

THE WAR OF THE THEATRES (1599-1601): FORMAL SATIRE,
CAMBRIDGE DRAMA, & SHAKESPEARE'S PART IN THE QUARREL

A Thesis

Submitted to

the Department of English and the Graduate Council
Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Joseph A. Bergman

August 1961

Thesis
1961
B

Approved for the Major Department

Charles E. Walton

Approved for the Graduate Council

Jimmie L. Byler

8-20-62 - Dept. of Math
184049⁵

DEDICATION

To Jane

PREFACE

The so-called war of the theatres that raged on the Elizabethan stage from 1599-1600 has long been a subject of investigation by scholars. At the suggestion of Dr. Charles E. Walton, Department of English, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, I first studied Thomas Dekker's specific involvement in the quarrel, but my reading led toward a survey of the entire problem. In Chapter I, I attempt to trace the beginnings of personal satire on the English stage and to offer an explanation for its development. Chapter II, a study of the plays connected with the war in chronological order, not only deals with the participants in the theatrical fray and their plays, but also reveals the history of the literary criticism of the problem. The university drama of the time, especially at Cambridge, is the subject of Chapter III. The Parnassus Plays are shown to be especially revealing in that they indicate the reaction of the students to the playwrights and other personalities of the London theatre. The last chapter, Chapter IV, includes a re-examination of the theories which attempt to find the "purge" of Jonson, attributed by the author of Return from Parnassus, Part II to Shakespeare and also the farther-reaching aspects of the quarrel.

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Walton for his patient assistance and his valuable suggestions throughout

the research and composition of this study; to Dr. June J. Morgan, also of the Department of English, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, who was second reader of the work, for her helpful suggestions; and to Miss Gertrude Lemmon for her help in obtaining numerous references used herein from various libraries.

J. A. B.

August 23, 1961

Kansas State Teachers College

Emporia, Kansas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. BACKGROUND OF THE WAR OF THE THEATRES	1
II. A RE-INVESTIGATION OF THE PLAYS INVOLVED IN THE WAR OF THE THEATRES	20
III. THE RELATIONSHIP OF ACADEMIC DRAMA TO THE WAR OF THE THEATRES.	67
IV. SHAKESPEARE'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE WAR OF THE THEATRES.	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	123

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Major Characters and Their Identities in <u>Cynthia's Revels</u>	47
II. Identifications of Players Alluded to in <u>Poetaster</u>	58

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE WAR OF THE THEATRES (1590-1599)

This is the strain that chokes the theatres;
That makes them crack with full-stuff'd audience;
This is your humour only in request,
Forsooth to rail.

--What You Will, III, ii.

The so-called war of the theatres has long been a subject of investigation by scholars. F. G. Fleay, Josiah H. Penniman, and their followers, had extended the stage war to include most of the poets of the time. R. A. Small, however, drastically modified the proportions of the quarrel. Later critics, including Sir E. K. Chambers, O. J. Campbell, J. B. Leishman, and Alfred Harbage, have continued to examine the various aspects of the war. To some extent the problem has been generally thought of as no longer a productive one. However, it is probable that the main aspects of the quarrel have a further reaching effect upon an understanding of such subjects as the printed play, formal satire, the professional acting companies, child-actors, university drama, travelling actors, and Shakespeare's literary reputation in his own time. In addition, scholars have made no attempt to review the entire scope of the war of the theatres, from its background to its conclusion, in the light of scattered research. One has sufficient reason, therefore, for proposing a re-investigation.

of the entire problem in the interests of a fuller comprehension of these ideas.

In July, 1597, the Privy Council of London limited the city acting companies to two groups, the Chamberlain's Men and the Admiral's Men.¹ This Privy Council decree was occasioned by The Isle of Dogs, a lost play attributed to Nashe and Jonson.² Its performance brought down governmental wrath upon its authors and, for that matter, upon the entire London theatrical profession. The play was performed by neither of the regular companies of 1596-97, but by Pembroke's Men at the Swan.³ Jonson suffered imprisonment because of it until October 3, 1597.⁴ He was ". . .not only an actor but a maker of parte of the said plaie."⁵ The offence was vaguely described as ". . .lewd matters that were handled on the stage and by resort and confluence of bad people."⁶

¹Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, I, p. 366; The former had played at the Curtain, near Shoreditch, until 1599, when the company tore down that theatre and built the Globe across the Thames; ibid., II, p. 403; The latter had played at the Rose until 1600, and then transferred to the newly-built Fortune, located in the suburbs north of London; ibid., p. 409.

²Ibid., III, p. 454.

³Loc. cit.

⁴Loc. cit.

⁵Ibid., IV, p. 323.

⁶Ibid., IV, p. 322. Chambers thinks it is quite possible that Nashe or Jonson called the King of Poland a pole; ibid., III, p. 454.

In addition to the public theaters, there were two "private" companies at the turn of the century. Paul's Boys re-opened in the winter of 1599, the Children of the Chapel at the Blackfriar's in 1600.⁷ Their managers were interested in profits, ". . .they would have let the boys sing canticles had it proved financially rewarding."⁸ Their admission prices were high, and, in turn, they had to satisfy the demands of their customers for a new and daring theatrical fare. John Day's Isle of Gulls, acted at Blackfriar's about 1601, contains an account of the audience taste of this time:

First Gentleman: . . .Is't anything critical? Are lawyers' fees and citizens' wives laid open in it? I love to hear vice anatomized and abuse let blood in the master vein. Is there any great man's life characterized in't? . . .and there not be wormwood water and copperas in't, I'll not like it.

Second Gentleman: . . .Is there any good bawdry in't, jests of an ell deep and a fathom broad, good cuckolding? May a couple of young setters-up learn to do well in't? Give me a scene of venery that will make a man's spirits stand on their tiptoes and die his blood in a deep scarlet, like your Ovid's Ars Amandi; there flows the true springhead of poetry and the very crystal font of Parnassus.

Third Gentleman: . . .give me a stately-penned history, as this: 'The rugged winds with rude and ragged ruffs,' &c. . . . if it be not high-written, both your poet and the house, too, lose a friend of me.⁹

⁷Ibid., I, p. 367.

⁸Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions, p. 81.

⁹John Day, The Ile of Gvls--1606, The Shakespeare Association Facsimiles, No. 12.

The most striking thing about the dramas performed by the private companies after 1599 is their overwhelming preponderance of satirical passages. Appended to Harbage's Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions is a list of extant plays of this period, from which he concludes:

In all but a few of the plays the theme is sexual transgression, coupled in tragedy with treachery and murder, and in comedy with cupidity and fraud. It is a body of drama preoccupied with lust and murder or lust and money, and with the exhibition of the foolish and the foul.¹⁰

In marked contrast with the private repertories, the public theatres offered history plays, sequences involving the clown, the revenge motif, and other ancient techniques of which the popular audience was fond, all of which reflect the different attitudes toward life, literature, and morality between the general public and the patrons of the private theatres.¹¹ But perhaps the terms, private and public, were not confined to philosophical or emotional tastes, since, while it is difficult to make confident generalizations, the repertories of these individual companies were interchangeable as to public acceptance within the two categories.¹² According

¹⁰Harbage, op. cit., p. 71.

¹¹Ibid., p. 87.

¹²Ibid., p. 88.

to Chambers, ". . .the exploitation of the poets by the playing companies brought about some cross-currents in the tone of the allusions to the theatre."¹³

It is in the pamphlets by Thomas Lodge, Thomas Nashe, and Robert Greene, then, that one discovers the background for the poet-player quarrel. In these pamphlets, the players are taunted for their mouthings on the stage, for their shifting from the service of one lord to that of another, and for their rapid rise to wealth as well as their extreme obscurity when they travelled from town to town. But the real point of vexation expressed in these pamphlets is that the players lived by the wits of scholars.¹⁴ Even Shakespeare was not spared by Greene in this matter, who in his Greatsworth of Wit called him an ". . .upstart crow, beautified with our feathers."¹⁵ The poet's viewpoint is, perhaps, best epitomized in the words of Studioso, a character in the anonymous Return from Parnassus: "With mouthing words that better wits have framed / They purchase lands and now esquires are named (II Returne, V, 1, 1927-28). These reactionary pamphleteers and poets objected to the decline of the patronage system and

¹³Chambers, op. cit., I, 376.

¹⁴Loc. cit.

¹⁵Hyder E. Rollins and Herschel Baker (eds.), The Renaissance in England, p. 855.

to the rise of a literature of the masses. In the decade before 1599, the "truly smart reading matter" had been erotic and satirical verse. In a steady stream, appeared Lodge's Glaucus and Scylla, Marlowe's Ovid's Elegies and Hero and Leander, Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis, Daniel's Complaint to Rosamund, Constable's Shepherd's Song to Venus and Adonis, Barnfield's Affectionate Shepherd, Chapman's Ovid's Banquet of Sense, Drayton's Endymion and Phoebe, Edward's Cephalus and Procris and Narcissus, and Marston's Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image.

In addition to erotic verse, there appeared, at the same time, a flood of satires written supposedly in imitation of Horace, Juvenal, Persius, and Martial. Included in this group are Lodge's Fig for Momus, the early verse of John Donne, Hall's Virgidemiarum, Marston's Certain Satires and Scourge of Villany, Guilpin's Skialetheia, and the epigrams of Davies, Harington, and Weever. Both the lists of erotic verses and satires contain items which were among the works that the restraining order of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1599 condemned to be burned.¹⁶ After the Archbishop's decree, the erotic and satirical strains were apparently channeled

¹⁶Edward Arber (ed.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A. D., III, 316.

into the plays then written by the poets and acted in the private theatres. Campbell shows that the "comicall satyres" of Jonson and others were influenced by the formal characteristics of the non-dramatic verse at the turn of the century.¹⁷

The theatre managers of the private companies brought into their service a number of new dramatists, self-made scholars like Jonson, and university men, such as Marston, who were antagonistic to popular literature and resentful of their employment by mere actors. However, not all the university men despised and ridiculed the popular plays, for some admired them; but

. . . they were not the ones for whom a classical education was a hard-won social distinction and a sole hope for worthy employment. Above all, they were not the ones who had been reduced to competing with non-university playwrights.¹⁸

Thereafter the complaints of these neglected scholars were common in the period. For example, Laureo, in Patient Grissil, having returned home unemployed after spending nine years in a university, laments:

Ist not a shame for me that am a man,
Nay more, a scholler, to endure such neede,
That I must pray on him, whome I should feede?
(Patient Grissil, I.ii.160-1)

¹⁷Oscar James Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida.

¹⁸Harbage, op. cit., p. 94.

The university-educated poets were dismayed to find the nobility unable or certainly unwilling to make the generous grants common in earlier periods. The scholars, forced to turn to the up-and-coming public stage, ". . . objected simultaneously to the prostitution of their muses and to the low rates paid for prostitution."¹⁹ A typical example is the highminded Chrisogonus of Marston's Histrionastix. He is disdainful of Sir Oliver Owlet's Men on general principles, but his immediate grievance is that they refuse his demand of £10 per play. However, a self-made scholar, Jonson, was the most vociferous opponent of the popular stage. In addition, ". . . he disliked the common herd. That the feeling was mutual is evidenced by the hostile reception of his Every Man out of His Humour and Sejanus by the popular audience."²⁰ Furthermore, passages in Dekker's Satiromastix suggest that Jonson had begun his theatrical career as an actor. Apparently, his ungainly frame and repulsive facial characteristics did little to help his stage career. One also learns that Jonson was employed by the Admiral's Men and had risen by rapid steps from player to playwright. He appears to have been employed, perhaps by the Pembroke's Men, to finish Nashe's satiric comedy, The Isle of Dogs, the "lewd plaie" which caused his

¹⁹Ibid., p. 95.

²⁰Ibid., p. 88.

arrest and imprisonment. After his release from jail, he is next referred to in Henslowe's Diary, on December 3, 1598, when Henslowe noted that he lent him twenty shillings in lieu of a forthcoming play.²¹ In 1598, his name is also among those on Meres's list of the best tragedians.²² None of Jonson's early tragedies is extant, however, and it is doubtful if any of his early work, except The Case Is Altered, ever found its way into print.²³

While it can be proved that Jonson was an actor and playwright in the employ of the regular companies, Marston's affiliation with the public theatre is less secure. Meres had ranked the young Marston among the leading English satirists in his Palladis Tamia of 1598.²⁴ Just when Marston had turned to playwriting is uncertain, but the first and only reference to him by Henslowe is found in an entry for September 28, 1599.²⁵ Here, Henslowe extended "the new poete," forty shillings in earnest of an unnamed play which Chambers

²¹R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (eds.), Henslowe's Diary, p. 85.

²²G. H. Herford and Percy Simpson (eds.), Ben Jonson, I, 17.

²³Chambers, op. cit., III, 374.

²⁴A. H. Bullen (ed.), The Works of John Marston, I, xxiv.

²⁵Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 124.

believes to have been The King of Scots.²⁶ Certainly if this is true, it is the only reference to be found of Marston's having written for the public theatres, since it is clear that his known dramatic works were undertaken in association with Paul's and the Queen's Revels.²⁷ Marston's next plays, Antonio and Mellida, Part I and Part II, and Histrionastix, were probably written in the same year, in 1599.²⁸ In Conversations with Drummond, one learns that Jonson ". . . had many quarrels with Marston beat him & took his Pistol from him."²⁹ Marston, although meaning to please, had apparently offended Jonson in The Scourge of Villany. Evidently, Marston was given to aiming satiric blows at Jonson and later to making effusive apologies, as, for example, his dedication of the Malcontent (1604)³⁰ to ". . . Beniamino Jonsonio, Poetae Elegantissimo, Gravissimo, Amico Svo, Candido et Cordato, Iohannes Marston."³¹ But Jonson's settled opinion of Marston was always one of contemptuous disdain.³²

²⁶Chambers, op. cit., III, 428.

²⁷Loc. cit.

²⁸Loc. cit.

²⁹Herford and Simpson, (eds.), op. cit., I, 140.

³⁰Chambers, op. cit., III, 431.

³¹Bullen, op. cit., I, 197.

³²Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, 192.

On the other hand, Dekker was a free-lance playwright, who wrote for the public as well as the private companies. Little is known about his early life. What has been written about him has been gleaned mainly from a study of the internal evidence of his prose and dramatic works. From such evidence, scholars have established his birth date as 1572.³³ The first mention of Dekker's name occurs in Henslowe's Diary when, on January 8, 1597, twenty shillings were advanced to ". . . by a booke of Mr. Dickers."³⁴ In the next year, his name also appears on Meres's list of the best writers of tragedies.³⁵ Unfortunately, there are gaps in the Diary, and names of authors are not cited therein until 1598. Henslowe records a revival of the First Part of Fortunatus, presumably Dekker's Old Fortunatus, on February 3, 1596,³⁶ and there is evidence that another extant play, The Whore of Babylon, belongs, in its original form, to Dekker's early period.³⁷ As reviser and collaborator,³⁸ he was one of Henslowe's busiest hacks, who

³³Chambers, op. cit., III, 289.

³⁴Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 86.

³⁵Mary Hunt, Thomas Dekker: A Study, p. 121.

³⁶Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 34.

³⁷Hunt, op. cit., p. 29.

³⁸Jonson called him a "play-dresser," and less generously, a "plagiary," Poetaster, V. iii. 220.

". . . had a hand in some forty-four plays, of which, in anything like their original form, only half a dozen survive."³⁹ Patient Grissil, written in collaboration with Chettle and Haughton,⁴⁰ was once thought to have been part of the Poetmachia, a theory which has since been discredited (as will be shown in a later chapter). Satiromastix or The Vntrussing of the Humourous Poet (1601) was Dekker's single contribution to the theatrical war. In her biography of Dekker, Hunt defends the playwright as having been modest and good-natured in this play, his reply to Jonson's Poetaster.⁴¹ In making a saint out of Dekker and a devil out of Jonson, however, Hunt apparently ignores Dekker's vicious personal invective directed against Jonson in Satiromastix.

At the turn of the century, while Dekker was busily working for Henslowe, Marston and Jonson went to work upon the private repertory, shouldering out the old stock of Chapel plays or revising them for future performance.⁴² It is

³⁹Chambers, op. cit.

⁴⁰W. L. Halstead has worked out a convenient table of lines assigned to the collaborators. He reassigns certain lines usually given to Dekker; "Collaboration on the Patient Grissil," Philological Quarterly, XVIII (October, 1939), pp. 381-94.

⁴¹Hunt, op. cit., pp. 66-75.

⁴²Harbage, op. cit., p. 71.

significant, therefore, that in Cynthia's Revels, produced in the winter of 1600,⁴³ Jonson cautioned against the revival of old plays: ". . .take heed, boy, if your house bee haunted with such hob-goblins, 'twill fright away all your spectators quickly" (Cynthia's Revels, "Induction," 197-8). And Marston, writing in Jack Drum's Entertainment in the same year, ridicules the old stock of plays as ". . .musty fopperies of antiquity" (Jack Drum's Entertainment, V.1). It appears that Marston's first work for Paul's was to revise the anonymous play, Histrionastix (1599). Antonio and Mellida and Antonio's Revenge, (sometimes referred to as Antonio and Mellida, I and II), were probably written in the same year as Histrionastix, but the latter play is a satire on professional players and, thus, directly connected with the warfare of the poets against the players, which had been a motive in the rehabilitation of the private theatres. Furthermore, Histrionastix may have given offence to Jonson and have led him, indirectly, to satirize Marston's style in Every Man Out of His Humour, marking the introduction of the war of the theatres on the stage to be discussed in the succeeding pages.

In addition, a less celebrated quarrel, but one which was instrumental in advancing personal satire to the London

⁴³Chambers, op. cit., III, 364.

stage, had occurred between Marston and Joseph Hall, a Fellow at Cambridge, from 1597-99. The quarrel had begun in an obscure manner. In 1598, Marston had written the Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image & Certaine Satyres as an answer to Hall's Virgidemiae. Davenport, who has presented the clearest view of the quarrel, finds no concrete evidence to indicate that Hall had actually attacked Marston directly in Virgidemiae.⁴⁴ It is more likely that Marston's attack upon Hall was unprovoked. The assault upon Hall and Virgidemiae is contained in the fourth satire in the Pygmalion group, "Reacto." In the Scourge of Villany written in the next year, Marston suggests that the quarrel had started because of ". . . an Epigram which the Author, Virgidemiarum, caused to be pasted to the latter page of every Pygmalion that came to the Stationer's of Cambridge."⁴⁵ Davenport suggests that ". . . Marston was jealous of Hall's priority and success as a satirist; that Hall retorted. . . and that Marston followed up the quarrel."⁴⁶ Hall had, in the prologue to the first book of Virgidemiae, claimed to have been the first to introduce

⁴⁴Arnold Davenport, The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, p. xxxi.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 101.

⁴⁶Arnold Davenport, "The Quarrel of the Satirists," Modern Language Review, XXXVII (April, 1942), p. 123.

classical satire into England: ". . .I first adventure:
follow me who list / And be the second English satirist
(Virgidemiae, "Prologue," 3-4).

Marston dedicated The Scourge of Villany to ". . .his
most esteemed, and best beloved selfe."⁴⁷ It was entered in
the Stationer's Register for James Roberts on September 8,
1598.⁴⁸ A second edition of the Scourge, containing an
additional satire (X), appeared in 1599.⁴⁹ Marston, according
to Bullen, deliberately adopted

. . .an uncouth and monstrous style of phraseology;
his allusions are frequently quite unintelligible to
modern readers, and even the wits of his contemporaries
must have been sorely exercised.⁵⁰

Certainly, Marston's vocabulary was especially attacked in
Every Man Out of His Humour and in Poetaster, two of Jonson's
plays connected with the "war." However, the pretentious talk
of "Judicial Torquatus" in The Scourge has left critics guessing
about whom Marston was satirizing. Craig writes that Marston
was directly satirizing Jonson under the name of Torquatus.⁵¹
However, an earlier critic, H. C. Hart, has suggested that

⁴⁷Miscellaneous Pieces of Ancient English Poesie, p. 164.

⁴⁸Arber (ed.), op. cit., p. 41.

⁴⁹Bullen, op. cit., p. xvii.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. xviii.

⁵¹Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare,
p. 797.

Torquatus probably refers to Gabriel Harvey. Before Hart, critics had thought that either Torquatus was Jonson, or that he was unidentifiable as an individual but was merely a type-character.⁵² F. G. Fleay thought that Marston's Satires were indirectly the origin of the three years' stage war between Jonson and Marston, Dekker, but he believed The Scourge was primarily an attack upon Hall:

. . . in all these Satires I find no one attacked but rival satirists, and no trace of enmity to Jonson or any playwright. Gifford, rash and inaccurate as usual, says that Marston in The Scourge ridiculed Jonson's words. . . in his earliest comedies; but when The Scourge was written not one of Jonson's extant comedies had been published, and scarcely one acted.⁵³

In his Conversations with Drummond, Jonson openly asserted that his quarrel with Marston had begun because ". . . Marston represented him on the stage."⁵⁴ Since The Scourge was a satirical poem and not a play, one must turn to Marston's earliest known drama, Histrionastix, written prior to Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humour, to find Marston's representation of Jonson in a dramatic medium. Marston evidently meant to compliment Jonson in Histrionastix in the character of

⁵²Josiah H. Penniman (ed.), Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Thomas Dekker's Satiromastix, p. xxvii.

⁵³F. G. Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, II, p. 69.

⁵⁴Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 140.

Chrysoganus, but Jonson apparently immediately took offence at being made to talk fustian and, consequently, abused Marston in Every Man Out of His Humour. However, Chambers agrees that Marston gave Jonsonian traits to Chrysoganus, and that he also intended to be complimentary, but does not believe it ". . . is necessary to suppose that Jonson misunderstood this and took offence, for the real offence was given by Jack Drum's Entertainment in the next year."⁵⁵ Penniman includes The Scourge in the war of the theatres on the basis that the "war" involved both literary criticisms and personalities and because the poem was concerned with the ridicule of affected language and an attack upon Gabriel Harvey, in which Jonson had evidently joined.⁵⁶

After the Scourge of Villany, Edward Guilpin's Skialetheia (1598) and Weever's Epigrammes (1599) were involved in the Hall-Marston quarrel. Next, came Weever's Fannus and Melliflora or, the Original of our English Satyres (1600), containing a reference to the burning of satirical books in June, 1599, which Davenport thinks shows a change in Weever's position in the quarrel. (In 1599, he was on Marston's side, but by 1600 he had joined Hall in the quarrel.)⁵⁷ The seventh

⁵⁵Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 19.

⁵⁶Penniman, op. cit., p. XXX.

⁵⁷Davenport, "The Quarrel of the Satirists," Modern Language Review, XXXVII (April, 1942), p. 213.

document of the series, The Whipping of the Satyre (1601), is ascribed to "W. I.," whom Davenport believes to be Weever.⁵⁸ The Whipping attacks a satirist, an epigrammatist, and a "humorist." These, Davenport submits to be Marston, Guilpin, and Jonson, thereby linking Jonson and the stage quarrel with the Hall-Marston quarrel.⁵⁹ The Whipping provoked The Whipper of the Satyre his pennance in a white sheet; or The Beadles Confutation (1601), by an unknown supporter of Marston whom Davenport suggests was Guilpin.⁶⁰ The last document of the series, No Whippinge nor trippinge: but a kinde friendly Snippinge (1601), is attributed to Nicholas Breton, who was successful in his attempt to smooth over the quarrel.⁶¹ According to Davenport, a ". . .series of interlocking quarrels touches at points, but does no seem to be really involved in the War of the Theatres, and developed into what was almost a free-for-all 'flyting'."⁶² However, it must be admitted that the restraining order of June, 1599, which attempted to halt the flow of satirical pamphlets, left Marston searching for a

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 127.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 128.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 129.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 130.

⁶²Ibid., p. 124.

new outlet for his bitter invective, one that was provided by revival of the Paul's Boys late in the same year. Hereafter, one must turn to the plays Marston wrote for the child-actors in order to trace his subsequent involvement in the stage quarrel with Jonson.

CHAPTER II

A RE-INVESTIGATION OF THE PLAYS INVOLVED IN THE WAR OF THE THEATRES

Ros. . . . There was, for a while, no money bid for argument, unless the poet and the player went to cuffs in the question.

Ham. Is't possible?

Gull. O, there has been much throwing about of brains.

--Hamlet, II,ii.

For the sake of expediency in future reference, the present author has chosen to treat the dramas thought to be involved in the so-called war of the theatres individually and with respect to chronology.

A Tale of a Tub (?)

F. G. Fleay believes that one of Jonson's early plays was A Tale of a Tub, a lost play recorded as having been performed in 1633-4.⁶³ Fleay believes that ". . .in its original shape, this play was certainly acted in Elizabeth's time."⁶⁴ Later critics do not accept this view and seldom include the play in a discussion of the war. Chambers dismisses its references to the Queen as being "purely dramatic."⁶⁵

⁶³Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 163.

⁶⁴Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 370.

⁶⁵Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 373.

The Case Is Altered (1597-98)

The Case Is Altered was composed by Jonson in 1597 or 1598,⁶⁶ but was first entered in the Stationer's Register, January 26, 1609.⁶⁷ The original acting company is unknown. Chambers refuses to believe that The Case Is Altered has anything to do with the war of the theatres.⁶⁸ The character Antonio Balladino, however, has been identified with Anthony Munday.⁶⁹ Onion, a character in The Case Is Altered, reminds Balladino (Munday) of having appeared in print as the best plotter, an obvious reference to Meres's inclusion of Munday in the former's list of principal authors in Palladis Tamia (1598).⁷⁰ Therefore, Herford and Simpson conclude that the satire on Anthony Munday must have been added at a later date because it points out that Meres in Palladis Tamia had ludicrously over-estimated Munday's skills in plotmaking.⁷¹ A second interpolation found by Herford and Simpson is contained

⁶⁶Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 166.

⁶⁷Arber (ed.), op. cit., II, p. 178b.

⁶⁸Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 358.

⁶⁹Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 357.

⁷⁰Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 167.

⁷¹Loc. cit.

in Valentine's speech referring to "the publicke theater" and "the common theaters," terms that do not emerge before the revival of the boy companies in 1599 and 1600.⁷² Further interpolations are found in Balladino's preference to "good ground" as distinct from the roofed theatre, and his satire on humour plays, which, according to Herford and Simpson, could not have been written before 1600.⁷³ They conclude that these additions were made for a revival of the work and feel that they ". . .obtrude an alien note into the play. They are satire. . .and of course have not the remotest bearing on the plot."⁷⁴ Language to be found in the works of Harvey is ridiculed in The Case Is Altered. Furthermore, the later interpolation of Antonio Balladino in this drama is certainly Anthony Munday. When Jonson satirizes him as Balladino, one finds a dual allusion to Munday's ballad writing and to his Palladino of England.⁷⁵ Munday was lampooned again in Marston's

⁷²Loc. cit.

⁷³Loc. cit. However, Chapman's An Humorous Day's Mirth is dated as early as 1597 by Chambers; Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 251.

⁷⁴Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit. It should be noted that Penniman pointed out the lines by Balladino referring to Munday as the best plotter to be a later addition or alteration as early as 1913; Penniman, op. cit., p. xxxi.

⁷⁵A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (eds.), Cambridge History of English Literature, V, p. 314.

Histrionastix as Posthaste, but there is no indication that he reacted to the attacks made on him. He impresses one as a man interested in furthering his own interests (and he became well-to-do), one who avoided involving himself in something which might lead to reprimand or censorship.

Every Man In His Humour (Sept. 1598)

Just after Mere's pronouncement of Ben Jonson as one of England's best tragedions in the early autumn of 1598, Jonson's Every Man In his Humour was performed by the Lord Chamberlain's Company at the Curtain.⁷⁶ Shakespeare heads the list of the principal actors listed in the 1616 Jonson folio edition of the play. There is a tradition that Shakespeare intervened in Jonson's favor and got Every Man In accepted by Lord Chamberlain's Company.⁷⁷ Chambers dates Every Man In shortly before September 20, 1598.⁷⁸ The play marks a turning point in the course of the Elizabethan drama since it introduced a new species, the comedy of "humours."⁷⁹ In the

⁷⁶Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 18.

⁷⁷Ibid., IX, p. 168.

⁷⁸Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 359.

⁷⁹Chapman's An Humourous Day's Mirth (1597) may be an earlier form of the new drama.

Prologue to the folio edition, Jonson clearly stated his dramatic platform: he refused to court popularity by writing in ways he could not approve; he refused to violate the unities by covering a span of years in a play, or to resort to cheap and sensational stage effects; and he intended to be realistic and to be satirical in a comical way. Such satire was to serve as a useful purpose in correcting the lesser vices of society.

The Q₁ date of Every Man In is established as shortly before September 20, 1598, in a letter from Sir Toby Matthew to Dudley Carleton.⁸⁰ The F₁ version has been assigned to 1601 by Fleay,⁸¹ and to the early part of 1605 by Chambers.⁸² However, Simpson believes that the folio edition was prepared by Jonson during 1612.⁸³ The first version of the play, the quarto version, is Italian scened and Italian characterized. The scene in the folio version is England and the characters are English. In addition to a change in scene and nationality of characters, the folio version is a complete revision of the Q₁ text. Many passages have been improved, the oaths have been omitted or cleaned up, and a slam at Anthony Munday,

⁸⁰Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 359.

⁸¹Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 358.

⁸²Chambers, op. cit.

⁸³Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 333.

(" . . . that he liue in more penurie of wit and inuention, then eyther the Hall-Beadle, or Poet Nuntius"; Every Man In His Humour, I, 1, 184-5), has disappeared. The prologue is not contained in the anglicized edition.

Simpson believes that there is only a slim possibility that the prologue, appearing in the folio edition, may have been written by and spoken at the original performance in 1598 and afterwards suppressed.⁸⁴ He prefers to believe that the prologue was written to introduce the new text of the play, ". . . one far more in keeping. . . than the old with the ideal of comedy it set forth."⁸⁵ Simpson concludes:

The play thus belongs to two periods of Jonson's artistic development, ten or more years apart. To the first it owes the entire dramatic substance of plot, character, and dialogue; to the second an infinity of heightening strokes of style and traits of characterization.⁸⁶

Fleay finds Every Man In to contain the first outbreak against Samuel Daniel that he has traced in Jonson. He finds that this onset in a snatch of verse by Daniel which Matthew (Every Man In, V, 1) admits was stolen.⁸⁷ Penniman supports the theory but Simpson suggests that it rests upon wholly

⁸⁴Loc. cit.

⁸⁵Ibid., I, p. 334.

⁸⁶Ibid., I, p. 335.

⁸⁷Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 359.

insufficient evidence.⁸⁸ Jonson attacks the use of absurd language and affected style in Every Man In, but with no reference to Marston, whom he satirizes later in Every Man Out of His Humour.

A few days after the production of Every Man In, Jonson quarreled with an actor in Henslowe's company, Gabriel Spencer, killed him, and was arrested. In the Conversations, Jonson bragged that Spencer's sword was ten inches longer than his. He was put on trial and escaped the gallows only by reading his neck-verse, also known as claiming benefit of clergy. He adopted the Catholic faith ". . . by trust of a priest who Visited him in Prison,"⁸⁹ but returned to the Anglican church in 1610.⁹⁰ Spencer's death was "harde and heavey" news to Henslowe.⁹¹ Perhaps, the player's death forced Jonson to move among the public theatres following his release from prison and was an important reason for his subsequent alliance in 1600-1 with the Children of the Chapel. However he was again writing for Henslowe in the year following

⁸⁸Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 351.

⁸⁹Ibid., I, p. 139.

⁹⁰Ibid., I, p. 19.

⁹¹Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 286.

Spencer's death, specifically Every Man Out. Evidently, he was a free-lance author in this period, writing for several companies and playhouses.

Antonio and Mellida I and II (1599)

Both parts of Antonio and Mellida were entered in the Stationer's Register, October 24, 1601.⁹² Chambers assumes, by means of internal evidence within the plays, that I Antonio and Mellida was written in the summer of 1599 and Part II, Antonio's Revenge, in the early winter of the same year.⁹³ The plays were part of the early repertory of Paul's Boys.⁹⁴ In Part I, Sir Jeffrey Balrudo carries on the tradition of the gull in his use of affected language, his foppish manners, and comic lines. He requires a painter to paint "Uh!" (Antonio and Mellida, v.i.30ff), in which Fleay finds a satire on both Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and a revised section by Jonson of Kyd's Spanish Tragedy.⁹⁵ Chambers dismisses Fleay's theory, but believes the "armed Epilogue" of Part I to be a criticism of the armed prologue of Jonson's Postaster, thereby making it

⁹²Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 75.

⁹³Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 429.

⁹⁴Loc. cit.

⁹⁵Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 75.

a later addition.⁹⁶ Thus, the play, in its original state, has nothing to connect it with the war of the theatres.

The date of performance of Antonio's Revenge was probably shortly after that of Antonio and Mellida. Marston had already planned the second part before the first was finished; in the induction to Antonio and Mellida, Antonio says:

. . .I have heard that those persons, as he and you, Feliche, that are but slightly drawn in this comedy, should receive more exact accomplishment in a second part; which, if this obtains gracious acceptance, means to try its fortune.

(Antonio and Mellida, "Induction")

As in later works by Marston, there are Shakespearean overtones. In his desire to be revenged, the ghost of Andrugio echoes the ghost of Hamlet's father. Antonio assumes a disguise in order to revenge his father; Hamlet, with the same intent, pretended to be mad. Nutriche, nurse to Maria, has the easy philosophy of Juliet's nurse in Romeo and Juliet. However, like Antonio and Mellida, its sequel, Antonio's Revenge, cannot be associated with the beginning of the war.

⁹⁶Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 430. It is interesting to note that Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida and Kyd's Spanish Tragedy also contain armed prologues. What connection the three may have is uncertain.

Histrionastix (1599)

Whether Antonio's Revenge should be placed before or after Marston's Histrionastix is uncertain; it appears that both were produced late in 1599.⁹⁷ Histrionastix is possibly Marston's first play connected with the stage war. It was entered in the Stationer's Register, October 31, 1610.⁹⁸ Fleay attributes the whole play to Marston, but the general view of later critics is that Marston was merely the reviser of a ". . . musty foppery of antiquity," possibly by Chapman.⁹⁹ Because the play is a satire on professional players and has an enormous number of characters, Chambers thinks that it must have been originally produced and later revived by amateurs or boys.¹⁰⁰ The revised play was performed at Court, probably by Paul's Boys, in 1599.¹⁰¹ The revision leaves Posthaste, a caricature of Anthony Munday, virtually untouched. Munday had appeared as Antonio Balladino in The Case Is Altered, and had been referred to as "Poet Nuntius" in the quarto version

⁹⁷ Ibid., IV, p. 17.

⁹⁸ Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 202.

⁹⁹ Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., VI, p. 45; Roscoe Addison Small, The Stage-Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-Called Poetasters, p. 67; and Chambers, op. cit., IV, pp. 17-18.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., IV, p. 18.

¹⁰¹ Loc. cit.

of Every Man In. Posthaste is probably not intended for Shakespeare, although some critics have advanced this theory and have linked "Sir Oliver Owlet's Men" with the Chamberlain's Company.¹⁰² Penniman is of the opinion that a particular theatrical group is satirized in Histrionastix and suggests Pembroke's Company.¹⁰³ Small believes that the players in general are satirized.¹⁰⁴ One notes that the characteristics of Chrisogonus--high ideals, impatience at attempts to attract the multitude by unworthy plays, self-importance, censorious attitude, poverty, and work as a translator, satirist and writer of epigrams--identify him with Jonson. This is Marston's first clear representation of Jonson. However, it must be pointed out that this representation does not necessarily mean Marston intended Chrisogonus as an attack upon Jonson. Most critics feel that the reverse is true--that Marston intended his drama to be complimentary. Jonson may have misunderstood the caricature himself and have taken offence, but Chambers thinks the caricature is irrelevant because ". . .the real offence was given by Jack Drum's Entertainment in the next year."¹⁰⁵ Yet, upon examination of

¹⁰²Campbell, op. cit., p. 123.

¹⁰³Penniman, op. cit., p. xlviii.

¹⁰⁴Small, op. cit., p. 88.

¹⁰⁵Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 19.

the following passage from Histriomastix, (which can hardly be a compliment to the shabbily-dressed Ben,) one may easily understand why Jonson may have been offended:

How, you translating scholar? You can make
 a stabbing satire or an epigram,
 And think you carry just Rhamnusia's whip
 To lash the patient! go, get you clothes:
 Our free-born blood such apprehension loathes.
 (Histriomastix, II,1)

Jonson was probably still associated with a regular company when Histriomastix was written. Nevertheless, one cannot be certain that Histriomastix was the cause of the hostility between Jonson and Marston. True, Marston did represent Jonson on the stage, and it may be Histriomastix to which Jonson was referring when he told Drummond that the quarrel with Marston started when ". . . Marston represented him on the stage."¹⁰⁶ But Chrisogonus (Jonson) is refused by the strollers as their playwright in favor of Posthaste (Munday) (Histriomastix, II, 1). Marston must have been aware of the discouragement Jonson felt toward the public playhouse and did not attack him as representative of the players and their playwrights.

¹⁰⁶Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 140.

Every Man Out of His Humour (1599)

Every Man Out of His Humour was Jonson's sequel to Every Man In. The production of the drama, which appears in the Stationer's Register, April 8, 1600,¹⁰⁷ must have been late in the year 1599. The date of performance is supported by a letter from Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sidney, dated November 13, 1599.¹⁰⁸ Chambers thinks that Jonson revived Every Man Out in slightly altered form when the Chamberlain's men took the play to Court at Christmas.¹⁰⁹ It is Jonson's first "comical satire." The point of Jonson's use of the term "comical satire" is the following: late in the year 1599, after the restraining order of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London on June 1, prohibiting all further printing of the works of Hall, Marston, Davies, and Nashe, the authorities ordered all copies on the market to be burned, and decreed that no satires or epigrams be printed thereafter.¹¹⁰ Jonson produced his Every Man Out, calling it a "comical satire," outwitting the bishops.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷Arber, op. cit., III, p. 58.

¹⁰⁸Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 186.

¹⁰⁹Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 362.

¹¹⁰Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 397.

¹¹¹Loc. cit.

In the play, Jonson alluded to Marston's Histriomastix. Clove, pretending to be a great scholar, talks "fustian" with Orange, and, after a good deal of unintelligible verbosity, ends his speech ". . .as you may read in Plato's Histriomastix --You conceive me, sir?" (Every Man Out of His Humour, III,1).

There is also an allusion to Shakespeare in the play:

". . .Then coming to the pretty animal as reason long since is fled to animals, you know" (Every Man Out of His Humour, III,1). An allusion to Julius Caesar follows. At the end of the play, Jonson also mentions Sir John Falstaff. Marston's Scourge of Villany and Harvey's phraseology, as well as words used by Harvey, are satirized in the play.

Fleay detects allusions to contemporary persons for nearly every character in the play:

. . .to give here all my grounds for identifying the persons satirized would require almost a history of contemporary poetry, non-dramatic as well as dramatic. I must, therefore, limit my observations to a narrow compass. Asper-Macilente is, of course, Jonson. Puntarvalo with his dog may be Sir John Harrington. . .Carlo Buffone. . .is Dekker. . . Fastidious Brisk I take to be Daniel; Deliro, possibly Monday, Saviolina, Elizabeth Carey.¹¹²

In addition, he identifies Sordido with Burbage, Gordatus and Mitis with Donne and Chapman, but maintains that Clove and Orange are not Dekker and Marston.¹¹³ He later associates

¹¹²Fleay, op. cit., I, pp. 359-60.

¹¹³Ibid., I, p. 360.

Carlo with Marston, an identification which was first made by Gifford on the basis of Carlo's being addressed as the "Second Vntruss of the time." The supposed allusion is to Marston's Scourge, which attacked Joseph Hall's claim to first honors.¹¹⁴ Aubrey's jottings on Sir Walter Raleigh, however, would seem to invalidate this theory, because Aubrey identified Carlo Buffone with Charles Chester, a scurrilous man-about-London at this time.¹¹⁵ This identification is supported by Small, Chambers, Simpson, and later critics.¹¹⁶ Penniman supports Fleay's identification of Fastidious Brisk with Daniel, Asper-Macilente with Jonson, and identifies Fungoso with Thomas Lodge, Puntavarlo with Anthony Munday, and Amorphus with Sir Walter Raleigh.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, Small, Chambers, and Simpson dismiss most of the Fleay-Penniman (and their follower's) identifications as mere guess work. Later critics maintain that the characters are types rather than individuals. Chambers writes:

The play has been hunted through and through for personalities, most of which are effectively refuted by Small. Most of the characters are types rather than individuals, and social types rather than literary or

¹¹⁴Penniman, op. cit., p. xx.

¹¹⁵Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 405.

¹¹⁶Small, op. cit., p. 36; Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 363; and Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 405.

¹¹⁷Penniman, op. cit., p. xlixff.

stage types. I do not think these are portraits of Daniel, Iyly, Drayton, Donne, Chapman, Munday, Shakespeare, Burbage, in the play or its induction at all. Nor do I think there are portraits in the strict sense of Marston and Dekker, although no doubt some parody of Marston's 'jyustian' vocabulary is put into the mouth of Clove.¹¹⁸

Simpson agrees that Asper, the literary lecturer of the induction, is Jonson, ". . .but to see Jonson in Macilente is a perversity of which his worst enemies in his own day were not guilty."¹¹⁹ As for the identification of Daniel with Fastidious Brisk, ". . .Not even the tip of Daniel's nose is visible."¹²⁰ Simpson concludes:

After a full weighing of the evidence, the general conclusion is that in this play Jonson did not use his carefully drawn representations of the humours to screen a series of personal attacks, that in Cynthia's Revels he did introduce lightly touched sketches of Dekker and Marston, indicated by a few satiric strokes only, which were clear at least to Dekker, and that it is not till Poetaster that he drew his full-length portraits of contemporaries. Even in the one figure of Every Man Out of His Humour, in which we can definitely trace satirical impersonation, it is not difficult to see an underlying literary purpose.¹²¹

Because the play was performed by the Chamberlain's Men in a public theatre, one may not with logic include the play in the "war" between the private and public playhouses.

¹¹⁸Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 362.

¹¹⁹Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 402.

¹²⁰Loc. cit.

¹²¹Ibid., IX, p. 403.

The fact that Shakespeare did not take a role in Every Man Out, as he did in Every Man In, might also lead one to believe that Shakespeare disapproved of the play, but the evidence, here, is inconclusive. Every Man Out was received with hostility by the popular audience, possibly one of the reasons Jonson left the public theatre to write for the newly-organized Chapel Children in the following year.¹²² Marston was already associated with Paul's Boys, who had been revived late in 1599. Evidently, the war had been declared soon after the boy companies had been revived, when they lashed out vigorously against their common enemy, the public playhouses. In an effort to enlist new customers, they offered an unrestrained bill of fare with an emphasis upon the erotic and satirical. However, the battle was not restricted to the common theatre; it included a struggle between the private companies, Paul's Boys and the Chapel Children, and between Marston on one side and Jonson on the other.

Patient Grissil (1600)

So far, Thomas Dekker had not become involved in the battle, and there seems to be no reason to believe that Patient Grissil was ever a part of the Footmachie. The play was produced in February or March of 1600, according to Chambers,

¹²²Ibid., IX, p. 407.

written in collaboration with Chettle and Haughton.¹²³

Attempts to assign the various parts of the play to the three men have produced a large body of criticism, but the problem in Patient Grissil that concerns the war of the theatres is the long recognized similarity between Emulo in Dekker's play and Fastidious Brisk in Jonson's Every Man Out, a similarity which Fleay, Penniman, and Small attribute to common source material.¹²⁴ Hunt, in her biography of Dekker, thinks the similarity is accounted for by the borrowings on the part of Jonson.¹²⁵ Her reason for believing that Jonson borrowed from Patient Grissil stems from her noting Tucca's taunt of Horace in Dekker's Satiromastix (1901):

Demetrius Dekker shall write a scene or two in one of thy strong garlic comedies, and thou shalt take the guilt of conscience for it and swear 'tis thine own, old lad, 'tis thine owne. (Satiromastix, I,11,333-6).

Halstead, in an attempt to refute Hunt's theory, points out that Patient Grissil is not one of Dekker's "strong garlic comedies."¹²⁶ He should be reminded, however, that it is not Dekker's comedy with which Tucca is taunting Horace (Jonson);

¹²³Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 292.

¹²⁴Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 361; Josiah H. Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 80; and Small, op. cit., p. 70.

¹²⁵Hunt, op. cit., p. 63.

¹²⁶Halstead, op. cit., p. 383.

rather it is Jonson's, and probably Every Man Out. Dekker satirizes the affected language and manners of Emulo, a foolish gallant, whom Fleay and Penniman identify with Daniel.¹²⁷ Small, however, rejects this suggestion.¹²⁸

Jack Drum's Entertainment (1600)

Marston's style, plainly discernible in the revision of Histrionastix, can be recognized in the anonymous Jack Drum's Entertainment (1600). He evidently had written it for the Children of Paul's immediately after he had completed the two parts of Antonio and Mellida. Chambers fixes the date early in the year 1600 on internal evidence within the play.¹²⁹ It was first entered in the Stationer's Register, September 8, 1600.¹³⁰ The play is a ". . .hodge-podge of underdeveloped romantic, comic, and satiric motifs,"¹³¹ indicating that Marston was endeavoring to discover just what form of stage entertainment would appeal to the audience and at the same time fill up Paul's coffers. The central theme is unrelated and over-shadowed by the satiric elements in the play, the derision

¹²⁷Fleay, op. cit., I, pp. 359-60; Penniman, Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Thomas Dekker's Satiromastix, p. xx.

¹²⁸Small, op. cit., pp. 42 and 184.

¹²⁹Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 21.

¹³⁰Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 64b.

¹³¹Campbell, op. cit., p. 155.

of a group of English gulls and fools. Chambers thinks that the beginning of the quarrel between Jonson and Marston lies in the offence given Jonson in this play.¹³² It is certain that the work contains words which were previously vomited by Crispinus (Marston) in Jonson's Poetaster. The critical gull-exhibitor, Brabant senior, who delights in scoffing at his companion's weaker natures, is generally agreed upon by critics to be a caricature of Jonson.¹³³ Brabant is a severe critic of his literary contemporaries and of the repertory of the recently reorganized Children of Paul's. His criticism of the "moderne witts" is insulting and typical of a buffoon:

Brabant Junior: Brother, how like you of our moderne witts? How like you the new poet Mellidus?

Brabant Senior: A slight bubbling spirit, a Corke, a Huske.

Planet: How like you Musus fashion in his carriage?

Brabant Senior: O filthily, he is as blunt as Pawles.

Brabant Junior: What thinke you of the Lines of Decius? Writes he not a good cordiall sappie stile?

Brabant Senior: A surreinde Jaded wit, but a rubbes on.

Planet: Brabant thou art like a paire of Ballance (s), Thou wayest all saving thy selfe.

Brabant Senior: Good faith, troth is, they are all Apes & gulls, Vile imitating spirits, dry heathy Turffes (Jack Drum's Entertainment, V,1).

The "new poet Mellidus" is the author, Marston, who had recently finished Antonio and Mellida. Brabant Junior, who may be

¹³²Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 19.

¹³³Ibid., IV, p. 21.

Marston, praises the audience in the last act and is engaged in the following dialogue:

Brabant Junior: 'Tis a good gentle Audience, and I hope the Boyes will come one day into the Court of requests.

Brabant Senior: I and they had good Playes, but they produce Such mustie fopperies of antiquitie, And do not sute the humorous ages backs with cloathes in fashion (Jack Drum's Entertainment, V,1).

The "musty fopperies of antiquity" probably refers to Marston's earlier revision of the old play Histrionastix and other plays revived for Paul's. However, because it is a self-made criticism by Marston, the passage cannot be taken too seriously as a blow delivered in the war of the theatres.

Brabant Senior's love for stupid, practical jokes leads him into a plan for disappointing the lust of Monsieur John fo de King, a lecherous Frenchman. He invites Monsieur John to his residence, pretending that it is a house of assignation and that he is a pander and his wife a whore. Brabant's trust in his wife's fidelity proves to be ill-taken, however, when, at the end of the last act, Monsieur John enters, exclaiming over the charms of ". . .de most delicate plumpe vench" to whom Brabant has introduced him. Thus, Brabant becomes a self-made cockold.

Chambers suggests that the adventures of John fo de King with Brabant's wife correspond to a story narrated by Jonson to Drummond, as one in which Jonson played the active, not the

passive, part.¹³⁴ The passage referred to is the following:

. . . he had many quarrells with Marston beat him & took his Pistol from him, wrote his Poetaster on him the beginning of ym were that Marston represented him in the stage in his youth given to Venerie. he thought the use of a maide, nothing in comparison to yet wantonness of a wyfe & would never haue any other Mistress. he said two accidents strange befell him, one that a man made his own wyfe to Court him whom he enjoyed two yeares erre he knew of it, & one day finding them by chance Was passingly delighted with it, one other lay diverse tymes with a woman, who shew him all that he wished except the last act, which she would neuer agree unto.¹³⁵

Fleay, in reading this passage, concluded that Jack Drum was the play in which Marston represented Jonson as "given to venerie," and therefore identified Monsieur John fo de King with Jonson.¹³⁶ Fenniman suggested a change in the punctuation, placing a period after "stage" and a comma after "venerie."¹³⁷ The punctuation changes altered the opinion that the absurd Monsieur John could be identified with Jonson, even though his role in Drummond's account corresponds to Jonson's. Because the passage concerning Jonson's racy amours is immediately preceded by his account of his enmity with Marston, a link between the two passages is implied. Yet, it is doubtful that the reference to Jonson's youthful "venerie"

¹³⁴ Loc. cit.

¹³⁵ Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 140.

¹³⁶ Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 74.

¹³⁷ Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 40.

would have been recognized as a personal allusion by the Blackfriar's audience. However, as Chambers points out, if Jonson ". . . had imparted the same story to Marston, he not unnaturally resented the use made of it."¹³⁸

The identification of Brabant Senior with Jonson is objected to by Fleay, who quotes Jonson's conversation with Drummond to support his view that Jonson is not Brabant, but rather Monsieur John.¹³⁹ Penniman agreed with Fleay initially, but then suggested the change in punctuation aforementioned. Therefore, one finds that Chambers, Small, Bullen, and Leishman identify Brabant Senior with Jonson.¹⁴⁰ However, O. J. Campbell feels that Brabant Senior is more a type of character than any one individual, ". . . a character in which he Marston could express a measure of his irritation toward his fellow dramatist." Campbell concludes, ". . . The figure derided is not Ben Jonson, my masters, but a satirist who misconceives his critical function by contaminating it with the laughter of a buffoon and the personal petulance of a detractor--such a person as Ben Jonson often seems to be."¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 21.

¹³⁹ Fleay, op. cit.

¹⁴⁰ Chambers, op. cit.; Small, op. cit., p. 97; Bullen (ed.), I, p. liv; and J. B. Leishman (ed.), The Three Parnassus Plays, p. 86.

¹⁴¹ Campbell, op. cit., p. 163.

On the other hand, Fleay, Simpson, and Penniman agree that young Brabant is Marston.¹⁴² Small disagrees, however, arguing that Marston did not deliberately make himself ridiculous as a ". . . very crazy innamorato in love with a most unworthy woman."¹⁴³ Campbell convincingly shows that Planet represents Marston's point of view.¹⁴⁴ The critics, including Small, are tolerant of Fleay's assertion that Sir Edward Fortune is Edward Alleyn.¹⁴⁵ Musus may be Chapman or Daniel, according to Simpson; Decius, writes Penniman, is Drayton.¹⁴⁶ Chambers takes Musus for Middleton and Decius for Dekker.¹⁴⁷ A number of guesses as to the identity of other characters in the play is made by Fleay--Timothy Tweedle (Munday), Christopher Fawn (Christopher Beeston), John Ellis (John Lyly), Pasquil (Nicholas Breton), Planet (Shakespeare),

¹⁴²Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 74; Percy Simpson, School of Shakespeare, II, p. 129, quoted in Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 74; and loc. cit.

¹⁴³Small, op. cit., p. 96.

¹⁴⁴Campbell, op. cit., p. 163.

¹⁴⁵Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 74.

¹⁴⁶Simpson, School of Shakespeare, op. cit., II, p. 131, quoted in Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 74; and loc. cit.

¹⁴⁷Chambers, op. cit.

the two Brabants (Hall and Marston)--but are generally disregarded by other critics.¹⁴⁸

Cynthia's Revels (1600)

The Fountain of Self-Love or Cynthia's Revels, the second of Jonson's "comicall satyres," was acted by the Chapel Children at Blackfriar's in 1600, according to the title-page of the 1616 Folio. Jonson was no longer writing for the Chamberlain's Company, by whom Every Man In and Every Man Out were presented. The play was first entered in the Stationer's Register May 23, 1601, and was published in quarto in the same year.¹⁴⁹ Cynthia's Revels has come down in both the quarto (1601) and the longer folio (1616) form. It is almost impossible to determine whether the passages peculiar to the folio are additions representing later revisions of the quarto text, or whether the folio represents the original text.¹⁵⁰ One has Jonson's word that it was acted at the Blackfriar's in 1600, and Chambers indicates that it was first performed, late in that year.¹⁵¹ Chambers' evidence dispels the former theory that the play, (which was addressed to the Queen), was

¹⁴⁸ Loc. cit.

¹⁴⁹ Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 189.

¹⁵⁰ Campbell, op. cit., p. 83.

¹⁵¹ Chambers, op. cit., II, p. 42.

never performed at Court, for it evidently had been performed there on January 6, 1601.¹⁵² However, Jonson, who, along with Marston, held ambitions for court preference, was unsuccessful in his bid for the Queen's favor, and Dekker chided Jonson for this failure in Satiromastix:

. . . when your Playes
are misse-lik't at Court, you shall not crye New Like
a Pusse-cat,
and say you are glad you write out of the Courtiers
Element (Satiromastix, V, 11, 324-27).

The reason for the Queen's indifference was probably due to Jonson's allusions to the Essex affair in the play. Essex, a soldier, statesman, and favorite of the Queen, was imprisoned for boldly intruding into the Queen's chamber, in September, 1599, when he surprised her at her toilet.¹⁵³ He was hanged for treason February 25, 1601.¹⁵⁴ The Queen's treatment of the popular favorite and the resentment it provoked, are alluded to in Cynthia's Revels. Perhaps, Jonson had sought to pose as a loyal defender of the Queen, but Elizabeth had probably not wished to be reminded of the incident, especially on the stage. She may also have rightly felt that the character Cynthia, a poet's name for Elizabeth, was overshadowed by that of Crites, who represented Jonson.

¹⁵²Ibid., III, p. 354.

¹⁵³Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 395.

¹⁵⁴Loc. cit.

In this play, Jonson shifted from the humours of the city man, the subject of Every Man Out, to the affectations of the courtier. Perhaps, in his desire to please the Queen and gain the favor of the Court, he elevated the harsh comic satire of Every Man In and Every Man Out to a masque-like court entertainment. The emphasis in the play is upon the dramatic dialogue and scenery, echoing Jonson's intention stated in the Prologue: "Words, above actions: matter, above words" (Cynthia's Revels, Prologue, 20).

Jonson's satire of the manners and pastimes of the Court are so mingled with allegorical and mythological elements that the characters seem abstract and unreal. But his satire, however elevated, is not obscured in the myth and morality. As in his previous play, Every Man Out, it is his satiric aim, though of a narrower and more subtle range, to ridicule vice and folly, now of the pseudo gallants and would-be ladies of the Court. Criticus is representative of the author's satiric point of view. Mercury, Cupid, and, in a sense, Cynthia, are fellow-critics representing the true order of their society. In the last act, when the gulls are unmasked and Cynthia sees that fools and knaves have forced their way into her presence, she commands them to be purged of their follies.

The question of whether or not any of the characters in Cynthia's Revels directly stand for or represent individual

enemies of Jonson has been lengthily discussed by the critics, and the answers range from the identification of nearly every character with a contemporary of Jonson, by Fleay, to the view held by Campbell, Simpson, and Berringer that the characters represent types with individual traits. With the exclusion of the latter three critics, the following is a table of the major characters in Cynthia's Revels and their identities according to Fleay, Penniman, Small, and Chambers:

TABLE I
MAJOR CHARACTERS AND THEIR IDENTITIES
IN CYNTHIA'S REVELS

	Fleay	Penniman	Small	Chambers
Crites	Jonson	Jonson	Jonson	Donne?
Amorphus	Harrington? Rich?	Munday		
Asotus	Lodge	Lodge		
Hedon	Daniel	Daniel	Marston	
Analdes	Dekker	Marston? Chester?	Dekker	

The main reason for the identification of Crites with Jonson is the passage in Satiromastix, wherein Tucca says to Horace:

. . .you must be
call'd Asper, and Criticus, and Horace, thy tytle's
longer a reading then the Stile a the big Turkes:
Asper, Criticus, Quintus, Horatius, Flaccus
(Satiromastix, I, 11, 311-15).

According to Dekker, Jonson appears as Asper in Every Man Out, as Crites in Cynthia's Revels, and as Horace in Poetaster. He

does not appear in Every Man In, as Dekker explains in the Preface to Satiromastix:

. . .if his Criticall Lynx had with as narrow eyes, obseru'd in himselfe, as it did little spots vpon others; without all disputation, Horace would not have left Horace out of Euery man in's Hvmour.
(Satiromastix, Preface).

In addition, Dekker, in Satiromastix, identifies Crispinus (Marston) and Demetrius (Dekker) of Poetsaster with Hedon and Anaiides of Cynthia's Revels. However, as can be seen by referring to the above table, the critics are divided between Daniel and Marston for Hedon, and Dekker and Marston for Anaiides. Small, on the basis of Dekker's Satiromastix, identifies Hedon with Marston.¹⁵⁵ Penniman places great emphasis upon Jonson's satire of Daniel and finds resemblances of him in Hedon (Cynthia's Revels), Matteo (Every Man In), Brisk (Every Man Out), Gullio, a character in the anonymous II Parnassus, and possibly in Dekker's Emulo in Patient Grissill.¹⁵⁶ Berringer is a later critic who follows Simpson and Campbell's thesis that Jonson intended no individual poet in the figure of Hedon. He dismisses the identification of Hedon with Marston on the basis that Hedon has no particularly Marstonian

¹⁵⁵Small, op. cit., p. 38.

¹⁵⁶Penniman, Ben Jonson's Poetsaster and Thomas Dekker's Satiromastix, p. xxviii.

characteristics and would not have been associated with him in the minds of the audience.¹⁵⁷ Thus, he asserts, if Hedon, who is the instigator of the plot against Crites in Cynthia's Revels, did not represent Marston, there is no reason for associating the play with the war of the theatres.¹⁵⁸

Berringer, taking an extreme view, also presents various arguments against the identification of Daniel with Hedon, and concludes that, ". . . both to Jonson and to his public, Hedon represented merely a study in the humours of the foppish courtier."¹⁵⁹

Small supports the identification Dekker made of himself with Anaides.¹⁶⁰ Penniman, however, is of the opinion that Dekker was wrong in taking Anaides to be a caricature of himself, and prefers to identify Marston with Anaides.¹⁶¹

The similarities between Anaides and Demetrius, noticed by Small, Penniman finds common to all Jonson's enemies.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁷Ralph W. Berringer, "Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and the War of the Theatres: the Case for the Identification of Hedon," Philological Quarterly, XX (January, 1943), p. 6.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶⁰Small, op. cit., p. 35.

¹⁶¹Penniman, Ben Jonson's Poetaster and Thomas Dekker's Satiromastix, p. lviii.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. x.

Therefore, Fleay and Small's identification of Anaides with Dekker seems unwarranted because, so far as is known, Jonson had no quarrel with Dekker prior to the writing of Poetaster. Simpson thinks that Dekker interereted the character of Anaides to himself.¹⁶³ Campbell adds that Dekker, ". . .in order to justify his attack on Jonson, accumulates unjustified ex post facto insults, for himself and Marston, where clearly none were intended."¹⁶⁴

Of the remaining characters, Fleay identifies Amorphus, first with Sir John Harington, and later with Barnaby Rich.¹⁶⁵ Penniman suggests Anthony Munday.¹⁶⁶ Small, however, believes that Amorphus is a type character.¹⁶⁷ Fleay and Penniman identify Asotus with Lodge, but Small does not believe that the character is a personal satire, and Herford and Simpson also finds no personal reference in the character.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 507.

¹⁶⁴Campbell, op. cit., p. 85.

¹⁶⁵Fleay, op. cit., I, pp. 360 and 363; Ibid., p. 363.

¹⁶⁶Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 92.

¹⁶⁷Small, op. cit., p. 49.

¹⁶⁸Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 410.

What You Will (1601)

Marston's What You Will was entered in the Stationer's Register, August 6, 1607.¹⁶⁹ The acting company of What You Will is not included on the title-page of the quarto printed in that year.¹⁷⁰ The appearance of so many page boys and women, Small points out, is a sure indication, that it is a children's play.¹⁷¹ Chambers, too, excludes the possibility of its having been performed in a public theatre because of the allusions in the induction to the small size of the stage and to the use of candles.¹⁷² It would hardly have been ". . . acted by the Chapel boys," as Fleay suggests, or even performed at Blackfriar's, where Hillebrand assigns the play.¹⁷³ It must have been produced by their rivals, Paul's Boys, for whom Marston had already written Histriomastix, Antonio and Mellida, Antonio's Revenge, and Jack Drum's Entertainment. Bullen, Small, Penniman, and Chambers agree that the play as

¹⁶⁹Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 157b.

¹⁷⁰H. Harvey Wood (ed.), The Plays of John Marston, II, p. 227.

¹⁷¹Small, op. cit., p. 101.

¹⁷²Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 430.

¹⁷³Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 76; Harold N. Hillebrand, The Child Actors: A Chapter in Elizabethan History, p. 35.

written in 1601 by way of answer to Cynthia's Revels.¹⁷⁴ Wood, the latest Marston editor, states that the play was ". . . written and produced probably between Cynthia's Revels (1600) and Poetaster (1601).¹⁷⁵ It must have followed Every Man Out and Cynthia's Revels because certain speeches contained in those dramas are parodied in it. Contrary to Fleay's assumption that What You Will must have preceded the Poetaster because it contains no allusion to that drama, Small indicates that What You Will actually was attacked in the Poetaster.¹⁷⁶ Since he can find only fourteen of the thirty-one words and expressions vomited up by Crispinus (Marston) in the Poetaster, Small suggests that most of the remaining words were included in What You Will and that Marston afterwards revised the play and eliminated those words.¹⁷⁷ Because the Poetaster loses much of its point if Marston had just produced a play free from the barbarous diction that Jonson attacks, Small's conjecture appears valid. In addition, it is unlikely that any of Marston's dramatic works, except a probable contribution

¹⁷⁴ Small, op. cit., p. 101; Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 137; and Chambers, op. cit., IV, p. 430.

¹⁷⁵ Wood (ed.), op. cit., I, p. xiv.

¹⁷⁶ Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 76; Small, op. cit., p. 107.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 108.

to the Scot's Tragedy, are lost.¹⁷⁸ At any rate, the emetic administered Crispinus (Marston) had a chastening effect upon Marston's later style. No outlandish phrases are to be found in his works printed after Poetaster.¹⁷⁹ Small cites revisions to prove that Marston radically altered the last two acts; hence, the confusion of the names of characters in the play.¹⁸⁰ The fact that the play was published without the usual title-page formula, ". . . as it hath been sundry times acted," also raises the question of a revision.¹⁸¹

What You Will, has, both in the induction and in the text of the play, a number of sarcastic references to Jonson's savage reaction to criticism.¹⁸² Doricus, in the induction, says:

¹⁷⁸The following entries from Henslowe's Diary connect Marston with this lost play: September 2, "Thomas Deckers Bengemen Jonson Hary Chettell & other Jentellman in earneste of a playe calle Robart the second kinge of Scottes tragedie;" September 28, "Unto Mr Marston the new poete in earnest of a boocke called [blank]"; Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 124. An identification of "Mr Marston the new poete" with the "other Jentellman" seems "fairly reasonable" to Chambers; Chambers, op. cit., II, p. 171.

¹⁷⁹Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IX, p. 578.

¹⁸⁰Small, op. cit., p. 109.

¹⁸¹Loc. cit.

¹⁸²The fact that the references to Jonson are included in the 1607 publication is no indication that the quarrel was still raging. According to Wood, it is unsafe to assume that Marston read the proofs; Wood, op. cit., I, p. xxvi.

. . .I wonder what tite braine
 Wrung in this custome to mainetaine Contempt
 Gainst common Censure: to give stiff counter buffes,
 To crack rude skorne even on the very face
 Of better audience (What You Will, Induction).

Marston's induction may be a reply to the induction to Jonson's Every Man Out, in which Jonson set out to ". . .strip the ragged follies of the time / Naked as at their birth. . ." (Every Man Out of His Humour, Induction). Campbell restricts the satire of Jonson to the induction and does not accept the findings in the play proper of the earlier critics. Fleay, one of the critics with whom Campbell takes issue, identified Lampatho Doria with the author, Marston, and Quadratus with Jonson.¹⁸³ Penniman, in supporting Fleay's identifications, becomes confused about Jonson's size. He cites Lampatho's remark to Quadratus ". . .I'll make greatness quake: I'll taw the hide of thick-skinned Eugeness," as a probable reference to Jonson's size.¹⁸⁴ It is true that in his later years Jonson grew increasingly stout, but he was called a ". . .staru'd rascal" and ". . .a leane hollow-cheekt Scrag" by Tucca in Satiromastix (V,ii,262).¹⁸⁵ Small, on the other hand, reverses

¹⁸³Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 77.

¹⁸⁴Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 142.

¹⁸⁵Jonson admitted to Lady Covell that he was ". . .fat and old, laden with belly," and also when he sat for his portrait, he told the painter that his shape was now ". . .one great blot;" Marchette Chute, Ben Jonson of Westminster, p. 306.

Fleay's identifications. Lampatho, he maintains, stands for Jonson; Quadratus, while he does not represent Marston, ". . .at times utters Marston's ideas."¹⁸⁶ In addition, if Quadratus is Marston's spokesman, it seems incongruous that Quadratus should call Lampatho by Marston's own pseudonym, "Don Kynsader": "Away Idolater, why you Don Kynsader / Thou canker eaten rusty curre" (What You Will, II, i). The identifications made by Fleay, Penniman, and Small are objected to by Campbell, who declares that the critics ". . .are obliged to resort to far-fetched subtlety in order to account for obvious contradictions."¹⁸⁷ Small is convinced that of the remaining characters, none can possibly be personally satirical in total effect or in detail.¹⁸⁸ Fleay, however, identifies the four characters of the induction--Signor Snuff, Monsieur Mew, Cavaliero Blirt, and Philomuse--with Armin, Jonson, Middleton, and Daniel.¹⁸⁹

Poetaster (1601)

Jonson, in the 1616 Folio, gave the date of the production of Poetaster as 1601, ". . .By the Children of

¹⁸⁶Small, op. cit., p. 26.

¹⁸⁷Campbell, op. cit., p. 179.

¹⁸⁸Small, op. cit., p. 114.

¹⁸⁹Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 77.

Queene Elizabeths Chappel."¹⁹⁰ The play was entered in the Stationer's Register, December 21, 1601.¹⁹¹ Small assumes that the fifteen weeks, mentioned by Jonson as the space of time in which Poetaster was written, began directly after Cynthia's Revels was produced.¹⁹² But it is not known exactly when in 1600 that play was produced. Poetaster and Satiromastix must have been written at very nearly the same time. Jonson evidently knew that Dekker had been hired to write a play satirizing him. Histrion, speaking of Demetrius, says: ". . .we haue hir'd him to abuse Horace, and bring him in, in a play" (Poetaster, III,iv,322-3), and Tucca later remarks, ". . .Come, wee'll goe see how forward our Iourney-men is toward the vnt'russing of him (Poetaster, IV,vii,26-7). Jonson must have hurried to finish Poetaster, because Satiromastix cannot possibly have been written until the contents of Poetaster were known to Dekker. In fact, Dekker employs characters from Poetaster in his play, notably Captain Tucca, Crispinus, Demetrius, and Horace. Chambers, therefore, dates the production of the two plays in the late spring or early autumn of the same year.¹⁹³ Simpson, however, believes that

¹⁹⁰Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IV, p. 325.

¹⁹¹Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 77b.

¹⁹²Small, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁹³Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 366.

the play must have been acted early in the year. His evidence for a spring performance is in the lines spoken by *Histris*, ". . .this winter ha's made vs all poorer, then so many staru'd snakes" (Poetaster, III,iv,328-9).

The play is Jonson's only openly avowed reply to attacks made upon him by other playwrights. He admitted that he assaulted his detractors in the "Apologetical Dialogue" appended to Poetaster, and in his own statement to Drummond.¹⁹⁴ Marston's vocabulary is ridiculed in the purgation scene (V.). There is no doubt that *Crispinus* represents Marston; *Demetrius*, Dekker; and *Horace*, Jonson. Furthermore, Captain *Tucca*'s name may have been derived from a character in *Guilpin's Skialetheia* (1598), or, perhaps, as Dekker indicates in Satiromastix, *Tucca* is Captain *Hannam* (Satiromastix, Dedication, 33), a captain under Drake in 1585.¹⁹⁵ *Histris* is meant to suggest a member of the rival Chamberlain's Company. It was this company which had retained Dekker and Marston for the play, Satiromastix. Other members of the Chamberlain's Company are also objects of Jonson's satire. Table II, page 58, presents identifications

¹⁹⁴Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 140.

¹⁹⁵Small, op. cit., p. 26; and Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 365.

of the seven players alluded to in Postaster, as listed by Baldwin and Gray.¹⁹⁶

TABLE II
IDENTIFICATIONS OF PLAYERS
ALLUDED TO IN POSTASTER

	Baldwin	Gray
"your fat fool"	T. Pope	T. Pope
"seven-shares and a half"	R. Burbage	R. Burbage
Histrion	A. Phillips	A. Phillips
Aesop	J. Heminges	Shakespeare
Frisker	W. Sly	R. Armin
Aenobarbus	R. Cowley	R. Cowley
Poluphagus	R. Armin	Sincklo

Gray offers several less than substantial reasons for identifying Shakespeare with Aesop. Simpson, in a reply to Gray, attempts to refute his hypothesis in favor of Baldwin's earlier identification of Aesop with Heminges.¹⁹⁷ Similar reference to actors occur in Webster's version of Marston's The Malcontent (1604). Sly, Sincklo, Burbage, Condell, and Lowin, all of whom are Chamberlain's men, participate in the induction. From the conversation herein it is learned that the Children of the Chapel had earlier acquired The Spanish Tragedy.

¹⁹⁶ Thomas W. Baldwin, The Organization of the Personnel of the Shakespearean Company, p. 233; and H. D. Gray, "The Chamberlain's Men and the Postaster," Modern Language Review, XLII (April, 1947), pp. 173-9.

¹⁹⁷ Percy Simpson, "A Modern Fable of Aesop," Modern Language Review, XLII (July, 1948), pp. 403-5.

possibly through the intervention of Jonson, who on September 25, 1601, was paid by Henslowe for additions to the play.¹⁹⁸ Furthermore, in the induction, Sly asks Condell why they are playing The Malcontent since another company already has an interest in it. Condell replies: ". . .Why not Malevale in folio with us, as Ieronimo in Decimo sexto with them. They taught us a name for our play, wee call it One for another" (Poetaster, "Induction").

Jonson's attack upon lawyers and soldiers in Poetaster caused him to be brought before the Lord Chief Justice, but his innocence of the charges was answered by his friend, Richard Martin.¹⁹⁹ In a kind of postscript to Poetaster, Jonson wrote an "Apologetical Dialogue" in which he denied having satirized personalities by their particular names. He admitted, however, that he had taxed the players:

Now, for the Players, it is true, I tax'd 'hem,
 And yet, but some; and those so sparingly,
 As all the rest might haue sate still, vnquestion'd,
 Had they but had the wit, or conscience
 To thinke well of themselues. But, impotent they
 Thought each mans vice belong'd to their whole tribe:
 And much good doe't 'hem. What th' haue done 'gainst me,
 I am not mou'd with. If it gaue 'him meat,
 Or got 'hem clothes. 'Tis well. That was their end,
 Onely amongst them, I am sorry for
 Some better natures, by the rest so drawne,
 To run in that vile line.

(Poetaster, "Apologetical Dialogue,"
 141-152).

¹⁹⁸ Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., p. 182.

¹⁹⁹ Chute, op. cit., p. 102.

In these lines Jonson gives an economic reason for the war, which, in view of the poverty of many poets and scholars of the time, undoubtedly has some validity. The lines, in which Jonson expresses his regret that some of the players had become involved in the censure of the author of Poetaster, have often been made to include Shakespeare. However, nothing but conjecture results from this attempt to exonerate Shakespeare from the war.

In the same year that Poetaster was written, Jonson joined Shakespeare, Marston, and Chapman in contributing poetical essays to Chester's Love's Martyr. In addition, in September, 1601, and June, 1602, Jonson was again working for Henslowe, apparently as a free-lance reviser of plays.²⁰⁰ However, one should remember that he was doing this work while he was still associated with the Children of the Chapel. Then, in 1603, he wrote Sejanus for the Chamberlain's Men, as the 1616 Folio title-page indicates.²⁰¹ Evidently his quarrel with Shakespeare's company was, by this time, a thing of the past. In 1604, Marston dedicated his The Malcontent to Jonson, and in the next year they were working in collaboration upon Eastward Ho.

²⁰⁰Foakes and Rickert (eds.), op. cit., pp. 182; 203.

²⁰¹Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., IV, p. 346.

There is, undoubtedly, a contradictory attitude toward personal satire in Jonson. Apparently, he considered it beneath his dignity to engage in highly personal invective. In his public statements, Jonson always denied that he included personal satire in his plays. For example, in the "Apologetical Dialogue" he writes, ". . . My Bookes haue still bene taught / To spare the persons, and to speak the vices" (Poetaster, "Apologetical Dialogue," 84-5). Yet, the fact remains that Jonson did point up the vicious and foolish traits of his contemporaries in his stage characters. As well, he boasted to Drummond of his quarrels with Marston. But perhaps Jonson had some valid justification for his denials of the use of personal satire, for he satirized an individual, not directly, but as a type character, and included but a few personal traits of the individual in the character. Whether he employed this method deliberately can only be conjectured. But certainly, Jonson, the great classicist, would not have admitted his satire was personal. He followed in the tradition of Juvenalian satire, which was obscure and moral. A study of Jonson's Timber or Discoveries, as well as his other critical documents, both in his plays and the Conversations, reveals that he was a dedicated poet. He had too great a respect for orthodox critical theory to depart from the accepted forms of either satire or comedy in order to vent

his personal animosities or cater to public taste in his drama. One thing must be said of Jonson: he did not play to the crowd. Therefore, one cannot accept the extreme view that explains Jonson's participation in the war of the theatres as one of purely personal animosity. Certainly his attack on the poetasters is better explained by his conviction that the profession of poetry was in need of a repair that could be accomplished only by a return to classic ideals.

Satiromastix (1601)

Whether Dekker was convinced that he had been ridiculed as Anaides in Cynthia's Revels or was roused by the insistency of Marston or the Chamberlain's Men, Dekker apparently began the writing of Satiromastix before Poetaster was finished. The fact that Jonson's satire is directed primarily against Crispinus (Marston) makes the satire of Demetrius (Dekker) seem to be of less importance. This difference can be seen in a comparison of the minor role of Demetrius with the more developed role of Crispinus. Demetrius appears briefly at the end of III, 1; at the beginning of IV, iv; and has a small part in the purgation scene in V. Crispinus, on the other hand, appears frequently throughout the play. After he had written the greater part of Poetaster, Jonson may have learned that Dekker's Satiromastix was in preparation and then inserted

his satire on Dekker in the play. The date of the production of Satiromastix, therefore, must have been sometime between the first performance of Poetaster in the spring of 1601 and its entry in the Stationer's Register, November 11, 1601.²⁰² Fleay and Small assume that Dekker employed less than fifteen weeks in writing the play, because Dekker ridiculed Jonson for requiring a similar amount of time to produce the Poetaster (Satiromastix, I, 11, 362-64).²⁰³ Chambers terms this theory "rather fantastic."²⁰⁴ It would seem, however, that since Jonson evidently learned of Dekker's intended play during the later stages of the writing of Poetaster, it may be that Dekker did write his satirical part in less than fifteen weeks. The play was originally intended to be a romance dealing with the time of William Rufus. Dekker, then, hurriedly added a comic sub-plot introducing Jonson as Horace, Marston as Crispinus, and himself as Demetrius, and copied other characters from Poetaster as well. The result was Satiromastix--incoherent, perhaps, but evidently tremendously effective upon stage. It was produced, not only by the Chamberlain's Men, but by Paul's Boys in their private

²⁰²Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 76.

²⁰³Fleay, op. cit., I, p. 128; and Small, op. cit., p. 119.

²⁰⁴Chambers, op. cit., III, p. 293.

theatre, as the title-page indicates. The fact that the drama was performed at Paul's is a strong indication of Marston's interest in it. While Satiromastix is not in Marston's style, it is likely that he may have influenced its plot and characterization.²⁰⁵ In support of this theory is the plural reference to "poetasters" by Dekker (Satiromastix, Epilogus, 23), and "vntrussers" by Jonson in the "Apologetical Dialogue," later appended to Poetaster (Poetaster, "Apologetical Dialogue", 53). One recalls that the stated purpose of Satiromastix is contained in Dekker's dedication "To the world," prefixed to the play:

Horace (questionles) made himselfe belseue, that his Burgonian wit might desperately challenge all commers, and that none durst take vp the foyles against him: It's likely, if he had not so beleiu'd, he had not bin so deceiu'd, for hee was answe'd at his owne weapon

(Satiromastix, "Dedication," 14-18).

Captain Tucca, whom Dekker borrowed from Jonson, is developed and fashioned into a blustering rogue and a partisan of the two poetasters. It is from Tucca that nearly all of the personal invective against Jonson is launched. His satiric shafts tell the modern reader more about the personal peculiarities of the early Jonson than does any other source. For example, one discovers allusions in the words of Tuccan

²⁰⁵Small, op. cit., p. 122.

and the other characters to Jonson's physical features, to his duel with Spencer, to his slow method of composition, to his superficiality, to his career as a soldier, to his early trade as a bricklayer, to his dress, to his manners, to his praise of his own poetry and valor, and even to his religion. In addition, the work is filled with echoes and reverberations from Jonson's earlier plays. Apparently, the drama had its desired effect, for Jonson made no reply except to reiterate his charges and to protest his innocence of intending any other than his detractors in the "Apologetical Dialogue." Instead, Jonson, in a mood of lofty detachment, replied that he would ". . .leave the monsters / To their own fate" (Poetaster, "Apologetical Dialogue," 221-22) and turn his mind to tragedy:

There's something come into my thought,
That must and shall be sung high and aloof,
Safe from the wolf's black jaw, and the dull ass's hoof.
(Poetaster, "Apologetical Dialogue,"
237-39)

This comprehensive investigation of the dramas known to have been involved in the war of the theatres clearly reveals, first, that Dekker was a minor participant in the quarrel insofar as his role of a contributor is concerned. Perhaps one should hereafter look upon Dekker as an individual dramatist who was caught up in the fray between two vigorous antagonists, Marston and Jonson, and probably should be remembered in this account more for his personality than for

his stage involvement. Secondly, one must take into account the vast amount of intentional or unintentional literary criticism which emerges from the war. This critical attitude toward the stage and toward the authors who wrote for the stage unquestionably came to the attention of the Cambridge students, as three plays, ostensibly written by Cambridge men, will indicate.

CHAPTER III

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ACADEMIC DRAMA TO THE WAR OF THE THEATRES

Studioso: Well Ingenioso, the worlde is badd,
and wee schollers are ordayned to be beggars.

--I Returne, I,1.

Early in the sixteenth century, plays were performed in the English grammar schools. Schools in or near London which produced plays and occasionally gave court performances were St. Paul's School, Eton, Westminster, the Merchant Taylor's Boys, the Children of the Chapel, and the boys players of Windsor.²⁰⁶ Little is known about the lesser schools. Outside of London, the King's School, Canterbury, and the boys of the town schools of Shrewsbury, Beverley, Hutchin, and others, have records of school plays. Of more importance, however, are the plays that were produced by the universities. The tradition of academic drama was firmly established at both universities, at which tragedies and comedies were performed primarily in Latin, by the middle of the sixteenth century. While Gammer Gurton's Needle was performed at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1554, it is the only comedy in English known to have been acted at Cambridge before the last decade of the

²⁰⁶Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., V, p. 102; and Hillebrand, op. cit., p. 14.

sixteenth century.²⁰⁷ At Oxford, Nicholas Udall was a prime English comedian. At both universities, the plays were considered part of the ordinary exercise of youths, and were put on at Christmas time or when entertainment was needed for a royal visit.

Queen Elizabeth's first and only visit to Cambridge was from August 5 to 10, 1564.²⁰⁸ Plays in her honor, performed in the chapel of King's College, were the following:

August 6--Aulularia (Plautus)

August 7--Dido, a Latin tragedy by Edward Halliwell, formerly a Fellow of Kings.

August 8--Ezechias, an English comedy by Nicholas Udall, an Oxford man.²⁰⁹

Aulularia was given by actors selected from colleges other than King's; Dido and Ezechias (both lost) were given by men of King's College; Ajax Flagellifer was to have been given by men of various colleges, but Elizabeth declined to hear it.²¹⁰

Two years later, 1566, Elizabeth visited Oxford University from August 31 to September 6.²¹¹ The players, who performed in Christ Church Hall, were assisted by Richard

²⁰⁷ Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 38.

²⁰⁸ Chambers, op. cit., I, p. 127.

²⁰⁹ Loc. cit.

²¹⁰ Loc. cit.

²¹¹ Ibid., I, p. 128.

Edwardes, who was formerly a student of Christ Church, but who was now Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal.²¹²

The schedule of performances was as follows:

- September 1--Marcus Geninus, a Latin prose comedy
(The Queen was not present.)
- September 2--First part of Palamon and Arcite,
by Edwardes
- September 4--Second part of Palamon and Arcite
- September 5--Progne, James Calphill's Latin
tragedy.²¹³

The plays, none of which is extant, were written by men of Christ Church but acted by men from various other colleges in Oxford.²¹⁴ Again, in 1592, Elizabeth visited Oxford, at which time, two plays were performed:

- September 24--Bellus Grammaticale, Leonard Hutten
(in Latin)
- September 25--Rivales, William Gager (in Latin)²¹⁵

Both performances took place at Christ Church, but actors from other colleges also may have taken part.²¹⁶ Rivales had been first produced at Christ Church in 1583 and had been revived there in February, previous to the Queen's visit.²¹⁷

²¹²Loc. cit.

²¹³Ibid., I, p. 129.

²¹⁴Loc. cit.

²¹⁵Loc. cit.

²¹⁶Loc. cit.

²¹⁷Ibid., III, p. 319.

Plays at the universities were also used as entertainment for visitors. On three occasions, the Oxford players needed help in staging the plays for their guests. In May, 1569, the Vice-Chancellor and Dean of Christ Church wrote to the Earl of Leicester, the patron of the Earl of Leicester's Men (or Lord Dudley's players), for help in supplying apparel for a play to be given on May 15 during the visit by Odet de Coligny, Cardinal de Chatillon.²¹⁸ In 1583, Leicester brought Albertus Alasco, Prince Palatine of Siradia in Poland, to Oxford and witnessed the Rivales and Dido of Gager on June 11 to 12; and the plays were given at Christ Church with the assistance of George Peele.²¹⁹ Again, in January, 1585, Leicester came to Oxford, with Pembroke and Sidney as his guests. Here, they saw Gager's Meleager at Christ Church, and possibly a comedy at Magdalen,²²⁰ for which acting apparel for these performances had been borrowed from John Lyly.²²¹ Lyly had received his B. A. degree from Oxford University in 1573, and his M. A. degree in 1575,²²² and was, in 1585, the chief playwright of the Paul's Boys at Blackfriar's.²²³

²¹⁸Ibid., I, p. 129n.

²¹⁹Loc. cit.

²²⁰Chambers, op. cit., I, p. 129n.

²²¹Loc. cit.

²²²Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., V, p. 121.

²²³Parrott and Ball, op. cit., p. 64.

Intercourse between the child actors and the universities is predominately between the two child actor groups, the Chapel Children and Paul's Boys, and Oxford University. The fact that Edwardes, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal and, later, Peele and Lyly, were called upon to assist in the production of the university plays, indicates the close relationship that existed between the grammar schools in London and the universities. If it were possible for one to identify the boy actors who took part in the production at the private playhouses prior to their dying out late in the last decade of the sixteenth century, one might show that the boys who continued their education at Oxford and Cambridge influenced and stimulated interest in the drama at the universities.

At this time, the growing Puritan faction at Cambridge University, especially in St. John's College and at Emmanuel, discouraged the production of plays. There is an example on record of the Puritan influence at St. John's. After the death of William Whitaker, Master of St. John's, twelve of the Fellows secretly wrote to Lord Burghley that the majority of their associates were now of the Puritan faction.²²⁴ Richard Clayton (1595-1612), "a man of easy principles,"²²⁵

²²⁴Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 69.

²²⁵Ibid., p. 41.

was elected Master, however, and his discouragement of the theological controversy nearly caused the feud to subside between Anglicans and Puritans in the college.²²⁶

Authors of plays included teachers of high esteem. James Calhill, a man of high ecclesiastical standing,²²⁷ wrote the tragedy Progne, which was to be staged by Oxford actors. Two plays of Dr. William Gager of Christ Church, Ulysses Redux and Rivales, were performed by students during the Christmas of 1591-92.²²⁸ A dispute developed between Gager and the Puritan Rainolds,²²⁹ a bitter opponent of the academic stage, whose argument was published in 1599, under the heading of Th' Overthrow of Stage-Players. But the general view of Oxford University was that taken by John Case, Fellow of St. John's College, in his Speculum Moraliu quaestronum (1585) and Sphaera civitatis (1588), two works in which he lists the better points of dramas, insisting that they give a

²²⁶Ibid., p. 69.

²²⁷Penitentiary of St. Paul's and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity; Chambers, op. cit., I, p. 251.

²²⁸Loc. cit.

²²⁹Rainolds played Hippolyta in Palamon and Arcite in 1566. Three persons were killed by the fall of a wall near the entrance door at the Queen's performance during the staging of this play, but this incident was not allowed to interfere with the representation of the play; ibid., pp. 128-9; Afterwards Rainolds became President of Corpus Christi College and influential in the Puritan party; ibid., p. 250.

lively picture of antiquity, that they teach experience of things and of the human heart, and that they afford training in the management of the voice, the features, and the gestures.²³⁰ Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, Chancellor of Oxford University, showed an active interest in the drama while patronizing the Puritan controversialists.²³¹ He had been appointed high steward of Cambridge University in 1562 and had stayed with the Queen at Trinity College in August, 1564, when she had made her well-known visit.²³² On December 31, 1564, he had become Chancellor of Oxford.²³³ Although he was a patron of literature and drama, Leicester's character did not suit his academic position. Leicester was the patron of Lord Leicester's Men, a company of players who are mentioned as early as 1559 with James Burbage as their chief. Incongruously, he approved, as chancellor of Oxford in July, 1584, the university statute against "common Stage Players." But he declared that he did not mean

. . . that the Tragedies, Comedies, and other shews of Exercises of Learning in that kind used to be set

²³⁰Ibid., pp. 250-1.

²³¹Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (eds.), Dictionary of National Biography, VI, p. 120.

²³²Ibid., VI, p. 116.

²³³Loc. cit.

forth by Universitye men, should be forbidden, but accepting them as commendable and great furderances of Learning do wish them in any wise to be continued at set times and increased, and the youth of the Universitye by good meanes to be encouraged in the decent and frequent setting fourth of them.²³⁴

The authorities at both universities did not take kindly to the professional players until Restoration times.²³⁵ For example, the Earl of Leicester's men were refused leave to play at Cambridge in 1580.²³⁶ In June of the same year, John Hatcher, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, wrote to acknowledge recommendations received from Lord Burghley, the Lord Chancellor, and Lord Chamberlain Sussex, that the Earl of Oxford's men should be allowed to play there.²³⁷ Hatcher explained that he thought it better to give them 20s and send them away unheard--for a number of reasons, because of pestilence, the need for industry at commencement, the previous refusal to Leicester's men, and a Privy Council order of 1575 forbidding open shows and large assemblies within five miles

²³⁴Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 34, citing F. S. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age, p. 192, citing Wood, History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, 1796, II, p. 222.

²³⁵Alwin Thaler, "The Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England," Modern Philology, XVII (January, 1920), p. 129n.

²³⁶Chambers, op. cit., II, p. 89.

²³⁷Loc. cit.

of Cambridge.²³⁸ Furthermore, Queen Elizabeth's Men came into conflict with the Cambridge University authorities in September, 1595, while they were at nearby Chesterton.²³⁹ Citing the order of 1575, and fearing plague, the authorities forbade them to play. Nevertheless, the players posted their bills upon the college gates and gave their performance.²⁴⁰ In 1604, Cambridge once more forbade all plays in order to put a stop to the corruption of the manners of youth.²⁴¹ Similarly, a statute of 1584 had excluded common stage-plays from the university at Oxford on the grounds of health, economy, and bad example to the students.²⁴²

A comparison of the number of visits by the professional acting companies to both university towns prior to 1603 shows that Oxford was the more frequently visited. The statute of 1584, however, was evidently well-enforced. With the possible exception of a visit by the Earl of Oxford's Men in 1584-5,²⁴³

²³⁸Ibid., II, p. 100.

²³⁹Ibid., II, p. 113.

²⁴⁰Thaler, op. cit., p. 129.

²⁴¹Loc. cit.

²⁴²Chambers, op. cit., I, p. 251n.

²⁴³Ibid., II, p. 101.

no touring companies appear to have played in Oxford until Queen Elizabeth's Men were allowed to perform there in 1594-5.²⁴⁴

The companies that traveled to the provinces were sometimes the full London companies; yet often the players of various companies combined to form a touring group.²⁴⁵ The number of players in these provincial acting groups, according to Albright, ". . . ranged from four to eleven as a rule."²⁴⁶ The list of unrecorded dramatic performances of these players, in Albright's estimation, would probably far outnumber their known performances in the provinces.²⁴⁷ The plays performed by the traveling companies were not likely to be the latest London successes, but rather those which the company had in reserve.

The attitude of the towns toward the players varied greatly with the town, the season, the company of actors, and the circumstances.²⁴⁸ At times, the generosity of the townspeople,

²⁴⁴Ibid., II, p. 115.

²⁴⁵Evelyn May Albright, Dramatic Publication in England 1580-1640: A Study of Conditions Affecting Content and Form of Drama, p. 13.

²⁴⁶Loc. cit.

²⁴⁷Loc. cit.

²⁴⁸Ibid., p. 15.

as when they paid the players to pass them by, was probably a desire to avoid antagonizing the patrons.²⁴⁹ Their reasons for opposition to the players were, in general, those of a danger from plague, moral resistance to plays, and the misbehavior of the players.²⁵⁰ That the townspeople permitted the players to act as often as they did, says Albright, ". . . is testimony to the widespread interest in the drama as a real national entertainment."²⁵¹

Topical and satirical comedies in Latin were popular at Cambridge long before the emergence of satire on the London stage. In 1545, Kirchmayer's Pammachius, a savage anti-papal satire, was acted at Christ's College.²⁵² The Cambridge play, Pedantius, ascribed by Nashe to a "M. Winkfield," was an attack upon Gabriel Harvey performed about 1580/1.²⁵³ The play is the first in the history of English drama to make use of personal attack.²⁵⁴ "The example of Pedantius," according to

²⁴⁹Ibid., p. 16.

²⁵⁰Misbehavior of the acting companies in the provinces was perhaps greater than in London. They evaded strict accountability by abuse of the license system, giving make-believe names for their company, or deliberately using the licenses of others; ibid., pp. 18-19.

²⁵¹Ibid., p. 19.

²⁵²Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., VI, p. 333.

²⁵³Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 36.

²⁵⁴Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., VI, p. 345.

Leishman, ". . . shows how far personal satire, parody, and allusion were sometimes carried on the University stage, and suggests how much may reasonably be looked for in the Parnassus Plays."²⁵⁵ According to Nashe, there were other plays at Cambridge directed against the three Harvey brothers, Gabriel, Gilbert, and Dick.²⁵⁶

The shift from the use of Latin to English in Cambridge drama may have been occasioned by the necessity of employing the vernacular in satirizing the townspeople of Cambridge in Club Law in the year 1599 or 1600.²⁵⁷ The play owes its origin to a long-standing feud between the University and the town of Cambridge. The ground of the dispute between town and gown at Cambridge was the possession by the University of extraordinary privileges since the time of Henry III.²⁵⁸ Under royal charter, the University held great powers of interference with the trade of the town, and also could enter into the houses of the townsmen. The University had extra-territorial rights over the townspeople, but could summon offenders before

²⁵⁵Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 38.

²⁵⁶Ward and Waller (eds.), VI, p. 345.

²⁵⁷G. C. Moore Smith (ed.), Club Law: A Comedy Acted in Clare Hall, Cambridge about 1599-1600, p. xii.

²⁵⁸Ibid., p. xii.

its own courts and commit them to prison.²⁵⁹ Disputes between the two bodies became especially acute. Townsmen rebelled against these restrictions, and members of the University were just as determined to protect their privileges. Fuller, in his History of the University of Cambridge, cites an amusing episode concerning the performance of the play:

Clare-Hall was the place wherein it was acted, and the mayor, with his brethren and their wives were invited to behold it, or rather themselves abused therein. A convenient place was assigned to the townfold (riveted in with scholars on all sides) where they might see and be seen. Here they did behold themselves in their own best clothes (which the scholars had borrowed) . . . lively personated, their habits, gestures, language, lieger-jests, and espressions.²⁶⁰

It was in this atmosphere that the Parnassus Plays were produced. Of most interest to scholars has been the connection between these plays and Shakespeare and the London theatre. It is not unreasonable to assume that the Cambridge students would have been quite interested in the goings-on at London, the seat of royalty, the hub of trade, and the center of fashion and art. London residents went to the theatre to keep abreast of the topics of interest; surely people in the provinces would have attended for the same reason. Cambridge,

²⁵⁹Ibid., p. xv.

²⁶⁰Quoted in Cambridge History of English Literature, VI, p. 346.

a little more than fifty miles from London, was only a day's journey on horseback.²⁶¹ Furthermore, England had a postal system, established in the sixteenth century, which included the exchange of private correspondence in the hands of couriers, who made the trips up to three times a week between major cities.²⁶²

The authorship of the Parnassus Plays has not, as yet, been ascertained. Indeed, there may have been more than one author. Leishman, in the introduction to his edition of the three plays, says:

I think. . . that the First Returne was not written by the author of the Pilgrimage, and secondly, . . . what, though probably, seems to me less certain, . . . that the Second Returne was written by the author of the First Returne.²⁶³

The dates of performance of the Parnassus Plays, also worked out by Leishman, fall at Christmas time in the following years:

1598/9--performance of The Pilgrimage to Parnassus
 1599-1600--performance of I Returne
 1600/1--no performance
 1601/2--first performance of II Returne
 1602/3--second performance of II Returne²⁶⁴

²⁶¹ Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life and Manners of His Age, I, p. 201.

²⁶² Ibid., I, p. 206.

²⁶³ Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 27.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 26.

The three plays revolve around the experiences of the two scholars, Philomusus and Studioso. In Pilgrimage, they set out for Parnassus, (Cambridge, or the B. A. degree) and meet various people along the way who try to dissuade them from their journey. One, Madido, argues that Parnassus is the third loft of a wine tavern and that Helicon is ". . . a cup of browne bastard." Stupido, a puritanical young man, and Amoretto, a devotee of Ovid, also attempt to deter them from their journey. Ingenioso, an embittered scholar, also warns them that their only reward will be poverty. "Alas," he tells them, "Apollo is banckrout" (Pilgrimage, V,1,620). But the scholars continue, and at the end of the play, they stand ". . . at the foote of this steep hill" (Pilgrimage, VI,1,700).

The Pilgrimage contains several literary allusions worthy of consideration. First, there is a reference to the Martin Marprelate controversy in Stupido's advice to ". . . buye a good Martin" (Pilgrimage, III,1,349). Madido claims he will ". . . make a better poeme then Kinsader's Satyrs, Lodges fig for Momus, Bastardes Epigrams, Leichfildes trimming of Nashe" (Pilgrimage, II,1,209-211), and makes an allusion to "Paul's church yarde" (Pilgrimage, II,1,221), the center of London book trade. "Vnchaste Shordiche streete" (Pilgrimage, V,1,541), an area in London notorious for its brothels,

is also mentioned. Kempe, a famous clown and fellow-actor of Shakespeare, is lampooned, as is also the convention of the clown on the professional stage (Pilgrimage, V,1,662ff). These references to the bookseller, the brothel, and the theatre indicate the author's interest in and knowledge of London, and one can probably assume that the audience of Cambridge students was not unaware of these allusions.

I Returns is a continuation of the story of the two scholars. Reluctantly taking leave of Cambridge, they decide to go to London with Ingenioso and Luxuro, where misfortunes befall them, and in the last scene Philomusus and Studioso resolve to visit Rome or Rheims. Fleay identified Ingenioso with Nashe, and the fact that what one hears of and from Ingenioso corresponds very closely with Nashe's life supports Fleay's assumption.²⁶⁵ In addition, there is the fact, shown in detail in Leishman's commentary, that the author of the Parnassus Plays was undoubtedly acquainted with Nashe's writings and displays this knowledge through the character of Ingenioso. Leishman also thinks that Luxurio may be a caricature of Harvey.²⁶⁶ Furthermore, one notes that another character, Gullio, is an example of the foolish courtier who had already

²⁶⁵Fleay, op. cit., II, p. 348.

²⁶⁶Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 80.

appeared in Jonson's comedies and in the satires of Hall and Marston. For example, in a line which may have been taken directly from one of Jonson's comedies, Ingenioso says: "Nowe gentlemen you may laughe if you will, for / here comes a gull" (I Returne, III,1,834-5). A speech by Gullio immediately follows that resembles the speech of Bobadilla, a character in Jonson's Poetaster, who, like Gullio, praises his Toledo and boasts of the feats he has performed with it (Poetaster, II,ii,102ff). In addition, there are other situations in I Returne indicative of the author's acquaintance with Jonson's early comedies--Every Man In His Humour, Every Man Out of His Humour, and possibly Cynthia's Revels.²⁶⁷

Ingenioso is reduced to flattering Gullio in order to maintain himself. In one scene Gullio asks him: ". . .suppose . . .that thou wert my Mrs [mistress]" (I Returne, III,1,976), and quotes badly from Venus and Adonis, Romeo and Juliet, and the Spanish Tragedy. Ingenioso, even before Gullio begins practicing on him, is resigned to hearing ". . .nothings but pure Shakspeare, and shreds of poetrie that he [Gullio] hath gathered at the Theators" (I Returne, III,1,986-7). As

²⁶⁷ Leishman makes this point, showing a parallel between Cynthia's Revels and I Returne; *ibid.*, pp. 25; 183. Because Cynthia's Revels was first acted in 1600, a later date, Christmas 1600/1, would necessarily be needed for the performance of I Returne in support of this conjecture.

Gullio leaves, he recites one last passage from Venus and Adonis and adds rapturously: "O sweet Mr Shakspeare, Ile have his picture in my study at the courte" (I Returne, IV, 1, 1031-2). At Gullio's insistance, Ingenioso later composes verses in the "vaine" of Chaucer, Spenser, and Shakespeare. After reciting verses in the manner of Chaucer and Spenser, Ingenioso gives some original lines in "Mr Shakspears veyne." Gullio is pleased with this final contribution:

By marry Sr. these have some life in them: let
 this duncified worlde esteeme of Specer and Chaucer.
 Ile worshipp sweet Mr. Shakspeare, and to honoure
 him will lay his Venus and Adonis vnder my pillowe
 (I Returne, IV, 1, 1199-1203).

Gullio's admiration for Shakespeare must be regarded as a very equivocal compliment. About the turn of the century, erotic poems in the manner of Ovid, such as Venus and Adonis, suddenly ceased to be fashionable, and became, like the gallants who admired the, subjects for satires and epigrams. Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, and Romeo and Juliet are Shakespeare's only poems and plays alluded to in I Returne. Besides the allusions to Jonson's three plays and Kyd's Spanish Tragedy already mentioned, I Returne contains references to Marston's Scourge of Villany, Weever's Epigrammes, Hall's Satires, and Lodge's Fig for Momus.

Included in I Returne are references, as well, to the Greene-Nashe-Harvey quarrel and the Martin Marprelate controversy, apparently of great interest to the students, possibly

since Greene, Nashe, and Harvey were all Cambridge graduates.²⁶⁸ Greene and his disciple, Nashe, wrote against the attacks of the puritan Martin Marprelate tracts and those of the younger Harvey brothers. Their eldest brother, Gabriel Harvey, continued the quarrel with Nashe after Greene's untimely death in 1592.²⁶⁹ In 1599, the satire between the two had become so bitter that the authorities ordered the confiscation of all Nashe's books and Harvey's books. The students and fellows at Cambridge were in the midst of this fray. Nashe prefixed to Greene's Menaphon (1589) a lively address to these students.²⁷⁰ Nashe also dedicated Have with you to Saffron Walden, in burlesque fashion, to Richard Litchfield, barber of Trinity College.²⁷¹ In the same way that the Hall-Marston quarrel had brought personal satire to the London theatre, perhaps the Nashe-Harvey-Greene quarrel was advanced to the academic stage by the unknown author of the Parnassus Plays. Certainly, the university playwright favored

²⁶⁸ Greene received his B. A. at St. John's in 1578-9 and his M. A. at Clare Hall in 1583; Stephen and Lee (eds.), op. cit., VIII, p. 509. Harvey received his B. A. at Christ's College, 1569-70 and was elected a fellow of Pembroke Hall in the latter years; ibid., IX, p. 83. Nashe also received his B. A. from St. John's in 1585-6; ibid., XIV, p. 102.

²⁶⁹ Parrott and Ball, op. cit., p. 74.

²⁷⁰ Stephen and Lee (eds.), op. cit., VIII, p. 512.

²⁷¹ Ibid., VIII, p. 106.

Nashe, perhaps because he had been Nashe's college friend and held a common dislike for the Harvey brothers.

II Returns is less concerned with the activities of Philomusus and Studioso (who have returned from Rome and Rheims and are determined to resort to "cony-catching" as a means of livelihood) than with the other characters. Furor Poeticus, introduced for the first time into this play, is regarded by Leishman as a vehicle for the parody of Marston's style,²⁷² although Marjorie Reyburn finds that no single or complete identification of that character can be made and concludes that Furor Poeticus is composite in nature, a reflection of Marlowe and Jonson as well as of Marston.²⁷³ The Recorder is a satirical portrait of Francis Brackyn, deputy recorder of Cambridge from 1590 to 1609.²⁷⁴ In addition, he is also representative of Common Lawyers in general who take advantage of the foolish and the unfortunate.²⁷⁵ Stupido, a

²⁷²Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 82.

²⁷³Marjorie L. Reyburn, "New Facts and Theories about the Parnassus Plays," Publication Modern Language Association, LXXIV (September, 1959), p. 333.

²⁷⁴"It is probable that Brackyn, as advocate for the town, often became a focus for the indignation of the University;" Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 66; also, "to our author and his audience, Common Law was Town Law, and Civil Law was Gown Law;" loc. cit.

²⁷⁵The Cambridge author may have learned some of the finer points of satire of the common lawyers from Jonson, whose Poetaster was attacked by the lawyers as a censure of their profession.

puritan admirer of Peter Ramus, may have been a caricature of William Gouge.²⁷⁶ Other minor characters, including Phantasma, Judicio, Academico, Sir Raderick, and Amoretto, contribute to the action, the theme of which is the hard lot of the scholar in an unappreciative society.²⁷⁷

The play is especially interesting in that it contains numerous allusions to the book trade, the London theatre, and to Marston, Jonson, and Shakespeare. It has been noted that I Returne has an allusion to the bookseller in the churchyard at Paul's. II Returne contains references to ". . . the paper warres in Paules Church-yard" (II Returne, I,ii,154-5), and an entire scene (I,iii), is devoted to a conversation between Ingenioso and Danter, a rather disreputable London printer.²⁷⁸ The fact that Nashe apparently lived with Danter, and later with his widow, lends substance to the identification of Ingenioso with Nashe. In the scene from the play (II Returne,

²⁷⁶William Gouge entered King's College in 1595, proceeded B. A. in 1600/1; M. A. in 1603. Like Stupido, Gouge was notorious for his puritanism and his championship of Ramus, the Calvinist author of Dialectis, a simplified version of Aristotle's logic; Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 70.

²⁷⁷It should be noted that this is the theme of Dekker's Patient Grissil.

²⁷⁸Danter printed the first (pirated) quarto of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet in 1597. He was constantly in trouble for the printing of pirated works and scurrilous pamphlets; Stephen and Lee (eds.), op. cit., IV, p. 393.

I,ii,329-30), Ingenioso visits Danter in Paul's Churchyard on business (" . . . about a little booke which I haue made, the name of it is a catalogue of Cambridge Cuckolls.") He tells Danter that ". . . this libel of Cambridge has much salt and pepper in the nose: it will sell sheerly underhand, whenas these bookes of exhortations and catechismes lie moulding on thy shopboard" (II Returne, I,ii,337-40).²⁷⁹ When Danter learns the contents of the book, he readily agrees to print it, saying, "Oh this will sell gallantly" (II Returne, I,ii,362).

One may find allusions to the contemporary London theatre in a scene in which Philomusus and Studioso join a group of fiddlers; in the "censure" of a list of poets, including Spenser, Constable, Lodge, Daniel, Watson, Drayton, Davies, Marston, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Churchyard, and Nashe; and in the Kemp-Burbage scene. Studioso, in an aside, says:

Better it is mongst fiddlers to be chiefe,
 Then at [a]plaiers trencher beg reliefe.
 But ist not strange these mimick apes should prize
 Vnhappy Schollers at a hireling rate?
 Vile world, that lifts them vp to hye degree,
 And treads vs downe in groueling misery.
England affordes those glorious vagabonds,
 That carried earst their fardels on their backes
 Coursers to ride on through the gazing streetes,
 Scooping it in their glaring Satten sutes,
 And Pages to attend their maisterships:

(II Returne, V,1,1916-26).

²⁷⁹ Danter's presses were confiscated in 1597 for printing Jesu's Psalter without authority; ibid., XIII, p. 323.

Secondly, the three poets pertinent to this study whose names appear on the list of poets to be censured in II Returne are Marston, Jonson, and Shakespeare. Judicio addresses Marston by his "non de plume," Kinsayder:²⁸⁰

Judicio: Monsier Kinsayder, lifting vp your legge and pissing against the world? Put vp man, put vp for shame.

Ingenioso: Me thinks he is a Ruffian is his stile, Withouten bands or garters ornament.

He quaffes a cup of Frenchmans Helicon,
Then royster doyster in his oylie tearmes,
Cutts, thrusts, and foines at whomsoeuer he meets,
And strews about Ram-ally meditations.
Tut, what cares he for modest close coucht termes,
Cleanly to gird our looser libertines?

(II Returne, I, 11, 267-76)

Marston, an Oxonian, had engaged in a literary quarrel with Joseph Hall, a Cambridge man who was graduated with a B. A. degree in 1592-3 from Emmanuel College, was elected Fellow in 1595, and proceeded M. A. in 1596.²⁸¹ Hall wrote his Virgideniae in 1597, while at Cambridge.²⁸² Marston, who was probably living in London in 1598,²⁸³ included a satire on Hall in The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image and Certaine

²⁸⁰ Marston liked to be known by the nickname of Kinsayder, as one who 'kinned' or docked the tails of wandering dogs and stray social abuses; Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 241n, citing Gosse, Life of John Donne, I, p. 33.

²⁸¹ Davenport (ed.), The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, p. xxix.

²⁸² Ibid., p. xxx.

²⁸³ Wood (ed.), op. cit., I, pp. xvii-xviii.

Satyres, written by him that year.²⁸⁴ Later in the same year, Marston, in a second edition of The Scourge of Villanie, accused Hall of pasting an epigram to every copy of Pigmalion that came to the Stationer's of Cambridge. This epigram referred to Marston as a mad dog and a human ass.²⁸⁵ Thus, the attack on Marston is explained in II Returne. Hall seems to have been admired by the author of the Parnassus Plays, and his satires are frequently imitated in II Returne. The fact that Hall did not leave Cambridge until December, 1601, indicates that he was undoubtedly personally familiar with the author of the Parnassus Plays.²⁸⁶ This satire on Marston must have been of keen interest to the literary-minded young men of Cambridge, especially since the person satirized was now the major dramatist of the newly revived Paul's boys in London.

Furthermore, the "censure" of Jonson, which follows, certainly shows that the university author had knowledge of the quarrel between Jonson and Marston and Dekker:

Iudicio: The wittiest fellow of a Bricklayer in England.

Ingenioso: A meere Empryrick, one that getts what he hath by obseruation, and makes only nature priuy

²⁸⁴Miscellaneous Pieces of Ancient English Poesie, p. 150.

²⁸⁵Davenport (ed.), The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall Bishop of Exeter and Norwich, p. xxix.

²⁸⁶Ibid., p. xviii.

to what he endites; so slow an Inuentor, that
 he were better betake himselfe to his old trade of
 Bricklaying; a bould whorson, as confident now in
 making of a booke, as he was in times past in laying
 of a brick

(II Returne, I,ii,293-99).

There are numerous allusions to Jonson's ". . .old trade of
 Bricklaying" in Satiromastix. The charge that he was ". . .a
 meere Emyrick"--in other words, that he dealt only with
 surfaces--was anticipated by Jonson himself in Poetaster,
 when Demetrius (Dekker) says of Horace (Jonson):

Alas sir, HORACE! hee is a meere sponge;
 nothing but humours, and obseruation; he goes
 vp and downe sucking from eurie societie, and
 when hee comes home, squcazes himselfe drie againe.
 (Poetaster, IV,iii,104ff)

Jonson may have been repeating what others were saying. The
 fact that he himself mentions it indicates that the charge
 must have been common knowledge. Jonson's detractors also
 accused him of slowness in composition. In Satiromastix,
 Tucca says of him: "What will he bee fifteene weekes about
 this Cockatrices egge too?" (Satiromastix, I,ii,363-4); and
 ". . .you and your Itchy Poetry break out like Christmas, but
 once a yeare" (Satiromastix, V,ii,202). The criticism of
 Jonson, however, is slight in comparison with the censure of
 Marston, leading Leishman to believe that the sympathies of
 the Cambridge poet rested with Jonson in the war of the
 theatres.²⁸⁷ Indeed, there are numerous parallels between

²⁸⁷Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 92.

Jonson's "humour," comedy, and the Parnassus Plays in the matters of subject, in style, and even in literary taste. Many of these are illustrated by Leishman in his commentary upon the three plays. Reyburn, however, does not agree with Leishman, who thinks that the Parnassus author's sympathies were entirely with Jonson, but maintains that the Cambridge poet was equally scornful of both.²⁸⁸ While the author is critical of Jonson, one concludes from this study that Marston is the one who bears the brunt of the invective.

Immediately following his discussion of Jonson, Judicio next considers Shakespeare:

Who loues not Adons loue, or Lucrece rape?
 His sweeter verse contaynes hart robbing lines,
 Could but a grauer subject him content,
 Without loues foolish lazy languishment.
 (II Returne, I,11,301-4)

It is clear that Judicio recognized the beauty of language and versification in Shakespeare's two early poems, but ". . . evidently considered that he was misusing his talents in producing luscious studies of amorous passion, though they might move Gullio and his kind to sentimental raptures."²⁸⁹ The author's attitude toward Shakespeare may be due, in the first place, to the fact that Venus and Adonis and The Rape of

²⁸⁸Reyburn, op. cit., p. 332ff.

²⁸⁹Ward and Waller (eds.), op. cit., VI, p. 351.

Lucrece were examples of a kind of poetry which all the satirists--Marston, Hall, Guilpin, and Davies included--were bitterly attacking. Leishman thinks that the sonnets and erotic poems in the manner of Ovid, such as Venus and Adonis, suddenly ceased to be fashionable, and became, like the gallants who admired them, subjects for satires and epigrams.²⁹⁰ A further reason for the author's attitude may have been that Shakespeare

. . . was also a practitioner of that popular drama which the author, like many other University men, seems to have despised, and worse still, he was in league with those exploiters of unfortunate scholars, the professional actors.²⁹¹

In a later scene, the Parnassus poet again deals with Shakespeare, not as a poet, but as a dramatist and actor. This scene contains the famous discussion between Burbage and Kempe, which may have been inspired by a recent visit of the Lord Chamberlain's Men to Cambridge:

Burbage: Now Will Kempe, if we can intertaine these schollers at a low rate, it will be well, they haue oftentimes a good conceite in a part.

Kempe: Its true indeede, honest Dick, but the slaues are somewhat proud, and besides, tis good sporte in a part, to see them neuer speake in their walke, but at the end of the stage, iust as though in walking with a fellow we should neuer speake but at a stile, a gate, or a ditch, where a man can go no further. I was once at a Comedie in Cambridge,

²⁹⁰Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 50.

²⁹¹Ibid., p. 58.

and there I saw a parasite made faces and mouths of all sorts on this fashion.

Burbage: A little teaching will mend these faults, and it may bee besides they will be able to pen a part.

Kempe: Few of the vniuersity [men] pen plaies well, they smell too much of that writer Quid, and that writer Metamorphoses, and talke too much of Proserpina & Iuppiter. Why heres our fellow Shakespeare puts them all downe, I and Ben Ionson too. O that Ben Ionson is a pestilent fellow, he brought vp Horace giuing the Poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath giuen him a purge that made him beray his credit.

(II Returne, IV, 111, 1753-73)

The condescending attitudes of Will Kempe and Richard Burbage, (respectively the most famous comedian and the most famous tragic actor of Shakespeare's company) toward the university players indicates that the Parnassus playwright was intimately familiar with the Chamberlain's Men. The only recorded visit of the Chamberlain's Men to Cambridge is 1594-5.²⁹² However, on the title-page of the first quarto of Hamlet, published in 1603, the play is described as having been acted ". . . in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford."²⁹³ If so, the visit almost certainly took place in 1601-2.²⁹⁴ An earlier Hamlet may have been performed during the 1594-5 visit, if the hypothesis put forward by H. D. Gray is correct. He maintains that Shakespeare made a revision of the old play of Hamlet by

²⁹²Sir E. K. Chambers, Shakespeare, II, p. 320; quoted in Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 336n.

²⁹³William Shakespeare, Hamlet, the Facsimilie First Quarto--1603.

²⁹⁴Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 336.

Thomas Kyd, with a brief transcript for the road in 1593.²⁹⁵
 If Hamlet were performed at Cambridge, and if the Parnassus poet had seen the play, it appears strange that the author would recommend that Shakespeare treat some graver subject than ". . . loves foolish languishment."

Kempe's having seen ". . . a comedia at Cambridge" may refer to the visit of the Chamberlain's Men in 1594-5, or possibly in 1601-2. The play which Kempe saw was evidently in Latin, and as a result he had nothing more to occupy his attention other than the faces and gestures of the actors. The author's low opinion of the players is evident from his satirical reference to their knowledge of the ancients. Leishman suggests that the praise of Shakespeare and the denigration of Jonson by the illiterate pair of players is intended to have the same significance as Gullio's admiration for Shakespeare and distaste for Chaucer in I Returne.²⁹⁶

Fleay, following the recognition of the "pill" as an allusion to Poetaster, first identified the "purge" with Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida.²⁹⁷ His identification

²⁹⁵H. D. Gray, "Thomas Kyd and the First Quarto of Hamlet," Publication Modern Language Association, XLIII, pp. 721-735.

²⁹⁶Leishman (ed.), op. cit., pp. 59-60.

²⁹⁷Fleay, op. cit., I, pp. 189-90.

was accepted by numerous succeeding scholars. But since John S. P. Tatlock, in 1915, showed that it was practically impossible to recognize Ajax in Troilus and Cressida as a lampoon of Jonson, Fleay's identification has been discredited.²⁹⁸ Other scholars have offered identifications, among them C. F. Tucker Brooke, who proposed that the "purge" was an expanded acting version of Hamlet.²⁹⁹ Leishman, in a new 1949 edition of the Parnassus Plays, makes a most convincing argument in support of Dekker's Satiromastix instead of a play by Shakespeare.³⁰⁰ The same identification was earlier suggested by Penniman,³⁰¹ and by Chambers.³⁰² Chambers writes:

The purge ought to be Satiromastix, and though there is nothing to indicate that Shakespeare had any responsibility for Satiromastix, it is just conceivable that a Cambridge man, writing before the play was assigned to Dekker in print, may have thought that he had.³⁰³

²⁹⁸John S. P. Tatlock, "The Seige of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood," Publication Modern Language Association, XXX (1915), pp. 727-34.

²⁹⁹C. F. Tucker Brooke, The Tudor Drama: A History of English Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare, pp. 383-6.

³⁰⁰Leishman (ed.), op. cit., pp. 59; 369-70.

³⁰¹Penniman, "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature Archaeology, p. 149.

³⁰²Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, p. 40.

³⁰³Loc. cit.

Reyburn has found internal evidence in II Returne to support Leishman's identification of the "purge" with Dekker's Satiromastix. Her evidence includes the connection of the word "purge" in Kempe's speech with Crispinus's announcement to Horace in Satiromastix, "We come like your Phisitions, to purge / youre sicke and dangerous minde of her disease" (Satiromastix, I,ii,247-8). The pun, "that writer Metamorphosis," Reyburn compares with a similar pun in Satiromastix (Satiromastix, IV,iii,118-121 and I Returne, IV,iv,121-22). In addition, Reyburn notes the parallel use of "vntruss" (II Returne, IV,iv,1798-99) and the use of the word in the Satiromastix subtitle, "The Vntrussing of the Humorous Poet," and has found other reflections of Satiromastix in II Returne.³⁰⁴ Dekker's Satiromastix was first published in quarto in 1602 by Edward White. The title-page reads:

As it hath bin presented publikely, by the Right Honorable, the Lord Chamberlaine his Seruants; and priuately, by the Children of Paules. By Thomas Dekker. . .Printed by E. A. for Edward White, and are to be solde at his shop, neere the little north door of Paules Church at the signe of the Gun, 1602.³⁰⁵

The author of II Returne could hardly have read Satiromastix in quarto, since it was first published in 1602, while the

³⁰⁴Reyburn, op. cit., p. 332ff.

³⁰⁵Fredson Bowers (ed.), The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, I, p. 229.

first performance of II Returne was at Christmas 1601/2. But the numerous parallels between Satiromastix and II Returne are most likely to have been the result of a careful reading of the play. If this were impossible, perhaps the university playwright may have taken notes on the play while attending a performance at Paul's or at the Globe. In the days of few printed books, Elizabethans were trained to listen intently, and the university scholar would have been especially interested because of the excitement generated by the play as an answer to Jonson's Poetaster.

That the Cambridge author should associate the play with Shakespeare does not necessarily imply that Shakespeare had any share in its composition. Leishman explains:

It may well be that, for the majority of Elizabethan playgoers and playreaders, the Globe and the Chamberlain's Men were as much 'Shakespeare's theatre' and 'Shakespeare's company' as for us today, and that, in their eyes, Shakespeare was as much responsible for what was done at the Globe as, in the eyes of the law, a husband is responsible for the torts of his wife.³⁰⁶

Dekker was undoubtedly little known by a reading public at this time. He was a hack writer, a reviser and a collaborator. His name had not appeared on the title-pages of the two plays which preceded Satiromastix into print, Shoemaker's Holiday³⁰⁷

³⁰⁶Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 370.

³⁰⁷Bowers (ed.), op. cit., I, p. 9.

and Old Fortunatus,³⁰⁸ although his name, "Tho. Dekker," did appear at the end of the latter.³⁰⁹ Shakespeare, on the other hand, was well known for his poems and his plays. Prior to 1602, his name had appeared on the title pages of at least six of his printed plays: Love's Labours Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Merchant of Venice, Much Ado About Nothing, Richard II, and II Henry IV. Other plays in quarto, prior to 1602, that did not mention his name were I Henry IV, Henry V, II Henry VI, Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, and Titus Andronicus. However, the omission of Shakespeare's name by the printer did not prevent the author of the Parnassus Plays from inserting lines parodying Romeo and Juliet and Richard II in I Returne (I Returne, III,1,989-90) and II Returne (II Returne, IV,iv,1838-9) and attributing them to Shakespeare. Nevertheless, the fact that the two Shakespeare plays from which passages were taken had been printed prior to 1600 leaves open the possibility that the author of II Returne had read them in quarto.

It has been shown that academic drama in the form of the Parnassus Plays was very closely related with the London theatre, and, more specifically, with the war of the theatres.

³⁰⁸Ibid., I, p. 105.

³⁰⁹Ibid., I, p. 198.

Although met with opposition, the visit of the touring professional acting companies to the universities had suggested a subject for satire to the university author of the Parnassus Plays. Joseph Hall had directed his quarrel with John Marston from Cambridge University and had enlisted the interest and sympathy of the Parnassus poet. The Greene-Nashe-Harvey quarrel had originated at Cambridge, and, in this quarrel, the university author had taken sides with Nashe against Harvey. Familiar allusions to the London book trade in the two later plays implies that the Cambridge students had access to the printed pamphlets and plays which were a part of the war of the theatres. Other satirical allusions to the contemporary London theatre in the Parnassus Plays may indicate that the author had a first-hand knowledge of city drama. But whether his knowledge of the London theatre was gained through personal visits to the theatre, or from having read the plays in print, his attitude toward Shakespeare, Jonson, Marston, and the professional London theatre was scornful and satiric.

For a complete comprehension of the full effects of the stage quarrel, one must also take into account the possible role which Shakespeare may have had in the argument, since it is in these Cambridge plays that Shakespeare is alluded to as having given the "purge" to Jonson, allusions which have

touched off a vast amount of speculative scholarship related to Shakespeare in this event.

... the London ...
... George ...
... his credit.

... fellow, ...
... a pill, ...
... a purge that

... IV, 111.

Shakespeare's

... down the ...

... 1712

... search for

... in white

... employed the

... 1712

... 1712

... 1712

... 1712

... 1712

... 1712

... 1712

appeared. CHAPTER IV explains that

SHAKESPEARE'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE WAR OF THE THEATRES

O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow, he brought vp Horace giuing the Poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath giuen him a purge that made him beray his credit.

--II Returne, IV, 111.

The allusion in II Returne to Shakespeare's having given a "purge" to Ben Jonson while putting down the university wits has led scholars to conduct a relentless search for the play or plays in which Shakespeare may have displayed this skill. Specifically, while they have concentrated almost entirely upon Troilus and Cressida and Hamlet, they have yet to solve the mystery.

As it has been shown, the first performance of II Returne occurred in Cambridge in 1601/2.³¹⁰ On the other hand, the date for Troilus and Cressida is generally thought to have been 1601 or 1602,³¹¹ inasmuch as this drama was entered in the Stationer's Register February 7, 1603.³¹² Within recent years, however, the attempt to discover the so-called "purge" in Troilus has waned, although it has not

³¹⁰Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 26.

³¹¹Harold N. Hillebrand (ed.), "Troilus and Cressida," A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, p. 365.

³¹²Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 91b.

entirely disappeared. Hillebrand explains that ". . . the evidence is so insubstantial, the proponents have been so ready to change their minds, and the various theories have so contradicted each other that interest has died out."³¹³ The association of Troilus with the "purge" is generally attributed to Fleay,³¹⁴ who first identified Dekker with Thersites, Jonson with Ajax, Achilles with Chapman, and Hector with Shakespeare.³¹⁵ Later, he was to reaffirm his identity of Ajax as Jonson in the first volume of his Biographical Chronicle of English Drama (1891), only to alter his opinion in the second volume to this work:

My hypothesis is that the "physic" given to "the great Myrmidon", i. 3, 378; iii. 3, 34, is identical with the "purge" administered by Shakespeare to Jonson in The Return from Parnassus, iv. 3, and that the setting up of Ajax as a rival to Achilles shadows forth the putting forward Dekker by the King's men to write against Jonson his Satiromastix. The subsequent defection of Thersites from Ajax to Achilles would then agree with the reconciliation of Marston and Jonson in 1601, when they wrote together in Rosalind's Complaint.³¹⁶

Hereafter, according to his changed view, Achilles was Jonson, Ajax was Dekker, and Thersites remained Marston. Small (1899)

³¹³Hillebrand (ed.), "Troilus and Cressida," A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, p. 365.

³¹⁴Loc. cit.

³¹⁵F. G. Fleay, A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare Player, Poet, and Playmaker, pp. 45; 188.

³¹⁶Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of English Drama, II, p. 189.

agreed with Fleay that Ajax may have been, in part, a personal thrust at Jonson, but he did not admit that Dekker and Marston were alluded to.³¹⁷ On the other hand, Tatlock (1916) stated that it was practically impossible to recognize Ajax as a lampoon of Jonson.³¹⁸ Herford and Simpson (1925-50) include only one discussion of the problem in their variorum work on Jonson, a note in which they indicate a return to the theories of Fleay and Small: ". . .it seems probable, on the whole, that this 'purge' was given in Troilus and Cressida."³¹⁹ Campbell (1938) supports Tatlock's view in spite of the latter's admission that personal satire often intruded into Jonson's comical satires. Campbell thinks that certain traits, attributed to Ajax by other characters in the play, were ascribed to Jonson by his enemies. However, Ajax's dominant characteristic was heavy stupidity, and Campbell believes that no one could have accused Jonson of that view.³²⁰ In addition, Campbell points out the different physical characteristics which exist between Ajax and Jonson.³²¹

³¹⁷Small, op. cit., pp. 168-9.

³¹⁸Tatlock, op. cit., pp. 727-34.

³¹⁹Herford and Simpson (eds.), op. cit., I, p. 28n.

³²⁰Campbell, op. cit., p. 219.

³²¹Loc. cit.

Nevertheless Campbell's main thesis, that Troilus was written by Shakespeare according to the newly developed form of "comicall satyre," is objected to by Lawrence, who contends that Shakespeare may have been only slightly influenced by the new form.³²² Elton (1948) defends Fleay's suggestion that Ajax is Jonson. After listing the motives which Shakespeare may have held in satirizing Jonson, he notes specific passages in Troilus which appear to tally with Jonson's known personal characteristics, and concludes

. . . that both external and internal evidence point to identification of Ajax as Jonson. Shakespeare "purged" Jonson by satirizing him as a witless, braggart soldier compounded of humours, and berayed his credit (befouled his reputation) by naming him Ajax, signifying a privy.³²³

Of all the hypothetical identifications of characters in Shakespeare's plays, Harbage (1952) finds that of Thersites with Marston to be the most feasible.³²⁴ He thinks that ". . . a kind of gleeful morbidity links the pair" and concludes that:

. . . we may take our choice whether another shot in the War of the Theatres was being fired,

³²²W. W. Lawrence, "Troilus, Cressida, and Thersites," Modern Language Review, XXXVII (October, 1942), p. 429.

³²³William Elton, "Shakespeare's Portrait of Ajax in Troilus and Cressida," Publication Modern Language Association, LXIII (June, 1948), p. 748.

³²⁴Harbage, op. cit., p. 116.

whether Shakespeare was consciously paying the coterie drama the compliment of imitation, or whether, as the most attentive and assimilative of the Elizabethans, he had merely heard midway in his career a new accent which he could use.³²⁵

Of the most recent critics, Leishman (1949) concludes that the "purge" was probably Satiromastix, not Troilus.³²⁶ On the other hand, Shakespeare's play, as Craig (1951) suggests, may be a ". . .rewriting to remove from it the traces of the controversy connected with the War of the Theatres."³²⁷ Certainly, the prologue alludes to Jonson's Poetaster (1601), in which Jonson had egotistically asserted that his play transcended the criticisms of ". . .that common spawn of ignorance / Our frie of writers" (Poetaster, "Prologue"). The following lines from the Troilus prologue illustrate Shakespeare's reaction to Jonson's redomontate:

. . .And hither am I come,
A Prologue arm'd, but not in confidence
Of Authors pen, or Actors voice.
(Troilus and Cressida, "Prologue")

However, aside from the identification of Thersites with Marston, who to all interests was on the side of the players against Jonson, one finds little to identify in the play as the "purge."

³²⁵Ibid., p. 118.

³²⁶Leishman (ed.), op. cit., pp. 370-1.

³²⁷Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare, p. 862.

There is a further possibility that Histrionastix (1599), Marston's revision of an earlier play, contains an allusion to Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. One of the fragments from plays recited by the players (II,1) contains the following lines:

Come Cressida, my Cresset light,
 Thy face doth shine both day and night,
 Behold, behold, thy garter blue.
 Thy knight his valiant elboe wears,
 That When he shakes his furious Speare,
 The foe in shivering fearfull sort,
 May lay him downe in death to snort.

There is nothing, however, which points to so early a date as 1599 for Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida.³²⁸ The use of the words shakes and Speare naturally suggests Shakespeare, but it is probable that the use, here, is accidental rather than deliberate. Whether the entire passage belongs to the revision by Marston or to the earlier play is also uncertain. Small, on the basis of a textual study of both plays, believes it a part of the revision.³²⁹ Chambers, however, is not satisfied by Small's hypothesis.³³⁰ He feels that the entire play is a satire on professional players and that it was undoubtedly both produced and revived by amateurs or boys.³³¹

³²⁸Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, p. 19.

³²⁹Small, op. cit., p. 147.

³³⁰Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, p. 19.

³³¹Ibid., IV, p. 17.

It is possible that the play might possibly have been performed again in the years following its revival in 1599. However, because it was probably one of the "musty fopperies of antiquity" with which the boys of Paul's returned to the stage, and because Jonson had ridiculed some of its "fustian" words in Every Man Out, one prefers to conclude that Histrionastix was probably not revived again in the war of the theatres.

On the other hand, Hamlet is the other Shakespearean play which scholars have related to the problem, mainly for its unusual comments upon London theatrical activities and the child-actors of the period. No one is certain of the precise time of its initial performance, although scholars tend to agree that a date between 1598 and 1601 may be correct.³³² Because the play was entered in the Stationer's Register, July 26, 1602, one may assume that it was at least acted by that date.³³³ Of the extant printed versions of the play, three, Q₁ (1603), Q₂ (1604), and the text of the 1623 Folio, are especially problematical. Each text has varying degrees of differences. For example, Q₁ bears the following

³³²There is a reference to Hamlet in Harvey's Marginalia, which was written possibly between 1598 and 1601; Craig (ed.), op. cit., p. 900.

³³³Arber (ed.), op. cit., III, p. 84b.

inscription on its title-page: "As it hath been diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere." It is, also, a short and inferior text. For example, Polonius and his servant, Reynaldo, are named Corambis and Montano, many of the speeches are abbreviated, and the order of scenes varies to some extent.

Scholars have generally assumed the text to have been pirated from the playhouse copy. There exists also the theory that Q₁ was a memorial reconstruction of the original text. Craig, however, believes that Q₁ was printed from a prompt-book which had been used by a company of actors on tour, possibly performing at both universities. After the touring company had returned to London, the Hamlet prompt-book had fallen into the hands of the printer.³³⁴ Consequently, Craig explains the degeneration of Q₁ as a result of continual deterioration on the road, the travelling company's being necessarily smaller and the actors of poorer quality.³³⁵ Craig's theory may be correct; however, the Kempe-Burbage scene in II Returne implies that well-known actors played at Cambridge. Kempe and Burbage almost certainly visited Cambridge with the

³³⁴Hardin Craig, A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos, p. 80.

³³⁵Ibid., p. 81.

Chamberlain's Men in 1594-5, and possibly in 1601.³³⁶ Kempe's portrayal by the Parnassus poet is too involved with his visit there to dismiss this point as a poet's fancy. In addition, Burbage, the first actor to play Hamlet,³³⁷ is ridiculed for having given advice to the university players in II Returne.

Next, Q₂ appeared in 1604 with the following advertisement on its title-page: "Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie." A comparison of Q₂ with the Folio text reveals that Q₂ contains more than two hundred lines which are omitted in the Folio, but leaves out about eighty-five lines which are present in the Folio.³³⁸ Craig suggests that Q₂ was printed from the foul papers of Shakespeare's revision of Q₁.³³⁹

The Folio is probably based upon the fair copy, or original playhouse licensed document which the acting company would normally have retained in its possession. Heminges and Condell, the editors of the 1623 Folio, offered their finished work to the public as the uncorrupted text of

³³⁶Leishman (ed.), op. cit., p. 336.

³³⁷Louis B. Wright (ed.), The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark, p. xviii.

³³⁸Ibid., p. xv.

³³⁹Craig, A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos, p. 82.

Shakespeare's plays. In an introductory note "To the great Variety of Readers," the editors stated:

. . .you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds, and stealths of inurious imposters, that expos'd them: even their limbes; and all the rest absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued them.

In addition, an extended passage concerning the child-actors is contained in the Folio but omitted in Q₁ or Q₂, although both quartos contain a brief allusion to the children. These references vary so widely as to warrant a detailed reproduction of their contents at this point:

First Quarto--1603

Ham. Players, what Players be they?

Ross. My Lord, the Tragedians of the City, Those that you tooke delight to see so often.

Ham. How comes it that they trauell? Do they grow restie?

Gil. No my Lord, their reputation holds as it was wont.

Ham. How then?

Gil. Y faith my Lord, noueltie carries it away, For the principall publike ardiencie that Came to them, are turned to priuate playes, And to the humour of children.

Ham. I doe not greatly wonder of it, For those that would make mops and moes At my vncle, when my father liued, Now giue a hundred, two hundred pounds For his picture: but they shall be welcome.³⁴⁰

Second Quarto--1604

Ham. . . .What players are they?

Ros. Euen those you were wont to take such delight in, the Tragedians of the City.

³⁴⁰Shakespeare's Hamlet: A facsimile of the Second Quarto--1603.

Ham. How chances it they traivle? their residence both in reputation, and profit was better both wayes.

Ros. I thinke their inhibition, comes by the meanes of the late innouasion.

Ham. Doe they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the City; are they so followed.

Ros. No indeede are they not.

Ham. It is not very strange, for my Vncle is King of Denmarke, and those that would make mouths at him while my father liued, giue twenty, fortie, fifty, a hundred duckets a peece, for his Picture in little, s'bloud there is somthing in this more then naturall, if Philosophie could find it out.³⁴¹

Folio--1623

Ham. . . . what Players are they?

Rosin. Euen those you were wont to take delight in the Tragedians of the City.

Ham. How chances it they traivle? their residence both in reputation and profit was better both wayes.

Rosin. I thinke their Inhibition comes by the late Innouation?

Ham. Doe they hold the same estimation they did when I was in the City? Are they so follow'd?

Rosin. No indeed, they are not.

Ham. How comes it? doe they grow rusty?

Rosin. Nay, their indeaucour keeps in the wonted pace; But there is Sir an ayrie of Children, little Yases, that crye out on the top of question; and are most tyrannically clap't for't: these are now the fashion, and so be-ratled the common Stages (so they call them) that many wearing Rapiers, are affraide of Goose-quils, and dare scarce come thither.

Ham. What are they Children? Who maintains 'em? How are they escoted? Will they pursue the Quality no longer then they can sing? Will they not say afterwards if they should grow themselues to common Players (as it is like most if their meanes are not better) their Writers do them wrong, to make them exclaim against their owne Succession.

341 Shakespeare's Hamlet: A facsimile of the Second Quarto--1604.

Rosin. Faith there ha's bene much to do on both sides; and the Nation holds it no sinne, to tarre them to Controuersie. There was for a while, no mony bid for argument, vnlesse the Foet and the Player went to Cuffes in the Question.

Ham. Is't possible?

Guild. Oh there ha's bene much throwing about of Braines.

Ham. Do the Boyes carry it away?

Rosin. I that they do my Lord, Hercules & his load too.

Ham. It is not strange: for mine Vnckle is King of Denmarke, and those that would make mowes at him while my Father liued; giue twenty, forty, an hundred Ducates a peece, for his picture in Little. There is something in this more than Naturall, if Philosophie could finde it out.³⁴²

The extended reference to the child-actors in the Folio does nothing to further the plot and, therefore, much be considered as a determined commentary by Shakespeare upon the London theatrical profession. The omission of twenty lines concerning the "little Yases" in Q₁ and Q₂ may have been an intentional theatrical editing by the Chamberlain's Company, since the war of the theatres was over by 1603 and 1604, the publication dates for Q₁ and Q₂.³⁴³ By this time, Jonson was

³⁴² Helge Kokeritz (ed.), Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, A facsimile edition of the First Folio--1623.

³⁴³ G. F. Tucker Brooke suggests that the omission of the passage in Q₁ and Q₂ was due to restraint by authority. In an attempt to find a rebuke of Jonson in Hamlet, he develops this idea to include a lost passage in Hamlet which may have contained the "purge." Brooke believes it lay in the power of Heminge and Condell to preserve this passage, but, to avoid humiliating Jonson, the editors declined to print it; Brooke, op. cit., pp. 385-6.

again associated with the Chamberlains Men, having written Sejanus in 1603, and there certainly would have been no reason for the Chamberlain's Men to have opened old wounds by leaving the "little Yases" passage intact. The omission of the passage concerning the child-actors, therefore, may be attributed to theatrical editing in order to avoid antagonizing a playwright in the employ of the Chamberlain's Men.

Certain allusions to the child-actors contained in the three texts have never been adequately explained. For example, in Q₁ the actors travel because the noueltie of private plays has attracted the public audience. Q₂ and Folio explain the players Inhibition by means of the late Innouasion. It appears that the word Innouasion (innovation) by juxtaposition should have the same connotation as noueltie in Q₁. Therefore, it is most likely that the word refers to the revival of the child-actors in 1599-1600. The idea that the innovation might refer to the Queen's condoning the child-actors is insubstantial. First, there is no reason to believe that Paul's Boys enjoyed special support. They are known to have played only twice before the Queen from the time of their revival until the Queen's death.³⁴⁴ Secondly, Blackfriar's, where the Children of the Chapel performed, was

³⁴⁴Hillebrand, The Child-Actors: A Chapter in Elizabethan History, p. 211.

. . . a purely private venture from start to finish, without an atom of royal support other than the encouragement of sympathy which Elizabeth had always shown the principal children's companies. It is quite right to insist. . . that the sovereign had nothing to do with the disappearance of the Chapel in 1584; it is equally true that she had nothing to do with their reinstatement in 1600.³⁴⁵

Other references in this section that have not been fully understood include the word tyranically to describe how the children are clapped or applauded. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word should be understood as meaning "exceedingly; violently; vehemently." The term Goose-quills probably has a double reference to the child-actors, (in juxtaposition with the players's swords), and to the authors of the children's plays.

It is generally assumed that, because of the competition of the boy actors, Shakespeare's company was forced to go on tour. Jonson has an actor from the Globe say ". . . this winter has made us all poorer than so many staru'd snakes: Nobody comes at us, not a gentleman" (Poetaster, III, iv). It is implied that the reason for the poor attendance at the Globe is the better theatrical fare offered by the children. Before accepting Jonson's word that he has won over the player's audience, however, one must consider two

³⁴⁵Ibid., p. 169.

things. First, the Globe, an outdoor theatre, did not present plays during the cold winter months. Secondly, Jonson qualifies his broad statement, ". . .nobody comes at us," with ". . .not a gentleman." On the other hand, Shakespeare makes a joke about the effect of the children on the Globe attendance, for in the words of Rosencrantz (Folio, 623), the boys carry away ". . .Hercules & his load too."³⁴⁶ There was, as far as is known, no general inhibition of acting as a result of the stage quarrel. Shakespeare, however, may have been wary of a restriction, similar to the Archbishop's restraining order of 1599, concerning erotic and satirical works. There is no indication, other than Jonson's allusion in Poetaster, that Shakespeare's company suffered any severe reversals because of the rivalry of the children. Undoubtedly, the entire scene in Hamlet concerned with the child-actors and the "common stages" was written by Shakespeare with tongue-in-cheek. In the first place, it does not stand to reason that Shakespeare would have admitted, in his play, that the child-actors had compelled his company to travel. Secondly, Harbage indicates that the combined audience capacity of the active public theatres, which gave daily performances,

³⁴⁶The pun is an allusion to the Globe Theatre, the sign of which was Hercules carrying the Globe; Hercules, according to the story, had relieved Atlas in this task.

was probably six times as great as that of the two private theatres, which played only weekly:

. . .it appears likely that in the year of Hamlet eighteen to twenty-four thousand spectators a week through nine or ten months of the year were patronizing the Chamberlain's Men at the Globe, the Admiral's Men at the Fortune, and Worcester's Men at the Boar's Head or Rose, compared with six to seven hundred spectators a week through six months of the year patronizing the Chapel boys at Blackfriar's and Paul's boys at their song school.³⁴⁷

Therefore, the effect of the child-actors on the Chamberlain's Men could hardly have been so disastrous as to have forced them to tour the provinces. In addition, the attitude of the professional players in the Kempe-Burbage scene (II Returne, IV,iii) is smug and superior. Certainly, if the well-informed author of the Parnassus Plays, who exclaimed against the wealth of players and the poverty of scholars, had known of an economic crisis in the professional theatre, he would gleefully have reminded his audience of the event.

Although there is no evidence that the Chamberlain's Men travelled in 1600-1,³⁴⁸ the Q₁ (1603) title-page states that the play was performed at Cambridge as well as at

³⁴⁷Harbage, op. cit., p. 47.

³⁴⁸Chambers finds no record for the Chamberlain's Men having travelled, except for brief periods in 1596, 1597, and possibly in 1601; Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, II, p. 194; However, Albright cautions that the unrecorded dramatic performances in the provinces probably far outnumbered the recorded ones; Albright, op. cit., p. 13.

Oxford and "elsewhere." A Cambridge performance by the Chamberlain's Men would not have been unusual, therefore. Furthermore, on May 17, 1603, James I, having ascended the throne at the death of Elizabeth, approved a royal patent whereby the Lord Chamberlain's Men became the King's Men. The document states that the men are to act at the Globe Theatre, in Surrey, and ". . .w[1] thin the liberties and freedome of any other Cittie Vniuersitie Towne or Borough whatsoue[er] w[1] thin o[ur] said Realmes and dominions."³⁴⁹ Exactly when Hamlet was performed at Cambridge is uncertain. However, if the play were performed there prior to the first performance of II Returne at Christmas, 1601/2, for it to have contained the "purge," it must have been performed after the date of Satiromastix. Since the date of Satiromastix is established between Postaster in the spring of 1601 and the Stationer's Register entry of Satiromastix on November 11, 1601, there is a strong possibility that Hamlet actually may have contained the "purge referred to in the Cambridge play.

One also recalls that Polonius, in Hamlet, is referred to as having acted the part of Julius Caesar in a university play:

³⁴⁹ Benjamin Roland Lewis (ed.), The Shakespeare Documents: Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations, and Commentary, II, p. 365.

Ham. My lord, you played once 'i the university, you say?

Pol. That did I, my lord; and was accounted a good actor.

Ham. What did you enact?

Pol. I did enact Julius Caesar: I was killed 'i the Capitol; Brutus killed me.

Ham. It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there.

(Hamlet, III,ii,103-11)

This reference to the character Julius Caesar does not necessarily imply that one should look for a caricature of a university man in the old Polonius. However, Shakespeare's allusion to the would-be actors in the universities as revealed in his treatment of Polonius would have been significant to a Cambridge audience.

In addition, the Kempe-Burbage scene in II Returne appears to be the Parnassus poet's reaction to the advice given the players in Hamlet. Burbage coaches Studioso in proper rendering of a well-worn line from Kyd's Spanish Tragedy: "Who calls Ieronimo from his naked bedd?" (II Returne, IV,iv,1806), as well as lines from Shakespeare's Richard III: "Nowe is the winter of our discontent / Made glorious by the sonne of Yorke" (II Returne, IV,iv,1838-39). Then, before leaving, Kempe reminds the university men to heed the advice of their betters: "Thou wilt do well in time, if thou wilt be ruled by they betters, that is, by my selfe, and such graue Aldermen of the playhouse as I am" (II Returne, IV,iv, 1833-35). Quite naturally the university author of II Returne,

like Greene and Nashe before him, was disturbed by the dependence of university men upon base and ignorant players.

A re-investigation of the entire scope of the war of the theatres shows that an outburst of formal satire in the last decade of the sixteenth century spread to the London stage, especially through the satirical drama of John Marston. In order to attract an audience for *Paul's Boys* and increase his own reputation as a satirist, Marston lashed out at the popular stage and well-known literary personalities. In doing so, he locked horns, perhaps unintentionally, with Jonson, who had taken to writing for the Children of the Chapel at Blackfriar's with the idea of reforming the conventions and practices of the stage by (1) pointing out the absurdities of current forms, (2) employing classical satiric standards, and (3) establishing, perhaps, a new form of drama, the "comical satire." Jonson's high disdain of Marston's attempts in the field of satiric comedy led to a display of invective. The sudden use of the child-actors and the satire of popular stages caused the professional players to become alarmed. Jonson was criticized for his personal satire in *Poetaster*. Dekker's *Satiromastix*, probably written with Marston's assistance, ended the quarrel, and Jonson turned to writing tragedy. Thus, it may be said that the war of the theatres was a result of vanity in a profession that was making its way in a new form of drama.

The Parnassus Plays not only belong to a tradition of topical and satirical comedy already established at Cambridge, but also are exceptionally revealing in that they indicate one reaction of the university to the London stage. The university men were not existing in a scholarly isolation from the newest trends of literature and drama. Indeed, they were themselves involved in the literary quarrels, as previously witnessed in the Nashe-Harvey-Greene and Hall-Marston frays. Naturally, they sided with the "University wits" against the popular players.

Furthermore, the subject of the printed play is closely tied in with the war of the theatres. The play in quarto undoubtedly stems from a public interest in the theatre, an interest that was fanned by the controversy between playwrights and players. Earlier, the Martin-Marprelate controversy and the Hall-Marston quarrel had attracted interested onlookers. Thus, the war of the theatres also contributed to a renewed interest in the book-trade. In addition, with the appearance of plays in quarto in the late 90's and early seventeenth century, the dramatist assumed a new role and stature as a gentleman of letters. Much of the former hack work now gave way to an avowed collaboration or even sole authorship. Because the professional companies were in competition with each other, they were reluctant to permit

the printing of choice plays in their repertory. On the other hand, writers for the child-actors, especially Jonson and Marston, perhaps hurried their plays into print after a run on the "private" stage. Perhaps these two were not confined by company regulations governing the professional writers and found the writing of plays a source of revenue and occasion for vanity. In addition, the topicality of the satiric play undoubtedly restricted the run of a play upon the stage. The less reputable printers, as evidenced in the scene involving Danter in II Returns, must have welcomed the erotic and personally satiric plays. Similarly, one assumes that a printer would have been unlikely to undertake a job if he had no hopes of a sale.

In addition to stimulating the book-trade, the war of the theatres cultivated the development of a literary criticism of drama. The satirical attacks of the playwrights upon the gulls and postasters also included discussions of contemporary writers and their drama, thus stimulating popular taste. Certainly, Jonson's contributions to satirical comedy attracted numerous imitators; and even Shakespeare was not adverse to incorporating new ideas into his dramas. Finally, Hamlet's advice to the players is evidence of a growing interest in the general critical standards of the acting profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dr. Evelyn May. Graphic Publications in England, 1580-1800. A Study of Social, Economic, Aesthetic Context and Form of the Book. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1927. 470p.

Edward (ed.). A History of the Book in England. The University of London Press, 1954-1969. 3 vols. London: Private, 1976.

Whitfield. History of the Book

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book of Hours. San Marino, CA. 246pp.

The Elizabethan Book. Clarendon Press, 1925.

The Journal of Westminister. New York: Longmans, Green, 1955. 200pp.

18-10-68
19-10-68

English
Book

III 1030

Book's
Library

with

New York

125

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, Evelyn May. Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640: A Study of Conditions Affecting Content and Form of Drama. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1927. 442pp.
- Arber, Edward (ed.). A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554-1640 A. D. In V vols. London: Privately Printed, 1876.
- Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield. The Organization of the Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961. 463pp.
- Baum, Helena Watts. The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947. 192pp.
- Bently, Gerald Eades. Shakespeare and Jonson: Their Reputations in the Seventeenth Century Compared. In II vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Berringer, Ralph W. "Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and the War of the Theatres: the Case for the Identification of Hedon," Philological Quarterly, XX (January, 1943), pp. 1-22.
- Bowers, Fredson (ed.). The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. In III vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker. The Tudor Drama: A History of English Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911. 461pp.
- Bullen, A. H. (ed.). The Works of John Marston. In III vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1838.
- Campbell, Oscar James. Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. San Marino: Huntington Library Publications, 1938. 246pp.
- Chambers, Sir E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. In IV vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Chute, Marchette. Ben Jonson of Westminster. New York: E. P. Dutton Company, Inc., 1953. 380pp.

- Clode, Charles Matthew. Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist in the city of London; and its Associated Charities and Institutions. London: Harrison and Sons, St. Martin's Lane, 1875.
- Collections. In V vols. Oxford: University Press, 1960.
- Conway, Eustace. Anthony Munday and Other Essays. New York: Privately Printed, 1927. 111pp.
- Craig, Hardin (ed.). The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1951. 1337pp.
- _____. A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961. 134pp.
- _____. "Textual Degeneration of Elizabethan and Stuart Plays: An Examination of Plays in Manuscript," The Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLVI (January, 1960), pp. 71-84.
- Cross, Gustav. "Manningham's Libel of Marston," Notes and Queries, CGI (September, 1956), pp. 377-8.
- Davenport, Arnold (ed.). The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall Bishop of Exeter and Norwich. Liverpool: At the University Press, 1949. 309pp.
- _____. "Quarrel of the Satirists," Modern Language Review, XXXVII (April, 1942), pp. 123-30.
- Day, John. The Ile of Gyls--1606. Shakespeare Association Facsimiles No. 12. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Elton, William. "Shakespeare's Portrait of Ajax in Troilus and Cressida," Publication Modern Language Association, LXIII (June, 1948), pp. 744-8.
- Enck, John Jacob. "The Case Is Altered: Initial Comedy of Humours," Studies in Philology, I (April, 1953), pp. 195-214.
- _____. Jonson and the Comic Truth. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957. 281pp.
- Evans, G. B. "Pandarus' House?: Troilus and Cressida, III, ii; IV. iv," Modern Language Notes, LXII (January, 1947), pp. 33-5.

- Fleay, Frederick Gard. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama. In II vols. London: Reeves and Turner, 1891.
- _____. A Chronicle History of the Life and Work of William Shakespeare, Player, Poet, and Playmaker. London: John C. Nimmo, 1886.
- _____. Shakespeare Manual. London: Macmillan and Company, 1878.
- Foakes, R. A. and Rickert, R. T. (editors). Henslowe's Diary. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1961. 368pp.
- Furness, Horace Howard (ed.). "Troilus and Cressida," A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1873-19.
- Gray, Henry David. "The Chamberlain's Men and the Poetaster," Modern Language Review, XLII (April, 1947), pp. 173-9.
- Gregg, Kate L. "Thomas Dekker: A Study in Economic and Social Background," University of Washington Publications, II (July, 1924), pp. 1-112.
- Grosart, Alexander (ed.). Robert Chester's "Loves Martyr, or, Rosalins Complaint" (1601) with Its Supplement "Diverse Poeticall Essais" on the Turtle and Phoenix by Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, George Chapman, John Marston, etc. London: N. Trubner and Company, 1878. 254pp.
- Halstead, W. L. "Collaboration on the Patient Grissil," Philological Quarterly, XVIII (October, 1939), pp. 381-94.
- _____. "New Source Influence on The Shoemakers' Holiday," Modern Language Notes, LVI (February, 1941), pp. 127-9.
- Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1952), 393pp.
- Harrison, G. B. (ed.). The English Romayne Lyfe. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1925. 105pp.
- _____. Henrie Chettle "Kind-Hartes Dreame"--1592 and William Kemp "Nine Daies Wonder"--1600. The Dodley Head Quartos. London: John Lane, 1923. 33pp.
- Herford, C. H. and Simpson, Percy (editors). Ben Jonson. In X vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925-50.

- Hillebrand, Harold Newcomb. "The Child Actors: A Chapter in Elizabethan History," (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XI, Nos. 1, 2). Urbana, Illinois, 1926.
- _____ (ed.). "Troilus and Cressida," A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Philadelphia and London: J. P. Lippincott and Company, 1953.
- Hollander, John. "The Twelfth Night and the Morality of Indulgence," Sewanee Review, LXVII (Spring, 1959), pp. 220-38.
- Hunt, Mary Leland. Thomas Dekker: A Study. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1911. 212pp.
- Jones, Frederic Lafayette. "Echoes of Shakspeare in Later Elizabethan Drama," Publication Modern Language Association, XLV (September, 1930), pp. 791-803.
- Kirschbaum, Leo. Shakespeare and the Stationers. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1955. 421pp.
- Knowland, A. S. "Troilus and Cressida," Shakespeare Quarterly, X (Summer, 1959), pp. 353-65.
- Koberitz, Helge (ed.). Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. A facsimilie edition of the First Folio. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. 889pp.
- Law, R. A. "Shoemakers' Holiday and Romeo and Juliet," Studies in Philology, XXI (April, 1924), pp. 356-61.
- Lawrence, William Witherle. "Troilus, Cressida, and Thersites," Modern Language Review, XXXVII (October, 1942), pp. 422-37.
- Leishman, J. B. (ed.). The Three Parnassus Plays: 1598-1601. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Limited, 1949. 398pp.
- Lewis, Benjamin Roland (ed.). The Shakespeare Documents: Facsimiles, Transliterations, Translations, and Commentary. In II vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1940. 324pp.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. "Fashionable Expression: Its Status in Poetaster and Satiromastix," Modern Language Notes, XLIV (February, 1929), pp. 93-6.

- McDiarmid, Matthew P. "The Stage Quarrel in *Wily Beguiled*," Notes and Querries, CCI (January-December, 1956), pp. 380-83.
- Miscellaneous Pieces of Ancient English Poesie. London: Printed at the Crown in Ludgate-Street, 1864. 234pp.
- Morrow, Donald. Where Shakespeare Stood: His Part in the Crucial Struggles of His Day. Milwaukee: The Casanova Press, 1935. 89pp.
- Murray, James A. H., Bradley, Henry, Craigie, W. A., and Onions, C. T. (editors). The Oxford English Dictionary. In XIII vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Nash, Ralph. "The Parting Scene in Jonson's *Poetaster*," Philological Quarterly, XXXI (January, 1952), pp. 54-62.
- Nathan, Norman. "Julius Caesar and The Shoemakers' Holiday," Modern Language Review, XLVIII (April, 1953), pp. 178-9.
- Newkirk, Glen Alton. "From Satire to Realism in the Works of John Marston," Unpublished Master's thesis, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas, 1956. 68pp.
- Nicholson, Brinsley and Herford, C. H. (editors). Ben Jonson. In III vols. London: Ernest Benn Limited.
- O'Donnell, Norbert F. "Shakespeare, Marston, and the University: The Sources of Thomas Goeffe's *Orestes*," Studies in Philology, L (July, 1953), pp. 476-84.
- Parrott, Thomas Marc and Ball, Robert Hamilton. A Short View of Elizabethan Drama. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. 311pp.
- Penniman, Josiah H. (ed.). Ben Jonson's 'Poetaster' and Thomas Dekker's 'Satiromastix'. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1913. 456pp.
- _____. "The War of the Theatres," Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology Literature and Archaeology, IV (1897), pp. 1-108.
- Phillips, J. O. Halliwell. Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. London: Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company, 1884. 480pp.
- _____. "The Vile Base of Demetrius," Language Series, XLII (January, 1954), pp. 48-50.

- Presson, Robert K. "The Structural Use of a Traditional Theme in *Troilus and Cressida*," Philological Quarterly, XXXI (April, 1952), pp. 180-8.
- Reyburn, Marjorie L. "New Facts and Theories about the Parnassus Plays," Publications Modern Language Association, LXXIV (September, 1959), pp. 325-35.
- Rickert, Edith. "Political Propaganda and Satire in a *Midsummer Night's Dream*," Modern Philology, XXI (August-November, 1923), pp. 134-54.
- Rollins, Hyder E. and Baker, Herschel (editors). The Renaissance in England. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1954. 1014pp.
- Schelling, Felix (ed.). Ben Jonson's Plays. In II vols. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Limited, 1953.
- _____ (ed.). Typical Elizabethan Plays by Contemporaries and Immediate Successors of Shakespeare. New York: Harper and Brothers. 797pp.
- Shakespeare's England: An Account of the Life and Manners of His Age. In II vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1916.
- Shakespeare's 'Hamlet.' The facsimilie of the First Quarto--1603. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Shakespeare's 'Hamlet.' The facsimilie of the Second Quarto--1604. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Simpson, Percy. "A Modern Fable of Aesop," Modern Language Review, XLIII (July, 1948), pp. 403-5.
- Small, Roscoe Addison. The Stage-Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-Called Poetasters. Breslau: Verlag von M. and H. Marcus, 1899. 204pp.
- Smith, G. C. Moore (ed.). Club Law: A Comedy Acted in Clare Hall, Cambridge about 1599-1600. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1907. 143pp.
- _____. College Plays Performed in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1923.
- Spencer, Terence. "The Vile Name of Demetrius," Modern Language Review, XLIX (January, 1954), pp. 46-8.

- Stephen, Sir Leslie and Lee, Sir Sidney (editors). Dictionary of National Biography. In XXII vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Tatlock, J. S. P. "The Seige of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood," Publications Modern Language Association, (1915), pp. 727-34.
- Thaler, Alwin. "The Travelling Players in Shakespere's England," Modern Philology, XVII (January, 1920), pp. 121-46.
- Tolman, Albert H. "Shakespeare's Manipulation of His Sources in As You Like It," Modern Language Notes, XXXVII (February, 1922), pp. 65-76.
- Traill, H. D. and Mann, J. S. (editors). Social England: A Record of the Progress of the People in Religion, Laws, Learning, Arts, Industry, Commerce, Science, Literature, and Manners, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. In VI vols. London: Cassell and Company, Limited, 1902.
- Wallace, Charles William. The Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars 1597-1603. (University of Nebraska in University Studies, 1908). 207pp.
- Ward, A. W. and Waller, A. R. (editors). Cambridge History of English Literature. In XV vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.
- Wood, H. Harvey (ed.). The Plays of John Marston. In III vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1934.
- Wright, Louis B. (ed.). The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1958. 147pp.