adorns your brows. By this you continue to deserve it. This will make it flourish with everlasting Green! This will preserve your memory dear to all Lovers of our immortal Shakespeare! This will inspire future amenders of that poet, and be as a Landmark to them to escape the perils that wait upon such hardy bold attempts! This, in one word, dear Colley, sums up the whole of your poetical life, and you may now retire from the stage full of honours, as the famous Broughton has from another, and with as good a *Hic cæstus artemque repono.* I have thus, dear Colley, made good my promise to you, in the beginning of this letter, and in return only request the favour of you to give it a reading. Among the many good qualities you have (which without a sneer, I frankly allow you) I know one is to laugh heartily at your being laugh'd at, and to own the hit. Like your worthy patron's playful muse, yours can also praise one who makes a flight that comes near you; and if, in keeping you so much in my eye, I have in the least excelled, I am sure of your commendation. I am, dear Colley, an admirer of your real merit, but no flatterer of your faults.

VALPY'S *KING JOHN*

In the *Advertisement* to his edition of *King John* R. Valpy says: 'When the editor formed the design of introducing the Play of *King John* on his classical stage he procured Cibber's *Papal Tyranny*, with a view of adopting some part of his plan and style. On the perusal he found two great obstacles to his wishes. Cibber's object, during the rebellion in 1745, was to paint the character of the Pope's Legate in the blackest colours, and to darken the principles of the Romish Church with circumstances of horror, which might increase the indignation of the people of England against them. In the present times, when the situation of the Pope had become a subject of commiseration to the Christian world, the aim of the Editor was to soften the features of Papal Tyranny as far as historical evidence would permit him. He also wished to preserve all the fine passages of Shakespeare. Cibber had scarcely retained a line of the great original. The more he compared *King John* with *Papal Tyranny*, the less he found himself inclined to depart from Shakespeare and to adhere to Cibber. He wished to correct and modernise the versification of the former whenever he could do it without offending the ears or the taste of his admirers; the latter had adopted his worst metrical irregularities, without the compensation of those noble flights of genius which soar above the rules of common criticism. Cibber succeeded in his alteration of *Richard III.* because he collected a cento of Shakespeare's expressions and speeches. [In the present alteration some few lines have been taken from Cibber's *Papal Tyranny*], but that part of the plan which is common to both, such as the omission of the First Act of the Original, was, in reality, determined before Cibber's play had been seen.'

GENEST (vol. vii, p. 585): T. R., Covent Garden, May 20, 1803, Mrs. Litchfield's bt. *King John*, altered from Shakespeare. King John—Cooke, 1st time; Faulconbridge—H. Johnston, 1st time; Hubert—Carles, 5th app.; King of France—Cory; Dauphin—Brunton; Pandulph—Hull; Arthur—Miss Norton, 1st app. at C. G.; Constance—Mrs. Litchfield, 1st time; Lady Blanch—Mrs. Beverley. This alteration was Dr Valpy's, which was printed in 1800; he made it for the purpose of having it acted at his school at Reading—and so far all was well—but when he sent it forth to the public from the press it did him no credit. He has omitted Shakespeare's first act. To supply this deficiency he has made some additions of his own, and has stooped so low as to borrow from *Papal Tyranny*. Dr Johnson says the character of the bastard contains the mixture of greatness and levity, which Shakespeare delighted to exhibit. Dr Valpy, like Cibber, has thrown a damp on the spirit of Faulconbridge. Like Davenant, &c., he has made many unnecessary changes in the diction. He seems to have sitten down to correct Shakespeare as he would correct a boy's exercise, putting in and putting out as it suited his fancy. He has, however, had the good sense not to tamper with the grand scenes. The allusion to the state of France in 1800, which he has thrown into Faulconbridge's speech, is contemptible. Dr Valpy has preserved the appellation given to Prince Lewis by Shakespeare, but observes that the title of Dauphin was first given to Charles, eldest son of John, King of France, in 1350. He wonders that this circumstance has escaped the notice of the commentators, particularly of Steevens and Malone.

CHARACTER OF KING JOHN

SKOTTOWE (i, 129): The same view is taken of John's character by Shakespeare and by the anonymous author. In prosperity he is bold and insolent and overbearing; in adversity, an abject coward—weak in judgement, precipitate in action. With no views beyond the exigency of the moment, he eagerly attempts the accomplishing of his desires, unrestrained by religious awe and unchecked by moral principle. Devoid of talent, he reaps not the benefit of his villainy; superior ability overreaches him; he succumbs to the power he insolently defies and affectedly despises, and he is at once the object of hatred and contempt. The old play makes John a usurper, and not, as represented by Holinshed, the legal possessor of the throne under the dying testament of his predecessor and brother, Richard. It was the object of both the dramatists to excite pity in favour of Arthur, and they, therefore, judiciously suppressed the facts recorded by Holinshed, that the nobility 'willingly took their oaths of obedience' to John, and that the pretensions of his nephew were at one time so little insisted upon that 'a peace was concluded upon betwixt King John and Duke Arthur.'

ULRICI (ii, 216): As in *Coriolanus* we have the antique state in conflict with its foundation, the family bond and its rights, so in *King John* the centre of the action lies in the struggle between the mediæval state and its one basis, the church. As the latter was or pretended to be the ideal side of political life, and thus, as it were, the ethos, that is, the conscience of the state, this struggle is first of all reflected in John's own life and character; we have it exhibited in the perpetual conflict between his better self, which was naturally disposed to manly dignity, independence, and quick and resolute action, and his tendency to arbitrary proceedings, love of dominion and pretension, to caprice and passionate recklessness. Being in conflict with himself, his naturally discordant disposition degenerates into complete inconsistency and want of character. Hence, although he has even resorted to murder, he cannot maintain his tottering throne either against Arthur's legitimate claims or against the interferences of France and of the Church. His own unjust title to the crown, his violence, and his inconsistent and arbitrary actions, his dispute with the Church, and the intrigues of the latter become the motives of France's breach of faith, of the ever-recurring contests from without, as well as of the internal dissensions of the kingdom. The relation between Church and State is the pulse of the whole historical action; John's dilemmas, his degradation and his death are its work, and the only means that it employs are that it contrives cleverly to make use of the illegitimacy attached to his crown, the weakness of his own character, and the want of strength in the feudal community, which again was the result of John's despotic rule.

GERVINUS (p. 357): As John appears at the commencement he is like a vigorous man prepared for everything, resolved with a strong hand to defend his possession of the throne against every assault. He is 'great in thought,' as Faulconbridge subsequently reminds him, referring to this early period; in the thought, he means, of maintaining with all his power against every pretension that English land which actually is on his side and has sworn allegiance to him, and of identifying the kingdom with his country as the straightforward Bastard ever does. He is not the image of a brutal tyrant, but only the type of a hard, manly nature, without any of the enamel of finer feelings, and without any other motives for action than those

arising from the instinct of this same inflexible nature and personal interest. Severe and earnest, an enemy to cheerfulness and merry laughter, conversant with dark thoughts, of a restless, excited temperament, he quickly rises to daring resolves; he is uncommunicative to his best advisers, laconic and reserved; he does not agree to the good design of his evil mother that he should satisfy Constance and her claims by an accommodation; it better pleases his warlike manly pride to bear arms against the threatened arms; in his campaigns against Constance and her allies the enemy himself feels that the 'hot taste,' managed with so much foresight, and the wise order in so wild a cause, are unexampled. Thus 'lord of his presence,' and allied to the great interest of the country, he appears feared, but not loved and desired, and he presents in truth no amiable side. No childlike reverence draws him to his mother, but her political wisdom attracts him; no vein of kindred links him with Faulconbridge, but his usefulness is the bond with him; to Hubert he speaks of love when he requires him, and of abhorrence after his services have proved injurious; the property of the church loses sanctity for him in necessity; but this manner of consulting only his immediate advantage in all circumstances leads him by degrees even to betray the great possession of the state in another time of need to this same despised and crushed church, whose arrogant interference he had before withstood with scornful defiance. No higher principle sustains the man and his energetic designs in time of danger; the great idea at the outset of his career leaves him during its progress and at its end. After his power, thus displayed against France, has risen even to the defiance of the Pope and the church, and to the inconsiderate design upon the life of a child whose temper was not to be feared and had not even been tried by him, it sinks down, struck by conscience, by curses, and by prophecies, by dangers without and within; he becomes anxious, mistrustful, superstitious, fearful to absolute weakness and to a degree of faint-heartedness, in which he sells his country as cheaply as once in his self-confidence he had held it dearly and had defended it boldly.

HUDSON (*Life, Art, & Character*, ii, 24): The chief trouble with John in the play is that he conceives himself in a false position, and so becomes himself false to his position in the hope of thereby rendering it secure. He has indeed far better reasons for holding the throne than he is himself aware of, and the utter selfishness of his aims is what keeps him from seeing them. His soul is so bemired in personal regard that he cannot rise to any considerations of patriotism or public spirit. The idea of wearing the crown as a sacred trust from the nation never once enters his head. And this all because he lacks the nobleness to rest his title on national grounds; or because he is himself too lawless of spirit to feel the majesty with which the national law has invested him. As the interest and honour of England have no place in his thoughts, so he feels as if he had stolen the throne, and appropriated it to his own private use. This consciousness of bad motives naturally fills him with dark suspicions and sinister designs. As he is without the inward strength of noble aims, so he does not feel outwardly strong; his bad motives put him upon using means as bad for securing himself; and he can think of no way to clinch his tenure but by meanness and wrong. Thus his sense of inherent baseness has the effect of casting him into disgraces and crimes; his very stings of self-reproach driving him on from bad to worse. If he had the manhood to trust his cause frankly with the nation, as rightly comprehending his trust, he would be strong in the nation's support; but this he is too mean to see. Nor is John less wanting in manly fortitude than in moral principle; he has not the courage even to be dar-

ingly and resolutely wicked; that is, there is no backbone of truth in him either for good or evil. Insolent, heart-swollen, defiant under success, he becomes utterly abject and cringing in disaster or reverse. 'Even so doth valour's show and valour's worth divide in storms of fortune.' When his wishes are crowned, he struts and talks big; but a slight whirl in the wind of chance at once twists him off his pins and lays him sprawling in the mud. That his seeming greatness is but the distention of gas appears in that the touch of pain or loss soon pricks him into an utter collapse. So that we may almost apply to him what Ulysses says of Achilles in *Troilus and Cressida:*

> 'Possess'd he is with greatness;
> And speaks not to himself, but with a pride
> That quarrels at self-breath: imagin'd worth
> Holds in his blood such swoln and hot discourse,
> That 'twixt his mental and his active parts
> Kingdom'd Achilles in commotion rages,
> And batters down himself.'

And as, in his craven-hearted selfishness, John cares nothing for England's honour, nor even for his own as king, but only to retain the spoil of his self-imputed trespass; so he will at any time trade that honour away, and will not mind eating dirt to the King of France or to the Pope, so he may keep his place.

DOWDEN (*Mind & Art*, p. 169): In *King John* the hour of utmost ebb in the national life of England is investigated by the imagination of the poet. The king reigns neither by warrant of a just title nor, like Bolingbroke, by warrant of the right of the strongest. He knows that his house is founded upon the sand; he knows that he has no justice of God and no virtue of man on which to rely. Therefore he assumes an air of authority and regal grandeur. But within all is rottenness and shame. Unlike the bold usurper Richard, John endeavors to turn away his eyes from facts of which he is yet aware; he dare not gaze into his own wretched and cowardly soul. When threatened by France with war, and now alone with his mother, John exclaims, making an effort to fortify his heart,—

> 'Our strong possession and our right for us.'

But Elinor, with a woman's courage and directness, forbids the unavailing self-deceit,—

> 'Your strong possession much more than your right,
> Or else it must go wrong with you and me.'

King Richard, when he would make away with the young princes, summons Tyrrel to his presence, and enquires with cynical indifference to human sentiment,

> 'Dar'st thou resolve to kill a friend of mine?'

and when Tyrrel accepts the commission Richard, in a moment of undisguised exultation, breaks forth with 'Thou sing'st sweet music!' John would inspire Hubert with his murderous purpose rather like some vague influence than like a personal will, obscurely as some pale mist works which creeps across the fields, and leaves blight behind it in the sunshine. He trembles lest he should have said too much; he trembles lest he should not have said enough; at last the nearer fear prevails, and the words 'death,' 'a grave' form themselves upon his lips. Having

touched a spring which will produce assassination he furtively withdraws himself from the mechanism of crime. It suits the king's interest afterwards that Arthur should be living, and John adds to his crime the baseness of a miserable attempt by chicanery and timorous sophisms to transfer the responsibility of murder from himself to his instrument and accomplice. He would fain darken the eyes of his conscience and of his understanding. The show of kingly strength and dignity in which John is clothed in the earlier scenes of the play must therefore be recognised (although Shakespere does not obtrude the fact) as no more than a poor pretence of true regal strength and honour. The fact, only hinted in these earlier scenes, becomes afterwards all the more impressive, when the time comes to show this dastard king, who had been so great in the barter of territory, in the sale of cities, in the sacrifice of love and marriage-truth to policy; now changing from pale to red in the presence of his own nobles, now vainly trying to tread back the path of crime, now incapable of enduring the physical suffering of the hour of death. Sensible that he is a king with no inward strength of justice or of virtue, John endeavors to buttress up his power with external supports; against the advice of his nobles he celebrates a second coronation, only forthwith to remove the crown from his head and place it in the hands of an Italian priest. Pandulph 'of fair Millaine cardinal,' who possesses the astuteness and skill to direct the various conflicting forces of the time to his own advantage, Pandulph is the de facto master of England, and as he pleases makes peace or announces war. The country, as in periods of doubt and danger, was 'possessed with rumours, full of idle dreams.' Peter of Pomfret had announced that before Ascension day at noon the king should deliver up his crown. John submits to the degradation demanded of him, and has the incredible baseness to be pleased that he has done so of his own free will:

> 'Is this Ascension-day? did not the prophet
> Say that before Ascension-day at noon
> My crown I should give off? Even so I have.
> I did suppose it should be on constraint;
> But, heaven be thank'd! it is voluntary.'

After this we are not surprised that when the Bastard endeavors to rouse him to manliness and resolution,

> 'Away and glister like the god of war
> When he intendeth to become the field,'

John is not ashamed to announce the 'happy peace' which he has made with the Papal legate, on whom he relies for protection against the invaders of England. Faulconbridge still urges the duty of an effort at self-defence for the sake of honour and of safety, and the King, incapable of accepting his own responsibilities and privileges, hands over the care of England to his illegitimate nephew, 'Have thou the ordering of this present time.'

Boas (*Sh. & his Predecessors*, p. 239): It is evident from the first that John, though his situation bears some resemblance to that of Richard III, is designed on no similar scale of lonely grandeur in crime. He has usurped the throne belonging by right to his nephew Arthur, but he has been instigated to the step by his mother Elinor, who realizes far more energetically than John himself that what force has seized force alone can hold. . . . Well may Chatillon speak of her as 'an Até, stirring him to blood and strife.' For

a time, indeed, John plays the part of a vigorous and able soldier. He crosses to France with a speed that disconcerts his enemies, and the fact that he is followed by a brave 'choice of dauntless spirits' shows that he can attract supporters to his cause. Shakespere himself, fully alive to the national dangers involved in the succession of a minor, is inclined to weigh in equal balance the claims of uncle and nephew. If John has an evil angel in his mother, so has Arthur, for the hysterical passion of Constance is as dangerous as Elinor's unscrupulous ambition, and her appeal to foreign aid in support of her son's rights estranges from her all national sympathies.

Miss C. PORTER (*Introduction to Folio Sh.*, p. xii.): If interest neither centres in John nor holds in any sense along with him against the ups and down of his fortunes, the result is, still, to characterize John. By that very negation of the interest at first aroused in him at the opening of the play the confusion of John's fate in the sequel is made manifest. Even at first the supreme royalty of nature in Constance belittles John and every figure in the canvas beside. No one else but Faulconbridge is master enough of his soul to count truckling to 'Commoditie' beneath him. Constance's scorn of it degrades John especially because they are the two opposites of the tragic action. She serves to set John down at once at the low appraisal he must bear later with Pandulph in the bargaining for his crown at any cost of honour. Despite the glamour of John's first bold successes, his mongrel coarseness, neither straightforward nor astute, traps him into crookedness. His murderous suppression of Arthur is worse than an evil deed for John, as Shakespeare clearly shows. It is bad policy. As such only John comes to lament it. Woe for Arthur next belittles John in England. Yet he never guesses, when it embroils him with the English nobles, that Pandulph has been watching the snare wherein he fell, and that he is the victim of a cleverer Roman Franco-English underhandedness than he would ever have the wit to indulge. But whether belittled by the nobility of Constance, or the passion of pity for Arthur, the public identification of John with mediocrity is the fruit of the clash of the noble Constance, grief-possessed and justice-inspired with the ignoble John. Shakespeare puts the political dilemma into human embodiments. John is characterized, and his career and its historic incidents are thus presented by means of the very scattering away of the supreme attention from himself to Constance and Arthur, to his 'discontented Peeres,' the invading Frenchmen, and the resentful clergy. It is all skilfully adjusted to suit and show the muddy, unsettled interval between French and native English domination over England, whence, as out of sediment, and the grave of John, better things arose for the English people. John's lack of distinction in the plot is typical of the curious inefficiency of his rule, the nugatory results of his first warlike deeds in France, and his first vigorous policy against Rome. In his ecclesiastical program the John of *The Troublesome Raigne*, unlike Shakespeare's John, enjoys, at least in the better figure he makes as a personality, the effect of his vigour. He is forcible, vivid, and stirring. Shakespeare cancelled all that. He struck out, along with the grossness of the raids upon the abbeys, most of the tokens of personal power in John when he recast the earlier play. It is commonly supposed that regard for the Church, or for Church-people, influenced the change. It is quite possible; it is obvious, besides, that the omission offered him an easy short cut in his task of reducing a double play to a single play's length. It is worth noticing, however, that there is further room for a deeper reason. The omission harmonizes with the rest of his developments and changes

of character. It contributes toward keeping the figure of John in low relief. Enough modelling for accent, for the proper introduction of the promise of his kingship is provided liberally for John. In the first flush of his accession to the throne, with the able and positive Queen-Mother, Elinor, backing her favorite, John spiritedly challenges France. With Elinor to advise and inspire him, he carries the war swiftly into the enemy's country. Before Angiers he speaks with impressive readiness. There, in the first heat, he draws strongly to himself the personal friendship of King Philip, and the loyal attachment for life of Hubert. John, then, is neither stupid nor unmagnetic. Yet, by himself, he is found lacking in nerve, insight, initiative energy, and steering power. These his mother Elinor supplies him in the morning of his career. Later, bold-eyed, showy, and personable animal as he is, his soul cannot hold out and make good. The coarse and shallow nature is unveiled in these fundamental incapacities. Shakespeare has put in several passing touches to denote how dependent he was on his mother's fostering care. Her death seemed to him an omen of his failure (IV, ii, 120, 121, 131, 189). This touch of nature redeems John. Again at the close of his life his sufferings capture human pity, and the affection Hubert and Faulconbridge yield him influence human sympathy. We remember, at his topmost moment of success, how timid and loath he was to feel his way through blind and groping words to the curt grim ones that put into Hubert's bosom his evil hankerings for Arthur's death. We see, even at the last, how dull his consciousness is to any but the bodily pains of fever and poison. We then gladly give his poor soul 'elbow roome.' John is so much of a minor character stranded amid the persons and events of his wrecked life that Shakespeare has prompted everybody to talk less of him than several others. Yet it has scarcely been realized that this qualifying of us all to ignore John in his own History is of itself a descriptive masterstroke in this portrait of 'confounded royalty.' The King who was forced to give his nobles the Magna Charta, never mentioned by Shakespeare or the writer of *The Troublesome Raigne*, is represented by Shakespeare, however, as bargaining to please his 'discontented Peeres' and asking 'what you would have reform'd.' Short of a representation more or less impossible in his day, of an abstract document of embryonic importance, the Poet has yet done much in choosing an unknown Englishman as the substantial hero of *King John*. In the day wherein the King was found no better than the conditions ruling him; wanting in power to exalt or dignify or represent England; the honest rough and bluff English type, the unknown man whose passion of patriotism glowed above all trials is the requisite popular here. Faulconbridge bears the honors of this Play away from its nominal incumbent in order to stamp upon John's reign the image it ought to wear—the image and superscription of the English people.

DEIGHTON (*Introduction*, p. xxii.): Here it seems to me that we have a nearer approach to nobility of nature than the play warrants; and, further, that Shakespeare would not be likely to invest with such firmness of backbone a character so soon to be shown as the very impersonation of weakness. For whatever John's behavior in the earlier scenes, from the time of his return to England we see in him nothing but meanness, the most piteous vacillation, grovelling humility, and utter absence of anything like courage in adversity. These may be the essential qualities of his nature which stirring events have for a time obscured while brightening; or it may be that 'coward conscience' after the manner threatened by the ghosts in Richard the Third's dream, paralyses whatever activity of mind he once

possessed, whatever resolution he had in France nerved himself to display. In order to strengthen his position with his own countrymen, he on his return goes through the farce of being crowned again (in reality for the fourth time); he yields, plainly out of fear, to the demand made by Pembroke for Arthur's liberation; he hypocritically laments Arthur's death when the news of it is brought to him; is terror stricken by the report of the Dauphin's invasion; with incredible meanness reproaches Hubert for the crime which had been his own suggestion; apologizes as unreservedly when told by Hubert that his order has not been carried out; yields up to Pandulph the crown which he had boastfully declared he would maintain 'without the assistance of a mortal hand'; beseeches him in the very spirit of cringing servility to negotiate peace with the Dauphin; in absolute prostration of mind leaves it to the Bastard to make preparations for defence; is seen hastening from the battle-field to nurse his fever at Swinstead, and finally in his death agony parades his facility of quibbling out maudlin lamentations for himself.

BROOKE (p. 233): The character of King John is perhaps nearer to historical truth than anything else in the play. Only he is not quite so bad a man as he actually was. 'Foul as hell is, hell is made more foul by the presence of John,' was the judgement of his contemporaries. This tradition has so influenced the critics of this play, that they have made the John of Shakespeare much more wicked and vile than the dramatist represented him. They have searched into every line for badness and have found it. But the king in Shakespeare's hands is no such unredeemed villain. He is, as he really was, an able politician, a wise war-leader, a bold and ready pursuer of his aim. He stands up for England, and when he does submit to the Legate (changing apparently his steadfast mind) it is not so much to bow to Rome, as to overthrow—as he does—the whole of the conspiracy of his foes against the English crown. He gains his end; his revolting nobles are brought back to his dying bed, and the invaders are forced, raging, to leave the shores of England. Nor is he represented as a coward, as some have said. He is quite as physically though not so morally brave as Faulconbridge. On the moral side Shakespeare joins with his accusers. On that side he is represented as he is, the ruthless politician, the murderer of Arthur. But even that villainy does not turn Faulconbridge against him; Faulconbridge who stands for England against the whole world! John is a wicked king, but, wicked or no, he represents to Faulconbridge England and her fates. As such he clings to him, supports him when the rest leave him, cheers him in his dismay, reports him to the French as the gallant and victorious king, denounces the revolting lords,—and indealising him thus as the embodiment of England,—comes even to love him, when he is ill fortuned, and finally to mourn his death.

> 'Art thou gone so? I do but stay behind
> To do the office for thee of revenge:
> And then my soul shall wait on thee to heaven,
> As it on earth hath been thy servant still.'

And this double aspect of John—bad and good—under which the Bastard views his master is also Shakespeare's representation of him. It was not his cue, at a time when England stood alone against the envious Continent, to lower the Monarchy of England. The case of Richard III. was different. To lower him was to exalt the Tudors, the true heirs of England in the eyes of an Elizabethan. Here King John was against France. He must not then be represented as infamous,

even though he slew the rightful heir. The King stands for England. Therefore John, except as the murderer of Arthur, is not completely blackened in this play. No one, not even Henry V, can speak more kingly, more concisely, than King John to the ambassador of France; nor did Henry V. act as rapidly, more like a great commander-in-chief, than John against France. He is on Philip's back before Philip thinks he has left England. In war, John is pictured as prompt to act, subtle to plan, making victory a certainty; and when, out of a difficult position in which France and the Church are both against him, he has wrung victory, the French confess his genius in war and policy—

> '*Lew.* What he hath won that hath he fortified;
> So hot a speed with such advise disposed
> Such temperate order in so fierce a cause,
> Doth want example: who hath read, or heard,
> Of any kindred action like to this?'

It is the description of a great general.

HOLINSHED (iii, 196): He was comelie of stature, but of looke and countenance displeasant and angrie, somewhat cruell of nature, as by the writers of his time he is noted, and not so hardie as doubtfull in time of perill and danger. But this seemeth to be an enuious report vttered by thos that were giuen to speake no good of him whome they inwardlie hated. Howbeit some giue this witnesse of him (as the author of the booke of Bernewell abbeie and other) that he was a great and mightie prince, but yet not verie fortunate, much like to Marius the noble Romane, tasting of fortune both waies; bountifull and liberall vnto strangers, but of his owne people (for their dailie treasons practised towards him) a great oppressour, so that he trusted more to forreners than to them, and therefore in the end he was of them vtterlie forsaken. Verilie, whosoeuer shall consider the course of the historie written of this prince, he shall find, that he hath beene little beholden to the writers of that time in which he liued: for scarselie can they afoord him a good word, except when the trueth inforceth them to come out with it as it were against their willes. The occasion whereof (as some thinke) was, for that he was no great freend to the clergie. And yet vndoubtedlie his deeds shew he had a zeale to religion, as it was then acompted: for he had founded the abbeie of Beauleau in the new forrest, as it were in recompense of certeine parish churches, which to inlarge the same forrest he caused to be throwne downe and ruinated. He builded the monasterie of Farendon, and the abbeie of Hales in Shropshire; he repaired Godstow where his fathers concubine Rosamund laie interred; he was no small benefactor to the minister of Lichfield in Straffordshire; to the abbeie of Crokesden in the same shire, and to the chappell at Knaresburgh in Yorkshire. So that (to say what I thinke) he was not so void of deuotion towards the church, as diuerse of his enemies haue reported, who of meere malice conceale all his vertues, and hid none of his vices; but are plentifull inough in setting foorth the same to the vttermost, and interpret all his dooings and saiengs to the woorst, as may appeare to those that aduisedlie read the works of them that write the order of his life, which may seeme rather an inuectiue than a true historie: neuerthelesse, sith we cannot come by the truth of things through the malice of writers, we must content ourselues with this vnfreendlie description of his time. Certeinlie it should seeme the man had a princelie heart in him, and wanted nothing but faithful subjects to haue assisted him in reuenging such wrongs as were doone and offered by the French King and

others. Moreouer, the pride and pretended authoritie of the cleargie he could not well abide, when they went about to wrest out of his hands the prerogatiue of his princelie rule and gouernment. True it is, that to mainteine his warres which he was forced to take in hand as well as in France as elsewhere, he was constreined to make all the shift he could deuise to recouer monie and bicause he pinched their purses, they conceiued no small hatred against him, which when he perceiued, and wanted peraduenture discretion to passe it ouer, he discouered now and then in his rage his immoderate displeasure, as one not able to bridle his affections, a thing verie hard in a stout stomach, and thereby missed now and then to compasse that which otherwise he might verie well haue brought to passe. It is written, that he meant to haue become feudarie (for maintenance sake against his owne disloiall subiects, and other his aduerseraries) vnto Miramumeline the great king of the Saracens: but for the truth of this report I haue little to saie, and therefore I leaue the credit thereof to the authors. It is reported likewise, that in time when the realme stood interdicted as he was abroad to hunt one day, it chanced that there was a great stag or hart killed, which when he came to be broken up, prooued to be verie fat and thicke of flesh; 'Oh (saith he) what a pleasant life this deere hath led, and yet in all his daies he neuer heard masse.' To conclude, it may seeme, that in some respects he was not greatlie superstitious, and yet not void of religious zeale towards the maintenance of the cleargie, as by his bountifull liberalitie bestowed in building of abbeies and churches (as before yee haue hard) it may partlie appeare.

Sir R. BAKER (*Chronicle*, p. 83): He was of stature indifferent and tall, and something fat, of a sowre and angry countenance and concerning his conditions, it may be said, that his Nature and Fortune did not well agree: For naturally he loved his ease, yet his fortune was to be ever in action. He won more of his enemies by surprizes than by battels, which shews he had more of Lightening in him then of Thunder. He was never so true of his word as when he threatened, because he meant alwayes as cruelly as he spake, not alwayes as graciously; and he that would have known what it was he never meant to perform, must have looked upon his promises. He was neither fit for prosperity nor adversity: for prosperity made him insolent, and adversity dejected; a mean fortune would have suited best with him. He was all that he was by fits. Sometimes doing nothing without deliberation, and sometimes doing all upon a suddain; sometimes very religious, and sometimes scarce a Christian. His unsatiablenesse of money was not so much, as that no man knew what he did with it; gotten with much noise, but spent in silence. He was but intemperate in his best temper, but when distempered with sickness most of all, as appeared at his last, when being in a feaver he would needs be eating of raw peaches, and drinking of sweet ale. If we look upon his works, we must needs think him a worthy prince, but if upon his actions, nothing lesse; for his works of Piety were very many, as hath been shewed before; but as for his actions, he neither came to the Crown by Justice, nor held it with honour, nor left it in peace. Yet having had many good parts in him, and especially having his royal posterity continued to this day, we can do no lesse but honour his memory.

HUME (i, 520): The character of this prince is nothing but a complication of vices equally mean and odious, ruinous to himself and destructive to his people. Cowardice, inactivity, folly, levity, licentiousness, ingratitude, treachery, tyranny, and cruelty—all these qualities appear too evidently in the several incidents of

his life to give us room to suspect that the disagreeable picture has been anywise overcharged by the prejudices of the ancient historians. It is hard to say whether his conduct to his father, his brother, his nephew, or his subjects were most culpable, or whether his crimes in these respects were not even exceeded by the baseness which appeared in his transactions with the King of France, the pope, and the barons. His European dominions when they devolved to him by the death of his brother, were more extensive than have ever, since his time, been ruled by an English monarch; but he first lost, by his misconduct, the flourishing provinces in France, the ancient patrimony of his family. He subjected his kingdom to a shameful vassalage under the see of Rome. He saw the prerogatives of his crown diminished by law, and still more reduced by faction; and he died at last when in danger of being totally expelled by a foreign power, and of either ending his life miserably in prison or seeking shelter, as a fugitive, from the pursuit of his enemies. The prejudices against this prince were so violent that he was believed to have sent an embassy to the Miramoulin, or Emperor of Morocco, and to have offered to change his religion and become Mahometan in order to purchase the protection of that monarch. But though this story is told us on plausible authority, by Matthew Paris, it is in itself utterly improbable, except that there is nothing so incredible but may be believed to proceed from the folly and wickedness of John.

STUBBS (*Walter of Coventry, Introduction*, p. xiv.): John, as far as I can read his character from his acts, was a mean reproduction of all the vices and of the few pettinesses of his family, of their intellectual as he was of their physical conformation. I say mean reproduction, because although his crimes were really greater, they are on a smaller scale, from smaller motives, significant of that more unbridled vice that checks at no obstacle and yields to the least temptation. Like his father, he is a profligate, but his sins are complicated with outrage and ingratitude; like Richard, he is an extortioner, but, unlike him, he is meanly mercenary, parsimonious, unsuccessful. Like Geoffry, he is faithless, but, unlike Geoffry, he is obstinate rather than impulsive. He never repents, even if it be only to sin again; he has no remorse, even for his failures. He contemns both the spirit and the form of law; of religion he has none, scarcely sense enough of it to make him found a monastery; he neither fears God nor cares for the souls of his people, but he is amenable to superstitions that his father would have spurned. He is passionate, like the rest of the Conqueror's descendants, but it is not the life-like transport of Henry and Richard; he is savage, filthy, and blasphemous in his wrath; but he sulks where he dare not reply, and takes his revenge on the innocent and in the dark. His ingratitude is not the common ingratitude of kings, to forget a benefactor when the benefit has grown cold; he heaps neglect on insult, and scatters scorn on the dead, whose chief fault has been that they have served him too well. Unlike his father and brother, he makes no friends among his ministers; they are faithful to him, but his only friends are his own creatures, whom he has raised and whom he need not fear to sacrifice. In the neutral tints of common character his pettiness is not less apparent. The favourite son of Henry II. and the pupil of Glanville could hardly be without a taste for law; the instinct that in his father produced great legal reforms, in John works only to the multiplication of little methods of extortion, or the devising of new forms of torture; like him he sits in the judgment seat, but only for the wages of unrighteousness. Henry's promptness and energy is in John undignified fussiness; the lofty self-assertion of conscious strength is represented in him by the mere vaunt that can plead no justi-

fication, his recklessness in running into danger is only equalled by the shamelessness with which he retreats before the evils that he has provoked. Of himself he does nothing great, and what is done for him by others he undoes by alienating or insulting them. Although the faults which come out in this form in him are faults so ingrained in the Angevin family that they can scarcely be regarded, except in the particular manifestation, as distinctive of John, somewhat of the result is no doubt to be attributed to his age and training.

CHARACTER OF CONSTANCE

Mrs Jameson (ii, 213): In the play of *King John* the three principal characters are the King, Falconbridge, and Lady Constance. The first is drawn forcibly and accurately from history: it reminds us of Titian's portrait of Cæsar Borgia, in which the hatefulness of the subject is redeemed by the masterly skill of the artist,—the truth, and power, and wonderful beauty of the execution. Falconbridge is the spirited creation of the poet. Constance is certainly an historical personage; but the form which, when we meet it on the record of history, appears like a pale, indistinct shadow, half melted into its obscure background, starts before us into strong relief and palpable breathing reality upon the page of Shakespeare. Whenever we think of Constance, it is in her maternal character. All the interest which she excites in the drama turns upon her situation as the mother of Arthur. Every circumstance in which she is placed, every sentiment she utters, has a reference to him; and she is represented through the whole of the scenes in which she is engaged, as alternately pleading for the rights, and trembling for the existence of her son. But while we contemplate the character of Constance, she assumes before us an individuality perfectly distinct from the circumstances around her. The action calls forth her maternal feelings, and places them in the most prominent point of view; but with Constance, as with a real human being, the maternal affections are a powerful instinct, modified by other faculties, sentiments, and impulses, making up the individual character. We think of her as a mother, because, as a mother distracted for the loss of her son, she is immediately presented before us, and calls forth our sympathy and our tears; but we infer the rest of her character from what we see, as certainly and as completely as if we had known her whole course of life. That which strikes us as the principal attribute of Constance is power—power of imagination, of will, passion, of affection, of pride: the moral energy, that faculty which is principally exercised in self-control, and gives consistency to the rest, is deficient; or rather, to speak more correctly, the extraordinary development of sensibility and imagination, which lends to the character its rich poetical colouring, leaves the other qualities comparatively subordinate. Hence it is that the whole complexion of the character, notwithstanding its amazing grandeur, is so exquisitely feminine. The weakness of the woman, who by the very consciousness of that weakness is worked up to the desperation and defiance, the fluctuations of temper and the bursts of sublime passion, the terrors, the impatience, and the tears, are all most true to feminine nature. The energy of Constance not being based upon strength of character, rises and falls with the tide of passion. Her haughty spirit swells against resistance, and is excited into frenzy by sorrow and disappointment; while neither from her towering pride, nor strength of intellect, can she borrow patience to submit, or fortitude to endure. It is, therefore, with perfect truth of nature that Constance is first introduced as pleading peace.

'Stay for an answer to your embassy,
Lest unadvised you stain your swords with blood:
My Lord Chattilon may from England bring
That right in peace, which here we urge in war;
And then we shall repent each drop of blood,
That hot, rash haste so indirectly shed.'

And that the same woman, when all her passions are roused by the sense of injury, should afterwards exclaim,

'War! War! No peace! peace is to me a war!'

That she should be ambitious for her son, proud of his high birth and royal rights, and violent in defending them, is most natural; but I cannot agree with those who think that in the mind of Constance, ambition—that is the love of dominion for its own sake—is either a strong motive or a strong feeling: it could hardly be so where the natural impulses and the ideal power predominate in so high a degree. The vehemence with which she asserts the just and legal rights of her son is that of a fond mother and a proud-spirited woman, stung with the sense of injury, and herself a reigning sovereign,—by birth and right, if not in fact; yet when bereaved of her son, grief not only 'fills the room up of her absent child,' but seems to absorb every other faculty and feeling—even pride and anger. It is true that she exults over him as one whom nature and fortune has destined to be great, but in her distraction for his loss she thinks of him only as her 'Pretty Arthur.'

'O lord! my boy, my Arthur, my fair son!
My life, my joy, my food, my all the world!
My widow-comfort, and my sorrows' cure!'

No other feeling can be traced through the whole of her frantic scene: it is grief only, a mother's heart-rending, soul-absorbing grief, and nothing else. Not even indignation, or the desire of revenge, interfere with its soleness and intensity. An ambitious woman would hardly have thus addressed the cold, wily Cardinal:

'And, Father Cardinal, I have heard you say,
That we shall see and know our friends in heaven:
If that be true, I shall see my boy again;
For since the birth of Cain, the first male child,
To him that did but yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.
But now will canker sorrow eat my bud,
And chase the native beauty from his cheek,
And he will look as hollow as a ghost;
As dim and meagre as an ague's fit;
And so he'll die; and, rising so again,
When I shall meet him in the court of heaven
I shall not know him: therefore never, never
Must I behold my pretty Arthur more!'

The bewildered pathos and poetry of this address could be natural in no woman who did not unite, like Constance, the most passionate sensibility with the most vivid imagination. It is true that Queen Elinor calls her on one occasion 'ambitious Constance,' but the epithet is rather the natural expression of Elinor's own

fear and hatred than really applicable. Elinor, in whom age had subdued all passions but ambition, dreaded the mother of Arthur as her rival in power, and for that reason only opposed the claims of the son; but I conceive, that in a woman yet in the prime of life, and endued with the peculiar disposition of Constance, the mere love of power would be too much modified by fancy and feeling to be called a passion. In fact, it is not pride, nor temper, nor ambition, nor even maternal affection which in Constance gives the prevailing tone to the whole character: it is the predominance of imagination.

I do not mean in the conception of the dramatic portrait, but in the temperament of the woman herself. In the poetical, fanciful, excitable cast of her mind, in the excess of the ideal power, tingeing all her affections, exalting all her sentiments and thoughts, and animating the expression of both, Constance can only be compared to Juliet. In the first place, it is through the power of imagination that, when under the influence of excited temper, Constance is not a mere incensed woman; nor does she, in the style of Volumnia, 'lament in anger Juno-like,' but rather like a sybil in a fury. Her sarcasms come down like thunderbolts. In her famous address to Austria—

> 'O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame
> That bloody spoil, thou slave! thou wretch! thou coward! &c.'

it is as if she had concentrated the burning spirit of scorn, and dashed it in his face; every word seems to blister where it falls. In the scolding scene between her and queen Elinor the laconic insolence of the latter is completely overborne by the torrent of bitter contumely which bursts from the lips of Constance, clothed in the most energetic, and often in the most figurative expressions. And in a very opposite mood, when struggling with the consciousness of her own helpless situation, the same susceptible and excitable fancy still predominates:

> 'Thou shalt be punish'd for thus frighting me;
> For I am sick, and capable of fears.'

It is the power of imagination which gives so peculiar a tinge to the maternal tenderness of Constance: she not only loves her son with the fond instinct of a mother's affection, but she loves him with her poetical imagination, exults in his beauty and his royal birth, hangs over him with idolatry, and sees his infant brow already encircled with the diadem. Her proud spirit, her ardent enthusiastic fancy, and her energetic self-will, all combine with her maternal love to give it that tone and character which belongs to her only: hence that most beautiful address to her son, which, coming from the lips of Constance, is as full of nature and truth as of pathos and poetry, and which we could hardly sympathise with in any other:

> 'But thou art fair; and at thy birth, dear boy!
> Nature and fortune joined to make thee great:
> Of Nature's gifts thou mayst with lilies boast,
> And with the half-blown rose: but fortune, O!
> She is corrupted, chang'd, and won from thee;
> She adulterates hourly with thine Uncle John;
> And with her golden hand hath pluck'd on France
> To tread down fair respect of sovereignty.'

It is this exceeding vivacity of imagination which in the end turns sorrow to frenzy. Constance is not only a bereaved and doating mother, but a generous woman,

betrayed by her own rash confidence; in whose mind the sense of injury mingling with the sense of grief, and her impetuous temper conflicting with her pride, combine to overset her reason; yet she is not mad; and how admirably, how forcibly, she herself draws the distinction between the frantic violence of uncontrolled feeling and actual madness! Not only has Constance words at will, and fast as the passionate feelings rise in her mind they are poured forth with vivid, overpowering eloquence; but, like Juliet, she may be said to speak in pictures. For instance—

'Why holds thine eye that lamentable rheum?
Like a proud river peering o'er its bounds.'

And throughout the whole dialogue there is the same overflow of eloquence, the same splendour of diction, the same luxuriance of imagery; yet with an added grandeur, arising from habits of command, from the age, the rank, and the matronly character of Constance. Thus Juliet pours forth her love like a muse in a rapture; Constance raves in her sorrow like a Pythoness possessed with the spirit of pain. The love of Juliet is deep and infinite as the boundless sea; and the grief of Constance is so great that nothing but the round world itself is able to sustain it.

'I will instruct my sorrows to be proud;
For grief is proud and makes his owner stout.
To me, and to the state of my great grief
Let kings assemble; for my grief's so great,
That no supporter but the huge firm earth
Can hold it up. Here I and Sorrow sit;
Here is my throne,—bid kings come bow to it!'

An image more majestic, more wonderfully sublime was never presented to the fancy; yet almost equal as a flight of poetry is her apostrophe to the heavens:

'Arm, arm, ye heavens, against these perjured kings,
A widow calls!—be husband to me, heavens!'

And death is welcomed as a bridegroom; she sees the visionary monster as Juliet saw 'the bloody Tybalt festering in his shroud,' and heaps one ghastly image upon another with all the wild luxuriance of a distempered fancy:

'O amiable, lovely death!
Thou odoriferous stench! sound rottenness!'

Constance, who is a majestic being, is majestic in her very frenzy. Majesty is also the characteristic of Hermione; but what a difference between her silent, lofty, uncomplaining despair and the eloquent grief of Constance, whose wild lamentations, which come bursting forth clothed in the grandest, the most poetical imagery, not only melt, but absolutely electrify us! On the whole, it may be said that pride and maternal affection form the basis of the character of Constance, as it is exhibited to us; but that these passions, in an equal degree common to many human beings, assume their peculiar and individual tinge from an extraordinary development of intellect and fancy. It is the energy of passion which lends the character its concentrated power, as it is the prevalence of imagination throughout which dilates it into magnificence.

CAMPBELL (*Life of Mrs Siddons*, i, 211): Mrs Siddons has left me in her memoranda her own remarks on the character of Constance. 'My idea of Constance,'

she says, 'is that of a lofty and proud spirit, associated with the most exquisite feelings of maternal tenderness, which is, in truth, the predominant feature of this interesting personage. The sentiments which she expresses, in the dialogue between herself, the King of France, and the Duke of Austria, at the commencement of the second Act of this tragedy, very strongly evince the amiable traits of a humane disposition, and of a grateful heart:

> "Oh! take his mother's thanks—a widow's thanks!
> Till your strong hand shall help to give him strength
> To make a more requital to your love."

Again, in reply to the King's bloody determination of subjugating the city of Angiers to the sovereignty of her son, she says,

> "Stay for an answer to your embassy,
> Lest, unadvis'd, you stain your swords with blood."

The idea one naturally adopts of her qualities and appearance are, that she is noble in mind, and commanding in person and demeanour; that her countenance was capable of all the varieties of grand and tender expression, often agonized, though never distorted by the vehemence of her agitations. Her voice, too, must have been "propertied like the tuned spheres," obedient to all the softest inflections of maternal love, to all the pathos of the most exquisite sensibility, to the sudden burst of heart-rending sorrow, and to the terrifying imprecations of indignant majesty, when writhing under the miseries inflicted on her by her dastardly oppressors and treacherous allies. The actress should be richly endowed by nature for its various requirements; yet, even when thus fortunately gifted, much, very much remains to be effected by herself; for in the performance of the part of Constance great difficulties, both mental and physical, present themselves. And perhaps the greatest of the former class is that of imperiously holding the mind reined-in to the immediate perception of those calamitous circumstances which take place during the course of her sadly eventful history. The necessity for this severe abstraction will sufficiently appear when we remember that all those calamitous events occur whilst she herself is absent from the stage; so that this power is indispensable for that reason alone, were there no other to be assigned for it. Because, if the representative of Constance shall ever forget, even behind the scenes, those disastrous events which impel her to break forth into the overwhelming effusions of wounded friendship, disappointed ambition, and maternal tenderness, upon the first moment of her appearance in the third act, when stunned with terrible surprise she exclaims,—

> "Gone to be married—gone to swear a peace!
> False blood to false blood joined—gone to be friends!"—

if, I say, the mind of the actress for one moment wanders from these distressing events, she must inevitably fall short of that high and glorious colouring which is indispensable to the painting of this magnificent portrait. The quality of abstraction has always appeared to me so necessary in the art of acting that I shall probably in the course of these remarks be thought too frequently and pertinaciously to advert to it. I am now, however, going to give a proof of its usefulness in the character under our consideration; and I wish my opinion were of sufficient weight to impress the importance of this power on the minds of all candidates for dramatic fame. Here then is one example among many others which I could

adduce. Whenever I was called upon to personate the character of Constance, I never, from the beginning of the play to the end of my part in it, once suffered my dressing-room door to be closed, in order that my attention might be constantly fixed on those distressing events which, by this means, I could plainly hear going on upon the stage, the terrible effects of which progress were to be represented by me. However, I never omitted to place myself, with Arthur in my hand, to hear the march, when, upon the reconciliation of England and France, they enter the gates of Angiers to ratify the contract of marriage between the Dauphin and the Lady Blanche; because the sickening sounds of that march would usually cause the bitter tears of rage, disappointment, betrayed confidence, baffled ambition, and, above all, the agonizing feelings of maternal affection to gush into my eyes. In short, the spirit of the whole drama took possession of my mind and frame by my attention being incessantly riveted to the passing scenes. Thus did I avail myself of every possible assistance, for there was need of all in this most arduous effort; and I have no doubt that the observance of such circumstances, however irrelevant they may appear upon a cursory view, were powerfully aidant in the representations of those expressions of passion in the remainder of this scene, which have been only in part considered, and to the conclusion of which I now proceed. Goaded and stung by the treachery of her faithless friends, and almost maddened by the injuries they have heaped upon her, she becomes desperate and ferocious as a hunted tigress in defence of her young, and it seems that existence itself must nearly issue forth with the utterance of that frantic and appalling exclamation—

> "A wicked day, and not a holy day!
> What hath this day deserved? what hath it done
> That it in golden letters should be set
> Among the high tides in the calendar?"

When King Philip says to her

> "By heaven! Lady, you shall have no cause
> To curse the fair proceedings of this day;
> Have I not pawn'd to you my majesty—"

What countenance, what voice, what gesture, shall realize the scorn and indignation of her reply to the heartless King of France?

> "You have beguil'd me with a counterfeit
> Resembling majesty, with being touch'd and tried
> Proves valueless: you are forsworn—forsworn,
> You came in arms to spill mine enemies blood,
> But now in arms you strengthen it with yours, &c."

And then the awful, trembling solemnity, the utter halplessness of that soul-subduing, scriptural, and prophetic invocation—

> "Arm, arm, ye heavens! against these perjur'd Kings!
> A widow cries—Be husband to me, Heavens!"

If it ever were, or ever shall be portrayed with its appropriate and solemn energy, it must be then, and then only, when the power I have so much insisted on, co-operating also with a high degree of enthusiasm, shall have transfused the mind of the actress into the person and situation of the august and afflicted Constance. The difficulty, too, of representing with tempered rage and dignified contempt

the biting sarcasm of the following speeches to Austria may be more easily imagined than explained:

> "War! War! no peace—peace is to me a war—
> O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame
> That bloody spoil—thou slave! thou wretch! thou coward!
> Thou little valiant—great in villany—
> Thou ever strong upon the stronger side!
> Thou Fortune's champion—that dost never fight
> But when her humorous Ladyship is by
> To teach thee safety—thou art perjured too,
> And sooth'st up greatness."

But, in truth, to beget, in these whirlwinds of the soul, such temperance as, according to the lesson of our inspired master, shall give them smoothness is a difficulty which those only can appreciate who have made the effort. I cannot indeed conceive, in the whole range of dramatic character, a greater difficulty than that of representing this grand creature. Brought before the audience in the plenitude of her afflictions; oppression and falsehood having effected their destructive mark; the full storm of adversity, in short, having fallen upon her in the interval of their absence from her sight, the effort of pouring properly forth so much passion as past events have excited in her, without any visible previous progress towards her climax of desperation, seems almost to exceed the powers of imitation. Hers is an affliction of "so sudden floodgate and o'erbearing nature" that art despairs of realizing it, and the effort is almost life-exhausting. Therefore, whether the majestic, the passionate, the tender Constance has ever yet been, or ever will be, personated to the entire satisfaction of sound judgment and fine taste, I believe to be doubtful; for I believe it to be nearly impossible. I now come to the concluding scene (III, v, 20–110), and I believe I shall not be thought singular when I assert that though she has been designated the ambitious Constance, she has been ambitious only for her son. It was for him, and him alone, that she aspired to, and struggled for, hereditary sovereignty. For example, you find that from that fatal moment when he is separtaed from her, not one regret for lost regal power or splendour ever escapes from her lips; no, not one idea does she from that instant utter which does not unanswerably prove that all other considerations are annihilated in the grievous recollections of motherly love. Her gorgeous affliction, if such an expression is allowable, is of so sublime and so intense a character that the personation of its grandeur, with the utterance of its rapid and astonishing eloquence, almost overwhelms the mind that meditates its realization, and utterly exhausts the frame which endeavours to express its agitations.'

KNIGHT (i, 35): If we may judge of Constance's character from the chroniclers, she was weak and selfish—deserting the bed of her second husband, and marrying the Lord Guy de Touars—at a time when the fortune, and perhaps the life of her son, by Geoffrey, depended upon the singleness of her affection for him. But it is exceedingly difficult to speak upon these points; and there is, at any rate, little doubt that her second husband treated her with neglect and cruelty. The surpassing beauty of the maternal love of the Constance of Shakespeare will, it is probable, destroy all other associations with the character of Constance. We have no record that Constance was not a most devoted mother to her eldest born; and in that age when divorces were as common amongst the royal and noble as

other breaches of faith, we are not entitled to believe that her third marriage was incompatible with her passionate love for the heir of so many hopes,—her heart-breaking devotion to her betrayed and forsaken son,—and her natural belief, that

'Since the birth of Cain, the first male Child,
To him that did but yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.'

The fate of Constance was not altogether inconsistent with Shakespeare's delineation of the heart-broken mother. She died in 1201. But Arthur was not then John's captive—although all his high hopes were limited to Brittany.

FLETCHER (p. 10): In her elaborate consideration of the character of The Lady Constance Mrs. Jameson falls somewhat into the error which has constantly, more or less, been committed in treating of Shakespeare's historical plays—that of failing to consider not only the composition of each drama on the whole, but the conception and development of every character in it, primarily and independently with relation to dramatic art, and without any regard whatever to real or alleged departures from the literal or even the substantial truth of history. Unless this point of view be steadily maintained by the critic in forming his dramatic judgment, his opinions will, at every moment, be liable to fall into inconsistency and injustice. A very little reflection should have sufficed to shew any commentator the preposterousness of dragging Shakespeare, the dramatist—the dramatist transcendently and exclusively—to the bar of historical criticism—a kind of procedure which, in the following observations, we shall studiously avoid. So far from representing either Arthur or his mother as ambitious, the poet, in legitimate pursuit of his dramatic object, has studiously excluded from view every historical circumstance that could countenance the smallest impression of that nature. He has not only reduced the prince's age to such tender years as would hardly admit of his harbouring a political sentiment; but, in direct opposition to the recorded facts, represents the boy as one of a peculiarly mild and quiet temper, devoid of all princely airs and all appetite for command—simple-hearted, meek, and affectionate. He weeps at the violent scene produced by his mother's meeting with Queen Elinor, and exclaims,

'Good my mother, peace!
I would that I were low laid in my grave;
I am not worth this coil that's made for me.'

Again, to his mother's violent grief at hearing of the accommodation between the two kings, he says,

'I do beseech you, madam, be content.'

And again, in 'his innocent prate' to his keeper Hubert,

'So I were out of prison, and kept sheep,
I should be merry as the day is long, &c.'

Is it not plain that this very inoffensiveness is designed by the dramatist to place in the stronger light the clearness of Arthur's title, as the exclusive reason for his Uncle's hostility, at the same time that it deepens so wonderfully the pathos of the scene wherein he pleads for the preservation of his eyes? Another element of this pathos is the exceeding beauty which the poet has ascribed to the princely

boy, which is made to affect the hearts of all who approach him, even the rudest of his Uncle's creatures, and gives to this only orphan child the crowning endearment to his widowed mother's heart. That mother herself, it is most important to observe and to bear in mind, whatever she was in history, is not represented by the poet as courting power for its own sake. Had he so represented her, it would have defeated one of those fine contrasts of character which Shakespeare so much delighted—that between Constance and Elinor, which is perfect in every way. The whole conduct and language of Constance in the piece shew that her excessive fondness for her son, and that alone, makes her so eagerly desire the restitution of his lawful inheritance. She longs to see this one sole, and beautiful, and gracious object of her maternal idolatry placed on the pedestal of grandeur which is his birthright, that she may idolize it more fondly still—

> 'Thou and thine usurp
> The domination, royalties and rights
> Of this oppressed boy.'

Such is her defiance to Elinor. Still more strikingly unfolded is the entire subordination, in the breast of Constance, of all ambitious view, to the concentrated feelings of the doting mother, in the well-known address to Arthur, when her sworn friends have betrayed her:

> 'If thou, that bidst me be content, wert grim,
> Ugly and slanderous to thy mother's womb,
> * * * * * *
> I would not care, I then would be content;
> For then I should not love thee; no, nor thou
> Become thy great birth, nor deserve a crown.
> But thou art fair; and at thy birth, dear boy!
> Nature and fortune join'd to make thee great.
> Of Nature's gifts thou mayst with lilies boast,
> And with the half-blown rose. But Fortune, Oh!
> She is corrupted, chang'd, and, won from thee,
> She adulterates hourly with thine Uncle John.'

If we could still doubt the absolute and all-absorbing predominance of the maternal affection, it is disclosed to us in all its awful and beautiful depth in those bursts of sublimest poetry that gush from her heart when informed of Arthur's capture. In all these she never once thinks of him as a prince, who ought to be a king—far less of the station to which she is herself entitled. It is the thought of never more beholding her 'absent child,' her 'pretty Arthur,' her 'fair son' that is driving her to distraction—

> 'I will not keep this form upon my head
> When there is such disorder in my wit.—
> O Lord! my boy! my Arthur! my fair son!
> My life! my joy! my soul! my all the world!
> My widow-comfort, and my sorrow's cure!'

We come now to consider the most important point of all that should guide us in judging of the histrionic expression of this character—namely, the indications afforded by the whole tenour of the incident and dialogue as to the individuality of Constance's person and disposition as a woman—independently even of that

maternal relation in which the drama constantly places her before us. That Constance, in the poet's conception, is of graceful as well as noble person we are not left to infer merely from the graces of her vigorous mind, nor from the rare loveliness of her child, and her extreme sensibility to it. We hear of her beauty more explicitly from the impression which it makes upon those around her—especially from the exclamations of King Philip on beholding her distress for Arthur's loss, the greater part of which we regret to find omitted in the present acting of the play—

'O, fair affliction, peace! . . .

* * * *

Bind up those tresses. Oh, what love I note
In the fair multitude of those her hairs, &c.'

But it is the moral and intellectual beauty, the logic and the poetry of the character, that is the most essential to consider. And here we are called upon to dissent materially from the view of this matter which Mrs Jameson has exhibited at some length. In commencing her essay on this character she numbers among the qualities which the Lady Constance of Shakespeare has in common with the mother of Coriolanus 'self-will and exceeding pride.' In a following page she speaks again of 'her haughty spirit' and 'her towering pride.' Again, of 'her proud spirit' and 'her energetic self-will'; and 'her impetuous temper conflicting with her pride.' Once more—'on the whole it may be said, that pride and maternal affection form the basis of the character of Constance'; and 'in all the state of her great grief, a grand impersonation of pride and passion.' But the contrary of all this inherent pride and self-will which the critic alleges appears in the poet's delineation. It is the mild language of gratitude and patience that we first hear from Constance, in the scene where she thanks the French King and the Austrian duke for their espousal to her dear son's cause, but entreats them to wait for John's answer to the French ambassador before they proceed to bloodshed. In the scene where she encounters Elinor all the 'pride and self-will' are on the side of her enemies; the outraged right and feeling on her own. To Elinor's

'Who is it thou dost call usurper, France?'

it is but natural that she should say,

'Let me make answer—thy usurping son.'

And Elinor's atrocious imputation upon her, of adultery and of guilty ambition—

'Out insolent!—thy bastard shall be king,
That thou mayst be a queen, and check the world!—'

more than justifies all the keenness of retort that follows. That she resents the insults thus added to the injuries of her foes, infers but little pride. To have remained silent under them, would have been nothing less than meanness in any woman—most of all in a sovereign princess on so public an occasion. Again, in all her exclamations on the betrayal of her cause by her selfish allies, we find, indeed, all the sensitive and intellectual widow and mother,

'Oppress'd with wrongs, and therefore full of fears;'

but where is the proud self-will? it seems extraordinary that Mrs Jameson and others should not have reflected that, had a particle of it been represented as belong-

ing originally and inherently to the character of Constance, it would have utterly marred the grand, the sublime effect of her concluding words in this majestic scene. It is simply because there is no pride in her nature—nothing but the indispensable self-respect of the woman, the mother, and the princess—and more especially because the whole previous tenour of this scene itself exhibits her as anything but 'an impersonation of pride'—

> 'A widow, husbandless, subject to fears;
> A woman, naturally born to fears—'

that the passage in question is so wonderfully impressive. It is not the proud, fierce, haughty woman, but the sensitive and apprehensive woman alone, lashed out of all of her usual habits of mind and temper, by direct injury and basest treachery, into intense resistance and resentment, to whom it can ever occur to say,—

> 'I will instruct my sorrows to be proud;
> For grief is proud, and makes his owner stout.
> To me, and to the state of my great grief,
> Let kings assemble; for my grief's so great,
> That no supporter but the huge firm earth
> Can hold it up. Here I and sorrow sit;
> Here is my throne—bid kings come bow to it!'

Here is pride indeed! wrung, for the first time, from a noble tender nature by the awful climax of indignant sorrow, and placing the 'gentle Constance' on that towering eminence from whence, in the desolate majesty of afflicted right, she hurls the keen lightnings of her eloquence upon the mean-souled great ones around her. Theirs, indeed, is the gain, but hers is the triumph! So much have we deemed it necessary to say in vindication of the moral qualities wherewith Shakespeare has endowed his heroine. We must now say something for the guidance, it may be, both of the reader and the performer, in correction of some erroneous views, as we esteem them, to which the authoress above cited, and others, have given circulation, respecting the intellectual powers developed in this character. The substance of Mrs Jameson's observations on this head is contained in the following sentence: 'The moral energy, that faculty which is principally exercised in self-control, and gives consistency to the rest, is deficient, or rather, to speak more correctly, the extraordinary development of sensibility and imagination, which lends to the character its rich poetical colouring, leaves the other qualities comparatively subordinate.' Following out this view of the matter, Mrs Jameson speaks of the dramatic Constance as 'a generous woman, betrayed by her own rash confidence.' Generous she is, but where is the rashness of her confidence? What better resource have she and her son than to trust in the solemn protestations which the potentates best able to assist them are made to deliver at the opening of the second act? What weakness of intellect is here implied? It is clearly her best policy to confide in them. Again, Mrs Jameson desires us to observe that the heroine cannot from her intellectual resources 'borrow patience to submit, or fortitude to endure.' But, all feeling apart, what, we would ask, betrayed on every hand, and friendless, as she is, has she to gain by submitting and enduring? Constance herself understands her own position as clearly, as she feels it keenly; and states it, too, with her ever forcible and coherent logic. In answer to the legate's observation respecting the excommunication of King John—

> 'There's law and warrant, lady, for my curse—'

most justly does she reply,—

'And for mine too, when law can do no right,
Let it be lawful that law bar no wrong:
Law cannot give my child his kingdom here,
For he that holds his kingdom holds the law
Therefore, since law itself is perfect wrong,
How can the law forbid my tongue to curse?'

Equally logical—more strikingly and terribly consequential than the cool reasonings of the Cardinal himself—are these sentences addressed to him in her despairing scene:

'And, father cardinal, I have heard you say,
That we shall see and know our friends in heaven.
If that be true, I shall see my boy again;
For, since the birth of Cain, the first male child,
To him that did but yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.
But now will canker sorrow eat my bud,
And chase the native beauty from his cheek,
And he will look as hollow as a ghost,
As dim and meagre as an ague's fit;
And so he'll die; and, rising so again,
When I shall meet him in the court of heaven,
I shall not know him: therefore never, never
Must I behold my pretty Arthur more!'

Here, indeed, her heart may be said to stimulate her intellect to a sort of preternatural activity; but she does not rave, she reasons herself into the climax of despair. Yet Mrs Jameson speaks of 'the bewildered pathos and poetry of this address'; and in a subsequent page proceeds in the same strain—'It is this exceeding vivacity of imagination which in the end turns sorrow to frenzy,'—and calls the sublime effusions of her despair 'the frantic violence of uncontrolled feeling.' This is nothing less than using to the afflicted mother the language addressed to her by the cold-blooded papal diplomatist,

'Lady, you utter madness, and not sorrow:'

and Constance's own answer to the Cardinal is a triumphant refutation of all such criticism:

'Thou art not holy, to belie me so.
I am not mad: this hair I tear is mine;
My name is Constance; I was Geoffrey's wife;
Young Arthur is my son, and he is lost:
I am not mad;—I would to heaven I were
For then, 'tis like, I should forget myself:
Oh, if I could, what grief should I forget!—
Preach some philosophy to make me mad,
And thou shalt be canoniz'd, cardinal;
For, being not mad, but sensible to grief,
My reasonable part produces reason
How I may be deliver'd of these woes,

And teaches me to kill or hang myself.
If I were mad, I should forget my son,
Or madly think a babe of clouts were he:
I am not mad: too well, too well I feel
The different plague of each calamity!'

But in spite of this convincing protest Mrs Jameson sees only, in the lady's invocation to Death, that she 'heaps one ghastly image upon another with all the wild luxuriance of a distempered fancy':—

'O amiable, lovely death!
Thou odoriferous stench! sound rottenness!
Arise forth from thy couch of lasting night,
Thou hate and terror to prosperity;
And I will kiss thy detestable bones,
And put my eye-brows in thy vaulty brows,
And ring these fingers with thy household worms,
And stop this gap of breath with fulsome dust,
And be a carrion monster like thyself!
Come, grin on me, and I will think thou smil'st,
And buss thee as thy wife! Misery's love,
Oh, come to me!'

For our own part we can only exclaim upon this, oh! tremendous and resistless logic of high and true passion! oh, 'lion sinews' lent to the intellect by the fearful pressure of despair upon the heart! We deem it requisite to dwell a little longer upon Mrs Jameson's general view of this matter, because the error into which she seems to us to fall respecting it is an essential one, and pervades her criticism of Shakespeare's more poetical characters. The two following passages from this same essay shall be our text: 'In fact, it is not pride, nor temper, nor ambition, nor even maternal affection which, in Constance, gives the prevailing tone to the whole character; it is the predominance of imagination. In the poetical, fanciful, excitable cast of her mind, in the excess of the ideal power, tingeing all her affections, exalting all her sentiments and thoughts, and animating the expression of both, Constance can only be compared to Juliet.' Again: 'Some of the most splendid poetry to be met with in Shakespeare may be found in the parts of Juliet and Constance; the most splendid, perhaps, excepting only the parts of Lear and Othello; and for the same reason, that Lear and Othello as men, and Juliet and Constance as women, are distinguished by the predominance of the same faculties—passion and imagination.' Here seems to us to lie a radical error, that of regarding the 'excess of the ideal power,' the predominance of passion and imagination, as productive of 'the most splendid poetry.' For the very reason that Lear and Othello, Juliet and Constance are sublime poets, that is, possess the creative mental power in the highest degree, neither fancy nor passion, however vigorous in them, can be predominant, but must exist in due proportion to the strength of the reasoning faculty. Otherwise, the result would be, not poetry, but mere wild, incoherent raving, such as Mrs Jameson has mistakenly attributed to the most impassioned speeches of Constance herself. But she herself protests she is not mad; and not being mad, her most impassioned are also her most logical passages; as is ever the case with a being like her in whom a noble nature has unfolded itself in harmonious vigour. Her glowing heart, indeed stirred by the deepest of all passions, a widowed mother's boundless and idolatrous love,

puts her rich and lively fancy into most active play; but only her bright, strong intellect could mould and elevate those crowding images into glorious and deathless imaginings. Whatever the actual princess might be, Shakespeare's Constance is a poetess of the first order; and so, in one sense, must the actress be who undertakes to personate her. Feeling, fancy, and reason, in her soul, must each be strong, and all harmoniously blended.

C. C. CLARKE (*Sh's Characters*, p. 324): Constance is a sublime personification of the maternal character, lashed into frenzy by the potency of will, but impotence of power to right herself of the injustice with which she is surrounded. She is a lioness at bay, her resources failed, and her retreat cut off. In the blind desire to secure her child's birthright, and in her wrath at his oppression, she fatally loses sight of the great privilege of his existence. How true to nature all this, and how accurately do we trace the gradual subsiding of her spirit of fury and resentment into an outpouring of tenderness and deprecation, as all her hopes and prospects of success fade away. I know nothing in dramatic contrast surpassing in grandeur that of Constance with the other characters in this tragedy—open, direct, vehement action, with bravery, but without judgment; opposed to cunning, treachery, and cruelty, without courage—moral or physical.

GERVINUS (p. 358): Ambition spurred by maternal love, maternal love goaded by ambition and womanly vanity, these form the distinguishing features of her character, features out of which, from the adversity of fate, that raging passion is developed which at last shatters the soul and body of the frail woman. She is a woman whose weakness amounts to grandeur, and whose virtues sink into weakness; like John in his masculine sphere, she is without those mental and moral resources which could make her moderate in prosperity or calm in adversity. To the daring man misfortune is the stone against which he stumbles, to the passionate woman this stumbling-stone is prosperity. From the transporting violence of her love and of her grief we may conclude how violent she could have been in hatred and arrogance. Her coarse outbursts against Elinor, her contemptuous and sarcastic outbreaks against the Duke of Austria when she stands on the doubtful ground between success and misfortune, testify to the sanguine, womanly, and even womanish want of self-command, which makes her irritable from fear, and would have made her irritable in prosperity. Her biting speech is even too bitter for her child and too moderate for her friends. Shakespeare has depicted in her the female counterpart to Richard II, who, imperious in prosperity, was speedily lost in adversity. Powerless to forward their own cause, the one from early self-abandonment, the other from the circumstances of her position and sex, both alike powerless in active defence and revenge, they both exhibit the exaggeration of a passion which rages within the man in smouldering heat, and within the woman in a bright blazing fire; they both present an exaggeration of the mind and the fancy manifesting itself in the most brilliant outpourings of eloquence and reflection, in the invectives of rage as well as in the outbursts of sorrow. Just as in Richard there gushes forth in Constance a deeply poetic vein in all her misery, and like him her imagination revels in her grief, which she calls so great that 'no supporter but the huge firm earth can hold it up.' Like Richard, she delights in picturing to herself dark images of death and its desired horrors; like him she plays with her sorrow in witty words and similes; like him her pride and majesty rise with misfortune. On the throne and state of her grief she feels herself more exalted than her false royal friends, and in the extreme of hopelessness she is seized with the frenzy which only threatened Richard.

BUCKNILL (*Mad Folk of Sh.*, p. 268): Constance is delineated with Greek simplicity. The grandeur of one great passion is weakened by no subordinate parts of character on which the mind can rest and feel relief. All is simple and clear, like the one thrilling note of a trumpet, rising higher or falling lower, but never altering its tone. The wondrous eloquence in which the passion clothes itself does but display its force. Its unity and directness of purpose remain unchanging and unchangeable. Passion is not seen except when transformed into action. Like a great wind, it would be voiceless except for opposition; it would be viewless except for its effects. These may be a few tossed leaves, or a whirling cloud-rack, or the crash of forests. The invisible force remains the same, measured most imperfectly by the casualties of resistance. But this passion itself, single in its onward force, is not altogether so in its nature and origin. It wears the garb of maternal affection, of the strong love a widowed mother bears to her only child; but, as in Queen Margaret, the fury of ambition is added; ambition for herself as much as for her son, which Elinor perceives, and with wounding truth expresses:

> 'Out, insolent! thy bastard shall be king,
> That thou mayst be a queen, and check the world!'

This fierce desire of power and place, which is but coldly expressed in the word ambition, is as undeniable in Constance as her mother's love. Had she no child she would be ambitious for herself. Having one, she is more vehemently ambitious for him, and indirectly for herself. The tenderness of love alone would have led her to shun contention and to withdraw her child from danger; as Andromache sought to withhold her husband from the field of honour with unalloyed womanly apprehension. But love influenced by ambition, and ambition stimulated by love, produced that compound passion which incurred all risks, braved all dangers. Combined passions are weak or strong, according to their perfection of union and singleness of purpose. If concurrent desires are but half of one mind, they pull diverse ways, and give rise to the weakness of inconsistency; but if they are thoroughly of one accord, chemically combined as it were, the product acquires new and irresistible strength. This force of compound emotion is finely developed in Constance, in contrast with the other female characters of the drama. Ambitious without love, she would have possessed the hard vigour of Elinor; loving without ambition, she would have been tenderly devoted like Blanch. Under the lash of the combined passion she is a fury, whom her boundless love and her deep woe barely suffice to redeem from our horror. The first words of Constance are those of prudent advice, the suggestion of a strong vehement nature against the first move in the dread game of war. They contrast well with the ready boasts of coward Austria and feeble France:

> 'Stay for an answer to your embassy,
> Lest unadvised you stain your swords with blood.'

It is the only tranquil speech which the poor woman is permitted to utter. The scolding match into which she immediately precipitates herself with Queen Elinor develops the irritability and vehemence of her temper. To Elinor's taunt of unchastity she replies with acrid tu quoque invective. She fairly overwhelms the queen mother with vituperation, and does her best to merit the contemptuous entreaty of John, 'Bedlam, have done!' and at length to earn the expostulations of her own friend.

'*Elinor.* Thou unadvised scold, I can produce
A will that bars the title of thy son.
Constance. Ay, who doubts that? a will! a wicked will!
A woman's will; a canker'd grandam's will!
K. Philip. Peace, lady! pause, or be more temperate:
It ill beseems this presence to cry aim
To these ill-tuned repetitions.'

She has already incurred the remonstrance of her gentle son.

'*Arthur.* Good my mother, peace!
I would that I were low laid in my grave:
I am not worth this coil that's made for me.'

Her very tenderness to her child is fierce, like that of some she-beast of prey. Had there been no motive in the mother's heart but that of love, this appeal might well have checked not only the unbridled use of speech, but the dangerous course of action into which Constance throws herself. But at this period ambition is much stronger than love, and it would be hard to say to what extent ambition for herself was not mixed up with that for her son. The scene affords clear insight into the natural character of Constance, as a proud ambitious woman, of irritable and ungoverned temper. The flight of her imagination, like that of her passion, is yet comparatively low. She roundly scolds her opponents indeed, but not until later is her unrivalled power of invective fully developed. In nothing is Shakespeare's master-hand more evident than in the manner in which he lays a true and consistent foundation for his characters. To have built such a one as that of Constance on the basis of the common female virtues would have been monstrous. Constance, in whom fierce passion is not the result but the cause of madness, could only have been from the beginning what she is plainly shown to have been, a haughty irascible woman, whose tongue and temper were dreaded by friend and foe. Constance even more than Lear establishes the fact that Shakespeare held the origin and nature of insanity to be emotional. Until the last there is no delusion, scarcely a deviation from correct reasoning, and yet she is conducted through a tempest of emotional disturbance into the very midst of maniacal excitement. All the causes of her disease are purely emotional. The predisposing cause is her fiercely passionate disposition. The exciting cause is grief. The symptoms are the same as the causes, transformed into abnormal conditions of degree. Disorder in the wit is felt, but scarcely exhibited. Loss of control over the operations of the intellect is manifested in the last speech only, or perhaps also in the disconnected expression preceding, 'To England if you will.' Nature is above art, as Lear says, and a truth now appreciated by science needs not the support of opinion even from so great an artist as Shakespeare. But perfect art is founded upon science, the science of exact observation at least, and to such a test there can be little doubt that this character was submitted in the crucible of the poet's great brain before it was moulded into that form of fierce power and beauty in which it excites our admiration and awe. The wondrous eloquence of Constance is second to that of no other character except Lear. It would seem that Shakespeare revels in the free swing of fancy, in the repudiation of all mental restraint which madness justifies. He uses these characters as the motley favourites of old courts were often used, to speak bitter truth without fear or favour, without hesitation or retention, without prudential subtraction or self-seeking after thought. The madmen of Shakespeare are his broadest exponents

of humanity. In the development of the insanity of Constance the power of passion finds a potent ally in that of imagination. Imagination, that creative faculty which paints in the mind's eye those images which in health may be dismissed at will, but which in disease haunt the oppressed brain with their importunate presence. The faculty of forming sensational ideas without the intervention of the external senses is one which, if not kept in subjection to a sober judgment, is more perilous to mental health than aught else except unbridled passion. In actual insanity this function runs riot, and the world of reality is supplanted by that of fancy.

HUDSON (*Life, Art, & Character*, ii, 27): I suspect that the genius and art of Mrs Siddons caused the critics of her time and their immediate successors to set a higher estimate upon the delineation of Constance than is fully justified by the work itself. The part seems indeed to have been peculiarly suited to the powers of that remarkable actress; the wide range of moods and the tugging conflicts of passion, through which Constance passes, affording scope enough for the most versatile gifts of delivery. If I am right in my notion, Shakespearian criticism has not even yet quite shaken off the spell thus cast upon it. At all events, I find the critics still pitching their praise of the part in a somewhat higher key than I can persuade my voice to sound. The abatement, however, which I would make refers not so much to the conception of the character as to the style of the execution; which, it seems to me, is far from displaying the Poet's full strength and inwardness with nature. There is in many of her speeches a redundancy of rhetoric and verbal ingenuity, giving them a too theatrical relish. The style thus falls under a reproof well expressed in this very play:

> 'When workmen strive to do better than well,
> They do confound their skill in covetousness.'

In pursuance of the same thought, Bacon finely remarks the great practical difference between the love of excellence and the love of excelling. And so here we seem to have rather too much of that elaborate artificialness which springs more from ambition than from inspiration. But the fault is among those which I have elsewhere noted as marking the workmanship of the Poet's earlier period. The idea pervading the delineation is well stated by Hazlitt as 'the excess of maternal tenderness, rendered desperate by the fickleness of friends and the injustice of fortune, and made stronger in will, in proportion to the want of all other power.' In the judgment of Gervinus, 'ambition spurred by maternal love, maternal love fired by ambition and womanly vanity, form the distinguishing features' of Constance; and he further describes her as 'a woman whose weakness amounts to grandeur, and whose virtues sink into weakness.' I am not indeed greatly in love with this brilliant way of putting things; but Gervinus is apt to be substantially right in such matters. My own tamer view is that the character, though drawn in the best of situations for its amiability to appear, is not a very amiable one. Herein the play is perhaps the truer to history; as the chroniclers make Constance out rather selfish and weak; not so religious in motherhood but that she betrayed a somewhat unvenerable impatience of widowhood. Nevertheless it must be owned that the soul of maternal grief and affection speaks from her lips with not a little majesty of pathos, and occasionally flows in strains of the most melting tenderness. I know not how the voice of a mother's sorrow could discourse more eloquently than in these lines:

'Grief fills the room up of my absent child,
Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me;
Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
Remembers me of all his gracious parts,
Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form:
Then, have I reason to be fond of grief.'

Nor is there any overstraining of nature in the imagery here used; for the speaker's passion is of just the right kind and degree to kindle the imagination into the richest and finest utterance. On the other hand, the general effect of her sorrow is marred by too great an infusion of anger, and she shows too much pride, self-will, and volubility of scorn to have the full touch of our sympathies. Thus, when Eleanor coarsely provokes her, she retorts in a strain of still coarser railing; and the bandying of taunts and slurs between them, each not caring what she says, so her speech bites the other, is about equally damaging to both; a storm of mutual abuse, in which there is neither modesty nor wit. It is true, she meets with very sore trials of patience, but these can hardly be said to open any springs of sweetness and beauty within her. When she finds that her heart's dear cause is sacrificed to the schemes of politicians; when it turns out that the King of France and the Archduke of Austria are driving their own ends in her name, and only pretending pity for her and conscience of right, to cover their selfish projects, the heart-wringing disappointment inflames her into outbursts of sarcastic bitterness and scorn; her speech is stinging and spiteful, and sounds quite as much of the intemperate scold as of the sorrowing and disconsolate mother.

BOAS (*Sh. and His Predecessors*, p. 244): Constance is drawn with far more delicate insight than any of the women in *Richard III*, and is the most highly elaborated female figure in the historical plays. She is another of that numerous company in Shakespeare's earlier dramas whose sensibilities are developed to an extravagant degree. Her instinct of maternal affection is not chastened by reason into a moral principle, but is inflamed by an imagination of hectic brilliance into an abnormal passion that swallows up every thought and energy. It is this exaggerated imagination, as Mrs Jameson has rightly insisted, that is the controlling force in the nature of Constance. The impetuous ardour of her fancy gives a special quality to her maternal love. The very attribute that is wont to be the source of all that is tenderest in womanhood breeds in her ambition, scorn, and hysterical passion, till at last it consumes her in its fires. But her imaginative sensibility, though the deepest element in her nature, is not made prominent at first. In the quarrel scene between her and Elinor she figures as a genuine vixen, whose bitter rush of invective amply earns the abusive epithets of her foes, and even irritates her friends. Her imperious temper on this occasion augurs ill for her future bearing in the event of fortune favouring her cause, but the disappointment of her hopes turns her emotion into a more seductive, though no less vehement, course. When she hears from Salisbury that Philip has been false to his oath there sweeps over her the overwhelming sense of her powerlessness, shaking her as a reed before the wind:

'For I am sick, and capable of fears;
Oppressed with wrongs, and therefore full of fears;
A widow, husbandless, subject to fears.'

Yet out of this weakness is born a strange grandeur. The imagination of Con-

stance playing upon her misery wraps her, as it were, in a haze when she looms large upon our view. The 'unadvised scold' of the earlier scene rises to well-nigh tragic stature as she flings herself on the ground and cries aloud:

> 'To me, and to the state of my great grief,
> Let kings assemble; for my grief's so great
> That no supporter but the huge firm earth
> Can hold it up: here I and sorrows sit:
> Here is my throne, bid kings come bow to it.'

In a similar vein, half-tragic, half-grandiose, is her appeal to the heavens to be the widow's husband, and to arm against the perjured kings. And when the heavens are deaf to her cries, with still more daring luxuriance of imagery she invokes 'amiable lovely Death' to be her mate, whom she may 'buss' as wife. It is remarkable throughout these speeches how seldom the thoughts of Constance are turned directly towards Arthur; it is her own widowed lot which forms the centre of her exuberant riot of fancy. This is in itself proof that her maternal impulse does not well up, pure and strong, from unfathomable depths in her being. How largely it is fed from merely æsthetic sources is shown by her own declaration that had Arthur been ugly, 'slanderous' to her womb, she would not have loved him, or deemed him worthy of a crown. And when the fortune of war tears him from her arms her grief at his loss is strangely mingled with the fantastic thought that sorrow will so despoil him of his beauty that she will not know him when they meet in heaven. King Philip's rebuke, 'You are as fond of grief as of your child,' is well deserved, but Constance catches in self-defence at the implicit personification of sorrow and expands it, with pathetic rhetoric, into the picture of grief filling up the room of her absent child, and acting his every part. But the vehemence of her passion, powerless against others, reacts with deadly shock upon her frail nature, and the special bridegroom whom she has so passionately invoked, claims her as his own.

BROOKE (p. 245): Amid all this hurly-burly of wars, contending kings, selfish interests walks like a spirit the awful figure of Constance—worn and wasted motherhood maddened by loss and grief; primeval motherhood isolated from everything else in its own passion.

> 'Look, who comes here! a grave unto a soul;
> Holding the eternal spirit, against her will,
> In the vile prison of afflicted breath.'

When she is present, all the others recede into the background—are only scenery for her wild figure, with disordered garments and hair unbound, and the sound of death in her voice. The actress who should undertake her part is scarcely born in a century. It needs a majestic woman whose soul has lived in the depths; it needs a man's strength to keep up so continuous a frenzy of passion. It needs a self-control, most rarely found in any artist, to present the fury of the part, its total abandonment, from carrying away the actress beyond the self-mastery she must hold over her emotion, lest her execution of the part should break down in feebleness, into mere rant and shouting. Moreover, she must have a noble intellect as well as a pitiful heart to act the part adequately; and added to that a spirit of imagination to feel poetic passion in the speech of Constance. All she says, in her grief, is steeped in the waters of poetry; the penetrating pity of imagination pierces through

her words into the secret recesses of sorrow. As to the intellect required, the part needs to be conceived on large and simple lines, so as not to lose its grandeur; and yet, within that simplicity, the part is so variously and finely conceived and wrought that she who acts it must have a hair-dividing, subtle intellect to wind in and out among its changes. Constance is not mad; she is only frenzied with grief, and the frenzy seems sometimes to rise into insanity. But she never loses the clear sequences of thought, and never (as a mad woman would do, as Ophelia does) gambols from the sense. Even her wildest cry, when she apostrophises Death, when she gets nearest to madness, is in intellectual order! Instead of becoming (as a mad woman in excitement would certainly become) more incoherent, she becomes quieter and quieter to the end of the scene, more clear and simple. The changes are as subtle, as delicate as the changes of a cloud; and their infinite interchange of feeling of thought needs a great intellect to conceive them, a passionate heart to follow their intricacy of emotion, and a great, grave, and self-mastering artist to represent them. When we meet her first she has no grief, but eager wrath that her son is kept out of his heritage; and keen desire, because she loves him, that he should have it. She does not care because he is her son and she his mother. It is her love that is the motive. The motive of Elinor, her opponent, is love of power. Even in their first quarrel these motives are plainly disclosed: Elinor's violence is cool; her policy and not her heart speaks. Every word of Constance is charged with the physical passion of motherhood. Motherhood, universal motherhood, the deep agony of the female in animals and in humanity; her defence of her young, her desire, her hope for them; her fury at their loss, her rapture at their recovery; motherhood unmodified by civilisation—it was that which rose into Shakespeare's soul and before his imagination when he pictured Constance. Only here he did not picture the happy motherhood of Hermione, or the proud joy of Volumnia in her son, but the misery of a mother's loss; the tigress robbed of her whelps.

CHARACTER OF FAULCONBRIDGE

HAZLITT (*Characters of Sh.*, p. 162): The character of the Bastard's comic humor is the same in essence as that of other comic characters of Shakespeare; they always run on with good things, and are never exhausted; they are always daring and successful. They have words at will and a flow of wit like a flow of animal spirits. The difference between Falconbridge and the others is that he is a soldier, and brings his wit to bear upon action, is courageous with his sword as well as tongue, and stimulates his gallantry by his jokes, his enemies feeling the sharpness of his blows and the sting of his sarcasms at the same time. Among his happiest sallies are his descanting on the composition of his own person, his invective against 'commodity, tickling commodity,' and his expression of contempt for the Archduke of Austria, who had killed his father, which begins in jest but ends in serious earnest. His conduct at the siege of Angiers shows that his resources were not confirmed to verbal retorts. The same exposure of the policy of courts and camps, of kings, nobles, priests, and cardinals, takes place here as in the other plays we have gone through, and we shall not go into a disgusting repetition.

VERPLANCK (*Introduction*, p. 7): Whilst the dramatic chronicle was condensed into a dark tragedy of the sorrows of Constance, the harrowing wrongs of her engaging child, and the guilt of John, a false and selfish tyrant, whose sins are unredeemed by

any of the nobler qualities of talent and courage or wit that gild the crimes of Iago and Richard—the author also saw that this sad tale would receive deeper truth, and a more living reality, from frequent contrast and gay relief. This contrast he supplies from the constant flashes of high spirits and gay courage, which his own genius strikes out so abundantly from the original hard and rough character of Cœur-de-Lion's son. He is made the comic relief to the purely tragic portion of the action, being himself the secondary hero upon whom the audience's sympathy is to repose, he is in himself a tragi-comedy of the higher order, a compound of Hotspur and Mercutio, a character of which we sometimes meet the resemblance amongst young soldiers and sailors, and, if it had been drawn at a later period, I should say more Irish than English. But Shakespeare drew him from his own countrymen, and he belongs to a class rather than a nation. If the poet had any other model in his eye than living nature, it was the historical and legendary character of Richard himself, whose son hath 'the very spirit of Plantagenet.'

LLOYD (*Critical Essay*, p. 384): The character of the Bastard and its progress are most effectively realized, and contrast with successive phases of the spirit of John. From the beginning to the end he is uniformly bluff and outspoken, but at first with a certain affectation of bluffness that smacks of the country and wears off without in any degree impairing his hearty sincerity, when he has seen more of the world, but never could be mistaken for bluster. Though not embarrassed by delicacy he preserves a principle of conscientiousness; and when, transferred to court, he recognizes the genius of the place, it is in self-defense that he proposes to cope with it. Interest and influence and power are the stakes on the board, the gamesters are unscrupulous, and he will cultivate the wit he does not lack to make sure he is not cheated. In the scenes in France he is the brave soldier and little more; a looker-on in scenes of general treaty, and blurting out indignation with no cautious regard to his relative diplomatic position. Only when a course is to be adopted in active management he frames a plan that, in his own words, 'smacks somewhat of the policy.' After the unprincipled convention of the kings indeed he professes allegiance to gain in his personal capacity, but he does not graduate far; his ransacking the abbey chests is not noted as affected by private peculation and he rises by nobler means. What we call in compliment to ourselves an English spirit—a spirit of independence, of fair play in hard fighting and of directness in negotiation, hatred of cruelty and meanness, and disgust at the pursuit of secular purposes under a religious pretext, especially in a foreign interest,—this is the spirit that animates the other English barons, but especially the Bastard, expressed casually and intermittently at first, but when the heart and health of John decline together he rises at once in consistency, dignity, and force. He gains in elevation and composure without relaxing one whit in energy; and sparing no exertion to keep the country together and place the quarrel on an open and healthy footing, he entrains the shrewd and only safe conviction that preparation for hard knocks will best support negotiation if unhappily too late to supersede it. He presents a prototype of the loyalty of which our history furnishes so many examples, loyalty to ideal qualities that would best become the throne, and that it persists in assuming,—such is the assistance of personal association, to sustain its enthusiasm and for the encouragement of the cause that should be in itself motive and stimulant enough. Thus there is still nothing slavish in his loyalty; the older dramatist allows him to appeal to the divine right:

'I say 'tis shame and worthy of all reproof
To wrest such petty wrongs in terms of right

Against a king anointed by the Lord.
Why, Salisbury admit the wrongs are true,
Yet subjects may not take in hand revenge
And rob the heavens of their proper powers
Where sitteth he to whom revenge belongs.'

But the Faulconbridge of Shakespeare directs his eye to a different point of right entirely, and loyalty is enjoined because patriotic, not patriotism on the ground of loyalty:

'And you degenerate, you ingrate revolts,
You bloody Neroes ripping up the womb
Of your dear mother England, blush for shame.'

REED (p. 69): It was Shakespeare's arduous achievement to fire the sentiment of patriotism with the story of a reign that was tyrannical, oppressive, cowardly,—a period of usurpation and national degradation. He has accomplished this chiefly by means of one character, which is almost altogether a creation of his mind from very slight historical materials. The fertile imagination of the poet, and his genial exuberance of happy and gentle feelings, seem to have craved something more than the poverty of the history he supplies; he wanted somebody better than a king, better than a worldly ecclesiastic, and better than the bold but fickle barons. It is in the highest order of dramatic art, and especially in the historic drama, that Shakespeare, on no other historical basis than the mere existence of a natural son of Richard, has created the splendid and most attractive character of Philip Faulconbridge. Besides playing an important part himself, he fulfils something like the function of the chorus of the ancient drama; for he seems to illustrate the purposes of the history, and to make the real personages more intelligible. He is the embodiment, too, of the most genuine national feeling, and is truer to his country than king or noble. With an abounding and overflowing humour, a dauntless courage, and a gentleness of spirit that characterizes true heroism, Faulconbridge carries a generous strength and a rude morality of his own amid the craft and cruelties and the feebleness of those who surround him. The character, imaginary as it is, has a historical value also in this, that it represents the bright side of a feudal loyalty. Honoured by the king, Faulconbridge never deserts him in his hour of need and peril, when the nobles are flying off from their allegiance and a foreign enemy is at hand. It is no servile fidelity, but such genuine and generous loyalty that we look upon it as faithfulness to his country rather than adherence to the fortunes of the king. He is, as it were, the man of the people in the play, and we hear him prompting brave actions and a generous policy—encouraging the feeble king to a truer kingly career; we see him withstanding the haughty barons, and still more indignant at papal aggression. He dwells in an atmosphere of heartlessness and villainy, but it pollutes him not; rather does his presence partially purify it. It is remarkable that we do not and cannot, I think, associate him injuriously with the character of King John, with whose fortunes he is identified, but from whose vices he is wholly aloof; and I am almost tempted to apply to him what has been said of a very different character:

'His soul was like a star and dwelt apart.'

The character and position of Faulconbridge in the play seem to me finely to illustrate the workings of the principle of chivalry during this early feudal period of history—that principle of which Mr Burke wisely said that 'Without confound-

ing rank, it produced a noble equality, and handed it down through all the gradations of social life. It was this opinion,' said that philosophic statesman, 'which mitigated kings into companions, and raised private men to be fellows with kings.'

C. C. CLARKE (*Sh's Characters*, p. 329): The grandest carrying out of the author's intention in displaying the 'Philosophy of war' is to be found in the character of Falconbridge. It forms throughout, as it were, a moral chorus to the tragedy, embodying Shakespeare's own sentiments as to the worthlessness of strife and contention, and proving the medium of forcing this conviction upon his audience. The way in which the character is first introduced is in correct costume and keeping throughout. We behold a young and fiery spirit grasping at the earliest chance of what he deems honour, even at the expense of the honour of his mother, wherein he eagerly seeks to derive his descent from Cœur-de-Lion—not so much as being King Richard, but as the warlike monarch, the renowned military leader, the byword and terror of the east, the plume in the helmet of Christian chivalry. He pants for distinction, come it how it may; and perceiving the cant of 'craft' to be the court fashion, he immediately announces his intention of adopting that course; adding—

> 'For he is but a bastard to the time,
> That doth not smack of observation.'

I have frequently recurred to Shakespeare's ingenuity in contrasting his characters in his dramas; great as this is, however, both this talent and effect are surpassed by the wonderful skill and ease with which he contrasts characters with themselves, as in this one of Falconbridge. The graduated manner in which he contrives to make one master-passion supersede another, and each in turn to become the dominant, still retaining the integrity, and even plausibility of the original construction, is in itself a profound metaphysical study. One more remark upon this grand personation. Upon the question that the reign of King John was deficient in character fully answering the demand for the dramatic interest in the play, and that in consequence the instinct of our poet perceiving the necessity for a supply of representative characters to meet that demand, the fine character just dismissed,—certainly one of the very finest in the whole gallery of Shakespearian inventive portraits,—is precisely the 'representative' character required. Thoroughly Gothic in features and proportions, and as thoroughly English in temper and spirit, his presence rays life and manliness into every part of the drama, where they would else be wanting.

GERVINUS (p. 366): Among Shakespeare's humorous characters the Bastard Faulconbridge is one in which the poet does not separate the spirit of seriousness and mirth as in most of the others, giving to the latter usually the preponderance, but he exhibits them both in a close and well-balanced combination. His mode of expression throughout, even in the most elevated and most solemn passages, is that of a skeptic, habituated to wit and bitter sarcasm. But placed as he is by fate at the very outset in the busy political world, occupation and work leave him no time to indulge this merry vein, and his deep seriousness in action counterbalances his idle inclination to trifle and to jest. His course through the tragic events, offering so little food to comic humour, is the very reverse to that of King John. The latter begins with power and kingly thoughts and ends in weakness, the Bastard bounds light of heart into the wider sphere that opens before him,

and advances steadily in seriousness and strength even to a tragic greatness. In his first soliloquy he looks jestingly upon his new dignity; his merriment is changed to bitter irony in the second soliloquy (Act II, sc. ii.) after the sad experience of the French breach of faith with Constance; in the third soliloquy the gloomy course of events leads him to serious reflection; and at last, ever increasing in power and personal importance, he wholly assumes the direction of the great concerns of the State, and concludes with the tragic resolve, which Shakespeare, in an antique grandeur of sentiment has imputed to all his faithful servants, to Horatio and to Kent, and here also to Philip, to follow his deceased King. The metal out of which this character is moulded is of a similar masculine character as in John. The older play furnished the die for the character, Shakespeare fashioned it into a true work of art. Even there he is depicted as a bold madcap, rude and daring; he is a wild intrepid warrior, whose defiance amounts to proud boasting; he has a straightforward and heart-sense for nature; he is coarse-grained in understanding and in morals; a contrast to crafty, considerate diplomatists, and faithless wranglers, to all custom and conventionality; 'a bastard to the time' which is regulated by such arts, just as he is a bastard by birth. Shakespeare, in this character also, is occupied with the idea of show and reality, of genuine nature, conventionality, and prejudice. Faulconbridge is in the rare position of being permitted, as it were, to choose between a legitimate birth from an indifferent father, or an illegitimate one from the famous Cœur-de-Lion. This first introduction at once develops his character, which clings rather to substantial honour than to conventional form.

HUDSON (*Life, Art, & Character*, ii, 31): The reign of King John furnishes no characters fully answering the conditions of high dramatic interest. To meet this want, therefore, there was need of one or more representative characters,—persons in whom should be centered and consolidated various elements of national character, which were in fact dispersed through many individuals; or a boiling down of the diffused old John Bull into an ideal specimen. And such is Falconbridge, with his fiery flood of Norman vigour bounding through his veins, his irrepressible dance of animal spirits, his athletic and frolicsome wit, his big, brave, manly heart, his biting sword, and his tongue equally biting; his soul proof-armoured against all fear save that of doing what were wrong or mean. *The Troublesome Reign* supplied the name, and also a slight hint towards the character:

> 'Next them a bastard of the King deceas'd,
> A hardy wild-head, rough and venturous.'

But the delineation is thoroughly Shakespearian, is crammed brimful of the Poet's most peculiar mental life; so that the man is as different as can well be conceived from anything ever dreamed of in the older play. And, what is specially worth the noting, Shakespeare clearly embodies in him his own sentiment of nationality, pours his hearty, full-souled English spirit into him and through him; so that the character is, at least in the political sense, truly representative of the author—all this, however, without the slightest tincture of egotism or self-obtrusion; the pure nationality of the man, extricated from all personal and partisan mixtures. So, to Falconbridge, both head and heart, the King, as before remarked, is truly the impersonation of the State; and he surrounds the throne with all those nobilities of thought and all those ideas of majesty and reverence, which are wanting in John himself. He thus regards the crown just as the wearer ought to regard it. Withal he is fully alive to the wrong-headedness and moral baseness of the King; but the office is to

him so sacred as the palladium of national unity and life that he will allow neither himself nor others in his presence to speak disrespectfully of the man. Faulconbridge is strangely reckless of appearances. But his heart is evidently much better than his tongue: from his speech you might suppose gain to be his God of gods; but a far truer language, which he uses without knowing it, tells you that gain is to him just no god at all: he talks as if he cared for nothing but self-interest, while his works proclaim a spirit framed of disinterestedness; his action thus quietly giving the lie to his words; this too in such sort as establishes the more firmly his inward truth. His course in this behalf springs partly from an impulse of antagonism to the prevailing spirit about him, where he sees great swollen pretences to virtue without a particle of the thing itself. What he most of all abominates is the pursuit of selfish and sinister ends under the garb of religion; piety on the tongue with covetousness in the heart fills him with intense disgust; and his repugnance is so strong that it sets him spontaneously upon assuming a garb of selfishness to cover his real conscientiousness of mind and purpose. So too, secretly, he is as generous as the Sun, but his generosity puts on an affection of rudeness or something worse: he will storm at you, to bluff you off from seeing the kindness he is doing to you. Of the same stripe is his hatred of cruelty and meanness: while these things are rife about him, he never gets angry or makes any quarrel with them; on the contrary, he laughs and breaks sinewy jests over them, as if he thought them witty and smart; upon witnessing the heartless and unprincipled bargaining of the Kings, he passes it off jocosely as a freak of the 'mad world,' and verbally frames for himself a plan that 'smacks somewhat of the 'policy'; then, instead of acting out what he thus seems to relish as a capital thing, he goes on to shame down, as far as may be, all such baseness by an example of straightforward nobleness and magnanimity. Then too, with all his laughing roughness of speech and iron sternness of act, so blunt, bold, and downright, he is nevertheless full of humane and gentle feeling. With what burning eloquence of indignation does he denounce the supposed murder of Arthur! though he has no thought of abetting his claims to the throne against the present occupant. He abhors the deed as a crime, but to his keen, honest eye it is also a stupendous blunder; and he deplores it as such, because its huge offensiveness to England's heart is what makes it a blunder, and because he is himself in full sympathy with the national conscience, which cannot but be shocked at its hideous criminality. So it may be doubted whether he more resents the wickedness or the stupidity of the act. And how much it imperils the state is revealed to him in the hard strain it makes on his own determined allegiance. The Poet manages with great art that Faulconbridge may be held to John throughout the play by ties which he is too clear of head and too upright of heart to think of renouncing. In the first place, he has been highly trusted and honoured by the king, and he cannot be ungrateful. Then again, in his clear-sighted and comprehensive public spirit, the diverse interests that split others into factions, and plunge them into deadly strife, are smoothly reconciled: political regards work even more than personal gratitude to keep him steadfast to the king; and he is ready with tongue and sword to beat down whatsoever anywhere obstructs a broad and generous nationality. In the intercourse of state functionaries he, to be sure, pays little heed to the delicacies and refinement of political diplomacy; his plain, frank nature either scorns them or is insensible to them, but his patriotism is thoroughly sound and true, and knows no taste of fear; and whatever foreign assailants dare to touch England or England's honour, he is for pounding them straight out of the way, and will think of no alternative but to be pounded out of the way by them. As a representative character, he stands next to Falstaff. Is it

strange that a nation which could grow such originals should have beaten all the rest of the world in everything useful and beautiful and great?

SNIDER (ii, 294): In the other plays the Poet has introduced the Bastard, but has endowed him with a character altogether different. In *Lear* and in *Much Ado About Nothing* he is portrayed as the natural villain, in hostility with the whole Ethical World. Since both Family and State disown him, deride him, oppress him without any fault of his own, he turns against them both and tries to destroy them. Such is the logical result of illegitimacy amid social institutions—their victim becomes their bitterest foe. But in the present play the Bastard is rescued by being elevated into a national existence, which is the more intense and vigorous because of his total separation from the domestic bond. He thus can have an institutional—and, hence, a truly national—life. Such is the meaning of his adoption into the Plantagenets—the royal family is national rather than domestic; but even in it he is still not legitimate.

WARNER (p. 50): The character of Philip Falconbridge, the natural son of Richard the Lion Heart, is looked upon as an ideal of the poet's brain, with no other foundation than the fact of the existence of such a person who was not at all conspicuous in history. But Falconbridge seems to have been more than an ideal. He did really exist, not as a faithful servant of King John, as in the play, but in hundreds and thousands of loyal steadfast men, citizens of England. Not nobles, nor barons, nor degraded serfs, but men. The forgotten men of most historic records. The men who are ploughing and sowing; buying and selling; marrying and bringing up sons and daughters like themselves; paying the taxes of despotism and suffering the inconvenience of oppression, while doing their duty in that state of life to which it had pleased God to call them. Men who faced the daily problems of life, and as God gave them strength sought to deal with them, not complaining over much. Even giving their bodies to be set up as targets at the king's will, because he was the king, and they were loyal to him as sons of the soil. Philip Falconbridge is an interesting study. It would appear that Shakespeare intended to have him represent the sturdy heart of English manhood, which while often misused, humiliated, and beaten back, finally conquered and rose to its proper place in the making of later and nobler England, as the commons; not the legislatures. So while Philip Falconbridge was an imaginary character he was not an imaginary force.

BOAS (*Sh. & his predecessors*, p. 247): From a purely dramatic point of view the figure of the Bastard, Faulconbridge, is scarcely necessary, but morally he is the very salt of the play. At first that salt would seem to be of somewhat coarse savour. The scene in which he discusses the question of his legitimacy in the presence of John and the Queen-mother is undeniably pungent, though Shakespeare, with greater delicacy than the elder dramatist, excludes the lady whose honour is at stake. It is characteristic of Faulconbridge that he decides to reject legitimacy and the material advantages that go with it, in order that he may claim descent from the heroic Richard. He disdains a father who can only transmit 'a half-face' like his brother's instead of his own 'large composition,' even though it be derived 'something about, a little from the right.' Thus throughout he prefers what is substantial and genuine, even if it will not stand the most delicate scrutiny, to all that smacks of conventionality or artifice. His character is in entire accord with the origin to which he lays claim. His royal blood gives him his daring in battle, and his stern

fidelity to duty in the crisis of his country's fortunes; while from his mother's side he draws his hearty, practical common-sense, and his thoroughly popular turn of humour. The latter qualities are shown especially in his soliloquies, as when after being dubbed knight he moralizes on his unfitness for this new honour, because he doth not 'smack of observation' according to the prescribed standard of fashion; or when he rails against the 'mad kings,' John and Philip, with their 'mad composition' against Arthur's interests. It is here that he unfolds his practical political philosophy, in which he traces all errors in the well-poised world to the 'vile-drawing bias' the 'daily break-vow,' commodity. With bluff sincerity he admits that, with similar temptation, he would similarly fall, though we feel that in this he does himself a wrong. He would never compromise his honour, though his morality is far from thin-skinned. He proposes to the kings a combined assault upon Angiers, because its scroyles flout them, and he makes no scruple of carrying out John's behest to shake the bags of hoarding abbots. But that he has at bottom a tender heart is shown in his words to Hubert, as they stand together over Arthur's body:

> 'Knew you of this fair work?
> Beyond the infinite and boundless reach
> Of mercy, if thou didst this deed of death,
> Art thou damned, Hubert.'

This crowning catastrophe, and the revolt of the nobles for which it gives the signal, perplex the honest soldier. This child of nature loses his way amidst the thorns and dangers of the world. He is confronted by intricacies which demand an intellect more subtle than his. He feels darkly that all is not well with John and the English cause, but he has too much patriotism to imitate the nobles and join his country's foes. Rather, the blacker the dangers that threaten, the higher does his spirit mount, till in the end he fills the rôle, vacated by John's poltroonery, of national leader and hero. It is he who seeks to stir the recreant king to be 'great in act,' in face of the invader, and who bids him 'away and glister like the god of war.' It is he who, giving voice to the popular instinct, pours contempt upon the 'inglorious league' which John makes with Pandulph, in order to buy off the assault of a beardless boy. And when the Dauphin refuses to be bound by the compact made over his head, it is the Bastard who, clothing the king in attributes borrowed from his own high-souled temper, describes him as an eagle towering o'er his aiery, 'to souse annoyance that comes near his nest.' The 'pygmy arms' of the French he ridicules with much of the old saucy insolence, and for the revolted lords he has epithets of burning indignation. How far his sturdy patriotism transcends their disloyalty, springing though it does from a moral motive, is made palpable when on the field of battle the dying Count Melun reveals the treacherous doom with which the Dauphin purposes to reward their treacherous aid. Under such sharp stimulus they rally again to the cause which the Bastard has so gallantly upheld, and, though John pays the last penalty of his misdeeds, the nation renews its youth. The foreigner retreats; unity is re-established, and the accession of the young Prince Henry marks the dawn of a nobler era thrilled by the spirit of the Bastard's closing words, which strike the very keynote of the whole group of historical plays.

BRANDES (i, 172): Faulconbridge is at first full of youthful insolence, the true mediæval nobleman, who despises the burgess class as such. When the inhabitants of Angiers refuse to open their gates either to King John or to King Philip of France, who has espoused the cause of Arthur, the Bastard is so indignant at this peace-

loving circumspection that he urges the kings to join their forces against the unlucky town, and cry truce to their feud until the ramparts are levelled to the earth. But in the course of the action he ripens more and more, and displays ever greater and more estimable qualities—humanity, right-mindedness, and a fidelity to the King which does not interfere with generous freedom of speech towards him. His method of expression is always highly imaginative, more so than that of the other male characters in the play. Even the most abstract ideas he personifies. Thus he talks of—

'Old Time, the clock-setter, that bald sexton Time.'

In the old play whole scenes are devoted to his execution of the task here allotted him of visiting the monasteries of England and lightening the abbots' bursting money-bags. Shakespeare has suppressed these ebullitions of an anti-Catholic fervour, which he did not share. On the other hand, he has endowed Faulconbridge with genuine moral superiority. At first he is only a cheery, fresh-natured, robust personality, who tramples upon all social conventions, phrases, and affectations; and, indeed, he preserves to the last something of that contempt for 'cockered silken wantons' which Shakespeare afterwards elaborates so magnificently in Henry Percy. But there is real greatness in his attitude when, at the close of the play, he addresses the vacillating John in this manly strain:

'Let not the world see fear, and sad distrust,
Govern the motion of a kingly eye:
Be stirring as the time; be fire with fire;
Threaten the threatener, and outface the brow
Of bragging horror: so shall inferior eyes,
That borrow their behaviors from the great,
Grow great by your example, and put on
The dauntless spirit of resolution.'

Faulconbridge is in this play the spokesman of the patriotic spirit. But we realise how strong was Shakespeare's determination to make this string sound at all hazards when we find that the first eulogy of England is placed in the mouth of England's enemy, Limoges, the slayer of Cœur-de-Lion, who speaks of—

'that pale, that white-fac'd shore,
Whose foot spurns back the ocean's roaring tides,
And coops from other lands her islanders,
. . . that England, hedg'd in with the main,
That water-walled bulwark, still secure
And confident from foreign purposes.'

How slight is the difference between the eulogistic style of the two mortal enemies, when Faulconbridge, who has in the meantime killed Limoges, ends the play with a speech which is, however, only slightly adapted from the older text:

'This England never did, nor never shall,
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror.
* * * * *
Come the three corners of the world in arms,
And we shall shock them. Naught shall make us rue,
If England to itself do rest but true.'

BROOKE (p. 240): Faulconbridge is intended by Shakespeare to be, amidst a crowd of selfish kings, princes and nobles, all pressing to their own advantage, an incarnation of the honest Englishman who loves his country, abjures the foreigner, clings to his king at all hazards because the king represents England; is not indifferent to his own interests; is bluff, outspoken, and brave as a lion, yet has a clear eye to see beyond the follies of the world into the serious heart of affairs. He can philosophise on the mad world because he really stands apart from all the rest. Amid all the changes of politics, the quarrels which are knit and unknit around him, he is steadily consistent. The principles he lives by remain at the end what they were at the beginning; they change only by development. Nor is he without natural and simple affection, the faithfulness of which is always to be relied upon. He heartens and consoles the King when misfortune lies heavy upon him. He is faithful to the last, even when he disapproves the King. Yet when he sees the dead body of Arthur, and thinks that the King is guilty of the murder, his natural pity and indignation break out of his heart—'Sir Richard, what think you?' cries Salisbury, and Faulconbridge replies—

> 'It is a damned and a bloody work
> The graceless action of a heavy hand.'

This is the man who, when we first met him, has come to the court from the country to defend his claim to his father's property—denied to him because he is not his father's son, but a bastard got on his mother by Richard Cœur-de-Lion. But he loved fame more than property, and when he is recognised by the King as the son of Richard, when Elinor asks him to follow her fortunes and receive knighthood, he flings away his claim, and will live to make his own fortune and his own fame. He rejoices in his sonship to the great warrior; he tells his mother, whom his affection consoles, that she was justified in yielding to the conqueror of the lion, that he is forever grateful to her; and he leaves her happy and at ease. Brave, ambitious, rough and frank, he has yet a kind heart, and a wise mind in affairs because his heart is kind. Shakespeare lifts him in this scene out of the countryman into the courtier without lowering his character. No sooner is he in his natural element as the king's son, no sooner does he realise that here, in war and policy, he can fulfil all the dreams he must have had when lost in the solitude of the country, than he flings his old life away for ever with a laugh. He sees the varied movement of the great world open before him like a fan, and his spirit burns to join the mêlée. John and Elinor watch his soul rise to his eyes; they see the man emerge from the chrysalis and they knit him to their side. This is, cries Elinor,

> 'The very spirit of Plantagenet!
> I am thy grandam, Richard; call me so.'

Nevertheless, he is not carried away out of good sense by his new honours. I am, he says, with his good-natured cynicism,

> 'A foot of honour better than I was;
> But many a many foot of land the worse.'

He laughs at the conventions of society which is chiefly made up of fools, but for that very reason suits a 'mounting spirit' like himself—one who observes, and will make of his observation means to grow—one who will soothe the world with deceit's sweet poison when it is necessary, yet will, on the whole, be true. This first of his

soliloquies paints him as less noble than he becomes. Shakespeare slowly develops Faulconbridge into a great nobility of character. Great affairs, in which he plays a serious part, lift him to greatness. There is that in him—his honest truthfulness, his unbroken faith—which makes him equal to arduous events, and above them. His large conception of England and of his duty to her and to the king as the image of England enlarges his mind, strengthens him in difficulty, opens his soul and sets him apart, in dignified separation, from all these kings and nobles who are struggling, without any high ideas of country and duty, for their own ends alone. He grows steadily from the brave and self-seeking man of the first Act, from the vainglorious soldier of the third, to the serious patriot and the honourable statesman of the last. Only one personal matter is at his heart. It is the avenging of his father on Austria, his enemy. To give his anger full reason Shakespeare makes Austria guilty of Cœur-de-Lion's death, which he was not; and to enable his personal revenge, keeps Austria alive, who had really been dead for some years. Faulconbridge mocks his enemy before the assembled princes, and in the battle slays him. When that is done he has no more personal aims. He is for England only.

CRITICISMS

GILDON (p. 338): As for the characters of this history, I think there are none of any figure but the Bastard and Constance; they, indeed, engage your attention whenever they enter. There is boldness, courage, self-reliance, haughtiness, and fidelity in whatever he says and does. But here is the misfortune of all the characters of Plays of this nature, that they are all directed to no end, and, therefore, are of little use, for the manners cannot be necessary, and by the consequence must lose more than half their beauty. The Violence, Grief, Rage, and Motherly Love and Despair of Constance produce not one incident, and are of no manner of use, whereas if there had been a just Design, a tragic limitation of some one grave action of just extent, both these characters being formed by the Poet, must have had their manners directed to that certain end, and the production of those incidents, which must beget that end.

JOHNSON: *The Tragedy of King John*, though not written with the utmost power of Shakespeare, 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.

F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Censor*, ii, 167): In writing this play Shakespeare disclaimed every idea of regularity, and has huddled such a series of historical events on the back of one another as shame the utmost stretch of probability; his muse travels lightning-winged, being here, there, and everywhere in the space of a few minutes. We are by no means advocates for that pinching limitation which so disadvantageously fetters modern composition; imagination will indulge several trespasses of liberty, but must be offended when all the bounds of conception are arbitrarily trodden under foot. In point of characters King John is a very disagreeable picture of royalty; ambitious and cruel, not void of spirit in the field, yet irresolute and mean in adversity, covetous, overbearing, and impolitic; from what we can observe, totally unprincipled; strongly tainted with the opposite appellations which

often meet—fool and knave; during his life we have nothing to admire, at his fall nothing to pity. There is no capital character within our knowledge of more inequality; the greater part of what he has to say is a heavy yoke on the shoulders of an actor. His two scenes with Hubert are, indeed, masterly and do the author credit; like charity, they may serve to cover a multitude of sins; the dying scene is not favourable to action. . . . The shameful irregularity of plot we have already remarked; in the characters there is variety. The Bastard is an original and pleasing oddity, though somewhat upon the extravaganza; the language is bold, flowing, and, where it ought to be, pathetic; yet in many places too figurative, obscure, and turgid. As to moral, there seems to be no other deduction but this: that King John's crimes having merited his fate, the justice of providential dispensation is thereby vindicated. This play wants much alteration to make it quite agreeable on the stage, and is at present, we think, a better reading than acting piece.

HAZLITT (*Characters of Sh.*, p. 159): It gives a soreness to our feelings of indignation or sympathy when we know that in tracing the progress of sufferings and crimes we are treading upon real ground, and recollect that the poet's 'dream' denoted a foregone conclusion—irrevocable ills, not conjured up by fancy, but placed beyond the reach of poetical justice. That the treachery of King John, the death of Arthur, the grief of Constance had a real truth in history sharpens the sense of pain, while it hangs a leaden weight on the heart and the imagination. Something whispers us that we have no right to make a mock of calamities like these, or to turn the truth of things into a puppet and plaything of our fancies. 'To consider thus' may be 'to consider too curiousiy'; but still we think that the actual truth of the particular events, in proportion as we are conscious of it, is a drawback on the pleasure as well as the dignity of tragedy. *King John* has all the beauties of language and all the richness of the imagination to relieve the painfulness of the subject. The character of King John himself is kept pretty much in the background; it is only marked in by comparatively slight indications. The crimes he is tempted to commit are such as are thrust upon him rather by circumstances and opportunity than of his own seeking; he is here represented as more cowardly than cruel, and as more contemptible than odious. The play embraces only a part of his history. There are, however, a few characters on the stage that excite more disgust and loathing. He has no intellectual grandeur or strength of character to shield him from the indignation which his immediate conduct provokes; he stands naked and defenceless, in that respect, to the worst we can think of him; and besides, we are impelled to put the very worst construction on his meanness and cruelty by the tender picture of the beauty and helplessness of the object of it, as well as by the frantic and heart-rending pleadings of maternal despair. We do not forgive him the death of Arthur because he had too late revoked his doom and tried to prevent it, and perhaps because he has himself repented of his black design our moral sense gains courage to hate him the more for it. We take him at his word, and think his purposes must be odious, indeed, when he himself shrinks back from them. The scene in which King John suggests to Hubert the design of murdering his nephew is a masterpiece of dramatic skill, but it is still inferior, very inferior, to the scene between Hubert and Arthur, when the latter learns the orders to put out his eyes. If anything ever was penned heart-piercing, mixing the extremes of terror and pity, of that which shocks and that which soothes the mind, it is this scene. Arthur's death afterwards, when he throws himself from his prison walls, excites the utmost pity for his innocence and friendless situation, and well justifies the exaggerated

denunciations of Falconbridge to Hubert, whom he suspects wrongfully of the deed. The excess of maternal tenderness, rendered desperate by the fickleness of friends and the injustice of fortune, and made stronger in will, in proportion to the want of all power, was never more finely expressed than in Constance. The dignity of her answer to King Philip, when she refuses to accompany his messenger, 'To me and to the state of my great grief, let kings assemble,' her indignant reproach of Austria for deserting her cause, her invocation to death, 'that love of misery,' however fine and spirited, all yield to the beauty of the passage, where, her passion subsiding into tenderness, she addresses the Cardinal in these words:

'O father Cardinal, I have heard you say
That we shall see and know our friends in heav'n;
If that be so, I shall see my boy again,
For since the birth of Cain, the first male child;
To him that did but yesterday suspire,
There was not such a gracious creature born.
But now will canker-sorrow eat my bud,
And chase the native beauty from his cheek,
And he will look as hollow as a ghost,
As dim and meagre as an ague's fit,
And so he'll die; and rising so again,
When I shall meet him in the court of heav'n,
I shall not know him; therefore never, never
Must I behold my pretty Arthur more.
K. Philip. You are as fond of grief as of your child.
Constance. Grief fills the room up of my absent child:
Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me;
Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
Remembers me of all his gracious parts;
Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form;
Thus have I reason to be fond of grief.'

The contrast between the mild resignation of Queen Catherine to her own wrongs, and the wild, uncontrollable affliction of Constance for the wrongs which she sustains as a mother, is no less naturally conceived than it is ably sustained throughout these two wonderful characters. The accompaniment of the comic character of the Bastard was well chosen to relieve the poignant agony of suffering, and the cold, cowardly policy of behavior in the principal characters of this play. Its spirit, invention, volubility of tongue, and forwardness in action are unbounded. 'Aliquando sufflaminandus erat,' says Ben Jonson of Shakespeare. But we should be sorry if Ben Jonson had been his licenser. We prefer the heedless magnanimity of his wits infinitely to all Jonson's laborious caution.

DRAKE (*Sh. & His Times*, ii, 419): If *King John*, as a whole, be not entitled to class among the very first-rate compositions of our author, it can yet exhibit some scenes of superlative beauty and effect, and two characters supported with unfailing energy and consistency. The Bastard Faulconbridge, though not perhaps a very amiable personage, being somewhat too interested and worldly-minded in his conduct to excite much of our esteem, has, notwithstanding, so large a portion of the very spirit of Plantagenet in him, so much heroism, gaiety, and fire in his constitution, and in spite of his vowed accommodation to the times, such an open and undaunted

turn of mind, that we cannot refuse him our admiration, nor, on account of his fidelity to John, however ill-deserved, our occasional sympathy and attachment. The alacrity and intrepidity of his daring spirit are nobly supported to the very last, where we find him exerting every nerve to rouse and animate the conscience-striken soul of the tyrant. In the person of Lady Constance, Maternal Grief, the most interesting passion of the play, is developed in all its strength; the picture penetrates to the inmost heart, and seared must those feelings be which can withstand so powerful an appeal; for all the emotions of the fondest affection, and the wildest despair, all the rapid transitions of anguish, and approximating phrenzy, are wrought up into the scene with a truth of conception which rivals that of nature herself. The innocent and beauteous Arthur, rendered doubly attractive by the sweetness of his disposition and the severity of his fate, is thus described by his doating mother:

> 'But thou, art fair, and at thy birth, dear boy!
> Nature and fortune join'd to make the great;
> Of Nature's gifts thou may'st with lilies boast,
> And with the half-blown rose.'

When he is captured, therefore, and imprisoned by John, and, consequently, sealed for destruction, who but Shakespeare could have done justice to the agonising sorrows of the parent? Her invocation to death and her address to Pandulph paint maternal despair with a force which no imagination can augment, and of which the tenderness and pathos have never been exceeded. Independent of the scenes which unfold the striking characters of Constance and Faulconbridge, there are two others in this play which may vie with anything that Shakespeare has produced, namely, the scene between John and Hubert and between Hubert and Arthur. The former, where the usurper intimates to Hubert his bloody wishes, is conducted in so masterly a manner that we behold the dark and turbulent soul of John lying naked before us in all its deformity, and shrinking with fear even from the enunciation of its own vile purpose. The scene with Hubert and the executioners, where the hapless Arthur supplicates for mercy, almost lacerates the heart itself; and is only rendered supportable by the tender and alleviating impression which the sweet innocence and artless eloquence of the poor child fix with indelible influence on the mind. Well may it be said, in the language of our Poet, that he who can behold this scene without the gushing tribute of a tear,

> 'Is fit for treasons, strategems, and spoils;—
> Let no such man be trusted.'

As for the character of John, which, from its meanness and imbecility, seems not well calculated for dramatic representation, Shakespeare has contrived, towards the close of the drama, to excite in his behalf some degree of interest and commiseration, especially in the dying scene, where the fallen monarch, in answer to the enquiry of his son as to the state of his feelings, mournfully exclaims,

> 'Poison'd,—ill fare;—dead, forsook, cast off.'

OXBERRY (*New English Drama*, vol. vii.): *King John*, though certainly not the best, is amongst the best, of Shakespeare's tragic dramas; there is in it a great variety of characters and all distinguished with most wonderful precision. The great defect is that the interest does not sufficiently centre in any one individual of the play, and the death of King John, the ultimate subject, is not obviously connected with the minor incidents; yet even this last censure must be admitted within cer-

tain limits, for a connexion does exist between the general events and the catastrophe, though not perhaps very strongly marked; the quarrel with France, respecting Arthur, leads to the invasion of that country, the invasion to a treaty; and from the breaking of this treaty, by the papal ban, arises the violent seizure of the property of the church, and this again induces the poisoning of the monarch by a revengeful monk. In all this there seems to be no want of context; not a link in the chain is broken; the fact seems to be that the beginning and the end are too remote from each other; there are too many connecting links between the first and the last object, that when we have attained the one, we lose sight of the other. The character of John, though drawn with great accuracy and vigour, is not precisely one of those which effect our sympathy or excite our admiration; vice, when accompanied by any splendid quality, whether it be wit, or mind, or courage, is sure to obtain our reluctant approbation; in the scale of depravity Richard is infinitely above King John, yet the giant iniquities of the former always delight; while the cold, weak, suspicious John lives without our pleasure and dies without our regret. Not that we would infer that the character of John is less true to nature; far from it, but there are some virtues as well as vices which are too quiet to excite our sympathy. Faulconbridge is one of those characters which Shakespeare apparently delighted to draw, in which he has never found a rival. In Congreve and in the French Comedies all the witty characters seem to be wits by profession; their aim is ever to say smart, pointed things; and certainly these efforts are successful; but Shakespeare's Faulconbridge has no effort; he is humorous from the overflowing abundance of his fancy, and from animal spirits that are incapable of restraint; with him wit is a part of his nature, a quality which he can no more change than the height of his stature; with the French wit is an assumption; a thing of education or, rather, of habit. The grief of Constance on the loss of her darling child is another proof of Shakespeare's admirable knowledge of the human heart; it is not only true to nature, but true to character; it is, indeed, royal grief. The scene between Hubert and the child, though it has been much praised, has little deserved it; the wretched conceits put into the mouth of young Arthur are fatal to it; and neither on the stage nor in the closet does it procure the least effect. As a whole, though the plot is far from excellent, and the language with few exceptions is not of the first order, yet the variety and exquisite truth of the characters place it high in the scale of dramatic composition.

G. DANIEL (*Cumberland's British Theatre*, vol. iv.): The plot of *King John* is from the English historians; on this foundation Shakespeare has raised a superstructure of great variety and beauty. If the towering majesty that distinguishes some of his grander productions be not always discernible in this, there are certain parts that bear full evidence of the master's hand; and terror and pity, two of the most powerful attributes of tragedy, are excited in no ordinary degree by the unrelenting cruelty of John and the maternal sorrows of Lady Constance. The portrait of King John is maintained with historical truth. He has all the ferocity of Richard without any of his bravery—cruel, fickle, and treacherous—irresolute, save in commission of evil—and then pursuing his dark purposes without pity or remorse; for, in the scene with Hubert, where he reproaches his minion with the death of young Arthur, and impatiently exclaims—

> 'It is the curse of kings, to be attended
> By slaves, that take their humours for a warrant
> To break within the bloody house of life.'

It is not compunction for the deed, but dread of the consequences that wring from him those passionate expressions. The incursions of France, with a powerful army into his dominions—the unexpected death of his mother—the desertion of his most attached courtiers—have broken down his spirit; added to these disasters, his superstitious fears are awakened by signs and wonders equally mysterious and alarming:

> 'My lord, they say five moons were seen tonight:
> Four fixed; and the fifth did whirl about
> The other, in wondrous motion.
> . . . Old men and beldams in the streets
> Did prophesy upon it dangerously.'

In the vain hope of appeasing the wrath of man—and the still vainer one, of heaven—he becomes reconciled with the Romish church; and, if the authority of history may be relied on, falls by the treachery of one of that communion into whose arms he had thrown himself for pardon and protection. There is no character in the writings of Shakespeare that bears stronger evidence of his peculiar manner than the Bastard Faulconbridge. He is a singular compound of heroism, levity, and—if his accommodating himself to the spirit of the times deserves so harsh a term—servility. He is, in truth, a soldier of fortune; acknowledging no law but that of honour, which in a military sense has somewhat of an equivocal signification. He compromises his own interest and his mother's fame for the proud distinction of being esteemed the base-born son of the Lion-hearted Richard; and enlists himself under the banners of a tyrannical usurper for the vaunted display of personal prowess against the injured and unprotected. Yet, with all these blemishes, Shakespeare has painted him in such bewitching colours—he has given him such nobleness of spirit—so much candour and frankness—such exquisite powers of wit and raillery—that his very errors are turned to good account, and, like the irregularities of Falstaff, form the most seductive parts of his character. To reconcile such seeming incongruities is one of the many triumphs of Shakespeare. He knew that character consists not of one but of various humours; and to blend them skilfully, without violating nature or probability, was an art that he left for the study and emulation of all future dramatists. But the great charm of this play is the Lady Constance, a character conceived with Shakespeare's profoundest art and finished with his utmost skill. Every feeling of her bosom—every emotion of joy or sorrow—have their origin in maternal tenderness. In that all powerful passion everything is centered: her anxious solicitude—her bitter reproaches—her phrenzy—her despair. Can indignation and contempt borrow stronger terms than her reply to Austria:

> 'O Lymoges! O Austria! thou dost shame
> That bloody spoil. Thou slave, thou wretch, thou coward:
> Thou little valiant, great in villainy!
> Thou every strong upon the stronger side!'

Where is sorrow depicted with greater pathos than her distraction for the death of Arthur? and grief unutterable and past consolation never produced an image more solemn and majestic than the following:

> 'To me, and to the state of my grief,
> Let kings assemble . . .

. . . Here I and sorrow sit
Here is my throne—bid kings come bow to it.'

The belief that those we have loved and have been beloved by on earth shall meet and recognise each other in a happier state of existence—a belief, glorious for the consolation that it affords, and perfectly consistent with our ideas of immortality—is thus pathetically alluded to by Lady Constance in her reply to Cardinal Pandulphus:

'O, father cardinal, I have heard you say
That we shall see and know our friends in heaven:
If that be true I shall see my boy again.'

There are two scenes of superlative excellence in this play: the one, where John discloses his dark purpose to Hubert; the other, where the horrible imaginings of Hubert are defeated by the artless innocence and pathetic entreaties of the unhappy Arthur. Indeed, the latter is almost too powerful a trial for our sensibility; the effects are so truly distressing that to render them bearable is the strongest test of dramatic skill. The language of this play is, for the most part, dignified and impressive. All that belongs to Lady Constance is of the highest mood of sentiment and poetry. The gaiety of Faulconbridge, though occasionally running into freedom and extravagance, is bold and characteristic, and might be allowable in an age when thoughts and words bore less palpable constructions. The incidents are deficient in connexion and continuity, and embrace a considerable portion of time; the scene is alternately laid in England and France. The assumption of Lady Constance by Miss O'Neil taught us, by comparison, rightly to estimate the wonderful powers of Siddons. To a just conception of the character Miss O'Neil added grace, dignity, and true feeling; but the eccentric fire that Mrs Siddons infused into the 'thoughts that breathe and words that burn' of Shakespeare, fairly drew the line betwixt superlative excellence and absolute perfection. The braggart Austria stood annihilated beneath her contemptuous reproaches; and, when she pleaded her wrongs and poured forth her sorrows every heart was bowed in subjection, and

'All was silence, sympathy, applause.'

So great was Lord Byron's admiration of Mrs Siddons that he never could be persuaded to see Miss O'Neil, lest she should disturb his recollection of her; this was the homage of kindred genius. For ourselves, we must behold some effort far beyond anything that we ever conceived of acting to disturb our remembrance of Siddons.

COURTENAY (i, 32): The lamentations of Constance, when represented by a powerful actress, form a very attractive part of this play; but her language is not uniformly admirable; and, surely, the scenes between John and Hubert are those which, coldly read in the closet, are the most striking of all. And I must do Johnson the justice to say that, though he omits it in his recapitulation, he has commended the second of these conferences as exhibiting 'many touches of nature.' And this is the better of the two—the former being somewhat disfigured by conceits and obscurities. The character of Constance, though founded upon reality, is none the less poetical. Nothwitstanding the command to put Arthur to death, the character of John is not brought out by the dramatist in the singularly odious

light in which all modern historians have taught us to view it; still there is nothing inconsistent either with nature or with history. Possibly a tradition from the revolting barons and the writing of ecclesiastics, who have the great advantage of recording the deeds of their enemy, may have exaggerated the faults of this unfortunate king. The merits of this play consist chiefly in the scenes, as distinguished from the plot, and the discrimination of character.

ULRICI (p. 361): As in *Coriolanus* the state appears in conflict with its principle —the ties and duties of the family—so *King John* exhibits the struggle between the Christian state and its foundation, which is the church. This conflict is shown primarily in the conduct and character of John himself, which is nothing but an endless struggle between his bitter feelings on the one hand, and the arrogance and pretensions of his earthly sovereignty on the other. His mind is never at peace within itself; and, naturally weak, he falls into the grossest inconsistencies and want of principle. The defect in his title to the crown, and his own weakness, lead to the dissensions within, and perpetual aggressions from without. In vain has he recourse to treachery and murder to hedge in his usurped majesty, and to suppress the growing demands of the commons and barons, or to resist the attacks of France and the Papacy. But not the state alone, but the Church also, is corrupt and rotten at the core. The political element is immoral, selfish, and encroaching, and, consequently, is loosened from its proper foundation; the ecclesiastical body seeks for nothing but external splendour, influence, and power; mistaking entirely its true and essential vocation, it degrades itself as low as the civil body by its intrigues and dissimulation. Cardinal Pandulph is the most correct delineation of a corrupt priest that poet ever painted. Accordingly, neither the Church nor the State gain by the quarrel; the whole benefit falls to the nobles and the people, who, comparatively speaking, are as yet morally and politically sound. The representative of the latter is Faulconbridge, the bastard son of the Lion-hearted Richard. He is the most independent character throughout the whole piece; and this advantage he owes to his birth, which connects him at once with the royal family and with the people. His motives are of the very purest patriotism and knightly honour; he therefore can dare to speak the truth with impunity, and he utters it with that overflowing fulness of humour which energetic and noble minds always have most at command. He rescues England from the deadly consequences of civil strife, as well as from the fangs of France and the Pope. The apparently inferior and subordinate power of knight and citizen rises superior to the influence of the mightiest potentates simply because it has on its side morality and manliness. This is the eternal lesson which the history of the world is ever teaching. The final result of these entanglements and quarrels, amidst which, however, the grace of God manifests itself, is the independence of the English nation, established from within by the hard won bulwark of its rights, Magna Charta, and from without by its victory over France and the papal aggressions. Thus does the Poet in *King John* exhibit modern history in that aspect of its relation between Church and State, which is as essential, as it is peculiar, to it. Indeed, the fundamental idea of the whole piece seems to be conveyed in its closing lines, delivered by Faulconbridge:

> 'This England never did, (nor never shall,)
> Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,
> But when it first did help to wound itself.
> Now these, her princes are come home again,

> Come the three corners of the world in arms,
> And we shall shock them. Nought shall make us rue,
> If England to itself do rest but true.'

For this truth to herself, this concord, can only be preserved when the state is pervaded by the ecclesiastical, and the church by the political, spirit, i. e., when both are animated by the pure spirit of Christian morality. The fortunes, the actions, and sufferings of all the subordinate personages are naturally affected and determined by the course of the principal events. If we have rightly interpreted this, we shall see its idea reflected in all the secondary characters. The plans of the king of France, the Dauphin, and the Archduke of Austria fail because the corrupt and grasping policy on which they are founded are utterly destructive of the very notion of political society, and with them the hopes of Blanche are wrecked. The conduct of the English barons is naturally explained by their position relatively to the sovereign power in general, and to the usurped dignity of John in particular. Where the whole frame is sick, the separate members cannot well be sound. As to the fortunes of Constance and Arthur, although they are primarily but an episode in the life and character of John, yet it is with great significance that they appear to be thus interwoven with the history of the state. The instruction they furnish forms a pendant to the general lesson of the piece; for they teach us that nothing in history more invariably meets its due punishment than weakness and passion—those hereditary failings of the female character. Women ought not to interfere in history, for history demands action, and for that they are constitutionally disqualified. The haste and impatience with which Constance labours to establish her son's rights, who, however, from his very minority, is as yet unsuited for a crown, justly involves him as well as herself in ruin. Arthur, therefore, although preserved by the compassion of Hubert, must nevertheless perish. Had his mother but had the prudence to wait until he could himself have asserted his own rights by his own arm, and when alone he could have possessed a perfect title, he could have gained for himself and her what lawfully belonged to them. No objection against the historical dramatist can justly be drawn from the facts that Robert Faulconbridge is no purely historical figure, but one that belongs rather to the popular legends of his country, or that the life of the Archduke of Austria is lengthened considerably beyond the truth, and mixed up with matters in which he really took no part, or from the political modification and colouring of many other minor parts of detail. The dramatist is the court-poet, and not the court-servant of history; documentary accuracy is not his business, but that of the keeper of archives, with whom he has nothing in common. It were, indeed, a great mistake to require of the poet historical fidelity and diplomatic accuracy in all his details. Often, indeed, he cannot be historically true, except by being false in some things. There is a mass of little details and external circumstances which, humanly judging, might have been altogether different, without affecting their truth and significance (their fundamental idea), which is derived from the larger momenta of the historical development. Every great event, like every great character, has around him a number of satellites, the assistants and ministers of his plans, the selection of which depends on his arbitrary choice, and which, therefore, might well have been different from what they actually are. All that the poet has to do is to give again the chief moments of history in their true import, and to illustrate the ground-idea in all the represented collection of deeds and events, and by the chief characteristic of the acting personages, with true historical fidelity; all besides must be left at the free disposal of his

artistic judgment. The greater poet he is, the less need will he have to alter, and the more will his free creations be historical poetry; i. e., the more strictly will they be composed in conformity and in character with the represented ground idea. It is only thus that he can elucidate historical truth; thus only can an historical event be made an object of art without infringing the restraints which the artistic form lays upon the poet. The preceding remarks apply more or less to all Shakespeare's historical dramas, and we now make them once for all. The reign of King John, so important historically, and yet so weak and undignified in itself, required pre-eminently a free poetical handling. The conflicting interests and disorganization of the political body, the fluctuations of fortune, and the vacillations of a selfish political prudence—the oscillations backwards and forwards of the course of history before it could assure its proper result—the multiplicity of actors and events; all required to be reduced and concentrated on certain, fixed, leading, and distinctly prominent phenomena. Shakespeare, therefore, has necessarily made use of representatives: the ardent chivalric enthusiasm of the thirteenth century is represented by Faulconbridge, whose opposite, the hollow, fair-spoken Archduke, represents the growing relation between the English and German nations, while both are equally necessary to represent the past history of the noble Richard Cœur-de-Lion. The papacy has its representative in the person of Pandulph, the English nobility in Salisbury and Norfolk, and those useful, subordinate agents, who in such periods of confusion aggrandize themselves, have theirs in Hubert de Burgh; while the mediæval superstition—that caricature of the energetic faith of the church—is embodied in Peter of Pomfret. The fall of the Austrian Archduke by the hand of Faulconbridge is a necessary consequence of the relative position of these two characters; poetico-historical justice demanded the punishment of the Archduke for his unjust imprisonment of Richard the First, and the son of the injured party was naturally the fitting instrument of such poetical retribution. And here, also, the poet has but condensed into one prominent trait a multitude of circumstances which in the actual history are spread over a wide space.

CAMPBELL (*Introduction*, p. xl.): There was an older English historical play than that of Shakespeare on the subject of King John, and it is curious to find that the former was almost an exact forerunner of the latter in point of incidences and personages. I say personages and not characters, for Shakespeare has thrown more vivacity into the part of Faulconbridge than can be found in the prototype; more dignity into that of Constance, and more pathos into that of Arthur. In the old piece there was no anticipation of Shakespeare's high painting. I am not sure, however, in his almost, though not entirely, copying the incidents of the old play, that Shakespeare has not omitted some which he could have turned from golden dross into pure gold. I mean particularly that scene in the old play where Faulconbridge, in fulfilling King John's injunction to plunder the religious houses, finds a young smooth-skinned nun in a chest where the abbot's treasures were supposed to be deposited. If ever romantic tragedy needed comic relief it was Shakespeare's *King John*, and this scene under his comic touches would have relieved it. It is remarkable that the Poet of England, and the most eloquent Poet who ever summed up the virtues of Brutus, should have dramatised the reign of King John without the most distant allusion to Magna Charta. Was he afraid of offending Elizabeth? I think not; for he brought out *Julius Cæsar* in the reign of King James, whose petty mind was more jealous of popular principles than that of Elizabeth. His main object was probably to recast, with all despatch, an old piece into a new one for the

stage. I regret further that his mighty genius did not turn to poetical account another event in King John's reign, still more adapted to poetry, namely, the superstitious desolation of the English mind, which immediately followed the papal excommunication that was issued from Rome against England and her King. The shutting up of the churches, the nation's sudden deprivation of all the exterior exercise of its religion, the altars despoiled of their ornaments, the cessation of Sabbath bells, and the celebration of mass with doors shut against the laity; all these circumstances have been wrought up by Hume into an historic picture that is worthy of Livy, and what would they have not been as materials for a poetical picture in the hands of Shakespeare? But let us be thankful for our Poet's *King John*, such as it is. No doubt it sets the seal as to the question about the probability of good historical tragedies proceeding from the pen of the best poets, and a negative seal; for after Constance leaves the stage Shakespeare's *King John* is rather the execution of a criminal than an interesting tragedy. There are scenes and passages, however, in our Poet's *King John* which may never be forgotten. The pathos of Arthur's conference with Hubert is entirely Shakespeare's, and so is the whole of the part of Constance, his mother, as well as that most appealingly interesting of dialogues between King John and Hubert touching the murder of young Arthur. In the old play Constance has a good deal of the virago in her portraiture; in Shakespeare she is the most interesting character in nature—a doating and a bereaved mother. Those who find themselves, as I do, older than they could wish to be, may derive some consolation for their age in recollecting that they were born early enough to have seen Mrs Siddons perform the part of Constance.

H. COLERIDGE (ii, 152): After the death of Arthur all interest is at an end, and Faulconbridge himself proves bad enough to be the legitimate son of a speech-making peer. Fine lines, fine sentences, fine orations may be quoted, but all lies dead; neither for John nor his opponents do we longer care. This protraction of business, after the interest has ceased, is a crying sin, and, in fact, the worst that Shakespeare is ever guilty of. Some other plays have it in a less degree, e. g., *Henry VIII*, where it is impossible to care about anybody after Wolsey and Queen Catharine are gone. Of the dying scene, where King John begs for cold comfort, I could never make up my judgment. It is either admirable or execrable; but, at any rate, it does not result from the foregoing passages of the play. Of the historic dramas, *King John* is perhaps the worst constructed, and *King Richard II*, which wants little to be a regular tragedy, is certainly the best.

GUIZOT (p. 302): The general style of *King John* is less firm and decided in color than that of several other tragedies by the same poet; the contexture of the work is also rather vague and feeble, but this is the result of the absence of one leading idea, which should continually direct all the parts of the drama toward the same centre. The only idea of this kind which can be discerned in *King John* is the hatred of foreign dominion gaining the victory over the hatred of tyrannical usurpation. In order for this idea to be salient, and constantly to occupy the mind of the spectator, it would be necessary for it to be reproduced in every direction, and for everything to contribute to give conspicuity to the misfortune of a conflict between the two feelings. But this plan, which would be rather vast for a dramatic work, was, moreoever, irreconcilable with the reserve which Shakespeare had imposed upon himself with regard to the character of the king; and thus a great part of the play is passed in discussions of but little interest, and in the remainder the events are not

well arranged; the lords change sides too lightly, first on account of the death of Arthur, and afterwards from motives of personal alarm, which does not present their return to the cause of England under a sufficiently honorable point of view. The poisoning of King John, moreover, is not prepared with that care which Shakespeare usually bestows upon the foundation and justification of the slightest circumstances in his dramas; and there is nothing to indicate the motive which could have led the monk to commit so desperate an action, as at that moment John was reconciled to Rome. The tradition from which Shakespeare has borrowed this apocryphal anecdote ascribes the monk's conduct to a desire to revenge an offensive epithet which the king had used regarding him. We cannot tell what could have induced Shakespeare to adopt this story, which he has turned to so little account; perhaps he desired to mingle with John's last moments something of infernal suffering without having recourse to remorse, which, in fact, would not have been in more accordance with the real character of this contemptible prince than with the modified delineation of it which the poet has supplied.

LLOYD (*Critical Essay*, p. 386): The picture of Popish interference and power makes the play peculiarly the picture of an epoch. The kingdoms of a modern Europe are still in the gristle, and the remains of ancient Roman civilization is potent among the irregular communities which are yet unprepared to make terms of compromise or boldly to assert independence. The degraded position of both John and Lewis successively, degrading and disastrous, provokes appeal to a national spirit which the centuries ripen. Thus is stated the problem that is scarcely solvent at present, the harmony and identity of national sympathies with the true as distinguished from the counterfeit, cosmopolitan. Pandulph, the legate, stands in group with the feudal princes like the representative of the adult fraud and heartlessness of priestcraft; the inheritor of high faculties cultivated to refined ill purposes from the old Roman pontifices; the root of evil living among the ashes of the empire and springing up amongst and poisoning the better and unsophisticated tendencies of the northern nations, apprentices in civilization, it is true, but also novices in deceit. In his elaborate explaining away of perjury, his authorization by religious sanction of secret, treacherous murder and revolt, and in his cold-blooded complacency as he speculates on the certain murder of Arthur if dexterously provoked and the advantages to result to Holy Church therefrom, we have most striking contrast to the spirit of honour, of hatred of cruelty, and of compassion for the weak and afflicted that characterizes the English barons. The power of the natural affections over a rude nature is expressed more glowingly in the relenting of Hubert, but scarcely more touchingly than by the tears of Salisbury at the distress of Constance, or in his bitterness of heart at his false position as an enemy:

> 'Where honourable rescue and defence
> Calls out upon the name of Salisbury,'

and by the generous indignation of the barons his companions, and of Faulconbridge no less, at the jeopardy and murder of Arthur. Formal religion is arrayed in the person of its official minister against the religion of humanity and sympathy, and the corruption of an artfully organized administration offends the spectator by assuming the honours and prerogatives of devotion and piety, when at war with all the feelings that by their essential qualities and in their own right properly devout, moral and pious; and hence neither in falling off from their allegiance nor

in returning to it do the barons admit the slightest weight, or even refer to the authority of Pandulph, as a sign of the future which is quite as significant as the hankering of the kings and nobles after ecclesiastical hoards, which seconded the popular movement so efficiently at last. Magna Charta is omitted in the play, and the obtaining of it from the reluctant and speedily recusant John was, in fact, as regards the leading movement of the reign, an episode, and omitted of necessity. The struggle that Magna Charta symbolizes awaited still its grandest manifestation when Shakespeare lived and wrote; and it was on the very day that he breathed his last at Stratford-upon-Avon that a chief person in the action which is still undramatized, Oliver Cromwell, at the threshold of manhood was entering his name as a student at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Still the genius of Magna Charta is infused into the play, and in the concession which John is forced to make the barons in the interest of humanity and conciliation of his subjects, we recognize the seal of the cause of justice against arbitrary administration. It is observable that after the legate, the excess of unscrupulousness and cruelty is the patrimony of the kings,—to some extent of Philip of France, though he is not utterly incapable of compunction, but chiefly of King John and his rival the dauphin. The atmosphere of high place and isolated dignity hardens their hearts and deadens their nature so far as to render them entirely different to the nobles who otherwise are stern enough. For the rest it is, of course, natural enough that a national poet should give a national advantage, and, accordingly, Shakespeare is not guilty of unduly ennobling the French. Their interested desertion of Constance and Arthur, after holy and conscientious professions, is placed in contrast to the pity of Salisbury; and not even John himself, suborning Hubert not without conscious shame and agitation, is so hateful as Lewis entertaining and seconding the Macchiavellian prophecy of the Cardinal; even more degraded is the nature that appears in the misconception and mean consolation of the noble emotion of Salisbury:

> 'Lift up thy brow, renowned Salisbury,
> And with a great heart heave away this storm. . . .
> Come, come; for thou shalt thrust thy hand as deep
> Into the purse of rich prosperity
> As Lewis himself.'

BATHURST (p. 51): *King John* is a most remarkable instance of Shakespeare's making much use of a former play in the general matter, and rising totally above it in the style and merit. Nothing that is good in Shakespeare's play is to be traced in the old one. He has written more freely and naturally than in most of his histories. The character of this play is strong, sometimes rich. Where it is not at its best, it is heavy, not thin. Of course I speak of it as compared with his other early plays; not those which abound with thought and speculation. This play yet retains much of the character of the old haranguing tragedies. Yet none more shows the capability of the author to get out of it, and give truly dramatic scenes of character, activity, and spirit. Unless I am fanciful, it does not manage those long political speeches with a turn of mind suited to them by system and practice, so much as in *Henry IV.* and *V*, but more unwillingly. This might lead us to fancy it to be earlier than they are. There is conceit, apt to be drawn out in a long pursuit of an idea, as sometimes in his poems; excursiveness; parenthesis. It flows, but not from simplicity and lightness, like *Henry V*, nor from softness, as *Richard II.* often does; but from a forward force of matter. It is his second style of verse,

admirably strong and free, but mostly, not always, unbroken. The incomparable speech of Constance,

'If thou, that bid'st me be content,' etc.,

and that in the same part,

'Grief fills the room up of my absent child,'

are partly in the enumerative style. Though it be true that enumerative passages lead more naturally to unbroken versification as a consequence, yet, perhaps, it is also true that the turn for the enumerative way of writing goes naturally with that kind of taste, and forms part of it, which would also delight in the unbroken form of verse for its own sake, and where the matter is not enumerative. Shakespeare's taste, perhaps, changed somewhat in both these respects, and not in one of them only, in the course of his life. Double endings are not common. Alternate rhymes occur more than once. One weak ending. It is unnecessary to observe that to the broken style belongs the dialogue in single entire lines, as between one speaker and another. That *John* is as early as *Richard II.* no evidence, I think, would make me believe.

HALLIWELL (*Introduction*, p. 337): The plot of *King John* being chiefly founded on that of an earlier play with merely a few incidents suggested by a recollection of other sources, either the chronicles of Holinshed and others, or old historical ballads, it is obvious that any attempt to reconcile the narrative with the exact facts of History would be irrelevant. The tragedy is undoubtedly invested with additional interest from the circumstance of its characters belonging to a momentous period of English history, and some of its incidents being romantic pictures of real events, but it is to be judged, in its character as a work of art, essentially as if the whole were imaginary, it being, in fact, a production the merits of which do not depend on its connection with a particular æra of the world's annals. Shakespeare and other writers of this department have merely made use of historical materials for dramatic purposes, without any necessary reference to the exactitude of history: so that an endeavor to exhibit the poet in the light of an historian, to correct with minuteness his numerous errors in dates, events, and even confusion of personages, or to reconcile the inconsistencies arising from his defiant neglect of chronology, is not required. Shakespeare in delineating some of the chief personages introduced into his historical plays has, with marvelous genius, elaborated the salient points of their characters as known to the public through the chronicles, ballads, poems, dramas, and other works of the sixteenth century; but there can be little doubt that any coincidences, not thus to be traced between the results of diligent Historical inquiry and the views taken of secret political workings and traits of evident men, are accidental; or, at most, are to be referred merely to the power of the Author's genius in estimating the characters of men from the obscure vindications of them given in the sources above alluded to. There is little of this, however, to be traced in the tragedy of *King John*, which partakes more than any of the other histories of the character of the romantic drama, both in the want of attention paid to the truth and the succession of historical events, and in the manner in which they are made subservient to the purposes of dramatic design.

GERVINUS (p. 355): *King John* has outwardly no reference to the two historical tetralogies [*Henry VI*, parts *1*, *2*, *3*, and *Richard III.*; *Richard II*, *Henry IV*, parts

1 and *2*, and *Henry V.*], but, with regard to the idea it contains, we shall see the poet in this play also working with the same political views which distinguish the cycle of ideas in the histories from that of the exact dramas. If we turn away from the historical subject, we might pronounce this piece to be a tragedy of the purest water, simply representing the idea of so many of the ancient tragedies; that 'There is no sure foundation set in blood; no certain life achieved by others' death.' But to this general idea the purport of the whole play does not pervadingly refer. A rich web of political actions, aiming at one central point, circles round Arthur's death, which forms, indeed, the main turning-point of John's fortune, though it is in nowise the sole cause of this reverse of fortune, any more than the guilt of the king alone is so; but from these political actions is developed, as in *Richard II*, an idea at once political and ethical, as special in character as the leading thoughts of all Shakespeare's real and strict historical plays.

C. & M. Cowden Clarke: The craft, with meanness, of King John; the craft, with insolence, of Pandulph; the craft, with spite, of Elinor; the vacillation of Philip Augustus, the French King; the youthful generosity of spirit in the Dauphin; the passion of Constance; the pathos of Arthur; the rugged exterior with touch of better nature in Hubert, down to the baronial independence of the Earls Pembroke and Salisbury, while even these two subordinate personages are distinguished the one from the other, by the superior refinement of the latter—all combine to make *King John* one of the Poet's most interestingly characterised plays among his dramatic histories.

Heraud (p. 159): The tragedy of *King John* is admirable in structure, and capable of being placed on the stage without alteration. It is, indeed, almost a classic for its regularity, as it is for the genius displayed in it. We may judge from it not only the merits of Shakespeare, but those of the playwrights capable of assisting him. The art of historical tragedy, when that of *The Troublesome Raigne* was published, had far advanced. Shakespeare found the skeleton complete; he clothed it with flesh and blood, and added to it beauty. He quickened the body with a soul, and inspired it with an idea; but its mechanism had already been mastered by inferior minds. Our Poet was an artist among artists. He could measure himself by others. If among the giants of that elder time he seems a giant, we may judge more accurately of his natural stature than if we measured him by himself alone. But not only may he be compared with his predecessors and contemporaries advantageously, but in many points he presents a perfect contrast to them. It is, for instance, as a politician and philosopher that Shakespeare shines in this magnificent tragedy; as the latter, manifesting an equality with Bacon—in certain aspects, indeed, a superiority.

Hudson (*Introduction*, p. 350): As a work of art the play has, indeed, considerable, though by no means the highest, merit; but as a piece of historical portraiture its claims may easily be overstated. In such a work diplomatic or documentary exactness is not altogether possible, nor is it even desirable any further than may well consist with the laws of art, or with the conditions of the poetic and dramatic form. . . . And the inferiority of *King John*, as an historical drama, lies in that, taking his other works in the same line as the standard, the facts of history are disregarded much beyond what the laws of art seem to require. For it need scarce be urged that in an historical drama literal truth is fairly entitled to give law whenever dramatic truth does not over-rule

it. The points where all the parts of *King John* centre and converge into one has been rightly stated to be the fate of Arthur. That is the hinge whereon the whole action is made to turn—the heart whose pulsations are felt in every part of the structure. The alleged right of Arthur to the throne draws on the wars between John and Philip, and finally the loss from the English Crown of the provinces of France. And so far the drama is strictly true to historical fact. But, besides this, the real or reputed murder of Arthur by John is set forth as the chief if not the only cause of the troubles that distracted the latter part of his reign, and ended only with his life; the mainspring of that popular disaffection to his person and government, which let in upon him the assaults of papal arrogance, and gave free course to the wholesome violence of the nobles. Which was by no means the case. For though, by the treatment of his nephew, John did greatly outrage the loyalty and humanity of the nation, still that was but one act in a lifelong course of cruelty, cowardice, lust, and perfidy which stamped him as a most base and wicked wretch, and finally drew down upon him the general hatred and execration of his subjects. Had he not thus sinned away and lost the hearts of the people, he might perhaps have safely defied the papal interdict; for who can doubt that they would have braved the thunders of the Vatican for him, since they did not scruple afterwards to do so against him? But the fact or the mode of Arthur's death was not the chief, much less the only, cause of that loss. So that here the drama involves in its central point such a breach of history, which it is not easy to see how the laws of the dramatic form should require, and which nothing less than such a requirement could fairly excuse; in other words, the rights of historical truth are sacrificed without sufficient cause.

R. SIMPSON (*New Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1874, p. 397): The alterations from the Chronicles in *King John* are many and considerable, and almost all taken from the old play (*The Troublesome Raigne*, 1591). But though the plot is borrowed, the political tendency of the old play is entirely suppressed. The clearly expressed design of the old play is to show the precursorship of John to the reforming Messiahship of Henry VIII. John was, like David, unworthy to build the temple because his 'hands with murder were attaint.' But a Solomon should succeed who should put down monks and their cells:

> 'I am not he shall build the lord a house
> Or root these locusts from the face of the earth;
> But if my dying heart deceive me not,
> From out these loins shall spring a kingly branch
> Whose arms shall reach unto the gates of Rome,
> And with his feet tread down the strumphet's pride
> That sits upon the chair of Babylon.'

This leading idea of the old play is utterly excluded from the new, where the points brought out are those connected with the tenure of the crown; whether it is held by hereditary right of the eldest branch, or the eldest male of the family, or by the accident of profession, fortified by the utility of the state; whether it is forfeited by crimes civil and ecclesiastical, whether such forfeiture is to be adjudged and executed by neighboring sovereigns, or by the state itself, its peers or its people, or by the Pope. For Shakespeare's play is practically a discussion whether John shall remain King. The grounds of the doubt are not, as in the Chronicles, the general villainy of the King, his cruelty, debauchery, effeminacy, falsehood, extrava-

gance, exactions, and general insufficiency, but two points which do not seem to have weighed a scruple in the minds of John's barons—the defect of his title as against the son of his elder brother, and his supposed murder of that son. The historical quarrel against John as a tyrant is changed into a mythical one against him as a usurper, aggravated by his murder of the right heir. I will select eight points where Shakespeare deserts the Chronicles, without precisely following the old play, which in some particulars he corrects by the Chronicles; showing that his departures from history were retained with full knowledge and intention:

1. In Shakespeare, John is told by his own mother that he must rely on his 'strong possession,' not on his right, and the suggestion of the old play that Arthur, being 'but young and yet unmeet to reign,' was therefore to be passed over, is thrown out. 2. Elinor tells Constance that she can 'produce a will that bars the title' of Arthur. 3. History is altered to heighten and refine the characters of Arthur and Constance. 4. John's loss of his French possessions is accentuated by the exaggeration of the dowry given to Blanche. 5. The scenes where John first persuades Hubert to murder Arthur, and then reproaches him for it, are inventions of Shakespeare. 6. The compression of John's four wars into two, though absolutely necessary for dramatic arrangement, is so managed as to have an Elizabethan bearing. Of these two wars the poet makes the first to concern Arthur's title, without any religious or ecclesiastical motive. The second he makes to be in revenge for Arthur's death, with an ecclesiastical motive added in John's excommunication. This is wholly unhistorical. No English lord interfered in behalf of Arthur, whose death raised no commotion in England, and was long passed and forgotten before the controversy with the Pope about Langton began. The confederacy between the barons and Lewis was ten years after Arthur's death, with which it had nothing to do. The Shakesperian representation of the troubles of John is that he had first to fight his own barons, who revolted from him because he had murdered the heir they acknowledged, and allied themselves with Lewis the Dauphin, who, now Arthur was dead, could claim, in right of his wife, the Spanish Blanche, the throne which John had forfeited by excommunication. The facts of this excommunication are misrepresented in the play. Really, John's kingdom was first put under interdict; a year afterwards he was excommunicated; but he prevented the document from entering the realm, and his theologians maintained that it was void. After four years Innocent absolved John's vassals from their oath of fealty, and exhorted all Christian knights to assist in dethroning him and substituting a more worthy successor. John was not proclaimed a heretic, neither was secret assassination of him publicly recommended. 7. Pandulph insinuates that it is his interest to abstain from interference till John's murder of his nephew should make interference profitable to himself. 8. Melun's confession of Lewis's intended treachery to the barons is the occasion of their return to allegiance. Every one of these points, in which the poet deviates from the Chronicles, is so turned as to contain indirect references and allusions to contemporary politics, or to events which had a decisive influence on them. Thus, 1. It was not the legitimacy of John's title that was the real object of interest to Shakespeare or his audience. Hecuba was nought to them. Elizabeth's title, and the succession to her crown, were the great questions of the day. Her father and brother were the only sovereigns since Richard II. whose titles had been undisputed. 2. The title of Mary of Scotland had been barred by the will of Henry VIII. 3. The helplessness and wrongs of Constance and Arthur are so managed as to suggest parallels with Mary of Scotland, Catharine Grey, or Arabella Stuart. 4. John Lackland's easy renunciation of all his French possessions (exaggerated by Shakespeare) must have suggested a

reference to the widely-blamed proceedings by which Calais was lost by Elizabeth's advisers. Leicester is accused of having sold it to the French in 1559 (*Leicester's Commonwealth*, p. 62). We may read George Sanders' ironical description of the French treatment of the Commissioners who went to demand either the money or the town in 1567: 'Our gentlemen were but easily entreated there and are returned without either money or possession' (Historical MSS Commission). Verstegan, in his tract against the Cecilian commonwealth in 1592, returns to this matter three several times, and Bacon in his reply touches it as lightly as possible. 5. The scenes between John and Hubert are considered by Warburton and Malone [IV, ii, 218 and notes] to be a covert attempt to flatter Elizabeth by throwing on Secretary Davison the blame of the Queen of Scot's death. They did not notice that if Hubert is Davison, John is Elizabeth. She cannot be flattered in the second of these scenes unless she is touched by the murderous suggestions of the first. In truth, both fit her completely (Act III, Sc. iii, l. 22 to the end; Act IV, Sc. ii, l. 213 to the end) and it is only wonderful that allusions so plain should have been tolerated. 6. It was no doubt dramatically necessary to abridge and summarize John's wars. But it was not necessary so to abridge them as to make them typify the troubles of Elizabeth. The Shakesperian John has to maintain two quarrels. One for his title, the second for his crown against the agents of the Pope. So it was with Elizabeth. Shakespeare altered the facts of John's interdict to make them fit the contemporary history of Elizabeth's excommunication. After the execution of the Queen of Scots Elizabeth's situation was exactly parallel to that of John after the death of Arthur, as (unhistorically) represented by Shakespeare. 7. The politic advice of Pandulph to Lewis to delay interfering till the murder of Arthur should leave Blanche the next claimant was acted on by Philip II, who prudently delayed his promised intervention in favour of the Queen of Scots till her death had opened a prospect for the claims of his daughter, the Infanta. Whether Father Parsons was his Pandulph in this counsel is not clear; but it is certain that Parsons was bitterly hostile to the school of Catholic politicians who would have come into power with the accession of Mary. 8. The intended treachery of Lewis to his English allies is precisely parallel to that intended by Medina Sidonia to the English who might favour his landing. He declared 'That if he might once land in England, both Catholics and heretics that came in his way should be all one to him: his sword could not discern them: so he might make way for his master, all was one to him' (Wm. Watson, *Important Considerations*, p. 73). This declaration was naturally made into a great motive against 'Spaniolation,' as Shakespeare unhistorically makes Lewis's intended treachery the motive for the return of the rebel peers to their allegiance. One of these points involves a reconstruction of the facts, another a reconstruction of the motives of history. To what end were these liberties taken with the Chronicles? All the changes seem made with a view to controversy on the title to the crown. This was the standing trouble of Elizabeth's reign. Her own title was controverted, first because she was illegitimate, next because she was excommunicate. The choice of her successor was equally a difficulty. And all the parties, those who opposed her, whether as illegitimate, or as excommunicated and tainted with the murder of the right heir,—those who maintained her, those who advocated the succession of the Scottish King, or Arabella, or the Infanta, or Derby, or Huntington, or Essex,—all appealed to foreign arbitration. The Queen of Scots relied first upon France, then upon Spain. Her agents abroad perpetually intrigued on her behalf with foreign powers. Those who defied Elizabeth as a heretic besieged the Pope, or Philip, or the Emperor, or the Italian Princes with their supplications and their plots. After

Mary Stuart's death her agents at Paris became agents for her son. Amidst these seething anxieties, and before the youthful heirs of the very families on whom the foreigner counted, Shakespeare produced his *King John*—a king to whom, with Edward II. and Richard II, Philopater and the malcontents were wont to liken the Queen. And he made the example more apposite, and the allusions more telling, by altering history. He showed the faction of Philip, men who thought he had commission

> 'From that supernal judge that stirs good thoughts
> In any breast of strong authority
> To look into the blots and stains of right,'

that the motive of his interference was not love of right, but 'commodity,' which would make the prince traitor to the cause he pretended to protect, and lightly sacrifice the claimant he backed, on the first scent of gain. Then he showed the Papal faction, the men who invoked the Pope's arbitration as a divine intervention of indifferent justice, that the Pope is and must be indifferent to every cause but his own. He cares not for legitimacy of the pretender, nor interferes with the usurper who leaves the church at liberty. John may imprison and murder Arthur, and the Pope is quiescent. But when John refuses to institute Stephen Langton, the Pope comes on the scene with a rival claimant not more legitimate than John, but likely to be more obedient, a more faithful vassal of the Church. Arthur is too weak for the purpose, so his legitimate claims are disregarded; Lewis seems a fit instrument, and he is selected, and the English barons are commanded to support him. But Lewis thus acquired no title to the Pope's continued support. He may be faithful as Pylades, and valiant as Hercules, John can at any moment cut away the ground from under him by doing penance. An act of politic hypocrisy restores John, makes Lewis an unjust aggressor, and changes the barons from Crusaders and Paladins into insurgents and traitors, handed over to the tender mercies of a false and vindictive tyrant. Such, the poet seems to say, being the result of foreign intervention, civil and ecclesiastical, it follows that home quarrels are to be settled at home, and British wrongs righted by British hands.

> 'This England never did and never shall
> Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror.
> But when it first did help to wound itself,
> ———Naught shall make us rue
> If England to herself do rest but true.'

The moral of the dramatist amounts to this. He seems to say to the malcontents of his day: 'Whatever you think about the justice of your cause or the crimes of your opponents, whatever outrages you have to endure, whatever the merits of the losers or the demerits of the winners—settle your quarrels amongst yourselves, and above all things beware of inviting foreign intervention!' If this was Shakespeare's meaning, it was certainly a lesson eminently needed by, and exactly fitted for, his contemporaries.

RÜMELIN (p. 129): I have not quite so high an opinion of the play of *King John* as the commentators would like to have us hold. The battle with France, the reconciliation, the renewed warfare, the changing position of the Papal Legate, the domestic uprisings following one another like foreign invasions, that, without any definite comprehension of their dependence on each other, we are forced to

allow these simply to pass by us. No one part comes to full and complete development; likewise the relation of the Papal Throne which the commentators wish to make the main point of the play, is not brought out clearly and vividly. The character of the King is neither sharply drawn nor convincing in any way whatever; the King of France, the Dauphin, the Arch-Duke are all also only half-formed figures. Fundamentally that which pleases lies merely in the incidents, the ornamentation, in Constance's maternal grief, in the scene of Hubert and Arthur, in the figure of the Bastard who from an audacious swaggerer changes into a patriot and hero.

VON FRIESEN (ii, 203): *King John* may be considered a thoroughly well-shaped and modulated work exhibiting superior application and great care. We may justify this last theory through the fact that the whole play has been patterned after another model, both in its outline and arrangement, while at the same time we are unable to detect one expression or one word which might have been taken from it. It stands to reason that this result may only be obtained through great application and attention in creating a work of this caliber. By carefully considering all its details we find plenty of points of support for this theory. In attempting to obtain a clear conception of Shakespeare's ideal, and in order to get oneself in a receptive frame of mind for this dramatic poetry we must beforehand absolve the author from all historical inaccuracies. The confusion of the viscount of Limoges with the Archduke of Austria, who had certainly behaved very ill towards Richard Cœur-de-Lion at the period where this play begins, but who had actually died many years before, hardly deserves to be mentioned; in fact, it had already become a tradition among Shakespeare's predecessors. More serious and significant possibly would be the objection that he has not made the remotest allusion to the contemporaneous origin of Magna Charta with religious and worldly events of the reign of King John. The antecedents of the earlier dramatic productions could hardly serve as a satisfactory apology for this, if we were not led to the conclusion that Shakespeare seems to have taken a very indifferent attitude towards the internal national life of his country. However, in such instance, we would have to ascribe a certain objective to Shakespeare, a thing which can hardly be looked for in those times. I trust I have not wasted any time in giving a description of the state and the national life of England which prevailed in those times, in the field of the then existing religious and political upheaval. We may at the same time point out the remarkable accomplishment of the government, and the exalted state of the public mind which prevailed at that epoch. We may also realize how much the public mind became deflected by the vital problems whose solution had to be solved after the advent of Magna Charta. Still the recollection of this document, as well as its importance, had to a great extent become relegated to the background. We are struck by the fact that we never read of any appeal ever having been made on occasions where the queen had exhibited much intolerance in carrying out arbitrary acts against the liberty of some of her subjects, in cases which affected the interests of the nation. It does not matter what the existing conditions may have been, Shakespeare would be open to the blame of having failed to make use of the historical material which was at his disposal. Assuming that such was the case, I dare say that there were some vital underlying reasons which influenced the author in excluding Magna Charta from this work. The whole play is pregnant with the spirit of disregard for others' rights and of violence in the carrying out of unjust edicts. Shakespeare did not appear to be

aware of any intention of portraying the actions of his personages in any other spirit. This contrast against the law and order of the world seems here again to be paramount in the King's mind. His doubtful claim to the crown is shown to be the primary source of all the complications. The author undoubtedly required a complete composite picture in order to illustrate all the events in his poetical work. Manifest hints are not lacking throughout the progress of the drama that John's tenure of the crown lay in the general voice and consent of the people; not to be regarded as following the claims of right or according to truth, but rather accepted as following for its governing principle his own interested self-seeking. This becomes quite evident in the very beginning of the play, when the queen, addressing her son, calls his attention to the weakness of his claim to the succession. The monologue of the Bastard, after the disgraceful compact between King John and King Philip, is a masterful apology for this mental condition. In fact, the King of France and his son the Dauphin are quite as faithless as King John himself. Cardinal Pandulph's underhand defense of a case of perjured breach of faith is a masterly work of the highest order. It seems hardly possible that words with more artificial rhetoric or more subtle agility could be uttered in justification of repudiation of sacred obligations. This happens to be one of the many parts of Shakespeare's pieces which is liable to embarrass us in deciding whether to grant him our admiration for his intuitive genius or for the penetrating conception of his subject. This play is also remarkable for its exquisite style; we also note the fact that its most minute composition of the severest antithesis is not applied according to a notion or whim, as we may generally observe in Shakespeare, but presents an objective which is coherent with the whole tableau. The guilt of the king in Arthur's death is advanced as the leading motive for the reversal in the King's fortunes. The peripetia of the whole drama is, to a great extent, based upon this occurrence. We are also met with the silent assent of the barons, particularly with Salisbury's, condoning this, the glaring wrong which the King had committed, followed later on by their highly treasonable desertion to the enemy of their country. This stands no doubt in definite relation with the general tendency to disregard everything pertaining to right, duty, and loyalty. On the one hand we are met with the treasonable deflection of the barons from country and King. As so often happens in real life, and in accordance with fact, the wrong of the treacherous revolt of the Barons cannot be remedied by the more treacherous intention of the Dauphin against them. This description may be opposed by the claim that Faulconbridge, Constance, and principally Arthur, who is absolutely guiltless, by their inner influence stand without this universal atmosphere. This, however, is not exactly so. The Bastard figures as the most brilliant personality of the whole drama and his portrait has been drawn with conspicuous partiality. His peculiarities, his kindness of heart, and the frivolous behavior which induced him to break his family ties, is another evidence for which the general tendencies of the times are accountable. Shakespeare has given us another evidence of his tact in the handling of this scene. It is somewhat repulsive and even aggravating to find the mother present during the argument of both the brothers, on the occasion of the presentation to the King of their claims to the right of inheritance. Besides that, we are witnessing the exhibition which Philip makes of himself by obtruding himself upon the King and the Queen as a natural son of Richard. On this same occasion we see him resorting to the most cruel threats against his mother for no apparent reason whatsoever. Thus Shakespeare was fully justified in altering the *mise en scene* to the extent of making both brothers appear alone before the King

and by allowing the discovery of Philip's descent to proceed from the mother. There is no denying the fact that the Bastard strikes us as being a unique exception of all the other types, through his steadfastness to the King and his devotion to his military calling. However, we are uncertain whether to ascribe his actions to worthy motives or to a combination of selfishness and adventurous impulse. His personality may possibly be considered as an anomaly when contrasted to the harmonious make-up of the other characters involved in the play, notwithstanding that we may look upon this genial and intimate creation as a most thorough rendition of a type of adventurer who appears to be gifted with the noblest qualities. It is very likely that he has shaped this type according to one of the characters of that particular period. We find Constance appearing in the first half of the Drama only, and she is almost invariably depicted as being on the side of right and justice. However, in the description of her individuality too much stress seems to be placed on her passionate claiming of her rights and those of her son. This may lead to the belief that the author considered her to have been an enthusiastic champion of justice and loyalty. While the others may have been under the nefarious influence of the existing trend, she can hardly be considered as imbued by it, because she, and her son in particular, were themselves the victims of lawless schemes. Both suffered most from the consequences of those tragic entanglements; and in considering their ruin we might ask the question, Where and how does the poetical sense of justice apply? Besides, would there be any justification in making the victims of disastrous complications assume a positive implication of guilt? Even when disregarding all this we may hardly reach such a conclusion when taking into account Constance's imaginary vagaries while swayed by her passionate impulses. Such could not apply to Arthur's case. Their ending is nevertheless incontestably tragic, because it stands in direct connection with the antitheses, which form the tragic element of the whole and thus furnish the motive for the pitiful fate of the leading actor. We must not overlook the importance of these two rôles which have been embellished with traits bearing the evidence of the master's hand. There is no doubt but that Shakespeare had many reasons for trying to enlist our sympathy for the personality of the unfortunate Arthur. If the poetical requirements obliged him to present the king's difficulties as the main motive for his death, this appeared unavoidable. This protasis did not only lead to the creation of two masterful scenes, but, as a consequence of it, the complications of this incident, which was already given in the old play, were retained in the new. The scene in which King John is shown instigating Hubert to destroy the prince's sight or murdering him is well imagined and complete. The King seems to have avoided expressing his real purpose for two vital reasons, he appears to be thoroughly aware of his criminal intentions, but he lacks the proper energy to carry out his vicious designs. One particular feature seemingly penetrates the entire representation, and I shall refer to it again later. It demonstrates King John's decided predisposition to injustice and malevolence and also his want of self-control and boldness in the execution of his vicious intentions. The following scene, where Hubert has made all preparations to destroy Arthur's eyesight, but is induced to desist from his purpose through the touching prayers of the young prince, is one of the most poetical productions which ever flowed from Shakespeare's pen, and this is so much more remarkable on account of his exact imitation of the situation found in the old play while depicting, at the same time, an entirely new personality. According to the historical resources which are at our disposal the details of Arthur's death cannot be confirmed. In considering the three different

accounts of the same we find that the one advanced in the older as well as that given in the newer drama is the least harmful to the King's reputation, even if his complicity remains established. Shakespeare's endeavors are only restricted to its setting. This exclusion of the complaints of the dying prince which are found in the older play are an evidence of his poetical tact. These show great poetical warmth; we may thus easily be inclined to credit them to R. Greene; however, they could hardly have been uttered by a dying person. Their length does not harmonize with the situation. This fact itself on the conviction that the feeling of sympathy has already been sufficiently satisfied did perhaps induce the author to abbreviate this particular situation. The intricacies of the play itself are so well adapted to the tragic requirements that they hardly call for any discussion. As the threads controlling fate escape human guidance, when once the will to overpower the same with illicit means has begun to assert itself, it is frequently observed that their failure has been brought on by the materialization of an overpowering force. This is an experience which is often met with in the ordinary course of human life as well as in that of the individual. Thus we observe here the voluntary mode of death chosen by the unfortunate prince, also the lying report of Hubert concerning his ending, and finally the finding of his body by the barons, and besides that, the recanting of Hubert. These complications can hardly be considered as ordinary chance happenings. In spite of the deeply tragical significance of many particular details we may easily lose sight of the organic tragical relation of the ensemble. The misfortune of the king stands in close relation with his misdeeds, and this condition prevails in the tragic conflict, but when observing the weakness of the human will and of his failure in combat due to his own shortcomings, we find that the combining of the tragic interest in one personality is not successful. The actual pathos of the drama cannot be centred upon the king because his individuality leads either to a feeling of pity or fear. Thus his death, not being directly the cause of his misdeeds, does not possess the effective value which is indispensable in a tragedy. I do not by any means consider that the poet deserves the reproach of having thus weakened his drama. I doubt that he had the intention of producing a tragedy within such narrow limits. The requirements of the author's poetical tendencies undoubtedly induced him in giving the whole the character of a history, accepting this expression with its specific meaning. Thus his principal object must have been the illustration of the historical happenings in the form which would be most advantageous to his country and not from a purely tragical standpoint. I shall not support the opinion that this drama was to be used as a prologue for his histories of the times of the Lancasters and the Yorks and at a later date, as an epilogue for *Henry the VIII*, on account of the want of any proof to that effect. On the other hand, we may rest assured that he did greatly value the material of which it is composed. This active work in the creation of the same and the setting of the drama with some of its most attractive situations is the best evidence of it. It appears self-evident that the triumph of England as an independent power over the assumptions of the Roman Curia, also the overpowering of an enemy in league with a treasonable rebellion in their own country, and last of all, the consequences of criminal acts of the king himself furnished enough attractive material for Shakespeare's poetical genius, in order to awaken his enthusiasm for this poetical production. I believe that Magna Charta would have been excluded from his work even if it had offered a proper and available material for his imagination, because the introduction of a new element might have impaired or complicated the smooth production of the whole. At the same time

I find therein an explanation for the prominent personality of the Bastard. The poet has typified, whether intentionaly or otherwise, the true national character of the English people with all its advantages and weakness. His loyalty, his fearlessness, and his bravery are the factors which dictated the resolution of saving the country from the confusion and ruin in which it was plunged. It is also quite noteworthy to observe the profound intuition with which the character of the king is described, his ill will and his lack of energy have already been the subject of our attention. It would be leading us too far should we attempt to go into a closer description in order to prove the accuracy of the historical character of King John without, however, trying to set him up as an historical subject. I can see therein another evidence of the intimate acquaintance of Shakespeare with the history of his country or, to use a broader, more indefinite expression, he stood in the most intimate relation with its history and its nature.

DOWDEN (*Mind & Art*, p. 172): There is little in the play of *King John* which strengthens or gladdens the heart. In the tug of selfish power, hither and thither, amid the struggle of kingly greeds, and priestly pride, amid the sales of cities, the loveless marriages of princes, the rumours and confusion of the people, a pathetic beauty illumines the boyish figure of Arthur, so gracious, so passive, untouched by the adult rapacities and crimes of the others:

> 'Good, my mother, peace!
> I would that I were low laid in my grave,
> I am not worth this coil that's made for me.'

The voice of maternal passion, a woman's voice impotent and shrill, among the unheeding male forces, goes up also from the play. There is the pity of stern, armed men for the ruin of a child's life. These, and the boisterous but genuine and hearty patriotism of Faulconbridge, are the only presences of human virtue or beauty which are to be perceived in the degenerate world depicted by Shakespeare. And the end, like what preceded it, is miserable. The King lies poisoned, overmastered by mere physical agony, agony which leaves little room for any pangs of conscience, were the palsied moral nature of the criminal capable of such nobler suffering:

> 'I am a scribbled form, drawn with a pen
> Upon a parchment, and against this fire
> Do I shrink up.'

SWINBURNE (*Fortnightly Review*, May, 1875): The one entire and perfect chrysolite of *Othello* is neither Othello nor Desdemona nor Iago, but each and all; the play of *Hamlet* is more than Hamlet himself, the poem even here is too great to be resumed in the person. But Constance is the jewel of *King John*, and Katherine the crowning blossom of *King Henry VIII.*—a funeral flower as of 'marigolds on death-beds blowing,' an opal of as pure water as 'tears of perfect moan,' with fitful fire at its heart, ominous of evil and sorrow, set in a mourning band of jet on the forefront of the poem, that the brow so circled may, 'like to a title-leaf, fortell the nature of a tragic volume.' Not indeed that without these the ground would in either case be barren; but that in either field our eye rests rather on these and separate ears of wheat that overtop the ranks, than on the waving width of the whole harvest at once. In the one play our memory turns next to the figures of Arthur and the Bastard, in

the other to those of Wolsey and his king; the residue in either case is made up of outlines more lightly and slightly drawn. In two scenes the figure of King John rises indeed to the highest height even of Shakespearian tragedy; for the rest of the play the lines of his character are cut no deeper, the features of his personality stand out in no sharper relief, than those of Elinor or the French king; but the scene in which he tempts Hubert to the edge of the pit of hell sounds a deeper note and touches a subtler string in the tragic nature of man than had been struck by any poet save Dante alone, since the reign of the Greek tragedians. The cunning and profound simplicity of the few last weighty words which drop like flakes of poison that blister where they fall from the deadly lips of the king is a new quality in our tragic verse; there was no foretaste of such a thing in the passionate imagination which clothed itself in the mighty music of Marlowe's burning song. The elder master might indeed have written the magnificent speech which ushers in with gradual rhetoric and splendid reticence the black suggestion of a deed without a name; his hand might have woven with no less imperial skill the elaborate raiment of words and images which wraps up in fold upon fold, as with swaddling-bands of purple and golden embroidery, the shapeless and miscreated birth of a murderous purpose that labours into light even while it loathes the light and itself; but Shakespeare alone has given us the first sample of that more secret and terrible knowledge which reveals itself in the brief heavy whispers that seal the commission and sign the warrant of the king. Webster alone of all our tragic poets has had strength to emulate in this darkest line of art the handiwork of his master. We find nowhere such an echo or reflection of the spirit of this scene as in the last tremendous dialogue of Bosola with Ferdinand in the house of murder and madness, while their spotted souls yet flutter between sonscience and distraction, hovering for an hour as with broken wings on the confines of either province of hell. One pupil at least could put to this awful profit the study of so great a model; but with the single and sublime exception of that other design from the same great hand, which bares before us the mortal anguish of Bracciano, no copy or imitation of the scene in which John dies by poison has ever come near enough to evade the sentence it provokes. The shrill tremulous agony of Fletcher's Valentinian is to the sullen and slow death-pangs of Shakespeare's tyrant as the babble of a suckling to the accents of a man. As far beyond the reach of any but his maker's hand is the pattern of a perfect English warrior, set once for all before the eyes of all ages in the figure of the noble bastard. The national side of Shakespeare's genius, the heroic vein of patriotism that runs like a thread of living fire through the world-wide range of his omnipresent spirit, has never, to my thinking, found vent or expression to such glorious purpose as here. Not even in Hotspur or Prince Hal has he mixed with more godlike sleight of hand all the lighter and graver good qualities of the national character, or compounded of them all so lovable a nature as this. In those others we admire and enjoy the same bright fiery temper of soul, the same buoyant and fearless mastery of fate or fortune, the same gladness and glory of life made lovely with all the labour and laughter of its full fresh days; but no quality of theirs binds our hearts to them as they are bound to Philip—not by his loyal valour, his keen young wit, his kindliness, constancy, readiness of service, as swift and sure in the day of his master's bitterest shame and shamefullest trouble as in the blithest hour of battle and that first good fight which won back his father's spoils from his father's slayer; but more than all these, for that lightening of divine rage and pity, of tenderness that speaks in thunder and indignation that makes fire of its tears, in the horror of great compassion which falls on him, the tempest and storm of a beautiful and godlike anger

which shakes his strength of spirit and bows his high heart down at sight of Arthur dead. Being thus, as he is, the English masterwork of Shakespeare's hand, we may accept him as the best man known to us that England ever made; the hero that Nelson must have been had he never come too near Naples.

I am not minded to say much of Shakespeare's Arthur; there are one or two figures in the world of his work of which there are no words that would be fit or good to say. Another of these is Cordelia. The place they have in our lives and thoughts is not one for talk; the niche set apart for them to inhabit in our secret hearts is not penetrable by the lights and noises of common day. There are chapels in the cathedral of man's highest art as in that of his inmost life, not made to be set open to the eyes and feet of the world. Love and death and memory keep charge for us in silence of some beloved names. It is the crowning glory of genius, the final miracle and transcendent gift of poetry, that it can add to the number of these and engrave on the very heart of our remembrance fresh names and memories of its own creation. There is one younger child in the heavenly family of Shakespeare's who sits side by side with Arthur in the secret places of our thought; there are but two or three that I remember among the children of other poets who may be named in the same year with them: as Fletcher's Hengo, Webster's Giovanni, and Landor's Cæsarion. Of this princely trinity of the boys the 'bud of Britain' is as yet the most famous flower; yet even in the broken words of childish heroism that falter on his dying lips there is nothing of more poignant pathos, more 'dearly sweet and bitter,' than Giovanni's talk of his dead mother and all her sleepless nights now ended for ever in a sleep beyond tears or dreams. . . .

In *Henry VIII.* even more than in *King John* the Poet's hands were hampered by a difficulty inherent in the subject. To an English and Protestant audience, fresh from the passions and perils of reformation and reaction, he had to present an English King at war with the papacy, in whom the assertion of national independence was incarnate; and to the sympathies of such an audience it was a matter of mere necessity for him to commend the representative champion of their cause by all means which he could compel into the service of his aim. Yet this object was in both instances all but incompatible with the natural and necessary interest of the plot. It was inevitable that this interest should, in the main, be concentrated upon the victims of the personal or national policy of either King; upon Constance and Arthur, upon Katherine and Wolsey. Where these are not either apparent in person on the stage, or felt in their influence upon the speech and the action of the characters present, the pulse of the poem beats fainter and its force begins to flag. In *King John* this difficulty was met and mastered, these double claims of the subject of the poem and the object of the poet were satisfied and harmonized, by the effacement of John and the substitution of Philip as the champion of the national cause and the protagonist of the dramatic action. Considering this play in its double aspect to tragedy and history, we might say that the English hero becomes the central figure of the poem as seen from the historic side, while John remains the central figure of the poem as seen from the tragic side; the personal interest that depends on personal crime and retribution is concentrated on the agony of the king; the national interest which, though the eponymous hero of the poem, he was alike inadequate as a craven and improper as a villian to sustain and represent in the eyes of the spectators was happily and easily transferred to the one person of the play who could properly express within the compass of its closing act at once the protest against papal pretension, the defiance of foreign invasion, and the prophetic assurance of

self-dependent life and self-sufficing strength inherent in the nation then fresh from a fiercer trial of its quality, which an audience of the days of Queen Elizabeth would justly expect from the poet who undertook to set before them in action the history of the days of King John.

SNIDER (ii, 286): *King John* strikes the keynote of the whole series of English Historical plays, namely, nationality. Its very beginning utters defiance against France, the hereditary foe of England. The glory and supremacy of Fatherland constitute the theme; there is a glow of patriotic exultation, which makes many verses shine like diamonds, while the spirit of the whole work is one grand outburst of the love of country. There is in it the intense consciousness of English greatness, English freedom, English manhood. The style, though varied, is always an exalted reflection of its thought and feeling; the poetic ferver rises at times to a sort of national ecstasy. Other strong passions of the human soul are portrayed in the play, but they are all subordinated to supreme devotion to country. Such is the atmosphere which we here breathe, and which nerves the spirit with a new inspiration. Indeed, there is a special character introduced as the representative of nationality—a character which gives tone to the entire drama. It is Falconbridge whose story is the golden thread which both illumines and holds together the other parts of the action. Following his career, we are perpetually reminded of the theme which furnishes life and unity to the work. In reading *King John* the chief disappointment seems to arise from the fact that nothing is said of the Great Charter. It would appear almost necessary that the great Dramatic Epochs of English History should begin with the struggle from which England dates her liberties, and to which she points as the origin of her first and most important constitutional document. Thus the rise and growth of the English constitution would be the subject of the English Historical plays. But in *King John* the Great Charter is not even mentioned, and the nobles who revolt proceed on grounds very different from those recited in the famous instrument. It is clear that Shakespeare did not attach as much importance to the covenant at Runnymede as we do, if, indeed, he knew of its contents at all; the discussions and conflicts of a succeeding age first disturbed the dust on the venerable parchment. The struggle for individual liberty, which the Great Charter was supposed to guarantee, had not yet arisen, though its mutterings were plainly heard by the last of the Tudors. Under the Stuarts it broke forth and resulted in the great Civil War. Then the origin of rights became the theme of warm discussion and diligent investigation; they were traced back to ancient grants and charters with that peculiar reverence for precedent in every Anglo-Saxon bosom—a reverence which will never accept a new idea unless dressed up in old, worn-out garments. Personal liberty, in its universal sense, was certainly not the essential point in the conflict between King John and his barons; that conflict arose between the rights of the nobility and the rights of the crown. The people, as such, occupy no prominent place in the Great Charter. But in the time of the Stuarts the struggle lay between the people on the one side, and the crown and nobility on the other. Had the Poet lived earlier or later, he might have taken one or the other form of this collision; as the case stands, he takes neither. The age of Elizabeth was not a struggle between the throne and the barons, nor between these united and the people. The elements of the nation were in harmony, hence it was a period of internal peace and national development. But there was a dynastic conflict with a foreign state, and a religious conflict with a foreign Church. The consciousness arising from this condition of

affairs is precisely the foundation of the present drama; hence its theme is, primarily, the Right of Succession to the crown. Must the title rest absolutely in the eldest of the line? Is it necessary or just that the heir should always be monarch? Here the answer will be given by Shakespeare. Secondary, but important, is the conflict with the See of Rome. The Poet cannot live out of his own time, in any true sense of the term; he writes his play, though it be historical, from the standpoint of his age. The action will show the nation upholding the king, both against the legal heir of the throne and against the Church, as long as that king, in so doing, maintains the right and supremacy of the State. It will show the nation falling off from the sovereign when the latter abandons his national principle and seeks to support his authority by violence and by external power. Thus there will be a transition from the true monarch of the people to the unfit occupant of the throne. The consciousness which underlies the whole fabric is, that the right of a nation to a ruler is superior to the right of an heir to the crown. A kingdom is not a mere piece of personal property, subject to the laws of inheritance, or even of possession. Such is the conflict, plainly indicated; it is the universal right of the state against the individual right of the heir or of the possessor. The drama has two well-marked movements—the one portraying the external struggle of the nation, the other portraying its internal struggle. Each movement has also two threads—the English and the foreign—and upon these threads the action takes its course. The first movement shows the king in conflict with the two extraneous powers—France and the Church—the political and the religious enemy. Both unite against England—the one supporting the right of Arthur as the legal heir to the throne, the other asserting the claim of Papal domination. King John steps forth as the defender of imperiled nationality; the people support him; he wins a complete victory over his combined enemies. This victory is brought about chiefly by Falconbridge, the type of the English national hero. Such is the first movement; the nation supports the king against the heir and against the Pope. The second movement now begins; it will show the change of the character in the monarch, and the consequent disruption of the country internally. As long as John maintained the honor of England abroad, and took nationality as his guiding principle, he retained the unswerving allegiance of the English people. But he has the misfortune to capture the true heir, and at once he plots the young prince's murder to secure his throne. Thus, by his own act, he makes title of supreme importance; and, as he has not the legal title in himself, he logically destroys his own cause. He abandons his national principle for the principle of inheritance, which he had himself previously nullified. His title is now questioned, since it is his own deed which calls attention to its defeat. Revolt of the nobles follows; disaffection of the people shows itself in dark forebodings. Then comes foreign invasion added to domestic strife, and, finally, an ignoble submission to the Church—that is, the victory which ended the first movement is completely reversed. John is no longer the true ruler, though he may now be the true heir after the death of Arthur; the nation is assailed from within and from without, and seems on the point of succumbing to the foreign political and to the foreign religious power—to France and to Rome. Nothing now remains to the king—who has sacrificed his most glorious national attribute, namely, the maintenance of the Independence of England against all foes, internal and external—but death. Still, the nation cannot perish with him; the national hero, Falconbridge, again comes to the rescue of the drooping country; the enemy is worsted and retires, the nobles return to loyalty, a new king is crowned, and England is once more free from dissension and war.

The very last speech of the play echoes the spirit of the whole; it is the exultant declaration of this same Falconbridge, the embodiment of English nationality, wherein he utters a parting shout of triumph and defiance:

'This England never did, nor never shall,
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,
But when it first did help to wound itself,
Now, these her princes are come home again,
Come the three corners of the world in arms,
And we shall shock them. Naught shall make us rue
If England to itself do rest but true.'

E. Rose (*Macmillan's Maga.*, Nov., 1878): What is it that has neutralised Shakespeare's efforts to make of *King John* a stage-play as successful and enduringly popular as, for example, *Richard III.*? It must be either the subject itself, or the way in which it has been dealt with in the original piece—which, in its broad outlines, he has not attempted to alter. The subject is perhaps not altogether a good one. The king's great crime is so dastardly, the leading cause of his misfortunes (his quarrel with Rome about Stephen Langton) is so undramatic, and his nature breaks down so entirely at the end—when even a villain like Richard III. fights nobly and forces some sort of respect from the audience—that it may be that no poet could have made a strong play of the story of his life. As it is in Acts I. and II. he is a non-entity. Falconbridge filling the first act and nobody being very important in the second; in the third act Constance is supreme, and in the fourth Arthur; while even in the fifth the king is not of very great importance, his death scene being much weakened in effect (however it may gain in refinement) by the removal of his violently remorseful and Protestant speeches. Indeed, it must be confessed that the omission from the play of the constant attacks on Popery, though an improvement from a purely literary point of view, destroys to a certain extent its raison d'etre, the spirit that helped to animate its old straggling mass, and, as has been pointed out, the motive of its denouement. The effort, too, to give the piece a hero in Falconbridge is a failure, because, as long experience teaches, you cannot force a character out of the position he would naturally occupy in a play. Falconbridge is properly little more than a chorus, a cynical critic of a wicked age—he might be entirely omitted without in the least degree altering the substance of the plot—and it is therefore impossible to make the story centre in him, as should every story in some one figure, or inseparably-connected group of figures. Shakespeare has no doubt kept so closely to the lines of the older play because it was a favourite with his audience and they had grown to accept its history as absolute fact; but one can hardly help thinking that had he boldly thrown aside these trammels and taken John as his hero, his great central figure; had he analysed and built up before us the mass of power, craft, passion, and deviltry which made up the worst of the Plantagenets, had he dramatised the grand scene of the signing of the Charter, and shown vividly the gloom and horror which overhung the excommunicated; had he painted John's last despairing struggle against rebels and invaders, as he has given us the fiery end of Macbeth's life—we might have had another Macbeth, another Richard, who would by his terrible personality have welded the play together, and carried us along breathless through his scenes of successive victory and defeat. That by this means something would be lost is true—Falconbridge, for example, would certainly be lessened—but the worth of

a real work of art is greater than the worth of any part of it; and Constance and Hubert probably need not suffer, while the influence of the death of Arthur might very likely be made to penetrate more thoroughly the entire play. In *Macbeth*, *Henry V*, *Richard III*, *Coriolanus* everything is subordinated to the centre, the mainspring of the plot; in *King John* each act has a different hero. What could be more fatal to the interest of the whole? To some it may seem presumptuous thus to criticise Shakespeare; but is it not indeed the only way to make sure that one really appreciates him? Of such appreciation I wish my unsparing criticism of his work to be a proof; it is a poor faith that dares not listen to and seek out every accusation against its idol.

CORSON (p. 162): The fierce partisan spirit of the old play has no place in Shakespeare's. Shakespeare's play is filled throughout with the spirit of Elizabethan England's defiance to the foreigner and the Pope—but to the Pope as a foreign power, rather than on religious grounds. That's the point to be observed. It is a national, patriotic, not a religious spirit, or rather not a religious spirit which informs his play. He understands too well the true function of dramatic art to make religion, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, or any other, the informing spirit of this play. Commentators have gone to *King John* for proof that Shakespeare was a Protestant. It might be shown, by other plays with as much certainty, that he was a good Catholic. But it cannot be shown that he was either one or the other. He was too great an artist to obtrude his own personal religious belief. One thing is quite evident, namely, that he was in spirit a true Christian—so true a Christian that he was perfectly tolerant. Shakespeare went to *The Troublesome Raigne* for his history in the composition of *King John*, and not to Holinshed's 'Chronicles.' His play turns on what is entirely unhistorical; or, if not entirely unhistorical, on what went for nothing with John's barons, namely, the defect of his title to the crown, and the exclusion of the rightful heir, his elder brother Geoffrey's son, Arthur, and the supposed murder of that son, in order to maintain usurped power.

FEIS (p. 32): If Shakespeare's *King John* is compared with the old play, *The Troublesome Raigne*, and with the chronicles from which (but more especially from the former piece) the poet has drawn the plan of his dramatic action, it will be seen that very definite political tendencies of what he had before him were suppressed. New ones are put in their place. Shakespeare makes his King John go through two different, wholly unhistorical struggles: one against a foe at home, who contests the King's legitimate right; the other against Romanists who think it a sacred duty to overthrow the heretic. These were not the feuds with which the King John of history had to contend. But the daughter from the unhappy marriage of Henry VIII. and the faithless Anne Boleyn—Queen Elizabeth—had, during her whole lifetime, to contend against rebels who held Mary Stuart to be the legitimate successor; and it was Queen Elizabeth who had always to remain armed against a confederacy of enemies who, encouraged by the Pope, made war upon the 'heretic' on the throne of England. Thus, in the Globe Theatre, questions of the State were discussed; and the politics had their distinct place there.

WENDELL (p. 137): Less careful, less constantly sustained than *Richard II*, *King John* often impresses one as queerer, more archaic, more puzzling than any other of Shakespeare's chronicle-histories. This impression, of course, may be chiefly due to the accident that in most editions of the series it is printed first, and so that

one is apt to read it with no preparation for its conventions. As we shall see, however, there are reasons enough in the play as it stands to make it seem at first sight more strange than what we have already considered, and yet, on inspection, to prove it a distinct step forward in the development of chronicle-history. One cause for its oddity of effect lies in its origin. Instead of translating directly from the chronicles, Shakespeare clearly did not trouble himself about them at all; but only adapted a clumsy old play to the improving conditions of the stage. At the time the subject of this play was accidentally popular. Though tradition generally confirms history in declaring John to have been the worst king England ever had, tradition and history equally agree in preserving a suspicion that he came to his end by poison, administered by an ecclesiastic who had been enraged beyond measure by John's attacks on the vested property of the Church. When England broke away from the church of Rome, then John, by an obvious distortion of tradition, became something like a Protestant hero. In the early editions of Foxe's Book of Martyrs there is a full page of illustrations, showing how the wicked monk, duly absolved to begin with, took the poison from a toad, put it in the king's wine-cup, tasted the liquor to disarm suspicion, died at the same time with the king, and had masses regularly said for his traitorous, murderous soul. This view of things was presented, among others, in *The Troublesome Raigne*. The old play, thus for the moment popular, was in two parts. In adapting it, Shakespeare reduced it to the limits of a single performance. However he may have improved it in many ways, he managed in one way to make it decidedly less intelligible than before. In *The Troublesome Raigne* there are a number of ribald scenes where the Bastard sacks religious houses, and incidentally discovers there a state of morals agreeable at once to the principles of Elizabethan Protestants and to the taste of Elizabethan audiences. This proceeding so excites the clergy that they compass the king's death. In Shakespeare's play this whole matter is compressed into two short passages. The poisoning of the King, then, comes without very obvious cause. In this respect, the old play is the better. Nor is this the only instance in which Shakespeare did not improve things. Shakespeare's Constance, in general, however her rhetoric may be admired, certainly rants; like so many passages in the earlier chronicle-histories, her long speeches belong rather to a grand opera than to tragedy proper. The Constance of *The Troublesome Raigne*, on the other hand, though less eloquent, is more human. Compare, for example, the last appearance of Constance in the two plays: it is when her heart has been broken by the capture of Arthur. Here is her last speech in *The Troublesome Raigne:*

> '*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.'

In *King John* this pathetic utterance is expanded into five speeches, which comprise aboue fifty lines of tremendous declamation, beginning:

> 'No, no, I will not, having breath to cry:
> O, that my tongue were in the thunder's mouth!
> Then with a passion would I shake the world;
> And rouse from sleep that fell anatomy
> Which cannot hear a lady's feeble voice,' etc.

Whatever Shakespeare's Constance may be at heart, she is not always so human in expression as the Constance of *The Troublesome Raigne*. In general, however,

Shakespeare's play is by far the better. To find such instances as we have just glanced at one must seek. Taking the two plays as a spectator or a hasty reader would take them, they differ in effect much as *Romeo and Juliet* differs from *Titus Andronicus*. The old play has so little vitality of imagination that it is hardly ever plausible; *King John*, on the other hand, is full of touches, when we once accept the old conventions, waken characters and scenes alike into something far nearer real life than we have yet found in chronicle-history. Character after character emerges into consistent individuality. Best of all, of course, is the Bastard, who from a rather lifeless comic personage becomes one of Shakespeare's own living men. Arthur, whose situation and fate recall those of the young princes in *Richard III*, is at once so human and so pathetic that many modern critics are set to wondering whether the tender sense of boyish charm and parental bereavement hereby revealed may not have been awakened by the illness and death in 1596 of Shakespeare's only son. Elinor is thoroughly alive, too, so is the intriguing Cardinal Pandulph, so is Hubert, whose scenes with the King and with Arthur remain dramatically effective, so is King John himself; and so often, in spite of her rant, is Constance. In no earlier chronicle-history, for example, is there anything like so human a touch as in the scene where Elinor tries to entice Arthur from Constance:

> '*Eli.* Come to thy grandam, child.
> *Const.* Do, child, go to it grandam, child;
> Give grandam kingdom, and it grandam will
> Give it a plum, a cherry, and a fig;
> There's a good grandam.'

In *The Troublesome Raigne* there is no hint of these speeches. They are all Shakespeare's. As concrete an example as any of what Shakespeare has done in *King John* may be found in the very opening line. *The Troublesome Raigne* opens with a formal speech by Elinor:

> 'Barons of England, and my noble Lords;
> Though God and fortune have bereft from us
> Victorious Richard scourge of infidels,' etc.

In general manner this is very much like the opening of *Richard II:*

> 'Old John of Gaunt, time-honour'd Lancaster,' etc.

Shakespeare's *King John*, on the other hand, opens with an improved version of the forty-first line of *The Troublesome Raigne*, the line with which the action begins:

> 'Now say, Chatillon, what would France with us?'

By the eighth line the passionate temperaments of John and Elinor have been revealed by the two characteristic outbursts for which *The Troublesome Raigne* affords no suggestion. The example is sufficient: what has happened in *King John* is what happened in *Romeo and Juliet*. Creative imagination, to all appearances spontaneous, has made real, living people out of what had previously been stage types. In this very fact lies the reason why *King John* generally impresses one as more archaic, or at least as more queer, than *Richard II*. Such a phrase as Richard's,

> 'Old John of Gaunt, time-honour'd Lancaster,'

could never have been uttered by any real man; such a phrase as John's,

> 'Now say, Chatillon, what would France with us?'

might be uttered by anybody still. In *Richard II*, then, the consistent conventionality of everything makes us accept the whole play if we accept any part of it. In *King John* the continual confusion of human vitality with the old quasi-operatic conventions combines with the general carelessness of construction to make each kind of thing seem more out of place than it would seem by itself. Like any other transitional incongruity, *King John* is often harder to accept than the consistent conventions from which it departs. Its very excellences emphasize its faults and its oddities. In *King John*, then, we find Shakespeare's creative energy awake, much as we found it in *Romeo and Juliet;* and somewhat as we found it in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, in *Richard III*, and in *Richard II*. From the fact that *King John*, while in some respects as vital as any of these, is less careful, we may infer that this creative energy was growing more spontaneously strong. Clearly, though, it has not here produced a work which for ripeness of development can compare with the comedy or the tragedy already before us. If our chronology be right, *King John* belongs to the same period as the *Merchant of Venice.*

BRANDES (i, 169): Despite its great dramatic advantages over *Richard II*, the play suffers from the same radical weakness, and in an even greater degree: the figure of the King is too unsympathetic to serve as the centre point of a drama. His despicable infirmity of purpose, which makes him kneel to receive his crown at the hands of the same Papal legate whom he has shortly before defied in blusterous terms; his infamous scheme to assassinate an innocent child, and his repentance when he sees that its supposed execution has alienated the chief supporters of his throne—all this hideous baseness, unredeemed by any higher characteristics, leads the spectator rather to attach his interest to the subordinate characters, and thus the action is frittered away before his eyes. It lacks unity, because the king is powerless to hold it together. . . . In this play, as in almost all the works of Shakespeare's younger years, the reader is perpetually amazed to find the finest poetical and rhetorical passages side by side with the most intolerable euphuistic affectations. And we cannot allege the excuse that these are legacies from the older play. On the contrary, there is nothing of the kind to be found in it; they are added by Shakespeare, evidently with the express purpose of displaying delicacy and profundity of thought. In the scenes before the walls of Angiers he has on the whole kept close to the old drama, and has even followed faithfully the sense of all the more important speeches. For example, it is a citizen on the ramparts who, in the old play, suggests the marriage between Blanch and the Dauphin; Shakespeare merely rewrites his speech, introducing into it these beautiful lines (II, ii.):

> 'If lusty love should go in quest of beauty,
> Where should he find it fairer than in Blanch?
> If zealous love should go in search of virtue,
> Where should he find it purer than in Blanch?
> If love ambitious sought a match of birth,
> Whose veins bound richer blood than Lady Blanch?'

The surprising thing is that the same hand which has just written these verses should forthwith lose itself in a tasteless tangle of affectations like this:

> 'Such as she is, in beauty, virtue, birth,
> Is the young Dauphin every way complete:

If not complete of, say, he is not she;
And she again wants nothing, to name want,
If want it be not, that she is not he,'

and this profound thought is further spun out with a profusion of images. Can we wonder that Voltaire and the French critics of the eighteenth century were offended by a style like this, even to the point of letting it blind them to the wealth of genius elsewhere manifested? Even the touching scene between Arthur and Hubert is disfigured by false cleverness of this sort. The little boy, kneeling to the man who threatens to sear out his eyes, introduces, in the midst of the most moving appeals, such far-fetched and contorted phrases as this:

'The iron of itself, though heat red-hot,
Approaching near these eyes, would drink my tears,
And quench this fiery indignation
Even in the matter of mine innocence;
Nay, after that, consume away in rust,
But for containing fire to harm mine eye'—(IV, i, 69–74).

[See also note by Brandes, IV, i, 116–127.] As regards their ethical point of view, there is no essential difference between the old play and Shakespeare's. The King's defeat and painful death is in both a punishment for his wrong-doing. There has only been, as already mentioned, a certain displacement of the centre of gravity. In the old play the dying John stammers out an explicit confession that from the moment he surrendered to the Roman priest he has had no more happiness on earth; for the Pope's curse is a blessing, and his blessing a curse. In Shakespeare the emphasis is laid not upon the king's weakness in the religio-political struggle, but upon the wrong to Arthur. Faulconbridge gives utterance to the fundamental idea of the play when he says (IV, iii.):

'From forth this morsel of dead royalty,
The life, the right, and truth of all this realm
Is fled to heaven.'

Shakespeare's political standpoint is precisely that of the earlier writer, and indeed, we may add, of his whole age. The most important contrasts and events of the period he seeks to represent do not exist for him. He naïvely accepts the first kings of the House of Plantagenet, and the Norman princes in general, as English heroes, and has evidently no suspicion of the deep gulf that separated the Normans from the Anglo-Saxons down to this very reign, when the two hostile races, equally oppressed by the King's tyranny, began to fuse into one people. What would Shakespeare have thought had he known that Richard Cœur-de-Lion's favourite formula of denial was 'Do you take me for an Englishman?' while his pet oath, and that of his Norman followers, was 'May I become an Englishmen if—,' etc.? Nor does a single phrase, a single syllable in the whole play refer to the event which, for all after times, is inseparably associated with the memory of King John —the signing of the Magna Charta. The reason of this is evidently, in the first place, that Shakespeare kept close to the earlier drama, and, in the second place, that he did not attribute to the event the importance it really possessed, did not understand that the Magna Charta laid the foundation of popular liberty, by calling into existence a middle class which supported even the House of Tudor in its struggle with an overweening oligarchy. But the chief reason why the Magna

Charta is not mentioned was, no doubt, that Elizabeth did not care to be reminded of it. She was not fond of any limitations of her royal prerogative, and did not care to recall the defeats suffered by her predecessors in their struggles with warlike and independent vassals. And the nation was willing enough to humour her in this respect. People felt that they had to thank her government for a great national revival, and therefore showed no eagerness either to vindicate popular rights against her, or to see them vindicated in stage-history. It was not until long after, under the Stuarts, that the English people began to cultivate its constitution. The chronicle writers of the period touch very lightly upon the barons' victory over King John in the struggle for the Great Charter; and Shakespeare thus followed at once his own personal bias with regard to history and the current of his age.

VISCHER (*Vorträge*, iv, 57): All things considered, this drama is not a masterpiece. Shakespeare treated the material because it gave him an opportunity to portray certain beautiful episodes with the power of his talent. It is difficult to retain in one's mind the entire contents. The obscure change of the course of events does not admit any clear review. Again and again I lose the threads, and must each time begin anew. The drama is not altogether unskilfully composed, but it lacks any real unity; the arrangement of its parts is too lax. It throws us into a realm where interest is pitted against interest, into an intricate wilderness of exceptional egotism. Comprehension is at once bewildered by the to-and-fro fortune of war; by the compacts and agreements made and cast aside. The fault lies even deeper; its chief cause is in the fact that there is no clear right shown on either side. Thus in the struggle between France and England, Richard's will is doubtful. The English poet naturally leans towards John, because France is on the side of Arthur. Up to his Victory at Angiers we can quite justify John in the course which he follows in both attacks. Only from this point on he misuses the advantage which his determination created for him. Yet how? Has John no right on his side against the church? Yes, but it is not clearly shown that he had any right to despoil the church of its treasure. The only interest which thus predominates is one of gain, and this forms but an ill continuity for a drama. Resolutions soon change on account of interest, soon on account of weakness. The central point of interest lacks a principal character. Such a one, even though entirely governed by love of power and self-interest, would preserve the unity. But a general instability predominates. Each and all act from a vehement desire or from fear, and no nobler motive is the active agent. Hence his conscience is awakened, not from a pure impulse of his inner self, but rather from an exterior opposition. He submits to the church insolently since he is quite as much interested and fearful as determined, we find him at times hard, at other times yielding, to-day strong, tomorrow weak, and even inconsistent in his wickedness and vacillation. Such a one we despise, for even a persistence in wickedness always extorts from us the avowal: he is a man, since he is consistent. John sinks from bold deeds into faint-heartedness, even in crime he is only murderous through anxiety. He is rejoiced that his murderous behest is not carried out. But that which Hubert fails to do accident accomplishes, and the accidental death of the boy strikes the conscience of the King, who is entirely responsible for it. So he forms only that passive point at which circumstance and cunning encounter each other. Philip and the Dauphin are mighty talkers and vacillate more than once. The English Peers become abandoned wretches, disloyal to their native country through a noble motive, yet quietly return to their allegiance. Hubert likewise vacillates,

yet, even as the Peers, from a good motive. The child Arthur is the only pure thing amongst these people—this tender blossom alone is to be trodden under foot by fate and disappears. Thus there remains but Pandulph, a veritable cleric. The King has no servant who has even so much steadfastness. Pandulph always knows, and always is, just what he wishes to be. But we have likewise seen that this cleric represents the lust for power of the church, and concedes as allowable every means to his end. And thereby all greatness in him is lacking. In this world of fragments there stands forth bright and sympathetic one figure and thus it gains the importance of a supplement: the Bastard Faulconbridge. He is significant as a principal attribute of the genius of Shakespeare and makes the most efficient check on the dark and turgid politics of King John, the most important supplement to his questionable right to the crown. Shakespeare has endowed him with a brilliancy which far outshines that of his namesake in the older piece. He is the arch-type of the fiery, inconsiderate English youth, such as the French ambassador describes, through and through manly, good humoured, not over-scrupulous, inclined, in those times replete with utter self-interest, to be like the times, yet throughout bearing all with humour, and, above all, brave. Rises more in the spirit of honor, speaks the truth bluntly both to the King and the peers, and will make no alliance with France. His word is strength. He is a fire-eater and thus like a foreshadowing of Hotspur, whom we find later in *Henry IV*. He has at least one energetic, positive attribute, that is, patriotism. How this deep feeling beats and flames in his fierce taunts! His native land, yes, that is the idea which binds him. But it stands not as the central point, therefore this character can have only a relative retaining power for the effectiveness of the drama. And now the women! Eleanor has a disposition like to Margaret's, but remains in the background and dies. Constance is beautiful in her maternal love, but at the same time wild and hateful in her passionate rage. Blanch, drawn with but few features, is yet strikingly lovely. Her delicacy in behavior, on the proposal of marriage to the Dauphin for purely political reasons should, by its beauty, have saved her. Thus we see shining points of light in this dark beclouded world, solitary figures that rise more brilliant for the black shadows.

MOULTON (*Moral System*, etc., p. 278): To the modern reader Shakespeare's dramatisation of the reign of King John comes as a surprise. There is not a hint of what we are accustomed to consider as the characteristic of that reign, making it the most critical period of English History; on the other hand, what would seem matter of inferior moment is treated with fine workmanship and dramatic vigour. The explanation is easy, if this play is to stand as prologue to the succession of histories, and if the spirit of history, as conceived by Elizabethan dramatists, consisted in the pendulum-like alternation of fortune. Nowhere else do we find the rival interests so evenly balanced, nor the balance so constantly emphasised; nowhere else do we see such sharp turns in events and such great mutations realised in such brief intervals. Moreover, the whole of this manifold alternation is within the limits of a single play, and centres around the single personality of King John.

HERFORD (*Eversley ed., Introduction*, p. 6): *King John* is probably, of all Shakespeare's Histories, the most distantly related to History. Theological fanaticism, that potent myth-maker, had, since the middle of the century, laid a powerful grasp upon the tradition, already not without its mythic elements, recorded in the Chronicles; and the wonderful transformation which this legend underwent in

Shakespeare's hands was certainly not undertaken in the interest of historical truth. Indeed, his most striking alterations only serve to detach it more completely from the Chronicles, and to draw it more explicitly into the sphere of irresponsible poetry. What manner of legend it was that underwent this apotheosis may be gathered from two dramas, one of them certainly unknown to Shakespeare, the other the immediate basis of his work. The English Reformers saw in the worst of the Plantagenets an early Protestant—an unsuccessful precursor of Henry VIII, and in Bale's incoherent *Kyng Johan* (c. 1545) the lineaments of the historic John wholly disappear in a single trait enforced with almost frenzied emphasis: his defiance of the Roman 'Antichrist.' Doctrinal theology played little part in shaping the Elizabethan drama; but the 'Protestantism of the Protestant religion' flourished as bravely in the playhouse as in the conventicle; and the events of 1588, which thrilled every fibre of the national self-consciousness, threw a heightened passion and inspiration, with which religion had very little to do, into the national protest against Rome. Nearly at the same moment the genius of Marlowe revealed the dramatic potency of protest, and filled the stage with imitations of the Titanism of Tamburlaine and Faustus. Both influences had told strongly upon the anonymous author of *The Troublesome Raigne of King John*. Shakespeare has followed his original almost scene for scene, retaining the outer mechanism of the plot unchanged, or at most dismissing into the background events which the earlier dramatist exhibited with genial prolixity on the stage. But he has essentially altered the significance of the action, and immensely strengthened and vitalised what he retained. We may say, generally, that, while *The Troublesome Raigne* is patriotic, Protestant, and Marlowesque, *King John* is the work of a man whose patriotism was more fervent, whose Protestantism was less fanatical, and who had definitely broken through the charmed circle of Marlowe. Shakespeare entirely adopts the bold device of his predecessor for saving the unpatriotic surrender of John. The Bastard plays an even more imposing part, and his energy pervades and animates the whole drama. As a character he belongs altogether to Shakespeare. The earlier Faulconbridge's alternate accesses of mysticism and horseplay disappear in the brimming vitality of this frank and burly Plantagenet. Shakepeare's bastard discovers his father not from rustling leaves, but by the contrast between his own giant frame and that of his mannikin brother, slays Austria without invoking his father's shade, and does battle without the ægis of his father's fortune. The grounds of his animosity to Austria are indeed rather hinted than explained. And with these mystic touches disappears the horseplay of the scene in the monastery. But the character of Faulconbridge is put to uses of which the earlier writer did not dream. His prototype is indeed already in some sense the mouthpiece of England, and rudely anticipates the magnificent closing assurance that

> 'This England never did, nor never shall,
> Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,
> But when it first did help to wound itself.'

Shakespeare's Faulconbridge, however, stands not merely for the cause of England, but for English character; for bluff, straightforward manliness against subtle shifts and unmeaning phrase, he has his jest at the rhetoric of the Angiers citizen who

> 'Talks as familiarly of roaring lions
> As maids of thirteen do of puppy-dogs';

and the subtle diplomatic chicaneries of Pandulph are thrown into relief with

caustic effect by the trenchant humour of the Bastard's famous exposure of 'Commodity.' Notwithstanding the jocose profession which closes that speech, private ends have little to do with his action; and with great judgment Shakespeare exercised the earlier playwright's explanation of his indignation at the match between Blanch and Lewis as arising from a previous betrothal of Blanch to himself. But while *King John* is informed with a yet keener patriotism, it is less aggressively Protestant than *The Troublesome Raigne*. The gross burlesque of Faulconbridge's raid upon the 'fat Franciscans' is altogether excised. John's relations with Rome remain unchanged, but it is no longer here that the principal ethical purport of the play is to be found. In the eyes of the earlier writer John's surrender of his birthright to Philip, his surrender of his crown to Pandulph, and his betrayal of Arthur seem co-ordinate causes of his fall. Shakespeare exposes his errors with at least equal trenchancy, but makes clear that the more deadly step is not the surrender but the crime. It is this which alienates his subjects, and gives the French invasion its sole chance of success. The thunders of Pandulph on either side do not affect the issue. The earlier dramatist treats the crafty legate with malignant hatred, as a 'curse' happily evaded; the later manages him with fine irony, as the wielder of an imposing but not really formidable authority, easily rendered innocuous, incapable of injuring a people true to themselves. And though John still meets his death at the hands of a monk, the act is dismissed with a studiously casual allusion, so that the 'resolved villain' seems merely the executant of Nemesis. Whereas in *The Troublesome Raigne* he dies to satisfy the vengeance of an incensed ecclesiastic, who has vowed never to let escape 'the king that never loved a friar, the man that did contemn the pope.' Naturally, Shakespeare ignores the 'moral' which this suggests to the bastard:

> 'This is the fruit of Poperie, when true kings
> Are slain and shouldered out by monks and friars.'

Nor does his John indulge any vision of a more fortunate Protestant successor. The Shakespearian Pandulph, finally, would suffice to show that Shakespeare was no longer under the spell of the fiery but nowise subtle intellect of Marlowe. If Marlowe was the first English dramatist who commanded the language of impetuous passion, Shakespeare was the first master of the language of polished and astute debate, of high-bred conversation, of courtly ceremony. The earlier John retains not a little of the lofty insolence of Tamburlaine; how kingly, on the other hand, is the later John's dismissal of Chatillon: dignified defiance, injunction, valiant forecast, courteous attention and farewell, all concentrated in eight lines (I. i). The two great creations, Constance and Arthur, also are touched with an intensity of pathos still strange to the Shakespeare of *Henry VI.* and *Richard III.* The situation of Margaret after Tewkesbury, of Elizabeth after the murders in the tower, resemble that of Constance; but Margaret utters her passion for vengeance more poignantly than the agony of her loss, and Elizabeth's outraged motherhood finds expression merely in sullen resentment. Constance is the Juliet of maternal love. Love for Arthur dominates her whole being, and the agony of bereavement finds utterance through phrases that burn in the fire of an imagination familiar with wild grief. Arthur's situation similarly recalls that of the young princes. The Arthur of *The Troublesome Raigne* does, in fact, bear himself like the young Duke of York in *Richard III*, boldly bearding his dangerous Uncle, and incurring reproof from the Elinor for his vehemence ('Peace, Arthur, peace,' etc., *Troublesome Raigne*, pt. 1, ii, 107). Shakespeare has endowed his Arthur not with the charm of precocious

talent, but with the pathos and shrinking tenderness of childhood: 'I am not worth this coil that's made for me'; and, instead of incurring reproof, it is he who, almost in Elinor's words, appeals to his own fiery advocate to cease pleading: 'Good, my mother, peace!' Of the death of the princes we have in the earlier play no more than a brief though exquisite picture; but Arthur's perilous captivity is displayed in the most tender and sympathetic dramatic detail; and the pathos of the scene is derived not from an accumulation of harrowing details, as to some extent it is in the grim finale of *Edward II*, but from the ideal loveliness of childlike character which unfolds itself under the stress of Hubert's threat.

LUCE (p. 183): *The Troublesome Raigne* is poor enough certainly; but I think it has lost something by inevitable comparison with Shakespeare, and, in fairness, I will mention its dying words of Arthur, which Shakespeare has rejected; yet rightly, for although the speech I refer to is the best thing in the old play, it might have been bettered by omission of the first eight lines. Indeed, the genius of Shakespeare is displayed most strikingly where it deals with tender years and helpless innocence. This may be seen in *Richard III.* (IV, ii, 98–104, and IV, i, 23); so here in *King John*, where Arthur pleads with Hubert; and, lastly, to do full justice to this genius of Shakespeare, I will quote once more from the older play:

> '*Arthur* . . . let the black tormentors of deep Tartary
> Upbraid them with his damned enterprise,
> Inflicting change of tortures on their souls.
> Delay not, Hubert, my orisons are ended.'

Here (and there is more of like import) is indeed a travesty of tender years and helpless innocence; Shakespeare rightly puts some such vituperation in the mouth of the bastard (IV, iii, 124–169) and not of 'that child' (line 166). Moreover, partly from his finer taste, partly from the large heart that would neither be bound by any creed nor condemn it, he omits a coarse scene in the old play that holds up the monastic system to contempt and ridicule. But there is no reference in *The Troublesome Raigne* to Magna Charta, and things thereto appertaining; the author was an artist, not a historian, and had at least some skill in choosing his incidents—his dramatic ground; but nothing grew there. It was left to Shakespeare a bare and barren patch, and from it sprang the immortal flowers of drama, Constance and Arthur.

G. P. BAKER (p. 154): In *King John*, though Shakespeare gains decidedly in dramatic skill, some of the old weakness persists. Again we face in John a weakling who can only slightly command our sympathy and whose death is far less touching than it would be had he in the earlier scenes been of larger mould. There can be no question that Faulconbridge is the strength of the play as a play. As any reader knows who has compared Shakespeare's *John* with the earlier play in two parts, from which he skilfully condensed it, *The Troublesome Raigne of King John*, and with the historical material in Holinshed, Faulconbridge is Shakespeare's creation from vague and inadequate suggestions. But it is not merely the courage, resourcefulness, and wit of Faulconbridge—in a word, his characterization—which make him memorable: it is he who passes straight through the play, carrying our sympathies and affection with him and giving to it a kind of unity. But he cannot give it that essential unity which would come from a compelling centre

figure indispensable to all the important scenes, without whom the play could have no being. Particularly noticeable is the development of the comic in this play. Part I. of *Henry VI.* showed only touches, and those coarse; Part III. lacked it; and in Part II. Cade's followers provided comic relief. *Richard II.* lacks it, and in *Richard III.* its place is taken by the sardonic irony of the king himself. In *Henry V*, as it stands, the comic alternates with the graver scenes. Thus far, then, the really comic has come almost entirely, if present at all, from people not closely involved with the main plot. In *King John* it is Faulconbridge himself, an important person in nearly all the main scenes, who brings the comic relief. This recognition that the comic is desirable for contrast and that it may relax tense motion till a hearer may again be wrought upon with effect, Shakespeare, in part, owes the author of the *Troublesome Raigne;* but a few years later in the *Merchant of Venice* he will show us in the trial scene that the comic and the tragic depend not upon the person who is looked at, but the sympathies of the person who looks at him. Growing maturity is seen also in *King John* in the scene of Arthur and Hubert, by the subordination of mere physical horror to working upon us through sympathies with the lad himself. There are, too, repeated instances which show increasing sureness of theatrical knowledge. In the original of the Hubert-Arthur scene, the murderers enter shortly after Hubert begins to speak with the lad and seize upon the boy. Shakespeare holds them back till just as Hubert is beginning to yield. Their coming fills an audience with dread lest it strengthen Hubert's weakening purpose. Our eager watching of Hubert relaxes only when he orders out the murderers, for then we know that he will yield. The earlier dramatists seem not to have understood how to make an entrance or an exit dramatically effective. Here Shakespeare proves that he knows how to make both significant for their scene. In this play, too, Shakespeare shows marked alertness to motivate the details of his story; for example, when Philip breaks his bond with John. In the original Philip breaks it promptly and with no conscience; in Shakespeare he yields only after appeals to him from all his friends and followers. This care for motivation in characters other than the title part is noteworthy because unusual in the preceding work both of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. In brief, *King John*, except in not providing for the title part a person who holds us to the end thoroughly sympathetic or fascinated by his evil doing, and in the momentary abeyance of rich poetic expression, shows dramatic gain by Shakespeare.

JUSSERAND (*Lit. History*, iii, 190): In *King John* Shakespeare once more remodels an old play which had met with success. He adds some marvelous touches, revealing his growing genius; for example, the scene where John, without at first discovering himself, speaks so as to test and better secure faithful Hubert's devotion to him, then lets him understand that he is in trouble, a trouble to be guessed, not told:

> '. . . If thou could'st see me without eyes,
> Hear me without thine ears.'

Then, sure of his ground, he plainly speaks out: the grave for that young boy, 'a very serpent in my way.' The poet, however, does not scruple to follow, here again, the old play very closely. It is a case of the eagle donning the jackdaw's feathers. He sometimes transcribes his model's lines without any change, preserving the historical errors, which are innumerable, making of King John a kind of

Henry VIII. who defies Rome, laughs at indulgences, and is 'under Heaven, supreme Head,' and suddenly modifying, as in the old play, the character of his hero, who seems to turn on a pivot, now a proud and high-spirited monarch, now a paltry weakling. The brag, merriment, coarseness, valiant deeds of the bastard Faulconbridge, the violent contrasts between the pretty little ways of a boyish victim and the ferocity of his tormentors, the ravings of a princess on the verge of madness, word plays, conceits and puns, constant appeals to a patriotism of the crudest sort, are the chief elements of success. The French are again treacherous, ungrateful, ignoble; they are fit to 'hug with swine,' they quake at the crowing of their own cock,

'Thinking his voice an armed Englishman.'

The Dauphin wins a battle which he would have lost without the help of some English lords, but it turns out that, traitor and ingrate, he intends 'cutting off their heads' as soon as his power is secure; he has sworn it on the same altar where he had promised them 'everlasting love.' All this enraptured the hearers, fed their passions, and ensured the success of the play; all this was, to be sure, very human; it was not superhuman.

ROBERTSON (p. 260): It is perhaps unnecessary to ask whether Shakespeare would have consented to publish as his the vision scene in *Cymbeline*, now given up by most editors, though some critics are still capable, with Mr Lowell, of ascribing it to him on the strength of such a line as 'the all-dreaded thunderstone.' But when we realise, as we soon can, that such sonorities of phrase were within the power of a dozen Elizabethans, and that we have noted at least thirteen plays —more than a third of the thirty-seven—in which some alien matter has been retained or added, we shall see cause to admit not only that a writer very far from being a precisian would in Shakespeare's place have scrupled to publish the existing mass of plays as his own, but that in regard to yet other plays, such as the early *Comedy of Errors* and *King John*, we have at least no right to set down the whole as unquestionably Shakespeare's. I will not labour that point in this connection, but will merely transcribe a few speeches from *King John* ('Act II, Scene ii.') as it stands, and ask the reader to compare them with a few sample harangues from Greene and Peele. It is one of the bewilderments of criticism that an instructed reader should profess to find the true Shakespearian ring in such forcible-feeble declamations as these:

'*French Herald*

You men of Angiers, open wide your gates,
And let young Arthur, Duke of Bretagne, in,
Who by the hand of France this day hath made
Much work for tears in many an English mother,
Whose sons lie scattered on the bleeding ground;
Many a widow's husband grovelling lies,
Coldly embracing the discolour'd earth;
And Victory, with little loss, doth play
Upon the dancing banners of the French,
Who are at hand, triumphantly display'd,
To enter conquerors and to proclaim
Arthur of Bretagne—England's king and yours.'

'*English Herald*

Rejoice, you men of Angiers, ring your bells;
King John, your king and England's, doth approach
Commander of this hot malicious day;
Their armours, that march'd hence so silver bright
Hither return all gilt with Frenchmen's blood;
There stuck no plume in any English crest
That is removed by a staff of France;
Our colors do return in those same hands
That did display them when we first march'd forth;
And, like a jolly troop of huntsmen, come
Our lusty English, all with purpled hands,
Dyed in the dying slaughter of their foes:
Open your gates nad give the victors way. . . .'

'*King John*

France, hast thou yet more blood to cast away?
Say, shall the current of our right run on?
Whose passage, vexed with thy impediment,
Shall leave his native channel and o'erswell
With course disturb'd even thy confining shores,
Unless thou let his silver water keep
A peaceful progress to the ocean.'

Whatever be thought of their genuineness, as compared with many of the surrendered passages in the Henry VI. plays, I have no hesitation in saying that they are easily within the scope of the men who wrote the following:

'The fairest flower that glorifies Africa,
Whose beauty Phœbus dares not dash with showers,
Over whose climate never hung a cloud,
But smiling Titan lights the horizon,—
Egypt is mine, and there I hold my state
Seated in Cairo and in Babylon.
From thence the beauty of Angelica
Whose hue's as bright as are those silver doves
That wanton Venus mann'th upon her fist,
Forc'd me to cross and cut th' Atlantic seas
To oversearch the fearful ocean.'

—Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (beginning)

'Meanwhile we'll richly rig up all our fleet
More brave than was that gallant Grecian keel
That brought away the Colchian fleece of gold;
Our sails of sendal spread into the wind;
Our ropes and tacklings all of finest silk,
Fetch'd from the native looms of labouring worms,
The pride of Barbary, and the glorious wealth
That is transported by the western bounds;
Our stems cut out of gleaming ivory;
Our planks and sides fram'd out of cypress-wood
That bears the name of Cyparissus' change,

To burst the billows of the ocean-sea,
Where Phœbus dips his amber-tresses oft,
And kisses Thetis in the day's decline;
That Neptune proud shall call his Tritons forth
To cover all the ocean with a calm:
So rich shall be the rubbish of our barks
Ta'en here for ballast to the ports of France,
That Charles himself shall wonder at the sight,
Thus, lordings, when our banquetings be done
And Orlando espoused to Angelica
We'll furrow through the moving ocean
And cheerly frolic with great Charlemagne.'
—Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (end).

I do not argue that there is any close likeness, save here and there, between *King John* speeches and these last; what I urge is that as Shakespeare wrote the whole of *King John* about 1596 he was half the time doing no better work than had been done by Greene and by Peele in 1594. Had we found in *King John* such lines as the following, none of us, I think, would have pronounced them inferior to those above copied from the Shakespearian play:

'Now hath the sun display'd his golden beams
And, dusky clouds dispers'd, the welkin clears,
Wherein the twenty-colour'd rainbow shows.'

'O deadly wound that passeth by mine eye,
The fatal poison of my swelling heart!
O fortune constant in unconstancy!
Fight, earthquakes, in the entrails of the earth,
And the eastern whirlwinds in the hellish shades!
Some foul contagion of th' infected heaven
Blast all the trees, and in their cursed tops
The dismal night-raven and tragic owl
Breed, and become foretellers of my fall,
The fatal ruin of my name and me!'
—Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*, Act. I, scs. i. and ii.

Even the versification here is better than much of what the idolaters are willing to call Shakespeare's. Let the open-minded reader, then, judge for himself whether Shakespeare's greatness is the better affirmed by the course of clinging as long as possible to every shred of the matter that has been preserved under his name, or by the methods of comparative analysis and inference from the accepted evidence, which lead us to pronounce much of the plays as ungenuine as it is unworthy of him, leaving untouched by doubt precisely those portions which set him so far above all rivalry.

MASEFIELD (p. 76): Like the best Shakespearian tragedies, *King John* is an intellectual form in which a number of people with obsessions illustrate the idea of treachery. The illustrations are very various. Perhaps the most interesting of them are those subtle ones that illustrate treachery to type, or want of conformity to a standard imagined or established. In the historical plays Shakespeare's mind broods on the idea that our tragical kings failed because they did not conform to a type lower than themselves. Henry V. conforms to type. He

has the qualities that impress the bourgeoisie. He is a success. Henry VI. does not conform to type. He has the qualities of the Christian mystic. He is stabbed in the Tower. Edward IV. conforms to type. He has the qualities that impress the rabble. He is a success. Richard II. does not conform to type. He is a man of ideas. He is done to death at Pomfret. King John does not conform to type. His intellect is bigger than his capacity for affairs. He is poisoned by a monk at Swinstead. King John presents that most subtle of all the images of treachery, a man who cannot conform to the standard of his own ideas. He fails as a king because his intellect prompts him to attempt what is really beyond the powers of his nature to perform. By his side, with an irony that is seldom praised, Shakespeare places the figure of the Bastard, the man who ought to have been king, the man fitted by nature to rule the English, the man without intellect but with a rough capacity, the man whom we meet again, as a successful king, in the play of *Henry V.* King John is placed throughout the play in treacherous relations with life. He is a traitor to his brother's son, to his own ideas, to the English idea, and to his oath of kingship. He has a bigger intellect than anyone about him. His brain is full of gusts and flaws that blow him beyond his age, and then let him sink below it. Persistence in any one course of treachery would give him the greatness of all well-defined things. He remains a chaos shooting out occasional fire. The play opens with a scene that displays some of the human results of treachery. John's mother, Elinor, has been treacherous to one of her sons. John has usurped his brother's right, and, in following his own counsel, has been treacherous to his mother. These acts of treachery have betrayed England into bloody and unjust war. The picture is turned suddenly. Another of the results of human treachery appears in the person of the Bastard, whose mother confesses that she was seduced by the 'long and vehement suit' of Cœur-de-Lion. The Bastard's half-brother, another domestic traitor, does not scruple to accuse his mother of adultery in hope that by doing so he may obtain the Bastard's heritage. The same breaking of faith for advantage gives points to the second act, where the French and English kings turn from their pledged intention to effect a base alliance. They arrange to marry the Dauphin to Elinor's niece, Blanch of Castile. In the third act, before the fury of the constant has died down upon this treachery, the French King adds another falseness. He breaks away from the newly-made alliance at the bidding of the Pope's legate. The newly-married Dauphin treacherously breaks with his wife's party. In the welter of war that follows the constant, human, and beautiful figures come to heartbreak and death. The common people of England begin to betray their genius for obedience by preparing to rise against the man in power. The fourth act begins with the famous scene in which Hubert fails to blind Prince Arthur. Even in the act of mercy he is treacherous. He breaks faith with King John, to whom he has vowed to kill the Prince. Later in the act King John, thinking that the murder has been done, breaks faith with Hubert by driving him from his presence. In the last act the English nobles, who have been treacherous to John, betray their new master, the French King. King John is a broken man, unable to make head against misfortune. He betrays his great kingly idea that the Pope shall not rule here by begging the legate to make peace. At this point death sets a term to treachery. A monk treacherously poisons John at a moment when his affairs look brighter. The play ends with the Bastard's well-known brag about England—

'Naught shall make us rue
If England to itself do rest but true.

This thought is one among many thoughts taken by Shakespeare from the play of *The Troublesome Raigne* and taken by the author of that play direct from Holinshed's *Chronicle*. Comedy deals with character and accident; tragedy with passionate moods of the soul in conflict with fate. In this play as in nearly all poetical plays, the characters that are most minutely articulated are those commoner, more earthly characters, perceived by the daily mind, not uplifted, by brooding, into the rare state of passionate intellectual vision. These characters are triumphant creations; but they come from the commoner qualities in Shakespeare's mind. He did them easily, with his daily nature. What he did on his knees, with contest and bloody sweat, are his great things. The great scheme of the play is the great achievement, not the buxom boor who flouts the Duke of Austria, and takes the national view of his mother's dishonour. Shakespeare, like other sensitive, intelligent men, saw that our distinctive products, the characters that we set most store by, are very strange. That beautiful kindness, high courage, and devoted service should go so often with real animal boorishness and the incapacity to see more than one thing at a time (mistaken for stupidity by stupid people) puzzled him, as it puzzles the un-English mind to-day. A reader feels that in the figure of the Bastard he set down what he found most significant in the common English character. With the exceptions of Sir Toby Belch and Justice Shallow, the Bastard is the most English figure in the plays. He is the Englishman neither at his best nor at his worst, but at his commonest. The Englishman was never so seen before nor since. An entirely honest, robust, hearty person, contemptuous of the weak, glad to be a king's bastard, making friends with women (his own mother one of them), with a trusty, good-humoured frankness, fond of fighting, extremely able when told what to do, fond of plain measures—the plainer the better—an honest servant, easily impressed by intellect when found in high place on his own side, but utterly incapable of perceiving intellect in a foreigner, fond of those sorts of humour which generally lead to blows, extremely just, very kind when not fighting, fond of the words 'fair play,' and nobly and exquisitely moved to deep, true poetical feeling by a cruel act done to something helpless and little. The completeness of the portrait is best seen in the suggestion of the man's wisdom in affairs. The Bastard is trying to find out whether Hubert killed Arthur, whose little body lies close beside them. He says that he suspects Hubert 'very grievously.' Hubert protests. The Bastard tests the protest with one sentence: 'Go bear him in thine arms.' He utters the commonplace lines—

> 'I am amaz'd, methinks, and lose my way
> Among the thorns and dangers of the world'—

while he watches Hubert's face. Hubert stands the test (the emotional test that none but an Englishman would apply), he picks up the body. Instantly the Bastard is touched to a tenderness that lifts Hubert to a spiritual comradeship with him:

> 'How easy dost thou take all England up.'

This tragedy of the death of a child causes nearly all that is nobly poetical in the play. All the passionately-felt scenes are about Arthur or his mother. Some have thought that Shakespeare wrote the play in 1596, shortly after the death of his little son Hamnet, aged eleven. The supposition accuses Shakespeare of a want of heart, of a want of imagination, or of both wants together. He wrote like every other writer, from his sense of what was fitting in an imagined situation. It was no more necessary for him to delay the writing of Prince Arthur till his son

had died than it was for Dickens to wait till he had killed a real Little Dorrit by slow poison. There is a great change in the manner of the poetical passages. The poetry of the *Henry VI.* plays is mostly in bright, sweetly running groups of rhetorical lines. In *King John* it is either built up elaborately into an effect of harmony several lines long, or it is put into a single line or couplet. The rhetoric is compressed:

> 'That shakes the rotten carcase of old Death,' and
>
> 'O death, made proud with pure and princely beauty,' and
>
> 'Old Time the clock-setter, that bald sexton Time.'

The finest poetry is intensely compressed—

> 'I will instruct my sorrows to be proud, For grief is proud,' and
>
> 'I have heard you say,
> That we shall see and know our friends in heaven.
> If that be true, I shall see my boy again,' and
>
> 'When I shall meet him in the court of heaven
> I shall not know him.'

The characters in this truly noble play daunt the reader with a sense of their creator's power. It is difficult to know intimately any human soul, even with love as a lamp. Shakespeare's mind goes nobly into these souls, bearing his great light. It is very wonderful that the mind who saw man clearest should see him with such exaltation.

MATTHEWS (*Sh. as Playwright*, p. 96): Plot and artistically constructed incidents had been lacking in most of the chronicle plays which Shakespeare was following, and yet these earlier pieces had often a forward movement absent from *King John* because Shakespeare fails to provide any single character to focus our interest. A chronicle play it is, with all the looseness of that easy form; but a chronicle play is only a kaleidoscope of battle, murder, and sudden death unless it has a central figure, like *Richard III.* or *Henry V.* to compel our interest. In *King John* the action is wandering and uncertain; it is even more fragmentary than that of *Richard II.;* and is wholly without the huddled swiftness of *Richard III.* Furthermore, King John himself, although not so absolutely unfit to be the leading personage of a play as *Richard II*, is not so presented as to grip our sympathy; and Faulconbridge, the valiant braggart, who is set before us with assured mastery, is external to the story, such as it is. . . . *King John* is curiously incongruous in the carelessness of its composition. It is in the main a drum-and-trumpet history with the flourishes of heralds, the challenges to instant battle and the sudden settling of a war by the unexpected betrothal of a prince and a princess who had never before met—a betrothal impertinently proposed by a private citizen and incontinently accepted by the warring kings. Then the fight breaks out again, when the Cardinal most unexpectedly intervenes; the French invade England with the aid of the English nobles, who suddenly turn against them when they are told that the Dauphin has inexplicably planned their needless assassination. The death of King John by poison is casual; it has not been prepared for by the dramatist, and it is therefore feeble in dramatic effect. The railings and the ravings of Queen Elinor and the Queen Constance are unseemly; they are unqueenly, if not unwomanly. The characters, however overdrawn they may be and however external to the action, in so

far as there is any action, are admirably depicted. They are living men and women; they are no longer merely parts, sketched in outline, to be colored by the personality of the performer; they are truly characters, standing on their own feet and speaking out of their own mouths. The gift of endowing his creations with life itself, of which Shakespeare gave little sign in his earliest plays, is now at last displayed. Equally undeniable is his gift of handling a pathetic situation with a full understanding of its possibilities. Nothing that he had done in any earlier piece foretold the psychologic subtlety of the scene in which King John suggests to Hubert the murder of Arthur or the compassionate handling of the scene in which Hubert undertakes to put out Arthur's eyes and is overcome by the little prince's irresistibly moving plea for mercy.

SHAKESPEARE AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM

KNIGHT (*Biography*, p. 37): It must be borne in mind that the parents of William Shakespeare passed through the great changes of religious opinion, as the greater portion of the people passed, without any violent corresponding change in their habits derived from their forefathers. In the time of Henry VIII. the great contest of opinion was confined to the supremacy of the Pope; the great practical state measure was the suppression of the religious houses. Under Edward VI. there was a very careful compromise of all those opinions and practices in which the laity were participant. In the short reign of Mary the persecution of the Reformers must have been offensive even to those who clung fastest to the ancient institutions and modes of belief; and even when the Reformation was fully established under Elizabeth, the habits of the people were still very slightly interfered with. The astounding majority of the conforming clergy is a convincing proof how little the opinions of the laity must have been disturbed. They would naturally go along with their old teachers. We have to imagine, then, that the father of William Shakespeare, and his mother, were, at the time of his birth, of the religion established by law. His father, by holding a high municipal office after the accession of Elizabeth, had solemnly declared his adherence to the great principle of Protestantism—the acknowledgement of the civil sovereign as head of the Church. The speculative opinions in which the child was brought up would naturally shape themselves to the creed which his father must have professed in his capacity of magistrate; but, according to some opinions, this profession was a disguise on the part of his father. The young Shakespeare was brought up in the Roman persuasion, according to these notions, because he intimates an acquaintance with the practices of the Roman Church, and mentions purgatory, shrift, confession in his dramas. Surely the poet might exhibit this familiarity with the ancient language of all Christendom without thus speaking 'from the overthrow of Roman Catholic Zeal.' Was it 'Roman Catholic Zeal' which induced him to write those strong lines in *King John* against the 'Italian priest,' and against those who

'Purchase corrupted pardon of a man'?

Was it 'Roman Catholic Zeal' which made him introduce these words into the famous prophecy of the glory and happiness of the reign of Elizabeth—

'God shall be truly known'?

He was brought up, without doubt, in the opinions which his father publicly professed, in holding office subject to his most solemn affirmation of those opinions.

The distinctions between the Protestant and the Popish recusant were then not so numerous or speculative as they afterwards became. But, such as they were, we may be sure that William Shakespeare learnt his catechism from his mother in all sincerity; that he frequented the church in which he and his brothers and sisters were baptized; that he was prepared for the discipline of the school in which religious instruction by a minister of the church was regularly afforded as the end of the other knowledge there taught. He became tolerant, according to the manifestation of his after-writings, through nature and the habits and friendships of his early life. But that tolerance does not presume insincerity in himself or his family. The 'Confession of Faith' found in the roof of his father's house two hundred years after he was born would argue the extreme of religious zeal, even to the defiance of all law and authority, on the part of a man who had by the acceptance of office professed his adherence to the established national faith. If that paper were to be believed, we must be driven to a conclusion that John Shakespeare was an unconscientious hypocrite for one part of his life, and a furious bigot for the other part. It is much easier to believe that the Reformation fell lightly upon John Shakespeare, as it did upon the bulk of the laity; that he and his wife, without any offence to their consciences, saw the common prayer take the place of the Mass-book, and acknowledged the temporal sovereign to be head of the church; that in the education of their children they dispensed with auricular confession and penance; but that they, in common with their neighbors, tolerated, and perhaps delighted in, many of the festivals and imaginative forms of the old religion, and even looked up for heavenly aid through intercession, without fancying that they were yielding to an idolatrous superstition, such as Puritanism came subsequently to denounce. The transition from the old worship to the new was not an ungentle one for the laity. The early reformers were too wise to attempt to root up habits—those deep-sunk foundations of the past which break the ploughshares of legislation when it strives to work an inch below the earth's surface.

GERVINUS (p. 354): Shakespeare delineates his Faulconbridge (and himself in him) rigidly and bitterly enough as a good Protestant in the base treatment of Popish arrogance. In suitable passages he gives full vent to the indignation of the English at Popish rule and intrigue, enroachment and oppression, which at that time was readily listened to in London. But he did not go so far as to make a farce of Faulconbridge's extortions from the clergy; the old piece offered him here a scene in which merry nuns and brothers burst forth from the opened coffers of the 'hoarding abbots,' a scene certainly very amusing to the fresh Protestant feelings of the time, but to our poet's impartial mind the dignity of the clergy, nay even the contemplativeness of cloister-life, was a matter too sacred for him to introduce it in a ridiculous form into the seriousness of history.

FULLOM (p. 60): We may leave controversialists to decide whether the poet's father was brought up in the tenets of the old Church; but as he must have been born after the secession of England in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and grew up in that of Edward the Sixth, the probability is that he was reared in the doctrines of the Reformation. At any rate, he was a zealous adherent of the Protestant faith under Elizabeth. One of the first acts of the new reign required all municipal authorities to take the oath of supremacy, and this was done by John Shakespeare, as he was appointed successively to the offices of constable, chamberlain, alderman, and bailiff of Stratford. There is even proof that he was something of a

fanatic, for in 1564 the chamberlain's accounts record that he paid two shillings for the defacement of 'an image in the chapel.' But, after all, it is not with the creed of John, but with that of William Shakespeare that we are concerned. Of him we know he was born under a Protestant sovereign, baptized in a Protestant church, and educated in a Protestant school. It is true that he shows himself versed in the Roman Catholic divinity; and the fact of his making a Catholic discourse of penance and absolution, unction and purgatory, exactly as a Roman Catholic should, is alleged as a proof that these doctrines were his own. We might as well infer that he was a believer in Jove, because his pagan characters profess paganism. Evidence against him is found in his very charity, and it is thought conclusive that he was of the old faith, because he not only abstains from reviling Catholics on account of their religion, but even presents monks and priests in the garb of humanity, when it was the fashion of the day to regard them as monsters. But, though free from religious bigotry, and untainted with sectarian bitterness, Shakespeare never leaves us in doubt as to his religious predilections. These are not to be gleaned from isolated sentiments, but from the whole development of the characters he presents—characters so complete that, like persons in real life, they pass before us again and again ere their points are apparent, as if they were endued with the power of keeping them out of sight. The monk's cowl is even worn so close that it hides his nature from himself as well as others, so that he is not conscious of the little traits that creep out. The delicate touch is spread through the action, as in real life, and scrutiny is required to see that what has captivated us by a general resemblance is natural in every lineament. Such is the character of Friar Laurence, who wins our respect by his benevolence, and our love by his gentleness, but who, on closer acquaintance, will be found wanting as a Christian priest. Not only is God not in all his thoughts; He is not in his thoughts at all. Thus he is angry with Romeo for his threat of suicide; but instead of pointing out the wickedness of such a design, and reminding him of the Christian duty of endurance, he speaks to him as a man of the world, seeking to reconcile him to life by the advantages it has given him, and by making light of his misfortunes. On another occasion he promises to give him 'armour' to resist his trials, and we might suppose him to have in view 'the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God'—'God's word,' as Shakespeare has it. But all he proffers is

> 'Adversity's sweet milk, philosophy,
> To comfort thee when thou art banished.'

Well may Romeo exclaim 'Hang up philosophy!' While Shakespeare marks the Christian character so faintly in his model friar, he presents no trace of it in his Romish prelates, those wondrous creations which we may call the hierarchy of the drama. The sleek insolence of Pandulph, the restless treason of Scroop, the 'monstrous life' of Beaufort, who 'dies and makes no sign,' all attest his antagonism to the old church. Even his favourite Wolsey, a butcher's son like himself, does not remember his holy calling till his fall, and then but to tell how he had neglected it—

> 'Oh Cromwell! Cromwell!
> Had I but served my God with half the zeal
> I served my King, he would not in mine age
> Have left me naked to mine enemies.'

But he is careful to throw the halo of sanctity over Wolsey's end—

'——To add greater honour to his age
Than man could give him, he dies fearing God.'

In contrast with types of the old priesthood, Cranmer, accused by the fierce Gardiner of filling the realm with 'new opinions,' is portrayed as a saint, and vested with the attributes of a prophet. No provocation exhausts his patience, and he preserves his meekness and humility under every affront. In the darkest peril he trusts for deliverance from his enemies to 'truth and honesty,' and, above all, to God. As we mark his demeanour, as we hear his words, the inspiration is obvious, and testifies as much to Shakespeare's creed as his own. But, in truth, Shakespeare needs no witness: he speaks for himself. On the great dogmas of the ancient church he has unmistakably pronounced. Absolution he utterly rejects, deriding those who

'Purchase corrupted pardon of a man
Who in that sale, sells pardon from himself.'

He denies the supremacy of the Pope, and contemns his spiritual powers. He ridicules the notion that there is miraculous virtue in the shrines of saints, and brings forward Saunder Simpcox to show what tricks were practised at those resorts to keep up their odour and repute. The varying emotions of King Henry in this scene form, indeed, a sermon of themselves, breathing such exquisite piety, such confiding faith, such fervent adoration. Even in delivering rebukes Shakespeare does not lay aside his excellent gift of charity. The childlike credulity of the gentle king, which disposes him to believe the miracle before he hears the report of it, is wrapped in the beautiful mantle of devotion—

'Good fellow, tell us here the circumstance,
That we for thee may glorify the Lord.'

And we are taught that holiness may exist in every creed by his burst of heartfelt worship, in which all sects may join—

'Now God be praised that, to believing souls,
Gives light in darkness, comfort in despair.'

Nor will the poet allow the exposure of the trick to bring any humiliation on the king, but, by a master-stroke of art, makes it draw out his piety and turn to the glory of Heaven—

'O God! see'st thou this, and bear'st so long!'

The old Church sealed up the Bible; Shakespeare is for having it open, declaring that where it is read 'God shall be truly known.' He thought no evidence so strong as 'proof of Holy Writ.' His sentiments, his imagery, his very language prove that he searched the scriptures. Cranmer's prophecy over Elizabeth is a paraphrase of the prophetic vision of Balaam. The noble words of the sacred Historian lose none of their effect in the version of Shakespeare—

'In her days every man shall eat in safety
Under his own vine, what he plants.'

Nor is the sublime exclamation of Isaiah, 'how art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning,' unworthily rendered by Wolsey—

'And when he falls, he falls like Lucifer,
Never to hope again.'

The Psalms lend their poet the noblest passage—'Who maketh the clouds his chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind,' which is put into the mouth of Romeo—

'When he bestrides the lazy-pacing clouds,
And sails upon the bosom of the air.'

But we will not multiply examples; the works of Shakespeare abound with such passages, and indeed no poet has borrowed from the Scriptures to the same extent, as none could borrow with the same effect. It is true that the blemish common to our literary partriarchs attaches to him, in his too familiar mention of the Deity. The practice had become conventional with our poets from the time of Gower and Chaucer, and this association of the holiest of names with the grossest ribaldry not only failed to shock the ear, but was looked upon as a natural mode of speech. Its prevalence would not excuse Shakespeare if he had merely yielded to the fashion of the time. But he aimed to represent nature as it stood, in all its aspects, even, as he says, in its deformity, that, in the mirror which he held up, vice might be frightened by its own features. He attained his object, but the means, judged by modern ideas, are not sanctified by the end; and it is only when we recall the license around him—the general corruption which he so loudly condemns—that his comparative purity can be appreciated. The most thoughtless must be struck with Shakespeare's religious consistency—his true catholic views of Christian duty and practice, maintained through so many changes and so many temptations; for he had not only to rise superior to the sectarian spirit of the time, but to pass through lights and shades seductive to a poetic and perilous to a speculative mind. In his boyhood, the monasteries and convents that had covered the land were but just broken up; as yet their walls were memorials, not ruins, and the country round preserved the vestiges of their rule. The eye might still rest on old abbeys, where the finger of monkish art was traceable in delicate stone-work. Shakespeare heard of the shows and processions, the festivals and holidays, which had overgrown the ancient church like ivy, and what looked rank when close, he might think picturesque in the distance. His imagination recalled the trains of pilgrims who visited the famous shrines of Canterbury and St. Albans, and Chaucer helped him to throw over them the hues of romance. A period more recent, almost within his own life, inspired more serious and deeper feelings. From his mother's lips he heard her experiences of the reign of Mary, and in the speech of Glendower seems to allude to the luminous appearances in the sky, which the people had supposed to be a supernatural reflection of the martyr fires—

'The front of heaven was full of fiery shapes,
Of burning cressets.'

What a rebuke to the fanatics of all sects in the retort of Paulina to Leontes:

'It is an heretic that makes the fire,
Not she which burns in 't.'

Even Shylock is made to reprove the intolerance of the age: 'Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions; fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is?' In Shakespeare's eyes, religion was too sacred a thing to be made an object of contention. The strife of creeds swept away, indeed, the noblest spirits of the age on

both sides, making them forget that the first injunction of Christianity is for men to love one another; but while the English people were kept in a ferment by a succession of religious convulsions, such as the struggle between the Huguenots and Roman Catholics in France, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the heroic stand of the Reformers in Holland, the persecution of the Protestants in Germany, the attempted invasion of England, and, lastly, the Gunpowder Plot, the poet, whose life was hedged in by all these events, still preached kindness to all men. Self-denial, forgiveness of injuries, integrity, forebearance, purity of life, and practical piety are the doctrines he always calculates:

> 'Love thyself last, cherish those hearts that hate thee;
> Corruption wins not more than honesty;
> Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace
> To silence envious tongues. Be just, and fear not;
> Let all the ends thou aim'st at be
> Thy God's and truth's.'

The works of Shakespeare keep perpetually before us a sense of God's presence —almost as much as the works of nature, of which they are the reflection. The appeals for His protection, the testimonies to His mercy, and the recognitions of His providence, occur, indeed, so frequently, that they must have been a leading thought in the poet's mind in the musings of his study. It would seem as if he looked out from this little chamber, as from an observatory, in the silence of the night, on the world, the heavens, and the universe, and learnt from them the littleness of man, the greatness of God. These are the images he presents to us, impresses upon us, and takes as the text of all his pleadings. They are not used to excite terror, but to humble, admonish, and melt us. He speaks to us as 'little children'; for, in the illumination of his mind, he retains his child's heart, as natural, as genuine, and as innocent in his latter as his early life. And the whole burden of his doctrine is to be charitable, to be forgiving, and to meekly follow the steps of our Great Examplar:

> 'Alas; alas!
> Why all the souls that were, were forfeit once,
> And he that might the 'vantage best have took,
> Found out the remedy: how would you be
> If He which is the top of judgment, should
> But judge as you are? Oh, think on that,
> And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
> Like man new made.'

SNIDER (ii, 306): The old play of *King John*, which Shakespeare probably took as the foundation of the present work, is full of Protestant rancor and one-sidedness. But here each element is given in its validity as well as in its adequacy. The result is curious: Shakespeare has been claimed to be both a Catholic and a Protestant, but he is neither; he is the Poet who sees in every great struggle two conflicting principles, each of which has its truth and its error, its right and wrong, yet one of which is supreme. His oath to his genius is: I shall show both sides as they are, by the eternal Gods. No doubt here is witnessed the same contest logically which is known in History as the Reformation. That movement was a protest of Conscience, Family, and State against the crushing formalism of the Church. The result of it was that it established, in a part of Europe, at least, the subordination

of Church to state; it justified the family by abolishing celibacy; it generally upheld the right of private judgment in regard to matters of conscience. But, on the other hand, the Church is not without its serious weakness. The Poet has taken the precaution to throw the struggle into a period long antecedent to the Reformation, and thus exhibit purely the principles at issue, without exciting the blinding passions of theological controversy which the real event would awaken. Nor are the principles confined to Englishmen. King Philip of France is a Protestant, uttering the protest of Conscience in a far higher sense than King John.

WILKES (p. 50): The first of the quotations by Knight looks very formidable; and when I read the above artificial presentation of it I fancied I had run against an insurmountable obstacle to the theory that Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic. But turning to the fountain of the phrase in the body of the text, I found that the quotation had been warped from its true meaning by the critic, and made, by a few accompanying words, to present a proposition which was not the author's. No one could read Knight's presentation of the quotation, along with his unwarranted words, without supposing it was launched not only against the one person addressed, but against all 'those who purchased "Corrupted" pardon of a man,' or without coming to the conclusion that Shakespeare meant to deride and reject the sanctity of that vital principle of the Roman Catholic Church, the rite of confession—and the consequent prerogatives of punishment and absolution. And I really admit that no Roman Catholic writer could ever have permitted himself to do this under any pressure of poetical necessity. But William Shakespeare never did it—never in the plays ascribed to him, at least. The line above quoted by Knight against Shakespeare's Catholicity is addressed by King John to King Philip Augustus of France, and applies to Pandulph, the Legate of the Pope, who had then recently been despatched from Rome to England to demand of King John the immediate appointment of Stephen Langton, the Pope's nominee, to the archbishopric of Canterbury on pain of excommunication; and also to interrogate him (King John) why he had thus far been contumacious to the supreme orders of his Holiness in this respect. Pandulph, in pursuance of this insolent commission, finds John in France, at the head of an English army of invasion, confronting a like array of the French legions under the command of Philip. Seizing the opportunity thus afforded him of making his insolence the more conspicuous, Pandulph, in the presence of the two kings, surrounded by their respective nobles, delivers his arrogant message. The English King is naturally aroused to anger and resistance by this insult, whereupon Shakespeare, through the mouth of John, treats the prelate in the political attitude he had assumed, and makes John speak with the spirit and dignity which became an English king. The practice of 'fitting' his characters is invariable with our poet, and is also in full accordance with dramatic rules and common sense. It is in agreement, likewise, with the practice of other Roman Catholic writers, as may be seen in the treatment given by Dumas to the Cardinals Mazarin and Richelieu. When the churchman sinks his profession in the character of an ambassador he is dealt with as a politician; and when a King (whom, as a king, Shakespeare always worships upon bended knees) abandons himself to crime and despotism he is always, as in the case of Richard III. and of John also, treated as a tyrant and a murderer. In these crimes the assassin sinks the king; as the primate, by his ambition, veils the priest. It was the only method by which the poet could protect his faith from the necessities of history, and consequently the epithets he uses through the mouths of his incensed characters, as 'false priest' and 'meddling

priest,' are only such as are irresistible to anger under any and all circumstances. Shakespeare was too well versed in human nature not to know that an inflamed mind will always assail its enemy where he is most false, and consequently where he is most weak—always preferring an accusation of hypocrisy to any other. But here I prefer to let the text speak to the reader for itself. In the light of these quotations, it becomes obvious that Knight's presentation of the first italicized line, with its inferential words, had the object of making it appear that Shakespeare was deriding and mocking at the sanctity of the rite of confession; and this plain perversion of the author's meaning was, consequently, not only an abuse of the truth, but an insult, by Mr Knight, to the understanding of his readers. The whole scene represents no independent sentiment of Shakespeare as a writer any more than does the language of John, when he orders Hubert to commit murder upon Arthur, represent Shakespeare's sentiments; or than the words of Richard III. represent the poet's principles, when Richard directs the assassination of the Princes in the Tower. But we can perceive by the course of the play of *King John*, where the poet does step in and takes sides; and, when he does make his individual inclinations thus seen, he decides most signally in favour of the Prelate and the Church. He shows that John, on the contrary, cannot withstand its power, but surrenders to it, humbles himself abjectly before the legate, and is finally consigned to an ignominious death. In the scene immediately following the above we find King John, while still in the height of his resentment, giving an order to his creature, Faulconbridge, to hasten to England, and ransack and plunder the monasteries. At the opening of Act V. we find that King John, unable to contend any longer, even in his own dominions, against the power of the Pope, makes absolute submission and resigns his crown, in order that he may undergo the humiliation of receiving it back from his haughty hands and of holding it subject to his breath. Here the Pope's Legate finishes with John. Now let us see what luck the poet assigns Pandulph, in his assumptions of Papal supremacy over the King of France. Carrying out his contract with King John, Pandulph next appears before the French forces, which, under the charge of Lewis the Dauphin, have invaded England, and are lying in camp near St. Edmundsbury. The Legate then curses the other side, whereupon the fight takes place, and the French, as becomes them, under the effect of Pandulph's new anathema, get the worst of it; but King John is led from the field sick during the middle of the mêlée and retires to Swinstead Abbey in the neighborhood. In the following scene his approaching death is described, and the lines—'The king I fear is poisoned by a monk' and 'A monk, I tell you, a resolved villain'—are those which the Protestant biographers stoutly rely upon to show that Shakespeare could not have been a Roman Catholic. The monk who did this deed had evidently prepared himself to carry out Pandulph's curse of excommunication, and also to revenge John's sacrilegious plunder of the monasteries. In those days of the absence of newspapers, this monk doubtless had not been informed of the very recent pardon of John by Pandulph, and therefore, instead of being regarded as 'a resolved villain,' as Hubert, King John's minion, naturally terms him, he would be esteemed by the faithful for this brave devotion of himself, as being worthy rather of 'canonization' (which, indeed, was promised by Pandulph) and a high place 'among the glorious company of the apostles' than of harsh terms, or any form of condemnation whatsoever. That the monk had long been 'resolved' in his purpose of poisoning the King, and to that extent was 'a resolved villain,' is evident from the fact that it must have cost him much time and considerable court influence to become 'taster' to his Majesty, as a preliminary to the glorious canonization

which he expected, for carrying out the orders of the Legate, at the expense of his own life.

BOWDEN (p. 120): *The Troublesome Raigne of King John*, the original of Shakespeare's play, was composed like that of Bale, to glorify Protestantism and vilify the ancient faith. Shakespeare, in adapting it, had only to leave untouched its virulent bigotry and its ribald stories of friars and nuns to secure its popularity, yet as a fact he carefully excludes the anti-catholic passages and allusions, and acts throughout as a rigid censor on behalf of the church. This we proceed to show. First, then, in the defiant speeches above quoted he omits the Tudor claim of spiritual and temporal supremacy, and the gruesome threat of chopping heads off after the manner of Henry VIII. 'As I am king so will I reign next under God. Supreme head over both Spiritual and Temporal. And he that contradicts me in this, I'll make him hop headless.' Again, he suppresses John's contemptuous reply to the excommunication. 'So Sir, the more the fox is curst the better it fares; if God bless me and my land, let the Pope and his shavelings curse and spare not'; and also his declared purpose of despoiling the monasteries, 'rousing the lazy lubbers (the monks) from their cells,' and sending them as prisoners to the Pope. In Shakespeare's play King John makes no reply to the prelate after the excommunication is pronounced, and is singularly silent till he threatens Philip at the close of the scene. The excommunication itself, however, is taken by Hunter and others as conclusive proof of Shakespeare's Protestantism. It runs thus:

> 'And blessed shall he be that doth revolt
> From his allegiance to an heretic;
> And meritorious shall that hand be called,
> Canonised and worshipped as a saint,
> That takes away by an secret course
> Thy hateful life'—(III, i.).

These words, we admit, at first sight seem difficult to reconcile with the theory of Shakespeare's religious opinions which we are defending. For here is Pandulph, the Legate himself, who is giving utterance to the very doctrines attributed to the Church by its enemies. Nor is it any answer to say that the speech was in substance in the old play, for our point has been that Shakespeare, in so far as he follows the original piece, uniformly expurgates it of any anti-Catholic virus. Why then, while rejecting so much which was particularly agreeable to the Protestant audiences of the time, did he allow this one passage to remain? First, then, it might, we think, be urged that a regard to his personal safety prompted the inclusion of the speech in question. His play of *Richard II.* had already, as we have seen, been condemned as treasonable, and though Hayward was in that instance the victim, might not Shakespeare himself be the next victim, if he left no Protestant sentiment to satisfy the royal sensitiveness? Such a motive is, indeed, unworthy of a bold and fearless champion of the Faith; but we have neither regarded nor represented Shakespeare in such a light, but rather as one who, whatever his convictions, was desirous, as far as possible, of avoiding any suspicion of recusancy. That he did flatter Elizabeth at times there seems no doubt. The imperial votaress who eludes Cupid's arrow and

> 'Passes on
> In maiden meditation, fancy free,'

is universally understood of her if the comma be omitted the line might bear, as Simpson suggests, the very different sense of a mind free alike from maiden meditation or thoughts of honourable marriage. In any case, that Shakespeare's conscience reproached him at times with being guilty of flattery and falsehood appears from his confession—

> 'I have sworn thee fair, and thought thee bright,
> Who art as black as Hell, as dark as night.'—*Sonnet* cxlvii.

But yet another motive for the insertion of Pandulph's speech suggests itself. Might not his words represent Shakespeare's own feeling with regard to Elizabeth? The lawfulness of tyrannicide was advocated in the sixteenth century by individuals of every creed, and, though on entirely different grounds, by Protestants of every shade, as well as by some Catholics. Melanchthon, the German Reformer, advocated it in the case of Henry VIII.; Goodman, the Puritan Divine, in case of Mary Tudor; and John Kanus, the Calvanist apostle, in that of that 'Jezebel' Mary Stuart. Some Catholics, as Catesby, Gresham, Digby, Fawkes, the perpetrator of the Gunpowder Plot, were of a similar opinion in the case of James. What then was Elizabeth in Shakespeare's judgment? In the eyes of his kinsfolk, friends, and associates she was illegitimate, excommunicate, an usurping, cruel tyrant. Nor would his reiterated condemnation of rebellion in theory, as fatal to its perpetrators and disastrous in its results, hinder his having the warmest sympathy with those who pursued such a line of action. Before the poet's mind, at the thought of Elizabeth, would have arisen a vision of victims more numerous than the spectres which haunted the last moments of Richard III. Arden and Somerville, his connections; Francis Throckmorton, so cruelly tortured; Babington and Tichborne, his friends and associates; Mary Stuart, whose shameful death is, according to Simpson, represented in that of Arthur in this very play; Essex, his leader; all these and many others would arise and cry for vengeance. Did he hear their voice? We know not. But it is significant that it is a 'Blessed spirit' from the other world who lays upon Hamlet the command to put to death the incestuous, usurping king, as a solemn judicial act of retributive justice; and Brutus, the slayer of Cæsar, is admittedly the noblest character in that play. May not Richmond's description of Richard III. be really Shakespeare's judgment on the 'virgin queen'?

> 'A bloody tyrant and a homicide;
> One rais'd in blood, and one in blood establish'd;
> One that made means to come by what he hath,
> And slaughtered those that were the means to help him:
> A base foul stone, made precious by the foil
> Of England's chair, where he is falsely set;
> One that hath ever been God's enemy:
> Then if you fight against God's enemy,
> God will in justice, ward you as His soldiers;
> If you do sweat to put a tyrant down,
> You sleep in peace, the tyrant being slain.'

If these were the poet's own feelings with respect to Elizabeth, they would gain weight by being spoken by a prelate whom Shakespeare portrays as a man of dignity and worth. In any case, the two interpretations suggested may have had the double purpose of securing the poet's personal safety, and of expressing to those who knew him his own personal condemnation of the Tudor queen. In the same

scene Pandulph calls on King Philip to break with John, and declares the alliance sworn with him void, but not, as in the old play, because 'the oath was made with a heretic.' This popular calumny against Catholic doctrine Shakespeare utterly repudiates, and instead he substitutes a careful, accurate, and detailed disquisition on the obligations of an oath, drawn out according to the Church's teaching. An oath is invalid, Pandulph says, when it is contrary to a former oath, or to a prior moral obligation. . . . After his victory over the French, John in the old play pours a flood of jeers and invectives over the 'mischievous Priest in Italy who calls himself Christ's Vicar' and is now hard at work with Dirges, Masses, Octaves, and Requiems, to assuage the flames of Purgatory for those who have fallen in battle. To this succeeds a round of abuse of those princes who 'formerly bore the yoke of the servile priest,' and in foolish piety submitted to the See of Rome. Shakespeare simply cuts out all this. Again he turns with disgust from the filthy cloister scenes, and the finding of the nun Alice in the Abbot's treasure-chest, though all this was, as Gervinus says, 'certainly very amusing to the fresh Protestant feelings of the time.' The old play makes Pandulph a hypocrite and a Macchiavellian simply because he is a Catholic prelate. In Shakespeare he appears as an experienced, far-sighted statesman, but also as a ghostly Father, full of sympathy for the afflicted. . . . In his speech to the Dauphin the Cardinal shows his political foresight, and his knowledge of the ways of Providence in the conduct of human affairs. The lost battle and Arthur's imprisonment do not deceive him. He knows 'that while warm life plays in that infant's veins' John cannot enjoy a peaceful moment. . . . The Church's curse was believed in the Middle Ages to be no idle threat. The Divine vengeance might be delayed, and when it came it might be accomplished not by any direct supernatural intervention, but by what seemed natural means; still its fulfilment was none the less certain. Shakespeare knew this—

> 'It is not so with Him that all things knows,
> As 'tis with us that spare our guess by shows:
> But most it is presumption in us, when
> The help of heaven we count the act of men.'
> —*All's Well that Ends Well*, II, i.

The prophecy of the Five Moons is stripped of its anti-Papal interpretation, and again, when John seeks reconciliation with the Pope, he addresses the Legate in variance with the old play, without prejudice to his kingly dignity.

> 'Thus have I yielded up into your hand
> The circle of my glory.'

Whereupon Pandulph gives him back the crown, with these words:

> 'Take again
> From this my hand, as holding of the Pope,
> Your sovereign greatness and authority.'

It is no less instructive to remark the poet's representation of Faulconbridge. In the older play he rails at the Pope and the Legate, he discovers the scandals and ludicrous scenes in the monasteries, and is never wearied of declaiming against the arrogance and greed of Rome. In Shakespeare he is represented, indeed, as ready to levy contributions on the monasteries.

> 'Bell, book, and candle shall not drive me back
> When gold and silver beck me to come on.'

He is a reckless, careless soldier, but he is not a Protestant bigot. On the contrary, instead of expressing indignant contempt—as he does in the old play—at John's submission to the Legate, by which 'friars are made kings, and kings friars,' Faulconbridge looks upon Pandulph as the friend of England and an honourable peacemaker. . . . The death of John marks the final contrast between the two plays. In the older piece the monk obtains the Abbot's blessing for murdering the king. John dies ascribing all his miseries to his submission to the Pope, and the Bastard stabs the Abbot. In Shakespeare's play the murderer, 'the resolved villain,' is alluded to in one line; and the Bastard, instead of expressing indignation at the crime, seems rather to see it in the punishment of a just God, and prays—

> 'Withhold thine indignation, mighty Heaven,
> And tempt us not to bear above our power!'

Finally, John dies, not a defiant prophet cursing Rome, but desolate and despairing, his torments intensified by the impotent sympathy of his friends. . . . In the Epilogue Shakespeare suppresses a final hit at the Pope, which concludes the old play, and terminates with the stirring words of the true patriot Faulconbridge—

> 'Naught shall make us rue
> If England to itself do rest but true!'

Having now compared the two plays, we can judge of their respective application. The moral of the old play was, that as David was the forerunner of Solomon, so John began the noble work which was to be fully accomplished by the more worthy hands of his descendent Henry VIII,

> 'Whose arms shall reach unto the Gates of Rome
> And with his feet tread down the strumphet's pride,
> That sits upon the Chair of Babylon.'

And the play was intended to keep alive the burning hatred of Popery, as was the account of the same transactions in the 'Homilies.' With Shakespeare all this disappears; in his hands the play becomes a moral and political essay on the events and questions of his time. The slaying of Arthur is closely parallel to that of Mary, Queen of Scots; John, like Elizabeth, first suggests, then commands the deed, afterwards feigns horror at its accomplishment and repudiates the perpetrators. John disowned Hubert as Elizabeth did Davison, though in both cases the order for the murder was given under the royal hand and seal. In fact, Sir Amyas Paulett, the governor of Fotheringay, knowing his mistress's way, refused to carry out Mary's execution till he had Elizabeth's warrant for the same, which angered her much and she complained of him as a 'dainty precise fellow' for his insistence. Again, Philip's disinclination after the loss of Angiers to prosecute the war till the prospect of Arthur's death opens his son's claim to the English crown, resembles the delay of Philip II. of Spain to make any serious attack on England till Mary Stuart's death made the Infanta or Duke of Parma possible claimants for the English throne. Louis's intended slaughter of his allies, the English rebel nobles, finds a parallel in the reported intention of the Duke of Medina Sidonia, Commander of the Armada, who declared that, once landed in England, all Catholics and heretics should be one to him, his sword would not discern them! so that he might make way for his master. But Shakespeare's *King John* extends beyond historical parallels and discusses principles. In the case of an usurping ruler, who is to decide between him and the nation what power has commission,

'From the supernal Judge, that stirs good thoughts
In any breast of strong authority
To look into the blots and stains of right'? (II, i.).

And the answer is found not in the alliance of princes which dissolve when

'That smooth-faced gentleman, tickling Commodity,
Commodity, the bias of the world,'

insinuates the prospect of gain to any of the contracting parties—but as we think with Raich, in the action of the Legate. Here we disagree with Mr Simpson, who thinks the play teaches, among other lessons, the futility of Papal interference in national disputes. We know that Pandulph is regarded generally as being also a slave to commodity, and of changing sides merely as suited the interests of the church. No doubt those interests were first with him, but with them were bound up the claims of justice and right and the liberties of the people. He is allied with France to enforce John to submit, but on John's submission he orders, as he was bound, the Dauphin to withdraw his invading force. His mission is completely successful. England is reconciled to the Church, France and England are friends again, the rebel nobles are pardoned, the rightful heir to the English throne, and all this is effected by the offices of the Legate and the action of Faulconbridge, the typical Englishman, of whom the poet is so fond. Shakespeare, then, on our view appears to have thought that the appeal to an international tribunal in the person of the Pope was not without its advantages; that the disputes between people and rulers, or between rival sovereigns, found safer, speedier, and more equitable adjustment when settled by a recognised arbitrator, himself the common head of Christendom, than when decided between the contending parties themselves by rebellion or war.

H. G. Beeching (Bullen's *Stratford Sh.*, vol. x, p. 346): Shakespeare omits all the ribald abuse of monks and nuns, which is a prominent feature of the earlier play; he omits also such fine Tudor sentiments as this: 'As I am King so will I reign next unto God, Supreme Head both over Spiritual and Temporal; and he that contradicts me in this, I will make him hop headless.' But while Shakespeare refuses to make of his play a mere Protestant tract, can it be said that he reveals it in any sympathy with the papal cause? If the character of the Legate Pandulph is made less of a caricature, is it made any more attractive? Prof. Herford seems to hit the mark exactly when he says of the two plays: 'The earlier dramatist treats the crafty legate with malignant hatred, as a curse happily evaded; the latter manages him with fine irony as the wielder of an imposing but not really formidable authority, easily rendered innocuous, incapable of injuring a people true to themselves.' Shakespeare had enough respect for historical versimilitude not to antedate by some three centuries the English nobles, even Faulconbridge, as disrespectful to a Cardinal legate. But is it credible that any Roman Catholic dramatist would have allowed Pandulph to play so ignominious a part as Shakespeare has assigned him? After John has made his submission, Pandulph says (V, i, 20):

'It was my breath that blew this tempest up,
Upon your stubborn usage of the Pope:
But, since you are a gentle convertite,
My tongue shall hush again this storm of war,
And make fair weather in your blustering land.

On this Ascension-day, remember well,
Upon your oath of service to the Pope,
Go I to make the French lay down their arms.'

But the next scene shows him quite powerless to fulfil his boast. Earlier in the play we have John's defiance of the Pope, which contains the lines—

'And from the mouth of England
Add this much more,—that no Italian priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions';

and following on this the solemn excommunication:

'Then by the lawful power that I have.'

'Thou shalt stand cursed and excommunicate;
And blessed shall he be that doth revolt
From his allegiance to a heretic:
And meritorious shall that hand be called,
Canonized and worshipped as a saint,
That takes away by any secret course
Thy hateful life.'

As to the second of these passages Mr Bowden urges that it represents the poet's own feelings toward Elizabeth; in which case it must be reckoned a very undramatic expression of them, for the speech would have aroused no sympathy in the audience, who still had occasion to remember Pius V's bull of depotism. But there is no evidence at all that Shakespeare detested the Queen, while *Sonnet* 124 is evidence that he detested the ultramontane policy. The first passage Mr Bowden considers a concession to protestant sentiment, prompted by the dramatist's concern for his own safety. But in that case, one asks why he should have meddled with the subject of King John at all, which obliged him to please his audience by affronting his own conscience. Alternatively, Mr Bowden argues that as King John was a villain, he must not be held to express the sentiments of the dramatist. But Shakespeare is always careful to make it plain to the audience when he does not agree with his villains. Has the audience any doubt as to the dramatist's opinion about John's treatment of Arthur? Hubert's conduct and the Barons' revolt are commentary enough. But when John defies Pandulph, he does so 'from the mouth of England,' and no English voice is roused in protest at the time or afterwards. These are very elementary considerations; but Mr Bowden's special pleading recognises no principle of criticism, even the most elementary.

STAGE HISTORY

From 1598, when *King John* is mentioned by Meres, down to the closing of the theatres in 1642, we have no record of a stage performance of Shakespeare's tragedy; even after the restoration it is not until 1737 that we find any account of its revival. At that time Cibber offered his adaptation of the play to the managers of Drury Lane Theatre; in reference to this Davies (*Dramatic Miscell.*, i, 5) says: 'So much was said, and with propriety, by the critics who wrote against Cibber in the public prints, in commendation of Shakespeare's *K. John*, that Mr Rich very wisely de-

termined to take the hint, and resolved to revive the long-forgotten tragedy. The principal parts, if I can trust my memory, were thus divided: King John, Mr Delane; the Bastard, Tom Walker (the original Macheath); Hale acted the King of France, and Ryan Cardinal Pandulph; Lady Constance by Mrs Hallam. *King John* was acted several nights with great applause; but the king was not remarkably well represented by Delane; he could not easily assume the turbulent and gloomy passions of the character.'—[Malone and Genest give the time and place of this performance: Covent Garden Theatre, February 26, 1737.—ED.]

FLEAY (*Introduction*, p. 10): Unless we are several years wrong in the date, this play must have been produced at the Curtain Theatre in Shoreditch, where *Romeo and Juliet* was also performed in 1596. The following actors were playing in the Chamberlain's Company in 1594–98: 1. John Duke; 2. Christopher Beeston; 3. John Sinkler; 4. Thomas Pope; 5. Augustine Phillips; 6. Richard Burbadge; 10. John Hemings; 11. Robert Cough; 12. Richard Pallant; 13. William Shakespeare. I shall not attempt to cast their parts, but believe that anyone with experience in stage representations could do it without much difficulty, and with considerable approximation to the truth.

[The following list of performances is taken from Genest.—ED.]

Covent Garden.	May 27, 1737.	(Tenth time.)
" "	Sept. 16, 1737.	(Opening night of season.)
" "	March 2, 1738.	
" "	Nov. 29, 1738.	
" "	March 8, 1739.	
" "	Oct. 22, 1739.	
" "	April 2, 1741.	
Drury Lane.	Feb. 20, 1745,	*King John*...Garrick (first time); *Bastard*... Delane; *Hubert*...Berry; *Pandulph*.... Macklin; *Constance*...Mrs Cibber.
" "	Feb. 22, 1745.	
" "	March 2, 1745.	(Eighth time.)
Covent Garden.	Feb. 23, 1750,	*King John*...Quin; *Faulconbridge*...Barry (first time); *Constance*...Mrs Cibber.
" "	April 25, 1751,	*Constance*...Mrs Woffington.
Drury Lane.	March 16, 1754.	
Covent Garden.	April 17, 1758,	*King John*...Sparks; *Faulconbridge*...Barry; *Constance*...Mrs Bellamy (first time).
" "	Dec. 9, 1760,	*King John*...Sparks; *Bastard*...Smith; *Constance*...Mrs Ward.
Drury Lane.	Dec. 17, 1760,	*King John*...T. Sheridan; *Bastard*...Garrick; *Constance*...Mrs Yates (first time).
" "	Dec. 23, 1760.	(By his Majesty's command.)
" "	April 2, 1761.	(Same cast as on Dec. 17, 1760.)
Covent Garden.	Dec. 21, 1764,	*King John*...Ross; *Bastard*...Smith; *Constance*...Mrs Bellamy.
Drury Lane.	March 20, 1766,	*King John*...Powell (first time); *Bastard*... Holland (first time); *Constance*...Mrs Yates.
Covent Garden.	May 6, 1766,	*King John*...Ross; *Bastard*...Smith; *Constance*...Mrs Bellamy.

Covent Garden.	Oct. 31, 1766,	*Pandulph*...Walker.
Drury Lane.	Feb. 7, 1767.	
Covent Garden.	May 28, 1767.	
" "	Sept. 23, 1767.	
" "	May 3, 1769.	
Theatre Royal, Liverpool.	July 19, 1773,	*King John*...Wroughton; *Bastard*...Palmar; *Constance*...Mrs Mattocks.
Covent Garden.	Dec. 1, 1775,	*King John*...T. Sheridan; *Constance*...Mrs Barry.
" "	Dec. 15, 1775.	
Theatre Royal, Bath.	Nov. 14, 1776,	*King John*...Henderson; *Bastard*...Dimond; *Constance*...Miss Mansell.
Drury Lane.	Nov. 29, 1777,	*King John*...Henderson.
Covent Garden.	March 29, 1783,	*King John*...Henderson.
Drury Lane.	Dec. 10, 1783,	*King John*...Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Siddons (first time).
" "	Dec. 16, 1783.	(Same cast.)
Covent Garden.	Jan. 16, 1784.	
Drury Lane.	March 1, 1792,	*King John*...Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
" "	Feb. 12, 1793.	
Theatre Royal, Bath.	July 1, 1793,	*Prince Arthur*...Miss Murray (her first appearance on any stage).
Drury Lane	March 14, 1795.	(Same cast as March 1, 1792.)
" "	Nov. 20, 1800,	*King John*...Kemble; *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Powell.
" "	May 13, 1801,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons (last time of her performing this season—she had acted *Constance* about six times).
Theatre Royal, Bath.	Feb. 10, 1801.	
" " "	April 18, 1801,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
Drury Lane.	Jan. 1 and 4,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
Covent Garden.	Feb. 14, 1804,	*King John*...Kemble; *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
" "	May 12, 1810.	(Same cast as Feb. 14, 1804.)
" "	June 25, 1810.	
" "	Oct. 27, 1810.	
" "	Sept. 25, 1811,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
" "	April 18, 1812,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons.
" "	June 8, 1812,	*Constance*...Mrs Siddons (being her final appearance in that character. She retired from the stage on the 29th).
Theatre Royal, Bath.	Dec. 1, 1812,	*King John*...Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Weston.
Covent Garden.	Dec. 8, 1814,	*King John*...Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Faucit.
" "	Dec. 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, 1816.	*King John*...Kemble; *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Constance*...Miss O'Neill (first time).
" "	April 22, 1817,	*King John*...Kemble.

Covent Garden.	June	14, 1817, *King John*...Kemble (his final appearance in that character. He retired from the stage on the 23d).
" "	Dec.	17, 1817, *King John*...Young; *Constance*...Miss O'Neill.
Drury Lane.	June	1, 1818, *King John*...Kean; *Faulconbridge*...Wallack; *Constance*...Miss Macauley.
Theatre Royal, Bath.	April	17, 1819, *King John*...Young; *Constance*...Mrs Yates.
" " "	Jan.	14, 1822.
Covent Garden.	May	21, 1822, *King John*...Young; *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Hubert*...Macready; *Constance* ...Mrs Faucit.
" "	March	3, 1823, *King John*...Macready (first time); *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Constance*...Mrs Faucit.
" "	Dec.	13, 1824, *Constance*...Mrs Bartley.
Drury Lane.	Dec.	6, 1825, *King John*...Macready; *Faulconbridge*... Wallack; *Constance*...Mrs Bunn (first time); *Blanch*...Miss Smithson.
Covent Garden.	Jan.	15, 1827, *King John*...Young; *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble.
" "	Jan.	22, 1827. (Same cast as on the 15th.)
" "	April	30, 1827.
" "	Oct.	26, 1827.
" "	April	30, 1829, *King John*...Warde.

[Genest's record ends here; the following additional record is compiled from the daily theatrical announcements in *The Tatler*, edited by Leigh Hunt, Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1831.—ED.]

Covent Garden.	March	21, 1831, *Faulconbridge*...C. Kemble; *Constance*... Miss F. Kemble.
" "	March	23 and 24, 1831. (Same cast as on March 21st.)
" "	April	13 and 18, 1831. (Same cast as on March 21st.)
" "	Nov.	16, 1831. (Same cast as on March 21st.)
Drury Lane.	Oct.	24, 1831, *King John*...Macready.

[The following are extracted from Miss Phelps's and Forbes-Robertson's *Life of Samuel Phelps* and Winter's *Shakespeare on the Stage*, 3d series.—ED.]

Drury Lane.	Oct.	24, 1842, *King John*...Macready; *Faulconbridge*...S. Phelps; *Constance*...Miss Faucit. [Presented twenty-six times during season.]
Sadler's Wells.	Sept.	30, 1844, *King John*...S. Phelps; *Faulconbridge*...H. Marston; *Constance*...Mrs Warner. [Presented eighteen times during season.]
Theatre Royal, Manchester.	Nov.	8, 1847, *King John*...G. V. Brooke; *Constance*... Miss Glyn (her first appearance on any stage).
Sadler's Wells.	Feb.	27, 1851, *King John*...S. Phelps; *Faulconbridge*...H. Marston; *Constance*...Miss Glyn.

Princess' Theatre.	Feb.	9, 1852, *King John*...C. Kean; *Constance*...Mrs Kean.
" "	Oct.	17, 1858. (Same cast as on Feb. 9th.)
Drury Lane.	Nov.	4, 1865, *King John*...S. Phelps; *Faulconbridge*...J. Anderson; *Constance*...Miss Atkinson [From opening of season to Christmas.]
" "	Sept.	24, 1866, *King John*...S. Phelps; *Faulconbridge*...B. Sullivan; *Constance*...Mrs Vezin. [From opening of season until middle of October.]
Crystal Palace.	Sept.	19, 1889, *King John*...H. B. Tree; *Faulconbridge*...F. Macklin; *Constance*...Miss Roselle.
Her Majesty's Theatre.	Sept.	20, 1899, *King John*...H. B. Tree; *Faulconbridge*...L. Waller; *Constance*...Julia Neilson.

[The following list of American performances is taken from Seilhamer, Ireland, T. A. Brown, and Winter.—ED.]

AMERICA

Southwark Theatre, Phila.	Dec.	12, 1768, *King John*...Douglass. [First American production.]
John St. Theatre, New York.	Jan.	16, 1769.
" " "	April	27, 1769.
Southwark Theatre, Phila.	Jan.	2, 1770, *King John*...Douglass.
New York Theatre.	April	26, 1773, *King John*...Douglass.
Baltimore Theatre.	Dec.	10, 1782, *King John*...Heard; *Faulconbridge*...Shakespeare; *Constance*...Mrs Wall.
Park Theatre.	March	2, 1798, *King John*...Cooper; *Faulconbridge*...Hodgkinson; *Constance*...Mrs Melmoth.
" "	Sept.	9, 1811, *King John*...G. F. Cooke; *Faulconbridge*...Cooper.
" "	Feb.	—, 1827, *King John*...Macready.
" "	July	26, 1831, *Constance*...Mrs Gilfert.
" "	Oct.	1, 1832, *King John*...Kemble; *Constance*...Miss Kemble.
Bowery Theatre.	April	30, 1834, *King John*...J. B. Booth; *Faulconbridge*...Hamblin; *Constance*...Mrs McClure.
Park Theatre, New York.	Nov.	16, 1846, *King John*...C. Kean; *Constance*...Mrs Kean. [Presented eighteen times.]
Bowery Theatre, New York.	May	14, 1849, *King John*...Hamblin; *Arthur*...T. S. Hamblin (his first appearance).
" " "	Dec.	29, 1856, *King John*...E. L. Davenport; *Constance*...Mrs Davenport.
Broadway Theatre.	May	3, 1865, *King John*...C. Kean; *Constance*...Mrs Kean.
Booth's Theatre.	May	25, 1874, *King John*...J. B. Booth; *Faulconbridge*...J. McCullough; *Constance*...Agnes Booth.

Grand Opera House, Chicago.	Nov. 18, 1907, *King John*...R. B. Mantell; *Constance*...Marie B. Russell.
New Amsterdam Theatre, N. Y.	March 8, 1908, *King John*...Mantell; *Constance*... M. Russell.

WINTER (*Sh. on the Stage*, 3d series, p. 504): No positive, detailed information of any value is obtainable relative to the manner in which the play of *King John* was acted on the early American stage. Douglass no doubt gave an acceptable performance of the King. Cooper was only twenty-two when he first played that part, but he had then been six years on the stage, he had performed the more exacting characters, among others, of Hamlet and Macbeth, and it is probable that he gave a creditable personation; he did not, however, retain *King John* in his ample repertory (264 parts), and a careful search of many old records has not discovered a specific account of his acting of it. He was specially admired for his *Faulconbridge*. Thomas Barry was one of those industrious, patient actors whom Fate ordains to do all things well and nothing greatly, to be faithful to every duty, through a long and toilsome life, and always to remain respected, and poorly rewarded and undistinguished. . . . Barry was long the stage-manager of the old Park Theatre, and when Macready at that house played *King John*, 1827, he was the Faulconbridge. The elder Booth is not extolled for his personation of King John in any of the various records of his remarkable career; but the actor who could portray, as he did, the remorse of Sir Edward Mortimer, and the subtle malignity and demoniac fury of Sir Giles Overreach could not have failed to incarnate the baleful personality and fierce, contending passions of King John. Hamblin, better fitted for characters of light calibre, such as Duke Aranza [Tobin's, *The Honeymoon*] and Petruchio, than for those which require portrayal of tragic conflict and poignant suffering, proved unequal to King John, nor could the Constance of his associate, that powerful actress Mrs Shaw, redeem Brougham's production of the play from precipitate failure. E. L. Davenport, one of the best of actors (so versatile that he charmed the public in parts as various as Hamlet, St Marc, Sir Giles, Damon, and the sailor-boy William), must surely have excelled in King John. His Sir Giles was second to that of only the elder Booth. J. B. Booth, Jr., though heavy and uninteresting as the King, was technically correct. I recall that his presentment of the tragedy was vitalized and made impressive by the dignity, tenderness, and fine art with which Agnes Booth played Constance, and by the manly, humorous, brilliant acting of John McCullough as Faulconbridge. Merriment tinctured with scorn glimmered like sunshine over this latter personation; the manner of it was bluff, the spirit of it was chivalrous, and at moments, with Hubert and with the dying king, it was rightly diffused with deep feeling. Madame Modjeska, who acted Constance, though not often and never in New York, honored me by asking my counsel, before she reviewed *King John*, as to the feasibility of condensing the tragedy. She wished to revive the play solely for the sake of Constance, and, merely to expedite her work and fulfil her desire, as an act of friendship, I made a version of it for her use, omitting the First Act and curtailing the other four. That version, with some modification, she used, but, as it did not remotely indicate what I deem proper treatment of the tragical history, without mention of me as accessory to the barbarous dismemberment. Her object was to concentrate attention on Constance, and that object she accomplished. Her royal demeanour, mournful beauty, and great tenderness of feeling, combined with her beautiful art, made her performance distinguished, lovely, and pathetic. She seems to me to have been better fitted to the

part than any other actress who has appeared since the time of Ristori. Her presentation of the garbled tragedy, however, was foredoomed to practical failure. Constance is not the central figure of the play and cannot be made so.

COSTUME

BOADEN (ii, 62): I preserve the dresses of Mrs Siddons where I find a note of them in my papers: in Constance she wore a black body and train of satin, and a petticoat of white, disposed in certainly the most tasteful forms of the day. The true actress is in everything an artist; the genius before us dishevelled her hair with graceful wildness.

C. KEAN (Acting Edition)

King John.—First dress: Crimson damask gown, with rich jewelled belt; cloth of gold undergown; cloth of gold robe, with jewelled border, lined with green silk, scarlet stockings; black and gold shoes; white jewelled gloves; gold crown richly jewelled; beard and moustache. Second dress: Chain armour, arms, legs, and hood; crimson velvet surcoat, showered with gold; gold waist-belt and sword; plain gold crown; gold spurs; crimson shield, with three gold lions.

Prince Henry.—Scarlet cloth gown, white undergown; blue robe; crimson cap; waist belt.

Arthur.—Light blue velvet gown, showered with gold; cap ditto. Second dress: Tight blue jacket, open in front, showing a white shirt; full breeches, tied below the knee; blue stockings and russet shoes; being the disguise of the sailor boy of the 13th century.

Earl of Salisbury.—Fawn colored gown, tight sleeves, rich waist belt hanging in front; blue cloth robe; red stockings; black pointed-toed shoes, embroidered with gold; white gloves with gold embroidery; red velvet cap with gold; sword.

Other English Nobles.—Same fashion as Salisbury's, varying the colours. All wear beards. Second dress: All in chain armour, with various surcoats and weapons, with their respective arms on their shields.

Philip Faulconbridge.—Buff gown, below the knee edged with blue; with blue hood thrown back; buff stockings, and black pointed shoes. Second dress: Chain mail with yellow surcoat.

Robert Faulconbridge.—Same as first dress of Philip Faulconbridge, but of other colours.

James Gurney.—Dark coloured cloth shirt, with hood thrown back; dark stockings and russet shoes.

Peter of Pomfret.—Long drab shirt, with a dark cloak or scarf; flesh coloured legs and rude sandals; long white hair and beard.

English Herald.—Part-coloured gown of red and blue, with a bag on the right hip, with the three lions of England emblazoned; one stocking red, and the other blue; red hood thrown back, and white wand. Two attendants dressed in a similar manner without wand.

Sheriff of Northamptonshire.—Dark gown with hood, with a gold collar and dagger.

Philip of France.—Rich surcoat.

Chatillon and Attendants.—In first scene dressed in long gowns and cloaks, very richly embroidered, with Phrygian caps, change to armour at close of 3d act.

French Nobles.—In surcoats of various colours, each carrying his arms on shield.

Austria.—A suit of mail armour, with a lion's skin on his back.

French Herald and Attendant.—Same fashion as English, only blue and white.

Cardinal Pandulph.—Scarlet robe.

Queen Elinor.—White long gown, figured with gold, richly jewelled belt, embroidered crimson robe, crown, and cowl.

Constance.—Black velvet dress, embroidered.

Blanch.—Blue long gown flowered with gold, jewelled waist belt, and white veil.

Lady Faulconbridge.—Grey cloth long gown, trimmed with black and gold, black velvet robe, and cowl.

KNIGHT (*Introduction*, p. 8): The effigy of King John in Worcester cathedral, which, by the examination of the body of the monarch, was proved to present a facsimile of the royal robes in which he was interred, affords us a fine specimen of the royal costume of the period. A full robe or supertunic of crimson damask, embroidered with gold, and descending to the mid leg, is girdled around the waist with a golden belt studded with jewels, having a long end pendent in front. An under tunic of cloth of gold descends to the ankles, and a mantle of the same magnificent stuff, lined with green silk, depends from his shoulders; the hose are red, the shoes black, over which are fastened gilt spurs by straps of silk, or cloth, of a light blue colour, striped with green and yellow or gold. The collar and sleeves of the supertunic have borders of gold studded with jewels. The backs of the gloves were also jewelled. A kneeling effigy of Philip Augustus, engraved in Montfaucon, shows the similarity of fashion existing at the same time in France and England. The nobles, when unarmed, appeared to have been attired in the same manner, viz., in the tunic, supertunic, and mantle, with hose, short boots, or shoes, of materials more or less rich according to the means or fancy of the wearer. Cloth, silk, velvet, and gold, and silver tissues, with occasionally furs of considerable value, are mentioned in various documents of the period. A garment called a bliaus (from whence probably the modern French blouse) appears to have been a sort of supertunic or surcoat in vogue about this time; and in winter it is said to have been lined with fur. The common Norman mantle used for travelling, or out-of-door exercise, had a capuchon to it, and was called the capa. A curious mistake has been made by Mr Strutt respecting this garment. In his *Horda Angel Cynan*, vol. ii, p. 67, he states that 'when King John made Thomas Sturmey a knight, he sent a mandamus before to his Sheriffs at Hantshire to make the following preparations: "A scarlet robe, certain close garments of fine linen, and another robe of green, or burnet, with a cap and plume of feathers, &c." The words in the mandamus are "capa ad pluua," a capa, or cloak, for rainy weather.' (Vide *Excerota Historica*; London, Bentley, 1883, p. 393.) The capuchon, or hood, with which this garment was furnished, appears to have been the usual covering for the head; but hats and caps, the former of the shape of the classical Petasus, and the latter sometimes of the Phrygian form, and sometimes flat and round like the Scotch bonnet, are occasionally met with in the twelfth century. The beaux, however, during John's reign, curled and crisped their hair with irons, and bound only a slight fillet round the head, seldom wearing caps, in order that their locks might be seen and admired. The beard was closely shaven, but John and the nobles of his party are said to have worn both beard and moustache out of contempt for the discontented Barons. The fashion of gartering up the long hose, or Norman chausses, sandal-wise prevailed among all classes; and when, on the legs of persons of rank, these bandages are seen of gold stuff, the effect is very gorgeous and picturesque. The dress of the ladies may best be understood from an

examination of the effigies of Elinor, Queen of Henry II, and of Isabella, Queen of King John, and the figure of Blanch of Castile on her great seal. Although these personages are represented in what may be called royal costume, the general dress differed nothing in form, however, it might in material. It consisted of one long full robe or gown, girdled round the waist, and high in the neck, with long tight sleeves to the wrist (in the Sloane MS. above mentioned the hanging cuffs in fashion about forty years earlier appear on one figure); the collar sometimes fastened with a brooch; the head bound by a band or fillet of jewels, and covered with a wimpel or veil. To the girdle was appended, occasionally, a small pouch or aulmoniere. The capa was used in travelling, and in winter pelisses (Pelices, pelisons) richly furred (whence the name) were worn under it. King John orders a grey pelisson with nine bars of fur to be made for the Queen. Short boots, as well as shoes, were worn by the ladies. The King orders four pair of women's boots, one of them to be fretatus de giris (embroidered with circles), but the robe, or gown, was worn so long that little more than the tips of the shoes are seen in illuminations or effigies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the colour is generally black, though there can be no doubt that they were occasionally of cloth of gold or silver richly embroidered. Gloves do not appear to have been generally worn by the females; but, as marks of nobility, when they were worn they were jewelled on the back. The mantle and robe or tunic, of the effigy of Queen Elinor, are embroidered all over with golden crescents. This may have been some family badge, as the crescent and star are seen on the great seal of Richard I, and that monarch is said to have possessed a mantle nearly covered with half moons and orbs of shining silver. The armour of the time consisted of a hauberk and chausses made of leather, covered with iron rings set up edgewise in regular rows, and firmly stitched upon it, or with small overlapping scales of metal like the Lorica squamata of the Romans. The hauberk had a capychon attached to it, which could be pulled over the head or thrown back at pleasure. Under this was sometimes worn a close iron skull-cap, and at others the hood itself was surmounted by a 'chapel de fer,' or a large cylindrical helmet, flattened at the top, the face being defended by a perforated plate or grating, called the 'aventaile' (Avant taille), fastened by screws or hinges to the helmet. A variety of specimens of this early vizored head-piece may be seen on the seals of the counts of Flanders in Olivarius Vredius' History; and the seal of Prince Louis of France (one of the personages of this play) exhibits a large and most clumsy helmet of this description. The seal of King John presents us with a figure of the monarch wearing over his armour the military surcoat as yet undistinguished by blazonry. On his head is either a cylindrical helmet, without the aventaile, or a cap of cloth or fur. It is difficult, from the state of the impressions, to decide which. He bears the knightly shield, assuming at this period the triangular or heart shape, but exceedingly curved or embowed, and emblazoned with the three lions, or leopards, passant regardant, in pale, which are first seen on the shield of his brother, Richard I. The spur worn at this period was the goad or pryck spur, without a rowel. The principal weapons of the knights were the lance, the sword, and the battle-axe. The shape of the sword may be best ascertained from the effigy of King John, who holds one in his hand; the pommel is diamond shaped, and has an oval cavity in the centre for a jewel. The common soldiery fought with bills, long and cross-bows, slings, clubs, and a variety of rude but terrific weapons, such as scythes fastened to poles (the falcastrum), and a sort of a spear, with a hook on one side, called the guisarme. The arbalast, or cross-bow, is said to have been invented in the previous reign, but Wace mentions it as having been known to the Normans

before the conquest. Engines of war, called the mangonell and the petraria, for throwing heavy stones, are mentioned by Guliel. Britto in his *Phillipeis*, 1, 7:

'Interea prossos petraria mittit ab intus
Assidue lapides mangonellusque minores.'

And in the close rolls of John is an order, dated 2d April, 1208, to the Bailiff of Porchester, to cause machines for flinging stones, called petrariae and mangonelli, to be made for the King's service, and to let Drogo de Dieppe and his companions have iron and other things necessary for making of them. Philip sent to his son Louis a military engine, called the malvoisine (bad neighbour), to batter the walls of Dover Castle.

PLANCHE (*Dramatic Costume*, pt i.): 'What the habits, both civil and military, were in the reign of King John, Henry III, and the succeeding ages,' says Camden, 'may better appear by their monuments, old glass windows, and ancient arras, than be found in writers of those times.' 'Silk,' however, he informs us, 'was first brought into use in the reign of Henry II. I mean bombacyna, made by silk worms, which came out of Greece into Sicile, and then into other parts of Christendom, for sericum, which was a doune kembed off from trees among the seres in East India, as byssus was a plant or kind of silk grass, as they now call it, were unknown. There was also a costly stuff at those times here in England, called in Latin aurifrisium, what it was named in English, I know not, neither do imagine it was auriphrygium, and to signify embroidery with gold as opera phrygia were embroideries. Whatsoever it was, much desired it was by the Popes and highly esteemed in Italy.' Strutt tells us that the mantels worn by the Norman monarchs and the principal nobility were made of silk, linen, and of the finest cloths that could be procured, embroidered often with silver and gold, and lined with the most costly furs; they were also in many instances ornamented with fringes and decorated with pearls. We may form some idea of the richness of the mantles in the 12th century from the following extract: 'Robert Black, second Bishop of Lincoln, made a present to Henry Ist of a mantle of exquisitely fine cloth, line with Black sables with white spots, which cost £100 of the money of that time' (equal in value to £1500 of the present money); 'and Richard the Ist. possessed a mantle still more splendid, and probably more expensive, which is said to have been striped in strait lines, adorned with half moons of solid silver, and nearly covered with shining orbs in imitation of the system of the heavenly bodies,' Strutt's *Dress and Habits*, vol. 1. The armour worn during the reign of King John consisted of a cylindrical helmet, a skull cap, and hawberk, or complete suit of mail, and a surcoat of arms; the use of the latter originated, it is believed, with the crusaders, both for the distinguishing of the many different nations serving under the banners of the cross, and to throw a veil over the iron armour, so apt to heat excessively when exposed to the direct rays of the sun. The first instance of an emblazoned surcoat is in the lives of the two Offas, by the hand of Mathew Paris, which cannot be much earlier than 1250, the fashion was not generally prevalent till the commencement of the 14th century; those painted on the monumental effigies of Robert of Normandy and William Longespee appear to have been done long after the tombs were constructed. 'The Queen and other great ladies were cloathed in modest elegant habits, consisting of a loose gown girded around the waist, which reached to the ground, and a vail over their heads. The chief distinction between the married and unmarried ladies appears to be an additional robe over the gown, which hangs down before, not unlike the sacerdotal habit

of a priest.' 'The chief dress of the common people was a short jacket, barely reaching to the knees, girt round the loins. Their heads they covered with a kind of hood.' 'The Normans constantly shaved their beards all over, and did not leave the upper lip unshorn, as the English in the time of the Confessor used to do; therefore, say the old historians, when Harold sent spies to watch motions, and discover the number of Normans, they returned and declared that they had not seen any soldiers, but an army of priests; the priests always holding it indecent to wear beards, and again Mathew Paris tells us that William, the seditious Londoner, in the reign of Richard the First, had the surname cum barba, from his obstinately wearing the beard, in despite of the custom of the Normans, which was to be close shaven.' —Strutt's *Antiquities*. King John and the nobles of his party were, however, exceptions to this general rule.

KING JOHN—First dress. Authority: His effigy, in the choir of Worcester Cathedral.

'This statue is five feet, one inch long; it is carved in Purbeck marble, and was probably made immediately after the Monarch's decease; since as a work of art it is less admirable than the better kind of sculpture, executed later in the 13th century. He is habited in a vest, thickly plaited, which appears to have been formerly (perhaps originally) coloured crimson gold. The coronet, sword, boots, and the lion at his feet, have been all gilt. The coronet, which was inscribed, "Johannes Rex Angliæ," the collar, the back of the gloves, the bordure at the bottom of the sleeves, the handle of the hilt sword, contain shallow concavities, of an elliptical form, in which jewels, or other ornaments, were originally placed, &c.' Wild's Illustrations of the architecture and sculpture of the Cathedral Church of Worcester.

KING JOHN—Second dress. Authorities: His great seal, and the impression of a seal used before he ascended the throne, and affixed to one grant in Sir John Cotton's library; and to two in the chamber of the Duchy of Lancaster, in the latter of which the arms are two lions passant; but, 'when he came to be king' (says Sandford, in his *Genealogical History*) 'he did bear the arms of his brother, King Richard, viz., Gules, three lions passant gardant, Or, for which vide his great seal.'

King John is represented on both seals in a hawberk, with sleeves, and wearing a surcoat—the first instance of that garment being worn by a King of England. In his great seal, the armour is not continued on the legs, as in the one made before his accession, and on the authority of which I have represented it here.. The armour on both seals, in Sandford, seems to be composed of small scales; but, in the new edition of the Foedera, that on his great seal (the only one there given) has more the appearance of rings placed edgewise; a kind of armour which came into general use about the close of King John's reign, and continued to be partially worn till that of Edward I. Either may be worn with propriety; and the minor details are unimportant to the general effect. The conical helmet of the first, and the cylindrical one of the second seal, have been abandoned for the crown and coif des mailles; the latter being equally correct, and far better adapted for representation on the stage or on canvas.

PRINCE HENRY—Authority: An Illumination in a MS. in the Cotton Lib. B. M. marked Vitellius, A, 13, representing the coronation of Henry III, then but nine years old. He is most plainly attired for such a ceremony; and upon comparing his habit with those usually worn by the French princes, and noble youths of the same

age and period, I find little difference, except in the length of the tunic, which I have shortened accordingly.

ELINOR, WIDOW OF HENRY II.—Authority: The queen's effigy, in the Abbey of Fonteveraud.

Montfaucon says, 'Son Manteau est d'un azur fonce, semé de fleurs d'or; sa tunique est blanche, semé de fleurs rouge et d'azur.'

BLANCH OF CASTILE—There are two engravings of this lady in Montfaucon, vol. 2, pl. 17; but they both represent her as Queen of Lewis VIII. Vide Gough's *Sep. Mon.*, vol. 1.

AN ENGLISH NOBLEMAN OF THE 13TH CENTURY in his state dress—Authority: MS. in Bodleian Lib. 86, Arch B.

This costume may be worn by Geoffrey Fitz Peter, Earl of Essex, and all the English nobles in the first scene of this play, the colours being varied at the fancy of the wearer.

WILLIAM, SURNAMED LONGESPEE, OR LONGSWORD, EARL OF SALISBURY—Authorities: Effigy of the earl, on the south side of the nave of Salisbury Cathedral. The jewelled fillet denoting his rank from the effigy of Alveric de Vere, second Earl of Oxford, a nobleman much favoured by King John.—Vide Gough's *Sepulchral Monuments*, vol. 1. The banner in the background quarterly, Gules and Or, in the first a mullett of five points, Argent, for Aubrey or Alveric de Vere, second Earl of Oxford, above mentioned.—Vide Vincent, Yorke, &c.

This William Longespee, so called from a long sword which he usually wore, was the base son of King Henry II. by Rosamond Clifford, commonly called Fair Rosamond. He departed this life in the nones of March, anno 1226, having been poisoned (as it is reported) by Hubert de Burgo, Earl of Kent. He bore the arms of his father-in-law, William Fitz-Patrick, Earl of Salisbury, viz., Azure, six lions rampant, Or, 3, 2, and 1.—Vide *Sanford's Geneal. Hist.*

WILLIAM MARESCHAL, EARL OF PEMBROKE—Authorities: Effigies of the earl, in the Temple Church, London,* with additions from the monument of the Earl of Oxford before mentioned.

The beard on the upper lip signifies his adherence to the king, who, it is reported, wore a beard in contempt of the barons. 'This William's father did beare for his armes Gueuilles a la bande fizelle d'Or; as his seal doth witnesse. But after hee and his sonnes came to be marshals, they used for their armes d'Or, party de Vert, un lyon rampant de Gueulles, sur le tout, arme et lampasse d'Azur.'—Vincent's *Discoverie of Brooke's Errors.*

PHILIP FAULCONBRIDGE—First dress. Authorities: Strutt's *Dress and Habits*, and the enamelled figures on King John's silver cup, in the possession of the Corporation of King's Lynn, Norfolk.

---

* It is necessary to observe that the effigy of the Earl of Pembroke, in the Temple Church, is certainly not much older than the time of Edward I, judging from the formation of the coif des mailles, which is considerably rounded, like all those of the latter end of the 13th century. I have presented him, therefore, with a skull cap, like that of the Earl of Salisbury, and as it appears in all authentic specimens of the reign of King John.

A habit of the same description but of different colours may be worn by Robert Faulconbridge.

PHILIP FAULCONBRIDGE—Second dress—and HUBERT DE BURGH—Authorities: Effigy of a knight of the 13th century in Malvern Church, Worcestershire. The spear added from a MS. in the Cotton Library.—B. M.

ENGLISH SOLDIERS OF THE 13TH CENTURY—Authority: A Transcript of Matthew Paris, in Bennet College Library, Cambridge, marked C. V. XVI.

Much difficulty exists in ascertaining the particular description of armour intended to be represented in old illuminations. We know, however, that scale armour, and single ring mail, were worn before and at this period, and that the scale armour was succeeded by that made of little square plates, covering one another in the manner of tiles, from which circumstance, Doctor Meyrick denominates it tegulated.—Vide his letter on the Body Armour anciently worn in England, *Archæologia*, vol. 19.

ENGLISH HERALD, 13TH CENTURY—Authority: Strutt's *Dress and Habits.*

'The herald,' says Strutt, 'whose office anciently was that of special messenger, when he appeared in his official capacity, has his Lord's badge or cognizance, attached to some part of his habit. The earliest representation that I have met with of a herald is in a manuscript, said to have been written at the commencement of the 13th century. He is there delineated kneeling, and holding a charter, or some such kind of an instrument, with a seal hanging from it; his head is covered with a white cap or coife, which is fastened under his chin; and the badge of his office in the form of a shield fastened upon his left side, and apparently to his girdle.' From the plate appertaining to this description it appears that a herald wore the common habit of a retainer, or domestic of the period, his only distinction being the badge above mentioned. I have copied the figure faithfully, as far as regards costume, with the exception of the white coife, which being fastened under the chin, would be anything but picturesque upon the stage; and coverings for the head were so seldom worn those days, except in bad weather, that the absence of it is of little consequence. Robert de Suzane, Roy d'Armes, who died 1260, is represented in Montfaucon, in a complete suit of mail, with a hood of mail covering his head, a plain surcoat without sleeves, a sword and a shield; the latter emblazoned with his arms, 'trois chevrons doublez'; and, therefore, habited in every respect like a knight of that period.

PHILIP, SURNAMED AGUSTUS, KING OF FRANCE—Authority: Montfaucon.

PRINCE LEWIS—Authority: Montfaucon.

The only effigies of Lewis in Montfaucon are those which represent him as king. I have armed him, therefore, with the exception of the helmet and shield, from an engraving of his half-brother, Philippe Comte de Boulogne, son of Philip Augustus and Agnes de Meranie, his third wife, born in 1200, and who was killed at a tournament in 1233.

ARTHUR, DUKE OF BRETAGNE.—Designed from costumes of the period.—Vide Montfaucon.

In compliance with established usage, I have represented Arthur as a mere child; but according to History he was at this period 'rising to man's estate'; and

before he fell into the power of John was knighted, married, and commanded an army. Arthur is said to have borne the arms assigned to his father, Earl of Geoffrey, which according to modern genealogists, were Gules, three lions passant gardant, or, a label of five points Argent, as displayed on the shield.—Vide Sandford's *Geneal. History.*

CONSTANCE, MOTHER OF ARTHUR. Vide Montfaucon.

FRENCH KNIGHT OF THE 13TH CENTURY—Authority: Montfaucon.

Costume for Melun and the Nobles of the French party. The distinguishing mark of a French knight was the shield hanging on his left thigh, the guige, or belt, passing over his right hip.

CARDINAL PANDULPH. Picart informs us that 'cardinals wore only the common vestments of priests, which were like the monkish habit till the time of Innocent IV.' (A. D. 1243), who gave them the red hat, in the council of Lyons; but they first used it, according to De Curbio, the year after the council, that is, 1246, on occasion of an interview between the Pope and Lewis IX. of France. 'That the Cardinals were allowed,' however, 'to wear red shoes and red garments, in the time of Innocent III. raised the see, A. D. 1198, appears from several writers who flourished at that time; but by what pope that privilege was granted them is uncertain.' Vide Picart's *Religious Ceremonies*, Bower's *Lives of the Popes*, &c.

LEOPOLD, DUKE OF AUSTRIA. The introduction of Leopold, Duke of Austria, in this play, Constance's addressing him by the title of Limoges, and the repeated allusions to his having killed Richard Cœur de Lion, &c., are errors sufficiently notorious. I have not been able to obtain any positive authority for the costume of this character further than the general representations and descriptions of temporary warriors and Crusaders. A complete suit of mail, with a surcoat nearly reaching to the heels, appears to have been the universal European war dress of the nobility at the commencement of the 13th century. Shakespeare, however, has made the lion's hide too particular an object to be dispensed with; and as the duke has been so unceremoniously compelled to 'burst his cerements,' and 'revisit thus the glimpses of the moon,' we will not quarrel with him for wearing an extra skin on so peculiar an expedition. The battle-axe in his hand is from a drawing of one kept in the Belfort tower, at Ghent, weighing about eighteen pounds, and said to have belonged to Baldwin Bras de Fer, Earl of Flanders. Richard I. is reported to have wielded one very similar.

'This King Richard, I understond,
Yer he went out of Englond,
Let make an axe for the nones,
Therewith to cleave the Saracen's nobes;
The head in south was wrought full weele,
Thereon were twenty pounds of steele;
And when he came to Cyprus lond,
This ilkon axe he took in hond.'

Leopold VII, second Duke of Austria, bore originally, Azure, six larks, Or; but in consequence of his surcoat, which was cloth of silver, being covered with blood, with the exception of the belt, at the siege of Ptolemais (Acre), he assumed the de-

vice displayed on his shield, viz., Gules, a Fess, Argent. He died A. D. 1194.—Vide Henninges, *Theatrum Genealogicum*, vol. 3, Camden's *Remains*, Nisbett's *System of Heraldry*, &c. [The following standard works on Costume may also be consulted: PAUL LACROIX: *Manners, Customs and Dress During the Middle Ages;* J. R. PLANCHE: *Cyclopædia of Costume;* D. C. CALTHROP: *English Costume*, vol. i.; KRETSCHMER & ROHRBACH: *Costumes of All Nations;* J. STRUTT: *Dress and Habits of the People of England;* Ibid.: *Regal Antiquities.*—ED.]

ACTORS' INTERPRETATIONS

F. GENTLEMAN (*Dram. Censor*, ii, 167): Mr Quin was the first we remember to see figure away in royal John; and, as in most of his tragedy undertakings, he lumbered through the part in a painful manner; growled some passages, bellowed others, and chaunted the rest. Mr Churchill has sneered at Mr Mossop for browbeating the French king; had he seen and remembered the gentleman under consideration, he would have thought the poor tame monarch in danger of being swallowed up alive by his voracious brother of England. Mr [Thomas] Sheridan has, no doubt, impaired as his faculties are at present, very striking merit; where he is working Hubert to the murder of the prince his utterance and attendant looks are highly picturesque. We allow him to be also deserving of praise where he upbraids Hubert with so readily obeying his bloody orders; but in other scenes of the four first acts, low as they are, he sinks beneath them; in dying, he overacts to a degree of particular offence. Mr Mossop, whom we have been obliged to find fault with upon several occasions, here deserves our warmest praise, and we are happy to give it to him. That stiffness and premeditated method which, in other characters, took off from his great powers and good conception, being less visible in his King John. The rays of glowing merit here broke upon us unclouded and dazzling; where the author's genius soared aloft, he kept pace with equal wing; where Shakespeare flagged, he bore him up; wherefore, we are venturous to affirm that no performer ever made more of good and bad materials mingled together than Mr Mossop did in this play. Mr Powell was too boyish, he wanted weight and depth of expression to excel in John. Of the chip-in-pottage French king we shall say nothing, as no actor can make anything of him; nor can his son, for the like reason, deserve much notice. However, we remember two performers that are worth mention, one Mr Lacy, who did more in the Dauphin than criticism had any right to expect; and Mr The. Cibber, who was undoubtedly the veriest bantam-cock of tragedy that ever crowed, strutted, and flapped its wings on a stage. The Cardinal is a very well drawn churchman of those times, subtle, proud, irascible; rather prone to promote than prevent public calamities, where his master's interest seems concerned; a mere politician, not incumbered with delicacy of principle, or the feelings of humanity; he is not in favour of the actor, yet appeared very respectable in Mr Havard's performance of him, no other person strikes our recollection. The Bastard is a character of great peculiarity, bold, spirited, free—indeed, too free spoken; he utters many noble sentiments, and performs brave actions; but in several places descends to keep attention from drowsing, at the expense of all due decorum; and what is very disgraceful to furious composition, causes the weaker part of an audience to laugh at some very weak, punning conceits. Mr Ryan had some merit in this part, by no means equal to what he showed in many others. The unhappy impediment of his utterance being more conspicuous in it than usual. Mr Sheridan

has apologized for it, but from what we have already said concerning his executive abilities, the reader may easily judge how very unlike the character he must be. Mr Holland was too stiff, and made too much use of his strong lungs. Mr Smith is pretty and spirited, but wants weight and bluntness. We have seen one Mr Fleetwood appear in it this season, at the Haymarket, with every fault of Mr Holland improved, and all his strokes of merit diminished. If ever Mr Garrick's figure made against him, it was in this part; he struck out some lights and beauties which we never discovered in the performance of any other person, but there was a certain petiteness which rather shrunk the character, and cut short the usual excellence of this truly great actor. Upon the whole, we are obliged to declare that our idea of the Bastard and Shakespeare's meaning, to our knowledge, has never been properly filled. Mr Barry, for external appearance and general execution, comes nearest the point. This remark may serve to show that though we greatly admire, and have hitherto warmly praised our English Roscius, we are not so idolatrously fond of his extensive merit as to think him always foremost in the race of fame. Hubert, though upon the whole an agreeable agent, is by no means an estimable personage; he appears in a very recommendatory light, and favours representation where there are any tolerable feelings. Messrs Sparks and Berry did him very considerable justice, and Mr Bensley has exhibited him with deserved approbation; we cannot say so much for Mr Gibson. At the Haymarket, Mr Gentleman has passed muster, as not having conceived or ill expressed the part; but we cannot, as a public performer, congratulate him much on the happiness of his figure or features. Prince Arthur is a very amiable and interesting character of the drama; we have seen it done affectingly by several children, whose names we forgot; however, recollect being particularly pleased with Miss Reynolds, now Mrs Saunders, some twenty years since. Who did the revolting lords has entirely escaped our memory, except at Mr Foote's, this summer, and those gentlemen who personated them there may wish to be forgot also. Every one of the female characters are too contemptible for notice except Constance; she, indeed, seems to have been an object of great concern with the author, and very seldom fails to make a deep impression upon the audience; her circumstances are peculiarly calculated to strike the feeling heart; dull, very dull must that sensation be which is not affected with the distress of a tender parent, expressed in such pathetic, forcible terms; even Mrs Woffington, who, from dissonance of tones might be called the screech-owl of tragedy, drew many tears in this part; to which her elegant figure and adequate deportment did not a little contribute. A fine woman robed with grief is a leading object of pity. Mrs Cibber, in the whole scope of her great excellence, never showed her tragic feelings and expression to more advantage than in Constance; there was a natural tendency to melancholy in her features, which heightened in action, and became so true an index of a woe-fraught mind, that with the assistance of her nightingale voice, she became irresistible; and almost obliged us to forget every other character in raptured contemplation of her merit. Mrs Bellamy fell far, very far short of the forementioned lady, and cathedralized the unhappy princess offensively. Mrs Yates and Mrs Barry have both powerful capabilities for the part, but can never justly hope to equal their great predecessor, Mrs Cibber, who must be always remembered with pleasure and regret by all persons of taste, who had the happiness to shed the sacrifice of tears at the shrine of her melting powers.

DAVIES (*Life of Garrick*, i, 332): Shakespeare's *King John* was played with great success at Drury Lane (1744). The King was personated by Mr Garrick with

very great skill, and unusual energy of action; but it must be confessed that Mrs Cibber, by an uncommon pathetic ardour in speaking, and a surprising dignity of action and deportment, threw every actor in the play at a great distance. This had a greater effect, from her having never before attempted characters where power of voice and action were so greatly requisite to express the passions of rage, anguish, and despair. This tragedy had, on Mrs Cibber's engagement at Covent Garden, been discontinued for several years at Drury Lane; but, soon after she returned to that theatre, Mr Garrick revived it in 1755. He then took the part of the Bastard, and gave the King to Mr Mossop. When the two principal characters of this tragedy were divided between Mr Garrick and Mr Sheridan, the former chose the King, and he actually consented that the Bastard should be Mr Sheridan's part. Secretly he was determined to the contrary; and after making some apology to Mr Sheridan, he endeavoured to persuade him to exchange parts, to which he was extremely averse; indeed, I know not for what reason; for though he well understood the sense of the part, yet there is in the Bastard Falconbridge an exuberant wantonness of humour and an excessively romantic spirit of gallantry which Mr Sheridan could not assume. Nor could Mr Garrick, with all his spirit and art, attain perfectly to the full exhibition of the character; he was so defective in the mechanical part of it, I mean height, look, and sinew, that he was obliged to search carefully for a proper actor to play his half-brother, one with a consumptive look and a meagre form, to contrast and set off his own person; and though in this he met with tolerable success, yet still there was an apparent deficiency; nor did the speeches which related to the Bastard's manly form produce the expected effect. It is but justice to the memory of Walker, who was the original actor of Macheath, to say that he performed Shakespeare's Bastard in *King John* with such native humour, spirited action, and vigorous deportment that, I think, no actor has, since his time, given an equal idea of the part. Mr Sheridan was, by continual solicitation of the manager, prevailed upon at last to take the part of King John; and in this compliance, I think, he gained great advantage to himself: the deep tones of his voice, and the vehemence of his action, were well adapted to the turbulent and gloomy passions of John. In the scene with Hubert in the third act his representation of the anxiety and distress of a mind which labours to disclose and is afraid to discover a secret big with death and horror was expressed with the feelings of one who is a master of the human passions. That accurate observer of the players' deficiencies, Churchill, could not withhold his approbation of Sheridan's action in King John, though in his panegyric he threw some ludicrous strokes on his excesses in look and action. The play was acted several nights, and was honoured with the King's command. Sheridan's success in King John heightened Garrick's jealousy, especially when he was informed by a very intimate acquaintance that the King was uncommonly pleased with that actor's representation of the part. This was a bitter cup; and, to make the draught still more unpalatable, upon his asking whether His Majesty approved his playing the Bastard, he was told, without the least compliment to his action, it was imagined that the king thought the character was rather too bold in the drawing, and that the colouring was overcharged and glaring. Mr Garrick, who had been so accustomed to applause, and who of all men living most sensibly felt the neglect of it, was greatly struck with a preference given to another, and which left him out of all consideration; and though the boxes were taken for *King John* several nights successively, he would never after permit the play to be acted.

C. Neumann

Bielschowsky (*Life of Goethe*, ii, 96): Among the five members whom the Weimar Court Theatre retained from Bellomo's troupe was Christiane Neumann, scarcely thirteen years old, but mature far beyond her years, an unusually talented and charming girl, who had been a favourite with the public ever since her first appearance upon the stage, at the age of ten. Goethe took it upon himself to prepare her for the highest performances, and his efforts were crowned with glorious success. Unfortunately this early blossom withered quickly. Married at the age of fifteen, she died in September, 1797, before she had reached the age of nineteen. Upon her grave Goethe placed as an unfading wreath of laurel the elegy Euphrosyne. In this elegy he has her describe how he, as her 'teacher, friend, and father,' taught her the first important rôle, that of Arthur in Shakespeare's *King John* (performed on the 29th of November, 1791):

Can'st thou the hour still recall, when thou on the stage at rehearsal
  Taughts me of tragical art all the more serious steps?
I was a boy, and an innocent child, thou calledst me Arthur,
  And in me didst fulfil Shakespeare's poetical dream,
Threaten'dst with red-glowing irons to burn out my sight, then turnedst,
  Deeply affected, away, hiding thy tear-streaming eyes.
Ah! thy heart was so tender, thou sparedst the life full of sorrow,
  Which an adventurous leap finally brought to a close.
Tenderly lifting my shattered form, from thence thou didst bear me:
  Folded so close to thy breast, long did I feign I was dead.
When I my eyes at length opened, I saw thee tenderly gazing,
  Earnest and still and sad, over thy favourite bowed.
Childlike I raised up my head, and, thy hands in gratitude kissing,
  Offered thee as a reward innocent kiss on my lips;
Questioned thee: 'Wherefore, my father, so serious? If 'twas a failure
  Oh! then show me, I pray, how I may better succeed.
Nought that for thee I attempt doth annoy me, every least detail
  Oft will I gladly repeat, taught and guided by thee.'
Thou didst clasp me with might and caress me with passionate fondness,
  But my heart at the thought shuddered deep in my breast.
'No, my lovely one,' thou didst exclaim; 'in every least detail
  Play for the folk on the morn just as to-day thou hast played.
Touch their emotions as mine thou hast touched, and, applauding thy playing,
  Glorious tears shall run down e'en from the dryest of eyes.
But 'tis thy friend, who embraceth thee, thou hast most deeply affected;
  Likeness of premature death causing him deepest dismay.

Mrs Siddons

Fletcher (p. 22): The remarks extracted from Mrs Siddons's memoranda on the character of Constance, whom she designates as 'the majestic, the passionate, the tender,' show that she felt and appreciated the essential tenderness of the character more fully and justly than the literary critic of her own sex, [Mrs Jameson]. Still we find, from a careful perusal of the great actress's observations, that the ideas of pride and majesty and command unduly predominate in her conception of the 'gentle Constance.' Our source of this error it is important to point out. The first mention of Constance in the play speaks of her as 'that am-

bitious Constance'; and we affirm most confidently that there is not another syllable in the piece from which it is possible to infer ambition on her part. It is quite plain that the indolence or carelessness of most readers—a carelessness or indolence of which we might cite many similar examples—has caused this description of Constance to pass with them as the *dramatist's own* view of the character. But what is the fact? That these words come from the lips of Constance's deadly enemy and rival, Queen Elinor, who almost in the same breath confesses to us the fact of her and her son John's usurpation. This same essential fact, attested by their own words, leaves not the smallest scope for ambition in Constance, even supposing that the poet had, which he has not, represented her as loving power for its own sake. Surely it is no more a proof of ambition, that she desires to see her son possessed of a crown which is his birthright, than it is of covetousness for a man to desire the payment of a debt which is justly due to him. Yet we find even the acute perception of Mrs Siddons to have been misled by the prevailing prepossession, though, abandoning the most absurd form of it, she says, 'I believe I shall not be thought singular when I assert, that though she has been designated the ambitious Constance, she has been ambitious only for her son. It was for him, and him alone, that she aspired to and struggled for hereditary sovereignty.' The same mistaken impression leads the great performer to speak repeatedly of 'disappointed ambition,' 'baffled ambition,' as among the indignant feelings of Constance at the treachery of her allies. To the same source it must surely be attributed that this interesting critic tells us at the very outset of her observations: 'My idea of Constance is that of a lofty and proud spirit, associated with the most exquisite feelings of maternal tenderness.' This mistake of regarding her, in the grand scene with her treacherous protectors, as possessed by a pride inherent and personal, instead of seeing that her sublime scorn and indignation spring exclusively from her deep, keen sense of violated friendship, now added with lightning suddenness to outraged right and feeling and affection, lent, we suspect, a colouring not quite appropriate, a too predominant bitterness and asperity of tone, to Mrs Siddons's acting of this scene, majestic and wonderful as it must have been. The sarcasms, we fear, were uttered too much in the manner of a woman habitually sarcastic; and she seems to have fallen somewhat into the same error which we have pointed out in Mrs Jameson's criticism, of confounding with mere frenzy the awful poetry that bursts from the tortured heart of the heroine. 'Goaded and stung,' she stays, 'by the treachery of her faithless friends, and almost maddened by the injuries they have heaped upon her, she becomes desperate and ferocious as a hunted tigress in defence of her young, and it seems that existence itself must surely issue forth with the utterance of that frantic and appalling exclamation—

"A wicked day, and not a holy day! &c."'

Yet Constance might more justly be likened to a hunted hind than a hunted tigress; nor should her exclamations on this occasion, however appalling, be termed frantic. In all this the poet, ever true to nature, has observed a due gradation. Here, indeed, is grief at its utmost, its proudest intensity; but here is no despair—she is not even on the way to frenzy, as we find her to be in the scene which follows the capture of her son.

EDMUND KEAN

HAWKINS (ii, 50): *Douglas* was succeeded by *King John* on the 1st of June. Miss Macauley had exceeded the tragedian's expectations in Lady Randolph, and he

gladly assigned her the part of Constance for the occasion. His King John, without disturbing the impression which John Kemble had created by his performance of the character, was nobly represented. The absolute triumph was won, as might be expected, in the scene where he darkly intimated to Hubert his desire for Arthur's death. Churchill's lines on Sheridan possessed the full extent of their application here:

> 'Behold him sound the depths of Hubert's soul,
> Whilst in his own contending passions roll;
> View the whole scene, with critic judgement scan,
> And then deny him merit if you can.'

In this and the subsequent scene where his remorseful fear prompted to overwhelm the supposed murderer with indignation, his characteristic fertility of expedient and quickness of invention were brought into conspicuous play. The wily, circuitous, and serpent-like approaches in the former derived a vivid and appropriate colouring from his action, voice, and force of feeling, from which they all drew the impulse of 'dire and fatal persuasion'; and the latter comprehended everything that could be wished for, no less than it exhibited a fine combination of energy and skill. His ardent display of fire in his passionate reply to the Cardinal's denunciation, and the qualms of conscience which he suffered when Hubert constantly recurred to the supposed murder of Arthur, were finely drawn, vigorous, and impressive pictures. The natural truth which pervaded the death scene elevated him in that part to a proud superiority over his predecessors. He did not destroy the reality by the exhibition of more energy than belongs to the exhausted powers of a dying man; he did not caricature and posturize in the representation of this awful close of human life. No; his delineation here stood in the place of nature. In the other scenes, where studied dignity predominates in the place of passion, he appeared to considerable disadvantage; neither being seconded by that premeditated regularity of art which, indispensable to the due effect of the character in the parts referred to, conformed so well with the statuesque inflexibility of Kemble as to have rendered the King John of the latter one of the most admired and successful of his impersonations.

J. P. Kemble

Hazlitt (*View of English Stage*, p. 271): (*King John* was revived at Covent Garden, Dec. 3, 1816.) We went to see Mr Kemble's King John, and he became the part so well, in costume, look, and gesture, that if left to ourselves, we could have gone to sleep over it, and dreamt that it was fine, and 'when we waked, have cried to dream again.' But we were really told that it was fine, as fine as Garrick, as fine as Mrs Siddons, as fine as Shakespeare; so we rubbed our eyes and kept a sharp lookout, but we saw nothing but a deliberate intention on the part of Mr Kemble to act the part finely. And so he did in a certain sense, but not by any means as Shakespeare wrote it, nor as it might be played. He did not harrow up the feelings, he did not electrify the sense; he did not enter into the nature of the part himself, nor consequently move others with terror or pity. The introduction to the scene with Hubert was certainly excellent: you saw instantly, and before a syllable was uttered, partly from the change of countenance, and partly from the arrangement of the scene, the purpose which had entered his mind to murder the young prince. But the remainder of this trying scene, though the execution was elaborate—painfully elaborate—and the outline well conceived, wanted the filling up, the true and master touches, the deep piercing heartfelt tones of nature. It

was done well and skilfully, according to the book of arithmetic; but no more. Mr Kemble, when he approaches Hubert to sound his disposition, puts on an insidious, insinuating, fawning aspect, and so he ought; but we think it should not be, though it was, that kind of wheedling smile, as if he was going to persuade him that the business he wished him to undertake was a mere jest; and his natural repugnance to it an idle prejudice, that might be carried off by a certain pleasant drollery of eye and manner. Mr Kemble's look, to our apprehension, was exactly as if he had just caught the eye of some person of his acquaintance in the boxes, and was trying to suppress a rising smile at the metamorphosis he had undergone since dinner. Again, he changes his voice three several times in repeating the name of Hubert; and the changes might be fine, but they did not vibrate our feelings; so we cannot tell. They appeared to us like a tragic voluntary. Through almost the whole scene this celebrated actor did not seem to feel the part itself as it was set down for him, but to be considering how he ought to feel it, or how he should express by rule and method what he did not feel. He was sometimes slow and sometimes hurried; sometimes familiar and sometimes solemn; but always with an evident design and determination to be so. The varying tide of passion did not appear to burst from the source of nature in his breast, but to be drawn from a theatrical leaden cistern, and then directed through certain conduit-pipes and artificial channels, to fill the audience with well regulated and harmless sympathy. We are afraid, judging from the effects of this representation, that 'man delights not us, nor woman either,' for we did not like Miss O'Neill's Constance better, nor so well as Mr Kemble's King John. This character, more than any other of Shakespeare's females, treads perhaps upon the verge of extravagance; the impatience of grief, combined with the violence of her temper, borders on insanity; her imagination grows light-headed. But still the boundary between poetry and frenzy is not passed; she is neither a virago nor mad. Miss O'Neill gave more of the vulgar than the poetical side of the character. She generally does so of late. Mr Charles Kemble, in the Bastard, had the 'bulk, the thews, the sinews' of Faulconbridge; would that he had had 'the spirit' too. There was one speech which he gave well—'Could Sir Robert make this leg?' And suiting the action to the word, as well he might, it had a great effect upon the house.

FRANCES ANNE KEMBLE

(*Records of a Girlhood*, p. 359): Mar. 13, 1831.

My dear H——, shut your eyes while you read this, because if you don't, they'll never shut again. Constance is what I am to play for my benefit. I am horribly frightened; it is a cruel weight to lay upon my shoulders; however, there is nothing for it but doing my best, and leave the rest to fate. I almost think now I could do Lady Macbeth better. I am like poor little Arthur, who begged to have his tongue cut off rather than have his eyes put out; that last scene of Constance—think what an actress one should be to do it justice! Pray for me. I have been sobbing my heart out over Constance this morning, and act Fazio to-night, which is hard work.

Your affectionate

F.

Dear H——, this is Wednesday, the 23rd; Monday and *King John* and my Constance are all over; but I am at this moment still so deaf with nervousness as not to hear the ticking of my watch when held to one of my ears; the other side of my head is not deaf any longer now; but on Monday night I hardly heard one word I uttered through the whole play. It is rather hard that having endeavoured (and

succeeded wonderfully, too) in possessing my soul in peace during that trial of my courage, my nervous system should give way in this fashion. I had a knife of pain sticking in my side all through the play and all day long Monday; as I did not hear myself speak, I cannot tell you anything of my performance. My dress was of the finest pale-blue merino, all folds and drapery like my Grecian Daughter costume, with an immense crimson mantle hung on my shoulders which I could hardly carry. My head-dress was exactly copied from one of my Aunt's, and you cannot imagine how curiously like her I looked. My mother says, 'You have done it better than I believe any other girl of your age would do it.' But of course that is not a representation of Constance to satisfy her or any one else, indeed. You know, dear H——, what my own feeling has been about this, and how utterly incapable I knew myself for such an undertaking; but you did not, nor could anyone, know how dreadfully I suffered from the apprehension of failure which my reason told me was well founded. I assure you that when I came on the stage I felt like some hunted creature driven to bay; I was really half wild with terror. The play went off admirably, but I lay, when my part was over, for an hour on my dressing-room floor, with only strength enough left to cry. Your letter to A—— revived me, and just brought me enough to life again to eat my supper, which I had not felt able to touch, in spite of my exhaustion and great need of it; when, however, I once began, my appetite justified the French proverb and took the turn of voracity, and I devoured like a Homeric hero. We are going to a party at Devonshire house to-night. Here I am called away to receive some visitors. Pray write soon to your affectionate

Fanny.

LEIGH HUNT (*The Tatler*, March 25, 1831): Miss Fanny Kemble repeated last night the part of Constance in *King John*, which she played for her benefit Monday. It is not one of her best performances, especially in the eyes of those who recollect her aunt in the character. It wants movement and effect. It wants passion. We do not mean vehemence, of which it has rather too much, but suffering and impulse. Finally, it wants dignity. There is now and then, in this as in other performances of Miss Kemble, a passing shade of family likeness to Mrs Siddons. Her head-dress last night assisted it. But to institute a direct comparison with her is surely unfortunate. The Constance of Mrs Siddons was one of the most natural, passionate, yet dignified of her performances. The passage in which Constance wildly seats herself upon the ground and exclaims—

'Here I and sorrow sit: let the kings come bow to me,'

produced no effect last night. All who remember Mrs Siddons must remember its electrical effect, and how marvellously she reconciled the mad impulse of it with habitual dignity. Miss Kemble was almost always stationary in her grief. Mrs Siddons used to pace up and down, as the eddying gust of her impatience drove her, and all her despairing and bitter words came with double force from her in the career. And then what a person she had! and how regal she used to look! hardly more so as Queen Constance than as Mrs Siddons herself! lofty tones and conscious modulations seemed natural in her mouth, as expressing the beauty of all that was ideal both in her theatrical and personal character. In Miss Kemble (without meaning to imply that she is not otherwise quite as estimable a person in every respect) they always carry with them an air of elaboration and assumption—we mean assumption in the literal sense—something taken up for the purpose of the moment, and foreign to her in the abstract. Her best passage last night was

the quiet and exhausted manner, the momentary patience into which she fell from her general vehemence, just before she resumed it and tore off her diadem. But the performance upon the whole was flat, and thought to be so. Miss Kemble never does anything without showing great occasional cleverness: in some characters, as in the Fair Penitent, she does more; but Constance is certainly not one in which any of her powers is elicited to advantage, not even in the sarcasms directed against Austria, which seemed rather the effusions of quiet spite, than of uncontrollable contempt. We doubt whether she will be tempted to repeat the character often. To mention Mr Charles Kemble's Faulconbridge is to praise it; for everybody knows how excellent it is.

W. C. Macready

(*Reminiscences*, 1823, p. 201): *King John* was the next play of Shakespeare's that added another character to my list. Kemble's reputation in this part had reference chiefly, if not exclusively, to the grand scene of John's temptation of Hubert. On this I bestowed, of course, my utmost pains, but brought also into strong relief that in which the coward monarch endeavors to shift his own criminality on Hubert, a scene to which Kemble, in his impressive representation of the part, had neglected to give prominence. It was in this play that Charles Kemble appeared to very great advantage. His handsome person answered to the heroic idea of Faulconbridge, and his performance of the character was most masterly.

(*Diaries*, April 19, 1836; Oct. 16, 1836): Acted King John in a way that assured me that I could play it excellently; it seemed to make an impression on the house, but I had not made it sure, finished, and perfectly individualized. Some fools set up a monstrous hubbub at the passage of defiance to the Pope, and Mr Charles Dance told me afterwards in the green-room that the Catholics would 'cut our throats.' It is a sin—or ought it not to be—to have the faculty of reason and power of cultivating it by examination, and yet remain so low in the intellectual scale. Mrs Sharpe was very ineffective in the effective part of Constance. What a character! But it is because every line is so effective that common minds cannot arise from one level, and have not the skill by contrast and variety to give relish and effect without great effort.

C. Cowden Clarke (*Sh. Characters*, p. 339) gives the following account of Macready's performance of King John at Drury Lane in 1842: 'In the first place, the difficulty of representing the skirmishes and alarms of battle on the stage—till then historically and proverbially ludicrous—was on that occasion triumphantly overcome. The siege of Angiers was a serious event. Also, the whole department which is technically styled 'the "getting up," the scenery, and the costume, were absolutely perfect; it was a gorgeous pictorial illustration of a great dramatic poet. But what I would principally distinguish as the crowning talent displayed in that very fine revival was the conception of the character of King John himself. It was the more artistical, inasmuch as the peculiar moral features of that bad king are rather to be suggested to the imagination than palpably and broadly developed. The stealthy watchfulness, the crafty caution, and the want of faith in human goodness, are all features that demand acute discrimination to perceive, and refined and delicate touches to embody. It requires subdued deportment, self-mistrust, or rather the want of self-confidence—nice points of character to study, and all which few actors dare to personate with fidelity, because, unless they be understood and

appreciated by an audience, it is frequently thought to be tame or under acting. The whole character and bearing of John, in the version of Shakespeare, form a striking contrast to those of Henry V. The one is ardent, brave, confident in the love and support of his people—the true English king; the other, wily, artful, making every movement by a stratagem, and feeling that he holds his subjects by no other tenure than the right of might, and an appeal to the baser passions of their nature. They who call to mind those two brilliant and impetuous speeches—those rousing appeals to the zeal of his people in *Henry V.*—beginning "Once more unto the breach, dear friends," in the 3rd Act; and, "What's he that wishes so? my cousin Westmoreland?" the celebrated speech upon the eve of the Agincourt fight; and then draw a parallel between them and the speech that King John makes to the citizens of Angiers in the 2d Act—

"These flags of France that are advanced here,
Before the eye and prospect of your town,"

sneaking his way, as it were, and feeling the pulse, as he proceeds, of those whom he is addressing—they, I repeat, who institute a comparison between these speeches in the two plays, will perceive my meaning. These words may be taken as keys to the two characters. In John we have no confiding appeals, no "dear friends"; but the extortionate tyrant to his people appears in such phrases as—

"Ere our coming, see thou shake the bags
Of hoarding abbots; imprison'd angels
Set at liberty: the fat ribs of peace
Must by the hungry now be fed upon:
Use our commission in its utmost force."

Compare this with Harry Monmouth's courageous and magnanimous reflection:

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out,
For our bad neighbour makes us early stirrers,
Which is both healthful and good husbandry:
Besides, they are our outward consciences,
And preachers to us all; admonishing,
That we should dress us fairly for our end.
Thus may we gather honey from the weed,
And make a moral of the devil himself."

And then note his playful intercourse with his soldiers, and those sprightly exclamations to his faithful old adherent, Sir Thomas Erpingham, "God 'amercy, old heart, thou speakest cheerfully." Compare his confident reliance on his English bosoms with John's misgivings and doubts, as of a man conscious and feeling that he has no right to the love of his subjects in the scene of his recoronation: "And looked upon, I hope, with cheerful eyes." And again, "I have a way to win their loves again"; as well as his storm of reproach and remorse, and base endeavour to shift the ponderous load of his guilt on to the shoulders of his instrument, Hubert. They who fortunately witnessed the performance will not forget the manner in which Mr Macready impersonated the King, and the artistical way in which he demonstrated the unhappiness of wickedness throughout; the gradual and constant declension of his spirit, its tide being always at the ebb; his small amount of confidence, his suggested consciousness of meanness, guilt, and the loss of all respect; his bearing latterly as that of a man who felt that indignant eyes were flashing on

him, and his gait as if surrounded by pitfalls; in short, the general substratum of wretchedness which pervades the whole character, and yet is only known and felt, not blazoned; all this unprotruded demeanour, and which the million do not appreciate, greatly surpassed in merit the conception even of his dying scene, terrifically real as that was. Alexander placed the poems of Homer in a jewelled casket of inestimable price, the shrine being an emblem only of the offering; and the late theoretical regenerator presented the public with illuminated editions of the world's poet; superb, indeed, and wholly worthy of the text, were it only by reason of the zeal with which they were executed.'

FLETCHER (p. 27): What strikes us first of all in Miss Helen Faucit's personation [of Constance] is her clear and perfect conception that feeling, not pride, is the mainspring of the character; that the dignity of bearing natural to and inseparable from it, and which the advantage of a tall, graceful figure enables this actress to maintain with little effort, is at the same time an easy, unconscious dignity, quite different from that air of self-importance, that acting of majesty, which has been mistakenly ascribed to it by those who have attributed to the heroine an ambitious nature. She makes us feel throughout not only the depth, the tenderness, and the poetry of the maternal affection dwelling in a vivid fancy and a glowing heart, but is ever true to that 'constant, loving, noble nature,' which is not more sensitive to insult from her foes and falsehood from her friends than it is ever ready to welcome with fresh gratitude and confidence the return of better feelings in any who have injured her. That intimate association, in short, of gracefulness with force, and of tenderness with dignity, which this lady has so happily displayed in other leading characters of Shakespeare, in her especial qualification for this arduous part—the most arduous, we believe, of all the Shakespearian female characters—for this plain reason, that while it is one of those exhibiting the highest order of powers, the range of emotions included in it is the wildest, and the alternations, the fluctuations, between the height of virtuous indignation and contempt, and the softest depth of tenderness, are the most sudden and the most extreme. The principle of contrast, in fact—that great element of the romantic drama, as of all romantic art—which Shakespeare delighted to employ not only in opposing one character to another, but in developing each character individually, is carried out to the highest pitch by the trials to which the course of the dramatic incident subjects the sensitive, passionate, and poetic,—the noble and vigorous nature of Constance. We think it one of the most notable merits in the representation of the part by the lady who now personates it, that so far from letting the indignant excitement cast for one moment the slightest shade upon her brow or harshness into her tone when turning to the boy, she follows undeviatingly the poet's indication; and, in like manner as he has made the first effusion poured out by Constance, on hearing her abandonment, one of maternal grief and tenderness only, so amidst her subsequent bursts of indignant reproach and fiery denunciation, in every look and word which the present actress addressed to Arthur, the afflicted mother seems to find relief from those effusions of bitterness, as repugnant to her nature as they are withering in their power, by melting into double tenderness over the beauties and misfortunes of her child. This, we repeat, seems to us to be one of the very happiest features in Miss Faucit's personation of the Lady Constance. Thus it is, for example, that in the first scene with Elinor she renders with such perfect truth and beauty the exquisitely characteristic passage:

'His grandam's wrongs, and not his mother's shames,
Draw those heaven-moving pearls from his poor eyes,
Which heaven shall take in nature of a fee:
Ay, with these crystal beads heaven shall be brib'd
To do him justice, and revenge on you.'

Again, in her scene with Salisbury, where Constance is informed of the peace made between the two kings, and where the emotions that agitate her are deeper and more conflicting, we can conceive nothing in acting, or in reality, more exquisitely touching than the expression which she gives to the passage,

'But thou art fair; and at thy birth, dear boy, &c.'

The faltering pauses, more eloquent than the finest declamation, must have gone directly not only to every mother's heart, but to every heart present alive to any touch of sympathy. Indescribably sweet, too, in her utterance, are the words—

'Of Nature's gifts thou mayst with lilies boast,
And with the half-blown rose.'

In those brief accents she breathes to us all the inmost soul of Constance, the idolizing mother, delicately sensitive and richly imaginative. Nor can anything be more beautiful in itself, or more true to nature and to the poet, than the graceful fondness with which, after throwing herself on the ground in the climax of her grief, she looks up, and raises her hand to play with the ringlets of her boy as he stands drooping over her. We must speak rather more at large of Miss Faucit's acting in the following scene, the most difficult of all in so difficult a part. Undoubtedly, the dramatist conceived of his heroine as of one endowed with the most vigorous as well as exquisite powers. Only such a person could rise to the adequate expression of that towering sublimity of virtuous invective and religious invocation which was indispensable to this part of his dramatic purpose. Equally certain it seems to be that these solemnly appealing and withering scornful passages, demanding above all things the display of what is commonly meant by tragic force, were the most successful parts of Mrs Siddons's personation of the Lady Constance. Not having had the advantage of witnessing those majestic efforts of the great actress, we are not enabled to compare the force of delivery shown in those particular sentences by Mrs Siddons and by the present actress respectively. But we have the means of comparing the force of execution in the present performer with what we conceive that the part itself demands, and in that view we find her personation adequate. The force which Shakespeare exhibits in the eloquence of Constance is not the hard force of an arrogant, imperious termagant, such as we see in his Queen Elinor, but the elastic force that springs from a mind and person having all the vigour of a character at once so intellectual, so poetical, and so essentially feminine as that of Constance. To the expression of this highest and most genuine tragic force we repeat that Miss Faucit shows her powers to be not only fully equal, but peculiarly adapted. She has that truest histrionic strength, which consists in an ample share of physical power in the ordinary sense, combined with exquisite modulation of tone and flexibility of feature—by turns the firm and the varying expressiveness of figure, voice, and eye. We say this after much attentive study of her acting, especially in her Shakespearian parts; and as regards the performance of the Lady Constance in particular, how perfect soever Mrs Siddons may have been in certain other Shakespearian characters, yet, considering her decided deficiency in tenderness, we cannot hesitate to regard the present personation of the

heroine of *King John* as truer to that spirit of bold and beautiful contrast which we have already observed, is in the very essence of the part, as it is in that of the whole Shakespearian drama. Thus it is that the caressing of her boy, while seated on the ground, according to the true Shakespearian conception, at once deepens the impression of the preceding words and action which make that sublime enthronement of her grief, and gives bolder effect to her majestically indignant contradiction of the French King's speech in glorification of that 'blessed day,'

'A wicked day, and not a holy day! &c.'

and yet more to the personal invective against Philip,

'You have beguil'd me with a counterfeit
Resembling majesty, &c.'

And in like manner, her action and tone, in bending down to clasp her son, with the words—

'And our oppression hath made up this league!'—

while they speak all the beautiful nature of Constance, make us the more strikingly and sublimely feel its energy when, as if drawing from her child's embrace the strongest stimulus of which the wronged and sorrowing mother is susceptible, she rises, as it were, to more than the natural height of her noble figure, and lifts high her hands to heaven in the majestic appeal—

'Arm, arm, you heavens, against these perju'd kings, &c.'

It is this exclamation of the figure—this aspiring heavenward of the whole look and tone, and gesture—that gives, and can alone give, adequate effect to the flashes of scorn that burst, in her glances and her accents, upon the despicable and devoted head of Austria, when he interrupts her invocation, in its highest fervor, with those very characteristic words of his, 'Lady Constance, peace!' This it is, as given by the present actress, that makes her piercing and scorching reproaches seem to be drawn down like the forked lightnings from above, searing and blasting where they strike, and sharpened to their utmost keenness by the practical sarcasm which she finds in the bodily aspect worn by the object of her indignation—in the 'lion's hide' upon 'those recreant limbs.' This, in all the part, is the passage most requiring the display of physical energy richly and variously modulated, as remote as possible from monotonous loudness and vehemence. Miss Faucit, in her whole manner of rendering this passage, shows how well she comprehends this distinction. By the fluctuating look and intonation,—by the hesitating pauses, at a loss for expressions adequate to the intensity of her unwonted bitterness, and giving keener force to the expressions when they come,—she makes us exquisitely feel the stung spirit of injured, betrayed, and insulted confidence and tenderness, more terrible and blighting far than that of mere exasperated pride. And after this climax of her indignation, when the legate appears, as if sent from heaven in answer to her call, most affectingly and impressively beautiful, to our mind, is the expression of the noble nature of the heroine, which her representative gives to the kneeling appeals which Constance makes to the virtuous and religious feelings of the Dauphin. Already, in speaking of Mrs Siddons's acting of the part, we have fully expressed our opinion as to the true reading of this important passage. We have here only to add that Miss Faucit gives that reading, as it seems to us, with admirable effect,

delivering especially, with all that noble and generous fervour which, we conceive, belongs to it, the unanswerable answer to Blanch—

'That which upholdeth him that thee upholds,
His honour; oh, thine honour, Lewis, thine honour!'

It is to be regretted that owing to the suppression, in the acting play, of that part of the dialogue which immediately follows, the last words of Constance in this scene—

'Oh fair return of banish'd majesty!'—

the crowning expression of her trusting, grateful, forgiving spirit—are nearly drowned in their delivery by the too hasty noise and bustle on the stage of breaking up the royal conference. We shall not attempt to speak in detail of this lady's acting in the terrible despairing scene. She renders its anguish-born poetry with a delicacy of expression yet more overpowering than its force. The looks, and tones, and gestures of a performance like this are not things to be described, but to be seen and heard, felt, and wept over. For our own part, long shall we be haunted by those accents, now piercingly, now softly thrilling—now enamoured of Death, now rushing back to the sweet and agonizing remembrance of her child, now hurrying forward to anticipate the chasing of 'the native beauty from his cheek'—till her last lingering ray of hope expires, and reason totters on the verge of frenzy. All these emotions are rendered to us by the actress, in all their varied beauty and their trembling intensity. In the concluding exclamation—

'O Lord! my boy! my Arthur! my fair son!
My life! my joy! my food! my all the world!
My widow-comfort, and my sorrow's cure!'—

her voice, it is true, rises almost into a scream; what, however, we would ask, are the whole three lines in themselves, but one long scream of intensest agony? The immediate effect upon the feelings of the auditor is doubtless painful, as the shrieking accents are to his ear; yet both are necessary to the full dramatic force and beauty of the passage. The woes of Constance and her son are to be visited in retributive justice on their oppressors; and to sustain our interest vividly through that subsequent portion of the drama it was requisite that the affliction of the bereaved mother should be brought home to us in its darkest and most heart-rending extreme. The poet, therefore, conducts her through every stage of desperate grief—the yearning for death—the longing for madness—the constant craving for the presence of the boy whose image 'walks up and down with her'—till this last fixed idea finally seizes, burningly and burstingly, on her brain, and consigns her not to insanity, which, as she says, might have made her 'forget her son,' but to a torturing frenzy, hopeless and mortal. Of this her final state on earth Shakespeare gives us one awful glimpse, one harrowing strain, then mercifully hurries her from our sight and hearing. An exclamation like this, then, let us repeat, in justice to the actress, can only have its due effect from being delivered, not with the harmonious modulation of tone appropriate to even the most impassioned words of Constance while her self-possession yet remains to her, but rather like the death-shriek of a spirit violently parting. Among the other omissions in the acting, we have to regret that of the lines spoken by King Philip in the middle of this scene—

'Oh, what love I note
In the fair multitude of those her hairs!
Where but by chance a silver drop hath fallen,

Even to that drop ten thousand wiry friends
Do glue themselves in sociable grief,
Like true, inseparable, faithful loves,
Sticking together in calamity!'

These are wanted not only for the purpose to which Shakespeare ever so diligently attended—to relieve the feelings and attention of the auditor, by breaking the continuity of the heroine's effusions of despair—but also to give double effect to those effusions, by the impression which the exquisite poetry of this passage shows to be made by her cureless affliction, even upon the not over-feeling personages about her. The dry, cold words which are left in Philip's mouth,

'Bind up your tresses,'

are a grievous falling-off. The suppression is an injury to the actress no less than to the heroine.

Charles Kean

Cole (i, 344): In the year 1846 Charles Kean ventured on an experiment never before hazarded in America—the production of two historical tragedies of *King John* and *Richard the Third* on a scale of splendour which no theatre in London or Paris could have surpassed. The scenery, the decorations, the banners, armorial bearings, heraldic blazonry, groupings, weapons of war, costumes, furniture, and all the minor details were so correctly studied that the most scrutinizing reader of Montfaucon or Meyrick would have been puzzled to detect an error. But our brethren of the stars and stripes are utilitarians rather than antiquaries; more inclined to look in advance than to turn over pages of the past, or to pore into ancient chronicles. They appeared not to understand or enjoy with a perfect zest the pomp of feudal royalty, and the solemn display of baronial privileges. The upshot of all was that the expenditure far exceeded the return, and the produce of the second year bore no comparison with that of the first.

Cole (ii, p. 26): [Under the management of Charles Kean, at the Princess's Theatre, London] *The Merry Wives of Windsor* ran for twenty-five nights, and then made way for *King John*, produced on the 9th of February, 1852. This may be considered the new manager's first great attempt on the plan he has since carried out with such indomitable success. He had long felt that, even by his most eminent predecessors, Shakespeare in many respects had been imperfectly illustrated. He had seen what earlier actors had accomplished. He felt that steps had been taken in the right direction, and longed ardently to press farther on in the same path, to a more complete end. No longer fettered by restraining influences, and confident in the result, although previous experiments were attended by failure, he entered boldly on the enterprise. The result is before the public. It has worked a complete revolution in the dramatic system by the establishment of new theories and the subversion of old ones. The time had at length arrived when a total purification of Shakespeare, with every accompaniment that refined knowledge, diligent research, and chronological accuracy could supply, was suited to the taste and temper of the age, which had become eminently pictorial and exacting beyond all former precedent. The days had long passed when audiences could believe themselves transported from Italy to Athens by the power of poetical enchantment without the aid of scenic appliances. In addition to the managerial credit which Mr Charles Kean established by this early effort, and the still higher expecta-

tions he gave birth to from the manner in which *King John* was placed baefore the public, he made an important step in his reputation as an actor of the first class by a very complete and well-studied embodiment of the principal character—one of the most difficult, and perhaps altogether the most repulsive on the stage. There is nothing to assist the representative—no taking qualities, no commanding energy, no brilliancy, even in crime. All is sordid, contemptible, gloomy, ferocious. Yet there is dramatic strength in this craven monarch, as Shakespeare has drawn him, which has commanded the attention of the greatest tragedians. Old stage records tell us how the 'shining' lights of the other days acquitted themselves in this arduous part. John Kemble's performance of the King was considered faultless; Young, following in the track of Kemble, played it with almost equal effect. Many estimated it as Macready's best Shakespearian attempt; and in Charles Kean's list it may perhaps take the fifth place, giving precedence to his Hamlet, Lear, Wolsey, and Shylock. In the Lady Constance Mrs C. Kean stepped out of the line peculiarly recognized as her own, and assumed a character of matronly dignity and agonizing passion, which had been supposed to tax their utmost the surpassing energies of her greatest predecessor, Mrs Siddons. She had performed the part with universal approbation in New York, but had not yet ventured it in London. It was a hazardous undertaking, with the reminiscences attached to it. The result completely took the public by surprise. Never was a character represented with more true feeling and natural pathos; with more convincing evidence of careful study, or a more complete demonstration of having thoroughly caught up the spirit with superior awe, Mrs C. Kean drew more largely upon their tears. Campbell says, in his *Life of Mrs Siddons*, that it was not unusual for spectators to leave the house when her part in the tragedy was over, as if they could no longer enjoy Shakespeare himself when she ceased to be his interpreter. This sounds very much like a poet's hallucination. The sentence reads with an imposing air, but we have never heard it corroborated.

H. Morley (p. 30—February 14, 1852): There is not a play of Shakespeare's which more admits or justifies a magnificent arrangement of scene than the chronicle-play of *King John*. Its worthy presentation in an English theatre was one of the triumphs of Mr Macready's direction of Drury Lane ten years ago, and Mr Charles Kean now follows that example in his revival of the play as well as a lavish expenditure of scenic resource which is entitled to the highest praise. So mounted, we see in this play—what the great Marlborough saw nowhere else so satisfactorily—a solid fragment of our English history. We see revived the rude chivalric grandeur of the Middle Ages, the woes and wars of a half-barbarious time, in all its reckless splendour, selfish cruelty, and gloomy suffering. Mr Kean plays John with an earnest resolve to make apparent to the audience his mean and vacillating nature, his allegiance to 'that smooth-faced gentleman, tickling Commodity, Commodity, the Bias of the World,' and the absence of dignity in his suffering. Mrs Kean throws all her energy, and much true emotion, into Constance; and in Faulconbridge Mr Wigan makes a more sensible advance than we have yet had to record into the higher region of chivalric comedy. There is a clever child, too, in Arthur, a (Miss Terry), and the minor parts are effectively presented.

H. B. Tree

(*Saturday Review*, Sept. 21, 1889, p. 328): Any lover of Shakespeare who went on Thursday to the Crystal Palace eager to see one of the finest of the historical

plays, and one which has not been given in London for several years, might well be ready to overlook many shortcomings due to hasty preparation for a single performance, to make allowances for defects of stage management, and to be duly grateful if only he might hear a fair rendering of the play as a whole. Such a playgoer would have been most agreeably disappointed. The performance went without a hitch; the voice of the prompter was almost unheard, and, considering the small size of the stage, which could not but mar the effect of such scenes as those before Angiers, the stage management was excellent throughout. Indeed, the only fault to be found with the mounting of the play is that the arms of England on the banners were those of the present day. We have heard it rumoured that the preparations for producing the play occupied little more than a week, and if this be the case the degree of perfection attained is indeed remarkable. To the majority of the audience probably the chief point of interest was the assumption of the part of King John by Mr Tree, whose presentation of a very different Shakespearian character is fresh in all memories. Tall and gaunt, with a rather colourless face, thin light beard, and wandering eyes, he represented well the anxious claimant of a crown not his by right. Perhaps he made rather too much of this aspect of the character; a little more kingly dignity would not have been amiss in the scene, for instance, with the nobles in the fourth act. Mr Tree was at his best in the two great scenes with Hubert—that in Act III, where he first broaches to him the death of Arthur, and again when he reproaches him with murder. The former scene was led up to by a well-conceived piece of 'business.' The King, weary from battle, sets down his helmet encircled by the crown. Arthur takes it up and puts it on his own head. John, seeing him, snatches the crown away, and his hints to Hubert arise quite naturally from this incident and the thoughts which it suggests. The speech itself was admirably given. The guilty look and the broken utterance, the nervous repetition of the words 'I had a thing to say,' were as good as they possibly could be. The conclusion of the scene lost something of its impressiveness by the omission, whether intentional or accidental, of the significant interchange of words which follows Hubert's promise so to keep Arthur 'that he shall not offend your Majesty.' The text runs thus:

'*K. John.* Death.
Hub. My Lord?
K. John. A Grave.
Hub. He shall not live.'

Hubert's impassive bearing through the scene makes John uncertain whether his meaning has really been understood, and this brief explanation is necessary and most forcible. But for some excessive clutching at Hubert's dress Mr Tree's gesture in this scene was as good as his speech, and he made a most effective exit. Equally good in a different way was his defiance of the power of Rome—which, by the way, ought to have produced more effect than it did on the throng of soldiers and courtiers in whose presence it was uttered. Such a speech in those times would have made all around shrink in horror from him who made it. Mr Tree was well supported in his best scenes by Mr Fernandez as Hubert. Next in interest to Mr Tree's King John is undoubtedly the Arthur of Miss Norrey's, whose success was complete. She looked the part to perfection, and spoke her lines admirably. In her scene with Hubert she showed true pathetic power, and produced great effect upon her audience. Her fall from the castle window, by the way, was not well managed, and came dangerously near to provoking mirth. If Arthur

must roll through a bush upon the stage, care should be taken that his tumble may not recall memories of last season's pantomime. Mr Macklin as Philip, the bastard, deserves to be spoken of with respect, if without enthusiasm. He has a manly presence and a soldier-like bearing, and speaks his lines with vigour and distinctness, but his emphasis appears to us to be a little mechanical, and to be placed sometimes with regard rather for sound than for sense. Moreover, he does not quite succeed in hitting off the humorous side of the character. The part is one which makes great demands, physical and other, upon the actor. The Bastard is at once adventurer, humourist, and resourceful man of action, and he has, moreover, to perform to some extent the functions of a Greek Chorus. Few actors could do all that the part requires; Mr Macklin does a great deal. Miss Amy Roselle, too, deserves praise, but not unreserved praise, for her performance of Constance. She has force and passion, but she reminds one rather too frequently of the injured heroine of modern melodrama, and has certain tricks of style and gesture which jar on the spectator more in Shakespeare than in a modern play. Her earlier scenes were marred by a gasping utterance, which almost disappeared in the great scene of all, after Arthur's capture, with the King of France and the Cardinal. Here Miss Roselle was at her best. Her delivery of the speech to Pandulph affected the audience as nothing else in the whole play did, but she has not fully mastered the difficult art of speaking blank verse. With regard to the remaining characters, it is only necessary to mention the admirable elocution and dignified bearing of Mr Kemble as Pandulph, and Mr Brookfield's clever little character sketch of Robert Faulconbridge. His make-up was excellent, and his stolid stare, awkward gait, and stooping shoulders represented the loutish squire to the life. There was some defective elocution among the minor characters, one or two of whom were at times almost unintelligible, but the acoustic properties of the Crystal Palace Theatre probably leave something to be desired, and if Mr Tree ever finds it advisable, as we hope he may, to produce *King John* at the Haymarket, these little shortcomings will, no doubt, be remedied.

G. B. SHAW (*Saturday Review*, Sept. 30, 1899, p. 420): In a nobly vaulted chamber of Northampton Castle are set the thrones of the king and the queen mother. The portly chamberlain, wand bearing, red-robed, stands waiting on one of the topmost steps of the great staircase. An organ sounds, and he stalks majestically down. After him skips a little jester. A long sombre procession of bowed heads and folded arms, the monks come, chanting a Mass. After them walk the courtiers. The monks pass away through the arches. The courtiers range themselves around the throne. A blast of trumpets heralds the king and the queen mother, who presently seat themselves upon the throne. In the brief parley with Chatillon—'new diplomacy,' with a vengeance!—one feels that not the king, but the sinister and terrible old figure beside him, is the true power, ever watching, prompting, enforcing. Chatillon flings his master's defiance and is escorted from the presence chamber. The ill-matched brothers are ushered in; the straight limbed elder, splendidly confident and insolent; the younger, lantern-jawed and cringing, grinning with fear. At the foot of the throne the younger whines his cause with quick, wretched gestures. The king suppresses a smile. His eyes wander to the bastard, finding in him 'perfect Richard.' 'Man and no-man' are here—and elemental situation. Sped by a blow of the jester's bladder, 'no-man' scurries out of the chamber, happy in the acquisition of his gold. The bastard is left exulting in his manhood and the glory it has brought him. . . . Under the walls of Angiers Philip of France

parleys with his enemy. The queen mother holds out her arms to little Arthur, and Constance reads in her eyes all that would befall him in England. The citizens open their gates, and on a cushion the keys of the city are presented to the two kings, who, hand in hand, pass in to hold revelry. . . . Pandulpho, tremendous embodiment of the Pope's authority, comes to the two kings. John, strong in his mother's presence, receives the curse. Philip snatches his hand away from the clasp of his ally. Torn with conflicting fears, he submits himself to Rome. . . . You see the two armies 'face to face, and bloody point to point.' In a corner of a dark field, fitfully lit by the flames of a distant village, you see the victorious Bastard fell his arch foe and snatch from his shoulders the lion skin of Richard. . . . In a glade of slim beeches John communes with the faithful, grim Hubert. The old soldier stands immovable while his master whispers in his ear. Beyond stands the queen mother, watching with her eyes of ill omen. Little Arthur is plucking the daisies. The king smiles down at him as he passes, and the child starts away. There are some daisies growing near the spot where the king has been whispering his behest. Lightly, he cuts the heads of them with his sword. . . . In the crypt there is no light but from the cresset where the irons will be heated. Arthur runs in, carrying a cross-bow on his shoulders. 'Good morrow, Hubert.' 'Good morrow, little prince. . . .' All the vassals have left their king. The jester who watched the scene from a gallery has fled too. The king takes up the sword and the sceptre, sits haggard upon his throne. Hubert comes in, and the sound of the footstep causes the king to shudder and cry out like a child. But Arthur still lives. Nothing but his death-warrant remains against the king. While the king burns this parchment on the cresset, the monks file into their mass. Up the stairs they go, chanting. The king smiles, and then, still leaning by the cresset, folds his hands in prayer. He walks, with bowed head, up the stairs, abases himself at the altar. . . . It is the dusk of dawn in the orchard of Swinstead Abbey, and through the apple-trees the monks hurry noiselessly to the chapel. The dying king is borne out in a chair. He is murmuring snatches of a song. The chair is set down and with weak hands he motions away his bearers. 'Ay marry,' he gasps, 'now my soul hath elbow-room; it would not out at windows nor at doors. There is so hot a summer in my bosom, that all my bowels crumble up to dust. . . . And none of you will bid the winter come, to thrust his icy fingers in my maw.' The bastard comes in hot haste, and the king, to receive his tidings, sits upright, and is crowned for the last time. He makes no answer to the tidings. One of the courtiers touches him, ever so lightly, on the shoulder and he falls back. The crown is taken from his head and laid on the head of the child who is now king. The bastard rings out those words in which the poetry of patriotism finds the noblest expression it can ever find. . . . I have written down these disjointed sentences less in order to enable my readers to imagine the production at Her Majesty's Theatre than to preserve and accentuate for my own pleasure my own impressions. Probably I have omitted many of the important points in the play and in the show. I have merely recorded the things which an errant memory has kept clearest. Most of the points I have alluded to are, as you will have observed, points of 'business' and the stage management. For this I make no apology. I have never seen the play acted before, and I must confess that, reading it, I have found it insufferably tedious. I had found many beautiful pieces of poetry in it, but drama had seemed to be absolutely lacking. That was because I have not much imagination. Lengths of blank verse, with a few bald directions—'enter A; exeunt B and D; dies; alarums and excursions'—are not enough to make me see a thing. (And, I take it, this is

the case with most of my fellow-creatures.) Therefore, when I go to a theatre and find that what bored me very much in the reading of it is a really fine play, I feel that I owe a great debt of gratitude to the management which has brought out the latent possibilities. I can imagine that a bad production of *King John* would be infinitely worse than a private reading of it. A bad production would make the play's faults the more glaring. But a good production, as at Her Majesty's, makes one forget what is bad in sheer surprise at finding so much that is good. I can say without partiality, and with complete sincerity, that I have never seen a production in which the note of beauty was so surely and incessantly struck as in this production of *King John*. As for the actual performance, there are many interesting points which, unfortunately, I cannot discuss this week. I shall write about the performance as soon as there are not so many other plays clamouring to be noticed.

(*The Speaker*, Sept. 30, 1899, p. 346): The *King John* Revival at her Majesty's is an excellent piece of work. To the present generation the play is virtually unknown—for few people, it is to be presumed, read chronicle plays for their own amusement, and there was only a sparse audience on that afternoon a dozen years ago or more when Mr Tree gave a scratch performance of *King John* at the Crystal Palace. I was present on that occasion, but as I remember nothing save the peculiar slipperiness of the cane-chairs in the Palace Theatre, it is plain that Mr Tree's acting then produced no sort of impression on my mind. I should not call his acting 'impressive' to-day—Mr Tree is not an impressive actor and, for that matter, King John is not an impressive part—but it is plausible, well-considered acting. And Mr Tree is always lively, he gives you the notion that there is something up, that he is taking a hand in the game. I do not mean that he lacks dignity. Indeed, his John is 'every inch a king'—even in that scene of the tempting of Hubert to Arthur's murder, wherein both John Kemble (according to Hazlitt) and Charles Kean (according to G. H. Lewes) fell to the ordinary level of melodrama. His death, too, has a certain grandeur (Charles Kean's reminded Lewes of 'the agonies of a Jew with the colic'), though one doubts whether—as with a good many other stage-deaths from poison—the manner of it would be approved by experts in toxicology. John's sardonic humour and Mephistophelean cunning are the points he seems chiefly to desire to bring out—as in the scene with Hubert after the murder is supposed to have been done, and in the effective little piece of dumb-show behind Pandulph's back after John's pretense of becoming 'a gentle convertite.' His appearance, whether he is in flowing white robes of white silk or in close-fitting chain armour, is always picturesque; and I was devoutly thankful to find that his make-up owes nothing to a certain portrait of Macready in the part, which is a thing of positively appalling hideousness. These are the chief points that strike me as a playgoer. Earnest students, fresh from the perusal of Green's *Short History*, it may be, will want to know more. As, What is Mr Tree's conception of John's character? and How does he help us to a better knowledge of the true John? The answer is that plays are not played to answer such questions, and that we are not to trouble ourselves about matters which certainly never troubled Shakespeare, and, I should hope, have not greatly troubled Mr Tree, even though he has not had Shakespeare's luck in escaping the age of historical research. The measure of Shakespeare's achievement is well given by Mr Pater (*Appreciations*, p. 194), who says the dramatist allows John 'a kind of greatness, making the development of the play centre in the counteraction of his natural gifts—that something of heroic force about him—by

a madness which takes the shape of reckless impiety, forced especially on men's attention by the terrible circumstances of his end, in the delineation of which Shakespeare triumphs, setting, with true poetic tact, this incident of the King's death, in all the horror of a violent one, amid a scene delicately suggestive of what is perennially peaceful and genial in the outward world.' This is Shakespeare's plan. Mr Tree 'goes and does it.' Et voila! But if John is the protagonist of the play, Faulconbridge is, of course, its popular hero. He starts with the immense advantage of bastardy—an advantage, indeed, on which he insists with somewhat embarrassing plainness. A hero who is at once a fils naturel (the younger Dumas knew all about that), 'one of nature's noblemen,' and at the same time 'kep' out of his rights' (like Arthur Orton), presents an irresistible combination. Faulconbridge has it all his own way, from his knighthood before he has been five minutes at court to the close of the play, when he preactically 'runs the show.' 'Have thou the ordering of this present time,' says John to him; and he has. This is just the part for Mr Lewis Waller, who 'bullyrags' Austria with great gusto, rails at 'commodity' as heartily as though he supposed his admirers in the pit were familiar with the Shakespearian use of that word, and delivers the final patriotic 'tag'—

> 'Come the three corners of the world in arms
> And we shall shock them. Nought shall make us rue,
> If England to itself do rest but true'—

as though he were defying Oom Paul. On the first night men's heads instinctively turned to the stage-box occupied by Mr Chamberlain, who sat tight. The hysterical grief of Miss Julia Neilson's Constance seems overdone. But it is of the essence of hysteria to seem overdone, is it not? After all, it is a part to tear a cat in, and (if my suspicions are correct) gives us an uncomfortable glimpse into Shakespeare's domestic experiences. Mrs Siddons used to shed real tears as Constance—at least, so she said; but that was in the sentimental age, and Miss Neilson's eyes are dry. Anyhow, if she cannot act like Mrs Siddons (I do not add 'Thank goodness!' though I sometimes think Mrs Siddons must have been what the Americans call 'a holy terror'), she is a much more beautiful woman. Master Charles Sefton, who astonished the town so much in *The Heather Field*, astonishes it still more as Arthur. He is a wonderful boy, seeming to live his part rather than to act it. If he is not spoiled by early success—and he has the air of being a modest, unaffected lad—he probably has a fine future before him. Miss Lettice Fairfax's Blanche is a 'dainty rogue in porcelain,' and Miss Bateman's Queen Elinor a granite monolith. The Hubert of Mr McLeay, the Austria of Mr McKinnel, Mr Gerald Lawrence's Dauphin, and Mr Louis Calvert's Pandulph are all good. The stage-spectacle is superb—giving the impression of tumultuous life essential to a chronicle play, which was in some sort a promotion of the kinematograph. And, as it is also of the essence of a chronicle play to be loosely constructed, tied down as it is by material limitations of the stage rather than by any rigid unity of treatment, I see no objection to the interpolated tableau of *The Granting of Magna Charta*. It is only a case of putting another slide into the lantern, not of tampering with the text—and, for that matter, if Shakespeare had known as much of Magna Charta as our Modern Board scholars, we may be sure he would have had something to say about it. The great thing, after all, in these Shakespearian revivals is to see that they are something more than mere survivals—to put new life into them, in short. Mr Tree puts new life into *King John*.

R. B. MANTELL

W. WINTER (*New York Tribune*, 9th March, 1909): The most important dramatic event of the year occurred last night, when Robert Mantell, appearing at the New Amsterdam Theatre, impersonated King John in Shakespeare's historical tragedy relative to that Monarch, and by a great performance gave conclusive proof that he is a great actor. The character of King John, although not one of the greatest of Shakespeare's creations, is, of all his characters, one of the most difficult of authoritative, enthralling representation,—for the double reason that, while it is not uniformly and explicitly drawn, it is embedded in a tumultuous and somewhat distracting profusion of military exploits. Almost all of the first half of the play is devoted to a development of the principal persons concerned in it, and to preparation, by means of debate and the clangor of martial combat, for the portrayal of those persons, in a web of movement essentially dramatic; and during that preliminary period the character of the king is, in a considerable degree, reserved from full disclosure—for he appears as an intrepid, resolute, expeditious warrior, not openly exhibiting either malevolence, weakness, or guile. When, therefore, after the capture of Prince Arthur, he suddenly reveals himself as a subtle, crafty, treacherous, sinister villain, prompting the perpetration of a dastardly murder, of which he scarcely has the courage to speak, the author's revelation of him in this new light tends to bring with it a sense of discord, and to make the character seem anomalous. Formation of a clear, consistent, definite, practical idea of *King John*, accordingly, requires keen discernment in a comprehensive survey of the tragedy as a whole, while the effective impartment of that ideal to a theatrical audience exacts the exercise of a consummate faculty of insinuation and extraordinary skill of embodiment. The crowning excellence of Mr Mantell's performance is his interfusion, from the beginning, of malignity with royal arrogance, duplicity with irascible valor, and a lurking incertitude beneath an outside show of power. In this respect his acting excels that of Charles Kean, the best and most renowned representative of King John who has been seen here, within a long rememberance of our stage. That interfusion is not accomplished by any expedients of extravagant demeanor, nor by any exacerbations of the traditional Plantagenet temper (John, it is recorded, habitually swore 'by God's teeth!'), but by aspect, movement, facial play, modulations of the voice, and such other close denotements of the personality as, while they cannot perhaps be precisely defined, are intuitively comprehended. The actor who is a scholar will, of course, avail himself of whatever biographical information he is able to obtain, relative to peculiarities of appearance and manner known to have been characteristic of any historic person whom he is desirous to represent; but the actor is not justified in going behind the poet's fiction in order to derive an ideal from the historian's alleged fact. The character of King John, as represented by History, is far from being identical with the character of King John as represented by Shakespeare. The actual man appears to have been a ruffian, and, though possessed of redeeming qualities (such as promptitude of will, inherent authority and sporadic, bulldog courage), hideously cruel, monstrously licentious, a savage tyrant, perfidious, ruthless, intrinsically wicked: such a man as, being practically almost a barbarian, could not, if literally drawn, be made interesting in a work of art. It should be remembered that the age of King John was one of violence; that, for the most part, the chronicles of his reign proceed from monkish writers, unlikely to be tender of the reputation of a prince who defied the Pope of Rome; and that, whatever may have been his vices and crimes, his sovereignty of England lasted for eighteen years, and was terminated, not by his disposition but

by his natural death. The purpose of art, in treating of such a person,—whether that art be of drama or romance,—could only be served, as it has been in Shakespeare's play of *King John* and in Scott's novel of *Ivanhoe*, 'through a judicious consideration of those facts, and through the conception of a character not compact of merely monotonous brutality, but commingled of many attributes, susceptible of artistic treatment and of more or less sympathetic exhibition.' A savage, occupied in the industry of ordinary crime, is practically useless, whether in a play or in a novel. Character, in order that it may be interesting, must be diversified. Shakespeare, in delineating *King John*, has largely ignored the testimony of such records as were accessible to him, and—closely following, as to plot and as to the ground plan of the several prominent persons, an old play, of which the authorship is unknown, but with which Shakesperian scholars are familiar,—has drawn a man and not a brute. Beneath the magic touch of the poet a burly barbarian is transfigured, so that he becomes a creature of imagination; a being capable of inspiring friendship as well as animosity; a being prone to frightful wickedness, but not immune from equally frightful remorse. The historian Macaulay designates King John as a trifler and a coward. Shakespeare has depicted him as an incarnation of valor, policy, and depravity—valor that is defeated by rashness and misfortune; policy that is thwarted by remorse and superstitious fear; and depravity that is punished by the defection of his barons and the protracted tortures of an agonizing death. In that way Mr Mantell has apprehended and represented the character, manifesting a broad comprehension of the whole subject, and enriching the stage with a Shakespearian figure not less magnificent than true. The dramatic thread of the tragedy is the opposition of King John to Prince Arthur, in a contest for the crown of England, the title to which is lawfully vested in the prince while the possession of it is unlawfully vested in the king. Behind the prince stands his mother, the passionate, picturesque Constance, clamorous for his royal birthright, and frantic in dolorous lamentation when that birthright is bartered. Behind the king stands the arrogant Queen-mother, Elinor, inspiring her son to hold, by the strong hand, that sovereignty to which she knows he is not entitled and cannot otherwise maintain; and behind him also stands the gay, martial, buoyant, truculent, honest Faulconbridge, whom no peril can daunt and no obstacle impede. Sometimes in alliance and sometimes in opposition, the scheming potent Philip, King of France, whether as friend or foe, is a continual menace to the English usurper. Behind all, —the spring and impulse of the action—stands Cardinal Pandulph, legate of the Pope, prompting to war or peace, as best befits his political purpose to augment the Papal power. Viewed even as a financial epitome of old English History—while allowing for its compression of events and its proved errors of alleged fact—the play is exceptionally luminous and vitally interesting. Viewed as a study of human nature it is precious for its substance of truth and marvellous for its beauty of expression. Maternal love and grief are nowhere else put into such superlative words as those of Constance. The exquisite scene in which Arthur pleads and Hubert relents is, of its pathetic order, unmatched and unmatchable. The consistent preservation of poetic tone is not less absolute than the sustainment of perfect fidelity to nature and essential fact. King John, in reality, was as contemptuous of the 'bell, book, and candle' of the church as Faulconbridge is in the play. His surrender to Rome, like his surrender to the Barons when he signed the Great Charter, was an act conceived in policy and performed under compulsion—for he well knew that what was demanded would soon be extorted if it were not then given. In the tragedy he is shown—after the death of his formidable mother, and lacking

her counsel and support—to be gradually but surely breaking beneath the affliction of a haunting doubt and a secret terror. Disasters thicken around him. Omens affright him. The fever that is heavy on him has troubled him for a long time. His heart is sick. The death of Arthur, for which he knows himself responsible, is a burden upon his guilty mind. He feels that his friends are falling away. He dreads the power of Rome. He dreads the power of France. Above all things else, he dreads the nameless horror of an inscrutable, retributive Fate. From the moment when King John incites and enjoins Hubert to murder Prince Arthur the atmosphere of the tragedy is tremulous with a fearful apprehension of mysterious, impending doom. From that moment the monarch, though he walks in sunlight, is conscious of the ever-darkening shadow. As far as possible in his treatment of the play, and entirely and decisively in his performance of the King, Mr Mantell has preserved the atmosphere. He endues the miserable sovereign at once with a dangerous personality, a nervous temperament, a disquieted mind, a sinister look, and an impetuous, irascible demeanor—making him a man who, while bold in pretention and expeditious in movement, is, furtively, ill at ease, continually rancorous and capable of evil, and yet at vital moments weakly irresolute. His impersonation, accordingly, is all of one piece, so that, when he reaches the King's temptation of Hubert to do a murder, he only fully reveals a nature that he has already indicated. That terrible speech of King John to Hubert—'I had a thing to say'—he speaks in a hollow undertone, placing, however, a distinct, blood-curdling emphasis on the conclusive phrases—'Death'—'A Grave!'—and enforcing them with gesture and glance so baleful, and of such fatal meaning, that the observer shudders with horror. The sudden change to grisly exultation, with the words 'I could be merry now!' intensifies that impartment of dread. Indeed, the whole treatment of the temptation scene is admirable for its investiture of wickedness with plausibility, and for its subtle transparency—the suggestion of treachery, cruelty, and hideous crime being made in such a way that Hubert's acceptance of it and compliance with it seemed unconstrained and natural. The King's convulsive, clinging grasp of the hand of Philip. when the Cardinal threatens the curse of Rome, is a significant forerunner of that submission which his shifting, irresolute mind will, in all its subsequent access of infirmity, make to his spiritual lord, and it is all the more felicitous, as a touch of art, because it follows a splendid burst of passion, in the defiance of the imperious priest. But while Mr Mantell does not in any scene act for 'points,' his finest effects are obtained in the scenes with Hubert and in the death scene. His shrill and querulous denunciation of Hubert, after the defection of the distempered Barons, in the telling words, 'I had mighty cause to wish him dead, but thou hadst none to kill him,' is exactly in the fitting tone of irrational, panic-stricken tremor and self-pity, while the frantic revulsion of feeling, when Hubert exclaims 'young Arthur is alive,' is rightly and most effectively made to express itself in hysterical clamor of relief. A singularly fortunate make-up intensifies every effect of the actor's part. Mr Mantell's King John, when he is first seen, is seen to be a sick man, feverish in body and distressed in mind. The aspect is singular, menacing, almost repulsive, and yet it is attractive—possessing the reptile fascination of the serpent. The face is blanched. The gaze of the cruel blue eyes is sometimes concentrated, cold, and stony, sometimes wavering and shifting, as in the habit of self-conscious evil. The lips are full, red, and sensual. The head is crowned with a shock of reddish hair. The cheeks are covered, but not concealed, by a red, matted beard. The body slightly stoops, and, while it indicates physical strength, it conveys a suggestion that the vital forces will not long prove adequate to sustain it.

The movements are quick and, at some moments, spasmodic. A trick of plucking at the hair of the beard expressively denotes a nervous, splenetic temperament, overstrained and with difficulty held in check. At first the voice of the king is clear, stern, and aggressive; later—especially in the scenes with Pembroke, Salisbury, and the other discontented lords, when he inquires 'Why do you bend such solemn brows on me?' and after he has been apprised of the death of Queen Elinor—it becomes thin, hoarse, and fretful. No essential detail of the part has been forgotten; no illuminative characteristic of it has been omitted. Thought is manifested in every device of treatment, and prudent care of the voice is shown in an improved and fluent elocution, obedient to each ordainment of design. Those facts possess a decisive significance. Mr Mantell has brought to a task of uncommon magnitude a fine intuition, sedulous study, profound sincerity, and a rare faculty of impersonation, and so the large result of great talents and many years of experience is shown in a noble achievement. Mr Mantell's version of *King John* is not a new version, but the old version authorized by Charles Kean, a little varied, and divided by a larger number of curtains than hitherto used. The more notable of the old actors who, on the American stage, appeared as King John were Douglass, Cooper, Barry, two of the Booths, Charles Kean, Hamblin, and E. L. Davenport. Edwin Booth never acted King John, but his father, J. B. Booth, acted it, and so did his elder brother, J. B. Booth, Jr., with John McCullough as Faulconbridge and Agnes Booth as Constance. In England the part has been less neglected than in our country. Mr Benson has been seen in it, and it was performed at Her Majesty's Theatre by Mr Beerbohm Tree. The scenery used by Mr Mantell is appropriate, handsome, and effective, but like most of the scenery that is provided on such occasions as this, it is obviously new, lacking the depth of mellow color and tinge of antiquity which would make it impressive. The discreet use of a 'pounce bag' would be beneficial. The closing scene of Shakespeare's *King John*—in its clear suggestion of picturesque, impressive investiture, in its marvellous fidelity (poetic, and not for even one instant degenerating toward realism) to the afflicting fact of a miserable death, and in the exceeding beauty of its language—beggars description. In that scene Mr Mantell is at his best; a somewhat rare felicity! for it is not always that a dramatic performance, even when it is of a high order, continues to be evenly, potently, and splendidly sustained until its very end. The situation is a simple one, and all the more exacting for that reason. The King is dying—poisoned by a monk. 'The life of all his blood is touched corruptibly.' His agony has been terrible. He has been delirious, making 'idle comment' and pathetically breaking into song. He momentarily recovers his reason at the last. He will not die within four walls or beneath a roof. His soul must have 'elbow room.' 'It would not out at windows nor at doors.' He is brought into the orchard of the Abbey. The time is night. A wavering, golden light streams over the form of the dying man, and over the stalwart knights and courtiers who are grouped around him—some of them in full armour, others in the sumptuous colored raiment that John, like all the Plantagenets, liked to see. The body of the King, convulsed with pain, is shrunken and withered. His hair and beard are dishevelled. His face is ghastly, and, as seen in the flickering light, it gleams with the gathering dew of death. He has thrown aside his rich attire, and is clad in black trunks and long black hose, with a white shirt, torn open at the throat; around his shoulders there is a loose robe. A more piteous spectacle—made awful with mysterious, grim, and weird environment—has not been seen; and Mr Mantell makes the illusion so complete that the theatre is forgotten. The threadlike, gasping, whispering, despairing

voice in which he utters the dying speeches of King John—the abject, pitiful supplication that his kingdom's rivers may be allowed to take their course through his burnt bosom—can only be heard with tears. If pity and terror be the legitimate object of tragedy—touching the heart and thrilling and exalting the mind—Mr Mantell, assuredly, has accomplished its object. Wonderful death scenes have, at long intervals, been shown upon our stage: those, for example, of Ristori in Queen Elizabeth; Davison in Othello; Edwin Booth in King Lear; Henry Irving in King Louis; Salvini in Conrade. The death scene of Robert Mantell's King John is worthy to rank with the best of them. The art of it is superb. The monition of it should sink deep into every heart. To each one of us the hour of death must come—the forlorn, abject isolation from humanity—the awful opening of that dread pathway which every human being must tread alone—the great mystery—the piteous solitude, when mortality breathes its last sigh and murmurs its last farewell.

Cast of King John

King John	Robert Mantell
Prince Henry	Lorraine Frost
Prince Arthur	Leila Frost
Earl of Pembroke	George Turner
Earl of Essex	Charles Keene
Earl of Salisbury	William Bowen
The Lord Bigot	Tefft Johnson
Hubert de Burgh	Ethelbert Hales
Robert Faulconbridge	Edward Lewers
Philip	Fritz Leiber
James Gurney	Otto Brower
Peter of Pomfret	Walter Campbell
Philip	James Brophy
Lewis	George Stilwell
Duke of Austria	F. Dallas Cairns
Cardinal Pandulph	Guy Lindsley
Chatillon	L. Rogers Lytton
A Knight	Olaf Skavlan
A Citizen of Angiers	Oscar Pfefferic
First Attendant	Frederick Baldwin
Second Attendant	Edwin Lear
Queen Elinor	Lillian Kingsbury
Constance	Marie Booth Russell
Blanch of Spain	Edith Campbell
Lady Faulconbridge	Josephine McCallum

DRAMATIC AND POETICAL VERSIONS OF THE LIFE OF KING JOHN

BALE'S *Kynge Johan*

COLLIER (Camden Society reprint, *Introduction*): The name of Bale nowhere occurs; but there can be no doubt of his authorship, not only from a comparison with existing autographs, but from the fact that in his *Scriptorum Illustrium majoris Brytanniæ, &c. Summarium*, p. 702, he enumerates *De Joanne Anglorum rege* as one of his twenty-two dramatic works *in idiomate materno*. The copy of the

Summarium, &c. in the British Museum, which belonged to Bale, has many notes in the same handwriting as the MS. from which this impression has been taken. The drama is divided into two parts or plays, and in this respect it accords with the description given by Bale, in the work above cited, of his *De Joanne Anglorum rege*. It has only recently been recovered from among some old papers, probably once belonging to the Corporation of Ipswich, and its existence was not known when I published *The History of English Dramatic Poetry*, &c., in 1831. From private hands it was transferred to the matchless dramatic collection of the Duke of Devonshire. Bale was a native of Suffolk; but in what way his *Kynge Johan* came into the possession of the municipal body of Ipswich it would be vain to inquire; possibly it was written for it; and we may reasonably conjecture that it was performed by the guilds or trades of the town, in the same manner as the guilds or trades of Chester, Coventry, York, and other places, at an earlier as well as at a later period, were in the habit of lending their assistance in the representation of Scriptural Dramas. The date when *Kynge Johan* was originally written cannot be clearly ascertained; perhaps before Bale was made an Irish prelate by Edward VI. in 1552; but this point may admit of dispute. From the conclusion, it would appear that Elizabeth was on the throne; but I apprehend that both the Epilogue (if we may so call it) and some other passages were subsequent additions. The introduction of the name Darvell Gathyron, of course, establishes that the line was written after 1538, but of that fact there could be no doubt. It is known that in many of our plays, from the earliest times to the closing of the theatres, it was not unusual to make changes and substitutions, either to increase the interest, to improve the story, or to adapt it to the circumstances of the time. Bale was originally a Roman Catholic, became a Protestant, was abroad during the reign of Mary, returned to England after the accession of Elizabeth, and was made a Prebendary of Canterbury about 1560. He never returned to his see in Ireland, and probably, therefore, derived no revenue from it. He died in 1563. The design of the two plays of *Kynge Johan* was to promote and confirm the Reformation, of which, after his conversion, Bale was one of the most strenuous and unscrupulous supporters. This design he executed in a manner until then, I apprehend, unknown. He took some of the leading and popular events of the reign of King John, his dispute with the Pope, the suffering of his kingdom under the interdict, his subsequent submission to Rome, and his imputed death by poison from the hands of a monk of Swinstead Abbey, and applied them to the circumstances of the country in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII.; that monarch is spoken of as dead:

> 'Tyll that duke Josue, whych was our late Kynge Henrye,
> Clerely brought us into the lande of mylke and honye.'

Among his plays in *idiomate materno*, Bale inserts another, which, from its title, we may perhaps infer related also to some well known incidents in the life of Henry VIII.: it is *super utroque regis conjugio*. This early application of historical events is a singular circumstance, but it is the more remarkable when we recollect that we have no drama in our langugage of that date in which personages connected with and engaged in our public affairs are introduced. In *Kynge Johan* we have not only the monarch himself, who figures very prominently until his death, but Pope Innocent, Cardinal Pandulphus, Stephen Langton, Simon of Swynsett (or Swinstead), and a monk called Raymundus; besides abstract impersonations, such as England, who is stated to be a widow, Imperial Majesty, who is supposed to take the reins of Government after the death of King John, Nobility, Clergy, Civil Order, Treason,

Verity, and Sedition, who may be said to be the Vice or Jester of the piece. Thus we have many of the elements of historical plays, such as they were acted at our public theatres forty or fifty years afterwards, as well as some of the ordinary materials of the old moralities, which were gradually exploded by the introduction of real or imaginary characters on the scene. Bale's play, therefore, occupies an intermediate place between moralities and historical plays, and it is the only known existing specimen of that species of composition of so early a date. The interlude, of which the characters are given in Mr Kemple's *Loseley Manuscripts*, p. 64, was evidently entirely allegorical; and the plays of *Cambyses* and *Appius and Virginia* are not English subjects, and belong to a later period of our drama. On this account, if on no other, *Kynge Johan* deserves the special attention of literary and poetical antiquaries. It will be seen, however, that the play (taking the two dramas as one entire performance) possesses both interest and humour, making allowance for the style of writing and particular notions of the time, and for the introduction of polemical and doctrinal topics in the dialogue. The 'popetly playes' of the clergy, prior to the Reformation, are censured; and it will be recollected that the object of the writers of them was to give the people such an acquaintance with the Holy Writ as suited the purpose of the Romish Church, and would enforce the tenets peculiar to it. (Vide *Hist. Engl. Dram. Poetr.*, II, 156.) Bale's intention was directly the reverse, and instead of founding himself upon some portion of the Old or New Testaments, he resorted to the Chronicles, and thus endeavoured to give attractive novelty to his undertaking. Nevertheless, he terms his play a 'Pageant,' which was the common designation of dramatic performances such as they had existed from the earliest period. He inserts an explanatory speech by a personage whom he calls 'the interpreter,' a course consistent with very ancient practice, and sometimes necessary for the development of the story, or the enforcement of the moral. (Here also) we meet with the words *Finit Actus Primus*, but in no other part of the manuscript is there any trace of such artificial divisions; and no intimation is given of the separation of the scenes, excepting by the entrances or exits of the characters, many of which, as pointed out in the notes, are not marked. At the end of the Manuscript we meet with these words, 'Thus endeth the ij playes of Kynge Johan'; but it is not possible now to ascertain precisely where the first play ended and the second began. [There is] a defect in the manuscript, the probability being that one of the additions made by Bale, and intended by him to separate the two parts of the drama, has been irrecoverably lost. This separation of the production into two plays is the earliest instance of the kind, although at a later date the practice became general whenever our dramatists treated historical subjects. In the case before us, the drama would obviously be loo long for a single performance. In another important respect Bale seems to have set an example in this interesting department of our literature. He neither observed the unity of time nor place. In the original manuscript the names of the different characters are inserted at length, but the spelling of them is often merely arbitrary, and it was thought that it would be a sufficient indication of a change of speakers to give their initials, as they are generally mentioned, with all necessary particularity in this respect, at the commencement of the scene, or on the entrance of each performer. It will be remarked that in the portion of the play copied by Bale, in another handwriting, but corrected by him, England is usually spelt 'Ynglond,' but in that portion of the play which he penned himself, it is spelt 'England.' In the same way Bale's scribe susually spelt Civil Order with an S, and Bale himself with a C. No list of the characters is given at the com-

mencement or conclusion of the performance, hence we may conclude that the piece was performed by six principal actors, some of them quadrupling their parts. Several of Bale's dramatic productions are in print, and are enumerated in the various accounts of his life. He possesses no peculiar claims as a poet, and though he could be severe as a moral censor, and violent as a polemic, he had little elevation and a limited fancy. His versification also is scarcely as good as that of some of his contemporaries, and the only variety he attempts is the abandonment of couplets in the shorter speeches for seven-line stanzas in the longer. On the whole, however, the 'two playes of Kynge Johan' have great merit for the time when they were written, and great curiosity for our own.

WARD (i, 179): Possibly *Kynge Johan* was one of the publications against which Bishop Gardiner protested in a letter to the Protector Somerset written in the first year of Edward VI's reign, when the Visitation had begun which was almost literally to change the face of the land, and which, while received with very different feelings elsewhere, may be supposed to have found friends at Ipswich. Cardinal Wolsey's birthplace had benefited by the abolition of some of the smaller monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII, and its grammar-school was to be endowed, probably from similar sources, by Queen Elizabeth. Some of the charitable foundations of this borough or its vicinity, as was mentioned above, happened to date back to the reign of King John, whose name had, therefore, a good sound in this part of the country. But the choice of theme might have naturally suggested itself on more general grounds and, indeed, a previous dramatic attempt on the subject seems to have been produced in the shape of 'an enterlude concernyng King John,' acted 'at my Lorde of Canterbury's' (Cranmer's) on January 2nd, 1540. The play of *Kynge Johan* (for I must treat it as s single one) breathes the very spirit of the period of its composition—an emphatic defiance of the Pope and of Popery, thoroughly in consonance with the tendencies which animated the sway of Somerset and the Calvanistic reformers. These were the men who made war upon the relics of Roman ritual and Church wealth spared by Henry VIII, against which the author of *Kynge Johan* inveighs with the utmost bitterness and vehemence. At no other time in the Tudor period was so 'thorough' a view in the ascendant in the reforming circles as to the authority of the temporal sovereign in Church as well as State; and it is this view which the play enforces with reiterated energy. The royal supremacy is repeatedly insisted upon in terms one may almost say of gusto, such as Cranmer would have heartily approved. It is curious, by the by (and incidentally likewise points to an early date), and though the author vigorously denounces the absurdity of employing the Latin tongue in the services of the Church, he almost invariably makes his own quotations from Scripture (which are very copious) in Latin, as if that were the tongue, after all, most familiar to him as the language of the Bible.

[Ward's synoptical analysis of Bale's *Kynge Johan*, which here follows, renders unnecessary, I think, a complete reproduction of the entire text; which is now easily accessible in Farmer's series of Early English Dramatists (*The Dramatic Writings of John Bale*, London, 1907), and in Collier's reprint for the Camden Society, London, 1838.—ED.] The drama begins with a speech from King John himself, declaring his lineage and position, and announcing his intention to do his duty by the people. To him enters 'Ynglond *vidua*'—a personification of the country as a widow, who at once beseeches the King to protect her from her oppressors. 'Who are these?' inquires the King. Her answer suggests the keynote to all that follows, in these plain-spoken words—

'Suche lubbers as hath dysgysed heads in their hoodes
Whych in ydleness do lyve by other menns goodes,
Monkes, chanons and nones in dyvers coloure and shappe,
Bothe whyght blacke and pyed, God send their increase yll happe.'

The conference is interrupted by *Sedwyson* (Sedition), who certainly proves deserving of the epithet of a 'lewde person' speedily applied to him by the King. *Sedition* is, in fact, at once the main agent in the conduct of the play, and its solitary comic character. While, therefore, he represents the Vice of the moralities, he not only by his humorous (and ineffably coarse) sallies enlivens the progress of the action, but is the spirit of evil as well as the spirit of mockery. He makes very clear to King John the source of the mischief which is abroad in the realm, and in no measured terms exposes the iniquitous designs of the Pope, as well as the arts by which his emissaries have mastered the minds of the nobles, the clergy, and the lawyers, upon whom the King had imagined he could rely. Personifications representing these three orders of men—*Nobilyte, the Clargy*, and *Syvill* (Civil) *Order*—are then introduced to prove that *Sedition* has spoken the truth, but are constrained by the King to promise such obedience as he may demand from them. Hereupon the plot is hatched by *Sedition* and *Dissumulation* ('dan Davy Dyssymulacyon), who recognise one another as cousins:

'*S.* Knowest thou not thi cosyn Sedycycon?
D. I have ever loved both the and thy condycyon.
S. Thow must nedes, I trowe, for we cum of ij bretherne:
If thou remember owr fathers were on mans chylderne.
Thou comyst of Falshed and I of Prevy Treson.
D. Then Infydelyte our grandfather ys by reson.
S. Mary, that ys trew and his begyner Antycrist,
The great Pope of Rome, or fyrst veyne popysh prist.'

After comparing their antecedents and principles, and finding them mutually satisfactory, these two worthies agree to summon to their aid *Pryvat Welth* and *Usurpyd Power*, who enter singing a canticle, and join in the conspiracy. The conspirators now severally assume the characters which are supposed to typify the qualities they represent, viz., *Dissumulation* becomes Raymundus, *Sedition*, Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, *Private Wealth*, Cardinal Pandulphus, and *Usurped Power*, the Pope. They agree that an Interdict shall be issued, and the rule of Popery fully established. Thus ends the 'first act' after the 'Interpretour' has summed up the position in the following stanzas, which may be quoted, as they will render unnecessary any close account of the remainder of the play:

'In thys present acte we have to yow declared,
As in a mirrour, the begynnynge of Kynge Johan,
How he was of God a magistrate appoynted
To the governaunce of thys same noble regyon,
To see mayntayned the true faythe and relygyon;
But Satan the Devylle, which that time was at large,
Had so great a swaye that he coulde it not discharge.

Upon a good zele he attempted very farre
For welthe of thys realme to provyde reformacyon
In the Church thereof, but they did him debarre

Of that good purpose; for by excommunycacyon
The space of vij yeares they interdyct thys nacyon.
These bloudsuppers thus of crueltie and spyght
Subdued thys good Kynge for executynge ryght.

In the second Acte wylle apeare more playne,
Wherein Pandulphus shall hym excommunycate
Within thys hys lande, and depose hym from hys reigne.
All other princes they shall move hym to hate,
And to persecute after most cruell rate.
They wyll hym poison in their malygnyte
And cause yll report of hym alwayes to be.

This noble Kynge Johan, as a faythfull Moyses
Withstode proude Pharao for hys poore Israel,
Myndynge to brynge yt owt of the lande of darknesse,
But the Egyptanes did against him so rebell,
That hys poore people did styll in the desart dwell,
Tyll that duke Josue, whych was our late Kynge Henrye,
Clerely brought us out in to the lande of mylke and honye.

As a strong David, at the voyce of verytie,
Great Golye, the pope, he strake downe with hys slynge,
Restorynge agayne to a Crysten lybertie
Hys land and people, lyke a most vyctoryouse Kynge;
To hir first bewtye intendynge the Churche to brynge
From ceremonyes dead to the lyvynge wurde of the Lorde.
Thys the seconde acte wyll plenteously recorde.'

The view of King John's motives indicated in the above pervades the play, in one passage of which he is called a 'Loller,' i. e., Lollard. Under the pressure of the Interdict, *Nobility*, *Clergy*, and *Civil Order*, in spite of remonstrances of the King, bend their knees before Langton and Pandulphus; then *Commynalte*, the personification of the suffering commons, who is blind as well as poor, and in whom, as the son of the widowed England, the King had placed his last trust, tremblingly submits to the arrogant Cardinal; the forsaken King receives news that enemies from abroad are threatening him on every side; and thus at last he gives way and delivers up his crown. The rest of the play (which from this point is in Bale's handwriting) is far less dramatically effective; the real dramatic climax being past. Futher concessions are forced out of the King, whose enemies finally determine to make away with him by poison. *Dissumulation*, on being promised eternal bliss as his reward, assumes to himself the responsibility of the deed and its consequences. To the King, who is athirst, he enters in the guise of a monk, bearing a cup in his hand and singing a wassail song; and after himself swallowing half the poisoned draught, persuades the King to drink the remainder. The treacherous monk hereupon goes to his death, comforted by the belief that he 'dies for the Church with S. Thomas of Canterbury'; and then his royal victim dies (not on the stage), after forgiving his foes and uttering a farewell to England:

'Farwell, swete Englonde, now last of all to the;
I am ryght sorye I coulde do for the no more.
Farwell ones agayne, yes, farwell for evermore.'

The whole of what follows may, in the irreverent language of the modern stage, be described as a tag. *Veryte* (Verity) expatiates on the King's virtues and good deeds, and on the lies which partisan historians have uttered against his memory, and inculcates at great length the doctrine of absolute obedience to princes. *Nobility*, *Clergy*, and *Civil Order* promise to amend their ways; and here at last the play might have come to a close, but the author could not forbear from bringing in, to wind up the action, what may be almost called a *deus ex machinâ* in the shape of one more personification—*Imperyall Majestie*. This abstraction, beyond doubt, very thinly veils the royal or 'imperial' (for he liked that style) figure of Henry VIII, with whose sentiments the oration in favour of the royal supremacy is in very complete accordance. *Sedition* is called to account by *Imperial Majesty*, and, though promised pardon if he will make a full confession, is consigned to the hands of *Civil Order* for the Expiation of his sins:

> 'Have hym fourth, Cyvyle Order, and hang hym tyll he be dead,
> And on London Brydge loke ye bestowe his head.'

This worthy having been taken away, after begging that some one will tell the Pope, so that he may be put in the litany and prayed to 'with candles' like Thomas Becket, there remains nothing to be said beyond some final words of admonition against sedition and popery. The exhortation against anabaptism (a term of very elastic application in the Reformation age) and the tribute of praise to Queen Elizabeth, as to the sovereign who may be a light to all other princes, are, as has been seen, later additions. As a matter of course, this play is written in anything but a historical spirit, and it would be of little advantage to criticise it from a historical point of view. Indeed, expert controversialist as he was, the author falls back on abusing the plaintiff's speech cited above, and in the assertion of *Nobility* (which for the rest does not lack point), that

> 'You pristes are the cawse that chronycles doth defame
> So many prynces, and men of notable name,
> Fro yow take upon yow to wryght them evermore,
> And therefore Kyng Johan is lyke to rew it sore
> When ye wryte his time, for vexing of the Clargy.'

In other words, this earliest example of a species which was soon to develop into the Chronicle Histories, pretended to bid defiance to the Chronicles, because they were written by priests; nor was it until a new generation of historical writers arose who were in sympathy with the sentiments of a large body of the laity that a national historical drama could draw its materials from congenial sources. It so happens that with the reign of King John began a new school of ecclesiastical chroniclers, associated with the monastery of St Albans, who reflected the change in the clergy of the age from political neutrality to active partisanship on behalf of the claims of the church. Authorities of this description Bale was not very likely to follow; and, indeed, even in the later Chronicle History of *The Troublesome Raigne of King John of England* mediæval historical tradition was treated with scant courtesy. Yet for the main series of his facts Bale had, notwithstanding, to depend upon the narrative of the Chroniclers. This furnished the outline of the action of his play and suggested the dramatic idea that lay at the root of the two later dramatic treatments of the same subject—viz., the fatal influence of the Roman Church. Thus the king became in his eyes a national hero, although, as perhaps was natural in an admirer of so arbitrary a 'duke,' he overlooked what we should term the consti-

tutional significance of John's reign, and utterly ignored Magna Charta. I have treated this production at what may perhaps seem disproportionate length, because of the importance attaching to it in the history of our dramatic literature on account of its theme, which was at once (in a sense) religious and national, and which accordingly places the work midway between the early religious and active beginnings of our national historical drama. Yet, as must have become sufficiently obvious, it has in form nothing of moment to distinguish it from the moralities; a very limited number of actors seems to have been contemplated for its performance. The exits and entrances of the principal characters (with the single exception of King John himself) are so arranged as to admit of four, three, or two of them respectively being played by the same persons; and stage directions frequently occur, such as '*Go out Ynglond, and drese for Clargy.*' In a prolific controversialist such as Bishop Bale it would be odd to look for literary merit of the poetical kind. As we shall see hereafter, the dramatist and the pamphleteer were in the annals of our literature more than once combined in the same individual—but such writers only very exceptionally attain to loftier flights. There is, however, some dramatic force in the struggle of King John as his catastrophe draws near, and a touch of pathos may perhaps be found in the figure of the poor '*Commonalty*'—which Lyndsay had made the central personage of his political morality, but which was to be often conspicuous by its absence from the actions of our English historical dramas. The staple metre of *Kynge Johan* consists of rimed Alexandrines, very irregular as to the number of syllables; quatrains and triplets are frequently introduced; the stanza form of the Interpretour's speech is Chaucerian. It should be perhaps pointed out that we possess no evidence as to Bale's *Kynge Johan* having actually served as a transition from the Moralities to the Chronicle Histories, and by means of these to the regular drama of the tragic or serious kind. Indeed, there is every indication to the contrary; for the earliest Chronicle History proper known to us belongs in date to the last decade but one of the sixteenth century; and to the author of the second in date (*The Troublesome Raigne*), which was printed in 1591, Bale's play was, as has been seen, unknown. After its composition, succeeded perhaps by one or more performances of it under King Edward VI, Queen Mary's reign had intervened, during which there were the best of reasons for keeping the MS. hidden away among the papers of the Corporation at Ipswich. Thence it only emerged on a single occasion early in Queen Elizabeth's reign, when, if not actually performed, it was certainly revised for some such purpose. The death of its author two years afterwards (1563) may help to account for its having, so far as we know, remained unprinted. In the first decade of the reign of Elizabeth the beginnings of English tragedy were, with the utmost distinctness, to attach themselves to examples of a very different kind of dramatic writing. Yet the fact of the composition and existence of *Kynge Johan*, whatever were the actual fortunes of the work, remains none the less of great significance. An age which could produce a play of this description could not fail before long to find writers who would abandon the worn ways of the moralities and their abstract characters, and appeal to a range of ideas and feelings no longer to be satisfied by the allegorical inculcation of ethical commonplaces, or by the repetition of familiar Bible stories and anecdotes of Saints.

DUCIS—*Jean Sans-Terre*

The Tragedy *Jean Sans-Terre* by Ducis was first acted in 1791, but was not published until 1830, with his other translations from Shakespeare. It can hardly be called a translation of Shakespeare's *King John;* it is not even an adaptation.

But let Ducis speak for himself in extenuation of his violent changes of Shakespeare's play; he says (vol. ii, p. 199): It was to me apparent, at representations of this Tragedy, since it was in five acts, that the last two were of but slight interest; but it was the public, who are never beguiled by sentiment, that opened my eyes to this essential fault, into which I was perhaps led, without knowing it, by the fervent love I felt for my subject. I ought to have seen that from the moment when Arthur, that lovely and unhappy child, was deprived of his sight, it was, in a certain way, to the public as though he were deprived of life. It seemed that the light of day, being extinguished for him, caused at the same time the interest for the audience in the piece to disappear. I therefore decided to condense the play into three acts, and hurry rapidly towards my denouement; in hastening the death of Arthur and his mother I have caused the prince to die by the hands of his uncle, because actually this barbarous and perfidious king himself stabbed Arthur, and it was not possible for me to falsify history in a fact so well known; but I thought it necessary to punish the king in making Hubert foretell his terrible and miserable death which he met by a cup of poisoned wine, and in this I have followed Shakespeare, who makes him die, in the sight of the audience, by a death of this sort, in cruellest torments. The fact cannot be ignored that Shakespeare provided me with the scene wherein King John incites Hubert to burn out the eyes of Arthur with red-hot irons, and also that where Hubert seeks, but in vain, to evade that horrible command. These two scenes are worthy of this great poet when at his best; it is the second only of these two, where Arthur speaks to Hubert with such eloquence and charm, which, as it were, urged me, through the lively emotion which it inspired, to place this incident upon our stage. But one desire alone remains to me, that is, that this incident actually suffice to sustain and make live the whole work; shown by the public I have been more than glad to correct a principal fault and hide, if possible, in part at least, the other faults which have escaped me. [The remainder of Ducis' introduction is devoted to his expressions of gratitude to Mlle Simon, who acted Arthur, and to M. Monvel, who played Hubert, when the piece was first represented. The following synopsis will, I think, give the reader a fairly comprehensive idea of Ducis' method and achievement—ED.]

JEAN SANS-TERRE

OR

THE DEATH OF ARTHUR

CHARACTERS

John, King of England, surnamed *John Sans-Terre*. *Constance*, Duchess of Bretagne, widow of *Geoffrey*, brother of *John*, and mother of *Arthur*, under the name of *Adele*. *Arthur*, young prince, aged ten years, son of *Geoffrey* and *Constance*, nephew to the King. *Hubert*, commander in chief of the Tower of London. *Nevil*, second in command in that Tower. *Kermadeuc*, an aged Breton. An Officer. A Soldier.

Guards, Soldiers, People.

The Scene: England, in the Tower of London.

Act I. Scene: A large hall in the Tower of London; with the doors of several prison cells opening upon it. Hubert soliloquises on the unhappy condition of the

King, hated by his subjects and in fear of losing the crown; and questions the reason of the king's demand for a conference with the head-keeper of the Tower and his assistant Nevil. He concludes with the reflection that as his harsh duties as jailer compel him to hear the plaints of prisoners he may be able to save some unhappy victim. Innocence oppressed by a cruel king, the enemy of his people, at all times is in need of a friend.

Enter King John, Nevil, and Guards, these last are dismissed by the King, who then informs Hubert and Nevil that he has himself sought refuge in the Tower. Among the prisoners there is one whom he especially fears—this is Arthur, the son of his brother Geoffrey, who believes that he is the rightful king. To this Nevil replies that the king's fears are groundless, since by Richard's will his nephew Arthur was set aside and the crown bequeathed to John; were this not so, of course, Arthur's right through his father Geoffrey would hold good; but John as he is now crowned and in possession of the throne has an unassailable right. Hubert then argues that as Arthur's rights to the crown of England are annulled, he should be returned to Britanny, of which he is the reigning Duke, and to this Dukedom the King of England has no claim. Nevil objects on the ground that there is safety only in holding Arthur as a hostage, since there have already been plots to rescue him, and his return to Britanny would be a signal for other uprisings. Hubert renews his pleas for Arthur's liberty, adding that his return to his mother Constance will placate her, and cause her to cease her attempts against King John. 'That is the very reason,' replies King John, 'why I must mistrust and fear this child. It is no vain rumor or mistake which I hear; that they have designs on my throne, that shortly an armed party is to rise in his defence.' Nevil replies that the English will never place on the throne a child deprived of sight; for that, after all, is a rumor which the king has himself disseminated. It is repeated and believed everywhere; and this fortunate rumor, though quite untrue, shall quickly extinguish both the love and zeal of the English; therefore no matter what this party may be, as long as their plot is known, it is futile. Hubert represents to the King that the people are questioning as to why, Arthur being still in prison, war should still be waged against him; rumor that he has been deprived of sight, false though it be, only serves to strengthen the feelings of the people in his behalf; particularly since deprived of the care of his mother, all mothers are interested in the fate of Arthur, Hubert therefore counsels the king to send Arthur back to Britanny. Justice demands this action; it should not be disregarded. The King refuses, since, as he says, the time for this has not yet arrived; he is about to seize the conspirators in a plot; Arthur must remain in prison; and with Nevil he departs. Hubert calls Arthur forth from his cell, and greets him with affection, which Arthur returns. Hubert warns him that he must give up all hope of deliverance at present, as the King is determined on keeping him still a prisoner. Arthur eagerly asks for tidings of his mother; but Hubert says that even her own people are ignorant of her fate. Arthur then confides to Hubert that he has taken a cross of wood which he had with him, and writing upon it the words, 'O English people, help Arthur,' has thrown it from the window of his prison in hopes that it may fall into the hands of friends. In this hope Hubert joins him, but warns him not to put too much trust in such an occurrence. Hearing the approach of the King, Hubert bids Arthur retire. King John again expresses his fears of a rising in favor of Arthur, telling Hubert that among the prisoners is an unknown Bretonne woman simply called Adele who was taken among those in the late conspiracy to Arthur; and also a Breton peasant, Kermadeuc; the King orders Hubert to allow these two to meet each other as though alone, but that

Hubert remain concealed in order to discover if there be any further plots, in which case both are to be put to death. With this the first act closes.

The first half of the second act is given to the interview between Kermadeuc and Adele. He tells her how he had often in Britanny seen his liege lord Arthur, and now pities the lot of his unfortunate mother, not knowing where she is or what has been her fate. He goes on to say that, anxious to find where Arthur is a prisoner, he one day while pacing the narrow courtyard noticed a small window of a dungeon heavily barred, and while looking towards it there was thrown out a wooden cross, which he picked up, and on examination found written upon it, 'O English people, help Arthur.' Adele, unable to restrain herself, reveals to Kermadeuc that she is Arthur's mother, the unfortunate Constance. Hubert enters suddenly and informs them that their words have been overheard by him; but that as he has ever been the friend of the unfortunate he will not betray them. Constance, thus encouraged, begs that she may but have a sight of her son; and to this Hubert finally consents, but only on the condition that she cover her face with her veil and refrain from revealing herself to Arthur. The Prince is brought in, and, forgetting her promise, Constance clasps him in her arms, telling him she is his mother. The interview is rudely interrupted by the approach of the King, and Hubert hastily dismisses all three to their separate cells. King John tells Hubert that he is still a prey to his fears; but that the main cause is his nephew Arthur, and here follows a weak imitation of Shakespeare's masterly treatment of this same situation. The King concludes with expressions of his great love for Hubert, and tells him that the people are planning a rescue of Arthur. The false rumor of Arthur's blindness, and his consequent inability to reign, must be made a fact; with this hint as a command to Hubert he leaves him, overcome with horror at the deed which he must perform. With his reflections on such barbarous cruelty the second act closes.

Act III. begins with a soliloquy by Hubert wherein he deplores the fact that he is unable to have access to the king, who remains in conference with Nevil. Hubert fears that they are plotting the death of Arthur, and that the deed is to be accomplished by Nevil. Arthur comes to Hubert and then follows an attempt to reproduce the scene from Shakespeare's play, where Hubert informs Arthur of the order for his blinding. Needless to say it is quite ineffective dramatically, owing to its position in the tragedy. It comes too late in the action. Hubert is not mollified by Arthur's tenderness, but summons the executioners and hands Arthur over to them without apparent compunction. Arthur is taken out to suffer blinding by hot irons. Nevil then tells Hubert that the king has revoked his order for the blinding of Arthur on his having heard that there is a report current in the city that Constance is alive and that Arthur's claim to the crown is legitimate. If such a report be true Arthur is to be put to death; if false, the first order of the King is to be carried out. An officer enters overcome with horror at what has just been accomplished and describes Arthur's condition now deprived of sight. Constance approaches, asking Hubert for a sight of her son, but suspects, from Hubert's silence, that Arthur is dead; on his telling her what has actually happened she is overcome with grief and horror. The King, not knowing who she is, sends word that, as Arthur is now helpless, Adele is to have charge of him; Arthur is brought in blind, but apparently suffering but little from his terrible experience. Constance tells him that she is to be his protector and guide, and again unable to restrain herself reveals to him that she is his mother. The approach of the King is announced, and on his entrance Kermadeuc is brought in. The King confronts him with the cross on which Arthur had written his appeal for help, threatening Kermadeuc with torture if he refuses to

reveal the meaning of this and telling him his accomplice has betrayed him. Kermadeuc remains firm in his refusal to reveal anything. The King, enraged, summons the guard to take Kermadeuc to instant death. Arthur intercedes for him; and the King asks if he knows anything concerning this cross and its message. Arthur acknowledges that he it was who had taken this means of appealing to the English people. The King orders that Kermadeuc, Arthur, and Adele be transferred to Pomfret. At that name Constance is unable to repress a groan of horror. The King enquires of Hubert the meaning of this, and is told that the name of Pomfret is ominous as a prison. The King, pitying the aged woman's unhappy lot, tells her that she is free and bids her deliver over to him the boy Arthur; she refuses to leave her prison or give up the boy; the King is at once suspicious of a plot, and orders that all three, Kermadeuc, Arthur, and Adele, be taken away. Hubert endeavors to take Arthur from his mother; and she inadvertently betrays the fact that she is Constance. King John is astounded at this and she upbraids him for his inhumanity. Word is brought that the whole city is in revolt against the King; and hastily giving orders in regard to the safe keeping of the prisoners the King prepares to repress this revolt. Constance, Arthur, and Kermadeuc at once attempt, with the aid of Hubert, to make their escape, and depart hurriedly. A soldier tells Hubert of the success of the people against the King, and in the midst of his recital King John enters, Hubert taunts him with failure of his plans, when the king draws a curtain and shows the bodies of Constance and Arthur whom he has slain with his own hands. The people are seen endeavoring to enter; but Hubert restrains them from killing the King, and in a long harangue prophesies to King John how miserable shall be his end, poisoned and dying in torments as just expiation for his crimes. On this scene 'the curtain descends simply because,' remarks Dr Doran (*Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1878), 'Hubert is too much out of breath to say any more, and John is struck dumb by his impertinence.'

THOMAS DELONEY: *The Lamentable Death of King John, how he was Poysoned in the Abby of Swinstead by a Fryer.*

[From the reprint of *Strange Histories, or Songes and Sonets, of Kings, Princes, Dukes, Lordes, Ladyes, Knights and Gentlemen.* London, 1607—ed. by J. Payne Collier for the Percy Society, 1841 (Publications, vol. iii.).]

A treacherous deede forwith I shall you tell,
Which on King John upon a sodaine fell:
To Lincoln-shire proceeding on his way
At Swinstead Abbey one whole night he lay.

There did the king oppose his welcome good,
But much deceipt lyes under abbots hood:
There did the king himselfe in safetie thinke;
But there the king received his latest drink.

Great cheere they made unto his royal grace,
While he remaynd a guest within that place;
But while they smylde and laughed in his sight,
They wrought great treason shadowed with delight.

A flat faced monke comes with a glosing tale
To give the king a cupp of spiced ale:
A deadlier draught was never offered man,
Yet this false monke unto the king began.

Which when the king (without mistrust) did see,
He tooke the cup of him couragiously;
But while he held the poysoned cup in hand
Our noble king amazed much did stand.

For casting down by chaunce his princely eye
On precious jewels, which he had full nye,
He saw the cullour of each precious stone
Most strangely turne, and alter one by one.

Their orient brightnesse to a pale dead hue
Were changed quite: the cause no person knew,
And such a sweat did overspread them all,
As stood like deaw which on fair flowers fall.

And hereby was their precious natures tryde,
For precious stones foule poyson cannot abide;
But though our king beheld their cullour pale,
Mistrusted not the poyson in the ale.

For why, the monke the taste before him tooke,
Not knew the king how ill he did it brooke;
And therefore he a hearty draught did take,
Which of his life a quicke dispatch did make.

Th' infectious drinke fumde up into his head,
And through the veines into the heart it spread,
Distempering the pure unspotted braine,*
That doth in man his memorie maintaine.

Then felt the king an extreame griefe to grow
Through all his entrels, being infected so:
Whereby he knew, through anguish which he felt,
The monks with him most treacherously had delt.

The grones he gave did make all men to wonder:
He cast as if his heart would split in sunder;
And still he cald, while he thereon did thinke,
For that false monk which brought the deadly drinke.

And then his lords went searching round about
In every place to find this traytor out:
At length they found him dead as any stone,
Within a corner lying all alone.

* See *King John*, V, vii, 4, and note.—ED.

For having tasted of that poysoned cup,
Whereof our king the residue drunke up,
The envious monke himselfe to death did bring,
That he thereby might kill our royall king.

But when the king with wonder heard them tell
The monkes dead body did with poyson swell,
Why then, my lords, full quickly now, quoth hee,
A breathlesse king you shall among you see.

Behold, he sayd, my vaines in peeces cracke,
A greevous torment feele I in my backe,
And by this poyson deadly and accurst,
I feele my hart-stringes ready for to burst.

With that his eyes did turne within his head;
A pale dead cullour through his face did spread,
And lying gasping with a cold faint breath,
The royall king was overcome by death.

His mournfull lordes, which stood about him then,
With all their force and troopes of warlike men
To Worcester the corpes they did convey,
With drumme and trumpet marching al the way.

And in the fair Cathedral Church, I finde,
They buried him according to their minde,
Most pompiously, best fitting for a king,
Who were applauded greatly for this thing.

RICHARD NICHOLS: *The Unfortunate Life and Death of King John* [contained in] *A Winter Night's Vision:* being an Addition of such Princes especially Famous who were exempted in the former Historie, [*The Mirrour for Magistrates*], London, 1610.

THE ARGUMENT

This Prince to future time, quoth Memorie,
Remaines a Mirrour of true Charitie,
Who at his death that traytour did forgiue,
Whose bloodie hand did him of life depriue:
But Marchades for vengeance did suruiue,
The traytor taken he did fley aliue.
Now to the next, whom vp from graue we bring,
Prince Iohn the brother of the late dead King:
He takes the crowne as due to him of gift,
At whose good fortunes many hands do lift.
Philip beyond the seas inuades his lands;
Arthur in Aniou with his British bands,
Pursues the aged mother of the King,
Who to the rescue all his power doth bring;
Takes Arthur captiue, and for his disdaine
Sends him to Rouen Castle, whence againe
He nere returnes: wonders in heau'n are seene,

Treason amongest the Peeres, the wrathful spleene
Twixt Romes proud Innocent and stout King Iohn.
The French afresh inuade, the King finds none
To take his part: the Irish do rebell;
The Welch breake forth, both whom he doth compell
To stoope their pride: the curse of Innocent,
Against whose pride the King stands stiffly bent,
Philips huge Nauie doth on England frowne,
The King vnto the Legate yeelds his crowne:
The Lords rebell, the King is left forlorne,
Abus'd, reuil'd, and made his peoples scorne:
Seekes th' aid of strangers, and in his fierce ire,
Flies o'er the kingdome like a flaming fire.
The Barons flie from him, and seeke to bring
The French Prince Lewis in, to make him King;
He lands in Kent, London receiues his traine,
From th' haplesse King all fals away againe;
The French mens pride the English sore opprest,
King Iohns reuenge, poore Englands woes encreast:
In midst of hope t' expell his enemies,
The wretched King at Swynsted poysoned dies.
All which, since many writers in his daies,
Of very malice writ in his dispraise,
That we may heare, let Fame with Summons call
His princely ghost, to tell his tragicke fall.

[The story in verse on the Life and Death of King John, which follows this argument, consists of ninety-nine stanzas of seven lines each; it is a laborious and meticulous paraphrase from Grafton's *Chronicle;* but since there is no evidence of the writer's having read or consulted either the older play or Shakespeare's *King John* its inclusion in the present volume is irrelevant. For further information on the subject see Miss R. Wallerstein's *King John in Fact and Fiction,* University of Pennsylvania, 1917.—ED.]

TIME ANALYSIS

P. A. DANIEL (*Sh. Soc. Trans.*, 1877–79, p. 263): Time of this play, seven days; with intervals, comprising in all not more than three or four months.

Day 1. Act I, sc. i.
Interval.
" 2. Act II, sc. i.; Act III, scenes i. to iii.
Interval.
" 3. Act III, sc. iv.
Interval.
" 4. Act IV, scenes i. to iii.
Interval.
" 5. Act V, sc. i.
Interval.
" 6. Act V, scenes ii. to v.
" 7. Act V, scenes vi. and vii.

HISTORIC DATES

Death of Richard Cœur-de-lion, April, 1199. John crowned at Westminster, March 27, 1199. John makes truce with Philip, June, 1199. Betrothal of Louis and Blanche, May 23, 1200. John and Isabella crowned at Canterbury, Oct. 8, 1200. Death of Constance, Aug. 31, 1201. John's 3d coronation, March 25, 1201. John's 4th coronation, April 14, 1202. Arthur taken prisoner by John and imprisoned at Falaise, Aug., 1202. Probable murder of Arthur by John at Rouen, April 3, 1203. Philip demands deliverance of Arthur, March, 1204. Death of Elinor, April 1, 1204. John besieges and takes Angiers, Aug., 1206. Truce of two years concluded, Oct., 1206. Stephan Langton elected Archbishop, Dec., 1206. The Interdict, March, 1208. John excommunicated, Dec., 1209. John yields to the Pope, 1213. Magna Charta, June, 1215. Death of John, Oct. 19, 1216.

THE END.

PLAN OF THE WORK, ETC.

In this Edition the attempt is made to give, in the shape of TEXTUAL NOTES, on the same page with the Text, all the VARIOUS READINGS of *King John*, from the Second Folio down to the latest critical Edition of the play; then, as COMMENTARY, follow the Notes which the Editor has thought worthy of insertion, not only for the purpose of elucidating the text, but at times as illustrations of the History of Shakespearian criticism. In the APPENDIX will be found criticisms and discussions which, on the score of length, could not be conveniently included in the *Commentary*.

LIST OF EDITIONS COLLATED IN THE TEXTUAL NOTES

The Second Folio	[F_2]	....	1632
The Third Folio	[F_3]	....	1664
The Fourth Folio	[F_4]	....	1685
N. ROWE (First Edition)	[Rowe i.]	....	1709
N. ROWE (Second Edition)	[Rowe ii.]	....	1714
A. POPE (First Edition)	[Pope i.]	....	1723
A. POPE (Second Edition)	[Pope ii.]	....	1728
L. THEOBALD (First Edition)	[Theob. i.]	....	1733
L. THEOBALD (Second Edition)	[Theob. ii.]	....	1740
SIR T. HANMER	[Han.]	....	1744
W. WARBURTON	[Warb.]	....	1747
E. CAPELL	[Cap.]	(?)	1761
DR JOHNSON	[Johns.]	....	1765
JOHNSON and STEEVENS	[Var. '73]	....	1773
JOHNSON and STEEVENS	[Var. '78]	....	1778
JOHNSON and STEEVENS	[Var. '85]	....	1785
J. RANN	[Ran.]	....	1787
E. MALONE	[Mal.]	....	1790
GEO. STEEVENS	[Steev.]	....	1793
REED'S STEEVENS	[Var. '03]	....	1803
REED'S STEEVENS	[Var. '13]	....	1813
BOSWELL'S MALONE	[Var.]	....	1821
S. W. SINGER (First Edition)	[Sing. i.]	....	1826
C. KNIGHT (First Edition)	[Knt i.]	(?)	1841
J. P. COLLIER (First Edition)	[Coll. i.]	....	1842
H. N. HUDSON (First Edition)	[Huds. i.]	....	1856
S. W. SINGER (Second Edition)	[Sing. ii.]	....	1856
A. DYCE (First Edition)	[Dyce i.]	....	1857
J. P. COLLIER (Second Edition)	[Coll. ii.]	....	1858
H. STAUNTON	[Sta.]	....	1860
R. G. WHITE (First Edition)	[Wh. i.]	....	1861
CAMBRIDGE (First Edition, W. G. CLARK and W. A. WRIGHT)	[Cam. i.]	....	1865
J. O. HALLIWELL (Folio Edition)	[Hal.]	....	1865

T. KEIGHTLEY	[Ktly]	....	1865
C. KNIGHT (Second Edition)	[Knt ii.]	....	1865
A. DYCE (Second Edition)	[Dyce ii.]	....	1866
H. N. HUDSON (Second Edition)	[Huds. ii.]	....	1871
A. DYCE (Third Edition)	[Dyce iii.]	....	1875
J. P. COLLIER (Third Edition)	[Coll. iii.]	....	1877
R. G. WHITE (Second Edition)	[Wh. ii.]	....	1883
W. A. WRIGHT (*The Clarendon Press Series*)	[Cla.]	....	1885
CAMBRIDGE (Second Edition, W. A. WRIGHT)	[Cam. ii.]	....	1891
W. A. NEILSON	[Neils.]	....	1906

W. HARNESS		1830
GLOBE (CLARK and WRIGHT)	[Glo.]	1864
N. DELIUS	[Del.]	1869
REV. JOHN HUNTER (*Longman's Series*)		1871
F. G. FLEAY (*Collins' Classics*)		1878
C. E. MOBERLY (*Rugby Shakespeare*)		1883
B. DAWSON (*University Shakespeare*)		1887
F. A. MARSHALL (*Irving Shakespeare*)		1888
T. PAGE (*Moffatt's Shakespeare*)		1892
F. P. BARNARD (*Arnold's Shakespeare*)		1897
G. C. MOORE SMITH (*Heath's English Classics*)		1900
T. PARRY		1900
C. H. HERFORD (*Eversley Edition*)		1904
W. J. ROLFE (Revised Edition)		1905
IVOR B. JOHN (*Arden Shakespeare*)		1907
MISS C. PORTER (*First Folio Edition*)		1910
H. M. BELDEN (*Tudor Shakespeare*)		1912
K. DEIGHTON		1913

These last eighteen editions I have not collated beyond referring to them in disputed passages, and recording, here and there in the *Commentary*, the views of their editors.

Within the last thirty-five years—indeed, since the appearance, in 1864, of the *Globe Edition*—the text of Shakespeare is become so settled that to collate word for word the text of editions which have appeared within this term would be a fruitless task. When, however, within recent years an editor revises his text in a second or third edition, the case is different; it then becomes interesting to mark the effect of maturer judgment. The present TEXT is that of the First Folio of 1623.

In the TEXTUAL NOTES the symbol Ff indicates the agreement of the *Second*, *Third*, and *Fourth Folios*.

I have not called attention to every little misprint in the Folio. The *Textual Notes* will show, if need be, that they are misprints by the agreement of all the Editors in their corrections.

Nor is notice taken of the first editor who adopted the modern spelling, or who substituted commas for parentheses, or changed ? to !.

The sign + indicates the agreement of ROWE, POPE, THEOBALD, HANMER, WARBURTON, JOHNSON, and the *Variorum of* 1773.

When in the *Textual Notes* WARBURTON precedes HANMER, it indicates that HANMER has followed a suggestion of WARBURTON.

The words 'Mnemonic Pope, Warb., Han.' in the *Textual Notes* signify that the passage indicated is marked by those editors as especially worthy of attention or memorising.

The words *et cet.* after any reading indicate that it is the reading of *all other* editions.

The words *et seq.* indicate the agreement of all subsequent editions.

The abbreviation (*subs.*) indicates that the reading is *substantially* given, and that immaterial variations in spelling, punctuation, or stage-directions are disregarded.

When *Varr.* precedes *Steev.* or *Mal.*, it includes the *Variorums of* 1773, 1778, and 1785; when it follows *Steev.* or *Mal.*, it includes the *Variorums of* 1803, 1813, and 1821.

An emendation or correction given in the *Commentary* is not repeated in the *Textual Notes* unless it has been adopted by an editor in his text; nor is *conj.* added in the *Textual Notes* to the name of the proposer of the conjecture unless the conjecture happens to be that of an editor, in which case its omission would lead to the inference that such was the reading of his text.

COLL. MS. refers to COLLIER'S copy of the Second Folio, bearing in its margin manuscript annotations.

In citing plays or quoting from them, the Acts, Scenes, and Lines of the *Globe Edition* are followed, unless otherwise noted. Of course, all references to *King John* refer to the present text.

LIST OF BOOKS

To economise space in the foregoing pages, as a general rule merely the name of an author has been given, followed, in parentheses, by the number of volume and page.

In the following LIST, arranged alphabetically, enough of the full titles is set forth to serve the purposes of either identification or reference.

Be it understood that this LIST does not include those books which have been consulted or used in verifying references; were these included, the list would be many times longer.

ABBOTT, E. A.: *Shakespearian Grammar*	London, 1870
ANDERS, H. R. D.: *Shakespeare's Books*	Berlin, 1904
ARROWSMITH, W. R.: *Editor of Notes & Queries and Singer*	London, 1858
BAILEY, S.: *The Received Text of Shakespeare*	" 1862
BAKER, G. P.: *Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist*	New York, 1907
BAKER, SIR R.: *A Chronicle of the Kings of England* (ed. iii.)	London, 1660
BATHURST, C.: *Differences of Shakespeare's Versification*	" 1857
BAYLEY, HAROLD: *The Shakespeare Symphony*	" 1906
BIELSCHOWSKY, ALBERT: *Life of Goethe* (translated by W. A. Cooper)	New York, 1908
BIRCH, W. J.: *Inquiry into the Religion and Philosophy of Shakespeare*	London, 1848
BOADEN, J.: *Life of J. P. Kemble*	" 1825
" *Memoirs of Mrs Siddons*	" 1827

BOAS, F. S.: *Shakespeare and His Predecessors*..... New York, 1896
BOWDEN, H. S.: *Religion of Shakespeare*..... London, 1899
BOWLE, JOHN: *Miscellaneous Pieces of English Poesie*... " 1764
BRANDES, G.: *William Shakespeare*..... New York, 1900
BRINK, B. TEN: *Five Lectures on Shakespeare* (translated by Julia Franklin)..... " 1895
BROOKE, STOPFORD A.: *Ten More Plays*..... " 1914
BROWNE, G. H.: *Notes on Shakspere's Versification*..... Boston, 1884
BUCKNILL, J. C.: *Mad Folk of Shakespeare*..... London, 1860
" *Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge*..... " 1860
" *Mad Folk of Shakespeare* (ed. ii.)..... " 1867
BULLOCH, J.: *Studies on the Text of Shakespeare*..... " 1878
BULTHAUPT, H.: *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*.....Oldenburg & Leipzig, 1903
CALVERT, G. H.: *Shakespeare: A Biographic Æsthetic Study*..... Boston, 1879
CAMDEN, W.: *Remains Concerning Britain* (Library of Old Authors)..... London, 1870
CAMPBELL, JOHN LORD: *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements* New York, 1859
CAMPBELL, L.: *Tragic Drama in Æschylus, Sophocles, and Shakespeare*..... London, 1904
CAMPBELL, T.: *Life of Mrs Siddons*..... " 1834
" *Life and Writings of Shakespeare*..... Philadelphia, 1846
CANNING, A. S. G.: *Thoughts on Historic Plays*..... London, 1884
" *Shakespeare Studied in Eight Plays*. " 1903
CAPELL, E.: *Notes, etc.*..... " 1779
CARTER, T.: *Shakespeare, Puritan and Recusant*..... " 1897
" *Shakespeare and Holy Scripture*..... New York, 1905
CARTWRIGHT, ROBERT: *Footsteps of Shakespeare*..... London, 1862
" *New Readings in Shakespeare*... " 1866
CHALMERS, G.: *Supplemental Apology*..... " 1799
CHESNEY, J. P.: *Shakespeare as a Physician*..... Chicago, 1884
CIBBER, C.: *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John*.. London, 1745
CLARKE, C. C.: *Shakespeare Characters*..... " 1863
CLARKE, C. and M. COWDEN: *Shakespeare Key*..... " 1879
COLERIDGE, H.: *Essays and Marginalia*..... " 1851
COLERIDGE, S. T.: *Notes and Lectures*..... " 1874
COLLIER, J. P.: *Kynge Johan by John Bale*..... " 1838
" *Notes & Emendations to the Text of Shakespeare's Plays*..... New York, 1853
" *History of Dramatic Literature* (ed. ii.)... London, 1879
COLTON, G. Q.: *Shakespeare and the Bible*..... New York, 1888
CORSON, H.: *Introduction to Study of Shakespeare*..... Boston, 1889
COURTENAY, T. P.: *Commentaries on the Historical Plays of Shakespeare*..... London, 1840
CREIZENACH, W.: *English Drama in Age of Shakespeare* [*Geschichte des neuren Dramas*] (translated by C. Hugon)..... Philadelphia, 1916
CUNLIFFE, J. W.: *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*..... London, 1893
DANIEL, P. A.: *Shakespeare Notes*..... " 1870

DANTE ALIGHIERI: *La Divina Commedia* (translated by H. F. Cary) ..... New York, 1852
DAVIES, T.: *Dramatic Miscellanies* ..... London, 1785
" *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick* ..... " 1808
DAVIS, C. K.: *Law in Shakespeare* ..... St. Paul, 1884
DELIUS, N.: *Shakspere Werke* ..... Elberfield, 1869
DENNIS, J.: *Letters, Familiar, Moral, and Critical* ..... London, 1721
DEVECMON, W. C.: *In re Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements* ..... New York, 1899
DOUCE, F.: *Illustrations of Shakespeare* ..... London, 1807
DOWDEN, EDWARD: *Shakespeare: His Mind and Art* .... " 1875
" *Shakespeare Primer* ..... New York, n. d.
DRAKE, N.: *Shakespeare and His Times* ..... London, 1817
" *Memorials of Shakespeare* ..... " 1828
DUCIS, J. F.: *Œuvres* ..... Paris, 1830
DUPORT, PAUL: *Essais Littéraires sur Shakspeare* ..... " 1828
DUSCHINSKY, W.: *Shakespeare'sche Einflüsse auf Schiller's Tell* ..... Wien, 1899
DYCE, A.: *Remarks on Collier's and Knight's Editions* ... London, 1844
" *Strictures on Collier's Edition* ..... " 1844
" *Few Notes, etc* ..... " 1853
DYER, T. F. T.: *Folk-Lore of Shakespeare* ..... New York, 1884
EARLE, J.: *Philology of the English Tongue* ..... Oxford, 1871
EASTWOOD, J., and WRIGHT, W. A.: *Bible Word-Book* ... London, 1866
EATON, T. R.: *Shakespeare and the Bible* ..... " n. d.
EDWARDS, T.: *Canons of Criticism* (Seventh Edition) ... London, 1765
ELZE, K.: *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists* ..... Halle, 1886
FARMER, R.: *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare* ..... London, 1767
FEIS, JACOB: *Shakespeare and Montaigne* ..... " 1884
FLEAY, F. G.: *Shakespeare Manual* ..... " 1876
" *Life and Work of Shakespeare* ..... " 1886
" *Chronicle History of the London Stage* ..... " 1890
" *Biographical Chronicle of English Drama* .. " 1891
FLETCHER, G.: *Studies in Shakespeare* ..... " 1847
FONTANE, T.: *Aus England: Studien und Briefe über Londoner Theater* ..... Stuttgart, 1860
FORSYTH, E.: *Some Notes on Shakespeare* ..... Edinburgh, 1867
FRENCH, G. R.: *Shakespeareana Geneologica* ..... London, 1869
VON FRIESEN, H.: *Shakespeare Studien* ..... Wien, 1874
FROUDE, J. A.: *Reign of Elizabeth* ..... London, 1869
FULLOM, S. W.: *History of William Shakespeare* ..... " 1864
FURNIVALL, F. J.: *Introduction to Leopold Shakspere* .... " 1877
GAEHDE, CHRISTIAN: *David Garrick als Shakespeare Darsteller* ..... Berlin, 1904
GARNETT, R., and GOSSE, E.: *Illustrated History of English Literature* ..... London, 1903
GENÉE, R.: *Ueber Shakespeare's Dramen* ..... Hildburghausen, 1871
GENEST, J.: *The English Stage 1660–1832* ..... Bath, 1832
GENTLEMAN, F.: *Dramatic Censor* ..... London, 1770
GERVINUS, G. G.: *Commentaries* (translated by Bunett) " 1863

GILDEMEISTER, OTTO: *Shakspeare's Werke* (ed. Bodenstedt) Leipzig, 1867

GILDON, C.: *Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare* (vol. vii. of Rowe's 2d ed.) London, 1710

GILES, HENRY: *Human Life in Shakespeare* Boston, 1868

GRAFTON, R.: *Chronicle, or History of England* (ed. Wright, 1809) London, 1569

GREEN, H.: *Shakespeare and the Emblem-writers* " 1870

GREG, W. W.: *List of English Plays written before 1643* " 1900

" *List of Masques, Pageants, etc.* " 1902

GREY, Z.: *Critical, Historical, and Explanatory Notes on Shakespeare* " 1754

GRIFFITH, MRS: *Morality of Shakespeare's Dramas* " 1775

GUEST, E.: *History of English Rhythms* " 1838

GUIZOT, M.: *Historical and Critical Notices on the Principal Dramas of Shakespeare* (translated) New York, 1852

HAGENA: *Berichtigungen der Schlegelschen Sh. Uebersetzung* Oldenburg, n. d.

HALL, H. T.: *Shakespearean Fly-Leaves* Cambridge, 1869

HALLAM, H.: *View of the State of Europe during Middle Ages* New York, 1864

HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS, J. O.: *Memoranda on Love's Lab., King John, Othello, and Rom. & Jul.* London, 1879

" " *Outlines of Life of Shakespeare* Brighton, 1882

HARDING, S. and E.: *Whole Historical Dramas of Shakespeare Illustrated* London, 1811

HARTING, J. E.: *Ornithology of Shakespeare* " 1871

HAWKINS, F. W.: *Life of Edmund Kean* " 1869

HAZLITT, W.: *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* " 1817

" *View of the London Stage* (new ed.) " 1906

HAZLITT, W. C.: *Shakespeare: Himself and His Work* (ed. ii.) " 1903

HEARD, F. F.: *Shakespeare as a Lawyer* Boston, 1883

HEATH, B.: *Revisal of Shakespeare's Text* London, 1765

HERAUD, J. A.: *Shakespeare's Inner Life* " 1865

HERR, J. G.: *Scattered Notes* Philadelphia, 1879

HILGERS, PROFESSOR DR: *Der Dramatische Vers Shakespeare's* Aachen, 1869

HUDSON, H. N.: *Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters* Boston, 1872

HUGO, FRANÇOIS VICTOR: *Œuvres Complètes de Sh.* Paris, 1872

HÜLSMANN, E.: *Shakespeare: sein Geist und seine Werke.* Leipzig, 1856

HUME, D.: *History of England* New York, 1879

HUNTER, JOSEPH: *New Illustrations of Shakespeare* London, 1853

HURDIS, J.: *Cursory Remarks* " 1792

INGLEBY, C. M.: *The Still Lion* " 1874

IRELAND, JOSEPH N.: *Records of the New York Stage* New York, 1861

JAMESON, MRS: *Characteristics of Women* London, 1836

JEFFEREY, E.: *Shakespeare Illustrated* " 1813

JERVIS, S.: *Emendations of the Text of Shakespeare* " 1860

JUSSERAND, J. J.: *Literary History of the English People.* New York, 1909

KEAN, C.: *Selections from the Plays of Shakespeare*..... London, 1860
KEIGHTLEY, T.: *Shakespeare Expositor*..... " 1867
KEMBLE, J. P.: *King John, as acted at Covent Garden Theatre*..... " 1804
KENRICK, W.: *Review of Johnson's Shakespeare*..... " 1765
KILBOURNE, F. W.: *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare*..... Boston, 1906
KINNEAR, B. G.: *Cruces Shakespearianæ*..... London, 1883
KNIGHT, C.: *Studies of Shakspere*..... " 1868
KREYSSIG, F.: *Vorlesungen uber Shakespeare*..... Berlin, 1862
LAWRENCE, W. J.: *The Elizabethan Playhouse*..... Stratford-on-Avon, 1912
LEE, SIR SIDNEY: *Life of Shakespeare* (new edition).... London, 1916
LETTSOM, W. N.: *New Readings in Shakespeare* (*Blackwood's Maga.*)..... Edinburgh, 1853
LEWES, L.: *Shakespeare's Frauengestalten*..... Stuttgart, 1893
LINGARD, J.: *History of England*..... Edinburgh, 1902
LLOYD, W. W.: *Essays on Shakespeare*..... London, 1858
LUCE, M.: *Handbook to the Works of Shakespeare*..... " 1907
MABIE, H. W.: *W. Shakespeare, Poet, Dramatist, and Man* (new edition)..... New York, 1904
MACDONALD, G.: *A Dish of Orts*..... London, 1895
MACREADY, WILLIAM C.: *Reminiscences* (ed. F. Pollock).. New York, 1875
" " *Diaries* (ed. W. Toynbee)..... London, 1912
MADDEN, D. H.: *Diary of Master William Silence*..... " 1897
MARTIN, P. J.: *Parallel of Shakespeare and Scott*..... " 1835
MASEFIELD, JOHN: *William Shakespeare*..... New York, 1911
MASON, J. M.: *Comments on the Var. 1778*..... London, 1785
" *Comments on Beaumont, Fletcher, and Observations on Shakespeare*..... " 1798
MASSEY, G.: *Secret Drama of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (ed. ii.) " 1872
MATTHEWS, BRANDER: *Shakespeare as a Playwright*..... New York, 1913
MEREDITH, E. A.: *Note on Some Emendations in the Text of Shakespeare* (transactions of Lit. & Hist. Soc.)..... Quebec, 1863
MEYER, ARNOLD O.: *England and the Catholic Church under Elizabeth* (translated by J. R. McKee)..... London, 1916
MINTO, W.: *Characteristics of English Poets*..... Boston, 1901
MOULTON, R. G.: *Moral System of Shakespeare*..... New York, 1930
MUNRO, J., and FURNIVALL, F. J.: *Troublesome Raigne of John* (*Shakespeare Classics*)..... London, 1913
NICHOLS, J.: *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*..... " 1817
NORGATE, KATE: *John Lackland*..... " 1902
OECHELHAÜSER, W.: *Shakespeare Dramatische Werke*.... Weimar, 1877
" *Einführungen zu Shakespere's Bühnen-Dramen*..... Minden, 1885
ORDISH, T. F.: *Shakespeare's London*..... London, 1897
PARIS, MATTHEW: See *Wendover, Roger of.*
PATER, W.: *Appreciations*..... " 1889
PERRING, SIR P.: *Hard Knots in Shakespeare* (ed. ii.)... " 1886

PHELPS, W. M., FORBES-ROBERTSON J.: *Life and Life-Work of Samuel Phelps*..... London, 1886
PYE, H. J.: *Comments on the Commentators*..... " 1807
RAICH, J. M.: *Shakespeare's Stellung zur Katholischen Religion*..... Mainz, 1884
RALEIGH, W.: *Shakespeare* (*English Men of Letters*)..... " 1909
REED, HENRY: *English History and Tragic Poetry as Illustrated by Shakespeare*..... " 1859
RITSON, J.: *Remarks Critical and Illustrative*..... " 1782
" *Cursory Criticisms*..... " 1792
ROBERTSON, J. M.: *Montaigne and Shakespeare*..... " 1909
RODERICK, R.: *Remarks on Shakespeare* (in EDWARD'S *Canons*, etc.)..... " 1675
ROHLEDER, J.: *Internal Evidence for Determining the Chronology of Shakespeare's Plays*..... Stuttgart, 1889
ROLFE, W. J.: *Life of William Shakespeare*..... Boston, 1904
ROSE, E.: *Shakespeare as an Adapter* (*Macmillan's Maga.*, November)..... London, 1878
RÜMELIN, G.: *Shakspere-Studien*..... Stuttgart, 1866
RUSHTON, W. L.: *Shakespeare's Legal Maxims*..... London, 1859
" *Shakespeare Illustrated by Old Authors*. " 1867
" *Shakespeare Illustrated by Lex Scripta*.. " 1870
" *Shakespeare and the 'Arte of English Poesie.'*..... Liverpool, 1909
SAINTSBURY, G.: *A History of English Prosody*..... Liverpool, 1908
SCHELLING, F. E.: *English Chronicle Play*..... New York, 1902
" *Elizabethan Drama, 1558–1642*..... Boston, 1908
SCHLEGEL, A. W.: *Dramatic Literature, Lectures* (translated by J. Black)..... London, 1815
SCHWARTZKOPF, A.: *Shakspere's Dramen auf Ewigen Gründe*..... Bremen, 1888
SECCOMBE and ALLEN: *Age of Shakespeare*..... London, 1903
SIMPSON, PERCY: *Shakespearian Punctuation*..... Oxford, 1911
SIMPSON, RICHARD: *The School of Shakespeare*..... London, 1878
SINGER, S. W.: *Text of Shakespeare Vindicated*..... " 1853
SKOTTOWE, A.: *Life of Shakespeare*..... " 1824
SNIDER, D. J.: *System of Shakespeare's Dramas*..... St. Louis, 1877
SPALDING, T. A.: *Elizabethan Demonology*..... London, 1880
STOKES, H. P.: *Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays* " 1865
STRUTT, J.: *Sports and Pastimes of the People of England* (ed. Hone)..... " 1841
STUBBS, WILLIAM: *Historical Collection of Walter of Coventry*..... " 1873
" *Constitutional History of England*.... Oxford, 1880
STÜMCKE, FERD.: *Studien zu Shakespeare's King John*... Ottendorf, 1889
SWINBURNE, A. C.: *A Study of Shakespeare*..... London, 1880
SYMONDS, J. A.: *Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama*..... " 1884
TETZLAFF, ARTHUR: *Die Kindergestalten bei den Englischen Dramatiker, &c*..... Halle, 1898

THEOBALD, L.: *Shakespeare Restored*..... London, 1726
THUMMEL, JULIUS: *Vorträge uber Shakspere-Charaktere* Halle, 1881
" *Shakspere-Charaktere*..... " 1887
TIECK, L.: *Alt-Englisches Theater*..... Berlin, 1811
TURNER, SHARON: *History of England during the Middle Ages* (ed. iii.)..... London, 1830
ULRICI, H.: *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art* (translated by A. J. W. Morrison)..... " 1846
" *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art* (ed. iii.) (translated by L. D. Schimtz)..... " 1876
UPTON, J.: *Critical Observations*..... " 1746
" *Remarks on Three Plays of Ben Jonson*..... " 1749
VALPY, R.: *King John: An Historical Tragedy*..... Reading, 1800
VAUGHAN, H. H.: *New Readings in Shakespeare's Tragedies* (ed. ii.)..... London, 1886
VEHSE, EDUARD: *Shakespeare als Protestant, Politiker Psycholog und Dichter*..... Hamburg, 1851
VERPLANCK, G. C.: *Shakespeare's Dramas*..... New York, 1847
VISCHER, F. T.: *Shakespeare-Vorträge*..... Stuttgart, 1901
WALKER, W. S.: *On Shakespeare's Versification*..... London, 1854
" *Criticisms on Shakespeare*..... " 1860
WARD, A. W.: *English Dramatic Literature*..... " 1875
WARNER, E. B.: *English History in Shakespeare's Plays* New York, 1894
WARNER, RICHARD: *Letter to David Garrick*..... London, 1768
WATSON, SIR F. B.: *Religious Sentences from Shakespeare* " 1843
WEISS, J.: *Wit, Humour, and Shakespeare*..... Boston, 1876
WENDELL, BARRETT: *William Shakespeare*..... New York, 1894
WENDOVER, ROGER OF: *Flowers of History* (translated by J. A. Giles)..... London, 1849
WETZ, W.: *Shakespeare vom Standpunkte der Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*..... Worms, 1890
WHALL, W. B.: *Shakespeare's Sea Terms Explained*..... London, 1910
WHITE, R. G.: *Shakespeare's Scholar*..... New York, 1854
" *Shakespeare Studies*..... Boston, 1886
WHITER, W.: *Commentary on Shakespeare*..... London, 1794
WILKES, G.: *Shakespeare from an American Point of View* New York, 1882
WINTER, WILLIAM: *Shakespeare on the Stage* (Third Series)..... " 1916
WIVELL, ABRAHAM: *Shakespeare's Monument*..... London, 1827
WORDSWORTH, C.: *Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*..... " 1864
Shakespeare's Historical Plays..... " 1893

INDEX

Absey book 53
Actors' Interpretations 669
Adjective in *-ible* with active meaning 406
" receiving weaker accent than noun qualified ... 98
'Adjure,' use of, in early editions of Bible 226
Advance = *lift up* 107
Affect = *imitate* 33
Alcides' shoes, or *shows* 90
'Aloft' used as preposition 317
Anachronisms in Shakespeare 24
Angel speaking, figurative use of ... 367
" value of 159
Angiers, description of 69
" pronunciation of 72
Antistrophe, example of 162
Arthur as central figure of political interest an invention of Shakespeare 304
" death of, and execution of Mary, Queen of Scots ... 320
" manner of death of, not certain 333
Arthur's prison, locality of 279
Article, indefinite, displacement of .. 299
Ascension Day, date of, in time of John 354
'Aspect,' accent of 112
Association of ideas, example of 109
'Assur'd' used in double sense 152
Até, Goddess of Revenge 78
Aula Regis in time of John 28
Austria and Limoges, confusion of a popular tradition 185

Baker, G. P., on *the Play* 634
Baker, Sir R., on *character of King John* 565
Bank'd 371
Basilisco, character in old play 63
Basiliscus = Cor leonis 64
Bastard to the time 55
Bastards are born lucky 48
Bathurst on *the Play* 608
Become = *adorn* 357
Bedlam = *lunatic* 99
Beeching on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism* 654
'Behaviour,' unusual meaning of ... 18
Bell, book, and candle 239
Bend = *direct the eyes* 310
Bent = *aimed* 75
Bequeath = *devise* 424
" = *transfer* 44
Bequest of Soul and Body 334
Bestow oneself = *behave* 213
Birthrights on their backs 80
Blindness as bar to crown 279
'Bloody' used proleptically 325
Blot = *blemish* 165
Boas on *character of Constance* 584
" on *character of Faulconbridge* .. 592
" on *character of King John* 560
" on John's surrender of crown . 351
" on lack of motive for murder of John 414
" on *the Date* 440
Boast = *extol oneself* 167
Body, the grave or prison of soul .. 256
Book and eye of beauty associated 146
Bought and Sold, a proverbial expression 385
Bowden on *Shakespeare's Roman Catholicism* 192, 658
Brandes on *character of Faulconbridge* 593
" on death of Hamnet and that of Arthur 291
" on *the Play* 628
Brave = *to defy* 358
" = *defiant speech* 381

Brink, Ten, on *the Date*..... 440
Broker = *pander*..... 157
Brooded watchful day..... 250
Brooke, S., on *character of Constance* 585
" on *character of King John*..... 563
" on *character of Pandulph* 260
" on *the Date*..... 442
" on *Troublesome Raigne*.. 469
Bucknill on *character of Constance*.. 581
" on Shakespeare's knowledge of symptoms of poisoning..... 405
" on Shakespeare's portrayals of madness..... 261
Buss = *coarse kissing*..... 259
But = *except*..... 180
'But once' = *once for all*..... 31
Byrom, John, extemporare lines on King and Pretender..... 113

Calfe bred from his cow..... 38
Calf-skin coat a mark of Fool's costume..... 187
Calvert on opening scene of Play... 20
Campbell, T., on *the Play*..... 605
Cannon in time of John an anachronism..... 24
'Canonized,' accent of..... 200
Capell on *Troublesome Raigne*..... 448
Carriage = *military equipment*..... 422
Carter on *Shakespeare's Roman Catholicism*..... 193
Cartwright on *the Date*..... 435
Cased lion..... 216
Casuistry..... 222
Catholicism, Roman, Shakespeare and..... 642
Censure = *estimate*..... 121
Center = *girdle*..... 350
Chalmers on *the Date*..... 433
Chattilion, pronunciation of..... 18
Check possibly used as in game of chess..... 87
Chesney on likelihood of death of John from malarial fever..... 415
Christendom = *Christianity*..... 281
Churchmen, Shakespeare's representations of..... 196
Cibber, Colley, Letter to..... 540
Cibber, Mrs. Theophilus, as Constance, Davies on..... 185
Cibber's acting of Pandulph..... 11
" *Papal Tyranny*, Davies on. 538
" " " Kilbourne on 540
Clarke, C., on Arthur's affection for his mother..... 165
Clarke, C. C., on *character of Constance*..... 580
" on *character of Faulconbridge*..... 589
" on Macready's acting of King John. 677
Clarke, C. and M., on *the Play*.... 610
Clarke, F. W., on *the Date*..... 443
Climate = *region of the sky*..... 124
Clip = *surround*..... 363
Cock as National Emblem of France 376
Cockred..... 358
Colbrand the giant..... 59
Coldly = *calmly*..... 77
Coleridge, H., on altercation of Constance and Elinor. 86
" on *the Play*..... 606
Coleridge, S. T., on *the Date*..... 432
Collier on Bale's *Kynge Johan*..... 694
" on *the Date*..... 435
" on *Troublesome Raigne*..... 465
Commodity = *selfish interest*..... 156
'Complete of,' unusual construction 136
Complexion of youth compared to lilies and roses..... 166
Compliments, extravagant use of.. 55
Composition = *agreement*..... 155
" Date of..... 432
'Compound' used in legal sense... 114
Conscience, to make..... 328
Constance, character of..... 167
" date of death of..... 315
" eloquence of, Bucknill on 185
" grief of, Rose on..... 258
" love of, for Arthur allowed with pride..... 166
" maternal love of, B. Matthews on..... 184
" not a widow..... 75
" Oechelhaüser on portrayal of..... 270
" sickness of, an indication of insanity..... 162

Content = *be calm* 165
Contrary accent of adjective 321
Control = *opposition* 22
Conversion 50
" = *conversation* 51
Convertite 354
Convicted = *overpowered* 255
Coronations of John, historic dates of 296
Corson on *character of Constance* ... 87
" on *the Play* 625
Costume 661
Counterturn, example of 162
Courtenay on historical situation ... 20
" on *the Play* 602
Coyle = *disturbance* 97
Cracker = *braggart* 93
Crises, medical doctrine of 272
Criticisms on the Play 596
Crown, Tenure of, Simpson on 393
Cry aim = *encourage* 105
Crying of your nation's crow 376

d and *e* final confounded in Folio text 395
Daniel, G., on *the Play* 600
Dauphin, earliest assumption of title 12
Dauphin's right to English crown .. 371
Davies on *Cibber's Papal Tyranny*, 241, 280, 538
" on Garrick's delineation of
" death of John 414
" on Mossop, Sheridan, and Garrick as King John 671
" on Mrs Cibber's Constance. 185
" on Quin, Garrick, and Mossop in III, iii 242
Davison and Queen Elizabeth compared to John and Hubert 323
Dawson on *the Date* 440
'Day' used as equivalent of *battle* .. 272
Days, favourable or not, marked in ancient calendars 181
Defy = *reject* 258
Deighton on *character of King John* 562
Delirium on cessation of pain 411
Delius on *the Date* 435
Deloney, T., *The Lamentable Death of King John* 705
Deloney's *Strange Histories*, reference to 406
Denounce = *proclaim* 231
Departed = *parted* 155
Devils, aërial 235
" sublunary, offices of 235
Dialogue of Complement 55
Dieu et mon droit, origin of 117
Diffidence = *distrust* 31
Disallow = *reject* 22
Dishabited = *dislodged* 109
Dispiteous = *pitiless* 283
'Display' used in technical sense ... 118
Distemper'd = *ill-humoured* 336
Dogged = *churlish* 295
Doors left open at time of death ... 415
Doubling of parts of Hubert and Citizen 120
Douce on *Peter of Pomfret* 317
Dowden on *the Date* 439
" on *the Play* 619
Drake on *the Date* 433
" on *the Play* 598
Dramatic and Poetical Versions of Life of King John 695
Drowsy race of night 245
Ducis—*Jean Sans-Terre* 701
Duke of Milan of Massinger, scene in, compared to III, iii 240
Dunghill villain 344
Dunois, Duke of Orleans, case of, compared to Philip Faulconbridge's 43
Duport on scene between Hubert and Arthur 281
Dust = *grain of dust* 273

Effect = *purpose* 283
Elinor, date of death of 314
Elizabeth and John, similarity in situation of, under excommunication 200
'Embattailed' 322
Emendations adopted in Cambridge Edition 431
Endless night 399
Essex as character in I, i, Fleay on 28
" death of, possible reference to, in IV, ii 324

Essex, expedition of, against Cadiz, compared to description in I, ii, 74–79 79
Every Man in His Humour, scene in, compared to III, iii 241
Excommunication, Bull of, by Pius V. against Elizabeth 198
Exercise = *martial exercise* 307
Expedient = *expeditious* 78
'Expeditious' or 'expeditions' 29
Eye of reason 158
" the outward 158

Faithless = *perfidious* 110
Fast and loose, a game 214
Faucit, Helen, as Constance 679
Faulconbridge and Hotspur compared 380
" change of character of 340
" character of 586
" identified with Falcasius de Breauté, and objections thereto 6
Fault = *defect* 300
Feis on *the Play* 625
'Fetch about,' meaning of 299
Fire driving out fire 222
Fleay on Act divisions 177
" on *character of Essex* in I, i ... 28
" on *the Date* 438
" on *Troublesome Raigne* 457
Fletcher on *character of Constance* .. 574
" on *character of Elinor* 86
" on Helen Faucit's Constance 679
'Footing' used for advance of enemy 358
For because 159
Forage = *range abroad* 357
Fore-wearied = *exhausted* 110
Forget = *not to remember* 50
French on date of opening scene ... 17
Friesen, von, on madness of Constance 262
" on *the Play* 615
" on *Troublesome Raigne* 454
Fullom on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism* 643
Furnivall on *the Date* 437
Furnivall on *Troublesome Raigne* ... 466
Future tense used for subjunctive .. 75

Garnett and Gosse on *the Date* 441
Garrick as King John 671
Garrick's delineation of death of John 414
Gates compared to eyes 108
Gauds = *toys* 243
Gentleman, F., on early actors of *King John* 669
Gervinus on *character of Constance* . 580
" on *character of Faulconbridge* 589
" on *character of King John* . 557
" on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism* 643
" on *the Play* 609
" on *Troublesome Raigne* ... 453
Gildon on loss of part of Act II 174
Glory to this hand 341
Goethe and C. E. Neumann's acting of Arthur 288
Golden letter 179
Gollancz on *the Date* 440
Good den 49
Gorion's, Joseph Ben, *History of Jewes Commonweale*, a possible source of incident in Act II, sc. i. 130
Gregory XIII, answer of, in regard to assassination of Elizabeth 200
Grief = *grievance* 337
" is proud 168
Groat, first coinage of 34
Guard = *trim with braid* 298
Guizot on *the Play* 606
Gurney, James, character of 60

Hair compared to golden wires 263
" former spelling of 375
Halfe that face 34
Halfe-fac'd groat 34
Halliwell on *the Date* 436
" on *the Play* 609
Hamnet, death of, a possible source of Shakespeare's portrayal of grief of Constance 267
Hands stained with blood of deer a hunting custom 119
Havocke, cry 125

Hawkins on E. Kean as King John. 673
Hazlitt on *character of Faulconbridge*. 586
" on J. P. Kemble's acting of King John. 674
" on *the Play*. 597
'He' used as noun absolute. 113
Hearsay evidence and dying declarations. 390
'Heat' for *heated*. 285
Heeres a stay. 138
Heraud on *the Play*. 610
Hercules Furens of Seneca, passage in, compared. 274
Herford on *the Date*. 441
" on *the Play*. 631
High tide = *solemn season*. 180
'His' used substantively. 41
Historic Dates. 709
" time of Acts II. and III. . . 69
Historical Register for 1736 by Fielding. 538
Historical situation in III, iv, Warner on. 274
Hold in chase. 59
Holinshed's character of King John 564
Homilys, Shakespeare's familiarity with. 220
Horn blown by Post. 58
Horrors on Elizabethan stage. 288
Hubert and Citizen of Angiers identical as characters. 120
" as portrayed by Shakespeare not historic. 348
Hudson on *character of Constance*. . . 583
" on *character of Faulconbridge*. 590
" on *the Play*. 610
Hugo, F. V., on allusions to contemporary events in IV, ii. 324
Hume's character of King John. . . . 565
Humours, doctrine of. 353
Hunt, Leigh, on F. A. Kemble's Constance. 676
Hunter, Joseph, on *Shakespeare's Roman Catholicism*. 199
Hurdis on *the Date*. 432

Image seen in eye of another. 148
Importance = *importunity*. 73
In at window = *born out of wedlock*. . 47
Indifferency = *impartiality*. 157
Indirect = *unjust*. 221
Indirectly or *indiscreetly*. 76
Infinitive, sign of, when omitted. . . 39
Infortunate. 98
Ingram on *the Date*. 436
'Interest to,' a legal phrase. 370
Interrogatories, accent of. 194
" and the Canon Law 194
'Intreaties' for *entreats*. 374
'It' for *its*. 96

Jameson, Mrs, on *character of Constance*. 567
Jean Sans-Terre by Ducis, Analysis of. 702
Jeopardy, origin of word. 233
Jeronimo, date of composition. 22
John and Elinor, moral tie between 315
" and Falstaff, deaths of, compared. 412
" and Henry V, characters of, contrasted. 678
" burial place of. 423
" change in character of, through sin. 311
" character of. 557
" death of, from malarial fever, likelihood of. 415
" " political effect of. . . 414
" intellectual activity contrasted with that of Richard III. . . 310
" not a usurper. 21
" poisoned by Monk not probable. 401
" strength of, dependent on four personages. 316
John, Ivor, on *the Date*. 441
John's moral and physical breakdown, when manifested. . 352
" tenure a naked possession. . 27
" yielding of crown, locality of incident. 351
Jusserand on *the Play*. 635

Kean, C., as King John. 683
" description of costumes. . 661
Kean, E., as King John. 673
Kemble, F. A., as Constance. 675

Kemble, J. P., as K. John..... 674
" " " Boaden on 252
Kilbourne on Cibber's *Papal Tyranny*..... 540
King and Pretender, Byrom's extempore lines on..... 114
King John, lack of entry of, in *Stationers' Registers*..... 431
Kings of our fear..... 127
Knight, C., on *character of Constance* 573
" on *Historic Costume*.... 662
" on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism*.... 642
" on *Source of Plot*..... 444
" on *the Date*..... 434
" on *Troublesome Raigne*. 452
Knight, J., on influence of personal suffering on inspiration of Shakespeare..... 267
Kreyssig on scene between Hubert and Arthur..... 291
" on similarity of situation in *King John and Richard III*..... 2
Kynge Johan, Bale's..... 694
" " synoptical analysis of, by Ward..... 697

Landless Knight, a..... 47
Lands in England, when devisable. 38
Leaves them invisible..... 409
Lee, S., on *the Date*..... 443
Legitimacy, English law in regard to 37
Lent=*given*..... 33
Letter to Colley Cibber, A..... 540
Lewis a mistake for Philip..... 70
Liable=*subject*..... 147
" =*subservient*..... 371
Lightning and thunder as distinct manifestations..... 23
Lily and rose national emblems.... 166
Line=*strengthen*..... 336
List of Books..... 710
'Lives' pronounced *lees*..... 233
Lloyd on *character of Faulconbridge*. 587
" on *character of Peter of Pomfret*..... 317
" on *Source of Plot*..... 445
" on *the Play*..... 607
Lord of thy presence..... 39
Love of soul..... 353
Luce on *the Date*..... 442
" on *the Play*..... 634
Lyen=*lain*..... 285
Lymoges and Duke of Austria confounded..... 72

Mabie on *the Play*..... 17
Macready, W. C., as King John... 677
Madness of Lear and Constance compared..... 261
Magna Charta, Shakespeare's probable knowledge of..... 351
Make work..... 133
Malone on author of *Troublesome Raigne*..... 16
" on *Date of Composition*.... 267
" on *Source of Plot*..... 444
" on *Troublesome Raigne*.... 447
'Man' in *rude man* of enclitic force. 30
Manage=*conduct*..... 26
Mantell, R. B., as King John..... 690
Many a many..... 48
Mark, value of..... 151
Martin, Lady (Helena Faucit), as Constance, Fletcher on..... 230
Marry to confess..... 62
Mary, Queen of Scots, execution of, and death of Arthur..... 320
Masefield on *the Play*..... 638
Matthews on *the Play*..... 641
Meagre=*dulness of colour*..... 179
Melancholy assumed as mark of courtier..... 281
Mercutio, Dryden's remark on..... 162
Metaphor, inconsistent use of..... 292
'Misery,' accent of..... 259
Mitford, John, author of Conjectural Emendations in *Gentleman's Magazine*..... 170
Module..... 419
Monk's cowl, John buried with.... 424
More, a=*a greater*..... 75
" a possible dissyllable..... 45
Morley, H., on C. Kean's King John 684
Mossop as King John..... 671
'Moth,' pronunciation of..... 290
Motion=*inward prompting*..... 57
Moulton on *the Play*..... 631
Mousing=*devouring eagerly*..... 125

Moyes on death scene of King John and of Falstaff ... 412
Munro on Shakespeare's change of dramatic sequence in *Troublesome Raigne* ... 356
" on *Troublesome Raigne* ... 467
Mutines = *mutineers* ... 130

Near = *nearly related* ... 134
'Needle' a monosyllable ... 380
Neilson, Miss J., as Constance ... 689
Neumann, C. E., as Arthur ... 288
'Next,' peculiar use of ... 369
Nichols, R., *Unfortunate Life and Death of King John* ... 707
No had ... 322
'Nob,' a cant word for *head* ... 44

Occasion = *course of events* ... 315
'On his death,' an asseveration ... 36
'One' confused with *on* ... 244
Or ere ... 336, 405
Ordish on locality of opening scene. 17
Outface = *browbeaten* ... 82
O id, influence of, on Shakespeare. 123
'Owe' used in modern sense and also = *own* ... 111

Pandulph as represented in *Troublesome Raigne* and by Shakespeare ... 261
" character of, Brooke on ... 260
" " Oechelhaüser on ... 190
Passion = *outburst of feeling* ... 309
Passionate = *sad* ... 152
Pathetic element in literature ... 268
Pencil, a broad brush ... 214
Performances, American, dates of ... 659
" " W. Winter on ... 660
" Chronological List of 656
Perjury, homily against ... 220
Philip, name for sparrow ... 60
Phipson, Miss E., on connection between natural phenomena and mankind ... 179
Picked = *exquisitely apparalled* ... 52
Plagued = *punished* ... 104
Plan of the Work ... 710
Planché on Historic Costume ... 664
Planché's description of costumes ... 665
Plantagenet, origin of name ... 45
Pluck on = *incited* ... 167
Plural and possessive case of nouns ending in *s* or *se* unchanged ... 116
Poison for age's tooth ... 56
Poisons, ideas of effects of ... 403
'Policie, the,' unusual use ... 132
Pope on authorship of *Troublesome Raigne* ... 15
Porter, Miss C., on *character of King John* ... 561
" " on scenic arrangement of II, i ... 178
'Possess' used with 'with' = *inform* ... 301
'Potents' used as substantive ... 126
President = *rough draught* ... 360
Private = *private communication* ... 335
Prodigious = *portentous* ... 165
Propertied ... 370
Prophesy = *expounding* ... 320
Proud = *overflowing* ... 164
Proverbs, use of ... 47
Pulling on *the Date* ... 436

'Quarrel' used in legal sense ... 422
Quoted = *noted* ... 327

Raleigh on Shakespeare's restraint as regards horrors ... 288
" on Shakespeare's use of metaphor ... 292
'Ramping' applied to lion ... 186
Rank = *exuberant* ... 393
'Rather,' with infinitive ... 39
Reed, Henry, on *character of Faulconbridge* ... 588
Regret ... 214
Relative, sudden change of ... 150
" with singular verb and plural antecedent ... 109
Repetition a characteristic of Constance ... 181
Resignation, John's Charter of ... 355
Respective = *heedful* ... 50
Respects = *consideration* ... 231
Richard Cœur-de-Lion, legend of ... 67

Richard Cœur-de-Lion, will of, appointing successor 105
Right in thine eye 393
Riot, make a 215
Robertson on *the Play* 636
Roman Catholicism, Shakespeare's attitude towards 192
'Rome' and 'room,' pronunciation of alike 200
Rose, a knot of ribbon 41
" the, on English coins 41
Rose, Edward, on grief of Constance 258
" " on Shakespeare's method of work 72
" " on *Troublesome Raigne* 459
Rounded = *to whisper* 155
Rounder = *Roundure* 112
'Rude man' as one word 30
Rümelin on *the Play* 614
Rumour = *confused din* 392

Saint George and dragon as Inn sign 115
Salute, a gold coin 160
Sarcasm inconsistent with speech of Constance in III, i, ... 230, 253
Saving in dialogue of compliment .. 54
Scamble = *struggle in a rapacious manner* 350
Scathe = *harm* 80
Scenery, movable, when first used. 177
Schelling on *the Date* 443
" on *Troublesome Raigne* ... 467
Schlegel on *Troublesome Raigne* 450
Scope of Nature 276
Scroyle = *scoundrel* 129
Sefton, Charles, as Arthur 689
Shadowing = *sheltering* 73
Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism 642
Shall = *must* 369
Shaw, G. B., on Tree's King John .. 686
Sheridan, T., as King John 671
Shoes of Hercules on child's foot ... 91
" varying fashions in 321
Siddons, Mrs, as Constance, Boaden on 168
" as Constance, Fletcher on 230
Siddons, Mrs, costume as Constance 270, 661
" on *character of Constance* 570
" on her acting of Constance 161
Sightless = *unsightly* 165
Simpson, R., on Shakespeare's use of the *Chronicles* ... 611
" on Tenure of Crown . 393
Sin of times 339
'Sir Robert his' 40
Skottowe on *character of King John* 557
" on *Troublesome Raigne* ... 450
Slander = *accuse unjustly* 32
Smith, Goldwin, on Shakespeare's attitude towards Roman Catholicism 192
Smith, Moore, on *Troublesome Raigne* 463
Smoake or *smack* 57
Smoke = *to thrash* 89
Snider on change in King John through sin 311
" on *character of Faulconbridge* 592
" on *character of King Philip* .. 84
" on *characters of King Philip and Lewis* 212
" on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism* 647
" on *the Play* 622
Sooth up = *flatter* 186
Soul and body, bequest of 334
" in body as in grave 256
" location of, in man 406
Soules fraile dwelling house 406
Source of Plot 444
Soverign de facto, law of 114
Spleen = *passionate desire* 137
Spot = *stain* or *disgrace* 363
Stage History 655
" setting, indication of 116
State = *chair of state* 173
Stay = *hindrance* 138
Steevens on *Source of Plot* 444
'Still' used in sense of *always*, and as equivalent to *in future* 150
Stokes on *the Date* 436
Stop = *end of swift career* 420
Straight = *avaricious* 418

Stranger March 362
Stubbs on *character of King John*.. 566
" on dependence of John on four persons 316
Suggestion = *incitement* 319
" = *temptation* 228
'Sullen' applied to sound of trumpet 25
" confounded with *sudden* ... 25
Sun an eye 297
'Sun-set,' accent of 184
'Supply' used as noun of multitude 383
Surly spirit melancholy 250
Suspire = *breathe* 266
Swan, dying song of 412
Swinburne on *the Play* 619
Swinstead Abbey, location of 383
Sympathy for King John, Knight on, and its change 237
Symploche or the poetical figure of reply 135

t and *c*, confusion of 78
t, verbs ending in, unaltered in past tenses 80
Table = *picture* 148
Take a truce 163
" head = *take life from* 157
Tarre on = *incite* 293
'Task' and 'tax' almost identical.. 195
Temporal power of Popes 198
Temporize = *compromise* 374
Tempt = *call upon* 405
Territories, the, only example of ... 20
That art or *thou* art 65
" as conjunctional affix 35
'The' used to denote *the well-known* 132
Theobald on Act divisions 175
'This' misprinted for *his* 378
'Thou' and 'you,' use of 345
Thou wert better 345
Three corners of the world 425
Tieck on *the Date* 433
" on *Troublesome Raigne* 448
Time Analysis 708
'To' in composition with verbs 364
Tooth-pick a mark of a foreigner ... 51
'Totter' a variant of *tatter* 396
Tower = *rise in flight* 379
Toys = *idle fancies* 62
Traveller as dinner entertainer 51
Tree, H. B., as King John at Crystal Palace, 1889 684
" as King John at Her Majesty's Theatre, 1899 688
Trick = *peculiar feature* 33
Troth-plighting, ceremony of, ... 151
Troublesome Raigne, The (Part I).. 471
" " (Part II). 510
Two Gentlemen, passage from, compared 123
Tyrrell, Anthony, mission of 200

Ulrici on *character of King John* ... 557
" on *the Date* 437
" on *the Play* 603
" on *Troublesome Raigne* 449
Unadvised = *lacking consideration* ... 104
Underwrought = *undermined* 82
Unheard = *unhair'd* 374
Unstained or *unstrained* 74
Unsur'd = *made uncertain* 144
Unthread the rude eye 385
Untrimmed bride 203
'Up' used emphatically 347, 381

'V' omitted between vowels 233
Verplanck on *character of Faulconbridge* 586
" on *the Date* 434
" on *Troublesome Raigne* .. 451
Vischer on *the Play* 630
Visited = *punish* 98
Volquessen 151
Vows, Shakespeare's theory of 221

Wall-eyed 339
Waller, L., as Faulconbridge 689
Ward on Bale's *Kynge Johan* 697
" on *the Date* 437
Warne = *summon* 106
Warner, B. E., on *character of Faulconbridge* 592
'Wars' and 'war' used interchangeably 370
Waters used for sea as body of water 123
Weather = *tempest* 312
Wendell on *the Play* 625
Wendover's account of John's installation 21

'What' used relatively..... 308
'Where' a contraction for *whether*.. 32
'Which' used adverbially..... 113
" " as an adjective..... 37
White, R. G., on Act divisions..... 176
" on *the Date*..... 435
Widdow Lady..... 153
Wife for a Month, passage from, compared to *King John* V, ii, 42–47..... 417
Wilkes on *Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism*..... 648
Winter, W., on American productions of *King John*..... 660
Winter, W., on *the Play*, see *Mantell, R. B., as King John*..... 690
With=*by*..... 155
'Withal,' how used..... 232
Woman completed by marriage.... 137
Work, make..... 133
Wright on *Source of Plot*..... 446
" on *the Date*..... 439

'Ye,' use of.....146, 371

Zeal compared to metal in state of fusion..... 144
Zealous=*religious piety*..... 136