

379
N81d
No. 380

THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER IN JACOBAN DRAMA:
CHARACTEROLOGY AND CULTURE

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Seiwoong Oh, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1993

379
N81d
No. 380

THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER IN JACOBAN DRAMA:
CHARACTEROLOGY AND CULTURE

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Seiwoong Oh, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1993

Oh, Seiwoong, The Scholarly Trickster in Jacobean Drama: Characterology and Culture. Doctor of Philosophy (English), August, 1993, 180 pp., works cited, 166 titles.

Whereas scholarly malcontents and naifs in late Renaissance drama represent the actual notion of university graduates during the time period, scholarly tricksters have an obscure social origin. Moreover, their lack of motive in participating in the plays' events, their ambivalent value structures, and their conflicting dramatic roles as tricksters, reformers, justices, and heroes pose a serious difficulty to literary critics who attempt to define them.

By examining the Western dramatic tradition, this study first proposes that the scholarly tricksters have their origins in both the Vice in early Tudor plays and the witty slave in classical comedy. By incorporating historical, cultural, anthropological, and psychological studies, this essay also demonstrates that the scholarly tricksters are each a Jacobean version of the archetypal trickster, who is usually associated with solitary habits, motiveless intrusion, and a double function as selfish buffoon and cultural hero. Finally, this study shows that their ambivalent value structures reflect the nature of rhetorical training in Renaissance schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. SCHOLARLY CHARACTERS IN CHAPMAN, MARSTON, AND JONSON	14
III. THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER IN WESTERN DRAMATIC TRADITION	77
IV. THE ARCHETYPAL TRICKSTER, RENAISSANCE UNIVERSITY MEN, AND THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER	108
V. THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER AND RHETORICAL MAN: THE AMBIVALENT VALUE STRUCTURE	142
VI. CONCLUSION	157
WORKS CITED	161

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Toward the end of her visit to Cambridge University in 1564, Queen Elizabeth said to the students:

This one thing then I would have you all remember, that there will be no directer, no fitter course, either to make your fortunes, or to procure the favour of your prince, than, as you have begun, to ply your studies diligently. (qtd. in Cooper 2:202)

However perfunctory this speech may at first sound to modern ears, there are historical facts which would testify to the validity of the queen's assurance. Not only do we find, as Mark H. Curtis notes, university graduates who became prominent men in "all professions and important callings in life" (Oxford 4), but also, as John Neale reports, there was during the first thirty years of Elizabeth's reign a growing number of parliamentarians who had received some training at the universities (407-9). The queen's assurance to Cambridge students, then, was not at all perfunctory but genuine.

The validity of the queen's assurance, however, seems to have lasted only a few decades. As historians assert, from the last years of her reign on to the next monarch's regime, diligent study brought frustration rather than preferment mainly on two accounts: the universities were, unlike in the early Elizabethan period, producing too many educated people for the limited positions available in the state and the Church; and the humanistic curriculum of the universities fell short of providing utilitarian education to their students, particularly to those who could not be accommodated within the state and the Church. As a consequence, the majority of university graduates, as Curtis points out, had to settle for positions which could not appease "their self-esteem and desire for recognition and honour" ("Alienated" 28), and in the early seventeenth century citizens began to demand a reform in both university and grammar-school education "in order that it might serve the practical ends of society" (Louis B. Wright 66).

Of course, the reality constructed by later historians is not necessarily the same as the one perceived by the people living in it. Turning to the statements made by those who lived in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England, however, one finds that they have noticed the same about the well-being of their intellectual class. Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, for example, includes

a definite statement about the "Misery of Schollers": "after all their paines, in the worlds esteeme they are accompted ridiculous and silly fooles, Idiots, Asses, and (as oft they are) rejected, contemned, derided, doting, and mad" (1:304). A few passages later, Burton lists their lack of practical knowledge and experience as the primary reason for their misery:

Your greatest students are commonly no better, silly, soft fellowes in their outward behaviour, absurd, ridiculous to others, and no whit experienced in worldly business; they can measure the heavens, range over the world, teach others wisdom, and yet in bargaines and contracts they are circumvented by every base Tradesman. (1:306)

To look at how these aspects were reflected in the literature of the period, one would turn to drama, "the abstract and brief chronicles of time," in Hamlet's words (2.2.531). Indeed, the drama of the period stages a number of scholarly characters, who in one way or another testify to the frustration and alienation of the class they represent. Perhaps the most comprehensive dramatic picture of the condition of university graduates would be found in the Parnassus Trilogy (1598-1602, anonymous),¹ in which two scholar-characters, Philomusus and Studioso, undergo a hard training in their university and, after drifting through a

series of mediocre occupations, turn into rogues. A line from the first part of the Trilogy, paraphrased from a line in Marlowe's portion of Hero and Leander (1.470), still echoes in the mind of the reader: "Learninge and pouertie will euer kiss" (The Pilgrimage to Parnassus Act 1, line 75).

If the Parnassus plays are atypical as material for discussion because they were written by a university student (or students) for a university audience, popular drama also hosts a number of scholarly characters, most of whom can be classified into three dominant types: innocent victims, malcontents, and tricksters, the first two somewhat corresponding to the actual social types. Of the first type, one would recall Baldock, for example, in Christopher Marlowe's Edward II (pub.1594),² who, although he later learns to use hypocrisy to thrive in the court, begins his career in court by determining to cast "the scholar off / And learn to court it like a gentleman" (2.1.30-1). Even in a play as late as James Shirley's The Lady of Pleasure (1635), the type seems to have been dominant: upon coming home from his university, Frederick is persuaded to be "translated" out of his "learned language" (2.1.101) and to proclaim

. . . Farewell, Aristotle!

Prithee, commend me to the library

At Westminster; my bones I bequeath thither,
 And to the learned worms that mean to visit 'em.
 (2.2.161-4)

Even though these characters' learning is not underlined by the playwrights, what they represent is consistent with the Renaissance cultural notion of the university-educated population. Besides Burton's statements quoted previously, William Cecil, a university chancellor, himself noted the difference between the life of the university and that of the court: in a letter dated 1561 to Throgmorton, the English envoy in Paris, about his son Thomas, he writes:

I mean not to have him Thomas scholarly learned but civilly trained. . . . if he might without corruption be in that Court France for three months, I think he should learn more both in tongue and knowledge than otherwise in double space. (qtd. in Kearney 25)

Of the malcontent type, there are many memorable examples, Pandion in John Lyly's Sapho and Phao (1584) probably being the "earliest representation" of the type (Babb 97). Both Jaques in Shakespeare's As You Like It (reg. 1599) and Dowsecer in George Chapman's An Humorous Day's Mirth (1599) suffer melancholy for too much learning; Bosola, "a fantastical scholar," in John Webster's The

Duchess of Malfi (pub. 1623) and Flamineo in the same playwright's The White Devil (1609-12) suffer from lack of opportunity to thrive in the world. Perhaps the most explicit and comprehensive treatment is in the figure of Macilente in Ben Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humour (1599), who is described as a "*Man well parted, a sufficient scholler, and trauail'd; who (wanting that place in the worlds account, which he thinks his merit capable of) falls into an enuious apoplexie*" ("Characters").

A number of critical analyses have been conducted on the malcontent type. Following a brief discussion of the social origins of melancholy by L. C. Knights in his influential 1937 book The Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson (Appendix B), Lawrence Babb, in his The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642, has conducted extensive research on the subject and concluded that literary representation of the malcontent scholar type is "confined to the drama" and that the type "corresponded more or less closely to an actual social type of Elizabethan London, Oxford, and Cambridge" (96). More recently, Joseph Thomas Ramondetta, in his dissertation on the scholarly malcontents in Renaissance drama, argues that the religious malcontent in the medieval ages transformed into the scholarly malcontent, and that the

malcontent, "a key dramatic archetype," was the spokesperson of the "shadow side" of the Renaissance (2-3).

If the first two types are consistent with the actual social types, and if they therefore pose no significant critical challenge to the student of literature, the trickster type remains puzzling and intriguing, and the characters of this type have received no collective critical treatment.

Characteristically, these tricksters participate in the plays' events for the sake of "mirth"; use tricks, mostly verbal; manipulate other characters so as to reveal their follies; and help to restore order at the end of the play, they themselves assuming the figure of an informal judge of social ethics. Some of them even get love or wealth, mostly by chance. With small variations, Rynaldo in George Chapman's All Fools (1605), Freevill in John Marston's The Dutch Courtesan (Pub. 1605), Truewit in Ben Jonson's Epicoene (1609-10), Quarlous in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair (1614), and Compasse in the same playwright's The Magnetic Lady (1631) all belong to this trickster type.

One may, of course, argue that this character type has its cultural origin in the fact that the students at the Inns of Court were well known for their wild pranks. In all likelihood, however, the type seems to have deeper cultural implications. Wild pranks by the students may correspond to

the "mirth" sought by the scholar-characters, but the correspondence ends there.

Rather, one would immediately recall the Vice in early sixteenth-century plays, the "homiletic showman, intriguer extraordinary, and master of ceremonies" (Bernard Spivack 151). One would also recall the familiar stock characters whom Renaissance dramatists inherited from Plautus and Terence: the witty servant, who uses tricks to move the action forward; the justice figure, who sets things right at the end, almost in the manner of *deus ex machina*; and the sportful son, who, with the help of his witty servant, achieves his initial purpose.

Such a character type would also remind us of what anthropologists and psychologists say about the archetypal trickster. In a summary of studies by Carl Jung and others on the nature of tricksters in folklore, David Beecher notes that the archetypal trickster is the "memory of outlaw freedom confronted by a repressive collectivity to which he attaches, but never reconciles himself, himself" (54). Beecher also writes that the nature of the trickster is ambiguous because

he is both the outlaw of vicarious pleasure and the regulator of aberrant behavior, an amoral figure who, in relation to the group, vacillates

between the incipient villain and the incipient cultural benefactor. (54)

Since rhetoric was an essential part of Renaissance humanistic education, one would also associate the scholarly tricksters with what Richard Lanham calls *homo rhetoricus* in his The Motives of Eloquence: Literary Rhetoric in the Renaissance:

Rhetorical man is an actor; his reality public, dramatic. His sense of identity, his self, depends on the reassurance of daily histrionic reenactment. He is thus centered in time and concrete local event. The lowest common denominator of his life is a social situation. And his motivations must be characteristically . . . agonistic. He thinks first of winning, of mastering the rules the current game enforces. He assumes a natural agility in changing orientations. He hits the street already street-wise. . . . He is thus committed to no single construct of the world; much rather, to prevailing in the game at hand. . . . Rhetorical man is trained not to discover reality but to manipulate it. (4)

This study investigates the connection between the character type and Jacobean culture. The main body of this

study is divided into three parts. The first part (Chapter II) will examine the traits and dramatic roles of the scholarly characters. Undoubtedly it would be ideal for a study of this nature to investigate all the plays written during the period--G. E. Bentley estimates that there are "approximately 1200 plays written by known authors" between 1590 and 1642 (17). This study, however, is selective. First, I have investigated major plays by all the professional dramatists who were active during King James' reign and whose reputations are secure in the literary canon: William Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Thomas Middleton, John Marston, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, John Fletcher, Francis Beaumont, John Webster, and Cyril Tourneur.³ Of these, Shakespeare's works are excluded because the playwright, even though he deals with the theme of education in a number of plays, does not make much of university education. As Nicholas Orme asserts in his chapter entitled "Shakespeare and Education," even when Shakespeare features university men like Hamlet, Horatio, and perhaps Laertes, he does not "labour the point" about their university education (279). Middleton's and Fletcher's works are also excluded for two reasons, even though a few of their heroes (Witgood in Middleton's A Trick to Catch the Old One, Valentine and Tom Lurcher in Fletcher's Wit Without Money and The Night Walker, or The Little Thief respectively, for example) share

a few of the characteristics of the character type in question. First, unlike the scholarly heroes to be discussed in this study, they--impoverished gallants as they are--participate in the plays' events not to seek mirth but to regain their wealth from avaricious elders; second, even when there are small hints of their learning, they represent more impoverished prodigal sons than the learned men victimized by their society. Of the remaining playwrights, I have chosen the comedies of Jonson, Chapman, and Marston because these writers, in most of their plays, consciously underline the scholarliness of their protagonists and because they seem to treat the theme of learning frequently. Moreover, their comedies appear to be adequate material for this study because they are essentially satiric and, arguably, realistic of the London scene.

The next chapter will attempt to locate the character type within the Western dramatic tradition, primarily by tracing the type's possible origins in the works of Greek, Roman, contemporary Italian, and English medieval writers whose influence remained strong in the late Renaissance period.

The fourth and the fifth chapters are interdisciplinary in nature. With the findings of the study in the previous chapters in hand, the fourth chapter will first investigate the relationship between the pseudo-reality of the

characters as reflected in drama and the reality of actual scholars of the period in question, incorporating a number of studies by cultural historians. The chapter will then examine why the intellectual class of the Renaissance was chosen for the role of the trickster. The fifth chapter will explore the relationship between rhetorical education and the speech and behavioral patterns of the characters.

NOTES

1. The year of production, according to The Oxford Companion to English Literature.
2. Unless otherwise noted, the year of the first performance or publication is taken from The Oxford Companion to English Literature.
3. I have excluded John Ford and Philip Massinger since their chief works are written and performed after the reign of James I.

CHAPTER II

SCHOLARLY CHARACTERS IN CHAPMAN, MARSTON, AND JONSON

Rynaldo in Chapman's All Fools

The three types of scholarly characters discussed in the previous chapter are all present in Chapman's comedies. Dowsecer in An Humourous Day's Mirth is a malcontent who is "rarely learned," but who "hateth companie, and worldly trash" (2.2.16-18). Aurelio in May Day, a "toward Scholler" who "writes a theame well" (1.1.173), is too bashful to approach his love, Aemilia, and only through the machinations of Lodovico does he finally have a chance to confess his love to her. Giovanello in the same play, "a Gentleman of Padua, a man of rare parts, an excellent scholler, a fine Ciceronian" (2.4.324-5), learns that "Venice has other manner of learning" (4.1.11). In Sir Gyles Goosecap, Knight, Chapman's adaptation of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde, scholarly Clarence, who has "Doue-like Innocence" (5.1.164), has to rely upon his friend Mumford, a self-appointed match-maker, to gain access to his love, Eugenia. Rynaldo in All Fools, Chapman's "most flawless, perfectly balanced play" (Manley x), is the master-intriguer

of the work, getting involved in the play's events merely to "sowe / The seede of mirth" (1.1.406-7), and whose dramatic role is "to manipulate the action and bring about through trickery the happy reversal in favor of youth" (Grant 84).

Rynaldo is not the only learned trickster in Chapman's comedies. Charlotte Spivack is correct in asserting that there is, beginning with Lemot in An Humourous Day's Mirth, a "succession of imaginative, energetic, and learned young men who in Chapman's later plays deftly manipulate the multiple plot threads in their respective dramatic vehicles" (68). Rynaldo, however, seems a fitting subject for detailed investigation because, while other tricksters' learning is merely hinted at via their speeches and actions, Rynaldo's scholarly background is quite explicitly emphasized by the playwright.

The plot and characters of All Fools are undoubtedly taken from Terence's Heautontimoroumenos, and an investigation of this source play offers an opportunity to find the genesis of the character of Rynaldo. The Latin comedy begins with the remorse of Menedemus, whose son Clinia has gone to serve abroad in the army after having been chastised by his father for loving a poor neighborhood girl. While the regretful Menedemus punishes himself by working like a slave (hence the title, "Self-Tormenter"), Clinia returns secretly and hides in the house of his

friend, Clitipho, who is in love with a courtesan. Clitipho's slave, Syrus, when asked to deliver Clinia's message to his beloved Antiphila, brings back both Bacchis, Clitipho's courtesan, and Antiphila disguised as her maid. Syrus has a sure plan for the young lovers: they will pretend that Bacchis is Clinia's love. The plan works well until Clitipho's father spots his son caressing the courtesan; Clitipho's father also finds that Antiphila is in fact his own daughter, whom his wife exposed at birth. Just when his plan is about to go awry, Syrus comes up with another plan: Bacchis is to move to Clinia's house, this time pretending that she is Clitipho's mistress. Menedemus, however, finds out the truth and tells Clitipho's father, who blesses the marriage between his daughter and Clinia. Clitipho, upon his father's threat of disowning him, promises to forsake the courtesan and marry another girl in the neighborhood. As Thomas Marc Parrott writes, the underlying structure of All Fools is taken directly from the Latin comedy, and "there are numerous instances where Chapman follows Terence in details, sometimes merely taking a hint, sometimes directly translating the Latin" (704).

Chapman of course made a few changes--adding a subplot centering on the jealous husband Cornelio, for example--to give his play an English atmosphere. One of the other changes is particularly noteworthy. While the character

configuration remains largely unchanged from the source, the witty trickster is no longer a slave but now a scholar. Chapman in fact goes to great lengths to underline Rynaldo's erudition. In the first scene, Chapman tells us that Rynaldo is Antonio's "younger son at Padua" (1.1.316); in the second scene, Rynaldo tells Valerio and others, "Downe on your knees; poore louers reuerence learning" (1.2.86). In the same scene, when Rynaldo promises to make the lovers' dream come true, Valerio asks, "All this by learning?" (1.2.105). Plotting a scheme to get even with Rynaldo, Cornelio says,

Goe shallow scholler, you that make all Guls,
 You that can out-see cleere-ey'd ieolousie,
 (although I be no scholler)
 Yet I have thus much Latin, as to say
Iam sumus ergo pares. (5.1.58-75)

Rynaldo even delivers a speech that echoes the major complaint made by the intellectual class of late Elizabethan England:

Loue's service is much like our humourous Lords;
 Where Minions carry more then seruitors,
 The bolde and carelesse seruant still obtaines:
 The modest and respectiue, nothing gaines.
 (1.1.33-36)

Despite the difference in social status, Rynaldo is similar to his prototype Syrus in several aspects. First, his tricks are essentially the same as those used by Syrus: he lies to Gostanzo that Gratiana is Fortunio's secret wife and that Fortunio is too afraid of his father's anger to reveal the relationship. When the first trick fails after Gostanzo catches his son Valerio kissing the supposed secret wife of Fortunio, Rynaldo builds his second trick upon the first one: while Gostanzo is still ignorant of the real relationship between his son and Gratiana, Rynaldo suggests moving Gratiana to Antonio's house on the pretext that she is Valerio's wife. He even asks Gostanzo to bless the couple, with Antonio watching, so as to fool Antonio.

Second, the tricksters are alike in handling the young lovers whom they set out to assist. To his young master, who is shocked at seeing his courtesan walking toward his house, Syrus boasts:

I know my plan's safe and sure, and it'll give you
a chance to have your girl with you in your
father's house with nothing to fear. Then there's
the money you've promised her; I can get it in the
same way. . . . What more do you want? (p.115)

In a similar manner, Rynaldo brags to Valerio in front of other helpless young lovers: "Well sir, you shall haue all meanes / To liue in one house, eate and drinke together, /

Meete and kiss your fils" (1.2.102-4). When Fortunio suspects that such is "too strange to be true," Rynaldo is again proud of his work: "Tis in this head shall worke it" (1.2.109-10).

Third, they seem to participate in the game of deception primarily to show off their nimble wit. After telling Clinia about the second trick, Syrus muses:

That's my prize plan, the one that I'm really
proud of! [Drawing himself up] It reveals in me
such a power and force of ingenuity that I can
deceive the pair of them simply by telling the
truth!" (p.134)

After playing his initial trick upon Gostanzo, Rynaldo celebrates:

But this will proue an excellent ground to sowe
The seede of mirth amongst vs; Ile go seeke
Valerio and my brother, and tell them
Such newes of their affaires, as they'le admire.
(1.1.406-9)

The scholarly trickster, however, differs from the Terentian trickster in several ways. First, compared to Syrus, "a rather older man" than Clinia's servant (p.111), Rynaldo is considerably younger. Second, whereas Syrus' well-being is constantly threatened by his master, Rynaldo is free to perform his tricks with little concern about the

consequences. Third, Rynaldo's dramatic presence is much more dominant than Syrus': Rynaldo dominates the initial discussion of love and speaks most of the soliloquies within the play, whereas Syrus is absent in the beginning and the ending scenes and speaks no soliloquies.

Unlike Syrus, moreover, Rynaldo is far more than a typical trickster. As Walter E. Forehand notes, the character of Syrus is rather "unremarkable": throughout the play, he "maintains a straightforward adherence to the role of comic trickster and shows little variety or development" (63). Moreover, Syrus' ability to read other characters' minds is somewhat limited. When, for example, Chremes subtly hints that Syrus should come up with a subtle means to get money from Menedemus to Clinia, Syrus wonders "whether he's joking or in earnest" (p.125). When Chremes threatens to disown Clitipho, Syrus even regrets his actions: "Damn me for a mischief-maker" (p.149). Syrus' limited perception is understandable since, as Richard C. Beacham notes, it was "forbidden for Roman slaves to be depicted in plays as cleverer than their masters" (37). In contrast, the ever-confident Rynaldo is able to fathom the minds of other characters and thus functions as the satirical commentator of the play. For example, Rynaldo correctly points out that Gostanzo is an "old dissembling Knight" (1.1.401) and a "Macheuil, / A Miserable politician"

(2.1.201-2). After fooling Gostanzo for the second time, Rynaldo meditates:

Heauen, heauen, I see these Politicians
 (Out of blind Fortunes hands) are our most fooles.
 Tis she that gives the lustre to their wits,
 Still plodding at traditionall deuices:
 But take vm out of them to present actions,
 A man may grope and tickle vm like a Trowt.
 (3.1.114-19)

Whereas Syrus is absent in the last scene of the play and is simply forgiven by his master Chremes, Rynaldo stands tall among all characters until the end and even assumes the role of a justice, one who effects reconciliation. In the last scene, in which Gostanzo mutters that he would punish his deceitful son, Rynaldo intercedes, reminding Gostanzo of the earlier blessing he unwittingly gave to his son:

Nay Sir, lets not haue
 A new infliction, set on an old fault:
 Hee did confesse his fault vpon his knees,
 You pardned it, and swore twas from your hart.
 (5.2.135-8)

After Gostanzo, Antonio, Valerio, and Fortunio are all reconciled, Rynaldo further takes care of Valerio's victim from the subplot:

Scilence my Maisters, now heere all are pleas'd,

Onelie but *Cornelio*: who lackes but perswasion
 To reconcile himselfe to his faire wife.
 (5.2.156-8)

In fact, despite all his interest in gulling other characters, Rynaldo displays essential goodness. When *Cornelio* and *Dariotto* draw their swords, Rynaldo steps in to hold them (3.1.334). After *Valerio* causes *Cornelio* to file a divorce against his wife (2.1.422-9), Rynaldo berates *Valerio*: "thou shalt answer it, / For setting such debate twixt man and wife" (4.1.223-4). Even in carrying out his trickery, as Charlotte Spivack notes, Rynaldo acts with "philosophical, even scholarly, reflection, and never descends to any really dishonorable action" (71).

While the triple role given to Rynaldo--trickster, commentator, and justice--evinces that Chapman consciously amplified the Latin trickster's role, the characterization of Rynaldo is puzzling. In the opening scene, Rynaldo questions *Fortunio's* love affair:

But brother, are you not asham'd to make
 Your selfe a slaue to the base Lord of loue,
 Begot of Fancy, and of Beauty borne? (1.1.41-3)

He further denounces women:

In out-side wonderous heauenly, so are women;
 But when a stranger view'd those phanes within,
 In stead of Gods and Goddessess, he should finde

A painted fowle, a fury, or a serpent,
 And such celestiall inner parts haue women.
 (1.1.87-91)

His view of marriage is no less cynical: according to him, wives are "sluttish, [and] nasty, to their husbands," and they remain "All day in cesselesse vprere with their housholdes, / If all the night their husbands haue not pleas'd them" (1.1.73,75-6). Despite all these negative attitudes towards love and marriage, Rynaldo volunteers to become the goodwill schemer for the union of lovers and even encourages Valerio to "repaire, / To Gratiana daily, and enjoy her / In her true kinde" (4.1.218-20).

His view of Fortune, though not elaborately developed in the play, is puzzling as well. After the successful initial plot, he boasts to Valerio that he has control over Fortune: "my wit hath put / Blinde Fortunne in a string into your hand" (2.1.209-10). He, however, is "a follower of Fortune" (MacLure 92) in the last act: he acknowledges that "Fortune the great commandresse of the world / Hath diuers wayes to aduance her followers" and that his "fortune is to winne renowne by Gulling" (5.1.1-2,11).

That he has no plausible motive and that he himself is gulled toward the end make his character more elusive. Rynaldo is, as Frank Manley writes, a "natural outsider who has been disappointed in love and thus has no young man's

passion" to get involved in any love affair and who has "nothing to gain" by helping Fortunio and Valerio (xv). Moreover, when he is gulled by Cornelio toward the end of the play, one would be inclined to disqualify him as the hero of the play. Thomas Grant regards the incident as a penalty for Rynaldo's "double folly, incurable meddling and scholarly detachment" (97). From the same, Susan Blair Green detects Rynaldo's comic hubris of being "blinded by pride, overgone in 'wisdom,' and unable to see the applicability of all this to himself" (142). Green therefore turns to Valerio to find the central character: it is, according to Green, "through Valerio's activities and attitudes that Chapman sets the tone of his play" (107).

The gulling of Rynaldo by Cornelio, however, deserves careful reconsideration, particularly in light of the fact that the play was first entitled All Fooles but the Fool for production at the Rose in 1599. The play was revised for production at Blackfriars in 1603 with a new title, All Fools. Since the first version is lost, it is impossible to know exactly what has been changed in the revision. But Parrott's suggestion, which is accepted by most critics, is convincing:

the gulling of Rinaldo, which makes the title All Fools appropriate, was wanting in the older form, which might therefore well be called All Fooles

but the Fool, i.e. the knavish, intriguing Rinaldo, who corresponds to the Vice or Fool of earlier comedies. (701)

Why Chapman included the gulling of Rynaldo in his revision remains a mystery, but it is possible to see how the revised version is different from the source play in terms of Rynaldo's role. As stated earlier, Syrus in Heautontimoroumenos disappears in the last scene, and Clitipho becomes the instrument of reconciliation: to pacify his angry father, Clitipho promises to give up his relationship with his courtesan and instead marry someone in the neighborhood. Clitipho then asks his father to pardon Syrus since all the tricks were performed for Clitipho's sake (p.155). In All Fools, on the other hand, even after having been gulled by Cornelio, Rynaldo dominates the last scene "in the center of things sprucely setting about to effect the reconciliation" (Manley xvi). Valerio, Clitipho's counterpart in Chapman's play, merely delivers a speech on cuckoldry, on "the vse, the vertue, the honour, and the very royaltie of the Horne" (5.2.235-6).

In summary, the character of Rynaldo is distinctive in several ways. As the chief intriguer of the play, he participates in the play with no specific interest but mirth-making; reveals and comments on the follies of other characters; and leads the play to its festive culmination.

Despite his busy meddling, he himself remains an outsider, and his action contradicts his own view of love.

Freevill in Marston's The Dutch Courtesan

In Marston's early plays, two characters are distinctively scholarly. In Histrion-Mastix, Or The Player Whipped, Chrisoganus, after becoming a "servant unto" all the liberal arts (1.1.p.249), turns into a malcontented satirist when he finds out that the "idiot" world "Blasts forward wits with frosty cold contempt, / Crowning dull clodds of earth with honours" (4.1.p.281). Although earlier critics linked the play with the War of the Theaters, recent critics see it as an allegorical piece about commonwealth, with Chrisoganus playing the role of the "moral and intellectual mentor" (Finkelpearl 124) or "the key human figure" who presents "crucial choric commentary (Geckle 34). In the intrigue comedy What You Will, another satirist by the name of Lampatho, usually identified as a satiric rendering of either Ben Jonson or Marston himself (Scott 59), rails:

I was a scholler: seaven use-full springs
Did I defloure in quotations
Of crossd oppinions boutte the soule of man;
The more I learnt the more I learnt to doubt,

Knowledge and wit, faithes foes, turne fayth
about. (2.1.p.257)

He nonetheless turns out to be a "toady," to borrow Anthony Caputi's word (172), who does not even know how to express his affection to his new-found love, Meletzas. He is therefore mocked by the worldly experienced Quadratus: "Uds fut thou gull, thou inkie scholler, ha, thou whoreson fop, / Will not thou clappe into our fashion'd gallantry?" (4.1.p.281). No matter how much these two plays are related to the poet's argument with his contemporary playwrights, Marston's portrayal of the scholarly characters, one as a malcontent and the other as a naive social freshman, seems in keeping with the late Elizabethan public's view of the intellectual class.

A few years later in Marston's tragicomedy The Dutch Courtesan (1605)--frequently called his best play--another scholarly character, Freevill, appears with a totally different dramatic role: a well-meaning trickster who, while his own views of love are questionable, attempts to reform his puritanical friend, Malheureux. John Scott Colley is right in saying that this eighth play of Marston shows the playwright's change from his early "violent disgust with folly and his vehement attack on fools" to "a sophisticated satiric treatment that is constructed around action, not words, 'drama,' and not 'theater'" (163). In other words,

if the early satirist figures played their roles through their utterances, Freevill plays his satiric, and comic, role with words and actions.

The education of Freevill is both explicitly and implicitly indicated. As if to inform the audience, Cocledemoy says to Freevill when they meet in the street: "thou art a scholar and hast read Tully's *Offices*" (1.2.77). Freevill himself displays his learning by his frequent use of Latin and numerous paraphrases of passages from Montaigne's essays--George L. Geckle counts forty-five, most of which are spoken by Freevill (153). Moreover, as Philip J. Finkelpearl observes, Freevill "tends to deliver advice with the patient condescension of a scholar who has surveyed all the arguments on a subject" (203).

That Marston used scholarliness as a major element in delineating the character of Freevill is particularly interesting when one examines how the playwright handled his main source, Nicholas de Montreux's Le premier livre des bergeries de Julliette published in Paris in 1585. According to the first discoverer of the source, John J. O'Connor, Le premiere livre is a "somewhat long-winded pastoral romance," featuring Dellio as the hero, "a young Venetian nobleman who has proved his valor in fighting against the Turks" (509-10). Obviously, then, Marston saw

it fitting to change the hero from a brave soldier to a learned man for the Jacobean theater.

Marston made other changes as well. Though O'Connor makes nothing of the change discussed above, he lists the addition of a subplot centering on the roguery of Cocledemoy, addition of several characters, alteration of the tone from dark to light, and dramatic compression (512). Also, while the hero in the French work has a strong friendship with his male companion, their counterparts in Marston's play, Freevill and Malheureux, are far from being friends:

It would have been immediately obvious to a Jacobean audience that at the beginning of the action Freevill and Malheureux are friends in name only. According to a generally accepted Renaissance view friends are two bodies sharing a single soul, and they must therefore be spiritually alike. . . . But Freevill and Malheureux could scarcely be more unlike.
(O'Connor 513)

Another interesting difference between Montreulx's Dellio and Marston's Freevill is noted by M. L. Wine:

Intuition and God prompt Dellio to return from hiding to see whether his plan is working out; Freevill, like Shakespeare's Duke Vincentio in

Measure for Measure, remains on the scene all the time in disguise to manipulate the entire action.
(xv)

Indeed, even though the fake duel designed by Freevill is taken from the source, the "tactic of having Freevill disguise himself as a bravo (IV,ii) and secure a place in Franceschina's service (IV,iv) so that he can oversee everything and forestall moments of genuine distress is entirely Marston's invention" (Caputi 231). Freevill's test of Beatrice's fidelity in his disguise is another addition. In short, the noble character in the source romance is transformed into a scholarly trickster, a "virtuous Machiavel," who turns into "a god of policy" and "concocts an elaborate plot involving a trick within a trick" (Finkelpearl 217).

The ostensible reason for Freevill's disguise is to reform the puritanical Malheureux. After the fake duel and before the disguise, Freevill says in a monologue: "I'll force thee feel thy [Malheureux's] errors to the worst" (4.2.34). Toward the end of the play, Freevill reconfirms his purpose:

Therefore, to force you from the truer danger,
I wrought the feigned, suffering this fair devil
In shape of woman to make good her plot. (5.3.45-
47)

It would be a mistake, however, to take his words at face value. As O'Connor points out, up to the fourth act "Freevill has been preaching promiscuity as a way of life. The pretended quarrel and duel are his ideas, in order to enable Malheureux to enjoy Franceschina in 'cold blood'" (514). Freevill's sudden decision to teach a lesson, O'Connor writes,

seems to spring from sheer perverseness or the desire to exercise his wit--an interpretation fostered by the parallel action of the subplot, in which wit is Cocledemoy's sole incentive--and such a change of heart, coming as it does hard upon his former evangelical fervor, makes the ending of the play seem merely contrived. (515)

O'Connor's observation can be further validated. After finding out that Malheureux has been sexually aroused at seeing Franceschina, Freevill immediately exclaims: "By the Lord, he's caught! Laughter eternal!" (1.2.176) Giving his ring to Malheureux, Freevill is again proud of his scheme: "Show her this ring, enjoy her, and, blood cold, / We'll laugh at folly" (3.1.318-19). In fact, Freevill seems aware of his dubious motive, as reformer and trickster, as he sums up nicely in the last act: "Where pleasure hath some profit, art is sweet" (5.2.81). One should note in his statement

that his primary purpose of action is "pleasure," and his secondary "profit."

Freevill's other dramatic roles are readily discernible. First, like his prototype, Dellio, he fulfills the role of the romantic hero, one who captures and recaptures (by coming back alive) the heart of Beatrice. Second, as Anthony Caputi asserts, Freevill occasionally functions as a choral character: "Marston had replaced the earlier critic-spectator by a character firmly rooted in the action who could from time to time fill the choral function" (234). Third, as he is the only character who has the right thread of all plot complications, Freevill becomes in the last scene something of a justice figure who sets things right. After revealing his identity in the presence of all major characters, he condemns the courtesan: "O thou comely damnation, / Dost think that vice is not to be withstood? / O, what is woman merely made of blood!" (5.3.50-2). When other characters are at a loss about the situation, Freevill closes the scene: "All shall be lighted, but this time and place / Forbids longer speech" (5.3.54-5). Since the audience knows what has happened all along, Marston apparently saw no reason to have Freevill recapitulate the events: the stage is therefore given to Cocledemoy, Freevill's counterpart in the farcical subplot.

The various aspects of Freevill's character discussed thus far can be further illuminated by looking at Cocledemoy. A "debauched scholar" (Parrott & Ball 157), Cocledemoy is "something of a moralist" who, like Freevill, is acquainted with Tully's Offices (Wine xxii). And as Wine points out, in the subplot Cocledemoy is "as much the central intelligence, archly manipulating the fiendish intrigues that bring Mulligrub to his senses, as Freevill is in his" (xxi). After Freevill closes the main plot with his chastisement of Franceschina, Cocledemoy closes the subplot by urging his victim Mulligrub to confess and repent his sins (5.3.115-129). He also tells the audience:

honest Cocledemoy restores whatsoever he has got,
to make you know that whatsoe'er he has done has
been only *euphoniae gratia*--for wit's sake: I
acquit this vintner as he has acquitted me. All
has been done for emphasis of wit. (5.3.156-161)

Since the subplot is a farce, one would hardly bother to question Cocledemoy's method of reform or his dubious motive; it is, however, a different matter when the reformer-hero is inconsistent. Freevill's role as a reformer necessitates that he be a consistently good character with approvable moral standards; but Freevill's character is far from being acceptable. He has, as Caputi maintains, "too much respect for the vagaries of natural

impulse to be excessively severe either with himself or with the institution of courtezans" (228). In the first scene, Freevill, who is to be married in a few days, tells us that he is going to visit Franceschina: "I am now going the way of all flesh" (1.1.103). He then delivers a long speech, in prose and in verse, in defence of prostitutes:

They are no ingrateful persons; they will give
quid for *quo*. . . . Nay, since all things have
 been sold--honour, justice, faith, nay, even God
 himself--

Ay me, what base ignobleness is it
 To sell the pleasure of a wanton bed?"
 (1.1.146-56).

Cocledemoy seems to know Freevill's frequent trips to the courtesan: "Ha, my fine knave, art going to thy recreation?" (1.2.83).

Having such an immoral hero as the reformer figure is quite unsettling; some critics therefore suspect that Marston's own personal struggles are reflected in the play. Calling the play "filthy and lecherous," Morse S. Allen writes that the playwright

dallies too long with vice, and protests too much
 when he is punishing it. Indeed, he is like the
 figure he imagines somewhere, of the beadle who
 itches to possess the whore he is whipping. (142)

O'Connor has a similar view:

Marston's moral compass has no fixed foot. . . .
 Marston has allowed himself to become emotionally
 too involved in his play, and what is presumably
 meant to horrify merely titillates. . . . The
 moral solution of the play is, to be sure,
 dramatically unconvincing. (515)

Peter Davidson agrees that

The romantic view of Freevill as a man whose
 experience and maturity are such that he can
 indulge himself sexually without becoming a slave
 to passion is . . . unconvincing" (8).

Caputi's assessment of the play hinges on ambiguity: the
 play, according to him, shows Marston's attempt "to generate
 by dramatic means the blend of moral distress and moral
 reassurance, ironical levity and ironical earnestness"
 (228).

Freevill has his defenders. Wine explains:

A perfect hero in any absolute sense Freevill may
 not be, but this is because in terms of absolutes
 he cannot, or chooses not to, react; he sees all
 too clearly his own and man's limitations; and
 uneasy though he may be, he sees the need for
 compromise in human life. (xviii)

Finkelpearl also justifies Marston's treatment of his hero: Freevill's morality, according to Finkelpearl, is "shown to be preferable to Malheureux's inhuman rigidity" (198).

In their attempt to establish Freevill as the hero, a few critics even misread, probably unknowingly, some of the events in the play. Colley, who calls Freevill's "normal passion, reason, and restraint" as the "ideal in the world of The Dutch Courtesan," emphasizes that "Freevill does drop his bawd when he decides to marry" (161-62). Lawrence S. Friedman similarly notes that the play's "moral center is Freevill, who plans one last visit to Franceschina . . . before settling down to married life with the angelic Beatrice" (1270). As for Freevill's defense of prostitution in the first act, Reginald Ingram contends that it is only parodic and ironic (119).

A close reading shows that none of the above is correct. As quoted previously, merely a few days before his wedding, Freevill wants to "go the way of all flesh" for "recreation"; and indeed he asks Franceschina to give him a "buss," a kiss that is "more full-blooded than a kiss," according to the editors (p.310). When Franceschina asks him for "no long absence," Freevill assures her: "Believe me, not long" (1.2.156-57). After realizing Malheureux's lust for Franceschina, Freevill confirms his earlier defence of prostitution and even encourages Malheureux: "Go your

ways for an *apostata*! . . . / Of all the fools that would
all man out-thrust, / He that 'gainst nature would seem wise
is worst" (1.2.200-3).

Michael Scott accurately notes that Freevill is
"totally inconsistent" (45). First, as Scott points out,
"we cannot believe in the morality" of Freevill (45).
Immediately after the brothel scene in which the audience
sees Freevill kissing Franceschina and promising her to come
back before long, the audience watches the hero appearing in
the next scene to pledge his life-long love to Beatrice:

I am sworn all yours.

No beauty shall untwine our arms, no face

In my eyes can or shall seem fair;

. . . .

He that is wise pants on a private breast.

So could I live in desert most unknown,

Yourself to me enough were populous. (2.1.29-39)

Second, Freevill's insistence on acknowledging and balancing
natural human impulses is undermined by his own inhuman
treatment of Franceschina. She is used, in Scott's words,
"without reference to her possible humanity" (42). It is
admirable that he teaches Malheureux a lesson on humanity;
but his method of using a human being contradicts the very
precept he sets out to teach.

Marston's scholarly trickster-reformer, then, is similar to Chapman's Rynaldo in several respects. He is portrayed as having a superior intelligence; his trickery reveals the follies of other characters; he assumes towards the end the role of a justice figure; and his actions contradict his precept revealed in his speeches.

Macilente in Jonson's Every Man Out Of His Humour

Jonson's first major play, Every Man In His Humour, "owes much of its shape to Latin comedy, particularly to Plautus" (Summers and Peabworth 50). The character configuration resembles that of the Plautine formula, with sportful sons Ned Knowell and Wellbred, the witty servant Brainworm, *miles glorioso* Bobadill, and the play's *deus ex machina*, Justice Clement. Brainworm, in particular, is reminiscent of the Plautine witty slave, who "fashions the play around him to become simultaneously its author and hero," and who "fills this role by virtue of his wit and intelligence" (Beacham 37).

Interesting in this context is the fact that Jonson eliminated the witty servant in his next play, Every Man Out Of His Humour, the first of his "comicall satyres" and his first printed play. Instead, the trickster-servant's role is now transferred to the scholar-hero, Macilente. As C. H.

Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson point out in their introduction to the play, Macilente is the "counterpart" of Brainworm in Every Man In in that he "plots and controls the intrigue which disillusiones the whole motley group of humorists" (9:402). Although Macilente should be classified as a scholarly malcontent, the play does show how the frustration of the highly educated is closely related to the emergence of scholarly characters.

The play has attracted much critical attention because of Jonson's experimental use of the Induction and Chorus, the much-quoted definition of "humours" in the Induction, and the number of statements on the dramatist's theory of comedy. The character of Macilente has also triggered much interest among critics because he is a typical malcontent and satirist. When the play was revised for presentation before Queen Elizabeth, he explicitly stated that the queen "hath chac'd all black thoughts" from him "as the sunne doth darknesse from the world" (p.599).

This flattering address to the queen and a few other pieces of evidence in the text have led scholars to label Macilente as an "envy archetype" (Dutton 34); "the embodiment of a malignant spirit of detraction" (Miles 44); and "a mere railer" who has "every twisted impulse, every dark and unpleasant characteristic of the satirist" (Kernan

160); "the most disagreeable scoundrel" of all the characters in the play (Woodbridge 30).

This consensus of critical judgment on Macilente is justified for several reasons. Macilente is described in the playwright's description of the characters as having fallen into "*an enuious apoplexie*" ("Characters"); after the first act, Cordatus, a stage commentator, remarks that Macilente envies rich Sordido "not as he is a villaine, a wolfe i' the common-wealth, but as he is rich, and fortunate" (1.Grex.162-64); and Macilente speaks a number of passages, especially in the first two acts, in which he reveals his envy of just about everything he sees--Deliro's wife, Sordido's wealth, and Fungoso's satin suit. Moreover, Macilente poisons Puntarvolo's cherished dog because "'twere the only true iest in the world to poison him" (5.1.69-70).

For these reasons, critics further conclude that Macilente is no heroic champion but simply another target of Jonson's satire. Alvin Kernan, for example, writes: "for the greater part of the play Macilente is merely an observer of the action . . . who merely stands and rails at the world without attempting to move in it" (160-1). To Richard Dutton, Macilente is "distinctly more repulsive than any of those he rails against; his poisoning of Puntarvolo's dog, for example, is the least sympathetic action in the entire play" (37). Anne Barton agrees that Macilente's poisoning

of the dog is "mean and spiteful" and that "it is impossible . . . to applaud" such an action (72). Macilente appearing so repulsive throughout, most critics find his transformation in the *finale* "overwhelming" (Beaurline 105). Frank Kerins goes even further:

Macilente's facile transformation lacks any dramatic validity and, in effect, denies the play's emphasis on the obsessive nature of humour, . . . a theme first brought up in the Induction and developed throughout the entire play. (146)

Part of these critics' evidence needs to be qualified, if not dismissed. First of all, Macilente's flattering address to the royal patron is no strong indication of his abrupt conversion since such an address was frequently no more than perfunctory in Renaissance England. As Herford and the Simpsons point out,

From the time of the moral interludes to the beginning of the seventeenth century it was a usual practice for the actors at the end of the piece to pray for their patrons. . . . Sometimes this prayer formed a part of the epilogue.

(9:481-2)

Moreover, the first quarto version of 1600, without the address to the queen, represents the play "*AS IT WAS FIRST COMPOSED* by the AUTHOR" (title page).

Second, Macilente's poisoning of Puntarvolo's dog, an action that is singled out by critics as the most abominable of all his actions, does not have to be seen as cruel as it might appear to the modern reader. For all we know, dogskin was used to make gloves in that time period, as Shakespeare refers to such gloves in Two Noble Kinsmen (3.5.46) and Henry VI, Part Two (4.2.25). Animal rights were far from being part of social awareness; in fact, except among "some clergy, particularly Puritans," bear- and bull-baitings were popular amusements for Elizabethans and were patronized by the queen "throughout her reign" (Greaves 446). Richard Greaves reports that even among the Puritans who opposed bear- and bull-baitings, some deplored them mainly because of the potential danger to the spectators, the gambling and drinking that accompanied the baitings, and, when they fell on Sundays, sabbath violations (444-46). Knowing how Jonson portrayed Puritans in his drama, one may even doubt if Jonson, and his audience for that matter, shared the Puritan views on animal rights at all.

F. P. Wilson's report on the laws regarding dogs in Shakespeare's time also reveals how dogs were treated in Renaissance England, especially during the periods of plague. In 1564,

dogs found in the streets between 10 p.m. and 4 a.m. were ordered to be killed. . . . In 1583

loose dogs and dogs that howled and annoyed their neighbours were destroyed. In 1606 all dogs without exception were ordered to be sent out of the City or killed. (The Plague 38)

Wilson further reports that from 1563 the City of London appointed special officers, who were paid two to four pence for every dog they killed and buried, and that many parishes hired dog-killers of their own (39).

If Elizabethans wore gloves made of dogskin, enjoyed watching dogs biting bears and bears hurling dogs, and considered dogs public nuisance, how cruel would Macilente's killing of Puntarvolo's dog have seemed to the Renaissance audience? Moreover, the fact that Every Man Out was first acted only three years after the five-year-long plague epidemic of 1592-6 makes Macilente's dog-killing certainly less cruel, if cruel at all, than it would appear to the modern reader.

To understand the significance of the dog-killing, one would rather examine the dog's proud owner, Puntarvolo, in connection with Macilente's purpose of the action. Jonson describes Puntarvolo as a "*Vaine-glorious Knight . . . palpably affected to his owne praise*" ("Characters"). As the plot unfolds, we find him to be a financial speculator who plans to embark on a ludicrous commercial gamble: if he and his travel companions, his wife and his dog,

successfully travel to and back from Constantinople, he is to take five times his wager of five-thousand pounds; if unsuccessful, he is to lose all his wager. Carlo Buffone remarks: "for a dog that neuer trauail'd before, it's a huge iourney to Constantinople" (2.3.261-62). Macilente's intention in killing the dog, on the other hand, at first seems to show a mean spirit: "'twere the only true iest in the world to poison him" (5.1.69-70). Two scenes after the dog-poisoning, however, Macilente says in an aside, "well, by this time, I hope, sir PVNTARVOLO and his dog are both out of humour to trauaile" (5.3.76-8). Having lost his dog, Puntarvolo of course changes his plan, this time to take his sick cat instead of the dog. One would surmise, then, that Macilente's poisoning of the dog is not necessarily the clearest indication of Macilente's mean spirit but rather, as Macilente says, a "jest" that is meant to stop Puntarvolo's exploitation of the animal.

A close examination of the plot in the quarto version suggests that Macilente's malicious envy is only temporary and that from the end of the second act Macilente's envy gradually dissipates and becomes in the last act what I would call a well-meaning, sportful trickster-reformer. As quoted in the previous chapter, Macilente is a "*sufficient Scholler*," who suffers from frustration because his merit is not properly rewarded. As the play begins, he appears with

a book in hand, complaining that "Stoique" philosophy cannot satisfy his "lanke hungrie belly" (1.1.2 & 15), and that "Wealth in this age will scarcely looke on merit" (1.3.87). After listening to the absurd conversations among other characters and observing their ridiculous behaviors, however, he is able to perceive the insignificance of their ephemeral, outward happiness. Looking at Fungoso getting money to buy a satin suit, Macilente, unlike the bitter malcontent he has been so far, now laughs away his frustration:

What is his inside trow? ha, ha, ha, ha, ha.
 Good heauen, giue me patience, patience, patience.
 A number of these popenjays there are,
 Whom, if a man confere, and but examine
 Their inward merit, with such men as want;
 Lord, lord, what things they are! (2.5.43-8)

As he goes into the court, Macilente is no longer maliciously bitter but satiric: by playing along with the foolish characters, he delights in exposing their follies. For example, when Fastidious puffs his tobacco frequently during his conversation with Saviolina, Macilente remarks: "I ne're knew tabacco taken as a *parenthesis*" (3.9.69). Macilente's change of attitude is in fact recognized by the stage commentator Mitis, who says to Cordatus, "This MACILENTE, signior, begins to bee more sociable on a

suddaine, mee thinkes, then hee was before" (4.8.Grex.149-50). Carlo Buffone properly calls Macilente "pure, honest, good deuill" (4.4.116).

Moreover, contrary to Kernan's belief that Macilente remains a "mere railer and observer," he leads the action in the last act of the play. Besides killing Puntarvolo's dog presumably to stop the ludicrous gamble, Macilente masterminds a number of intrigues that help cure the "humours" of other characters. By teaching Sogliardo how to speak and behave in court and taking him to Saviolina, a court-lady and an admirer of her own wit, Macilente finally reveals the shallowness of Saviolina. By making Puntarvolo believe Shift to be the killer of the dog and thus challenge him, Macilente helps reveal the cowardice of the braggart Shift, who is driven to kneel and confess:

I, (as I hope to be forgiven, sir) I ne're rob'd
any man, I neuer stood by the high-way-side, sir,
but only said so, because I would get my selfe a
name, and be counted a tall man. (5.3.64-67)

Also by inciting a fight between violent Puntarvolo and foul-mouthed Carlo, Macilente causes Carlo's mouth to be sealed up by Puntarvolo, who in turn is taken to prison by a constable (5.6). By making pennyless but good-apparelled Fungoso a "pawne for the reckoning" at the tavern (5.7.29), Macilente causes Fungoso to be arrested and to declare

afterwards that he has "done imitating any more gallants either in purse or apparell" (5.7.29). As if he performed the trickery out of a goodwill to reform Fungoso, Macilente advises him to keep his distance from his previous "humours" and not to be "made a shot-clog any more" (5.9.46-7).

Macilente's intention in doing all the above is not very clear. On the one hand, judging from what he says at the beginning of the play, he seems to be motivated by jealousy, as most critics observe, to destroy whoever looks more fortunate than he is. From his comments made after the tricks and from the results of the tricks, on the other hand, he seems to mean well, to punish and reform the foolish characters and to translate them out of their humour.

One main thread of the plot, however, shows Macilente's progressive movement from bitter resentment to good intentions. When we first see Deliro and Macilente together, the latter calls the former a "foole" and envies his wealth (2.4.8-15). When he sees Deliro's wife, Macilente mutters: "What mou'd the heauens, that they could not make / Me such a woman?" (2.4.159-60) After Deliro's wife, Fallace, turns out to be vain and unfaithful to her husband, Macilente tries twice in vain to persuade Deliro not to trust her (4.2 & 4.4). The last four scenes of the play are devoted to Macilente's major trickery to reform

Deliro out of his dotage on his wife, to punish Fallace for her abuse of her husband, and to lock up Fastitidious in prison for his outrageous lies and financial exploitation of gulls. Macilente tells Deliro to please his wife by bailing out her brother and thereby to "make her dote, and grow madde of" his affections (5.8.19-20); tells Fallace to bail out Fastidious while Macilente himself would be "protracting" Deliro's return (5.8.69); and finally takes Deliro to see for himself the dishonesty of his wife and consequently to sue Fastidious for not paying the debt, a lawsuit he deferred so as not to displease his wife. The way Macilente goes about performing this orchestrated trickery is reminiscent of Brainworm: both of them use lies to move the plot.

Several interesting aspects emerge in the character of Macilente. First, he, a scholarly character, is chosen by the playwright, to become the agent of reform and proper punishment. Second, he uses tricks, mostly verbal, to bring about the culmination of the plot, his tricks being played upon the "humour" of the tricked. Also discernible is his gamester-motive in carrying out his schemes; for example, Macilente initiates his prank in the court so as to make Fastidious and Puntarvolo "both applaud, and admire" him for it (4.8.67). Third, his comments on the behavior of other characters, ironic or straightforward, reinforce the

satirical intent of the playwright. Fourth, even though he actively participates in the play's event, he remains intellectually aloof throughout: he speaks his mind mostly in monologues and asides. Finally, he displays no coherent set of values. Unlike the Macilente who could not be content when his "lanke hungrie belly barks for foode," the Macilente at the end is "at peace" though he is still presumably hungry; and he begins "to pitty" those whom he ridiculed, punished and reformed (1.1.15 & 5.11.54,62). In a sense, he exhibits an ambivalent ideological tenet: though motivated by a pragmatic concern over "hungry belly," his actions display moral imperatives of doing good to others, in his own sense.

Truewit in Jonson's Epicoene, or The Silent Woman

Dauphine and Clerimont as a pair belong to the prodigal son comedy tradition--a young impoverished heir and his confidant who set out to take wealth away from an avaricious elderly relative. In contrast, Truewit, "the best character of a gentleman which Jonson ever made" (Dryden 142), occupies a peculiar position in the play because of his gamesterly motive in carrying out his tricks and his seemingly ambivalent value structure. The fact that he is

portrayed as a scholar makes his dramatic role all the more interesting.

That Truewit represents the educated class is clear within the play. As most critics agree, many of Truewit's speeches are paraphrased from Ovid and Juvenal. In the great comic scene in which Otter and Cutbeard--one disguised as a divine and the other as a canon lawyer--debate in shabby Latin the validity of Morose's grounds for divorce, it is Truewit who feeds the captain and the barber with correct Latin words (5.3). Dryden seems correct in saying that

Truewit was a scholar-like kind of man, a gentleman with an allay of pedantry, a man who seems mortified to the world, by much reading. The best of his discourse is drawn, not from the knowledge of the town, but books; and, in short, he would be a fine gentleman in an university.
(174)

Concerning the education of Truewit, Douglas Duncan makes an interesting point. Of the seven major characters briefly described in the "Persons of the play," Truewit alone is given "no badge of social status" (178): whereas all others are either gentlemen or knights, he is simply "another friend" of Dauphine. Duncan further points out the significance of Truewit's name as compared to others'.

Whereas "Dauphine Eugenie" suggests noble heir and "Clerimont" a courtly lover, "Truewit" represents "the perfection of a quality of mind" and is an anglicized version of the "tradition of humanist dialogue and dramas" (178). From this and the role of Truewit within the play, Duncan infers that

the character for Jonson had an intellectual rather than a social orientation: he was conceived to represent a type of mind rather than a class of gentleman. It is in fact true that he exists on a slightly different plane of reality from the other characters in the play. Though intimately familiar with their world, he himself has no defined place in it; he alone has no 'off-stage' life referred to. (178)

Indeed Truewit occupies an odd position in the play; nevertheless, contrary to Duncan's belief, Truewit's "off-stage" life is hinted at in the first scene of the play, as being typical of the university graduates in late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England who found no employment worthy of their education. As he confronts Clerimont in the first scene of the play about the latter's lifestyle--"between his ingle home, high fare, soft lodging, fine clothes, and his fiddle" as if "the hours ha' no wings"

(31-33)--Truewit calls such a lifestyle "our common disease" (69, *italics mine*). He rebukes Clerimont further:

with what justice can we complain, that great men
will not look upon us, nor be at leisure to give
our affairs such dispatch as we expect, when we
will never do it to ourselves?" (1.1.69-73)

Clerimont simply discards Truewit's moral lesson:

Foh! thou has read Plutarch's *Morals*, now, or
some such tedious fellow; and it shows so vilely
with thee. . . . leave this Stoicity alone, till
thou mak'st sermons. (1.1.75-81)

Furthermore, unlike his two friends, Truewit seems to live remotely from the court. When Clerimont, who "came but from court yesterday," says that he has not heard of the news of the ladies who call themselves "the Collegiates," Truewit asks: "Why, is it not arriv'd there yet, the news?" (1.1.88-92)

After this slight hint at Truewit's background is given, Truewit goes out to perform a number of tricks. Blowing a trumpet and "feigning to be a post" from the court, he visits Morose to punish the noise-hater by "thund'ring into him the incommodities of a wife, and the miseries of marriage" (2.4.13-18); by lying to Jack Daw and Amorous La Foole about each other's animosity, he forces them to reveal their cowardice (4.5); and by dressing up

Barber Cutbeard and Captain Otter as a divine and a lawyer and by having them declare Morose's grounds for divorce invalid, Truewit further torments Morose. As Dauphine says, Truewit is a man of "many plots" (4.5.25). George E. Rowe goes as far as saying that "Much of the comedy might even be described as a chronicle of Truewit's endeavors to demonstrate the accuracy of his name" by playing tricks (116).

His performance as an intriguer has received various responses from critics. For Joseph A. Bryant, Jr., Truewit is a "fatuous meddler" who has "neither displayed true wit nor committed any offense that is forgivable" (103, 109); for Barton, "the master-wit of Epicoene, the equivalent of Brainworm in Everyman In His Humour" (123); and for William E. Slights, "the most likeable of all Jacobean trickster-heroes" (89).

This divergence of critical evaluations appears to have its roots in two major errors that Truewit makes in performing his trickery. His attempts to stop Morose's marriage by "thund'ring into him the incommodities of a wife, and the miseries of marriage" (2.4.13-18) produces reverse effects on Morose, who decides to expedite the marriage. Moreover, Truewit, for all his intelligence, seems incapable of discerning Epicoene's real gender until it is revealed by Dauphine and Clerimont.

In a recent essay, Philip Mirabelli offers an interesting reading to prove otherwise. To summarize briefly, Truweit's anti-matrimonial lecture to Morose contains "the standard tricks of vituperative rhetoric" to produce the effect of "reverse psychology" (317), which would validate Truweit's statement that he "knew it would be thus" (2.4.82). When Dauphine does not believe him, Truweit again insists: "I saw it must necessarily in nature fall out so: my genius is never false to me in these things. Show me how it could be otherwise" (2.4.90-93). Mirabelli also argues that, judging from Dauphine's suspicious behavior and Truweit's "incredulous behavior" in his conversation with Dauphine, Truweit must have known Epicoene's real gender all along (315). Mirabelli's reading, if accepted, would establish Truweit as the major trickster-hero of the play, the chief instrument of forwarding the plot.

A master-intriguer he may be, Truweit remains an elusive figure. Jonson in his Timber, or Discoveries writes: "Language most shewes a man: speake that I may see thee" (625). Truweit does speak plenty of lines in the play; however, readers are hardly able to "see" him. Jonas A. Barish, in his Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy, speaks for the majority of readers when he notes that "Truweit speaks through so many masks that one is not

sure when, if ever, he is speaking in *propria persona*" (157).

Truewit indeed contradicts himself in a number of occasions. For example, after chastising Clerimont's waste of time "between his mistress abroad and his ingle at home," Truewit recommends that a man should do "nothing; or that which, when 'tis done, is as idle" (1.1.31-42). To Dauphine, on the other hand, he says that men should love "all women; some one for the face . . . ; someone for the skin; a third for the voice" (4.1.173-77). Sometimes, it is hard to tell what he advocates: after condemning his own society in which finding "a chaste wench" is impossible, Truewit goes on to recall "King Etheldred's time," in which one may find a "dull frosty wench" (2.2.42-50). Barish convincingly asserts:

The two ways of responding to the kind of reality projected by Jonson--the satirist's impulse to reject it with a cry of outrage, and the "realist's" impulse to embrace it or at least accept it with a cynical shrug--reach a kind of uneasy suspension in Truewit. (Ben Jonson 148)

Barish goes on to call Truewit a "kind of surrealist" whose "imagination discloses so many planes of possibility to him at once that he can scarcely choose between them" (Ben Jonson 156).

Truewit's motives of his actions are as incongruous as his discourse. In the first act, hearing from his friend Dauphine that his uncle Morose plans to disinherit him, Truewit pledges to be "the author of more to vex" Morose to revenge for his friend (1.2.15-16). As Dauphine, Clerimont, and Truewit plan to have a feast in Morose's house, Truewit wants to make the whole event "a jest to posterity," a day's "mirth," and he will "undertake the directing of all the lady-guests there" (2.6.32-43). He promises to make all the ladies love Dauphine "afore tonight" by playing a mountebank or a bawd for a drink (4.1.180-86). After exposing Jack Daw's and Amorous La Foole's cowardice by his own design, Truewit is happy that their language will now be "tamer" (4.5.427). At the end of the play, he becomes a judge of social ethics as well: he chastises Jack Daw and La Foole for their boasting habits. One would conclude, with Barish, that Truewit is "too many things at once" ("Ovid" 218): the trickster-hero is a moralist, a fashionable gallant, and a realist all at the same time.

Truewit's role as the expositor of other characters' follies, on the other hand, is undoubtedly clear. Like Macilente, he is, as Mirabelli maintains, the "spokesman for the author in the philosophical colloquies, commentator on the other characters, [and] covert expositor of the action" (330). When Clerimont says that Jack Daw is "a very good

scholar," Truewit corrects him by calling Daw "a fellow that pretends only to learning, buys title, and nothing else of books in him" (1.2.92-96). After bantering with the collegiate ladies and thereby exposing their superficial intelligence, Truewit comments: "all their actions are governed by crude opinion, without reason or cause; they know not why they do anything" (4.4.76-79).

Another interesting aspect of his character is his aloofness. Not only does he exist above the fools and gulls, but also he is isolated from his friends Clerimont and Dauphine. As previously discussed, of all three gallant-characters, Truewit alone seems to have no connection to the court, and his motives are quite different from his money-hunting friends. Even his use of pronouns shows that he is not really a part of their company: he tells Dauphine, "These be the things wherein your fashionable men exercise themselves, and I for company" (1.1.49-50). Moreover, his friends seem to have no intimate knowledge of Truewit's character: after Truewit leaves, Clerimont calls Truewit "a very honest fellow," and Dauphine agrees that the "frank nature of his is not for secrets" (1.3.4-6). Of course, they decide to leave out Truewit from their acquisitive scheme.

In summary, then, Truewit resembles Macilente in a number of ways. First, they are scholarly tricksters who

move the plot towards its culmination, they themselves gaining nothing materialistic out of their trickery. Second, their tricks not only expose follies but also lead to the proper punishment of them. Third, their comments on other characters reinforce the satirical themes of the plays. Fourth, despite their active participation in the plays' events, they are fundamentally alienated. And finally, they both exhibit an ambivalent attitude towards life, blending realistic values and moral imperatives almost indistinguishably.

Quarlous in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair

In 1947, Herford and Simpson asserted that the play has "no hero, no dominant character" (2:137); in 1963, Maurice Hussey agreed that Quarlous and Winwife offer "nothing of value to the play and easily reducible to the level of stage mechanisms" (xv). As critics gradually discovered the structural principles and the character configuration within this seemingly bewildering play, however, Quarlous' crucial role has been recognized. Bryant, for example, observes that Quarlous occupies "the central position in the action" (144); Judith Gardiner also sees him as the hero, through whom "the audience can enjoy Oedipal fantasies of rebelling against the 'stepfathers' and of gaining sexual access to

the 'mother'" (130). It is almost fitting that Knockem calls him "Duke Quarlous" and "Prince Quarlous."

That Quarlous is the most intelligent character in this 1614 play is recognized by most critics; the text, in fact, is more specific on that matter. Quarlous himself says that he "was in Oxford" (1.1.228); and when he learns of Grace's predicament, he wishes that he "had studied a year longer in the Inns of Court" so as to be her lawyer (3.1.702). There is little indication, on the other hand, that Winwife is as well-educated as Quarlous. As if his education gave him the power of perception, Quarlous is able to tell us from the beginning that Zeal-of-the-Land Busy is a "notable hypocritical vermin" (1.1.254). When the scene moves to the fairground, he describes the characters there, thus guiding the audience's response and at the same time provoking laughter. Leatherhead is a "Orpheus among the beasts, with his fiddles and all"; and Trash is a "Ceres selling her daughter's picture, in gingerwork" (2.1.338-42).

Why Quarlous and his gallant-friend Winwife participate in the play's events in Smithfield is also explicit. As soon as they learn that Littlewit, Cokes, and Wasp are headed towards Bartholomew Fair, Quarlous and Winwife decide to follow them because "These flies cannot, this hot season, but engender us excellent creeping sport" (1.1.524-26). Most of the critics who acknowledge Quarlous as the hero

also count Winwife as an equally important intriguer; however, Winwife, a widow-hunter in the beginning, does not appear to be a major intriguer since he mostly stands next to Quarlous when the latter initiates a trick.

While Quarlous' educational background, perspicacity, and initial motive in participating in the play's event are all clear, the rest of his character and his dramatic role are largely a puzzle. Commenting on Quarlous' acquiescence to the mad world without attempting to shape it, George Rowe writes:

Whether such acquiescence is a sign of wisdom or cynicism or both is one of the most difficult questions raised by this wonderful yet puzzling play--a question that I am not, at this point, ready to answer. (141)

For Carol Anne Ostrowski, Quarlous neither "wins our whole-hearted support or disdain" (139).

Such a difficulty in the analysis of Quarlous' character, and in turn the play itself, is also evidenced by the diverse responses from critics. Jackson I. Cope identifies Quarlous as Satan "fast emerging as the natural challenger to the omnipotence of the bungling justice, Adam Overdo" (147); Barry Targan regards him as representative of "opportunism" (281); and C. G. Thayer calls him "the least moral person in the play" because he "cheated Grace and Dame

Purecraft both, and both for money" (156). Robert E. Knoll finds him to be a "rational" character, who takes advantage of circumstances "without injury to innocent bystanders" as well as a guide of our judgment, like a chorus (150, 161). For Bryant, Quarlous "moves during the course of the play from the vulnerable position of righteous indignation to one of charity" (145). For Ostrowski, Quarlous, a gentleman at the beginning, becomes a "new rogue of the Jacobean period" after learning that dishonesty thrives in his world "where roguery spells money and money spells success" (153).

Cope's analysis, however detailed, is not convincing. Justice Overdo, a God-figure in Cope's analysis, buys Grace from the king and wants to sell her to Cokes, while Quarlous, Satanic figure in Cope's essay, comes out as the winner in the last scene of the play, chastising Overdo for standing "fixed here, like a stake in Finsbury, to be shot at, or the whipping-post i' the Fair" (718-19). Overdo, of course, gladly admits that Quarlous, the "pleasant conceited gentleman," has "prevailed" (730). Overdo's role in the play, as his name suggests and as most critics agree, is rather a parody of the popular duke-in-disguise plot, as used in Shakespeare's Measure for Measure and Middleton's The Phoenix.

Ostrowski's argument rests primarily on the fact that Quarlous, who delivers at the opening of the play a witty

diatribe against Winwife's widow-hunting, later makes "a calculated decision to marry Dame Purecraft himself" (112). In the first act of the play, Quarlous tells Winwife to leave "widow-hunting at once" in order not to "waste the brand of life for to be still raking himself a fortune in an old woman's embers" (1.1.183, 188-89). Two acts later, however, he urges Winwife: "Now were a fine time for thee, Winwife, to lay aboard thy widow, thou'lt never be master of a better season or place" (3.1.179-81). In the last act, he decides to marry the widow himself: "It is money that I want, why should not I marry the money when 'tis offered me?" (5.2.80-81).

Ostrowski, however, overlooks two important points. First, when Quarlous delivers his speech against widow-hunting, he is not taking a moralist's but a cold, calculating pragmatist's position. After listing all the drawbacks of marrying an old widow, Quarlous explains why he is dissuading Winwife:

And all this for the hope of two apostle-spoons,
to suffer and a cup to eat a caudle in! For that
will be thy legacy. She'll ha' conveyed her state
safe enough from thee, an she be a right widow.
(1.1.219-222)

Only after Dame Purecraft tells him about her wealth, Quarlous decides to marry her, thus indicating that he is

willing to endure all the drawbacks of marrying the old widow so long as she has money. Second, as Bryant points out, with both Justice Overdo's blank warrant and Coke's marriage license at his disposal, Quarlous is in a position to have "money and a young pretty wife as well," but he gracefully chooses not to use his power and thus contributes to the restoration of order and harmony (153).

Each of the arguments of other critics--Targan, Thayer, Knoll, and Bryant--makes a falsely homogeneous reading of Quarlous by forcing him to fit onto a neat label; their points, however, can be combined to show that Quarlous is all at the same time rational and opportunistic, dishonest and charitable, pragmatic and moral. Having observed how Macilente and Truewit are portrayed--as being possessed of ambivalent character traits--one should not be surprised to find in Quarlous no coherent value structure.

First of all, tricksterly Quarlous uses dishonest verbal, legal, and physical means for mirth as well as for gain. After asking Edgeworth, the cutpurse, to steal from Waspe the black box that contains Coke's marriage license, Quarlous tells us:

I would fain see the careful fool deluded! Of all beasts, I love the serious ass: he that takes pains to be one, and plays the fool with the greatest diligence that can be. (3.1.687-90)

After Edgeworth brings the box and the license within, Quarlous again tells us that "it was for sport" (4.4.15). As John Gordon Sweeney writes, Quarlous is in the fair to "entertain himself at the expense of others, watching and helping them make fools of themselves" (174).

When he in the disguise of the madman Troubleall tricks Justice Overdo into issuing a warrant, Quarlous turns into an opportunist, as Targan says, who takes advantage of the situation for monetary gain. Upon finding out that Edgeworth is a thief, he turns the discovery into his own gain rather than reporting to the authorities. After Purecraft signs as witness to the warrant, Quarlous says in an aside: "Why should not I have the conscience to make this a bond of a thousand pound now, or what I would else?" (5.2.120-21). Of course he successfully carries out his plan by having Grace pay him "value" (5.3.709).

His practical, market wisdom is also discernable. As he realizes that Grace is destined for Winwife, and as Dame Purecraft offers him her hand in marriage, Quarlous declares: "There's no playing with man's fortune" (5.2.82-3). Bryant calls the fair a "middle-class world of business," where the compelling motive is "getting as much as possible for as little as possible" (140). Quarlous, a fellow "too fine to carry money," in Edgeworth's words (2.1.501), ends up getting the largest amount of money. He

is by no means a medieval hero who gets the lovely woman; rather, he is a hero in his capitalistic world who comes out with great fortune.

Quarlous even appears as a hypocrite. After denouncing Puritans as "the only privileged church-robbers of Christiandom," and even after Dame Purecraft confesses that she is "by office an assisting sister of the deacons, and a devourer, instead of distributor of alms," Quarlous decides to marry her because she not only is a rich widow but also has a "good trade" (5.2.44-5, 54-5, & 76).

Despite all his dishonest trickery and opportunistic disposition, Quarlous remains a rational man throughout, one that guides our judgment, a commentator. He describes each character cynically and yet accurately, as shown previously. Grace Wellborn describes him as a reasonable creature who has "understanding, and discourse" (4.2.36-7); and Quarlous himself claims near the end of the play that he is "mad but from the gown outward" (5.3.688-9).

In the final scene of the play, in the presence of all other characters, Quarlous even assumes temporarily the role of authority, a role that was given to Justice Clement in Every Man In. After untangling the plot complications that have been developed up to that point, he congratulates Winwife for winning Grace as wife, thanks Troubleall for helping him win a wife, and thanks Waspe for the license.

More important, he tells Justice: "remember you are but Adam, flesh and blood! You have your frailty, forget your other name of Overdo, and invite us all to supper" (720-22).

Despite all his active participation in the play, Quarlous, like Macilente and Truewit, remains aloof. Whereas other denizens of the fair--Purecraft, Littlewit, Win, Cokes, Overdo, Grace, and Win--are related to one another either by blood or marriage, and Zeal-of-the-Land Busy and Winwife are suitors to the two marriageable women, Quarlous alone participates in the fair merely to enjoy the "creeping sport." As Sweeney writes, Quarlous seems to "stand outside the fair, to consider it a play to be observed and not enacted" (183). Even his friendship with Winwife is, as Barton observes, "a matter of convenience, not in any sense a bond of the heart" (213).

Quarlous' aloofness is accompanied by his sense of superiority as well. His initial contempt of other characters, the "flies," persists even in Act IV: when Edgeworth invites Quarlous into Ursula's tent and offers to give him a gift, Quarlous rejects: "Keep it for your companions in beastliness. I am none of 'em, sir" (4.4.7).

Bryant is accurate in saying that the character of Quarlous is "ambiguous, and endowed with credibly human imbalances and contradictions" (144); like Macilente and Truewit, he defies a homogeneous definition. The scholarly

hero is simultaneously the major intriguer, a madcap satiric commentator, a market-wise opportunist, and, at the end of the play, a voice of authority that closes the play. In other words, Quarlous, like Truewit, is a man of the moment. Barish's close analysis of Quarlous' speech pattern, which will be treated in detail in Chapter V, adds significantly to the evidence previously given:

Quarlous' rapid-fire style carries to one extreme the power of baroque rhetoric to suggest incipient rather than finished thought, the ideas seeming to leap and tumble at random from the tongue, scarcely half formed in the brain beforehand. (Ben Jonson 193)

Compasse in Jonson's The Magnetic Lady

Compasse in The Magnetic Lady, Jonson's last completed play, is the only character in all of Jonson's plays who is described as a scholar in the "Dramatis Personae." The guests of the house are divided by their professions: "The Courtiers, and the Souldiers, and the Schollers / The Travellers, Physicians, and Divines" (1.4.3-4). If one is to infer from this list, a scholar would mean a profession or a class. In the Renaissance period, of course, a scholar may mean a man of letters; Compasse, however, is not a

literary man. True, he recites a couple of epigrams; but he says that he is merely quoting "Ben: Jonson" (1.2.34). Rather, he is a mathematics scholar who, as he tells us, has been employed by some of the "greatest States-men o' the Kingdome / These many yeares" (1.1.21-2). He has also been to commercial travels with John Loadstone, Lady Loadstone's deceased husband. The best guess one can make from these facts is that he is called a scholar, so that his erudition can be underlined and compared with other characters.

The play presents familiar characters--the greedy guardian, Sir Moath Interest, the cowardly courtier, Sir Diaphanous Silkworm, and the unscrupulous lawyer, Mr. Practise; and it also presents a familiar plot that draws foolish fortune-hunters and reveals their follies, as in Volpone and The Alchemist. To a dinner at Lady Loadstone's house, Compasse invites, among others, characters who are interested in Placentia, Loadstone's supposed niece who is to inherit a large amount of money that her deceased parents left for her. In the middle of the play, Compasse overhears the nurse confessing that she changed her own child, Pleasance, with her master's child, Placentia, so as to let her own child inherit the money. Compasse then successfully orchestrates a scheme to marry the real heiress.

Compasse's role as the play's central figure has been recognized by critics. Ronald E. McFarland, for example,

describes him as a "controlling or directive figure in the comedy" (291); Freda L. Townsend agrees that Compasse is "the real shuttle character" (89).

Moreover, the scholarly Compasse appears as the most intelligent character in the play, one who reveals the follies of other characters and thus guides our responses. When Bias says that

the Arts,
And Sciences doe not directlier make
A Graduate in our Vniversities;
Then an habituall gravitie prefers
A man in Court, (1.7.59-63)

Compasse replies: "Which by the truer stile, / Some call a formall, flat servility" (1.7.64-65). When Diaphanous Silkworm is wounded by the attack of Ironside, Compasse comments:

your Clothes are wounded desperately,
And that (I thinke) troubles a Courtier more,
An exact Courtier, then a gash in his flesh.
(3.4.11-3)

Compasse's role as the manipulator and commentator of the other characters, of course, may be likened to that of the playwright. Probee, one of the on-stage spectators, remarks:

If I see a thing vively presented on the *Stage*,
 that the Glasse of custome (which is *Comedy*) is so
 held up to me, by the Poet, as I can therein view
 the daily examples of mens lives, and images of
 Truth, in their manners, so drawne for my delight,
 or profit, as I may (either way) use them.

(2.7.Chorus)

The metaphor of glass finds an echo in Compasse's words to Ironside, his adopted brother, after the latter disrupts the dinner by violence: Compasse chastises Ironside by saying, "You should have us'd the Glasse / Rather as ballance, then the sword of Justice" (3.2.10-11).

These glimpses of Jonson's self-presentation, or self-indulgence, have led critics to see Compasse as the playwright's "surrogate" (Riggs 332), and the play, like Shakespeare's *Tempest*, as "a dramatic portrayal of his [Jonson's] *ars poetica*" (Champion 104). David Riggs' and Larry Champion's points are valid to an extent: besides the above hints, the name Compasse recalls the playwright's personal device, a broken compass, and the marriage between Compasse and Placentia may signify the union of the poet-entertainer and pleasure.

The allegorical reading of the play, however, is not entirely fitting. First, the Compasse in the play represents more a navigational than a drawing device; as

Palate says, Compasse is "the perfect instrument" that the Lady Loadstone "should saile by" (1.3.14-5). Sometimes he is a "needle drawn to a magnet" as well (Summers and Pebworth 108). Second, while it is correct that the true Placentia stands for pleasure and profit, she is taken by a wrong person. As the three pseudo-spectators in the play agree, the chief aim of the poet is to "please" the spectators (Induction 42); in the play, however, it is not the spectators but the poet-entertainer himself who takes both pleasure and profit. Third, unlike Jonson, who spent his life as a bricklayer, a soldier, a tutor and a poet, the Compasse in the play is described as a "dainty Scholler in the Mathematicks," who "went to Sea" with Lady Loadstone's husband and helped him bring "home the rich prizes" (2.4.11-12).

Once we look at the play not as an allegory of the playwright's dramaturgy but as a realistic satire of the humours represented within, the similarities between Compasse and Quarlous in Bartholomew Fair can be discerned. Like Quarlous, Compasse is intelligent enough to become the major commentator of other characters' follies; he is the major intriguer whose machinations help bring the plot to its proper culmination; and his mirth-seeking motive at the beginning turns into a worldly, practical pursuit as the

plot develops, though he remains a rational moral guide throughout the play.

That Compasse is the major intriguer is clear from the beginning. Like a typical intriguer, he announces in the opening scene:

. . . if I can but hold them all together,
And draw 'hem to a sufferance of themselves,
But till the Dissolution of the Dinner,
I shall have just occasion to beleeve
My wit is magisteriall; and our selves

Take infinite delight, i' the successe. (1.1.9-14)

To fulfill his tricksterly motive, Compasse invites violent Ironside to the dinner at Lady Loadstone's house, so as to perplex the suitors; by praising the status of Silkworm as a courtier, Compasse manipulates him to challenge Ironside and thereby reveals the cowardice of the courtier; while making the lawyer Practise, a suitor to Pleasance (the real Placentia), wait near a church for a wedding with her, Compasse himself takes her as his wife.

His motive in running all these tricks changes, like that of Quarlous, from mirth-seeking to material gain. At the beginning he claims that he is "for the sport: / For nothing else" (1.1.52-3). As he learns by eavesdropping that Pleasance is in fact Placentia, the real heiress, he tells himself that the secret is "worth the discovery"

(4.4.31); and he loses no time to ask the real Placentia to be his wife. Oddly enough, before this marriage proposal, we hear only once, and very briefly, that he liked and loved her before (4.2.52-53). After the marriage, Compasse threatens Interest with a lawsuit, so as to eke out five hundred thousand pounds from the greedy guardian of Placentia.

Another interesting aspect of Compasse is his dual perspective on human values: sometimes he is a stern moralist, and sometimes a opportunistic materialist. He criticizes Rut for being a "slave of money" (1.2.42); berates Practice for speaking only for "his fee/ Against his Father, and Mother, and all his kindred" (2.5.55-6); and chastizes Interest for being a "true corroding Vermine" (4.8.28). Yet he is the one who decides to marry Placentia only after he realizes the amount of her dowry; and he is the one who takes money from Interest by frightening him with a lawsuit.

His views of marriage and religion are also ambivalent. After marrying Placentia, Compasse makes amends to Practise, Placentia's suitor, by saying: "What should you doe / With such a toy as a wife, that might distract you, or hinder you i' your Course?" (5.3.7-9). After chastising Silkworm for "seeking to deface, / The divine Image in a man" (3.6.187-8), he asks Parson Palate to "run the words of Matrimony"

over his couple (4.6.29). When Parson Palate refuses to marry Compasse and Placentia because marriage in any afternoon is "Directly against the Canon of the Church," Compasse first promises to lie to other people about the time of marriage and then threatens to lock the parson in the house "'till 't be done elsewhere, / And under the feare of Ironside" (4.6.34, 46-7). Compasse's utterances are geared to suit his needs of the moment than to express his deep-felt convictions.

Despite all his trickery and materialistic pursuits, Compasse remains a moral guide throughout the play. As Barton notes, Compasse is "rational and collected" (298); and as Judd Arnold remarks,

His own moral vision is never deficient. He can censure with a quip the hypocrisy of Parson Palate, the licentiousness of Dr. Rut, the affectations of Diaphanous, and the false sentiment of Practice. On occasion he gives vent to a moralist's anger at the "malitious Knight" Moth. (75)

Moreover, toward the end of the play, he assumes the role of a typical justice figure. He makes Polish confess her sin, punishes her as well as Interest, and gives Practice an office that he himself is entitled to. Since he is the most intelligent character who has "the right thred"

(5.10.81), it is fitting that he untangles the plot complications in front of all other characters and find proper rewards and punishments for them.

Although Compasse remains at the center of action, his aloofness and sense of superiority can be discerned. He calls other characters "Animals, / Halfe-hearted Creatures" (1.1.46-7). When the pregnancy of the false Placentia is announced, he is the one that becomes the main suspect of the misconduct. As Compasse's adopted brother Ironside observes, Compasse belongs to the world where "all the Guests are so mere heterogene, / And strangers, no man knowes another" (2.6.106-7).

Considering the complexity of Compasse's character and his dramatic role, it is not surprising that critics are uncomfortable in dealing with the scholarly hero. Like other scholarly heroes discussed so far, he is a mirth-seeking trickster and moral reformer; again like other scholarly heroes, he embodies contrary values. Following Herford and Simpson's observation that the play "lacks the unifying force of a central satiric motive" (2:203), Knoll writes:

Compass, the Mosca of the piece . . . , is not sharply motivated, and his actions are not delineated with precision. . . . One cannot be sure that Compass has not plotted for this

conclusion from the beginning. In this play Jonson seems more interested in moving his characters about the stage than in giving them rational motives. (191)

Contending that the play signals Jonson's "failing power," Knoll, like most other critics, decides that Jonson's "genius had burned out" during his final years (192).

If one is to measure this play, as most critics do, against Volpone or The Alchemist, it is true that the play is a failure in the sense that the audience cannot see clearly the moral direction of the play. Once we understand the nature of the scholarly characters investigated so far, it is conceivable that the early seventeenth-century audience understood something that is no longer clear to us. Exploration of this missing link is the subject of the next three chapters.

CHAPTER III

THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER IN WESTERN DRAMATIC TRADITION

To understand how the scholarly tricksters were received by the Renaissance audience, one may need to start by examining the genesis of such characters. An audience is likely to accept a character type without questioning its motive or moral values if it properly belongs to a literary tradition. When a knight in medieval romance commences on an arduous journey to impress his lady, readers are so accustomed to the tradition that they are willing to overlook the ludicrousness of the knight's motive and the impossibility of his self-imposed task. By the same token, the appreciation of the story largely depends upon the readers' familiarity with and acceptance of the traditional elements. The same seems to have held true for the Renaissance comic intriguer; Leo Salinger is right in observing that

Unless they are downright opponents of the theatre, renaissance critics, in spite of their unvarying preoccupation with the moral effect of literature, never seem to take notice of the ethics of comic deceivers. Moralists though they

are, they assume, almost without question, that, within certain limits or on certain licensed occasions (such as Carnival), double dealing and practical jokes are permissible and even admirable. (88-89)

Renaissance drama is known to be a product of the "happy marriage of classical and native English drama" (Eugene P. Wright 2263). On the one hand, as Thomas Marc Parrott and Robert Hamilton Ball write, "the Elizabethan audience was by no means ready or willing to abandon" the native dramatic tradition (27), including the sportful mirth provided by the Vice figure, who played "the role of mischief-maker" (30). As English drama develops, on the other hand,

a fresh gift of the classic becomes apparent.

This is an addition to the drama of a number of stock figures drawn from Latin comedy: the worldly wise and anxious father, the roistering son, the wily servant, the braggart, and the pedant.

Commonplace as these may seem to us, they were a real enrichment of English drama, where the Devil and the Vice, plus a pair or two of rustics, had long been almost the sole representatives of the comic spirit. (Parrott and Ball 33)

What is true of Renaissance drama in general seems true of the scholarly trickster. In fact, a few of the scholarly characters discussed in the previous chapter have reminded critics either of the witty servant in Latin comedy or of the Vice figure in morality plays, or both. Kirk H. Beetz, for example, comments that Rynaldo in Chapman's All Fools is "a schemer roughly related to the Vice of medieval morality plays and to the intriguing servant of classical drama" (354). Robert E. Knoll cites the "historical affinities" between Truewit in Jonson's Epicoene and "certain Vice figures in the Tudor drama" (114). Compasse in Jonson's The Magnetic Lady is also seen as "the Mosca" of the play (Knoll 191), a character frequently regarded as a later development of the Vice figure (Happé, "The Vice: A Checklist" 23).

These passing remarks by critics show that the similarities between the scholarly tricksters and the Vice figure or the witty servant in the New Comedy are readily discernible; however, to understand the scholarly tricksters properly, it is essential to look closely at how they are similar to and different from their dramatic prototypes and in turn at how the playwrights blended the native and classical dramatic elements. In his study of Elizabethan comic character conventions, Paul Kreider describes the trickery of the English Vice figure as "hilarious, boisterous, noncorrective, good-natured, and nonpractical"

and that of the witty servant in Latin comedy as "sly, malicious, and earnestly motivated" (78). This brief distinction is not necessarily correct, as will be shown below, and there is need for a more detailed comparison of the two important figures of intrigue comedy in Western dramatic tradition.

The Witty Servant and the Scholarly Trickster

Scholars have long been divided in their opinions regarding the origins of the wily slave-character in Latin comedy. A. W. Gomme, for example, writes that

This truly comic character, the deviser of ingenious schemes, the controller of events, the commanding officer of his young master and his friends . . . is a creation of Latin comedy, especially of Plautus. . . . Menander did not like exaggeration. . . . In no one of his plays is there a sign of the slave who holds the will and the conscience of his master, to whom the latter not only defers, but is helpless without him.

(286-7)

By looking at various documents, however, Philip Whaley Harsh argues that the "deceptive slave is thoroughly and undeniably at home in Greek New Comedy" (142).

At least for the present study, however, it matters little whether the witty servant is the creation of Plautus or Menander. Menander's influence on Renaissance dramatists is scarce, if any, and it is unlikely that Renaissance intellectuals had the now-lost Menander comedies at hand. In contrast, Plautus and Terence, whose plays were translated into English and played in schools (Brooke and Shaaber 447-8), had exerted great influence on any educated person in the Renaissance. Whoever created the witty servant-character as a character type, then, English Renaissance dramatists learned of the type from Plautus and Terence.

In the previous chapter, I have shown that one of the scholarly tricksters, Rynaldo in George Chapman's All Fools, is similar in a few aspects to his source-character, Syrus in Terence's Heautontimorumenos: the nature of his trickery against older characters, his habit of boasting, and his motive in showing off his wit. I have also shown that, unlike Syrus, Rynaldo is educated, young, essentially good-hearted, and confident of his scheming ability throughout the play. He is also perceptive enough to be the satirical commentator of the play; dominant throughout the series of events, even assuming the role of justice in the last scene; and ambivalent in his attitude towards love and marriage.

To examine the proper relationship between the scholarly characters and the witty servant in Latin comedy, however, one needs to turn to Plautus as well. Walter E. Forehand asserts that Syrus is "the slave in Terence most nearly approximating the traditional *servus callidus*, or 'tricky slave,' of Roman comedy" (63). Syrus, however, is quite different from his counterpart in Plautine comedy; Terence does not allow his slave characters to dominate the stage. As George Duckworth asserts, trickery in Terentian comedies "seems always secondary to the difficulties of the young lovers" (168); in the comedies of Plautus, in contrast, "the plight of the young lover serves merely to motivate the activity of the intriguing slave" (168).

Once we turn to Plautine comedy, Rynaldo finds better rivals in trickery and dramatic function. Like the ever-confident Rynaldo, Chrysalus in Bacchides and Palaestrio in Miles Gloriosus "invent their stratagems with calm deliberation and, undaunted by difficulties and setbacks, carry them through to a glorious conclusion" (Duckworth 168). For example, when Palaestrio in Miles declares that he has "got it all under control" (p.161), he literally means it, and the play centers on showing how successfully he fools the title character, Pyrgopolynices.

Just as Rynaldo is the self-appointed rescuer of the helpless lovers from their vigilant fathers, the typical

slave in Plautus' comedy works "as an agent for his young master, usually scheming for the son of the house in opposition to his real master, the father" (Salingar 107). In Mostellaria, for example, Tranio assures his young master:

I'll see you're all right. Look, what do you say if I fix it so that when your father arrives, he won't come in--what's more, he'll run for his life in the opposite direction. (p.44-5)¹

Pseudolus in Pseudolus also calms his young master:

I'll never desert a master in love. Somewhere or other, before the day's out, by hook or crook--or by this hand--I think I can find you some pecuniary assistance. (p.220)

Pseudolus reassures his master: "you know what I can do when I wave my magic wand, what a dust I can stir up when I set about it" (p.220).

Like Rynaldo, the Plautine slave is intellectually superior as well and is sometimes given philosophical soliloquies. Even in the midst of running an elaborate scheme, Pseudolus, for example, has to a chance to say that we're all fools though we don't know it. . . . We lose the certainties while seeking for uncertainties; and so we go on, in toil and

trouble, until death creeps up on us. . . . But
 enough of this philosophizing. (p.243)

As in Chapman's All Fools, moreover, the dramatic action in several Plautine comedies is "decisively dominated neither by imperiled lovers nor vainglorious gulls but by the quick-witted, fast-talking, self-possessed, and masterful slave" (Torrance 66). It is fitting that Pseudolus says to his young master, "Leave it all to me, and you can sleep sound" (p.221); the witty slave indeed takes over the stage throughout the play, giving directions to his aides and musing over his accomplishments. When Calidorous asks him what he is going to do, Pseudolus replies: "I'll tell you when the time comes. No point in going over it twice--plays are long enough as it is" (p.232). Pseudolus is in fact very well aware of what is expected of his dramatic role. He tells the audience:

What's an actor for, if he is not to bring some
 new kind of surprise on to the stage? If he can't
 do that much, he'd much better make way for
 someone who can. (p.239)

In the last scene of the play, when young lovers are reportedly "enjoying themselves," Pseudolus appears on the stage to declare his victory and bid farewell to the audience (p.265-66).

In summary, Rynaldo, though he is modelled after a Terentian slave, shares much in common with the Plautine intriguer: trickery, boasting habit, tricksterly motive, confidence, intellectual superiority, and dramatic dominance. Since most of the scholarly intriguers discussed in the previous chapter share most of these characteristics, it would be safe to say that Chapman, Marston, and Jonson probably had the Latin intriguing slave in mind, at least in part, in delineating the scholarly heroes.

Ludovico Ariosto's influence on Elizabethan playwrights is possible but likely to have been little, if any, in changing the character traits of the Latin witty slave. Works of this Italian writer, who initiated the so-called Erudite Comedy by following closely the "prescriptions" of New Comedy (Griffin 27), were translated by John Harington; and George Gascoigne translated his I Suppositi, the plot of which was incorporated into the Lucentio-Bianca plot in Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew (Brooke and Shaaber 449). In his I Suppositi, "largely built up by clever combination of plot devices" from Plautus' Captivi and from Terence's Eunuchus (Brooke and Shaaber 449), however, Ariosto keeps the typical character configuration of New Comedy. Erostrato, who has come to study at the University of Ferrara with his servant Dulippo, falls in love with Polinesta, who is already promised to an old man by her

father. As in Plautus and Terence, the tricks are provided by the servant, who, by exchanging identities with his love-sick young master, promotes the love affair: in the first act of the play, Erostrato says, "My servant has told me that he intends to set a trap in which this cunning fox [old suitor to Polinesta] would be caught; what he has concocted I don't know" (1.3,p.60).² In Ariosto's last comedy, I Studenti, the trickery is again provided by the servant, Accursio, who orchestrates a scheme for his master's love affair. Like the Plautine trickster, he convinces his young master: "Let me take care of it" (1.3,p.277); his master, like his counterparts in Latin comedy, is to reply, "Do whatever you think is best" (1.3,p.277). In Ariosto's plays, then, the witty slave remains unchanged from his dramatic prototype in Plautus and Terence.

In Jonson, Marston, and Chapman, however, the tricksters differ from their Latin prototype in several aspects. Unlike the Latin slave, they are highly educated³; they are satiric commentators; they assume the role of justice at the end of the play; except Rynaldo, they are isolated from other characters, while functioning as moral reformers; and they show ambivalent attitudes towards the very values they are dealing with in their respective plays. To trace further possible origins of these unique traits in

the scholarly heroes, one may turn to the next possible ancestor: the Vice in early Tudor plays.

The English Vice Figure and the Scholarly Trickster

Robert Withington appropriately asserts that "nothing imported from an alien stage can grow in a new environment unless the soil has been prepared for the transplanting" ("The Ancestry" 525). When the Plautine slave found his way into English drama in early Tudor times, the English soil indeed had a comparable figure, the Vice, who is, as Withington calls him, the "most important figure of the morality play" ("The Ancestry" 525). Even before the middle of the sixteenth century, he emerged as "homiletic showman, intriguer extraordinary, and master of dramatic ceremonies" and the Tudor stage "submitted to his spell" (Bernard Spivack 151). By the middle of the sixteenth century, he was already "a favorite with the audience" (Mares 13); and for about thirty years in the second half of the sixteenth century, as Peter Happé notes, "he was a theatrical reality, unmistakable, pungent, and effective enough to be almost indispensable to writers" ("The Vice' and Popular Theatre" 13). In fact, as much as

he owes his eventual popularity chiefly to the small groups of professional players of interludes

which became successful from about 1550 . . . he contributed very largely to that success, for the relationship reciprocated. ("The Vice' and the Popular Theatre" 17)

As for the origin of the Vice figure, scholars are widely divided. In a 1969 essay, F. P. Wilson writes that, if all scholars are right in their arguments on the ancestry of the Vice figure, "the Vice has more ancestors than can be counted on the fingers of one hand" (English Drama 62). As Happé shows in his bibliography of the scholarship on the Vice figure, the Vice is shown to have come from the domestic fool, the devils and vices in earlier morality plays, the comic characters in folk plays, the seven deadly sins in medieval sermons, and the mystery-play Devil. Scholars have also shown that the dramatic role of the figure has been influenced by a number of "cross currents from other influential dramatic genres" including "the Machiavel, the parasite, the braggart, the clown, and probably the accumulated influence of the *Commedia dell'Arte*" (Happé, "The Vice: A Checklist" 17).⁴

Even the term "Vice" has an obscure origin. L. W. Cushman, in his The Devil and the Vice, argues that the term is an "invention of the actors" who wanted to give a generic name to such similar characters as Folly, Hypocrisy and Iniquity (68). Rejecting John Upton's suggestion that the

term comes from the Latin word "vice" as in words like "vicar" or "viceroy," Francis Hugh Mares agrees with George Steevens that the term probably has its origin in the old French word "vis," a mask, since the Vice appears frequently with a mask or a painted face (397). Although he offers no guess at the origin of the term, E. K. Chambers introduces a few more explanations produced by the "irresponsible philology" of some scholars: "from device, 'a puppet moved by machinery,'" and from the old English word "jeck" meaning "formal character" (2:204).

It would be beyond the scope of this study to argue one way or another about the origin of the Vice figure and his name, though we know for certain that the Vice became a stock figure from his appearance in John Heywood's Play of the Wether and Play of Love, and that from that time on he was "used by publishers to advance the interest of certain plays" (Gayley xlix). A review of the history of the intriguer in English drama from late medieval plays to early Tudor comedy, however, does show a gradual and consistent development in his dramatic significance until we get to the scholarly trickster.

Bernard Spivack, whose influential work Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil is central to the following discussion, describes the vices in late morality plays like Mankind as follows:

the vices monopolize the theatrical life of the play--its diversified intrigue and its humor. All the elements of comedy and satire are concentrated in their hands and the whole energy of the plot springs from their activities. They are the playmakers, the chorus, the comedians, the satirical moralists, and the agents of destruction of every play in which they appear. (126)

Most of these characteristics are no doubt similar to those of the scholarly tricksters discussed in the previous chapter. Moreover, the role of these vices--to put their victims "on moral display, conducting themselves as masters of ceremonies" (Bernard Spivack 126)--closely resembles that of the scholarly tricksters, whose primary function is to expose the follies of men in society. Of course, the fundamental difference between them--one representing the destructive, evil forces in the human world and the other moral, corrective forces in society--is too great to invite any further comparison.

When the dramatic intriguer in English drama loses his scriptural and allegorical significance and becomes a human figure in the Renaissance, and when he emerges as "the dramaturgic darling of the popular stage" (Bernard Spivack 150), he shows more resemblance to the scholarly tricksters. In some plays, such as those discussed by Happé, he is still

frequently associated with the Devil ("The Vice' and the Popular Theatre" 19). Beginning with such other plays as those of John Heywood's, in which the name "Vice" first appears as the generic designation of the master-intriguer, the Vice figure appears purely as a "comic artist who displays his cunning operation upon his human dupes" (Bernard Spivack 148). As J. A. B. Somerset notes, plays like Ulpian Fulwell's Like Will to Like (1568) and Thomas Lupton's All for Money (1578) are centered upon the Vice figure, "who meets successive group of mankind-victims" (75). Also in the anonymous Common Conditions (1576), the metaphorical significance of the morality vice has evaporated. What remains is simply its dramatic by-product, the stage image perpetuated by a century of repetition. In Common Conditions the Vice has lost its subjective meaning and become simply the unprincipled exponent of the art of deceit and wily subterfuge, illustrating only himself and delighting the audience by his stratagems and jubilant explanations. (Bernard Spivack 295)

A brief comparison of the motive of the Vice in these plays and the scholarly characters in the plays treated in the previous chapter would show the proximity between their dramatic roles. Common Conditions, the Vice of the play,

explains that he "will bring them [his victims] together, sure! howsoever it falls out; / For, at length, it will redown to my profit, I do not doubt" (p.203).⁵ He goes on to inform the audience:

I have wrought a fetch to set them by the ears,
hap what shall ensue.

By my honesty! it doth me good that I so crafty
should be. (217)

His plan does work, and he declares that "'tis good to be merry and wise" (253). Compare these with the opening statement by Compasse in Jonson's The Magnetic Lady:

if I can but hold them all together,
And draw 'hem to a sufferance of themselves,
But till the Dissolution of the Dinner,
I shall have just occasion to beleeve
My wit is magisteriall; and our selves
Take infinite delight, i' the successe. (1.1.9-14)

Rynaldo in Chapman's All Fools also declares a similar motive in his actions, as he says that the play's event "will proue an excellent ground to sowe / The seede of mirth" (1.1.406-7). When Ill Report, the Vice in Thomas Garter's The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna (1569), boasts of his "goodly wit, oh noble brayne, whence commeth this

deuyce" (185), one cannot but recall Rynaldo, who brags that "Tis in this head shall worke it" (1.2.110).

Other general characteristics of the Vice also resemble those of the scholarly tricksters. Mares, who has examined forty-four plays containing named vices, finds that the Vice is "often left free to extemporize"; he is on "intimate terms with his audience"; he acts as a "presenter and chorus, introducing other characters to the audience and commenting on them aside"; he is not "evil disguised as good as the conventional morality explanation would lead one to expect, but does both good and evil 'Haphazardly'" (13-4). Similarly, the scholarly tricksters, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, often appear alone to deliver moral or philosophical statements; guide the response of the audience, acting as choral figures; comment on other characters usually in asides; and engage in both moral and immoral activities.⁶

The resemblance between the traditional English intriguer and the scholarly tricksters becomes more immediate in the early Tudor farces--Jack Juggler, Ralph Roister Doister, and Gammer Gurton's Needle, for example--that are heavily influenced by classical literature. In these plays, the English Vice

acquires a biographical reality, achieves a personal or professional relation to his victims,

who treat him as their fellow member of the human species, and even decks himself vaguely with conventional human motives for his traditional aggression. (Bernard Spivack 311)

Since these plays are greatly influenced by Latin comedy, and since we have already had an occasion to examine the Latin slave, it may seem redundant to examine the trickster-figures in these plays; nonetheless, these intriguers deserve a separate examination because they are characters more English than Latin. Even though the Latin influence is clearly discernible in the playwrights' observance of unities of time and place and division of the plays in five acts (except in the interlude Jack Juggler), the characters and settings are "wholly English" (Brooke and Shaaber 448). Indeed, in Jack Juggler (1555), the intriguer Jack Juggler is introduced in "The Players' Names" as "The Vice"; and even though his stratagems resemble those of Mercury in Plautus' Amphitruo, his "voice and performance belong to" the traditional Vice (Bernard Spivack 316). The same holds true for Matthew Merrygreek, the chief intriguer in Nicholas Udall's Ralph Roister Doister (1553): even though his role is taken from Gnatho, the parasite in Terence's Eunuchus, his whole behavior is "a merry aggression against his dupe for the sake of the 'sport' and the demonstration, a far remove from the behavior and aim of

the parasite" in the source (Bernard Spivack 321). Charles W. Whitworth, Jr., also notes that Merrygreek is "only nominally a parasite" in that he "enters singing, like the Vice, and after announcing his intentions . . . spends the rest of the play mocking, insulting and gulling Roister Doister" (xxxvii). In Gammer Gurton's Needle, published in 1575 and probably written by William Stevenson, the plot and characters "have not even a derived affinity with Latin comedy but originate in the life and manners of rural England" (Bernard Spivack 323); the characters are "English through and through" (Whitworth xxxi).

Since a substantial, convincing treatment of the Vice-figure in these plays appears in Bernard Spivack's Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil, it will suffice here to compare the Vice with the scholarly tricksters.

The most significant and rather obvious similarities between the Vice and the scholarly tricksters are their trickery and their dominant dramatic roles in their plays. Jack Juggler centers on the prank that the Vice plays on Jenkin Careaway, a delinquent servant of his gallant-master, Bongrace. The major events--physical and verbal fights among characters--in Gammer Gurton's Needle are caused by the tricks of Diccon, the Vice of the play. Merrygreek, the Vice in Ralph Roister Doister, plays upon the foolishness of

Roister Doister, thereby creating the major source of laughter in the play.

The mirth-seeking motive of the Vice also resembles that of the scholarly tricksters. Jack Juggler opens the play with this announcement: "I have laboured all day, till I am weary, / And now am disposed to pass the time, and be merry" (p.6).⁵ As an anthropomorphized figure, he even attempts to justify his motive:

And as for me, of my mother I have been taught
To be merry when I may, and take no thought.
Which lesson I bare so well away,

That I use to make merry once a day. (p.7)

He does have a reason for selecting Jenkin Careaway for the day's mirth: "This Jenkin and I been fallen at great debate / For a matter, that fell between us a-late; / And hitherto of him I could never revenged be" (p.7). This revenge-motive, however, seems nothing but "motive-hunting for the sake of verisimilitude" (Bernard Spivack 318). First, We are not told what debate Jack Juggler had with Jenkin; second, the motive fades away when Jack Juggler boasts to the audience before his final exit:

How say you, masters, I pray you tell,
Have I not requited my merchant well?
Have I not handled him after a good sort?

Had it not been pity to have lost this sport?

(p.29)

In Ralph Roister Doister, Merrygreek displays a similar lack of motive except that of sport. Like the typical parasite in Latin comedy, he says that Ralph Roister Doister is his "chief banker / Both for meat and money" (1.1.27-8). Such a stock relationship exists only on the surface, as Merrygreek himself cancels out his *raison d'être*: "But such sport have I with him as I would not lese, / Though I should be bound to live with bread and cheese" (1.1.53-4). Indeed, as soon as he senses that his victim is in love, Merrygreek says in an aside that "we shall have sport anon!" (1.2.4) After he arranges a meeting between Roister Doister and Dame Custance, he tells us of his plan: "Now that the whole answer in my device doth rest, / I shall paint out our wooer [Roister Doister] in colour of the best" (3.3.1-2). When Custance and Trusty ask him why he became involved in Roister Doister's wooing, Merrygreek tells them that "We should thereat such a sport and pastime have found, / That all the whole town should have been the merrier!" (4.6.19-20) In the presence of all characters toward the end of the play, Merrygreek tells them that they "ne'er had better sport" and that "such a fool it is, / As no man for good pastime would forego or miss" (5.5.17-20). Diccon in Gammer Gurton's Needle, when he hears from Hodge what happened to

Gammer Gurton, also tells us in an aside what he is about to do:

Here is a matter worthy glozing
 Of Gammer Gurton's needle losing,
 And a foul piece of work.
 A man, I think, might make a play
 And need no word to this they say,
 Being but half a clerk.
 Soft, let me alone: I will take the charge
 This matter further to enlarge
 Within a time short. (2.2.7-15)

Diccon's hint that even an half-educated man could write a play out of Gammer Gurton's loss of her needle is echoed in All Fools, as Rynaldo promises to the helpless lovers:

And you shall see to what a perfect shape
 Ile bring this rude Plott, which blind Chaunce (the Ape
 Of Counsaile and aduice) hath brought foorth blind.
 (1.2.122-24)

The sportful motive of the Vice is accompanied by his confidence. Jack Juggler announces to the spectators: "I woll conjure the nowl, and God before! / Or else let me lese my name for evermore" (p.7). Merrygreek likewise tells us what he can do with his victim Ralph Roister Doister:

I can with a word make him fain or loath,
 I can with as much make him pleased or wroth,

I can when I will make him merry and glad,
 I can when me lust make him sorry and sad,
 I can set him in hope and eke in despair,
 I can make him speak rough and make him speak
 fair. (1.1.57-62)

Diccon the Bedlam's confidence in his manipulative skills is also great, as he promises the audience:

If ye will mark my toys, and note,
 I will give ye leave to cut my throat
 If I make not good sport! (2.2.16-18)

The confidence of these tricksters is well evidenced in their successful exploitation of their victims, and toward the end of their stage actions they show no modesty in evaluating their performance. As quoted earlier, Jack Juggler exults himself before the audience before his final exit:

How say you, masters, I pray you tell,
 Have I not requited my merchant well?
 Have I not handled him after a good sort?
 Had it not been pity to have lost this sport?
 (p.29)

In the last scene of the play, Diccon asks other characters to "say 'Gramercy, Diccon,' for springing of the game"; Gammer Gurton replies by saying, "Gramercy, Diccon, twenty times" (5.2.318-9). Considering his successful role-

playing, it is appropriate that at the end of the play Diccon asks the audience to let the players "have a *plaudite*" (5.2.333). In the last act of Ralph Roister Doister, Merrygreek is able to boast to other characters that they "ne'er had better sport" (5.5.17).

The confidence of these trickster-intriguers and their success in manipulating other foolish characters would of course require that they, like the scholarly characters and the Latin slave-character, are perceptive readers of other characters' minds. Jack Juggler knows Jenkin Careaway's "old guise and condition, / Never to leave, till all his money be gone" in gambling (p.9). Diccon, although he is called a Bedlam in "The names of the Speakers in this Comedy," is no typical Bedlam beggar, if one is to infer from King Lear. Edgar describes his disguise in "the basest and most poorest shape" of man:

my face I'll grime with filth,
Blanket my loins, elf all my hairs in knots,
And with presented nakedness outface
The winds and persecutions of the sky.
The country gives me proof and precedent
Of Bedlam beggars, who, with roaring voices,
Strike their numbed and mortified bare arms
Pins, wooden pricks, nails, sprigs of rosemary.
(2.3.9-16)

This description, as Bernard Spivack observes, "has nothing to do with Diccon": "His clothing is sober, his language trim and sophisticated, his behavior sane and efficient" (324). Diccon rather shows his perspicacity as he plans his tricks based upon his knowledge of Gammer Gurton's and Dame Chat's disposition. He predicts:

My gammer, sure, intends to be upon her bones
With staves or with clubs or else with
cobblestones!

Dame Chat, on the other side, if she be far behind
I am right far deceived; she is given to it of
kind. (2.5.3-6)

Merrygreek likewise knows his victim: "Praise and rouse him well, and ye have his heart won, / For so well liketh he his own fond fashions, / That he taketh pride of false commendations" (1.1.50-52).

One would recall that these characteristics shared by both the Vice and the scholarly tricksters--their trickery, mirth-seeking motive, boasting habit, confidence in their manipulative ability, and perspicacity--are also shared by the Latin slave as demonstrated earlier. Unlike the Latin slave, however, the Vice has additional characteristics that are somewhat reminiscent of the scholarly tricksters.

Unlike the Latin slave who is characteristically attached to his young master, and like the scholarly

tricksters, the Vice does not belong to the community in which he finds himself. In Jack Juggler, the Vice tells us "the very truth" of his relationship with the other two major characters, Master Bongrace and Jenkin Careaway: "Nother of them both knoweth me not very well" (p.7). In fact, even the audience remains uninformed of his identity. As for Merrygreek, Bernard Spivack correctly notes that he is a "transient visitor to the scene for a day" (321); even though he is supposedly a parasite of Roister Doister, he denies the relationship in favor of mirth: "But such sport have I with him as I would not lese, / Though I should be bound to live with bread and cheese" (1.1.53-54). Diccon the Bedlam likewise does not belong to the community in which he creates a frenetic situation. Diccon himself tells us in his opening speech that he is a mere passer-by: he has walked "divers and sundry ways" and "over the country with long and weary walks" (1.1.1,6).

Being thus isolated, the Vice, like the scholarly tricksters, acquires the position to make witty and satirical comments upon the behavior of other characters. Of course, the satire within these farcical plays is only minimal compared to that in the plays of Jonson, Chapman, and Marston; nonetheless, it seems significant that these farcical intriguers are given the role of satirical commentators. Jack Juggler informs the audience that Jenkin

Careaway is "as cursed a lad, / And as ungracious wage, and as foolish a knave / As any is now within London wall" (p.7); indeed, Jenkin Careaway, as his name implies, neglects his messenger-duty, loses all his money in gambling, and devises lies to protect himself from the scrutiny of his master's wife. Merrygreek also informs the audience that Ralph Roister Doister "taketh pride of false commendations" (1.1.51). After getting Doctor Rat beaten by Dame Chat with his trick, Diccon comments that "the cat [Dr. Rat] was not so madly allured by the fox" but "leapt in for mice" (5.2.229-31). This comment is fitting, and the implicit satire is pointed toward the clergy: a few scenes earlier, when Doctor Rat is summoned by Gammer Gurton to help her recover her lost needle, the parish priest explains why he usually answers the call from his congregational members: "when I come not at their call, I only thereby lose, / For I am sure to lack therefore a tithe-pig or a goose" (4.1.11-12).

Considering these two additional characteristics that the Vice shares with the scholarly tricksters, one may conclude that the scholarly tricksters have more in common with the Vice than with the Latin slave. Considering the tradition of the Vice, "dramaturgic darling of the popular stage" (Bernard Spivack 150), who is characterized for his unprovoked aggression, it is also probable that the

Renaissance audience accepted the scholarly tricksters without questioning their motive; and if so, Robert E. Knoll's complaint about Compasse's lack of any "rational motive" (191) and Susan Blair Green's criticism of Rynaldo's "comic hubris . . . blinded by pride" (142) show how far we have moved away from that long English tradition.

After all is said, however, there remain several aspects of the scholarly tricksters that are hardly traceable in either of their prototypes: their educational background, ambivalent value structure, and multiple dramatic role--trickster, reformer, justice, and, occasionally, romantic hero. The Latin slave and the Vice alike are given no educational background; their deeds and words are consistent; and the role of justice is usually given, in Latin comedy, to an elderly character, and in English farce, to authority figures--Master Bongrace in Jack Juggler, Master Bailey in Gammer Gurton's Needle, and Goodluck in Ralph Roister Doister.

A departure from tradition may be explained by the culture that engendered such a departure. As the English Renaissance culture moved towards secularly oriented humanism, the traditional elements in morality plays faded. In a monarchy, tragic heroes are predominantly kings and princes, as in Shakespeare; in a democratic society, they are everyday citizens, like Willy Loman in Arthur Miller's

The Death of a Salesman. To come to grips further with the scholarly characters with particular emphasis on their unique aspects, then, it seems logical to turn to the culture of late Elizabethan and early Stuart England.

NOTES

1. The translator, E. F. Watling, does not give act or scene numbers. The same holds true for other Roman plays quoted in this chapter and elsewhere, though they may have been translated by other scholars.
2. Since line numbers are not given in the text, the last entry within the parenthesis is the page number instead.
3. In his 1955 essay "The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity," Clarence A. Forbes contends that in ancient Greece and Rome "a great number of slaves were freeborn and fully educated before the fortunes of war or the misfortunes of piracy or other untoward circumstances reduced them to slavery" (322), and that many Roman slaves, though they were not allowed to enter a law school or otherwise acquire legal training, "were educated in a wide variety of lower and higher occupations" (360). The tricky slaves in Plautus and Terence, however, are given no educational background.
4. Despite the similarities between the Vice and the Latin slave, critics have not explored the relationship in any detail. At best, Leo Salinger comments in passing that the Vice is "related in several ways to the impudent slaves of New Comedy" (172).

5. Since the lines are not numbered in the text, the page number is given here.

6. It would be a mistake, however, to say that the Vice has an ambivalent moral structure. At best his moral structure, if any, is obscure, whereas that of the scholarly tricksters is self-contradictory.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARCHETYPAL TRICKSTER, RENAISSANCE UNIVERSITY MEN, AND THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER

Looking at the amount of scholarship on trickster figures in myth and folklore, one would agree with Michael P. Carroll that more has "probably written about 'tricksters' than about any other single category of character that appears in the myths and folktales of the world" ("The Trickster" 105). Particularly after the appearance of Paul Radin's influential book, The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology (1956), the study of tricksters has expanded to include not only oral literatures of various regions of the world but also drama, novel, art, and film.¹

In a sense, the primary finding of these wide-ranging studies of trickster--that the trickster exists in various cultures and time periods--validates Carl Gustav Jung's early assertion that the trickster is a "'psychologem,' an archetypal psychic structure of extreme antiquity," and that in "many cultures his figure seems like an old river-bed in which the water still flows" (140, 142). There is, according to Karl Kerényi, "an unchanging, indestructible

core that not only antedates all the stories told about him, but has survived in spite of them" (174).

A problem in dealing with these studies, however, is that the definition of the term "trickster" remains unclear. Most researchers either begin without a clear definition of the trickster or start by describing a few regional trickster figures, whose characteristics are not identical to those of other regional counterparts. Even as recently as in 1991, Tim Callahan starts his essay, "Devil, Trickster and Fool," with this statement:

. . . the Trickster is hard to define. One seeks a fixed point from which to begin. Yet the central characteristic is that he (usually, although sometimes she) has no fixed nature. (29)

Carroll agrees that "modern scholars tend to use an extremely broad definition of the term trickster itself, in that they tend to apply this term to any character who makes extensive use of deceit" ("The Trickster" 105). In fact, this problem with the ever-blurring definition of trickster has been so well recognized that T. O. Beidelman suggests that "we abandon the term [the trickster] and renew analysis from the concerns manifest within each particular society considered" (38).

One, however, has to start somewhere, because the findings of the studies mentioned at the opening of this

chapter are too valuable to be dismissed. Since this chapter's first aim is to discover why scholars are chosen as trickster-intriguers in late Renaissance drama, a reasonable approach would require that one begin by establishing the scholarly trickster as a manifestation of the archetype and then proceed to examine the kinds of figures chosen for the role of trickster in various cultures and time periods. By doing so, we can finally reach some conclusions about the cultural forces that made possible the emergence of the scholarly trickster.

After examining various tricksters who appear in the myths and folktales of three continents--Africa, North America and South America--Carroll argues that in many cultures the tricksters share two outstanding characteristics that are ahistorical and transcendent: these deceivers are "simultaneously selfish-buffoons and culture heroes" ("The Trickster" 125). Robert Pelton's observation is similar:

Loutish, lustful, puffed up with boasts and lies, ravenous for foolery and food, yet managing always to draw order from ordure, the trickster appears in the myths and folktales of nearly every traditional society. (1)

Though the trickster "practices enormous cruelties upon others" to gratify his "almost constant hunger or his

seemingly uncontrollable desire for sexual intercourse," he is at the same time

a type of culture-hero, specifically as a transformer who makes the world habitable for humans by ridding it of monsters or who provides those things (such as fire or various ways of capturing animals) that make human society possible. (Carroll, "Lévi-Strauss" 305)

Despite the fundamental difference between primitive tribal lore and Renaissance comedy--one using fantastic material and the other mostly realistic--the close resemblance between the roles of tricksters in both is unmistakable. As shown in the second chapter of this study, the scholarly tricksters are "puffed up with boasts" about their tricksterly abilities, "ravenous for foolery" against gulls, manipulative in dealing with other characters, and cruel toward courtiers and rogues. Moreover, while some of them promote their own self-interest (such as pursuit of marriage and dowry), the scholarly tricksters bring order within the dramatic world by correcting behaviors of other characters. If one accepts Carroll's suggestion that we should "adopt a relatively specific and restricted definition of the term trickster," and that the trickster label should only be used to "those deceivers who are simultaneously selfish buffoons and culture heroes" ("The

Trickster" 125), the scholarly tricksters undoubtedly fit into the class of tricksters.

Not only do the scholarly tricksters meet the categories set by Carroll, but they also share a number of additional characteristics with their individual counterparts in other parts of the world in myth, folktale, and literature. For example, like the scholarly tricksters, the West African Trickster shows "linguistic deftness" (Pelton 223). Like the scholarly tricksters who guide the response of the audience, the West African trickster

teaches West Africans, again and again, how to see, [and] he instructs them over and over how to piece together their experience and to discover in that new whole the same open-ended order that they have always known as the source of transcendent ordinaries. (Pelton 275)

Like the scholarly tricksters who liberate the pathetic fools from their obsession with appearances and manners, the trickster in Canadian literature since the 1950's acts to free other characters from "the socially defined traps" such as marriage and respectability (Brown and Bennett 287).

In fact, as we move into popular literature, the scholarly tricksters find immediately comparable figures. In his analysis of popular tricksters around the world, Orrin E. Klapp lists four major elements of a successful

trickster, most of which are also found in the scholarly tricksters: humour, deception, physical disadvantage, and escapes. Like the scholarly tricksters whose practical jokes mark their identity, the popular comic hero enjoys "wisecrack," showing "a quick shrewdness demonstrated in encounter with others" (22-3). Like the scholarly tricksters who are frequently amoral or immoral, and who emerge as winners, the popular hero "may not be a good man--indeed he is usually far from being an exemplar of virtue," and he has "the last laugh" while his opponents are "humiliated in some comic way," causing their loss of status (23). Deception is "a source of strength" for the popular comic hero (25), as much as it is for the scholarly tricksters; just as the scholarly tricksters depend on deceptive means to perform their trickery, the popular hero must "tell his opponents a story, seem to be what he is not, or surprise him with an unexpected strategy" (25). Just as the scholarly tricksters ridicule and humiliate courtiers who presumably have better connections to the power, and rich fools who enjoy more economic power, the popular hero beats his opponent who is "overconfident, a bully, pompous, overbearing, or slightly stupid" (27). As much as the scholarly tricksters are immune from gulling, the popular hero "gets away, disappearing and reappearing with ease, evading traps" (29).

The fact that the Renaissance scholarly tricksters have certain transcultural and transhistorical qualities in them would no doubt make it safe to assume that they are indeed a Renaissance version of the archetypal trickster. Once we recognize that such a figure exists as an archetype, we can now come back to the initial question: why did Jonson, Marston, and Chapman found scholars suitable for the tricksters' role? Of course, to answer this question, we will have to examine, more comprehensively than in the opening chapter of this study, the state of actual scholars, narrowly conceived as the university-trained.

Cultural Background of the University-Trained as Reflected in History and Literature

Historians tell us that the religious, regional, and class-oriented conflicts during the Renaissance had a positive effect on the growth of education. According to Richard L. Greaves, the influx by the 1580s of Jesuits and seminary priests caused the government to encourage education so as to "stem the exodus of young people to the Continent for Catholic schooling" (327); Puritans and Anglicans alike "shared this zeal for the religious value of education" (330); and even though they disagreed on the academic curriculum, both Puritans and Anglicans were

committed to financial support of education, considering it a religious duty" (369). Repudiating the "unproved assumption that the increase in university education under the Tudors and early Stuarts dissolved local loyalties and created a more homogeneous nation," Victor Morgan shows how localism was pervasive particularly in the manner of giving endowments (185). Louis B. Wright argues that between 1550s and 1650s, middle-class citizens "placed an uncritical faith in the grammar schools and regarded with infinite respect the learning of the universities" (43). Following J. H. Hexter's assertion that the English aristocracy, which looked down upon bookish learning in the Middle Ages, now began to take it "with unprecedented seriousness in the sixteenth century" (6), Lawrence Stone explains that the new attitude toward learning among the members of the governing class sprang from their "growing anxiety about the nobility maintaining their grip on the key positions in the political system" (The Crisis 672). One would recall, in this context, that even Mammon in Jonson's The Alchemist promises to Subtle that when he gets money out of the philosopher's stone, he will "employ it all in pious uses" including "Founding of colleges and grammar schools" (2.3.51-2).

Having thus become major centers of contention among the various segments of society which wanted to promote their own political, regional, and religious interests,

universities grew in size. According to Stone, the educational "boom" between 1560 and 1640 is in "such magnitude that it can only be described as a revolution" ("Educational" 68). During the thirty years between the early 1550s and the 1580s, both Oxford and Cambridge Universities saw "an enormous expansion, during which freshman numbers apparently increased threefold" (Stone, "Size" 17); after 1604, a year after James' arrival in London, "there began a second great movement which lasted until the outbreak of the Civil War, and which carried the number of [university] entrants up to a level which was not reached again before the 1860s" (Stone, "Educational" 51).

Hugh Kearney lists reasons behind the influx of such a large number of entrants into the universities in the second half of the sixteenth century. The universities and the Inns of Court offered young men "the cheapest and the easiest route" toward being distinguished as gentlemen (27); and in the "economic doldrum of Elizabeth's reign, the attractions of a professional career, whether in law or divinity, were greatly increased," for such a career ensured an adequate income (32).

The educational boom, nonetheless, had a side-effect. Sons of the peers and leading squires "returned home only to find that the English court, the English bureaucracy and the English army were too small and too restricted of access to

satisfy their aspirations" (Stone, "Educational" 76). Sons of the gentry fared no better:

Having finished at the university, the young gentlemen were obliged to return home to their muddy shires, marry a barely literate girl, and find what intellectual stimulus they could in the dull grind of a seat on the bench at the quarter and petty sessions, together, if they were lucky, with a few weeks' excitement every few years at one of the rare sessions of Parliament. (Stone, "Educational" 76)

Particularly noteworthy is the state of university graduates during the late years of Elizabeth and the early years of James I, during which the universities experienced a temporary "slump in enrollment" (Stone, "Size" 17), and during which most of the plays dealt with in this study were written and performed. One of the reasons for the slump in student enrollment between 1590 and 1615 is, according to Stone, that "the growth in output of university-educated laymen had for a time outpaced the expansion of suitable jobs":

Elizabeth kept the bureaucracy on a very tight rein, and there was little or no increase in the size of the administration during her lifetime, despite the secular pressures for expansion and

the great increase in the number of job-seekers.

("Size" 29)

In the first decade of the Stuart period, the situation was no better:

Having been geared to the extraordinary demands for trained men which the Elizabethan Church and State made upon them, they poured out into early Stuart society more educated talent than that society in its unreformed condition could put to work in ways that would contribute either to its own health or to the satisfaction of the individuals concerned. (Curtis, "The Alienated" 27)

In the 1630s, the situation became even worse: Morgan estimates that the combined figures "for laymen and prospective clergymen suggest that 67 percent of university men did not enter immediately upon a recognized professional career" (244). The dissatisfaction was probably greater for the plebian students who went to the universities, according to Thomas Hobbes, to learn to preach and to become "capable of preferment and maintenance" (147-48).

While the statistical evidence offered by Stone and Curtis is convincing, there is additional evidence--two voices from people involved in the universities--found in Charles H. Cooper's Annals of Cambridge, one that is worth

reproducing here since it is nowhere cited by the historians. As quoted earlier in the first chapter, Elizabeth promised "preferment" to hard-working students. Four year later, in 1568, she sent a letter to William Cecil, the chancellor of Cambridge University at the time, in which she asked him to recommend well-prepared divinity students because "she would from time to time prefer [them] to places of wealth and honour in the church" according to their merit (2:235). In 1587, some twenty years later, however, John Beacon, a fellow of St. John's and a "practising Civilian," sent a letter to Lord Burghley, urging him to renew and execute the queen's promise that was "remaining in the records of Cambridge, either never once begun to be put in practise, or soon intermitted" (2:435-6).

The letter informs of

the general and just complaint in these days, for want of sufficient instruction of the people in divers countries, of sharing ecclesiastical livings between corrupt patrons, ordinaries, and hirelings, of suffering many godly and learned preachers in both the Universities to remain less profitable to the Church, less comfortable to themselves, and no less discouragement of young students in divinity. (2:436)

The writer goes on to plead that "timely preferment" would "revive the dulled and discouraged spirits of University students" (2:436). Five years later, in 1592, the situation does not seem to have improved: school administrators desired Archbishop Whitgift to intercede with the Queen, that in the bestowal of ecclesiastical benefices and preferments in the patronage of the Lord Keeper, greater regard might be had to the scholars of the Universities. (2:514)

The fact that the university-educated found their post-graduation positions unsatisfactory and that a number of them did not even have jobs at all would have made them resentful; there were other causes, however, which added to the disillusionment of the intellectuals. The oversupply of ministers created an employers' market and "brought the abuses within the Church into even more prominence than ever" (Curtis, "The Alienated" 33); and especially under the Stuarts, "patrimony operating through a system of purchases and reversions usually determined who held places" (Curtis 38).

How the alienation and frustration of the intellectuals are reflected in the works of the literary writers of the period is interesting. By looking at these literary works, one might even see an important analysis of the mental state of the intellectual class; after all, most of these writers

witnessed or even experienced the alienation and frustration of the university-educated. Morgan writes that "a proportion of the superfluity of graduates from Oxford and Cambridge subsequently became the penurious writers of Elizabethan London," and that of the two hundred poets alive between 1525 and 1625 "at least 76 percent had attended university" (235). In case of drama, as Eugene P. Wright notes,

Educated young men from Oxford and Cambridge, passionate young minds excited by the Humanistic spirit who had no inheritance or patrons to support their literary efforts, found in drama a way to mold language and ideas into a form which would support them. (2268)

These "University Wits" were, as Wright asserts, "trend-setters in developing a distinctively English literature" (2269): through drama, they expressed their ideas "sparked by an awareness of the political, social, moral, and economic problems of sixteenth-century England," and the tradition established by them "was continued by" Jacobean and Caroline dramatists (2269, 2287).

In a sense, most of what Stone and Curtis find in historical data can be found in Robert Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, except that the latter frequently uses figurative language. "University men," Burton says, "like

so many hide-bound Calves in a Pasture, tarry out our time, wither away as a flowre ungathered in a garden, and are never used" (323). Burton is explicit at times:

after all their paines taken in the *Universities*,
cost and charge, expenses, irksome houres,
laborious tasks, wearisome daies, dangers, hazards
. . . they shall in the end be rejected,
contemned, & which is their greatest misery,
driven to their shifts, exposed to want, poverty
and beggery. (307)

Just when the graduate is "fit for preferment," Burton continues, "he is as farre to seek it as he was . . . at the first day of his comming to the *University*" (308). Burton underlines the unfairness of the situation by comparing the fate of scholars to that of merchants and husbandsmen whose investments are certain (307) and also by associating scholars with grasshoppers, who must sing "in Summer, and pine in the Winter, for there is no preferment for them" (309).

A similar observation is reflected in the anonymous The Return from Parnassus, or The Scourge of Simony (1602).

When Philomusus and Studioso visit a theater to try their talent as actors, Kempe, who personifies the famous actor William Kempe, encourages them: "is't not better to make a

foole of the world as I haue done, then to be fooled of the world, as you schollers are?" (4.4.1786-88).

Turning to John Webster's plays, one would find how the problem of unemployment and underemployment of the highly educated is used in character delineation. In The Duchess of Malfi, Deliro, Antonio's faithful friend, tells us that Bosola, the major villain of the play, was

in Padua, a fantastical scholar, like such who
study to know how many knots was [sic] in
Hercules' club; of what colour Achilles' beard
was, or whether Hector were not troubled with the
toothache. He hath studied himself half blear-
ey'd, to know the true symmetry of Caesar's nose
by a shoeing-horn; and this he did to gain the
name of a speculative man. (3.3.40-46)

After realizing that the world does not reward hard work, this scholar-villain is easily bought into evil service by the Cardinal.

In The White Devil, Flamineo is given a similar background and motive of action. He tells his mother:

You brought me up,
At Padua I confess, where I protest,
For want of means, (the university judge me,)
I have been fain to heel my tutor's stockings
At least seven years. . . . (1.2.317-21)

Seeing a "path so open and free" to his "preferment" (1.2.325-6), this Machiavellian scholar contrives the death of his brother-in-law in order to give Duke Brachiano free access to his new-found love, Vittoria, Flamineo's sister.

That The White Devil is based on an "Italian scandal of adultery and murder" in the late sixteenth century among such noble families as the Medici and the Orsini is well known (Ranald 32); the play is interesting in that Webster adds the educational background to the character of Flamineo.

Since there are numerous versions--one hundred and nine manuscripts still existing (Boklund 201-12)--of the historical event that might have been available to the playwright, "no one knows the exact form in which Webster heard or read this story" (John Russel Brown xxvii). Nonetheless, critics have found that in major versions of the story no "special attention is devoted to Marcello," who becomes Flamineo in the play (Boklund 37); we only know that he was a confidential chamberlain to Duke Brachiano, that he killed someone in Rome, and that he was banished from the city (Lucas 73). In most of the shorter versions, appended to John Russel Brown's edition, the historical Marcello's role in causing the death of his brother-in-law is not even mentioned; at best, one report, known as the most probable source, merely reads that the duke "had the husband of the

lady murdered" (189). In all likelihood, then, Webster, as he wanted to amplify the role of Flamineo in the play, invented details, including his educational background, to suit his character.

Calling Flamineo the "Machiavel," the "ultimate" villain, Margaret Loftus Ranald states that Webster gives him "no real motivation--merely a delight in doing evil" (42); however, what Flamineo tells his mother finds a curious echo in a public sermon that Burton heard "not many yeares since" from a "grave Minister then, and now a reverend Bishop of this lande" (313). After mentioning all the "torments of martyrdome" in the University, the lack of rewards after graduation, and the abuses of the Church, this minister asks:

What father after a while will be so improvident, to bring up his sonne to his great charge, to this necessary beggery? What Christian will be so irreligious, to bring up his sonne in that course of life, which by all probability and necessity, cogit ad turpia, enforcing to sinne, will entangle him in simony and perjury. (313)

Burton agrees with this minister: "what did our parents meane to make us schollers, to bee as farre to seeke of preferment after twenty yeares study, as wee were at first" (314). At least for the minister and Burton, then,

Flamineo's complaint to his mother, and his initial motive in action, must have sounded "real," though they probably would have been shocked, as much as we are, at seeing what Flamineo does in the course of the play.

The anger of those who found the world hostile finds expression also in The Return from Parnassus, or The Scourge of Simony. Ingenioso, who turns to writing in order to make a living, begins to write satire, since he wants to "giue the world a bloody nose" (1.2.126-26). Philomusus likewise says, "Ile vex the world that workes me so much paine" (1.4.400).

As shown in Chapter II, Jonson and Chapman use this unemployment crisis in the character delineation of Truewit and Rynaldo; there is, moreover, a hint that the complaint of the university graduates has even become something of a fashion. John Daw in Jonson's Epicoene, who affects learning by citing classical authors, also "rails at his fortunes, stamps, and mutinies, why he is not made a counsellor, and call'd to affairs of state" (1.3.22-25).

While the university-educated complained of the lack of opportunity, the public seems to have attributed the same problem to the lack of practical skills; as John Earle writes, "The time has got a veine of making him [a scholar] ridiculous, and men laugh at him by tradition" (41). Of course, ridiculing the highly trained is nothing uncommon.

In the military, veteran sergeants frequently belittle newly commissioned second lieutenants, who know much about theory but little about practical problems; one would remember, for example, Iago's telling Roderigo that Cassio, who has "never set a squadron in the field," is only good at "bookish theoric"--"Mere prattle, without practice" (1.1.19-23). The same holds true in business: experienced workers occasionally frown upon new employees with master's degrees in business administration. The ridicule against the Renaissance intellectuals seems to have been in keeping with this time-honored social tradition. "A meere scholler," writes Thomas Overbury, "orders all things by the Booke, is skillful in all Trades, and thrives in none" (34). "A downe-right Scholler," describes Earle, "cannot kisse his hand and cry Madame . . . and he mistakes her nose for her lippe" because his study has "made him som what vncouth" (41). In teaching Asotus how to look like a courtier, Amorphus in Jonson's Cynthia's Revels first instructs him not to have the academic face--"an honest, simple, and methodicall face" (2.3.25).

Although most of the Renaissance playwrights were disaffected scholars themselves, they did not ignore this social stereotype of scholars; rather, they staged the naive scholar as comic material. A few examples are already cited in the section on Chapman in Chapter II: Clarence in Sir

Gyles Goosecap, Knight, Aurelio and Giovanello in May Day.
The Elder Brother, partially written by John Fletcher before 1625 and then completed by Massinger "not much before 1637" (Editor's Introduction 3), provides an additional example. The whole plot of the play is based on the stereotypical behavior of the scholar-hero, Charles, who upon coming home from "the University Louvain" gives up his inheritance in favor of study:

My books, the best companions, is to me
 A glorious court, where hourly I converse
 With the old sages and philosophers;

. . . .

Can I, then,
 Part with such constant pleasures, to embrace
 Uncertain vanities? (1.2.192-201)

Numerous lines are devoted to describing Charles' scholarly habits and thoughts and to reflecting what seems to be the general public's reaction to the scholar's behaviors. For example, Angelina tells her father that Charles is unfit for a husband since his learning can bring neither a "tire" for her head nor a "rich gown" (1.1.107-8). Brisac, Charles' father, explicitly distinguishes the difference between university learning and practical knowledge, as he tells his scholarly son:

In our care

To manage worldly business, you must part with
 This bookish contemplation, and prepare
 Yourself for action. (1.2.122-25)

When Charles replies that he can learn about "tillage" from Virgil's Georgics, about curing diseased cattle from Virgil's Bucolics, Brisac finally gives up the hope of persuading his elder son with this lament: "Was ever man that had reason thus transported / From all sense and feeling of his proper good?" (1.2.204-5). As in the case of Dowsecer, the melancholy scholar in Chapman's An Humorous Day's Mirth, it is only when he falls in love at first sight with Angelina that Charles finally wakes up to reality, minutes before his inheritance goes to his younger brother.

We can only speculate how the university-trained dealt with their frustration. Financially ill-fated, intellectually alienated, and ridiculed by the public, the university-trained seem to have sought refuge in isolation. In John Donne's "Satyre I," the scholar-speaker, who condemns his fellow scholar who "Sells for a little state his libertie" (70), asks his friend: "Leave mee, and in this standing wooden chest, / Consorted with these few books, let me lye / In prison, and here be coffin'd, when I dye"

(2-4). He adds: "Shall I leave all this constant company, / And follow headlong, wild uncertain thee?" (11-2).

In his The Art of Living in London (pub. 1642) Henry Peacham first tells his reader that solitude is better than socialization. The first thing to do in London--"the city being like a vast sea, full of gusts, fearful dangerous shelves and rocks, ready at every storm to sink and cast away the weak and unexperienced" (243)--is to "Let the Bible and other books of piety such as treat of philosophy, natural or moral, history, the mathematics, as arithmetic, geometry, music, sometimes heraldry, and the like, be your chief company" (245). In a sense, this advice suggests a division between the capitalistic ethos of London streets and the idealism of the educated.

The story of scholars presented in the Parnassus plays may not be taken literally, particularly since the plays were written to amuse the university audience and tend to exaggerate certain elements for satiric purposes; however, the final resignation of the scholars in the last play denotes the yearning for isolation from society. Upon hearing that Ingenioso wants to give the world "a bloody nose," Judicio reminds him that he cannot be successful since the "enemies haue the aduantage of the ground" (1.2.125-30). After their successful completion of studies and the subsequent ill-treatment from the public, Philomusus

and Studioso come to the same conclusion: as Studioso tells Philomusus, the world knows too well their "lame reuenging power" (1.4.401). This resignation of the scholar-characters leads them to a departure from the busy streets of the world. Philomusus decides to live a "shepheards poore secure contented life" because "True mirth we may enjoy in thacked stall, / Nor hoping to higher rise, nor fearing lower fall" (5.2.2037, 2051-52); Studioso joins Philomusus, determined to "shun the company of men, / That growes more hatefull as the world growes old" (5.4.2159-60); Academico will go back to his "Cambridge cell againe" (5.4.2165); and even Furor, writer of satire, bids farewell to "musty, dusty, rusty, fusty London" since she is "not worthy of great Furors wit" (5.4.2196-97).

In summary, the historical evidence and literary expressions suggest that the scholars of the late Renaissance period formed what Everett Stonequist and Barbara Babcock-Abrahams call a marginalized class. The marginal man, according to Stonequist, is

a personality type that arises at a time and place where, out of conflict of races and cultures, new societies, new peoples and cultures are coming into existence. The fate that condemns him to live, at the same time, in two worlds in which he

lives, the role of cosmopolitan and stranger.

(xvii)

The scholars were marginal also both in the sense that they would "deliberately opt from the center . . . for outsiderhood" and in the sense that they were "consigned to that status" by the society (Babcock-Abrahams 153).

Scholars as Tricksters

That the scholars were socially marginalized and that they were associated with solitude provide us with some clues as to why they were chosen as tricksters. Experts in trickster study have pointed out that the creators of myths and folktales have usually chosen figures with "solitary habits" as tricksters (Carroll, "Lévi-Strauss" 307). Carroll, for example, finds that "the animal categories most often associated with trickster figures in North America are 'coyote,' 'ravens,' and 'hare'--and in all these cases these are animals noted for their solitary habits" (309). In another article published years later, Carroll also finds that the same holds true for South American and African tricksters; he further predicts that if specialists in tricksters of other continents examine their regional tricksters, they will probably "find such tricksters

associated with solitary animals, or at least solitary habits" ("The Trickster" 127). Considering the desire for solitude among the university-educated in the late Renaissance period, Carroll should be given credit for his accurate prediction.

How the tricksters are usually members of a marginalized class in a given society, whether in the sense of being better or worse than the other classes, is pointed out by a number of experts. Interpreting the North American trickster as symbolic of human struggle to make the world human--as the precursor of Prometheus, Milton's Satan, Nietzsche's Superman, and the Marxist "New Man"--Mac Linscott Ricketts asserts that, because "the goal of all man's strivings is power," the trickster, who represents these strivings, opposes the gods and mock the shamans (344); and in myth, of course, humans constitute a marginalized class in the universe. Babcock-Abrahams also notes that the trickster in various genres of literature and time periods "belongs to the comic modality or marginality where violation is generally the precondition for laughter and *communitas*" and that despite "his peripheral and interstitial pattern of residence, the marginal figure often appears as 'intruder'" (153). Robert M. Torrance also maintains that the trickster's "sharp wit, a clever tongue, or . . . a loud mouth can serve as a weapon . . . against a

social order that would deny his individuality by confining him to a permanently inferior or even inhuman status" (8).

Readers of W. H. Auden will recall the celebrated line in his elegy of W. B. Yeats: "poetry makes nothing happen." The same holds true for drama. The scholarly tricksters humiliate fools and hypocrites, reform their behaviors, and occasionally gain something material; but the real society remains largely the same. For that matter, the trickster's victory in any given story "does not change social status" (Pelton 265).

One would ask, then, what appeal the tricksters had to the audience of Renaissance England. Experts in the study of the trickster offer valuable insights regarding the cultural significance of the popularity of trickster tales. Babcock-Abrahams summarizes six basic propositions offered by "many literary critics, psychologists, historians of religion, and anthropologists": first, as "entertainment pure and simple, as a 'time-changer' that offers temporary respite and relaxation from the tedious business of daily life and social reality"; second, as "operative, iterative, and validatory or explanatory"; third, as "'an outlet for voicing protest against many, often onerous, obligations'" such as social order, religion and ritual; fourth, as "evaluative, as contributing to a reexamination of existing conditions and possibly leading to change"; fifth, as

reflective, teaching the audience that "an accepted pattern has no necessity"; and sixth, as reflective of "imagination freed from the constraints of social structural roles" (182-85).

None of these is, as Babcock-Abrahams notes, "sufficient and complete" by itself (182). The first explanation ignores the social significance of literature; the second is unable to account for social satires in which the existing order is viewed negatively. The last four explanations, however, while they complement and overlap one another, can be combined to form a more comprehensive answer to the social and cultural significance of trickster narratives: by protesting against the established social order, trickster tales evaluate "what is" and teach the audience "what could be," thereby freeing the audience's imagination confined to the existing social structure.

While the above comprehensive answer would describe the social and cultural significance of trickster narratives in general, an additional and more culture-specific explanation becomes necessary when it comes to the plays involving the scholarly characters. Most tricksters in myth, folktale, and literature are animals with little association with any particular group of people within their society; in other words, the mythic trickster represents the abstract division of power and undefined social order rather than a specific

group of constituents of a given society. There are, however, others who represent, allegorically, a group of people in a particular society and time period. "Everyone knows that Reynard stands for the peasant against King Lion and Baron Wolf" (Klapp 28).

To get to a culture-specific answer to the question raised above, we may begin by focusing on the power structure of society as reflected in trickster narratives. Klapp makes a general statement: since

the chasm between the great and the small, the oppressor and oppressed, extends through all cultures, it is a strategic situation which everyone understands; . . . hence there is a universal sympathy for anyone who overthrows a persecutor. (28)

The trickster, adds Klapp, not only provides "the pleasure of comedy" but is also "a status-adjuster, checking rampant power, and deflating those whose hats are too big or who in other respects have grown too big for their britches" (30). Torrance shares a similar view: "Once society with its oppressive inhibitions is seen as the Other, his [the trickster's] cause becomes ours and we share in his most preposterous triumphs" (8).

In a similar vein, Donald Beecher, who gives an overview of tricksters in Renaissance drama, sees a similar

significance of tricksters' role in drama. Beecher's definition of the trickster--"the archetypal embodiment of the impulse for play" (57)--is so broad that he includes in his discussion a wide variety of tricksters, in fact almost anyone who uses trickery: "slaves, bawds, marriage brokers, servants, meddling friends, . . . the climbing courtier, and the duke-in-disguise" (56).² While it is curious that he nowhere mentions scholarly tricksters, his remarks on the social implications of the vogue of intrigue play have a point:

The age was preoccupied with new influence and new money, with the contest between the old families and the parvenu; in the social transactions and transitions of the age, intrigue seemed to serve as the operative means and metaphor for such contests of power. The plays suggest, repeatedly, that deception was the tactic of the new man, his means to power, both licit and illicit, in a post-chivalric world. (66)

What Klapp, Torrance, and Beecher assert can be applied to interpreting the cultural significance of the scholarly heroes. As the capitalistic ethos prevailed in late Renaissance England, and as the social mobility largely depended on the favor of the court rather than on individual merit, the Renaissance audience, particularly a learned

audience, perhaps enjoyed a temporary, imagined empowerment and dreamed of a change for the better, while watching the alienated intellectuals, the underdogs, humiliate hypocritical courtiers and rich, miserly merchants.

The Multiple Dramatic Role of Scholarly Tricksters

In the previous chapter, I have shown how, unlike their earlier dramatic prototypes, the scholarly tricksters usually become, with the progress of the plays, reformers, justices, stage commentators, and (in the case of Freevill, Quarlous, and Compasse) romantic heroes. On the one hand, this multiple role given to tricksters must be seen as an experiment of the playwrights because such treatments are nowhere to be found in their prototypes. In Terence's Heautontimorumenos, for example, Syrus plays the role of trickster, while the role of romantic hero is given to Clinia and the role of justice to Chremes, who finally forgives his son and his slave. In Gammer Gurton's Needle, Diccon plays the role of trickster, while Master Bailey appears toward the end of the play to assume the role of justice. Even in Jonson's 1598 play, Every Man In His Humour, the dramatist assigns different characters to different roles: Brainworm plays the role of ruse servant, a trickster; and Knowell, Jr., a romantic hero; Justice

Clement, a justice. The fact that these roles are combined, in varying degrees, to create the scholarly tricksters suggests that the playwrights were trying something new.

On the other hand, this experiment can be explained in two ways, although both answers must remain speculative. First, the therapeutic effect of trickster stories on the sympathetic audience is bound to increase if the trickster assumes, in addition to intellectual superiority, the power to taunt and forgive the vain, the proud, and the hypocritical. The same would hold true if the trickster, over other characters in the play, becomes the winner of romantic love and wealth.

Second, as the playwrights experimented with a new type of intriguer by giving him a social status much elevated from those of his prototypes--slaves, madmen, and vices--they perhaps found it acceptable to extend the role of the trickster. It would certainly have violated the principle of mimesis to give slave-tricksters the role of reformer, justice, or romantic hero. In these highly learned characters, the playwrights perhaps found a convenient outlet for their own voice for reform. Since the scholars are placed within the social scene as representatives of a marginalized class, it was probably appropriate to give them a motive, be it heroic, romantic, or acquisitive, in addition to the traditional tricksterly motive, "sport."

In addition, giving a multiple role to the scholarly tricksters would have meant dramatic structural advantages. The appearance of a justice figure who untangles the plot complications not only seems contrived but also forces the audience to hear what it has already witnessed. In Jonson's Every Man In His Humour, for instance, we are made to listen to what we already know, when the major characters tell Justice Clement what they did. In contrast, Freevill in Marston's The Dutch Courtesan can afford to close his scene with this remark: "All shall be lighted, but this time and place / Forbids longer speech" (5.3.54-55).

NOTES

1. See for example Ellen B. Basso's investigation of South American tricksters, Brian V. Street's and Robert D. Pelton's studies of African tricksters, Munro S. Edmonson's survey of tricksters in the folklore of some twenty-seven tribes world-wide, Russel M. Brown and Donna A. Bennet's analysis of tricksters in Canadian novel, Orrin E. Klapp's examination of contemporary American tricksters in literature and film, John Beebe's examination of tricksters in art, and David Beecher's study of the early seventeenth-century English trickster-intriguer such as Volpone. All these works are included in the "Works Cited."
2. Beecher mentions too many characters to name all here; and while his assertions are largely valid, he uses little textual evidence to support his argument. Considering the large number of tricksters he names, it is difficult to see why he does not mention or deal with any of the characters I have dealt with in this study.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOLARLY TRICKSTER AND RHETORICAL MAN:

THE AMBIVALENT VALUE STRUCTURE

The dual nature of tricksters in different genres of literature is well noted by experts. Orrin E. Klapp, for instance, writes that the trickster, despite all his attractiveness, is "usually far from being an exemplar of virtue. . . . He is a specialist in triumphant but sometimes shady transactions" (23). Donald Beecher maintains that the trickster, such as Volpone or Subtle in Jonson's Volpone and The Alchemist, arouses both attraction and repulsion:

"attraction in that he expresses deviant instincts" and repulsion in that he "goes beyond our sense of fair play" and violates "common morality, the sanctity of reputation and of private property" (61-2). In a slightly different vein, the trickster in myth and folklore displays dual nature as well: "Just when we've decided he's a villain," writes Tim Callahan, "he does something heroic" (29).

This generic duality of the typical trickster, however, does not explain away the ambivalent, if not obscure, value structures of the scholarly tricksters. The most difficult problem in dealing with the scholarly tricksters lies not in

the dual nature as in myth, or the dubious transaction as in popular folk literature, but rather in the obscurity of their speeches. One would agree with Jonson that language "most shewes a man" (Timber 625); however, the scholarly tricksters' language serves to hide rather than elucidate their value structure. As Jonas Barish writes, Truewit "speaks through so many masks that one is not sure when, if ever, he is speaking in *propria persona*" (Ben Jonson 157). Richard Dutton agrees that "nothing may be taken for granted in Epicoene and Truewit is perhaps the most paradoxical character in the play" (105). Barish's analysis of Quarlous' verbal style also illuminates the extent to which the scholarly trickster's speeches are almost beyond decoding:

Quarlous' rapid-fire style carries to one extreme the power of baroque rhetoric to suggest incipient rather than finished thought, the ideas seeming to leap and tumble at random from the tongue, scarcely half formed in the brain beforehand. (Ben Jonson 193)

If "Jacobean plays were primarily verbal, rather than visual experiences" as Dutton says (102), one would wonder how to deal with the speeches of the scholarly tricksters. Blocking our major channel of experiencing the plays, and thereby causing much distress to those whose job is to interpret them, the scholarly tricksters are consistently

inconsistent in their speeches as well as actions. This consistent pattern of their incongruity, however, suggests that there must be something we no longer understand; hence the subject of this chapter.

A few critics attempted to explain the problem. Dutton, for example, explains that "in Epicoene and the later comedies, Jonson plays with language . . . to keep the audience questioning what is real and what is illusory" so as to keep the audience "involved within the satiric process" (102). Douglas Duncan, on the other hand, writes that Truewit is a

relativist who takes up and drops literary and philosophical poses not so much out of a quarrelsome spirit of contradiction as out of a mischievous delight in the play of mind as an end in itself; a sophisticated reasoner who argues for the sheer joy of doing so; a master of paradox who shows not the slightest concern to use his art in the service of truth. (182)

David Riggs sees Quarlous as an "embodiment of what [Stephen] Greenblatt calls 'the subversive perception of another's truth as an ideological construct'" (212); in short, Quarlous is a relativist like Truewit.

Not only do these critics address individual characters, but also their analyses do not offer sufficient

answer to the problem at hand. First, if we are to accept Dutton's explanation, it is hardly possible that the playwrights wanted to keep the audience ignorant about the plays' meaning all the time; after all, the plays were for entertainment as well as instruction. Furthermore, if we assume that the scholarly tricksters represent the university-educated, it is difficult to believe that the universities produced mostly relativists with no fixed values.

It is possible to explain the reason for the obscure speeches and the ambivalent value structure of the scholarly tricksters in the context of the multiple role assigned to them. Their trickster role compels them to be impudent in speech and action; their reformer role makes them utter moral speeches and perform moral deeds.

A more plausible answer, however, can be found by examining the type of rhetorical education in the Renaissance. Richard Lanham, after describing a typical process in rhetorical training, asks: "What would be 'the rhetorical ideal of life' be like?" (3). He then goes on to answer his own question:

Rhetorical man is an actor; his reality public, dramatic. His sense of identity, his self, depends on the reassurance of daily histrionic reenactment. He is thus centered in time and

concrete local event. The lowest common denominator of his life is a social situation. And his motivations must be characteristically . . . agonistic. He thinks first of winning, of mastering the rules the current game enforces. He assumes a natural agility in changing orientations. He hits the street already street-wise. . . . He is thus committed to no single construct of the world; much rather, to prevailing in the game at hand. . . . Rhetorical man is trained not to discover reality but to manipulate it. (4)

Lanham's assertion sounds provocative and even blatant; worse yet, Lanham offers little more than theoretical evidence. Once we look at what Renaissance authors said about rhetorical education, however, Lanham's assertion can be somewhat validated.¹ Francis Bacon, for example, writes in his Advancement of Learning that the culture of the sixteenth-century England saw

an affectionate study of eloquence and copie of speech, which then began to flourish. This grew speedily to an excess; for men began to hunt more for words than matter; and more after the choiceness of the phrase, and the round and clean composition of the sentence, and the sweet falling

of the clauses, and the varying and illustration of their works with tropes and figures, than after the weight of matter, worth of subject, soundness of argument, life of invention, or depth of judgement. . . . Then did Car of Cambridge, and Ascham, with their lectures and writings, almost deify Cicero and Demosthenes, and allure all young men that were studious unto that delicate and polished kind of learning. (3:283-84)

A similar disapproval of the method of rhetorical education was voiced by Gabriel Harvey, an "English Ramist" and "fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and university praelector in rhetoric" (Kearney 47). Praising Ramism, which emphasized content as much as style, Harvey regrets his past fascination with Ciceronianism:

I valued words more than content, language more than thought, the one art of speaking more than the thousand subjects of knowledge; I preferred the mere style of Marcus Tully to all the postulates of the philosophers and mathematicians; I believed that the bone and sinew of imitation lay in my ability to choose as many brilliant and elegant words as possible, to reduce them into order, and to connect them together in a rhythmical period. (69)

Lanham's assertion can be further substantiated by examining the type of intellectual training current during the Renaissance. In his study of rhetorical education in the Renaissance, Joel B. Altman lists fourteen types of required exercises for students, three of which seem relevant here. The *destructio* or *subversio* trained students "to overthrow any argument," whereas the *confirmatio*, the reverse of the *destructio*, taught them to "prove that all the stories are probable" (46-7); paired together, then, these two exercises emphasized the ability to argue well on either side. The third form of exercise was the *ethopoeia* or mimetic speech, which taught students to assume someone else's character, create the person and his nature, and speak accordingly. Furthermore, as Altman notes, arguing both sides of a question was "frequently employed as a method of political inquiry and . . . of political hedging. . . . it also turned to use simply as a pastime" (32). Altman goes on to say that the habit of "arguing in *utramque partem* permeated virtually all areas of intellectual life" during the Renaissance (34).

It would be a mistake, of course, to assume that the educated class of the Renaissance actually had the mental habit described by Lanham. Production of what Lanham calls rhetorical men would mean an utter failure of the Tudor educational system, a system which produced highly esteemed

literary writers, philosophers, and scientists whose relentless pursuit of truth inspired many following generations.

What we can accept, however, is the fact that the kinds of rhetorical exercises in school might have caused the intellectuals to acquire an "Argus-eyed view of any subject of discourse" (Altman 53) and to have, at their disposal, the ability to argue with utmost wit on any side of a given situation. Once such is accepted, we can apply Lanham's theory to explaining the puzzling value structure of the scholarly tricksters.

In the previous chapter, I have suggested that the trickster stories can be seen in part as a contest for power, as an imagined inversion of the existing political and economic hierarchy. In that context and in connection with what Lanham says about the rhetorical ideal, a passage from an anonymous satirical comedy, The Return from Parnassus, or the Scourge of Simony (1602), is revealing. After trying out different professions and realizing the impossibility of succeeding in the world with honest means, Philomusus tells Studioso: "Ile vex the world that workes me so much paine" (1.4.400), and Studioso replies, "We haue the wordes, they the possession haue" (1.4.403).

In staging the scholarly tricksters, then, the playwrights seem to have found rhetorical skills a fitting

weapon for the scholarly characters, whose job in the play is to unmask the imposters and reverse the political and economic hierarchy. Whereas the impudent Latin slave deploys disguises and impersonations as his means of trickery, and whereas the Vice uses downright lies and sophistry whose moral inadequacy is immediately clear to the audience, the scholarly tricksters frequently rely on their sophisticated rhetorical skills to confound their opponents. In fact, compared to disguises and impersonations, rhetorical skills as the primary means of intrigue would have seemed less contrived. The fact that the scholarly tricksters are not in the court or arcadia but in the streets makes their deployment of rhetorical skills more plausible; after all, they are dealing with people with morally and ethically deviant behaviors, with people who are not likely to listen to reasonable argument.

In Renaissance drama, there are numerous examples to indicate that the display of rhetorical skills is a major element of the scholarly tricksters. In Chapman's All Fools, for example, Rynaldo opens the play by asking a question:

Can one selfe cause, in subjects so alike
 As you two are, produce effects so vnlike?
 One like a Turtle, all in mournful straines,
 Wailing his fortunes? Th'other like the Larke

Mounting the sky in shrill and cheereful notes,
 Chaunting his ioyes aspir'd, and both for love.
 (1.1.1-6)

While this initial question indicates an open-ended inquiry into the nature of love, Rynaldo, when Fortunio and Valerio praise women, attempts to build a case against them by giving an extremely one-sided argument; so much so that Fortunio replies, "Fye, thou profan'st the deity of their sexe" (1.1.79). This debate is never resumed in the play, but the fact that Rynaldo assists the helpless lovers and that he tells Valerio to to enjoy Gratiana in "her true kinde" (4.1.219) suggests that Rynaldo's earlier diatribe against women was not an expression of his deeply held conviction but an exercise in the *destructio*, merely to overthrow Fortunio's and Valerio's argument. In fact, Bacon recommends as a way of rhetorical training that one should learn to make a case "exaggerated both ways with the utmost force of wit, and urged unfairly, as it were, and quite beyond the truth" (4:472).

In Marston's The Dutch Courtesan, what Lanham calls "the rhetorical ideal of life" comes to life more conspicuously. When Malheureux asks Freevill what Cocledemoy did to Milligrub, Freevill declares that his answer will be in "most sincere prose" (1.1.16). As the puritanical Malheureux fears that Freevill may be drawn to

"some common house of lascivious entertainment" (1.1.77-8), Freevill delivers a lengthy defence of prostitution, and, as if to praise his own rhetorical *tour de force*, he wittily demands, "Give me my fee!" (1.1.161). This impression of Freevill's playfulness is noted by John J. O'Connor: Freevill's decision to teach his puritanical friend "seems to spring from sheer perverseness or desire to exercise his wit" (515). Moreover, when we contrast Freevill's legal defence of brothels with his "fatuous moralizing" toward the end of the play (Geckle 164), it is evident that neither Freevill's speeches nor his actions can be taken seriously since they are no index to his character; if we believe all he says or does, we can only agree with Michael Scott that Freevill is "totally inconsistent" (45).

Quarlous's random, "rapid-fire style" of speech also displays his tendency to use words not to indicate his beliefs but to remain in control of whatever situation he is faced with. Immediately after we discover that Quarlous is a "madcap" (1.1.79), Quarlous appears on stage to deliver a long lesson against widow-hunting. This tirade, however, provides little information about his value structure; we only know that he is, as his name indicates, quarrelsome. Littlewit even warns his wife, Little, not to "quarrel with Master Quarlous" (1.1.169); and Grace Wellborn accurately calls him a man of "discourse" (4.2.37).

Truewit, "the most paradoxical character" in Jonson's Epicoene (Dutton 105), can be analyzed from the same perspective. Like a student who has mastered the skill in the *ethopoeia*, or mimetic speech, Truewit assumes the character of a post from the court and delivers a lengthy harangue against matrimony (2.4.13-18). Moreover, as if to show off his training in *destructio* and *constructio*, he argues "suspect cases with a great show of brilliance" (105 Dutton). Truewit's "numerous rhetorical postures" are nicely summarized by Barish:

He can philosophize on time at one moment and deprecate his own philosophy in the next. He can praise feminine artifice and undermine it in one breath. He can describe the Ovidian life of seduction as an ideal, and then expose the embodiments of that ideal--the collegiates--as shams. (Ben Jonson 156)

Truewit handles each case, as Barish observes, as if to "exhaust for the sake of argument a whole spectrum of possibilities," and the arguments are made "disinterestedly, unmotivated by the itch for gain or by moral fervor" (Ben Jonson 153-56).

"To be disturbed by the play" Epicoene, writes Duncan, "is nowadays a normal response" (166); and, as much as Truewit's "words and actions dominate the play" (Andrews

33), critics are widely divided in their understanding of the play and the character of Truewit. Barish concludes that "Jonson's effort to project worldly, realistic attitudes in a frame of benign approval goes too much against the grain of his own deeper instincts at this time to produce a harmonious work" (Ben Jonson 224). Peter Hyland remarks that Truewit is "not an imbecile, but he is finally immoral because he is inauthentic, a play-actor with too many roles" (103). Michael Andrews asserts that Truewit, with all his "essential triviality," is meant to be an object of "sardonic satire" (54,36). Duncan's conclusion sounds more convincing: "to criticize Truewit's behavior is to swim against the tirade of the play. . . . None of his remarks, taken singly, defines his nature" (187).

What Duncan says about Truewit can be applied to the scholarly tricksters in general; in fact, they are not meant to be judged. Whereas playwrights commonly reveal characters' value structures through speeches and actions, they only show the scholarly tricksters as they perform their rhetorical acrobatics, saying and doing whatever is required to fulfill their role as tricksters, unmasking the imposters and doing what cannot be done in the real world. They are, in short, actors within their literary world, created out of the playwrights' experiment with intrigue comedy.

We will have to look outside the plays to find what the scholarly tricksters represent. Judging from what we have seen, they are, as a group, a Jacobean version of the conventional intriguers and an embodiment of the Jacobean intellectuals' desire for a better world. Perhaps the Renaissance audience, familiar with the rhetorical training in school and the frustration of the highly trained, had a tacit understanding that the scholarly tricksters' speeches are mere exercises of wit, that their actions are mere role-playing, and that they as characters remain outside the domain of textual criticism.

NOTES

1. Lanham's assertion may apply to the scholarly tricksters, but not to malcontents or naifs. Despite their rhetorical education, such scholarly malcontents as Bosola and Flamineo in Webster's The Duchess of Malfi and The White Devil are committed to a single construct of the world. Naive scholars, on the other hand, are not even able to read a social situation, much less to manipulate it.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that the scholarly tricksters, who are known as elusive or inconsistent, have their origins in both the Vice in early Tudor plays; that they are each a Jacobean version of the archetypal trickster commonly associated with solitary habits, unprovoked aggression, and a double function as selfish buffoon and cultural hero; and finally that their ambivalent value structures reflect the nature of rhetorical training in Renaissance schools.

While these findings reconfirm the long-held belief that literary works should be understood in their historical and cultural contexts, they point to an additional insight into the function of comedy. Writers and critics alike agree that comedy aims to delight and instruct. As the Prologue in Nicholas Udall's Ralph Roister Doister says, "mirth prolongeth life and causeth health" and "merry comedies" contain a "very virtuous lore, / With mysteries and forewarnings very rare" (8 & 16-18). From what this study has shown concerning the function of trickster narratives, however, an additional function can be discerned, especially in the case of intrigue comedy. That

is to say, intrigue comedy can be a way of sociotherapy: by protesting against the established social order, it evaluates the current paradigm of the society's culture and shows the audience an alternative paradigm, thus liberating the spectators' minds beyond their ordinary experiences.

This sociotherapeutic function of intrigue comedy can be further explained by looking at the way festivals function in society. In explaining the trickster's cultural significance, Jung correctly maintains that "the spirit of the trickster" is revealed in "some strange ecclesiastical customs" in early Middle Ages: during the New Year feast, a Children's Bishop was elected on Innocents' Day, who, dressed in pontifical robes, paid "an official visit to the palace of the archbishop and bestowed the episcopal blessing from one of the windows"; during the Feast of Fools, priests and deacons not only elected a pope of their own called Fools' Pope but also in various disguises of women, lions, and mummers sang indecent songs in the choir, ate greasy food, and played dicing games (136-38). During these festivals, the participants seem to have enjoyed the temporary anarchy, reversal of roles, and violation of norms.

Jung states that these festivals "seem to have died out by the beginning of the sixteenth century" (138); however, at least in England, a similar traditional festival

continued, according to E. K. Chambers, throughout and beyond the Renaissance period, despite numerous attempts to prohibit it (1:414-15). Unlike her father and brother, Queen Elizabeth does not seem to have appointed a Lord of Misrule (called the Abbot of Unreason in Scotland) at court, a "special officer, told off to superintend the revels, pastimes and disports of the Christmas season" (1:407,403). However, the reign of the Lord of Misrule, "a direct offshoot from the vanished Feast of Fools" (1:418), extended "far beyond the verge of the royal palace . . . especially in vogue at those homes of learning, the Universities and the Inns of Court" (1:407). Puritans attempted to do away with the tradition in the universities, and the Bench forbade the same in the Inns. The tradition, however, persisted: according to the records cited in Chambers' study, Lords of Misrule were appointed at least until 1617 at Gray's Inn, 1627 at the Inner Temple, 1635 at the Middle Temple, and even 1661 at Lincoln's Inn (1:415-18).

The activities involving the Lord of Misrule can be associated with the spirit of the trickster. Some of those are same as those "that happened at the Feast of Fools" (Chambers 1:412), as shown in the detailed account of the 1607 Lord of Misrule at St. John's College, Oxford. On Christmas day, he "was attended to prayers, and took the vice-president's chair in hall"; on New Year's day, he

attended a show, which was, according to "an honest chronicler," "'a messe of absurdities'"; and even after his reign ended after a "mourning procession," he held "a lottery 'for matters of mirth and wit'" (I:408-10).

Of course, having focused on one character type, this study by itself hardly does justice to the generalized assertion of the sociotherapeutic effect of intrigue comedy, trickster narratives, and carnivals. To begin with, it is necessary to look into other trickster-intriguers, as there are many, in their own cultural contexts. In fact, besides the Jacobean scholarly trickster, the Latin slave, and the Vice, the Restoration rake-hero seems to share similar tricksterly qualities; according to Harold Weber, the rake's sexuality as well as "love of disguise, need for freedom, and fondness of play all establish the complexity of the rakish personality" (3). After all is said, however, one can only invite others to research further into the subject, while he waits for the maturity of his insights.

WORKS CITED

- Allen, Morse S. The Satire of John Marston. Columbus, Ohio: F. J. Heer, 1920.
- Altman, Joel B. The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.
- Andrews, Michael Cameron. "Truewit and the Tone of Epicoene." Jacobean Miscellany 3 (1983): 32-59.
- Ariosto, Ludovico. The Comedies of Ariosto. Trans. & Ed. Edmond M. Beame and Leonard G. Sbrocchi. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1975.
- Arnold, Judd. A Grace Peculiar: Ben Jonson's Cavalier Heroes. The Pennsylvania State University Studies 35. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1972.
- Auden, W. H. "In Memory of W. B. Yeats." The Norton Anthology of Modern Poetry. 2nd edition. Ed. Richard Ellmann and Robert O'Clair. New York: W. W. Norton, 1988. 742-43.
- Babb, Lawrence. The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642. Studies in Language and Literature. East Lansing: Michigan State College P, 1951.

- Babcock-Abrahams, Barbara. "'A Tolerated Margin of Mess': The Trickster and His Tales Reconsidered." Journal of the Folklore Institute 11 (1974): 147-86.
- Bacon, Francis. The Works of Francis Bacon. 14 Vols. Ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath. 1859. Stuttgart-Bad, Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1963.
- Barish, Jonas A. "Ovid, Juvenal, and The Silent Woman." PMLA 71 (1956): 213-24.
- . Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1960.
- Barton, Anne. Ben Jonson, dramatist. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Basso, Ellen B. In Favor of Deceit: A Study of Tricksters in an Amazonian Society. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 1987.
- Beacham, Richard C. The Roman Theatre and its Audience. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Beaurline, L. A. Jonson and Elizabethan Comedy: Essays in Dramatic Rhetoric. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library P, 1978.
- Beebe, John. "The Trickster in the Arts." Jungian Literary Criticism. Ed. Richard P. Sugg. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1992. 302-11.
- Beecher, Donald. "Intriguers and Trickster: the Manifestations of an Archetype in the Comedy of the

- Renaissance." Comparative Critical Approaches to Renaissance Comedy. Ed. Donald Beecher and Massimo Ciavolella. Carleton Renaissance Plays in Translation Ser. 9. Ottawa, Canada: Dovehouse Editions Canada, 1986. 53-72.
- Beetz, Kirk H. "George Chapman." Critical Survey of Drama. English Language Series. Vol. 1. Ed. Frank N. Magill. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Salem Press, 1985. 351-61.
- Beidelman, T. O. "The moral imagination of the Kaguru: some thoughts on tricksters, translation and comparative analysis." American Ethnologist 7 (1980): 27-42.
- Bentley, Gerald Eades. The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- Boklund, Gunnar. The Sources of The White Devil. Essays and Studies on English Language and Literature 17. Ed. S. B. Liljegren. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1957.
- Brooke, Tucker, and Matthias A. Shaaber. The Renaissance (1500-1660). Vol. 2 of A Literary History of England. 2nd ed. Ed. Albert C. Baugh. New York: Meredith Publishing Co., 1967.
- Brown, John Russell. Introduction. The White Devil. By John Webster. Ed. Brown. The Revels Plays. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960. xvii-lxxiii.

- Brown, Russel M. and Donna A. Bennett. "Magnus Eisengrim: The Shadow of the Trickster in the Novels of Robertson Davies." Jungian Literary Criticism. Ed. Richard P. Sugg. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1992. 285-301.
- Bryant, Joseph A., Jr. The Compassionate Satirist: Ben Jonson and His Imperfect World. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1972.
- Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. 2 vols. Ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1989-90.
- Callahan, Tim. "Devil, Trickster and Fool." Mythlore 17.1 (1991): 29-34, 36.
- Caputi, Anthony. John Marston, Satirist. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1961.
- Carroll, Michael P. "Lévi-Strauss, Freud, and the trickster: a new perspective upon an old problem." American Ethnologist 8.2 (1981): 301-13.
- . "The Trickster as Selfish- Buffoon and Culture Hero." Ethos. 12.2 (1984): 105-31.
- Chambers, E. K. The Mediaeval Stage. 2. Vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1903.
- Champion, Larry S. Ben Jonson's Dotages: A Reconsideration of the Late Plays. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1967.
- Chapman, George. The Plays of George Chapman. 2 Vols. Ed. Allan Holaday et al. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1970.

- Colley, John Scott. John Marston's Theatrical Drama.
Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama
Studies 33. Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Englische
Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1974.
- Common Conditions. Five Anonymous Plays. Early English
Dramatists 4th series. Ed. John S. Farmer. Facsimile
ed. 1908. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 181-256.
- Cooper, Charles Henry. Annals of Cambridge. 4 vols.
Cambridge: Warwick and Co., 1842-52.
- Cope, Jackson I. "Bartholomew Fair as Blasphemy."
Renaissance Drama 8 (1965): 127-52.
- Cross, Gustav. "Marston, Montaigne, and Morality: The Dutch
Courtesan Reconsidered." ELH 27 (1960): 30-43.
- Curtis, Mark H. Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-
1642: An Essay on Changing Relations between the
English Universities and English Society. Oxford:
Clarendon P, 1959.
- . "The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England."
Past and Present 23 (1962): 25-43.
- Cushman, L. W. The Devil and the Vice in the English
Dramatic Literature before Shakespeare. Studien zur
Englischen Philologie 6. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1900.
- Davidson, Peter. Critical Introduction. The Dutch
Courtesan. By John Marston. The Fountainwell Drama
Texts. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968. 1-10.

- Donne, John. "Satyre I." John Donne: Prose and Poetry.
Ed. Frank J. Warnke. New York: Modern Library, 1967.
106-09.
- Dryden, John. Essays of John Dryden. Ed. W. P. Ker. Vol.
1. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1926.
- Duckworth, George E. The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in
Popular Entertainment. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952.
- Duncan, Douglas. Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition.
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Dutton, Richard. Ben Jonson: To the First Folio. British
and Irish Authors: Introductory Critical Studies.
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Earle, John. Micro-Cosmographie. Ed. Edward Arber.
English Reprints. Westminster: A. Constable and Co.,
1895.
- Edmonson, Munro S. Lore: An Introduction to the Science of
Folklore and Literature. New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Finkelpearl, Philip J. John Marston of the Middle Temple:
An Elizabethan Dramatist in His Social Setting.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1969.
- Fletcher, John. The Elder Brother. Ed. W. W. Greg. Vol. 2
of The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher.
Variorum edition. London: George Bell and Sons, 1905.
9-100.

- Forbes, Clarence A. "The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 86 (1955): 321-60.
- Forehand, Walter E. Terence. Twayne's World Authors Ser. 745. Boston: Twayne P, 1985.
- Friedman, Lawrence S. "John Marston." Critical Survey of Drama. Ed. Frank McGill. English Language Series. Vol. 3. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Salem Press, 1985. 1265-74.
- Gardiner, Judith K. "Infantile Sexuality, Adult Critics, and Bartholomew Fair." Literature and Psychology 24 (1974): 124-32.
- Garter, Thomas. The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna. The Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1936 (1937).
- Gayley, Charles Mills. "An Historical View of the Beginning of English Comedy." Representative English Comedies: From the Beginnings to Shakespeare. Ed. Gayley. New York: McMillan, 1930. xiii-xcii.
- Geckle, George L. John Marston's Drama: Themes, Images, Sources. London: Associated UP, 1980.
- Gomme, A. W. Essays in Greek History and Literature. Essay Index Reprint Series. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1937.

- Grant, Thomas M. The Comedies of George Chapman: A Study in Development. Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies 5. Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1972.
- Greaves, Richard L. Society and Religion in Elizabethan England. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1981.
- Green, Susan Blair. "The Ethical Comedies of George Chapman." Diss. U of Pennsylvania, 1986.
- Griffin, Robert. Ludovico Ariosto. Twayne World Authors Series 301. New York: Twayne P, 1974.
- Hamilton, Donna B. "Language as Theme in The Dutch Courtesan." Renaissance Drama: New Series 5 (1972): 75-87.
- Happé, Peter. "The Vice: A Checklist and An Annotated Bibliography." Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama 22 (1979): 17-35.
- . "'The Vice' and the Popular Theatre, 1547-80." Poetry and Drama 1570-1700: Essays in Honor of Harold F. Brooks. Ed. Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond. London: Methuen, 1981. 13-31.
- Harsh, Philip Whaley. "The Intriguing Slave in Greek Comedy." Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 86 (1955): 135-42.

- Harvey, Gabriel. Ciceronianus. 1577. Trans. Clarence A. Forbes. University of Nebraska Studies in the Humanities 4. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1945.
- Herford, C. H., and Percy Simpson. Ben Jonson: The Man and his Work. Vol. 2 of Ben Jonson. Ed. Herford and Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1925.
- Herford, C. H., Percy and Evelyn Simpson, ed. Ben Jonson. Vol. 9. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1950.
- Hexter, J. H. "The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance." The Journal of Modern History 22 (1950): 1-20.
- Hobbes, Thomas. Behemoth, or the Long Parliament. Ed. Ferdinand Tönnies. 2nd ed. London: Frank Cass & Co, 1969.
- Hussey, Maurice. Introduction. Bartholomew Fair. By Ben Jonson. Ed. Hussey. New Mermaids. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1964.
- Hyland, Peter. Disguise and Role-Playing in Ben Jonson's Drama. Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies 69. Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, Universität Salzburg, 1977.
- Jack Juggler. Anonymous Plays. Early English Dramatists 3rd series. Ed. John. S. Farmer. Facsimile ed. 1906. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. 1-40.

- Jonson, Ben. The Alchemist. Stuart Plays. Ed. Arthur H. Nethercot et al. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. 199-261.
- . Bartholomew Fair. Ed. Maurice Hussey. New Mermaids. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1964.
- . Cynthia's Revels. Vol. 6 of Ben Jonson. Ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1932. 1-184.
- . Epicoene, or The Silent Woman. English Drama 1580-1642. Ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke & Nathaniel Burton Paradise. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co., 1961. 529-72.
- . Every Man In His Humour. Stuart Plays. Ed. Arthur H. Nethercot et al. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. 12-63.
- . Every Man out of His Humour. Ben Jonson. Vol. 3. Ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1927. 419-604.
- . The Magnetic Lady. Ben Jonson. Vol. 6. Ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1938. 505-97.
- . Timber, or Discoveries. Ben Jonson. Vol. 8. Ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1947. 562-649.

- . Volpone, or The Fox. Stuart Plays. Ed. Arthur H. Nethercot, et al. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971. 133-93.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. The Four Archetypes: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. Bollingen Ser. 20. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1969.
- Ingram, Reginald W. John Marston. Twayne's English Authors Ser. 216. Boston: Twayne P, 1978.
- Kearney, Hugh. Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain 1500-1700. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970.
- Kerins, Frank. "The Crafty Enchaunter: Ironical Satires and Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humour." Renaissance Drama: New Series 14 (1983): 125-50.
- Kerényi, Karl. "The Trickster in Relation to Greek Mythology." The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology. By Paul Radin. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956. 173-91.
- Kernan, Alvin. The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance. Yale Studies in English 142. New Haven: Yale UP, 1959.
- Klapp, Orrin E. "The Clever Hero." Journal of American Folklore 67 (1954): 21-34.
- Knights, L. C. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1937.

- Knoll, Robert E. Ben Jonson's Plays: An Introduction.
Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1964.
- Kreider, Paul. Elizabethan Comic Character Conventions as
Revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman. Ann Arbor:
U of Michigan P, 1935.
- Lanham, Richard. The Motives of Eloquence: Literary
Rhetoric in the Renaissance. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976.
- Leggatt, Alexander. Ben Jonson: His Vision and his Art.
London: Methuen, 1981.
- Lucas, F. L. "Historical Introduction: Webster's Sources."
The Complete Works of John Webster. By John Webster.
Vol 1. Ed. Lucas. New York: Oxford UP, 1937. 70-90.
- Lytle, Guy Fitch. "Patronage Patterns and Oxford Colleges
c. 1300-c. 1530." Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th
to the Early 19th Century. Ed. Lawrence Stone.
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974. 111-49. Vol. 1 of The
University in Society.
- MacLure, Millar. George Chapman: A Critical Study.
Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1966.
- Manley, Frank. Introduction. All Fools. By George
Champan. Regents Renaissance Drama Ser. BB 229.
Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1968. ix-xx.
- Mares, Francis Hugh. "The Origin of the Figure Called 'The
Vice' in Tudor Drama." Huntington Library Quarterly
22 (1958-59): 11-29.

- Marlowe, Christopher. Edward II. Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays. Ed. J. B. Steane. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969. 431-533.
- Marston, John. The Dutch Courtesan. The Selected Plays of John Marston. Ed. MacDonald P. Jackson and Michael Neill. Plays by Renaissance and Restoration Dramatists. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. 294-393.
- . Histrionastix, or The Player Whipped. Vol. 3 of The Plays of John Marston. Ed. Harvey Wood. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939. 247-302.
- . What You Will. Vol. 2 of The Plays of John Marston. Ed. Harvey Wood. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1938. 231-95.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. Ben Jonson and the Roman Frame of Mind. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.
- McCollom, William G. "From Dissonance to Harmony: The Evolution of Early English Comedy." The Theatre Annual 21 (1964): 69-96.
- McFarland, Ronald E. "Jonson's Magnetic Lady and the Reception of Gilbert's De Magnete." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 11 (1971): 283-93.
- Miles, Rosalind. Ben Jonson: His Life and Work. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

- Mirabelli, Philip. "Silence, Wit, and Wisdom in The Silent Woman." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. 29 (1989): 309-36.
- Morgan, Victor. "Cambridge University and 'The Country' 1560-1640. Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the Early 19th Century. Ed. Lawrence Stone. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974. 183-245. Vol. 1 of The University in Society.
- Neale, John E. The Elizabethan House of Commons. New Haven: Yale UP, 1950.
- O'Connor, John J. "The Chief Source of Marston's Dutch Courtezan." Studies in Philology 54 (1957): 509-15.
- Orme, Nicholas. Education and Society in Medieval and Renaissance England. London: Hambledon Press, 1989.
- Ostrowski, Carol Anne Carr. "The Dynamics of Roguery: Studies of the Jacobean Rogue in Selected Plays of Jonson and Middleton." Diss. U of Connecticut, 1977.
- Overbury, Thomas. The Overburian Characters. Ed. W. J. Paylor. The Percy Reprints 13. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1936. New York: AMS Press, 1977.
- The Oxford Companion to English Literature. 5th ed. Ed. Margaret Drabble. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Parrott, Thomas Marc. Introduction and Notes. The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies. Ed. Parrott. Vol 2. New York: Russell & Russell, 1961. 673-911.

- Parrott, Thomas Marc and Robert Hamilton Ball. A Short View of Elizabethan Drama. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Peacham, Henry. The Art of Living in London. The Complete Gentleman, The Truth of Our Times, and The Art of Living in London. By Henry Peacham. Ed. Virgil B. Heltzel. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1962. 243-50.
- Pelton, Robert D. The Trickster in West Africa: A Study of Mythic Irony and Sacred Delight. Berkeley: U of California P, 1980.
- The Pilgrimage to Parnassus. The Three Parnassus Plays. Ed. J. B. Leishman. London: Ivor, Nicholson & Watson, Ltd., 1949. 94-132.
- Plautus. Miles Gloriosus. Plautus: The Pot of Gold and Other Plays. Trans. E. F. Watling. London: Penguin Books, 1965. 147-212.
- . Mostellaria. Plautus: The Rope and Other Plays. Trans. E. F. Watling. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964. 23-84.
- . Pseudolus. Plautus: The Pot of Gold and Other Plays. Trans. E. F. Watling. London: Penguin Books, 1965. 213-68. 23-84.
- Radin, Paul. The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956.

- Ramondetta, Joseph Thomas. "The Scholarly Malcontent of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Stage." Diss. U of Massachusetts, 1987.
- Ranald, Margaret Loftus. John Webster. Twayne's English Authors Ser. 465. Boston: Twayne P, 1989.
- The Return from Parnassus, or The Scourge of Simony. The Three Parnassus Plays. Ed. J. B. Leishman. London: Ivor, Nicholson & Watson, Ltd., 1949. 217-367.
- Ricketts, Mac Linscott. "The North American Indian Trickster." History of Religions 5 (1965): 327-50.
- Riggs, David. Ben Jonson: A Life. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Rowe, George E. Distinguishing Jonson: Imitation, Rivalry, and the Direction of a Dramatic Career. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.
- Sackton, Alexander H. Rhetoric as a Dramatic Language in Ben Jonson. New York: Columbia UP, 1948.
- Salingar, Leo. Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1974.
- Scott, Michael. John Marston's Plays: Theme, Structure and Performance. New York: Harper & Row P, 1978.
- Shakespeare, William. The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare. Ed. Sylvan Barnett et al. New York: HBJ, 1972.

- Shirley, James. The Lady of Pleasure. Stuart Plays. Ed. Arthur H. Nethercot et al. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971. 955-99.
- Slights, William E. "The Trickster-Hero and Middleton's A Mad World, My Masters." Comparative Drama 3 (1969): 87-98.
- Somerset, J. A. B. "'Fair is foul and foul is fair': Vice-Comedy's Development and Theatrical Effects." The Elizabethan Theatre V. Ed. G. R. Hibbard. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1975. 54-75.
- Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains. New York: Columbia UP, 1958.
- Spivack, Charlotte. George Chapman. Twayne's English Authors Ser. 60. New York: Twayne P, 1967.
- Stevenson, William. Gammer Gurton's Needle. Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies. Ed. Charles W. Whitworth, Jr. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1984. 1-87.
- Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1965.
- . "The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640." Past and Present 28 (1964): 41-80.
- . "The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body 1580-1909." Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the Early 19th Century. Ed. Lawrence Stone. Princeton:

- Princeton UP, 1974. 3-110. Vol. 1 of The University in Society.
- Stonequist, Everett. The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- Street, Brian V. "The Trickster Theme." Zande Themes: Essays Presented to Sir Edward Evans-Pritchard. Ed. André Singer and Brian V. Street. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972. 82-104.
- Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Ben Jonson. Twayne English Authors Ser. 268. Boston: Twayne P, 1979.
- Sweeney, John Gordon, III. Jonson and the Psychology of Public Theater. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.
- Targan, Barry. "The Moral Structure of Bartholomew Fair." Discourse 8 (1965): 276-84.
- Terence. Terence: The Comedies. Trans. Betty Radice. New York: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Thayer, C. G. Ben Jonson: Studies in the Plays. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1963.
- Torrance, Robert M. The Comic Hero. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978.
- Townsend, Freda L. Apologie for Bartholomew Fayre :The Art of Jonson's Comedies. Modern Language Association Revolving Fund Ser. 15. London: Oxford UP, 1947.

- Udall, Nicholas. Ralph Roister Doister. Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies. Ed. Charles W. Whitworth, Jr. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1984. 89-211.
- Weber, Harold. The Restoration Rake-Hero: Transformations in Sexual Understanding in Seventeenth-Century England. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1986.
- Webster, John. John Webster: Three Plays. Introduction and Notes by D. C. Gunby. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Whitworth, Charles W., Jr., Introduction. Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies. Ed. Whitworth. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1984. xiii-lix.
- Wilson, F. P. The English Drama 1485-1585. Ed. G. K. Hunter. The Oxford History of English Literature 4.2. New York: Oxford UP, 1969.
- . The Plague in Shakespeare's London. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1927.
- Wine, M. L. Introduction. The Dutch Courtesan By John Marston. Ed. Wine. Regents Renaissance Drama Ser. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1965. xii-xxiv.
- Withington, Robert. "The Ancestry of the 'Vice'." Speculum 7 (1932): 525-9.
- . "'Vice' and 'Parasite.' A Note on the Evolution of the Elizabethan Villain." PMLA 49 (1934): 743-51.

- Woodbridge, Elisabeth. Studies in Jonson's Comedy. Yale Studies in English 5. 1898. New York: Gordian Press, 1966.
- Wright, Eugene Patrick. "Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama." Critical Survey of Drama. Supplement. Ed. Frank N. Magill. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Salem Press, 1987. 2263-93.
- Wright, Louis B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1935.