Boğaziçi Üniversitesi
Dilbilim ve Edebiyat Bölümü

MAJOR INFLUENCES ON THE FORMATION OF BEN JONSON'S SATIRIC STRATEGY: A STUDY OF THE "COMICALL SATYRES"

(Doçentlik Tezi)

Dr. Saliha Paker

İstanbul - 1982

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The "comicall satyres" which are three in number and amount to one-fifth of Jonson's total dramatic output[1] have a unique status among his other plays in their outstanding concern with the practical and theoretical aspects of the satirist's art. This particular quality of the "comicall satyres" far outweighs their merit as works of drama and constitutes the basis of the critical assumption that they belong to the formative period in Jonson's dramatic career. Yet in spite of their obvious importance in the formation of the dramatist's satiric strategy, the "comicall satyres" have received scant critical attention from this vital point of view. Those studies which are still considered to be the most notable ones focusing on the "comicall satyres" are C.R. Baskervill's English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (1911) and O.J.Campbell's Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1939).

In our view the fundamental reason motivating a critical study of the "comicall satyres" lies in their importance as experiments in a dramatic genre which exposes

the major influence of the classical tradition and a somewhat limited influence of the native English drama in the formation of Jonson's dramatic strategy as a satirist. The main significance of the formative quality of the "comicall satyres" appears in the fact that they embody conscious and meticulous efforts on the part of the dramatist to expound and formulate his conception of the purpose, the technique, and the function of satire in a new type of drama in the comic tradition. These efforts which are largely directed by Jonson's sound classical training, exhibit themselves in three phases, between 1599 and 1601, and each "comicall satyre" represents a phase, one following the other in three consecutive years.

Hence, all three plays constitute a process of experimentation: the first one, Every Man Out of His Humour (1599) laying the foundations of Jonson's satiric strategy, and the following plays, Cynthia's Revels (1600) and Poetaster (1601) complementing one another by elaborating and extending Jonson's initial attempt in the first play. Thus, although in themselves they cannot be rated as successful drama, as experiments in an innovative dramatic genre they present an outstanding unity of satiric conception which may even be assessed as a theory of satiric drama in its own right.

The innovative nature of the plays must be stressed, because literary historical investigation has shown that there is nothing quite like the "comicall satyres" in the

earlier English or classical dramatic tradition. In view of this special feature, it is rather surprising not to find any mention of these plays in the elaborate classification of types of satire in G.Highet's well-known Anatomy of Satire. Another feature that requires emphasis is the predominant influence of Jonson's classical scholarship on the formation of his satiric strategy in the "comicall satyres". While it is true that Jonson's works cannot be correctly evaluated outside the context of the native English tradition, the influence of classical literature on his "comicall satyres" is so extensive that it must be considered not of secondary but of primary importance - a point which has been generally acknowledged by critics. This influence is seen to exhibit itself not only in his outlook and purpose as a satirist, but also in his dramatic technique; that is, in practice as well as in precept.

It must also be noted that although Jonson testified to his lifelong interest in the theory of poetry and satire in Discoveries, a collection of critical notes and essays, this work belongs to his later years and represents an attempt to re-evaluate his accumulated dramatic experience which also includes the precepts and practices suggested and applied in the "comicall satyres".

In view of the above-mentioned aspects of the plays in question, the aim of this study may be defined as an attempt to evaluate the fundamental formative influences on Jonson's

satiric strategy which are largely classical but which also include some belonging to the native tradition.

Acting on the assumption that the "comicall satyres" are a combined product of Jonson's natural inclination for satiric drama and his deep interest and involvement in classical literature, it has been thought that an evaluation of the major influences, especially those of the classical tradition, would illuminate Jonson's development of a satiric strategy in writing the plays. Hence, to serve such a purpose, our evaluation has been based on a study of the specific influences on the dramatic form, structure, characterisation, method of satiric exposure, and themes of the "comicall satyres"[(2)]. The manner in which these constituents serve in the dramatic framework of Jonson's concept of satire, of its function and purpose, has been taken as what constitutes his satiric strategy.

A study of the "comicall satyres" from this point of view is intended also to serve the purpose of substantiating the extent of the influence of Horatian and Juvenalian satire on the plays. This subject has not been treated so far in a comprehensive study in relation to the dramatic features mentioned above. Furthermore, it is also among the contentions of our study that the comedies of Aristophanes have been particularly influential on Jonson's dramatic technique in the "comicall satyres". Apart from being the subject of two comparative studies, Aristophanes has so far been relatively

ignored in favour of Terence as a shaping influence on Jonson's comedy. Even those critical studies mentioned above, C.Gum's The Aristophanic Comedies of Ben Jonson (1969) and A.Lafkidon-Dick's Paideia Through Laughter: Jonson's Aristophanic Appeal to Human Intelligence (1974) are general comparisons of the two dramatists and do not focus exclusively on the technical aspect of Aristophanic influence on the "comicall satyres".

Hence, the first chapter of our study is intended as an introductory survey of the prominent influences on Jonson as humanist, scholar, and satiric dramatist in the context of classical and Renaissance critical theory. This is meant to serve in defining the nature of his involvement in classical scholarship and his attitude to the basic issues of his time so as to establish a point of view which will allow for a meaningful evaluation of the major influences on the plays.

The second chapter is devoted to a discussion of Every Man Out of His Humour. Beginning with a comparative assessment of Every Man in His Humour, the preceding comedy of "humours", it investigates the basic features of the genre introduced as "comicall satyre", in form, structure, characterisation, method of satiric exposure, and theme, from the point of view of influences operating on them, with special emphasis on that of Aristophanic comedy.

The third and fourth chapters are on Cynthia's Revels and Poetaster respectively, and follow the same methodological

outline and comparative approach of the preceding chapter in evaluating the innovations and developments in each, and in relation to one another.

The conclusion is a general assessment of Jonson's satiric strategy in the light of the achievements of the "comicall satyres".

In reference to the chapters devoted to the plays, it must be pointed out that although each chapter contains discussions on form, structure, characterisation, method of satiric exposure, and theme for the purpose of maintaining a unity of argument, the sequence and the extent of discussion may vary according to the importance of the issues raised in each play.

Furthermore, in discussing influences, especially of classical origin, it has been our aim to focus mainly on the most significant ones and their relation to specific aspects of the plays, and to exclude references to all the classical sources, which are in effect far too numerous to be cited in such a study, and which can in any case be found in the critical editions of Gifford, and of Herford and Simpson(3). When necessary, classical texts have been quoted in translation.

Finally, in the study of the "comicall satyres" special care has been taken to discuss dedicatory prefaces, inductions, and prologues which are the direct expression of the

dramatist's views and principles elaborated in the plays proper, and which have a highly significant bearing on the development of the dramatic genre suited to Jonson's satiric purposes.

CHAPTER ONE
JONSON AND THE CLASSICAL TRADITION

Jonson is indisputably one of the few great satiric dramatists in English literature. It is equally significant, however, that he combined classical scholarship in the humanistic tradition with his natural talent for satiric drama and poetry. His close interest in classical literature is apparent in the wealth of phrases and sentences drawn from works of antiquity and incorporated in his works.

Indeed it was his enthusiasm for the writers of classical antiquity that led him to practice in such Latinate genres as the epigram, ode, elegy, and epistle, thereby establishing him as a founder of English classicism(1). Even the arguments that stress the importance of the influence of the native English tradition on Jonson concede that it was his classical training and his profound familiarity with the precepts and practices of the authors of antiquity which resulted in "intellectual clarity and restraint as dominant characteristics of his work"(2), and which were the fundamenta forces in the shaping of his comedy.

However, familiarity with classical literature in the humanistic tradition often implies a certain ammount of imitation. Hence, to avoid misinterpretation, it seems necessary to explain first the nature of the classical influence on Jonson and to discuss its implications so far as the imitation of the writers of antiquity is concerned.

In examining the Renaissance conception of imitation with which Jonson was well acquainted, a basic distinction must be made between imitation of nature and imitation of other poets. The former, seen as the fundamental function of all poetry, corresponds roughly to Aristotle's mimesis. In Sidney's words, it is "that fayning notable images of vertues, vices, or what els, with that delightful teaching, which must be the right describing note to know a Poet by"(3). As for the imitation of the works of great poets, this was generally accepted to be the most viable means of achieving a true imitation of nature, though such English guides as Sidney and Puttenham offered no practical advice in the matter.

Surveying some of the essential opinions held by Italian renaissance critics, it is observed that B. Parthenio(4), in line with the majority of humanists who recommended Cicero, Seneca and Virgil as the best models for the cultivation of prose and poetic styles, proposed that imitation should be practiced for the purpose of achieving a style at the same superior level of the model imitated;

B.Ricci[5] believed that exclusive imitation of an author was an error; and T.Tasso[6] the poet, condemned a reproduction of theme or of stylistic peculiarities but favoured that which transcended mere words.

It appears that Jonson came closer to Tasso's precept than to any other, in that he took quite a number of classical authors as guides but not at the expense of innovation and originality, as a statement in his Discoveries implies: "Much arises from the Ancients, yet much has been left to posterity" (Disc.141)[7]. To him, the classical authors were a source of inspiration rather than masters whose works or dicta should be rigidly imitated or applied. So Jonson's relationshi to classical literature can perhaps be better understood if we apply the term "assimilation" rather than "imitation"; a point that is confirmed in Disc. in which Jonson gives his definition of imitation as the writer's ability "to convert the substance, or Riches of an other Poet to his owne use" (Disc.2467).

In this study we are primarily concerned with Jonson's use of the classical literary tradition as a creative force, giving impetus to the writing of such innovative works as the 'comicall satyres'. This type of satiric drama may well be judged as a unique product of Jonson's total assimilation of classical learning and of his powerful dramatic ability, which was motivated to a large extent by a desire to reform the contemporary English drama. So, in order to be able to

evaluate Jonson's innovative works in the proper perspective, we must have an overview of the aesthetic and the ethical problems inherent in the drama of his day.

On this issue Sidney, for instance, voices the following criticism with special reference to Gorboduc,

> Our Tragedies and Comedies (not without cause cried out against), observing rules neyther of honest civilitie nor of skilfull Poetrie, excepting Gorboduc... which notwithstanding, as it is full of stately speeches and well sounding phrases, clyming to the height of Seneca his stile, and as full of notable moralitie, which it doth most delightfully teach, and so obtayne the very end of Poesie, yet in troth it is very defectious in the circumstances, which greeveth mee, because it might not remaine as an exact model of all Tragedies. For it is faulty both in place and time, the two necessary companions of all corporall actions (8).

Similarly George Whetstone, in his dedication to Promos and Cassandra, having first remarked that the works of contemporary continental playwrights fall short of the standard set by such classical dramatists as Plautus and Terence, goes on to criticise the English in particular:

> The Englishman in this qualitie is most vaine, indiscreete, and out of order: he fyrst groundes his worke on impossibilities, then in three howers runnes he throwe the worlde, marryes, gets Children, makes Children men, men to conquer kingdomes, murder Monsters, and bringeth Gods from Heaven, and fetcheth Divels from Hel(9).

These criticisms, no doubt based on a conception of dramatic form that the Renaissance drew from the study of

classical drama, call attention to the need for a clearer sense of form, for adherance to the principles of decorum and verisimilitude, which seem to be largely absent from the drama of the times. They also seem highly meaningful in relation to T.S.Eliot's criticism of the Elizabethan drama on account of its lack of convention. For convention in Eliot's sense is "a selection or structure or distortion in subject matter or technique; any form or rhythm imposed upon the world of action"(10).

An awareness of the relative lack of aesthetic concern in dramatic construction, as expressed by Sidney and Whetstone, no doubt increased in proportion to the growing interest in poetic theory and criticism which was spreading from Italy throughout the rest of Europe. Scaliger's Poetices(1561) and Minturno's De Poeta(1559), both landmarks in the Renaissance critical theory, were basically interpretations of classical aesthetics, with considerable emphasis on drama. As is well known, in such works and in those primary sources like Aristotle's Poetics and Horace's Ars Poetica to which they directed attention, aesthetics in drama was inseparable from moral concerns. In keeping with classical precepts, defenders of poetry such as Sidney believed that poetry, dramatic poetry in particular, had a definite moral function to fulfill in society. One must conclude that this was particularly relevant in view of the Puritan attacks on the stage on the grounds of immorality, which no doubt forced

playwrights to reflect seirously on the role of drama as a moral and instructive force in society. In Jonson's case a heightened sense of moral responsibility went hand in hand with a concern for dramatic form.

T.S.Eliot, in his discussion of Elizabethan dramatists including Shakespeare, singles out Jonson as the poet who had "a fine sense of form, of the purpose for which a particular form is intended"(11). Jonson's dramatic works themselves, especially the "comicall satyres", make it plain how seriously he was in search of greater formal definition in drama, of techniques that would enlighten both writers and audiences on what was appropriate in a dramatic poem. This quest for a clearer definition of the form and function of drama led him like many of his contemporaries to a study and consideration of the theoretical and critical works of antiquity.

That in the search for theory and convention he sought the guidance of the classical authors and found much to his satisfaction, is amply clear in Disc., which is a collection of critical notes, observations, and brief essays. The content of Disc. reveal that Jonson had read the essays of Donatus on tragedy and on comedy; that he knew Aristotle's Poetics, which had been available in Latin translations from the middle of the 16th century on; and that he was familiar with the critical writings of the Renaissance scholars. Therefore, it would be correct to regard this work as an

indication of Jonson's pursuit of a common theoretical and critical tradition rather than as a product of original speculation or of a systematic enquiry. It is true that Jonson' dramatic works too, especially Poetaster, embody theoretical concepts and principles that seem to have been assimilated in the process of scholarly study. But it is not quite possible to attribute to their author a systematic treatment of poetic theory which might be called a poetics of his own. What seems to be a better approach from our point of view, is to recognise two mutually interactive forces that motivated Jonson's works: one, a serious and sustained interest in the nature and purpose of poetry in general, and of dramatic poetry in particular; and secondly, an equally serious and intense creativity in the domain of satiric drama.

However Disc. may still be considered a suitable source for demonstrating Jonson's concern with the theoretical aspects of poetry. In the description of poetry for instance, as "the Queene of Arts: which had her Originall from heaven, received thence from 'Ebrewes, and had in prime estimation with the Greeks, transmitted to the Latines, and all Nations, that profess'd Civilitie,"(Disc 2382-85) the superiority of poetry is expressed in terms of divine origin[12]. Elsewhere in the same work, it is the moral and instructive effects that are emphasised; for poetry "offers to mankinde a certaine rule, and Patterne of living well and happily; disposing us to all Civill offices of society" (Disc. 2386-88); it is" a dulcet and gentle Philosophy, which leades on, and guides us by the

hand to Action, with a ravishing delight, and incredible Sweetnes"(Disc.2398-2400). So, in keeping with the classical precepts, Jonson held that the ethical and social impact of poetry was of primary importance since it was seen as capable of improving men as individuals and as members of society.

Moreover, according to Jonson the function of poetry could be compared to that of oratory, since as implied above, he saw part of the poet's duty as one to move men to action.

> "The poet is the neerest borderer upon the Orator, and expresseth all his vertues, though he be tyed more to numbers; is his equall in ornament, and above him in his strenghs. And (of the kind) the Comicke comes neerest: Because, in moving the minds of men, and stirring of affections (in which Oratory shewes, and especially approves her eminence) hee chiefly excells".
>
> (Disc. 2528-34)[14]

In pointing out the similarity between the poet and the orator, Jonson is in line with the Renaissance view of poetry and oratory as related arts - a view that was no doubt established by the favour shown by humanists to Cicero's De Oratore, and Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria. From our point of view,however, it is Jonson's reference to the comic poet as one coming closest to the function of the orator in "moving the minds of men" that is of especial interest. For, in the context of his Horation view of poetry as a source of instruction and pleasure, comedy appears to be invested with an additional power to affect audiences. What is more, the comic poet's duty could very well extend from mild didacticism to an active reproof of folly and vice, as is made evident by

the following passage devoted to a defense of satiric writing as Jonson understood and practiced it:

> "Whilst I name no persons, but deride follies; why should any man confesse, or betray himself?... Is it such an inexpiable crime in Poets, to taxe vices generally; and no offence in them who, by their exception, confesse they have committed them particularly?"
>
> (Disc. 2304-10)[15]

This seems to be a good example of how the creative aspect of Jonson as satiric dramatist operated in response to the theoretical precepts on the nature of poetry, derived from the study of the classical authors.

That he saw satiric drama as potentially capable of fulfilling the moral and social function of great poetry is made evident in the insistence with which he pursued his experimentation with a genre that he labelled "comicall satyre". It will no doubt be appropriate at this point to emphasise yet once more that for Jonson, form and convention in drama were inseparable from its function and equal in importance.

The form of Jonson's plays was based on a set of assumptions and governed by a clear conception of certain conventions, which originated partly from the theoretical precepts and critical judgements of Aristotle, Horace, and Donatus, and partly from such models as Aristophanes, Plautus and Terence.

As is shown by the following passage from Disc. containing the definition of the dramatic poet, Jonson followed Aristotle in regarding the plot, (or the 'Fable' as he called it after the Romans) as the most vital element of a play:

> "...Hence, he is call'd a Poet, not hee which writeth in measure only; but that fayneth and formeth a fable, and writes things like the Truth. For, the Fable and Fiction is (as it were) the forme and Soule of any Poeticall worke or Poeme."
>
> (Disc. 2351-55)[16]

His discussion of the unity of dramatic action, and its proper magnitude (emphasising the importance of observing limit and proportion in designing the plot, the general attentiveness to the demands for structural wholeness) are seen to be a rephrasing of the same material in the Poetics.

> "The fable is call'd the Imitation of one entire, and perfect Action; whose parts are so joyned, and knitt together, as nothing in the structure can be chang'd, or taken away, without impairing, or troubling the whole; of which there is a proportionable magnitude in the members."
>
> (Disc. 2681-86),
>
> "Now, in every Action it behooves the Poet to know which is his utmost bound, how farre with fitnesse, and a necessary proportion, he may produce, and determine it. That is, till either good fortune change into the worse, or the worse into the better. For, as a body without proportion cannot be goodly, no more can the Action, either in Comedy, or Tragedy is esteem'd the best that is largest, till it can increase no more: so it behooves the Action in Tragedy, or Comedy, to be let grow, till the necessity aske a Conclusion: Wherein two things are to be

> considered: First, that it exceed not the compasse of one Day; Next, that there be place left for digression, and Art."
>
> (Disc. 2735-47)

As has been noted by Herford and Simpson, Jonson's entire exposition on the nature of the 'dramatic fable' follows Heinsius's De Tragoediae Constitutione, which in turn depends upon Aristotle(17).

The majority of Jonsonian critics from Dryden on have been in unanimous agreement on the dramatist's highly developed structural skills. Dryden qualified works like Epicoene as "the most correct plays"(18), Coleridge rated Jonson equal to Sophocles and considered The Alchemist to be one of the three great examples of structural excellence in European drama(19). Likewise, among other twentieth century critics who have drawn attention to Jonson's structural competence Herford praises the "extraordinaty constructive power"(20) that exhibits itself in Volpone, The Alchemist, and Epicoene, while Bamborough states that Jonson's "superb skill in plotting and the manipulation of action distinguishes him from his contemporaries, more perhaps than any other of his strengths"(21).

There is no doubt that studying the Poetics and translating Horace's Ars Poetica(22) heightened Jonson's sense of structural excellence. Evidence must be shown, however, that Jonson's practical understanding of plot structure

derives not from Aristotle or Horace, but from the Terentian model and from Donatus, whose essays on drama were published as an appendix to the playtexts of Terence.

A study by Snuggs demonstrates that although in theory the correct distribution of acts within a play received critical attention, in practice, particularly in public theatres, almost no attention was paid to act-division before 1610. Of the 131 quarto editions printed before 1610, belonging to specific theatre companies, 56 have act-divisions while 75 have not. Of the 75 undivided plays, 71, and of the 56 divided plays, 10 were produced in public theatres. It is significant that four out of the ten belonging to the category of divided plays staged in public theatres, are Jonson's works. Consequently Snuggs states: "Jonson is the great exception, the only leading dramatist whose public theatre plays printed in this period consistently exhibit the five-act pattern"(23).

This is a case in point, because the division of plays into five acts was seen as being founded on the five-act structure, which in turn was related to the protasis-epitasis-catastrophe plot development. This tripartite division was one of the fundamental elements of Reanissance comic theory based on Donatus' exposition on Terentian plot structure(24), and it was usually made to coincide with the five-act distribution, with the protasis covering the first act two acts, the epitasis the third and fourth acts, and the catastrophe the final act(25).

It is seen that Jonson used the term epitasis as early as in 1599, in the third act of E.M.O. where Cordatus addresses Mitis as follows: "Lose not yourselfe, for now the Epitasis or the busy part of our subject is in act"(III,viii, 100-102). Much later, in the summary of the plot of The New Inn produced in 1629, Jonson wrote: "Here begins, at the third Act, the Epitasis, or businesse of the Play, ...The fifth and last Act is the catastrophe, or knitting up of all". Finally, at the end of the first act of The Magnetic Lady(1632) one member of the chorus, commenting and making observations on the play, explains to another character, the structural arrangement of the play:

> Do you looke, Mr.Damplay, for conclusions in a protasis? I thought the Law of Comedy had reserv'd (them) to the Catastrophe: and that the Epitasis (as wee are taught) and the Catastasis, had beene intervening parts, to have been expected. But you would have all come together, it seems. The Clock should strike five, at one with the Acts.
>
> (I,vii, 7-3)

Such significant statements on the correlation of act-division and qualitative parts evidently show how much of Jonson's awareness of form and structure owes to a practical study of the characteristics of Roman Comedy in general, and of Terence in particular. They are also important in that they underline Jonson's preoccupation with form and structure which apparently extended to the point of incorporating what might be called technical matters into the play and bringing them specifically to the attention of his audience. In view

of this acute sense of the importance of form and structure inherent in Jonson's writings, it seems that one has to be cautious in condemning the "comicall satyres" for lack of proper structure. As will be discussed in the following chapters Every Man Out of His Humour, Cynthia's Revels, and Poetaster have been labelled as 'episodic' and so far, with the exception of a few, critics have tried to explain this feature by seeking similarities between these plays and the miniature character sketches in Roman formal satire. It is among the contentions of this study that the "comicall satyres", besides showing influences of Terentian plot structure and of certain characteristics of the formal satire of Horace and Juvenal, owe much to the comedy of Aristophanes - especially in their structure and characterisation. This is not surprising, for the Roman satirists themselves acknowledged Aristophanes and other writers of Old Comedy as their mentors, in intent and spirit, if not in literary form.

To continue with our discussion of the influence of classical models on Jonson, it will be useful to survey the range of ancient works that have a bearing on the form and content of his works, and that have no doubt complemented the influence of theoretical precepts and critical judgements pointed out earlier.

That the tragedies of Seneca and the comedies of Plautus and Terence were the most influential dramatic models in the Elizabethan period is common knowledge. As far as Jonson the

comic dramatist is concerned, the main model seems to be the plays of Terence, as has been previously indicated. But it is also true that Jonson made use of Plautus' Captivi and Aulularia, in composing The Case is Altered, one of his earliest plays. Besides, Disc. offers evidence that he esteemed Plautus very highly, qualifying him, after Varro, as "the Prince of Letters and Elegancie in the Roman Language" (Disc. 2551-54), and that in some ways he preferred him to Terence:

> In the Greeke Poets, as also in Plautus, wee shall see the Oeconomy, and disposition of Poems, better observed than in Terence, and the later: who thought the sole grace, and vertue of their Fable, the sticking in of sentences, as ours doe the forcing in of jests".
>
> (Disc. 1815-1820)

However, in trying to reconcile his own appraisal with Horace's criticism of Plautus in the Ars Poetica as coarse and lacking in art, Jonson weighed up the merits and demerits of both Roman dramatists, and reached the conclusion that while Terence could be more appealing to those of good judgement on account of "equity, truth, perspicuity, and Candour" (Disc. 2669-70), Plautus was superior to him in comic vitality. And this does not seem to be in contradiction with the advice given in Poetaster by Virgil to Crispinus, a character who indulges in crude poetry:

> ...Then come home,
> And taste a piece of Terence, sucke his phrase
> Instead of lycorice; and, at any hand,
> Shun Plautus, and old Ennius, they are meats
> Too harsh for a weake stomacke.
>
> (V,iii,539-43)

As for Jonson's debt to the third dramatist in question, "the merry Greeke, tart Aristophanes", critical opinion varies on the extent to which he was influenced by this comic-satiric poet.

There would not be much point, of course, in discussing such an influence had Jonson not commented on Aristophanes several times in his writings, had there not been a large number of Aristophanic borrowings in his work[26], and most important of all, had he not declared that Every Man Out of His Humour was written "somewhat like Vetus Comedia".

Although there has been some critical controversy on Jonson's use of this term, vetus comoedia is generally understood to be referring to the Gerek Old Comedy of Aristophanes, which focused directly on the contemporary Athenian life of 5th century B.C. and the purpose of which was to expose and correct topical abuses through comic and satiric devices. Since this matter will be discussed later within the context of Every Man Out of His Humour, the question to be clarified at this point is the degree of Jonson's familiarity with Aristophanes.

That Jonson was proficient in Ancient Greek as well as in Latin has been substantiated by Simpson. Apart from the well-known fact that Jonson was educated in Westminster School and studied under the distinguished classical scholar J.Camden, the headmaster, whose teaching led the way

to the publication of a grammar book of Greek. Simpson has offered the evidence of Jonson's Greek notes on the masques, and his corrections of the Latin translation of the Greek text of Aelian's Tactica (edited in 1613) to prove this point[27].

It has also been established that Jonson's library contained two editions of Aristophanes' comedies, each with a Latin translation appended to the Greek text, though it is thought possible that these might have been purchased after the fire that destroyed Jonson's library in 1623[28].

Another point to be clarified is whether Greek Old Comedy was known and read widely enough so that Jonson's reference to vetus comoedia would create response from the audiences of Every Man Out of His Humour.

Scholarship has produced sufficient evidence that Aristophanes was known to those men of the 16th century who had been educated at schools which placed emphasis on humanistic scholarship. Although Aristophanes' plays were performed only twice in England during the 16th century (Plutus in 1536, and Peace in 1546 in Cambridge, where interest in Greek literature and language was predominant) it is konwn that all the eleven plays of the Greek dramatist were included in the academic curricula[29]. Lord and Baldwin have shown the extent of the publications and the recommendations of Aristophanes' works and the considerable amount of popularity they enjoyed in the 16th and 17th centuries[30].

Moreover, it must be remembered that even those Elizabethans who were not familiar with the ancient Greek texts of Aristophanes could very well have acquainted themselves with Old Comedy, though in general terms, by readin Latin classics such as Horace's Satires and Ars Poetica, Persius' Satires, Pliny's Letters, Cicero's De Officiis, or Plutarch's Moralia.

Horace, whom Jonson acknowledged more than once as his master, had openly associated himself in his Satires with the tradition of Aristophanes which he regarded as being reborn in the works of Lucilius, the father of Roman formal satire (31 In view of this, what is of particular significance for us is that, whatever may have been the extent of Aristophanic influence on Jonson, his dramatic interests show that he definitely placed himself in the same satiric tradition extending from Old Comedy to Roman Satire. However, regarding his general conception of Old Comedy, it must be noted that Jonson did not approve of the typical Aristophanic method of inducing laughtr through forcical devices or scurrilous personal invective.

The following commentary in Disc. may be taken as an indication of his familiarity with Aristophones as well as of his disapproval of the vulgar aspect of Old Comedy:

> ...it was clear that all insolent, and obscene speaches; jests upon the best men; injuries to particular persons; perverse, and sinister

> Sayings... in the Old Comedy, did move laughter; ...and scurrility come forth in the place of wit... Of which Aristophanes affords an ample harvest, having not only out gone Plautus, or any other in that kind; but express'd all the moods, and figures, of what is ridiculous, oddly.
>
> (Disc. 2646-57)

That Jonson must also have been well acquainted with the peculiar structural elements of Greek Old Comedy is a subject that will be discussed in Chapter Two. At this point however, it is necessary to draw attention also to the influence which Roman formal satire, though not a dramatic genre, exerted on Jonson, especially through the works of Horace and Juvenal.

Quintilian, comparing Greek and Roman literature had stated that satire as a literary genre (satura) was wholly Roman (Institutio Oratoria, 10.1.93). Satura, as is known, means 'a medley' full of different things, variety being intrinsic to it[32]. Livy the historian refers to the primitive saturae in the context of the native Italian dramatic forms (the Fescennine verses and Atellan farces) and describes them as medleys incorporating dialogue, music, rhythmical miming and spontaneous buffoonery (Ab Urbe Condita Libri, 7.2.) After Ennius, the first distinguished Roman poet and also the first to compose a poetic satire based on the stage satura, the genre was developed in two different forms: one, by Lucilius, exclusively in hexameter verse, and the other by Varro, which was a combination of prose and verse. The latter came to be called "Menippean", after the manner of the

Hellenistic Cynic philosopher Menippus. Apart from the difference in medium, Menippean satire was more philosophic and less biting, while the satire of Lucilius was designed as a fierce reproof of vice and folly in the contemporary society Accordingly, the subjects of Lucilius were topical and personal and his language more colloquial than literary. Although all three of the later distinguished formal satirists, Horace, Persius, and Juvenal, professed themselves to be the followers of Lucilius, it was Juvenal who remained closest to Lucilius in ferocity of spirit(33).

Roman formal satire, Juvenal's in particular, came to be highly popular in England in the 1590's, and was imitated so forcefully by such poets as Donne, Hall, and Marston that this revival eventually provoked the strong reaction of the ecclesiastical authorities, culminating in the Bishop's Ban of 1599(34). By this act, certain prose and verse satires were burnt in public and further publications of such works were prohibited on the grounds that they were obscene in language, injurious to living personages, and politically subversive. But a better understanding of the strong reaction of the authorities to the sudden popularity of a literary genre can b reached through the examination of some of the critical assumptions that governed its conventions.

The predominant view of satire held by Renaissance critics was that, due to its origins in one of the most ancient and primitive forms of poetry, this mode was by natu

rough, crude in meter as well as in language, and bitter in invective. The source for this view lay in Donatus' De Fabula where it was claimed that satire as written by Lucilius, for example, had descended from the satyra, the old Greek satyr-play, which itself was seen as a direct descendant of Greek Old Comedy, and which as a dramatic genre was replaced by the New Comedy of Hellenistic times(35).

Thus George Puttenham, a critic of the 16th century, following Donatus, believed that satyrs, the lascivious demi-gods of the woods, were used as a mouthpiece by the authors of the satyr-plays for railing against abuses:

> ...to the intent their bitternesse should breede none ill will, either to the Poets, or to the recitours (which could not have bene chosen if they had bene openly knowen) and besides to make their admonition and reproofs seme graver and of more efficacie..."(36).

Kernan, examining the attitude to satire as unrestrained and libelous invective in the context of the "Juvenalian" poems of the 1590's, attributes the harshness and obscenity of the English satirists to their adherance to the supposed tone of the old satyr-plays(37). Kernan also claims that these satirists regarded the satyr, traditionally considered an obscene jeerer, as tainted by the very vices he attacks. Amongst other examples he notes that in G.Wither's satires for instance which were illustrated by the drawing of a fierce satyr, the poet's persona admits his immorality: "Thus are vices scourg'd by mee/Yet my selfe from vice not free"(38).

When we compare retrospectively this attitude of the satirist regarding himself with that of Horace or Juvenal, we see that the Roman poets associated themselves not with the satyr but with Lucilius, who, in the words of Horace, "courageously invented the composition of this type of poetry and tore the mask from the faces of men who presented a fair front to the world but were inwardly corrupt" (Satires II, 1,62-65). Moreover, Horace emphasises his own moral integrity, since his professed aim is to "merely criticize a man who deserves it", while keeping himself "free from blame" (Satires II,1,39-41). Thus the Horatian goal is that of the vir bonus, the good man who will not only expose the evil in society by rebuking the vicious, but who will also praise good men and try to live as their friend.

As for Juvenal, whose "savage indignation" is in obvious contrast to Horace's judicious irony, it may be said that his attitude is one that places more emphasis on the role of the satirist as a moral champion. He writes "I urge my car on the drill ground/Where Lucilius drove his chariot" (Satire, I,19-20) thus declaring himself a warrior against corruption. Viewing contemporary Rome, with vice running rife, he professes that for the virtuous "it is difficult not to write satire" (Satire, I,30), and that if the language used in his satires is too strong or lacking in art for some tastes, then it must be remembered that it is indignation more than natural ability that gives birth to his verses.

In summing up the tradition in which Horace and Juvenal appear as the final distinguished examples, the following statement by Kernan is appropriate: "The historical movement of satire is from crude scoffs and revilings to polished literary forms which have as their distinguishing marks the qualities of wit and morality"(39). And it seems that it was precisely in the pursuit of morality as much as wit that Jonson strove to make his satire worthy of its illustrious Roman ancestors, and to assert its superiority to the concept of satire as a descendant of the rough satyr-play.

In what sepcific manner Jonson followed the example of Horace and Juvenal is a subject that will be covered in the subsequent chapters. In describing his attitude towards satire in its broad outline, we note that Jonson is in line with his classical models in regarding it as a form of moral instruction, as a mode of attacking vices and follies generally, without regard to particular persons. The passages from Disc. quoted earlier, plainly show his disapproval of personal invective as, for instance, displayed in Aristophanes' plays. His aim, following Horace's, was to "spare mens persons, but taxe their crimes" (Poetaster, III,v,134). As for his mediu of satiric expression, we know that he chose comic drama which was "accomodated to the correction of manners" (E.M.O. III,vi,208-9.) as conceived by Cicero.

This choice gains particular significance in his definition of the three plays he wrote in the years 1599-1601

as "comicall satyre"; a term which he coined to explain a new dramatic genre. It is in these plays that he expounds his mission as satirist and experiments with a comic mode of dramatic expression that in his view is particularly suitable as a vehicle for satire. In each play, the dramatic action is presided over by a satiric persona, who seems to represent the Jonsonian ideal; Asper in Every Man Out (1599), Crites in Cynthia's Revels (1600), and Horace in Poetaster, (1601).

It is highly significant that the first of these "satyres" Every Man Out of His Humour was produced in 1599, after the Bishop's Ban in June of the same year. As indicated by the following statements of Campbell, one of the most notable critics of the "comicall satyres", this ban had immediate and far reaching effects. He writes:

> Despite the apparent effectiveness of these radical measures, the satiric spirit that had been so vigorous during the preceding decade could not be destroyed by decree. Almost immediately, authors associated with the proscribed movement devised a form of comedy which effectively preserved its salutary purposes and methods. Ben Jonson's Every Man Out was apparently the first play consciously dedicated to that purpose. It was composed soon after the restraining order of the bishops. - probably during the second half of the year 1599 (40).

Although it is not certain that Jonson was one of the "authors of the proscribed movement", there is no doubt that he had associated himself with the satiric movement in England in the 1590's, as well as with Roman satiric tradition. In all three of the comedies, each of which he explicitly labelled

"comicall satyre", he drew heavily on Roman satire, as did the English formal satirists, and took great pains to explain his satiric motive and technique to his audiences.

The reason for this particularly defensive and explicatory attitude must surely have been the fact that in the writing of these "satyres", he was engaged in a process of innovation and anticipated criticism. That Every Man in His Humour, which preceded Every Man Out, was very different in structure and tone, and subdued in satiric intent, confirms that 1599 was the beginning of a new phase in Jonson's dramatic career.

CHAPTER TWO

EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR

'Nothing that Jonson had written up to this time, nothing, indeed, in the history of Elizabethan drama, quite prepares one for Every Man Out" writes E. Partridge, in beginning his discussion of this play[1]. What in fact Jonson has attempted in Every Man Out of His Humour[2], is a dramatic genre which combines the features' of a panoramic comedy with those of a satiric pageant. Although the title of this play might lead one to assume that it is a sequel to Every Man in His Humour, the very fact that it has been labelled by Jonson as "comicall satyre" implies that it is different from the preceding comedy of humours.

In comparing E.M.O. with its predecessor E.M.I., Herford and Simpson make the following assessment on the relationship between the two plays; "E.M.O. is neither a counterpart nor a contrast, neither a companion piece nor a sequel to E.M.I. It is a second handling of the same theme, with a more direct satiric purpose and a more uncompromising and defiant originality of method."[3] These statements call

for agreement, but also indicate the necessity for an appraisal of E.M.I. so that the differences may be better understood.

Firstly, E.M.I. was designed as a genuine Roman comic intrigue-plot, but unlike the preceding play The Case is Altered, which was a combination of Plautus' Aulularia and Captivi,(4) it was Jonson's own invention. Furthermore the characters in E.M.I. were typical figures of Roman comedy; the old father, the young son, the clever and scheming servant, the braggart soldier(5). In accordance with the conventions of Roman Comedy the opposition of father and son, and the deceptions conceived and carried out by the trickster-servant in alliance with the son, formed the basis of the comic intrigue in E.M.I.

A point of interest concerning Jonson's technique in this play is that he should have appropriated the character types and the intrigue of Roman comedy so adeptly for his own comic purposes. These purposes become particularly evident in Jonson's "humourous" characterisation. As confirmed by, the majority of critics, the greatest vitality of E.M.I. arises from the dramatic display of the "humours" of the characters(6). Jonson explains this type of characterisation in E.M.O. by referring to the doctrine of the four humours, a point that will be discussed with reference to that play. It may however, be explained also in terms of a particular dramatic technique, by which a character is conceived in terms

of a predominant habit or attitude, and is brought to life on the stage through successive and repeated display of his or her peculiarity by means of speech and actions that remain consistent with his or her fixed nature. What this amounts to is, of course, caricature in dramatic terms. This type of characterisation based on a predominant feature is essential to the English morality play by which Jonson was undoubtedly influenced[7]. But it is also a fundamental principle of Plautian dramatic technique which may very well have contributed to other influences on Jonson at this stage of his career.

What is interesting to note is that in E.M.I., the technique of "humourous" characterisation serves to convey the basic moral idea which establishes the view-point of the play: namely, the opposition between the rule of reason and the power of uncontrolled "affections". This view is voiced by Lorenzo Senior, in a monologue expressing his concern for his son:

> My labouring spirit being late opprest
> With my sonnes follie, can embrace no rest,
> Till it hath plotted by aduise and skill,
> How to reduce him from affected will
> To reasons manage; which while I intend,
> My troubled soule beginnes to apprehend
> A farther secret, and to meditate
> Upon the difference of mans estate:
> Where is deciphered to true iudgements eye
> A deep, conceaid, and precious misterie.
> Yet can I not but worthily admire
> At natures art: who (when she did inspire
> This heat of life) plac'd Reason (as a king)
> Here in the head, to haue the marshalling
> Of our affections: and with soueraigntie
> To sway the state of our weake empirie...
>
> (II,ii,1-16)

It is observed that the "humour" characters stand for the unchecked impulses and desires ("affections") that are displayed through affection. In fact, "humour", "folly", and "affectation" are almost synonymous in E.M.I. as indicated by the following definition of "humour":

> Marrie ile tell thee what it [humour] is (as tis generally receiued in these daies) it is a monster bred in a man by selfe loue, and affectation, and fed by folly.
>
> (III,i,156-158)

Thus, Jonson's conception of "humours" may be qualified as basically psychological and moral.

A close reading of the play reveals that the exposition of humours follows the development of the plot. As the momentum of the intrigue increases, each character's pursuit of his humour becomes proportionately exaggerated and ridiculous. But the moral requisite implicit in the dramatic action itself is that all the characters should be ultimately liberated from their respective "humours." Hence the dénouement of the plot is arranged so that the "humourists" are made to recognise the absurdity of their follies. In this process Doctor Clement, who functions as an arbiter of justice[6], instrumental in bringing about the liberation from "humours" by imposing penalties to those follies that appear most outstanding. However, the very fact that Doctor Clement is himself a "humourist" shows that whatever the punishments ma be, the administering of justice is carried out without

impairing the comic tone which was maintained throughout the play.

It must be pointed out that Jonson made use of this type of ending in the subsequent "comicall satyres", placing considerable emphasis on the passing of moral judgement on figures of folly and of vice. But as indicated in the Prologue appended to the folio edition of 1616[9], Jonson's purpose in E.M.I. was to expose "...deedes, and language, such as men doe use:/And persons, such as Comoedie would chuse./When she would shew an Image of the times,/And sport with humane follies, not with crimes"(21-24). Thus it is implied that in this play the emphasis is merely on the foolish and ridiculous aspects of "humours", though it is possible to discern from time to time an undertone of more serious implications.

However, in Jonson's subsequent "humours" play, E.M.O. we note a drastic change in purpose and tone, and this change is naturally accompanied by a number of others which shall henceforth be surveyed in the context of form, structure, characterisation, and theme.

Beginning with the question of form, it is to be noted that Jonson has not called it simply a comedy, but a "comicall satyre", no doubt to emphasise the heavily satiric quality of the play. But it should also be noted that certain parts of E.M.O. are devoted to explanatory discussions on the nature of comedy, on the role of the comic poet, and on the nature of

this play in particular.

In Act III, for instance, in a dialogue between the two members of the Chorus, Mitis and Cordatus, the latter offers a Ciceronian definition of comedy as the basis for the play in question:

> You say well, but I would faine heare one of these autumne-judgements define once, Quid sit Comoedia? if he cannot, let him content himselfe with Ciceros definition (till hee haue strength to propose to himselfe a better) who would haue a Comoedie to be Imitatio vitae, Speculum consuetudinis, Imago veritatis; a thing throughout pleasant, and ridiculous, and accomodated to the correction of manners...
>
> (III,vi,202-209)

This passage, (the source of which is known to be an essay called De Comoedia[10] by Donatus, the most eminent of 4th century grammarians) defines the form and objects of comic representation, as "imitation of life" (imitatio vitae), "mirror of customs" (speculum consuetudinis), and "image of truth" (imago veritatis); the manner of comic expression, as pleasant and inducing laughter; and the purpose, as the correction of manners. Thus it covers the whole range of the constituents of comedy, though in highly general terms.

However, this broad formula gains in significance when evaluated in the light of a description of E.M.O. given in the Induction, in a dialogue between the choric characters. Asked by Mitis as to what type of play E.M.O. is, Cordatus replies:

> Faith sir, I must refraine to iudge, only this
> I can say of it, 'tis strange, and of a particular
> kind by it selfe, somewhat like Vetus Comoedia...
>
> (Induction, 230-232)

It is this last distinction that constitutes internal evidence for the uniqueness of the form of the comedy in question: a comedy that fits the Ciceronian definition, but also one that apparently allows the poet the freedom of innovation.

But before proceeding with a discussion of Jonson's conception of Vetus Comoedia which seems to underlie the innovations in the play, it will be useful to survey its general characteristics.

Cast in the structure of a five-act play, it does not, however, have the linear development of an intrigue plot, but consists largely of episodic scenes in which a considerably wide range of characters are dramatically exposed according to their various "humours". Some of these "humours" are exaggerated affectations or follies of the kind to be observed in E.M.I. Puntarvolo, Fastidious Brisk, and Saviolina comprise the aristocratic group and indulge in peculiarities appropriate to their high standing, while the middle-class Fungoso, Deliro, Fallace, and the country bumpkin Sogliardo aspire to the courtly manners and appearance of the superior group. Other "humours" are flagrant vices such as envy and avarice as personified in Macilente and Sordido respectively, while yet another major character, Carlo Buffone, is generally

accepted to be a personification of scurrility and backbiting. Among the dramatis personae, there also exist a "Grex" or Chorus of two, Mitis and Cordatus, and the fictional author of the play, Asper. These three characters appear in the Induction which precedes the play proper, and discuss the principles of comedy and the Jonsonian view of "humours". Asper, whose stage presence is confined to the Induction, can immediately be identified as the satirist of the play when he declares his purpose to "strip the raggied follies of the time". The Grex, on the other hand, remain on the stage throughout the play, and operate as an exegetical commentary on the characters and the dramatic action. It must also be pointed out that Jonson's innovative introduction of a Chorus-satirist combination coincides with his first use of the Induction[11] which is a structural division that appears in the other "comicall satyres" as well.

But now to resume the discussion on the formal features of the play in relation to vetus comoedia it must be noted that the meaning intended by this term would have been clear enough for critics, if Jonson, some twenty years later in 1619, had not made a casual reference to medieval English plays in almost the same terms: "Comoedia Vetus."[12] Used in this sense, the term assumes a meaning that is entirely different from the "normal" definition, which, as Campbell explains, "the critics of the Renaissance applied to the Greek comedy which

culminated in the works of Aristophanes, and to nothing else"[13]. It is difficult not to agree with Campbell that the term was used in E.M.O. to mean Greek Old Comedy because Jonson, who was undoubtedly familiar with the critical use of vetus comoedia in the works of Horace, Donatus, and Scaliger, used the term to distinguish E.M.O. from other plays, and to support his description of the play as "strange" and "a particular kind of it selfe", which he would not have done, if he had meant the term to refer to the English morality play tradition.

Furthermore, it is impossible to overlook Jonson's satiric purposes in the play, and his affinity to the Roman satirists, who had declared themselves to be followers of Aristophanes. According to Baskervill however, "there is little in the structure, the type of incident, or the method of characterization to connect E.M.O. with classic comedy"[14], and the general critical tendency is to regard Jonson's use of the term as figurative rather than technical. Herford, for instance, asserts that if Jonson "claims that it [E.M.O.] is like vetus comoedia, the likeness lies in its vigorous independence of tradition"[15] Bradbrook takes the term as a reference to both Aristophanes and to morality plays[16] and even Campbell, who goes to great lengths to establish that vetus comoedia refers to the kind of comedy written by Aristophanes, extends the meaning of the term to include formal satire[17].

Although it is true that both the Romans and the Renaissance critics regarded formal satire as a linear descendant of vetus comoedia and emphasised their relationship, neither of the two went as far as ignoring the difference in genre between poetic satire and Greek Old Comedy, and it is unlikely that Jonson should have differed from them. But a study of the play reveals that its novelty is the product of more than one influence and that while the shaping force is undeniably that of the corrective satire as embodied in Greek Old Comedy, in dramatic structure, characterisation and theme it should be seen as a compound of several principles adopted from Aristophanic comedy, Roman comedy, formal satire and the English morality plays.

In the Induction, which Herford and Simpson qualify as "the elaborate manifesto of a literary theory"(18), Cordatus, having first described the play as "somewhat like Vetus Comoedia", goes on with a brief survey of ancient comedy from its primitive beginnings up to Plautus, underlining the various innovations that took place in the development of the genre (Induction,247-266); the point of the survey being to support the innovative aspects of E.M.O. in reference to classical precedents.

It is of some interest to note that in the course of Cordatus' historical sketch, while all precedents are drawn from dramatic literature, not all authors are from Greek Old

Comedy; that in Act III, Plautus' Cistellaria is cited as precedent for Sordido's attempted suicide; that in Scene vi of the same act, Cicero's definition of comedy is given as the basic model for E.M.O. and that in Act II, Scene i(89-90) explicit reference is made to formal satire in a choric remark quoting Horace[19]. Judging by such evidence, it may be said that although Jonson claims to be writing in the dramatic tradition, he does not appear to have confined his interests to a single tradition; a point which is corroborated by Cordatus in the conclusion of his survey:

> I see not then, but we should enjoy the same licence, or free power, to illustrate and heighten our inuention as they [the classical authors] did; and not bee tyed to those strict and regular formes, which the nicenesse of a few (who are nothing but forme) would thrust upon us.
>
> (Induction, 66-70)

What is evidently uniform and consistent in Jonson's dramatic strategy, on the other hand, is this insistence on the exposure and correction of folly and vice, a feature that is ultimately the characteristic of Old Comedy. The vituperative speeches of Asper in the Induction are sufficient to set the tone of the play as predominantly satiric, and the same tone is maintained in the course of the play by Macilente and Buffone who substitute for Asper as satiric voices in ridiculing and reproving the follies and vices of the "humourists."

In reference to this aspect of E.M.O. it must be pointed out that the source for the summary of classical comedy offered by Cordatus in the Induction is Donatus' De Fabula[20], in which the latter describes Old Comedy mainly in terms of its purpose in exposing and correcting contemporary abuses. That Jonson's satirical targets are similarly topical and contemporary is indicated first in the Induction, when Mitis warns Asper to be careful in his criticism because "the dayes are dangerous, full of exception,/And men are growne impatient of reproofe", and also later in the choric remarks where it is pointed out that the play might cause public displeasure because it aims in particular at the courtly circles and the citizenry (II,vi,141-179). This directness and relative topicality of E.M.O., as well as its aim to ridicule, reprove, and correct may be observed as features that are highly similar to those of Aristophanic comedy[21].

The play's similarity to Old Comedy, however, is not confined to these features only. Among the most significant similarities is the use of the Chorus. As stated earlier, two characters are assigned the role of the Chorus, or "Grex", and they function as a means of exposition and commentary not only in the Induction but also in between and in the course of the acts. Although, technically speaking, this cannot be considered a duplication of the Old Comic Chorus, whose twenty-four members also danced and sang, it must be granted that Jonson was able to transfer one of its main functions to

his own Chorus; namely that of acting as a spokesman for the poet-dramatist. Cordatus, the chief choric voice is described (in the Character of the Persons, 111-113) as "the Authors friend; a man inly acquainted with the scope and drift of his Plot: Of a discreet, and understanding judgement," and having "the place of a Moderator", all of which imply that not only is he the author's spokesman, but a fictional 'mediator' intended to serve in establishing an area of agreement with the audience which will allow this "strange" play to be judged favourably and according to its merits. In view of this, it is interesting to note how closely Cordatus is aligned to Horace's view that a chorus "should side with the good, and give friendly counsel; sway the angry, and cherish the righteous", (Ars Poetica, 196-197).

Nevertheless, it may be claimed that in his use of choric statements[22] Jonson was equally influenced, if not more, by the parabasis of Greek Old Comedy. Symonds, who has been one of the first to note this, regards Jonson as one who has:

> ... understood and appreciated the function of the Parabasis, in Greek Comedy, where the author addressed the audience in his own person, through the mouth of the Chorus. Having no chorus (in the Greek manner), Jonson made full use of Dedication, Prologue, Epilogue, Induction, and Dialogue between the acts- devices whereby the poet was enabled to communicate his private opinions and his critical observations to the public [23].

In view of this affinity between Old Comedy and certain devices used in E.M.O., it will no doubt be useful to make a

brief survey of the structural features of Old Comedy as they appear in the comedies of Aristophanes, whose eleven plays are the only extant examples belonging to that tradition.

The structural divisions in Old Comedy were not quantitative, but qualitative, and usually comprised the prologue the parodos (the entrance song of the Chorus), the agôn (the set contest or dispute between certain characters) the parabasis (a choric section communicating the message of the poet to the audience) and an episodic part consisting of a series of comic and farcical scenes with intermittent short choric songs, brought to an end by the kômos, a final festive processional[24].

The parabasis, which is the most interesting part of an Aristophanic comedy from the point of view of modern criticism, was usually located in the middle of the play. It was a long break in the action, resulting in a suspension of dramatic illusion. Hence, the structure of the dramatic action proper in such a comedy may be considered essentially bi-partite: the part leading up to the parabasis and containing the argument of the play, and that which follows the parabasis and covers the final series of episodes.

It may also be said that the parabasis, by virtue of being an address to the audience delivered by the Chorus-leader and the Chorus in the absence of all other actors, was an entirely extra-dramatic device and the fullest and most

impressive form of moral and satirical comment in the play[25]. For the function of the parabasis was to allow the poet-dramatist not only to praise his play, comment occasionally on matters of dramatic technique, deprecate his rivals generally in a playful manner, but also to offer serious advice to his audience on political and civic matters, and to criticise them[26]. The parabasis is also significant in that it repeatedly asserts the role of the poet as teacher and moralist. The anapaestic section of the parabasis of Acharnians, the earliest extant comedy by Aristophanes, is a fine example to illustrate this point[27]. But, in reference to this function of the poet, Dover draws attention to the tradition of Greek archaic poets who used to address their poems to the public, and "were regarded essentially as preachers who chose poetic form in order to promote wisdom, justice, and courage..."[28] Evidently it was on the basis of such a tradition that Aristophanes and other comic poets made use of the parabasis to lecture their audience on moral civic values.

Although the criticism and advice offered by the parabasis did not have to be strictly relevant to the issues raised in the course of the dramatic action-a point that is contrary to Jonson's usage whereby all choric comments and explanations are exclusively oriented towards matters related to the play-it is reasonable to conclude that Jonson's conception of the main function of the Chorus as displayed in

E.M.O. indicates the influence of the Old Comic parabasis in so far as the Grex is made to assume the didactic role of the poet-dramatist[29] for explaining his technique, and for defending and praising his play.

In attempting to determine Jonson's purpose in using the Grex in E.M.O., such critics as Campbell, Herford and Simpson suggest, without referring to Old Comedy, that the dramatist, being very much aware of the unusual form of the play, devised means such as the Chorus, or the "interpreters for the characters and the action" to defend and elucidate the "comicall satyre"[30]. We may supplement this view by suggesting further that Jonson seems to have transferred the parabatic function of the Greek Comic Chorus (which, it must be remembered was confined by tradition to a particular structural division of the comedy) to his Grex, to be maintained consistently throughout the play. For, the commentary of the Grex, embodying the critical theories, moral attitude, and didactic purposes of Jonson, continually explicate and defend his technique, and occasionally praise him.

But it is the Induction as a structural division that seems to bear the closest resemblance to the parabasis in content, if not in form. For just as Aristophanes gives an account of his comic antecedents in Knights(507-544), in the Induction Jonson lists his precedents in comedy, including

Aristophanes; and just as the Greek Comic poet underlines his innovations in the parabases of Clouds, Wasps, Peace, and in a number of others, Jonson asserts his independence in attempting new techniques. Thus, viewed as a whole which includes Asper's role as satirist, the Induction is seen to have absorbed many of the components of Aristophanes' parabases; a vindication of the poet's techniques, an explanation and defense of certain devices, an appeal to historical precedents as well as satiric attacks on the audience.

So the Grex may be identified fundamentally as an agent of instruction that strives to justify the poet's ways as much as to elucidate them. It may be claimed furthermore that they also serve to provoke an extra-critical alertness in the audience, as indicated by some of their comments on other characters such as Macilente and Buffone who likewise function as commentators. In reference to the double commentary in the play, Knoll makes the following remarks:

> One may not object to a double chorus as a kind. Every playgoer is accustomed to scenes within scenes. But here are scenes within scenes within scenes, and this is too much (31).

The choric dialogue between Acts I and II may be offered to illustrate Jonson's use of double commentary. At the beginning of the action proper, Macilente, the leading character of the play is presented and exposed in his "humour" which may be qualified as a combination of envy and indignation. Shortly after, Sordido the farmer appears on the

stage to expose himself as a mean and greedy grain hoarder, or "regrater"[32], expecting to make profit on account of the bad harvest. Macilente, having heard Sordido's self-expository speech, comments vehemently in an aside but is apparently too indignant to make a direct comment. In the choric dialogue at the end of the act, however, Mitis criticises Macilente for having left the stage too early: "...me thinks... hee might haue beene made to stay, and speake somewhat in reproofe of Sordido's wretchednesse, now at the last"(I,iii,149-152). Cordatus, on the other hand, tries to vindicate the author by pointing out that this would have been technically "improper", but upon Mitis' insistence he is made to engage in an elaborate commentary on how Macilente's envy should be properly interpreted (162-171).

In the course of this dialogue, it is observed that the Grex recognise Macilente's function as a satiric commentator although this character is primarily presented as a "humourist" What is even more important, however, is that Jonson should have felt it necessary for Cordatus to make a judicious interpretation in order to avoid a misunderstanding on the part of the audience in assessing Macilente's "humour". Thus his present use of choric commentary on the chief satiric commentator seems to be highly purposeful, if somewhat dramatically objectionable. It shows that his dramatic technique is based on a highly developed critical alertness, a quality which he would have his audience, as represented by

Mitis, share as well. Besides, choric usage of this type, which may well be regarded as a type of "alienation effect" (to use Brechtian terminology)[33] in view of its function, is also found in Aristophanes' choric descriptions of Dicaeopolis (Acharnians, 971ff.), Demos (Knights, 1111ff.), Trygaeos (Peace, 856ff.), Philocleon (Wasps, 879ff., 1457ff.) all of whom serve also to comment on other characters in the plays.

As may be inferred from the foregoing discussion, it is the formal conception of E.M.O. founded on certain principles borrowed from Old Comedy that accounts for its fundamental innovative quality. But the innovations in the play cannot be confined to its formal features since they naturally extend to features of dramatic structure as indicated by the device of the Induction, and to those of characterisation. Since it is evident that characters hold a position of prime importance and that the dramatic structure is subordinate, the following discussion will first deal with aspects of characterisation.

Apart from Asper and the Grex, as stated earlier, the dramatis personae are characterised in terms of "humours", and their names epitomise their particular follies or vices. Two characters, however, stand out amongst others for having been made to assume also the function of satiric commentator/expositor: Macilente (as pointed out above in reference to the commentary of the Grex at the end of Act I) and Carlo Buffone. Accordingly, the characters in the play may be

classified in two basic groups: those whose "humours" are merely exposed, and those, like Macilente and Buffone, whose "humours" are instrumental in exposing the "humours" of others.

It is interesting to note that the respective "humours" of Macilente and Buffone are defined by the manner in which they perceive their human environment. Macilente declares:

> I looke into the world and there I meete
> With obiects, that doe strike my bloud-shot eyes
> Into my braine; where, when I view my selfe;
> Having before observed this man is great,
> Mighty and fear'd; that lou'd and highly favor'd:
> A third, thought wise and learned; a fourth, rich,
> And therefore honor'd; a fifth, rarely featur'd;
> A sixth admir'd for his nuptiall fortunes:
> When I view these (I say) and view my selfe,
> I wish the organs of my sight were crackt;
> And that the engine of my griefe could cast
> Mine eye-balls, like two globes of wild-fire, forth,
> To melt this unproportion'd frame of nature.
>
> (I,i,16-28)

But Jonson is careful to qualify Macilente's envy-motivated vision as one that is combined with disgust and hate for what is abominable. Hence Cordatus is made to give the following explanation about Macilente's envy.

> ...if we make his [man's] monstrous, and
> abhord actions our obiect, the griefe (we take
> then) comes neerer the nature of hate, then
> enuie, as being bred out of a kinde of
> contempt and lothing, in our selues.
>
> (I,iii,167-171)

As for Buffone, his view of man is one of jeering misanthropy:

> Mary, I say, nothing resembling man more then
> a swine, it followes, nothing can be more nourishing:
> for indeed (but that it abhorres from our nice nature)

> if we fed one upon another, we should shoot up
> a great deale faster, and thriue much better...
>
> (V,v,69-73)

It is evident that Macilente's and Buffone's visions are distorted, and yet they are made to dominate the play, apparently because they allow Macilente and Buffone who are vicious themselves to discern vice and folly easily and to expose them more forcefully.

The similarity of the roles of these characters lie in their ability to function as satiric voices. Yet their tone and manner of expression, are very different. While Macilente is bitter and indignant, Buffone is scurrilous and mocking. It is interesting to note that Macilente hates Buffone and dreads being a butt of his raillery(IV,iv,114-115).

In comparing these two characters, Herford and Simpson hold that both are "types of the reviling tongue and the malignant eye", and regard Buffone as an extension of Macilente's satiric persona[34]. Campbell, on the other hand, finds him a typical stage buffoon, who as opposed to Macilente, must have represented for Jonson an improper agent of satire and one whose "derisive attitude and his vindictiveness fail to accomplish any reform in others but make a fool of him"[35]. Campbell's assessment is correct in that the proper satiric agent in the play is Macilente. For the latter does in fact, accomplish some reform in the last act by purging the satirical figures of their "humours" and, among them Buffone suffers

the punishment of having his foul mouth sealed with hot wax. What is additionally significant is that Macilente should discover himself to be purged of his own "humour" after having brought about a purgation in others:

> Why, here's a change! Now is my soule at peace.
> I am as emptie of all enuie now,
> As they of merit to be enuied at.
>
> (V,xi,54-56)

This indicates that Macilente has undergone what may be called a sudden catharsis, which indeed accounts for and justifies his final identification of himself with Asper, the satirist of the Induction: "Well, gentlemen, I should haue gone in, and return'd to you, as I was Asper, at the first..."(75-76). This identification has led critics to regard Macilente as an alter ego of Asper; hence, the frequent critical reference to the two main satiric personae in the form of "Asper/ Macilente"(36).

A convenient starting point for a discussion of the implications of the dual aspect of the satirist is Juvenal. For it has been possible to trace a strong influence of Juvenalian satire in Asper's speeches and in the Asper/ Macilente relationship. While most of the dialogue in the Induction is heavily indebted to Juvenal, Asper's first speech can be qualified as almost a paraphrase of his first Satire.

> Who is so patient of this impious world,
> That he can checke his spirit, or reine his tongue?
>
> (Induction, 4-5)

These lines are strongly reminiscent of the following verses from Juvenal: "It is hard not to write satire. For who can be so tolerant of this monstrous city, who so iron of soul, as to contain himself when..."(Satire I, 30-31)[37]. As Asper persists in the generally Juvenalian indignant tone, Cordatus warns him not to be too bold; an admonishment which parallels the warning given to the satirist by his friend at the end of the first Satire(155-157). But unlike Juvenal's satirist, Asper refuses to be silent or to modify his attack, and continues with a list of corrupt contemporaries:

> I feare no strumpets drugs, nor ruffians stab,
> Should I detect their hatefull luxuries:
> No brokers, usurers, or lawyers gripe,
> Were I disposed to say they're all corrupt.
> I feare no courtiers frowne, should I applaud
> The easy flexure of his supple hammes.
>
> (Induction, 21-28)

This passage is a compressed version of the parade of vicious personages catalogued, in the first Satire(31-74). Another significant similarity is observed when Asper directs his attention to the abuse of literature, especially of drama:

> O, how I hate the monstrousnesse of time,
> Where euery seruile imitating spirit.
> (Plagu'd with an itching leprosie of wit)
> In a meere halting fury, striues to fling
> His vic'rous body in the Thespian spring,
> And streight leaps forth a Poet!...
>
> (Induction, 66-71)

It is well known that references to the degradation of literature abound in Juvanal's Satires. In the general context of the abuse of wealth and power, the distortion of sexual

values, the degeneration of the client-patron relationship, and the corruption that seems to have permeated every level of Roman life, the subject of the abuse of literature appears as an indication of a decaying society. The subject is frequently treated by Juvenal in reference to the degeneration of the theatre into burlesque, or into a parade for the unrestrained members of aristocracy to expose themselves. The view that decay in art is a reflection of the ills of the society to which it belongs is one that receives special emphasis in his seventh Satire. It is therefore remarkable that amidst other similarities to Juvenalian satire in the general context of the Induction, the same view should underlie Asper's words.

It may also be claimed that in the person of Asper, Jonson has in effect put the satiric persona of Juvenal's Satires on the stage and set him attacking contemporary abuses in outrage and indignation. McEuen, for instance, asserts that "Jonson and Juvenal fearlessly exposed the follies and vices of their day in such mordant language that there is little doubt as to the similarity of their attitude,-their satiric pose- toward existing conditions"(38).

"Mordant language" is of course the common characteristi of all powerful satirists and seems to be motivated by the "furor poeticus" which Cordatus ascribes to Asper and which is known to be a characteristic feature of Aristophanes and

Lucilius, as well as of Juvenal and Jonson. Since all these satirists are essentially critics of the morals of their communities, and primarily interested in exposing folly, vice, and crime, their rhetoric is necessarily violent. Juvenal, for instance, having declared himself a follower of Lucilius, the first great Roman satirist, describes him as one who: "...roars and rages as if with sword in hand, the hearer whose soul is cold with crime grows red; he sweats with the secret consciousness of sin. Hence wrath and tears"(Satire I, 165-168).

But it appears that in Jonson's view, poetic fury and violent rhetoric are not the only requisites for such a satirist as Asper. For in the "Character of the Persons" he is described as a character "of an ingenious and free spirit, eager and constant in reproofe, without feare controuling the worlds abuses. One, whom no servile hope of gaine, or frosty apprehension of danger, can make to be a Parasite, either to time, place, or opinion"(1-5). This description indicates that Asper's satiric function in E.M.O. is conceived as being dependen as much on his virtues as on his indignation and vehemence, a conception that justifies the intention he declares in the following speech:

> I will scourge those apes;
> And to these courteous eyes oppose a mirrour
> As large as is the stage, whereon we act:
> Where they shall see the times deformitie
> Anatomiz'd in euery nerve, and sinnew,
> With constant courage, and contempt of feare.
>
> (Induction, 117-122)

In examining this speech, it will be noted that initially Asper is given the double duty of punishing the fools and of offering an analysis of the "times deformitie" to the "courteous eyes", i.e. the judicious members of the audience. In the context of subsequent statements, these duties may be considered a "phisicke of the mind"(132) for the fools, or "pills to purge/And make them fit for faire societies"(175-176), which, as Asper presumes, the judicious will welcome as "attentive auditors/Such as will ioyne their profit with their pleasure,/And come to feed their understanding parts"(201-203). Thus the function of the satirist as formulated by Asper is three-fold: to analyse, hence to expose, to punish, and to purge, i.e. to reform the offensive behaviour of contemporary men and women as exemplified by the "humourists" who are concrete representations of "times deformitie". The function of Asper as a fictional character reflecting Jonson's deep preoccupation with the morals of the society, is also to establish a fundamental and consistent point of view, a perspective in which follies and vices can be seen for what they are, in the manner of the harsh and uncompromising spirit of Juvenal's satirist.

In view of this, Macilente's first speech, (I,i,16-28) although somewhat modified by his dominant "humour", may be considered essentially an extension of the perspective established by Asper in the Induction. There, despite the tone of predominant egocentricity, Macilente's persistent use of

verbs of perception, his emphatic references to his organs of vision, his enumeration of offensive examples as "objects", and his overwhelming sense of outrage demonstrate a fundamenta likeness to Asper's attitude. Moreover, it is interesting to note the link between Macilente's desire to "melt this unproportioned frame of nature"(I,i,28) and Cordatus' following remark to Asper:

> Unlesse your breath had power
> To melt the world, and mould it new againe,
> It is in vaine to spend it in these moods.
>
> (Induction,48-50)

This similarity in reference, is yet another indication of the similarity between Asper and Macilente, since both are apparently conceived by Jonson as characters intent on "meltin deformities: a process which as the incidents of the play show, will be carried out by Asper impersonating Macilente. Asper's declarations of his intended satiric analysis in the Induction are followed up by a more detailed analysis in the form of an exhibition of specific "humourists" in the dramatic action proper. There the main agent for satiric exposure is Macilente, with Buffone serving under him. Moreover the conclusion of the play devoted to the purgation of the "humourists", in which Macilente is once more the chief agent and whereby he himself is dishumoured and able to return to his proper state as Asper.

The duality inherent in the satiric function of Asper/ Macilente has been the subject of considerable critical

discussion. According to Kernan, for instance, Asper and Macilente are direct descendants of Juvenal's satirist with Asper possessing his positive qualities, and Macilente, the negative aspects[39]. In Juvenalian formal satire, the satiric persona is in fact a commentator; although he is omnipresent and provides the only point of view in the narrative, he takes little or no overt action, and therefore is not a dramatic character. While Asper fits this description, Macilente does not; he is at once a satiric commentator and an intriguer and thereby transcends the functions the persona of formal satire.

In Knoll's view, however, there seems to be "no plot reason for Macilente's presence" for he is removed from the primary action during much of the play[40]. While it is true that Macilente usually appears as a by-stander in the dramatic action, it is also correct, as Townsend observes, that he serves as a "shuttle" character,"consciouly weaving together many strands of interest and many types of character"[41]. And it is in this function that he can act as an intriguer of the only plot in the play: that which leads to the final purgation of the "humours" characters.

Campbell, whose thesis is that Jonson adapted formal satire into "comicall satyre", believes that the primary task Jonson faced in creating his dramatic satirist was "to fill the indispensable post of commentator" that had to be "suited to the half-dramatic and half-critical services which were required" of him[42]. Kernan, following a similar line of

thought, elaborates on the same problem by indicating that the dramatic satirist as opposed to the satiric persona of formal satire cannot remain uninvolved in the dramatic action and at the same time "rail and commend himself as the only absolute foe of vice, because he does so. His railing becomes action which can be judged by its issue"(43). Furthermore, Kernan holds that the very act of satirising implies an unpleasant even vicious aspect in the satirist in that "as a result of his violent attacks on vice, he acquires a number of unpleasant characteristics which make suspect his pose of a simple lover of truth"(44).

In view of these arguments it is possible to conclude that Jonson's creation of a dual satiric persona as Asper/ Macilente is the solution to the technical problem of transposing the commentator of formal satire on to the stage, as well as a solution to the ethical problem pointed out by Kernan, whereby the "vicious aspects" of the satiric persona are associated with Macilente, and the healthy ones with Asper. It is also possible to see Macilente as a satiric mask adopted by Asper, who in turn is very closely associated with Jonson himself.

However, in view of Jonson's claim that E.M.O. is "somewhat like Vetus Comoedia", it seems reasonable to suppose that Jonson, in creating Macilente as a dramatic character and Asper as his own spokesman, was directly influenced by certain features of characterisation peculiar

to Old Comedy, in which the elderly protagonist functions as satiric voice while the Chorus-leader of the parabasis also performs the same duty as the dramatist's spokesman.

Aristotle's classification of character types as "buffoon" or "fool" (bomolochos),"impostor" (alazôn) and "ironical man" (eirôn) may serve as a starting point in our discussion of features of characterisation in Old Comedy(45). As Cooper has shown, all three types listed above are present in the comedies of Aristophanes(46). And in all but two comedies, Lysistrata and Ecclesiazusae, the central character is an elderly man who combines irony with buffoonery in railing at the impostors around him and in scourging them, and who is finally vindicated at the end of the play. Cornford explains that "in the Old Comedy, 'buffoonery' is only the outer wear of 'irony'," that "while the 'impostor' claims to possess higher qualities than he has, the 'ironical man' is given to making himself out worse than he is.", and that "in comedy the special kind of irony practiced by the 'impostor's opponent is feigned stupidity"(47).

These comments call for agreement because what lies at the root of Aristophanic irony is dissimulation of foolishness, or of any other defect that may prove expedient when confronting the impostor. Strepsiades, for instance, the famous protagonist of Clouds, assumes the guise of a fool when he visits Socrates' "thinking shop" so that he may learn the art of dissumulating a rogue in order to avoid paying his son's

creditors(48).

What is particularly significant is that in adopting the posture of a fool, the protagonist is free to make disparaging remarks which are generally satiric in nature and intended either to ridicule the impostor, or to be addressed to the audience.

In reading E.M.O. it is noted that Jonson has developed a method of characterisation that is similar to the above-mentioned aspects of Aristophanic comedy. For he uses Asper and the Grex to defend him, to explain his purpose, and to justify his satiric method, in the same manner as the Chorus-leader of the parabasis, and thus reserves the right to address his audience directly in the manner of Aristophanes. Moreover he has created another character, Macilente, who shares the author's indignation with vice and folly, but who also behaves like a vicious and unscrupulous character so that by his very lack of restraint he may freely, and in a dramatic sense, more effectively expose folly and corrupt morals. It is seen that while the functions of buffoonery and scurrility are assigned in E.M.O. to Carlo Buffone, who as stated earlier, may be considered an extension of Macilente to serve as a further instrument for exposing the "humourists", the function of the eirôn or "ironical man" is reserved for Macilente. Although Macilente does not have the comic qualities of the elderly protagonists of the Old Comedy, like them he is angry, unethical, and bent on exposing impostors. Consequently

in Acts IV and V, in order to expose and punish the "humourists" by means of an intrigue Macilente assumes the posture of the self-effacing man in their presence, and feeling that the end is justified, is free to lie and betray those like Deliro, who have trusted him. In his most distasteful appearances, in Act V he poisons Puntarvolo's dog, deceives him into thinking that Shift, the braggart soldier, has stolen it and then provokes Buffone to rail at Puntarvolo's misfortune. He also deceives Saviolina into believing that Sogliardo, the country bumpkin, is a gentleman in disguise, and by an elaborate plan, resembling those in Roman comedy, forces Deliro into a shocking discovery of his wife Fallace's infatuation with Fastidious Briske. This intrigue which is prepared for the purpose of dishumouring the impostors, obviously shows Macilente in the ironic posture of hiding his disgust for the "humourists", in order to expose them, -a point which is brought to our attention by the Grex:

> Mitis : This Macilente... begins to bee more sociable on a suddaine, mee thinkes, then hee was before: there's some portent in't, I believe.
>
> Cordatus: O, hee's a fellow of a strange nature. Now do's hee (in this calme of his humour) plot, and store up a world of malicious thoughts in his braine, till hee is so full with 'hem, that you shall see the very torrent of his enuie breake forth like a land-floud.
>
> (IV,viii,149-156)

This passage indicates that envy is the motivating force of Macilente's dissimulation of friendliness with the "humourists" at whom he was railing shortly before. Whatever may be the underlying reason, dramatically Macilente is made to appear worse than he actually is, especially in the last act; and it is this point that seems to lead Campbell, to conclude that "Macilente is an ironical character in the sense in which the Greeks use the term"(49).

At the end of the play Macilente is purged of his envy, and is liberated from his role as dissimulator or eirôn. This change enables him to be presented finally as identical with Asper. But it must be pointed out that this type of transformation is not witnessed in the ironical characters of Aristophanes, with the exception of Demos, the protagonist of Knights, who is made to boil literally out of his former habits. In view of this, a point of interest is that although Jonson effects such a transformation in his ironical character, he does not place emphasis on the moral identification of Macilente with Asper. Evidently his purpose is to keep the duality of satiric view-point (one expressed by Asper and the other by Macilente) as separate and as intact as possible without impairing their complementary nature. In short, Jonson's portrayal of these characters in line with the general practice in Old Comedy, in which a similar duality of satiric viewpoint is maintained by the ironical protagonist and the parabatic Chorus-leader.

Another point of similarity that remains to be mentioned is that which lies in the relation between Aristophanic impostors and Jonson's characterisation of the "humourists" in E.M.O. Although the critical tendency in the past has been to emphasise the importance of the "humours" theory for a correct understanding of Jonson's characters, modern criticism has on the whole minimised its importance. As an exponent of the recent critical trend Knoll, for

instance, observes: "The idea of humours was to Jonson's day what the idea of complexes is to ours. If someone were to write a comedy today called 'Everybody Has His Complex' and a second called 'How to Cure Your Complex' we would not assume him to be a student of Freud or Adler"(50). This assessment of Jonson's relation to the theory of "humours" seems to be correct, for it is not difficult to see that in E.M.O. the concept of "humour" is understood in its loosest sense.

Asper as Jonson's spokesman in the Induction, is keen to define the true meaning and the correct application of the word "humour" (88-102) in reference to the physiological, or medical basis of the "humours" theory. Subsequently, he explains that the term may be applied to the general human disposition:

> As when some one peculiar quality
> Doth so possesse a man, that it doth draw
> All his affects, his spirits, and his powers,
> In their confluctions, all to runne one way,
> This may be truly said to be a Humour.
>
> (Induction, 105-109)

But, as the following part of the speech indicates, Jonson's focus is on the corrupt use and his attack is on the incorrect application of the term which appears to have been widespread in his day:

> But that a rooke, in wearing a pyed feather,
> The cable hat-band, or the three-pild ruffe,
> A yard of shooetye, or the Switzers knot
> Or his French garters, should affect a Humour!
> O, 'tis more then most ridiculous.
>
> (110-114)

Furthermore Cordatus, in confirming the truth of Asper's words, prompts him to announce his satirical target:

> Cordatus: ... if an Idiot
> Haue but an apish, or phantasticke straine,
> It is his Humour. Asper: Well I will scourge those apes
> (115-117)

Thus it is clear that for Jonson "humour" stands for an affectation, an imposture that is ridiculous, (just as it did in E.M.I.) but one that also requires punishment.

Having taken Jonson's definition and explanation of "humour" as our basic point of reference, it is possible to argue that the "humourists" of the play function in a manner very similar to certain characters in Old Comedy. For, as has been noted by Campbell, all the characters in E.M.O., apart from Macilente and Buffone, belong to the classification of "impostors" (in the sense that they all pretend to be what they really are not) established by the Tractatus Coislinianus[51], which has been shown by Cooper to have its source in Old Comedy[52]. Furthermore the studies of Cornford offer evidence that the impostors which appear in the classification of the Tractatus, are precisely those that are represented on Aristophanes' stage in large numbers[53].

The character of ridiculous pretensions is, of course, a staple of satiric literature, but it is interesting to note that in Old Comedy he is often explicitly called an impostor.

Moreover, in Old Comedy the impostors appear in groups mostly after the parabasis, their numbers reaching six at times, filing on and off the stage almost in a procession, in a series of episodes in which the ironical protagonist is made to confront and to scourge them successfully by verbal, and even physical attacks.

According to Cornford, the impostors in Old Comedy, may be divided into two groups: a smaller number of major impostors, and a considerably large number of minor impostors(54). Lamachos in Acharnians, Cleon in Knights, and Socrates in Clouds, all drawn from the contemporary Athenian scene, belong to the first group and have whole plays built around them. The more numerous minor impostors, on the other hand, may be qualified as generally unnamed, "humours"-type characters who are referred to merely by a very brief description of their occupations. Thus, in Birds, the impostors are named as "poet", "oracle-monger", "inspector", "statute-seller", and "informer", among whom two characters, Meton and Cinesias are the exceptions who have proper names.(55) Thus the larger number of impostors are type-named characters(56). Lever, for instance, states:

> "The great majority of the characters in Old Comedy, are types, -named and unnamed...- Their names indicate the class of people or qualities they represent, and their actions exemplify their natures"(57).

In associating such impostor-types of Old Comedy with the "humours" characters of Jonson, it is necessary to refer to the criticism of Baskervill, the most

authoritative exponent of the influence of the native English sources on Jonson's "comicall satyres". Baskervill, in discussing Jonson's method of characterisation in reference to the "humours" theory, points out that with the advent of the Renaissance, emphasis in character treatment shifted from social class and vocation to quality in the individual. Subsequently, "typical" qualities became more prominent in the characters of the morality plays and in the satiric literature of the Renaissance; - a process which finally placed emphasis "not on the combination of qualities, but on the single dominant quality associated with the preponderance of one humour in the composition of the body"(58). Baskervill goes on to argue, however, that the association of "humour" with character which appears in Jonson's plays as the combination of a type with an abstract folly or vice(a characteristic peculiar to allegory) is not entirely new. He agrees with Gayley in that the morality plays, the characters of which were often derived from life, and despite their abstract names had distinctive motives for action that distinguished one from the other, were the forerunners of Jonson's comedy of humours. Baskervill concludes that the new development brought about by Jonson's treatment of types, "is the bringing of vices and follies home to men and women by the greater nearness to actual life, by the concreteness and individualization that abstractions take on".

This view serves to point out an aspect of native

medieval literature that exerted considerable influence on Jonson's dramatic technique. It is also particularly useful in reminding us that Jonson's works should not be regarded in isolation from the continuity in the native English dramatic tradition.

However, it is also necessary to take Baskervill's opinion a step further and to indicate that the crowd of "humourists" who are the objects of satiric derision in E.M.O., go beyond impersonating traditional vices and follies, and as pointed out by Campbell, represent some aspects of the social and the economic changes brought about by the growth of commercialism in Jonson's England(59).

To take Campbell's examples, Sordido, for instance, "represents the economic royalist of the day - a man who gives free rein to his acquisitive instincts... the sort of miser most immediately hated by Jonson's contemporaries... a hoarder of grain, a lawbreaker, and an oppressor of the poor(60). He is followed by social pretenders such as Fastidious Briske, a type highly conspicuous in Jonson's contemporary society who has sufficient economic means to maintain him in his ambition to secure a position in the court. Sordido's son Fungoso the "fashion-monger" ranks below Briske in his social pretensions. He concentrates his efforts on preying on his father's ill-acquired money and in exhibiting himself in clothes of the latest cut, similar to

those worn by Briske. Fallace, the rich merchant-citizen's wife is an other social pretender whose ambition to reach the court circles parallels that of Briske.

Thus it is possible to suggest that although the "humourists" in E.M.O. are far more elaborately treated than the impostors of Aristophanes (with the exception of Socrates, Cleon and Lamachos), they are nevertheless representative of the contemporary English society in the same manner as the Aristophanic impostors who stood for the foolish and vicious members of contemporary Athenian society, and were personally attacked as such.

But what is of fundamental importance for us is not so much the similarities in the nature of the characters as those that may be observed in their dramatic functions within a particular structure common to both the Aristophanic comedy and E.M.O.: namely, the episode. The most coherent and conspicuous structural unit in E.M.O. is not the act-division but the episode in which the impostors tend to cluster in the presence of either one of the satiric commentators. Considering Jonson's satiric purpose, this unit serves well to display the "humours" of the satirical figures in the light of the immediate satiric and ironic commentary of Macilente or Buffone.

Campbell finds a close connection between the type of episodic structure peculiar to E.M.O. and the thumbnail

sketches of the satirical figures in formal satire, and states that "in order to transform the procession of derided or scolded figures, which marches through the formal satires, into groups of characters acting and reacting upon each other he (Jonson) was forced to keep his stage filled with eccentrics"[61]. Since Jonson's purpose was more or less the same as that of the formal satirist, this is not surprising. It appears to be too simplistic, however, to reduce Jonson's technique to a mere transposition of characters from narrative to drama.

The sequential treatment of satirical figures referred to in Campbell's statement is observed in episodes which cover almost the whole of the first four acts of the play, and which are related structurally only by the reappearance of certain characters. Hence, the intrigue set up by Macilente in the final act may be considered the only link between this play and the intrigue plots of the earlier comedies like The Case ise Altered and E.M.I. For it is hardly possible to discern any dramatic progress that may be qualified as rising action in E.M.O.: The first three acts are static because dramatically they merely serve to present character sketches and three or four basic situations; and Act V, which is the conventional division devoted to the dénouement, is instead almost a play in itself where plans are made and carried out by Macilente to expose the "humourists".

Thus, it is evident that in the overall design of E.M.O. there is no unity of dramatic action, despite the five-act division in the manner of Terentian intrigue comedy. This feature stands out as yet another similarity with Aristophanic comedy which, as Scaliger was one of the first critics to note, lacks the structural unity that is a characteristic of later Greek New Comedy, and its offshoot the intrigue drama(62).

What accounts for the absence of unity in Old Comedy is, of course, the combination of the structural conventions summed up earlier in the chapter: the parabasis that suspends dramatic action and virtually divides the play into two parts, with the set contest (agôn) usually in the first, and the loose episodes in the latter part.

In view of the structural features of E.M.O. what is of special interest for us is the serial arrangement of the episodes in the second half of Aristophanic comedy, which presents the impostors and the ironical protagonist in confrontation. As described by Pickard-Cambridge "in the early plays, one particular type of iambic scene is particularly frequent - that in which one ridiculous or pretentious character after another comes in, tries to 'get round' the victorious hero, and is driven away discomfited".(63) It may also be added that these scenes do not present a linear development, hence do not lead up to a dramatic climax. They can be connected only thematically to the issue

raised in the "contest" in the earlier part of the comedy, since there is no plot-line in the dramatic action of the play that can be compared with that of Menandrian New Comedy or Roman comedy. Furthermore the episodes figuring the impostors may also take place in the first part of the comedy, before the parabasis, as in Acharnians, Knights, Clouds, and Thesmophoriazusae, as well as in the latter part.

Hence it is possible to conclude that the episode in which the impostor is confronted by the satiric-ironic protagonist, and the serial arrangement of such episodes which are intended to expose and castigate the numerous impostors one after another, are the features of Old Comedy that have had considerable influence on Jonson's dramatic technique in E.M.O. For in this play, the basic structural unit is the episodic scene, with the acts consisting mainly of the serial arrangements of such scenes. In these units the "humourists" occupy the central position, demonstrating their affectations through dialogue and action. Macilente, for instance, as the satiric commentator and ironical character equivalent to the almost ubiquitous ironical protagonist of Old Comedy, appears in twenty-five of the thirty-seven scenes of the play, while in the twelve scenes from which he is absent, his satiric function is fulfilled by Buffone. In the last act, the serial arrangement serves also to highlight the consecutive punishment and dishumouring of the impostors brought about by Macilente's intrigue, in a manner that is

highly reminiscent of similar scenes of castigation in Old Comedy.

It must also be noted that it is this particular arrangement giving prominence to impostors which ensures the unity in E.M.O.: a unity based on theme rather than on structure as is the case in Old Comedy.

Knoll's evaluation of the themes of E.M.O. and of the manner in which they are expressed through the characterisatio of the impostors is extremely significant. Having first qualified the play as an "Elizabethan Street Scene" and not just" a parade of fools", he claims that Jonson expresses a deep concern for economic questions: and that although he focuses on the condition of false courtliness, in the characters of Sordido, Puntarvolo and Deliro he strives to emphasise his concern in the relationship of money to false values which underlies the courtly pretensions(64). This view is, of course, in line with the argument of L.C. Knights whose study of the works of Jonson in the socio-economic context of his times is well known(65). Furthermore, in opposition to Campbell's view that Renaissance moralists tended to attribute social troubles to individual immorality rather than to faults in the social system, Knoll contends that in E.M.O. Jonson "was examining the flaw within the order, not within men"(66).

To this we may add that Jonson presents the social

structure of his time through the perspectives of characters belonging to three locations: the country, the city, and the court. Although the setting of the play is the "Fortunate Isle", this stands as a fictional equivalent of London. Sordido the farmer, his brother Sogliardo, his son Fungoso, and Puntarvolo the knight, belong to the country. Deliro the merchant and his wife Fallace represent the wealthy citizenry, while Buffone, Shift, Clove and Orange, all city-born, represent the social underlings in the metropolis operating mainly in the "middle aisle of St.Paul's" and the Mitre tavern. Highest in the social scale are Saviolina and Briske as the representatives of the court. As for Macilente the scholar, who stands apart from the rest of the characters, it may be said that he represents a group in contemporary society to which Jonson meant to address himself in particular.

Thus the abuses and false values that Jonson presents in dramatic terms are evidently intended to be typical of specific social classes. The impostors in the restless pursuit of their "humours" are made to demonstrate the particular abuses that Jonson has selected as his satirical targets. Hence, Sordido ruthlessly exploits the poor in order to increase his fortune; Sogliardo, possessed of land and money comes to the city to ape the gallants and courtiers; Deliro the wealthy merchant spends extravagantly to meet the demands of his socially ambitious wife Fallace, who for her part

tries to achieve a pseudo-courtly status through her flirtatio with Briske. The latter in his turn strives to establish himself as a courtier in alliance with Saviolina whose pretensions and aim are the same. That Saviolina mistakes Sogliardo for a gallant, and that Fungoso despite all his efforts, remains forever behind Briske in the latest fashions, add to the ludicrous quality of the "humourists" activities set against the restless everyday London life centering around St.Paul's and the Mitre which serve as a meeting place for fools and knaves.

Thus while the more fortunate members of the society depicted in E.M.O. spend their time striving for greater wealth or higher status, the less fortunate ones like Shift, Clove and Orange manage to survive solely by their wits or cunning. As pointed out by Campbell, this activity conveys the same sense of teeming and chaotic life which can be seen in the Elizabethan imitators of Roman satire and in the pamphlets of Nashe and Greene(67).

It is evident, however, that the characters do not represent a random choice on the part of the dramatist, nor is the characterisation geared merely to a display of "humours". For it must be remembered that the basic intention of Jonson as voiced by Asper in the Induction, is to "anatomize times deformitie", which indicates the dramatist's analytical approach to the reasons underlying the surface display of

vice and folly. Hence, to return to Knoll's argument on the fundamental themes of the play, it may be observed that for the purposes of satiric analysis and exposure, Jonson has conceived of the major "humourists" in three groups, "each pursuing a similar purpose, and all unconcerned with similar values"[68] which point to a thematic unity in the play.

This does not appear to be too clear at first, for Jonson's technique is really one of varied juxtaposition, whereby the "humourists" are displayed in their characteristi attitudes, and then arranged in various combinations. This form of presentation allows them to react with each other and to elaborate and clarify themselves for the further amusement and enlightenment of the audience. The interrelation among the "humourists", however, is not of the kind to be found in intrigue comedy, but one that achieves what Campbell calls "pictorial coherence"[69] rather than general dramatic coherence. As indicated by Cordatus in his defense of the dramatist's technique, the point is to make each "humour" "perspicuous", and a "full scene" is the best means to achieve it (II, iii, 290-298).

However, a closer analysis of Jonson's treatment of the "humours" characters, confirms Knoll's observation that there is an underlying and unifying concept in the play according to which Briske, Fungoso and Sogliardo, may be assigned to one group, Puntarvolo and Deliro to another, and the ladies Saviolina and Fallace, to a third[70].

Sordido, whom Knoll qualifies as "the most original and the most ludicrous creation of the play"(71) from the rest in that his sole concern is in miserly acquisitiveness, while the interest of the others lie primarily in courtliness and secondly in money. Briske, Fungoso, and Sogliardo are extravagantly interested in courtly manners and dress but their pursuit is seen to be entirely divorced from genuine courtly ideals that are inherited by birth, since all three of them abuse their material resources in one way or another in their attempt to attain an appearance of courtliness. In the second group, Puntarvolo indulges in a self-centered chivalric sentimentalism that is reflected in his affected dedication to his wife and pets, and in this he is imitated by Deliro whose uxoriousness can be regarded as an extension of Puntarvolo's affectation. But the sentimentalism of neither of these characters has any substance of chivalric honour, since as is revealed by Jonson himself in the description of the characters (in the Character of the Porsens) as well as in the play, Puntarvolo is highly concerned with profit and speculation and Deliro's pretensions are encouraged by his finances as a merchant. According to Knoll, Captain Shift, who is a variation of the "braggart soldier", also belongs to the group consisting of Puntarvolo and Deliro, on the grounds that his claims for an honourable military career are invalidated by his self-degradation as one capable of any vice in return for money. Finally the female impostors Saviolina and Fallace, whose

courtly pretensions are very much akin to those in the first group, are displayed as parasites who depend on others for material resources.

Parallel to the surface display of courtly affectation runs the theme of the irresponsible use, or abuse of money as the source of such false values as those exhibited by the "humourists". Money and finance constitute a subject that is repeatedly brought up in the context of the exposure of various "humours" and finds full dramatic expression in the character of Sordido who, significantly, is the first "humourist" to be dishumoured in the play. His purgation is demonstrated as separate from the rest, almost as a prerequisite for the serial purgation of the other "humourists". It is also significant that Jonson has chosen to dishumour him through his tragi-comic attempt at suicide on account of a good harvest; the attempt being unsuccessful and resulting in a seriously expressed recognition of his vice. As stated earlier the punishment and purgation of the rest of the "humourists" is brought about by Macilente's intrigue. Saviolina's recognition of Sogliardo's feigned gallantry results in purgation for both. Subsequently Puntarvolo is dishumoured by the death of his dog which he had tried to insure against accident, Deliro by discovering Fallace's infidelity, Briske by being arrested for not paying his

debts to Deliro, and finally Fungoso and Shift, by having to confess their follies publicly. In view of the penalties inflicted on the "humourists", Knoll rightly claims that, "Jonson is satirizing manners, but more basically, he is attacking the assumption that manners may be separated from connent, and ends from means"(72).

In E.M.O. Jonson has experimented with a type of comedy which is panoramic and satiric at the same time. As is well known, this combination is the fundamental characteristic of most of the plays of Aristophanes. But it must also be pointed out that in E.M.O. the satiric and the didactic aspect of Old Comedy is absorbed and combined with a consistently and pervasively maintained ethical viewpoint which is also observed in the Satires of Horace and Juvenal. It may be on account of this that E.M.O. is more serious and satiric than comic in the Aristophanic sense.

In Horace and in Juvenal the all-important principle is the concern with ethical questions and the practical ordering of life, both individual and collective. This concern provides the motive for writing satire and determines the poets' outlook on their human environment and their stance in relation to it. The same concern exists in E.M.O. and it is not directed superficially to mere "manners" but also to causes that give rise to them.

The sense of an ethical norm which gives coherence

to the representation of life in Roman satire, finds expression in E.M.O. in Asper and Cordatus, who jointly represent Jonson's norm of behaviour and perception. And in this connection it is interesting to note that while Asper voices the "savage indignation" of Juvenal, Cordatus who frequently quotes or paraphrases Horace, acts as the Horatian voice of moderation having its source in the Aristotelean "mean", thus counterbalancing the righteous but extreme Juvenalian attitude of Asper. Just as Horace and Juvenal depended on norms as a principle of order in expressing their vision of of the diversity and disorderliness of Roman life, Jonson relies on his two spokesmen, Asper and Cordatus, to voice his norms for a purposeful presentation of an "image" of his times, or to be more precise, of a society in restless motion as displayed in the activities of the figures of vice and folly.

CHAPTER THREE
CYNTHIA'S REVELS

Cynthia's Revels[1] is yet another attempt at experimentation with the genre initiated in E.M.O. For like the preceding play, it is formally identified as a "comicall satyre" on the title page, and the following lines from the Prologue voice Johnson's claim to innovation and originality:

> In this alone, his Muse her sweetnesse hath,
> Shee shunnes the print of any beaten path;
> And proues new wayes to come to learned eares.
>
> (Prologue, 9-11)

As the rest of the Prologue shows, there are certain Horatian features in it which, apart from indicating Jonson's affinity with the Roman poet, provide insight into his motives:

> Pied ignorance she neither loues, nor feares.
> Nor hunts she after popular applause.
> Or fomie praise, that drops from common iawes:
> The garland that she weares, their hands must twine,
> Who can both censure, understand, define
> What merit is: Then cast those piercing raies,
> Round as a crowne, in stead of honour'd bayes,
> About his poesie, which (he knowes) affoords
> Words, aboue action: matter, aboue words.
>
> (Prologue, 12-20)

Here Jonson, besides contending that his inspiration has new sources, appeals to the learned against the vulgar and the ignorant, which is an application of the advice given by Horace in Satire I, x, (72-92). Moreover, the final assertion that the play will place "Words, aboue action: matter, aboue words" incorporates Horace's criticism of the masses who appreciate nothing but spectacle, and his statement in the Ars Poetica that words should follow matter (Ars Poetica, 311)—the matter of poetry being the same as that of moral philosophy: life and manners.

As a reading of the play will reveal, Jonson's main concern in C.R. is with satire as a means of expounding a moral philosophy with words as its main agent of expression, while dramatic action remains subordinate to both, following the hierarachy of matter - words - action as formulated above. In reference to Jonson's claim to originality, Baskervill states that Jonson's intention here was not to conceal his debt to his literary precedents but to draw attention to the novelty of the play in its combination of various elements, and to the general tone of the work[2].

C.R. was produced in 1600, at Blackfriars theatre by the Children of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, a private company, and was dedicated to the Court, while E.M.O., staged the year before by the Lord Chamberlain's Men at the Globe, was addressed to the Inns of Court[3], a more popular audience having a more varied range of concerns.

According to Bradbrook, those dramatists who wrote for the children's companies were few in number, and those who did, were "acknowledged poets, with pretensions to wit and learning"[4]. Thus it followed that the audiences of these companies which are known to have specialised in satirical plays as of 1599, were far more educated and sophisticated than those of the public theatres, as made explicit in the Prologue of this play.

That C.R. is "composed of a large number of diverse elements", as Baskervill asserts, and that most of these elements seem to have been combined to appeal to the aristocratic élite, tend to emphasise Jonson's orientation toward courtly circles in writing this "comicall satyre". In the dedication to the Court, which appeared in the folio edition of 1616[5], the Court was qualified by Jonson as "The Speciall Fountaine of Manners". The fact that the alternative title given to C.R. is "The Fountaine of Selfe - Loue" may be taken as an immediate indication of the satirical target of the play: the Court as the fountain of manners but motivated by self-love.

Leaving aside the satiric themes for later discussion, it is necessary to consider first the formal and structural features as well as the mode of characterisation that distinguish C.R. from E.M.O. and that reveal various literary influences.

The main innovative feature of E.M.O. lies in its application of certain formal and structural principles of "vetus comoedia" and in the fusion of these with the aesthetic, ethical and satiric concerns of the Roman satirists. Jonson's choice of form for C.R. his second "comicall satyre", seems at first curiously different from that of E.M.O. Although certain features of Roman formal satire, (and English formal satire) as well as of Greek Old Comedy can still be observed to function in the body of the work, and although some important traces of late morality plays can be discovered especially in characterisation, the most striking aspect of C.R. is its form. This may be described as a combination of mythological, allegorical, and courtly elements, all intended to serve the author's satiric purpose.

As Baskervill has shown, in making use of such a combination, Jonson adopted the Lylyean model of courtly allegory(6). The majority of Lyly's comedies have mythological characters bearing allegorical meaning, along with elements of romance and masque, all of which are exploited for a mildly satirical study of courtly manners. In view of the satirical target of C.R., it is reasonable to agree with Campbell who believes that Jonson, "in filling almost half of C.R. with mythological and allegorical devices, was adopting the easiest method of making his satire palatable to the particular audience for which it was

written"(7).

What is absolutely evident is that in the fictional setting of the "Vale of Gargaphie" in C.R. Jonson has placed the Court under a magnifying glass for a closer scrutiny and analysis of its involvement in trivialities. Thus, the play focuses on a section of English society narrower than that in E.M.O.

The dramatis personae of C.R., however, bear close resemblance to some of the characters in E.M.O. and are divided into the same groups according to their functions. In fact, Berringer finds C.R. a reworking of the previous play since "it seeks to exhibit in the setting of the Cour the same humours which had already been exposed in the City and suburbs"(8).

The plays show an interesting continuity in that Jonson's satiric strategy in C.R. is similar to that in E.M.O in fundamental purpose and in characterisation. Crites, whose name means 'judge', has assumed the function of Asper as the satirist, but dramaturgically he is closer to Macilente on accoun of his participation in the action. Mercury and Cupid are choric figures like Mitis and Cordatus, but they are also directly involved in the dramatic action and represent in C.R. variations in the satiric voice similar to those of Macilente and Buffone. As for the satirical characters, Hedon ("the voluptuous") is portrayed in a manner very close to

Fastidious Brisk, Amorphous ("the deformed") to Puntarvolo, Anaides ("the impudent") to Buffone, and Asotus ("the prodigall") to a combination of Sogliardo and Fungoso(9).

In C.R. the number of female satirical figures has risen to five: Philautia ("selfe-loue"), Phantaste ("light - wittinesse"), Argurion ("monie"), Moria ("mistresse folly"), and Gelaia ("laughter"), her daughter; among whom Philautia ("selfe-loue") parallels Saviolina, and Phantaste is to a certain extent reminiscent of Fallace in E.M.O. The close correspondence between the impostor-characters of C.R. and E.M.O. is evidently an indication of the fact that characterisation in the second of the "comicall satyres" centres on "humours" as in the earlier play, and that this has become a characteristic feature of Jonson's satiric method. It must be noted, however, that in C.R. the origin of all "humours" is presented explicitly as self-love and, what is even more significant, the "humorous" characters, as indicated by their Greek names, personify their follies and vices rather than embody them as in E.M.O. Furthermore, in the second of the "comicall satyres", there is a cast of ideal figures that, apart from Crites who is an extension of the morally flawless Asper, have no prototypes in E.M.O. Such are Arete, Phronesis, Thauma, and Timé, representing Virtue, Wisdom, Wonder, and Honour respectively. These function as ladies in waiting to

the Divine Cynthia, the female counterpart of Crites in moral rectitude and wisdom, who is also a patron of the arts, and a conventional allegorical representation of Queen Elizabeth[10].

There also appear to be certain formal differences between E.M.O. and C.R. For one, Jonson seems to have abandoned the use of a formal chorus which was an outstanding feature of E.M.O. The exegetical machinery operated by Cordatus and Mitis in the Induction between and throughout the acts has given way to dramatic action. According to Campbell, this may have been due to Jonson's wish to conceal "the satiric scaffolding, of which in E.M.O. ...he had kept his audience constantly aware"[11]. In C.R. Mercury and Cupid are choric figures who exchange comments in much the same way as Mitis and Cordatus, with Cupid asking questions like Mitis, to draw answers from Mercury who, like Cordatus, acts as Jonson's spokesman. They offer extended character descriptions, make expository comments, and put in satirical remarks about characters and situations, like the Grex of E.M.O. But unlike Mitis and Cordatus, they do not appear in the Induction, nor remain on stage throughout the play, nor comment on dramatic technique. They present themselves as "the invisible spectators of this strange show" (II, iii, 9-10), but also participate in the dramatic action disguised as pages to the courtiers.

A non-dramatic description of the "Character of the Persons" such as that preceding E.M.O. is in this play replaced by an extended choric characterisation of the courtiers by Mercury and Cupid in Act II. This shows, that in some respects Jonson has attempted at a fuller dramatisation of certain elements of the play(12). Furthermore, in comparison with that of E.M.O., the Induction of C.R. is composed with a keener eye for dramatic action, - a point that has been observed by Baskervill(13). Instead of choric commentators and the satiris explaining the dramatist's purpose and technique as in E.M.O., the audience is presented with a debate or a mock-quarrel among the child players of C.R. as to who shall speak out the Prologue. This includes a synopsis of the plot of the play, to be followed by specific and highly mordant satirical attacks: first, on arrogant and misbehaving spectators, secondly, on obscene and crude play-wrights, and finally on ignorant and injudicious critics who might criticise the play for the wrong reasons; the last being acted out as between the critical spectator and the dramatist.

Baskervill, having first cited dramatic antecedents for the device of the debate and the use of actors in the Induction in earlier native English plays, notes that although these devices had been combined for the first time by Jonson in the Induction to E.M.O. during the brief appearance of

Buffone and the debate about the Prologue, it is in C.R. that they have for the first time been exploited fully to enhance the dramatic quality of the Induction parallel to the expression of the critical views of the author.

However, it is possible to find precedents in Roman comedy and in Greek Old Comedy for what Jonson offers in the Induction to C.R. Both Plautus and Terence frequently used their prologues for some discussions of the play as a play, and Plautus usually gave a synopsis of the plot in the prologue, a practice which Terence, as mentioned in his prologue to the Adelphoe, rejected deliberately. It has also been argued that Jonson in composing the Induction to C.R. may have drawn on the prologue of Plautus' Poenulus in which a plot-summary is given, and those spectators who are considered offensive by the playwright are characterised in mocking terms(14). However, it must also be kept in mind that making satirical attacks on the audience, discussing the play as a play, defending the dramatist, and asserting that the play is original and superior to others are features characteristic of the parabasis of Old Comedy, as pointed out in the previous chapter. So, notwithstanding its more dramatic set-up, the Induction to C.R. is similar to the Induction to E.M.O. in its general satiric purpose and in its parabatic content and function. Although it excludes choric commentators, it does inform the audience of what to

expect in the play and what critical attitude to adopt towards it. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the more dramatic quality of the Induction and the integration of the choric commentators in the dramatic action do not help much to speed up the development of C.R. as a play. In fact, it is correct to qualify C.R. as even more static than E.M.O., for the pace of dramatic development from the second act until the beginning of the fifth act seems quite imperceptible.

The dramatic action in C.R. may be summed up as the reformation of the group of courtly representatives of vice and folly by means of a two-part masque or "revels", in which each satirical character is made to act the part of the virtue most closely related to his or her dominant vice. The masque worked out by Crites, who is significantly a poet as well as the satirist of the play, takes place in the fifth act, which as in E.M.O., is the busiest and lengthiest part of the play. Besides the masque, it consist of a courting match between Amorphous and Mercury and the final scene of purgation and reform. Although the main plot-action is concentrated in the last act, even this part of the play lacks the dramatic vitality that is witnessed in the last act of E.M.O. As for the preceding parts of the play, the first act covers what Knoll calls the "mythological prologue"(15) with Mercury, Cupid, and Echo at Narcissus' Fountain of Self-

Love, discussing Niobe, Actaeon, and Narcissus, all three of whom represent presumption born of self-love; the second act is devoted to a static characterisation of the courtiers who, having drunk from the Fountain of Narcissus, are shown to be in a state of excessive self-love; and the third and fourth acts are confined to a tediously detailed display of the frivolous manners and trivial word games played by the courtiers and their mistresses.

Gifford's view of the plot as "so finely spun, that no eye perhaps but Jonson's has ever been able to trace it"(16), reflects the general critical bewilderment resulting from an attempt to find a regular plot line in the play. Yet C.R. has drawn criticism on itself not only on account of its lack of a well-defined plot, but also because of the general effect of tediousness that seems to accumulate with the reading of the play - an effect which has been almost unanimously acknowledged by Jonsonian critics. It is possible to argue, however, that the dullness of C.R. does not really arise from the allegorical form or the abstractness of characterisation, as some may have reason to contend, but from Jonson's method of holding all dramatic considerations subservient to his didacticism, or to his satiric and moral concerns.

It is mainly on account of this peculiarity that the play has earned such harsh criticism as, for instance,

Swinburne's, who qualified C.R. as "the intolerable elaboration of pretentious dullness and ostentatious ineptitude", manifesting "the Cyclopean ponderosity of perseverance which hammers through scene after scene at the task of ridicule by anatomy of tediousness and preposterous futilities..."(17). While Swinburne is keen to balance the unappealing and uninteresting quality of the content of the play with what in his view is an inartistic manner of dramatic composition, more recent and less rhetorical criticism focuses mainly on problems of dramatic construction. According to Herford, for instance, the play is "denuded of dramatic structure" and cannot be criticised by classical standards(18). This, of course, must be taken to refer to the lack of dramatic structure to achieve a unity of action in the classical sense - a point which is raised also by Daiches who points out that while many marks of dramatic skill are manifest in the play they cannot be said to bring about a unity in dramatic action(19).

What attempts there have been to find unity in the play have centered on thematic concerns and allegorical types. Knoll, for instance, contends that the structure of C.R. must be recognised in terms of a thematic coherence by which characters and actions are united(20), while according to Talbert, the mythological elements in the play may be seen to serve in achieving an allegorical unity(21).

However, in the light of the foregoing criticism

focusing on thematic and allegorical unity, it is possible to find an underlying structure which follows a pattern rather than a plot-line. A close examination of the play reveals a balanced structure of paired opposites: on the one hand, the world of Reality as represented by Cynthia's court of virtuous characters, and on the other, the world of Appearance as represented by the set of "humorous" courtiers.

The balanced structure of virtues and vices is, of course, a common feature of English morality plays; but the opposites in C.R. appear to be of the Platonic kind which establish an absolute distance between the ideal world of Reality and the actuality which is mere Appearance(22). In this context, Crites and Mercury, the satiric commentators, serve to establish a point of contact at which the two worlds meet. Crites, representing the poet and the perfect man, is nevertheless made to mix with the vain and foolish courtiers of the world of Appearance whom he calls "impostors all" (V. xi. 112) thus setting up a contrast to them. As such, he is fit to be assigned by Cynthia to devise a masque in which the impostors will participate and be exposed. As for Mercury, besides playing his traditional role as mediator between gods and men, he is also made to join with Crites in an "ironicall confederacie" (V.i.29) to expose the impostors.

On the basis of the evidence of the masque at the end of the play, it would be correct to distinguish the two worlds in which Crites and Mercury move in terms of

the opposition of an Imitation Court to an Ideal Court. The former, in its blindness caused by self-love, is seen to distort the virtues and courtly manners of Divine Cynthia's Ideal Court and to replace its decorum with perverted and ridiculous behaviour. Dramatic activities in each court are juxtaposed until the last scene of the last act in which, after Crites' masque has exposed the impostors the Ideal Court superimposes its presence upon the Imitation Court.

The Ideal Court centering around Cynthia, who personifies a combination of Virtue, Wisdom, Justice and Courtliness[23], consists of four ideal female figures, (Arete, Phronesis, Thauma, and Time), with their four male counterparts (Crites, Chrestus, Euthus, and Phronimus). It is interesting to note that in dramatic terms the Ideal Court is not fully represented, for three of the ideal women are mute characters and three of their male counterparts are merely mentioned as belonging to the group and do not even make stage appearances - a point which makes it quite clear that for Jonson their raison d'être is to maintain a balanced and paired structure. The members of the Imitation Court are similarly arranged in two groups of four: Amorphous, Hedon, Anaides, and Asotus in one, and the courtly ladies Philautia, Phantaste, Moria, and Argurion in the other.

In Baskervill's view, the grouping of courtly ladies for a display of their foolish or vicious affectations (a device which does not appear in Jonson's previous plays) is

similar in function to those in Lyly's comedies, where such groupings are frequently created for the purpose of satirical attack(24). Furthermore, Baskervill offers a table of the contrastive arrangement of the groups of courtiers and relates the "grouping by fours" to the allegorical mode of such English morality plays as Skelton's Magnificence and Wilson's Three Lords and Three Ladies of London. He also draws attention to the characterisation of Crites in terms of the four humours, and among a number of other sources makes references to Lyly's allegories and Shakespeare's Love's Labour's Lost to point out the frequency of grouping by fours.

The manner in which the pattern of paired opposites manifests itself in the masque is curious as well as impressive. On Cynthia's command Crites is assigned by Arete to produce a masque for the occasion of the evening's revels and is encouraged to seek his inspiration in the presence of the members of the Ideal Court. As opposed to this, the members of the Imitation Court are shown to be engaged in playing absurd parlour games. By devoting almost the entire fourth act to a variety of such games, which incidentally reinforce rather than diminish the static quality of the play, Jonson seems to demonstrate that this type of activity, in opposition to that of Crites', is pointless beyond itself. Huizinga in Homo Ludens defines games as

"useless" and characterised by fixed conventions or rules, taking place in a limited time and space which set up a special reality. He points out that "courtly culture is particularly prone to adopt the play form (for) it moves in a small and restricted circle"[25]. Obviously for satirical purposes this appears to take an extreme form in C.R. where such formal word games as "Substantiues and Adiectives", "The Crab, or a Thing done, and who did it" and others are used by Jonson to stress the emptiness, the frivolity and the imitative nature of the pseudo courtiers. The masque which follows is clearly intended as an antidote for this kind of futile activity.

In the first half of the masque, the four ladies of the Imitation Court impersonate the attributes of courtly decorum or virtue: Phantaste (light-wittinesse) for instance is masked as Euphantaste ("well-conceited wittinesse"), and Philautia ("selfe-loue") as Storgé ("allowable self-loue"). In the second half, the four male courtiers are similarly masked, whereby Amorphous ("deformed") and Anaides ("shameless") are made to impersonate Eucosmos ("neate and elegante") and Eutolmos ("properly audacious") respectively. The bipartite masque takes place in four consecutive scenes of the play in the form of rounds of dance, to be concluded by Cynthia's confrontation with the maskers. But an aspect which has attrached critical attention is the absence of a contest or struggle between the paired opposites.

It has been pointed out by Meagher that in the contemporary masque the Virtues and Vices usually engaged in an allegorical battle[26]. Besides, as evidenced by Skelton's Magnificence, in morality plays Vices could be disguised as Virtues in such allegorical struggles. In C.R., however, although the same device is used, the masque contains no struggle. It appears that in Jonson's view the disguise is significant because it exposes the disparity between the impostors' actual manner of conduct and the courtly values represented by the masks.

Nevertheless the distinction between Self-Love (Philautia) and Allowable Self-Love (Storgé), or that between Shameless (Anaides) and Properly Audacious (Eutolmos) is very thin. For it indicates that the difference between "what is" and "what should be," lies in degree, not in kind. In view of this, it is possible to agree with Gilbert that "the virtues represented in the masque are not the fundamental ones of noble character, but rather the secondary ones of good manners"[27]. Hence, Crites' corrective masks would be implying that the best the courtiers can aspire to is a kind of proportioning, and that what are offered as ideal courtly qualities may be interpreted as being quite insubstantial. However, in view of Jonson's general moral outlook, as

exhibited in his other works, it seems more reasonable to adopt Baskervill's assumption that Jonson's ethical stand in C.R. is ultimately Aristotelian, and takes its source from the Nicomachean Ethics[28]. As indicated in the preceding chapter, the Aristotelean "mean" is the guiding principle of Horatian ethics adopted by Jonson. Accordingly, in C.R. the idea underlying the masque may well be interpreted as illuminating the Aristotelian conception of vice as "the excess of what in the mean state is a virtue"[29], since the corrective masks do in effect stand for virtue conceived "in the mean state".

To reinforce this conception, there is the dominating personality of Crites who functions as the embodiment of the ideal "mean," hence, of virtue. His character is described by Mercury as follows:

> A creature of a most perfect and diuine temper. One, in whom the humours and elements are peaceably met... he is neyther too phantastikely melancholy, too slowly phlegmaticke, too lightly sanguine, or too rashly cholericke, but in all, so composde and order'd, as it is cleare, Nature went about some full worke, she did more then make a man, when she made him. His discourse is like his behaviour, uncommon, but not unpleasing... Hee striues rather to bee that which men call iudicious, then to be thought so: and is so truly learned that, that he affects not to shew it. Hee will thinke, and speake his thought, both freely: but as distant from deprauing another man's merit, as proclaiming his owne. For his valour, 'tis such, that he dares as little to offer an inuirie, as receiue one. In summe, he hath a most ingenuous and sweet spirit, a sharp and season'd wit, a straight iudgement, and a strong mind...

> He counts it his pleasure, to despise pleasures, and is more delighted with good deeds, then goods. It is a competencie to him that hee can bee vertuous. He doth neyther couet, nor feare; hee hath too much reason to doe eyther: and that commends all things to him.
>
> (II, iii, 123-145)

This description incorporated in the play, is almost fully quoted because it epitomises Jonson's conception of both the ideally virtuous man and the ideal satirist in Horatian terms. In the description of Crites' character the Aristotelian conception of the ideal "mean" or virtue is expressed in terms of an harmonious order among the "humours". Here Jonson does not seem to be as concerned with re-expounding a psychology of "humours" as with setting up a contrast between positive and negative exemplars. In C.R. the most concrete positive exemplar presented in dramatic terms is Crites who acts as a satiric commentator on the figures of folly and vice thus bridging the gap between the two opposing courts, who prepares the masque to bring about the wholesale purgation of the male and female pseudo - courtiers, and who is finally assigned by Cynthia to pass judgement on them.

At this point it must be noted that the function of the characters in C.R., as in E.M.O. is necessarily linked to

the dramatic structure. For it is the actions and the interaction of the characters that determine the structural arrangement of the plays, which are similarly episodic. Naturally, the same observation may be made in the case of Aristophanic comedy in which a comprehensive understanding of the structure is quite impossible without an understanding of the central character and his interaction with the impostor - characters. The following critical views will serve to show why it is illuminating to approach C.R., as well as E.M.O., with Old Comedy in mind.

In commenting on the plot structure of Old Comedy. Moore has placed emphasis on perhaps its most outstanding feature by stating that "Aristophanes was the first playwright who made characters the nuclei of plays that are otherwise amorphous"(30). As observed in relation to E.M.O., the elderly protagonist functioning as the comic-satiric expositor of numerous impostors, is the dramatic element which unifies the Aristophanic play composed of diverse structural parts as the prologue, agôn (set contest) and the episodes following the parabasis. This may be supplemented by Butcher's view that "a play of Aristophanes is a dramatised debate...in which the persons represent opposing principles, for in form the piece is always combative, though the fight may be a mock fight"(31). Evidently, the idea underlying this statement is that the opposition between the protagonist, on the one hand, and the impostors on the other, arises from the dramatic nature and

function of each.

What is particularly meaningful from our point of view is that these features emphasised by Moore and Butcher should appear in C.R. in the person of Crites who functions as the unifying dramatic element in the loosely constructed play, and in the structure of paired opposites. The opposites are represented on the one hand by the court of Cynthia with Crites as its most eloquent spokesman, and on the other, by the group of pseudo-courtiers.

In view of these combined features, C.R. when compared with E.M.O., suggests a modification in Jonson's satiric strategy. Firstly, although Crites functions like Macilente as the satiric commentator and the agent for the exposure of vice and folly, unlike Macilente, he is a morally flawless character, more akin to Asper. In reference to this point Dessen assumes that Jonson, by creating a satirist only of "admirable qualities" in C.R., has purposely abandoned the "somewhat cumbersome method devised in E.M.O."(32); the "cumbersome method" obviously being the dual satiric persona in Asper/Macilente.

Indeed, the ideally virtuous characterisation of Crites the satirist, approximating the character of the "Aristotelian high-minded man"(33) or of a "moral laureate"(34), as suggested by Baskervill and Campbell respectively, may have been prompted by a possible confusion

over the character of Macilente presented not only as a satirist but also as a person ostensibly dominated by his ruling "humour" envy. Crites, in contrast, is a character of "perfect and diuine temper" (II, iii, 123). However, it must also be noted that besides being just as morally upright, he is similar to Asper in possessing a certain amount of indignation, which seems an essential element in his dramatic function as purger. For although Crites is generally presented as a Horatian satirist of greater restraint than the Juvenalia Asper, flashes of righteous indignation break out in certain speeches of his, such as the following:

> O how despisde and base a thing is a man,
> If he not striue t'erect his groueling thoughts
> Above the straine of flesh! But how more cheape
> When, euen his best and understanding part,
> (The crowne, and strength of all his faculties)
> Floates like a dead drown'd bodie, on the streame
> Of vulgar humour, mixt with commonst dregs?
>
> (I, v. 33-39)

That Crites proves himself capable of anatomising and caricaturing the foolish pretenders in a vein similar to that in the speech above, confirms the point that he has been conceived by Jonson as a combination of features belonging to both of the satirists of E.M.O., Asper and Macilente. However, a striking aspect of Jonson's satiric strategy in C.R. is the importance he has placed on th

elevation of the role of the satirist in society as the positive exemplar whose didactic function is meant to go hand in hand with the satiric.

The effort to elevate the role and the function of the satirist is manifested through the characterisation of Crites not only as a scholar of virtue and moderation, of "a sharp and season'd wit, a straight iudgement, and a strong mind" (II, iii, 138-139) most suited for the purpose of satiric analysis and commentary, but also as an artist and a poet who combines these qualities in his person. While Macilente characterised as "a man well-parted, a sufficient scholler" (Character of the Persons, 7) was able to bring about the exposure and the purgation of the impostors in E.M.O. merely by intrigue, Crites as a poet fulfills the same function through an artistic creation such as the masque. That at the conclusion of the play Crites, unlike Macilente, is assigned by Cynthia literally to pass judgement on the pretenders, confirms the elevation of the poet-satirist in a manner unwitnessed in E.M.O.

Significantly, it is Mercury, presented in his traditional role of the divine patron of wit and eloquence, and Arete, divine virtue, who first seek out Crites' satiric and poetic talents in the service of Cynthia. For in Act III, after having listened with approval to Crites' satirical sketches of the pseudo-courtiers, Arete asks of him to provide

entertainment worthy of Queen Cynthia's revels that night; and later, Mercury requires his services as a satirist in order to pursue his plan to expose the self-loving folly of the courtiers. Thus the divine powers are observed to take special interest in the poet-satirist, not permitting him to remain aloof.

Since the satiric episodes in which the courtly pretenders either expose themselves or are exposed by Crites and Mercury gain full meaning only after the final masque that restores them to virtue, it is understood that the duty of the satirist cannot be limited merely to exposing and reproving folly and vice, but that it must also persuade men to virtue. Thus it becomes evident that Crites' roles as poet and satirist are one.

It is also to be noted that Crites' effectiveness as the agent of purgation in the last act is heightened because it involves a reversal from the earlier part of the play in which he is regarded as a contemptible scholar. Lady Moria and Argurion, for instance describe him as "the poore, plaine gentleman, i' the blacke "..." a fellow that no body so much

as lookst upon, or regarded..." (IV, i, 83-86); Hedon, as "a piece of serge or perpetuana" (III, ii, 30), "a meere poore scholer" (IV, v, 54); Amorphous, as one of the kind wearing a "poor coate" (III, i, 36). These references to Crites, which significantly express contempt directed to his appearance, are also reflected in the satirist's self-description as a creature "despisde and poore" (V, i, 23-29).

In reference to the "ironical" aspect of the satirist, it is interesting to note that although Crites is made to appear as worse than he actually is in the eyes of the false courtiers, he cannot be considered an eirôn, a dissimulator like Macilente or like the comic-satiric protagonist of Old Comedy. While it is true that he acts as a dissimulator by assuming the guise of Mercury's agent and by challenging the Asotus-Amorphous pair to a duel to ridicule them, and that earlier in the play he very nearly approximates the attitude of an eirôn, by asking himself, "what ridiculous circumstance might I deuise now, to bestow this reciprocall brace of butterflies [Asotus and Amorphous] one upon the other?" (I, iv, 76-78), on the whole, his serious and philosophical attitude towards his human environment is presented as incompatible with the role of the dissimulator. The only type of dissimulation that he seems to be truly capable of is expressed by Mercury when he describes Crites as one who is "so truly learned that he affects not to shew it" (II, iii, 133-134); which is precisely the type of "irony" peculiar to

Horatian satire. The fact that "he doth neyther covet, nor feare" because "he hath too much reason to doe neyther" (II, iii, 144-145) places Crites far above the impostors around him. His view of the futility of their lives is expressed in the speech quoted above (I, v, 33-39), deploring the subjection of reason to the pursuit of trivial appetites.

Whatever involvement Crites may have with the courtly pretenders can only take place at what may be qualified as a philosophical distance. This is demonstrated in the scene in which Crites overhears Hedon and Anaides plotting to spread the rumour that his poetry is plagiarised. Hedon's words reveal that they are acting out of spite because Crites has ignored their envy and contempt:

> Gods precious, this afflicts mee more then all the rest, that wee should so particularly direct our hate, and contempt against him, and hee to carrie it thus without wound, or passion! 'tis insufferable.
>
> (III, ii, 19-22)

Crites' reaction is to ignore them yet once more, for in his view, "of such to be disprais'd, is the most perfect praise" (III, iii, 12-18). By doing so, he suggests his selflessness, which stands in direct opposition to the self - love of Hedon and the rest of the false courtiers. As pointed out earlier, he is presented as a satirist who will serve not

his own interests but those of Cynthia which evidently stand for the interests of the society at large.

Thus in character and function Crites stands in quite a different position from Macilente the embittered and envious critic, and as such, it must be admitted that his perfections render him far less interesting, especially as a dramatic character. But like Macilente, he maintains the satiric stance required of him as a commentator on the manners and actions of the pretenders.

So far as the method of satiric exposure is concerned, it must be said that when Crites is compared to Macilente in terms of function, he is seen to be less enthusiastic in censuring folly and vice, despite his greater participation in the dramatic action. As pointed out above, this restraint evidently results from Crites' role as a satirist who avoids the display of contempt that Hedon and Anaides, for instance, regularly engage in. It may be on account of this quality that Crites' duties as satiric commentator are to a great extent shared conveniently by Mercury, the god of often mischievous eloquence. In fact, the play provides sufficient evidence that

the greater part of Crites' satiric duties is accomplished through the reformative masque in Act V, and that the task of exposing folly and vice through ridicule is a secondary one for him.

In his first scene in the play (I, iv) Crites is portrayed as the good-natured but sharp-eyed satiric commentator in the Horatian tradition, rather than in the Juvenalian one of "savage indignation." He exploits the typical Horatian device of making subtle jokes which the understanding spectator will enjoy but which is totally missed by the vain and single-minded figures of ridicule. Preserving the urbane and affable quality of Horace, Crites allows Amorphous and Asotus to act out their follies without attacking them directly. As has been pointed out by Anderson, the essential method of the Horatian satiric persona is to tell truth with a laugh: "ridentem verum dicere"(35).

Another technique of exposure assigned to Crites is the insertion of miniature or thumb-nail satires in the manner of Juvenal(36). These satiric commentaries on the actions of the false courtiers which are delivered in indignation to Arete in Act III, Scene iv, in the form of two long monologues, echo Juvenal's satires in many respects.

One of the figures in the satirical parade in the first monologue is depicted as being waited on "by mimiques, iesters, panders, parasites/And other such prodigies of men"

(19-21). Another is a man who presses his creditors to pay their debts, but whose gains "he hurles away/Into the laps of bawds and buffons mouthes" (40-41). Yet another is "any thing but honest; serves the time,/Houers betwixt two factions, and explores the drifts of both" (44-46). It is interesting to note that these brief sketches have their counterparts in Juvenal's third Satire[37]. Moreover, Crites' following conclusion includes a direct reference to Juvenal as "the Satyrist", and the last line is a paraphrase from his first Satire.

> ...one that dares
> Doe deeds worthie the hurdle, or the wheele,
> To be thought some bodie; and is (in sooth)
> Such as the Satyrist points truly forth,
> That onely to his crimes owes all his worth.[38]
>
> (49-52)

The influence of Juvenal's Satires may also be traced in the second monologue that continues with the satirical parade. Crites' highly contemptuous attitude towards the overwhelming concern of the courtiers for cosmetics and dress which comes close to suggesting perversion, is similar in tone to Juvenal's second Satire attacking perverts. Crites' description of a certain courtier in terms of the "Neophyte glazing of his face/Pruning his clothes, perfuiming of his haire" (55-57) recalls one of Juvenal's perverts engaged in similar activity[39]. And in the person of the courtier who "repeats/Like an imperfect Prologue, at third musicke/His

part of speeches, and confederate iests/In passion to him selfe..." (58-59), Crites expresses his scorn for those who rehearse actors' speeches and attend to their courtships in a make-believe world of play-acting, in a manner which strongly resembles Juvenal's indignation with the Roman aristocrats, who in their pretensions to histrionics, made fools of themselves on the public stage[40]. Such instances of parallelism, which are in fact too numerous to cite in the present discussion, are doubly significant. First, they show that Jonson's reasons for paraphrasing or reflecting the tone of Juvenal's Satires lie not in mere imitation but in a concern with similar pretensions and vices, and secondly they point out the similarity to formal satire in the technique of satiric exposure.

Further on in Act V, however, a device for satiric exposure that is quite different from the Juvenalian commentary mentioned above appears in Scene iv, (added to the folio edition of C.R.) in which Crites takes part in a joint intrigue with Mercury. This intrigue takes the form of a comic challenge in the "mysterie" of courtship and includes such competitions as "the bare Accost", "the better Reguard", "the solemne Addresse", and "the perfect Close" (V, iii, 106-109), all of which have been devised by Mercury to deflate the impostors in what may be termed a "ridiculing session", preliminary to the final reformation to be achieved by the masque. Here, Crites is made to carry out the process of

exposure through a parody of courtly jargon, using the Horatian technique of humourous irony. The point of the scene seems to be that satiric ridicule should not be destructive, but should serve the purpose of promoting good sense in the figures of folly. Crites warns Mercury that in ridiculing the courtiers' affectations, he "should doe more charitably, to doe it more openly; that they might discover themselves mockt in these monstrous affectations" (V, iv, 288-298). But what is rated by Crites as "charitable" satire only serves in angering the courtiers and in increasing their insolence and pride. Thus, judging by a comparison with the final act of E.M,O., it is clear that at this point in C.R. satire has not yet fulfilled its purpose of correcting folly as well as exposing it, but that the grounds have been prepared for it.

It has been observed earlier that, like E.M.O., C.R. is constructed on the principle of displaying the relationship between the satirist and the impostors around him, but that unlike the preceding play, C.R. has as its main satiric persona not a "humourist" but one whose character and satiric method are different from those of Macilente. It must also be noted that Jonson's conception of the ultimate satiric aim as represented in Crites' reformative masque suggests yet another difference: his intention to produce a more elevated and sophisticated kind of satire. Hence, the differences between the satirists of the two plays explain the difference in the manner in which the relationship between Crites and the

courtly pretenders are dramatically treated.

The dual satiric function represented by Asper/ Macilente is substituted by the dominant satiric voice of the morally flawless Crites, evidently for a more commendable purpose in Jonson's opinion. In dramatic terms this has necessarily placed Crites as an opponent to the false courtiers who, unlike the impostors in E.M.O., openly acknowledge the opposition by scorning and even hating Crites from the beginning of their involvement. Though Jonson allows the courtiers to indulge in a full display of their foolishness and vanity in a manner similar to that in E.M.O., in C.R. the range of the impostor-characters is narrower, and what is even more important, they present a homogeneity in presuming that they possess courtly wisdom, and very nearly duplicate one another's role. Thus, characterisation in C.R. is less intense than in E.M.O. just as the focus is more limited - a point that is also exhibited in the speeches of the courtiers, which, as noted by Barish, are undistinguished except for those of Amorphous(41).

Another point to be observed about the characterisation of the courtly pretenders who are openly qualified by Crites as "impostors all" (V, xi, 113), is that besides having strong affinities with the impostor-characters of E.M.O. and hence with those of Old Comedy listed in the Tractatus Coislinianus(42), they also bear some resemblance to Theophrastan characters, who likewise have a lineage in

Aristotle. In commenting on this similarity, Boyce bases his argument on the character descriptions given by Mercury and Cupid in Act II, and claims that the pseudo-courtiers' relation to the "humours" appears in the "merely picturesque and mechanical collecting of externals", and that while they do not have the "well-defined moral or psychological propensity governing a number of tabulated actions" that is required for a Theophrastan character, they are nearer the Greek standard than any English sketches written prior to C.R.(43). The importance of this argument lies primarily in its indication of yet another specific classical influence on Jonson's technique of characterisation, manifested in the sketches drawn by Mercury and Cupid.

As for the characters of Mercury and Cupid, it may be said that in dramatic function both of these deities suggest an interesting parallelism with the comic eirôn of Aristophanic comedy. In the first act, they are presented as comic portrayals in the Lylyean manner engaged in witty conversation drawn mainly from Lucian's Dialogue of the Gods(44), where they are introduced in the context of their traditional attributes. Soon after, however, they engage themselves as page and attendant in the service of the courtly pretenders, having taken on human disguise. Their intention is explained by Cupid as follows:

> Since wee are turn'd cracks, let's studie to be like cracks; practise their language, and behauiours, and not with a dead imitation: act freely, carelessly, and capriciously, as if our veins ranne with quicksiluer...
>
> (II, i, 5-10)

But more important than serving as comic vehicles for wit, punning, and jesting, they are also intended as dissimulators to help expose the affectations of the courtiers with much the same function as that of the "ironical man" or dissimulator of Old Comedy. Since the character of Crites the protagonist has been initially conceived as unsuitable to assume the guise of the eirôn, except incidentally as in Act V, Jonson has shifted this function onto the two mythological figures who are evidently suited for it, and made them share it in a way that is more or less similar to the sharing of the same function by Macilente and Buffone in E.M.O. What is particularly significant is that Jonson should have considered this function indispensable for his method of satiric exposure in drama and should have combined it with yet another. For it is seen that from their vantage point as dissimulators, Mercur and Cupid are also able to comment upon and explicate the action of the play besides providing the audience with the preliminary character sketches of the "humourists".

Towards the end of the play, however, Mercury assumes a more important and serious role in acting as an agent to persuade Crites to fully expose the falseness of the would-be

courtiers by means of a masque:

> But for our sake, and to inflict iust paines
> On their prodigious follies, aide us now
> No man is, presently, made bad with ill.
>
> (V, i, 10-12)

The last line of the passage above, which is almost a translation from Juvenal's second Satire("no one reaches the depths of turpitude all at once"(8) refers to Crites' qualms as to why he should at all continue to observe the behaviour of the impostors when it is already known that his soul "is hurt with meere intention on their follies" (I, v, 42). This, of course, is a point that shows Crites', or more precisely, Jonson's awareness of the problem of the honest and virtuous satirist who must live among and profess a knowledge of the vicious without blemishing himself morally. But Mercury asserts himself once more in the function of the moralist:

> It is our purpose Crites, to correct
> And punish with our laughter, this nights sport
> Which our court-Dors so heartily intend:
> And by that worthy scorne, to make them know
> How farre beneath the dignitie of man
> Their serious, and most practis'd actions are.
>
> (V, i, 17-25)

This recalls Crites' initial indignation with the false courtiers whose folly, in his view, springs essentially from the abuse of their own minds and results in self-degradation (I, v, 35-39). What cannot escape our notice is that Mercury's present speech, another part of which is quoted below, like

Crites' speech in Act I, is pervasively Juvenalian in tone and theme and in fact contains a line (31) that echoes one from the eighth Satire: "virtue, and virtue alone, remains the one true nobility". For it is a close reflection of Juvenal's view that the Roman nobility, engaged in a senseless imitation of degenerate Greek customs and obsessed by an absurd concern for mere appearances, disgrace their social status instead of serving as a model for those who are socially inferior(45):

> The better race in court
> That haue the true nobilitie, call'd vertue,
> Will apprehend it (the masque) as a grateful right,
> Done to their separate merit: and approue
> The fit rebuke of so ridiculous heads,
> Who with their apish customs, and forc'd garbes,
> Would bring the name of courtier in contempt.
>
> (V, i, 30-36)

The idea implicit in this passage, that the aristocracy should set a positive example for the nation, is not the only Juvenalian theme in C.R. However, before surveying the themes prevalent in the play it seems necessary to point out the special relevance of the passage quoted above to Jonson's dedication to the Court, which heads the later folio edition(46). This dedication, besides providing an explicit statement of the theme of the responsibility of the court in offering exemplary moral values and conduct, is particularly significant in its use of the metaphor of the spring or fountain as a source of courtly virtue, evidently in contrast to the Fountain of Self-Love in the first act of the play:

> Thou art a bountiful, and braue spring: and waterest all the noble plants of this Iland. In thee, the whole Kingdome dresseth it selfe, and is ambitious to use thee as her glasse. Beware, then, thou render mens figures truly, and teach them no lesse to hate their deformities, then to loue their formes: For, to grace, there should come reuerence; and no man can call that louely, which is not also uenerable. It is not pould'ring, perfuming, and euery day smelling of the taylor, that conuerteth to a beautiful obiect: but a mind shining through any sute, which needes no false light either of riches, or honors to helpe it.
>
> (Dedication, 5-17)

Here, by directing our attention to the relationship between the court and society at large, Jonson is emphasisin the responsibility of the court in holding up for society a mirror of true values and virtuous conduct, not one of distorted images as those that appear in the play. Thus, in distinguishing falseness from truth to nature and in upholding truth and virtue, the dedication projects a microcosm of the play, the underlying assumption being that the head of state, Cynthia, naturally possesses the integrit that the nobility is urged to adopt.

As illustrated by the masque in Act V, it is evidently Jonson's view that the court may be rescued from the self-loving pseudo-courtiers who hold up a deceptive and distorting mirror, like the pool into which Narcissus gazed (I, ii). For Queen Cynthia, the head of state, is regarded as potentially capable of detecting and purging all types of uncourtly values and behaviour, and of setting up the proper

model of virtue for the rest of the nation. Hence, despite her brief stage appearance, Cynthia is a key character as the keeper of the state and of the fountain of truth. In this feature C.R. evidently displays a major difference from E.M.O. in which no such ideal norm was presented in dramatic terms. The ethical norms represented by Asper and Cordatus were neither as emphatically argued nor dramatised in terms of the ideal.

It has already been indicated that the bi-partite masque supervised by Cynthia and constituting the most important dramatic device for the exposure and correction of the false courtiers stands in the same relation to C.R. as Macilente's intrigue to E.M.O. Similarly, it is the only part of the play which brings into focus the interrelationship of all the dramatic characters, the ideal figures as well as the impostors.

In a general assessment of the masque in the context of the play, Gilbert observes that "from the beginning Jonson looks forward to the masques which concentrate the counterfeit ideals of the presumptuous and reveal them to Cynthia. The action [of C.R.] is not that of a play of adventure or intrigue ... Word and act do not lead by direct action to the masques, but they show why the characters are such as to fall into the trap of the masque laid for them by Crites; in their foolish self-love they think they are the good qualities they

impersonate"[47]. Although it is not quite correct to consider Crites' masque a "trap" in the same sense as Macilente's intrigue for reasons that have already been explained in connection with Crites' function as a satirist, "word and act" do in fact show "how" as well as "why" the counterfeit courtiers are ripe for correction. Following, the gradually accumulated display of self-love in the serial arrangement of the episodic scenes, it is noted that by the fifth act this display has reached the point of unprecedented flagrancy.

The climactic moments are presented in Act V, Scene x, when the mischievous Cupid, disguised as Anteros during the masque, secretly shoots arrows at Amorphous and Phantaste among the maskers, but is unable to arouse in them anything but exorbitant self-love:

> Amorphous: Cynthia (by my bright soule) is a right exquisite, and splendidious lady; yet Amorphous, I thinke, hath seene more fashions, I am sure more countries; but whether I haue, or not, what neede wee gaze on Cynthia, that haue our selfe to admire?
>
> Phantaste: O, excellent Cynthia! yet if Phantaste sate where shee doo's, and had such a tire on her head (for attire can doe much) I say no more--but goddesses are goddesses, and Phantaste is as shee is!
>
> (V, x, 42-50)

Thus it is seen that the courtiers' inability to fall in love with each other and their hybristic insistence on admiring themselves more than the Divine Cynthia is the ultimate

dramatic expression of their uncontrolled vanity and their abandonment of reason.

Campbell has observed that it was a common principle that the climactic display of folly should coincide with the moment for purgation and reform[48] - a pattern that exhibits itself also in E.M.O. in the final act of sequential punishment and purgation. In C.R., however, it is quite evident that Jonson is aiming higher, because the ultimate purpose of satire is conceived as one that will reform the impostors and not just purge them of self-love. What is of particular significance, moreover, is that the aim should be fulfilled through the artistic medium of a masque of genuine courtly qualities.

In the masque, each self-loving courtier is made to impersonate the positive quality most nearly allied to his or her ruling "humour". Amorphous (Deformed) is masked as Eucólos (neat and elegant) for instance, and Philautia (self-love) as Storge (allowable self-love). As announced by Arete to Crites in ActV, Scene x, it is Cynthia herself who has willed that the false courtiers and no others should take part in the masque:

> ...Shee resolu'd
> Of sports and triumphs, under that pretext
> To haue them muster in their pompe, and fulnesse;
> That so shee might more strictly, and to roote,
> Effect the reformation shee intends.
>
> (V, v, 42-46)

In the first half of the masque (V, vii) the courtly ladies are introduced to Cynthia by Cupid, who is appropriately disguised for Cynthia's presence as Anteros (Love's enemy), with a full description of each courtly virtue impersonated including the emblem and motto of each. The same procedure is repeated in the second half of the masque (V, ix) and the introduction of each courtier is carried out by Mercury disguised as a page.

The final exposure which naturally takes the form of unmasking, is effected first by Cynthia (Scene xi) in a long speech (50-99) of mildly indignant censure and reproof, and then by Crites, who is requested by Cynthia and Arete to be discreet in dispensing the penalties to the impostors. It must be noted at this point that in dramatic terms the transforming power of the masque is presented as almost magical. For, as soon as the courtiers unmask to reveal their real follies and vices that are represented in their respective names and are reproved for their imposture as dramatised in the masque, all that they say is "We doe", and "Yes" -in unanimous confession of their offenses and in unanimous assent to the "sharpe correction" that is their due. This sudden and highly undramatic change in the pretenders can only be attributed to the probable underlying conception that the power of art and rhetoric as represented by the masque and the ensuing speeches of censure can effect such positive transformation. This idea seems to be confirmed

by the nature of the task set by Crites for the complete reformation of the impostors: they must proceed on

> ...to the well of knowledge, Helicon:
> Where purged of your present maladies,
> (Which are not few, nor slender) you become
> Such as you faine would seeme: and then returne,
> Offring your service to great Cynthia.
>
> (V, xi, 153-157)

The waters of Helicon symbolise poetry. This in Jonson's view will provide knowledge, or rather self-knowledge, that will act as an antidote to the harmful waters of Narcissus, Fountain of Self-love. Poetry is seen as a power capable of transforming man's ruling vice into its allied virtue - a conclusion implied by Talbert's statement that the masque demonstrates that the origin of the courtiers' vices are qualities which can be disciplined into virtues[49]. Thus, what we finally witness is that the artistic imposture assumed for the purposes of the masque, which is evidently the first phase in the transformation of the courtiers, becomes reality at the end of the play.

The elevation of poetry and art to such a high moral status appears to be very closely allied with one of the main themes of C.R.: the plight of poetry and art in a debased society, which incidentally is a recurrent theme in Juvenal's seventh Satire. It must be noted, however, that in Gilbert's opinion, for instance, the purpose of C.R. "is to attack the vapidness of court life and show how high and noble and yet pleasing and graceful a court should be"[50]. Although this

is true, the statement does not do full justice to the fundamental argument offered by Jonson. This argument is epitomised in Talbert's and Knoll's contention that the moral of C.R. is that men should observe decorum(51).

The self-loving courtiers engaged in trivia are certainly presented as lacking the moral responsibility which they should possess, and which as a result of the purgation effected by the masque they are made to assume. But it is also made clear by the masque that decorum which derives from the Aristotelian "mean," is the essential principle which can lead such figures of excess to adopt the values and the conduct befitting their social status. Besides, decorum as upheld by Horace in the Ars Poetica, is the principle which keeps a work of art consistent, orderly, and harmonious. Thus, it may also be concluded that it is the artistic and poetic decorum embodied in the masque which has imposed itself on the courtiers to induce them to accept without resistance the virtues which they impersonated in the masque.

In view of this, it is interesting to look back in the play and note yet once more that Crites, though finally triumphant as scholar - artist - satirist and central character of the play, is initially presented as a contemptible figure from the view-point of the would-be courtiers. Furthermore, most of these courtiers are made to display interest or even personal involvement in arts and learning. Amorphous is

described as one who takes special pride in his learning, artistic talent, and command of several languages, but evidently for their mere decorative value. Hedon is said to keep a fencer, a pedant, and a musician as attendants, but no poet, for he "him selfe is a rimer, and that's a thought better then a poet" (II, i, 47-48). Madam Moria is compared to the "ignorant Poetasters of the time, who when they haue got acquainted with a strange word, neuer rest till they haue wroong it in, though it loosen the whole fabricke of their sense" (II, iv, 15-18). Philautia is depicted as having "a good superficiall iudgement in painting and would seeme to haue so in poetry" (II, iv, 44-45). Conversation between the false courtiers turn constantly to poetry, but Jonson makes it plain that to them poetry is only another area in which one's appearance may be enhanced. It is also implied that the genuine scholar or artist is in danger of being exploited in such a society, as made clear when Amorphous instructs the ignorant Asotus on the art of witty speech and recommends that he should keep company with Crites to learn to imitate his sophisticated phrases. This being the case, it is hard not to see the parallelism between Juvenal's seventh Satire and Jonson's view on the relation of arts to a society that is merely interested in appearances and self-indulgence.

In the seventh Satire, Juvenal praises the Emperor Hadrian for his encouragement of the arts, for it is he alone

who shows any consideration for the poets. This idea finds its parallel in C.R. in the person of Cynthia as the head of state and as the only one who protects and elevates Crites the poet.

In Juvenal's view, the rest of the Roman court circle have become so corrupt and so vain that the poets who depend on their patronage may as well resign themselves to poverty and humiliation. The aristocracy consist mainly of the newly-rich social climbers and of those who engage superficially in arts as poetaster-aristocrats. These debase poetry by their artistic pretentions and besides degrading themselves succeed in humiliating the real poets through their overwhelming vanity. The genuine but belittled poet appears as a sign of corruption in society in much the same manner as Crites at the beginning of C.R.

Thus, it is highly illuminating to discover the close thematic parallelism between Juvenal's satire and C.R. But it must also be pointed out that while in Juvenal the tone is one of bitterness and despair, Jonson, in keeping with his persistently corrective purposes and, of course, with the comic nature of his drama, assumes a hopeful tone. For Jonson's Cynthia, besides acting as Crites' patron, shows that she is aware of the responsibility of the court as a mirror for the rest of the nation, when she pronounces her final admonishment:

Princes, that would their people should doe well,
Must at themselves begin, as at the head;
For men, by their example, patterne out
Their imitations, and regard of lawes:
A vertuous Court a world to vertue drawes.

(V, xi, 169-173)

CHAPTER FOUR
POETASTER

Poetaster or His Arraignement[1] which is the third and the last of the plays to be labelled as "comicall satyre", has two noteworthy aspects that do not appear with such clarity in either of the two preceding plays. One is a pervasive Latin classicism reflected in the choice of setting, characters, poetic content, and in the approach to satire, and the other is its topicality. These two features may be said to merge in Jonson's choice of an historical setting in Augustan Rome for the purpose of providing an analogy to certain aspects of the theatre of his time.

The contemporary English stage was witnessing at the time, what is generally referred to as the "War of the Theatres" between Jonson and his opponents the satiric dramatists, John Marston and Thomas Dekker. As Herford and Simpson have shown, Marston and Dekker had taken offense on account of a supposed satirical identification of their persons with Hedon and Anaides in C.R., and Dekker was planning to retaliate by lampooning Jonson in Satiromastix, his prospective play[2].

Before he could do so, however, Jonson, who was determined to forestall his plans, produced Poet. which contained two highly unflattering portraits of his antagonists in the satirical figures of Crispinus and Demetrius the poetasters. The play was performed by the Children of Queen's Chapel in 1601, only four or five months after the production of C.R. and created such an uproar that Jonson is said to have appended an "Apologeticall Dialogue" to a performance his Poet. before Satiromastix was staged(3). In the Dialogue he defended himself on the grounds that he "us'd no name", and tried to "spare the persons and to speake their vices"(84-85) in the setting of ...

> "... Augustus Caesars times,
> When wit, and artes were at their height in Rome,
> To shew that Virgil, Horace, and the rest
> Of those great master-spirits did not want
> Detractors, then, or practises against them".
>
> (Apologeticall Dialogue,(101-105).

Naturally, considerable critical attention has been paid to the topical aspect of the play, but mainly for the reason that the supposed lampoonery intended against Marston and Dekker unnecessarily rushed the play for performance and consequently marred its composition. Herford and Simpson, for instance, qualify its construction as a "loose mixture of different techniques"(4) and Knoll finds it "unfinished"(5). Campbell, on the other hand, argues that if it is regarded merely "as a hastily constructed document in the stage

quarrel" it will appear incoherent, whereas when the element of personal lampoon is placed in its proper pespective, (i.e. considered subordinate, which it certainly is) it becomes apparent that Jonson's concerns in the play transcend mere personal attack, and that the dramatic structure in no way bears traces of carelessness(6).

In our view, however, it is not the element of lampoon that accounts for the flaws in construction, but Jonson's attempt to incorporate too many of his aesthetic and moral concerns in the play. For Poet. not only contains personal invective against Marston and Dekker in the larger context of satirical attack on poetasters, actors, lawyers, soldiers, social upstarts, and depraved courtiers, but also offers an assessment of poetry, of satire in general and satiric drama in particular, of the problem of libel, of the poet's and the satirist's relationship to society, of the Court's responsibility to the men of letters, supplemented by a variety of samples of Roman poetry-the totality of which fail to be fully assimilated in a plot conceived in terms of Ovid's love affair with Augustus' daughter and Horace's struggles with fake poets and political informers. Nevertheless, the wealth of material incorporated in Poet. requires special attention, and will be best surveyed in the context of its features pertaining to form, structure, characterisation, and theme.

The formal features of Poet. that distinguish this play from E.M.O. and C.R. are essentially those that pertain to historical drama. The form experimented with in E.M.O. combined certain formal principles of Greek Old Comedy and of Roman formal satire and in C.R. this form was modified to some extent to absorb certain formal requirements of the mythological courtly allegory. In both plays, Jonson adhered to a method of characterisation based on "humours", to the device of the satiric-commentator, and to the scene-by-scene or episodic exposition of satirical characters leading up to a final judgement scene in which the satirist engages in the punishment, purgation and even reformation of the figures of folly and of vice. Thus the first two "comicall satyres" do not appear to be too different from each other and neither of them is constructed in terms of an intrigue-plot. But the form adopted in Poet., which approximates that of historical drama, seems to have necessitated a fundamental change rather than a modification of the previous structural model applied in E.M.O. and C.R. In view of this fact, there is reason to believe that the essential difficulty which Jonson had to cope with in Poet. was his insistence on maintaining the same satiric strategy applied in the previous plays in the framework of an historical drama which required a different structure. Before taking up this matter, however, it will perhaps be illuminating to discover the possible reasons for Jonson's choice of form for his new play.

Jonson's preference for the historical setting of Augustan Rome seems to represent a deeper concern than the apparent one of objectifying his invective on Marston and Dekker. As observed in the previous plays, Jonson's satiric strategy has been consistently geared to holding up a mirror to the "image of the times" (E.M.I. Prologue.23). In Poet., however, as opposed to the fictional setting of the previous plays, he presents his times in the guise of an image of the historical past, presumably with the intention of investing his play with the authority of history itself. For, as pointed out by Barish, Jonson, like many of his Renaissance comtemporaries apparently believed that "historical truth" could serve better than a plot of his own invention in conveying "moral truth"(7). Historical drama appeared to possess an advantage over others in reflecting reality, for it was already acknowledged to be that mirror of human affairs which drama usually aspired to. It is no doubt largely on account of this conception that Jonson sought to exploit in Poet., as in his later historical tragedies Sejanus His Fall and Catiline, the means offered by the "historical" example. He may well have considered that the historicity of the play would endow it with a universality similar to that attempted in C.R. through the use of mythology and allegory.

The historical features of Poet. may be summed up as Ovid's relationship with his father, his love affair with Julia, Emperor Augustus' daughter, resulting in his denuncia-

tion and exile by Augustus (though the historical authenticity of this incident is dubitable)[8] and Horace's elevated position in the courtly circles of his patrons, Maecenas and Augustus. As indicated by this brief summary, the events centering on Ovid point to a plot development in Poet. - a feature that was noticeably absent from the preceding "comicall satyres." Furthermore, the fact that Horace does not take part in these incidents except peripherally indicates that he will appear in a separate plot-line. In fact, no critic has been able to overlook the co-existence of two dramatic developments in the play. As Knoll asserts, Poet. is structured on the model of the Elizabethan double plot[9]. But some critics like Campbell and Jackson consider the Ovid-Julia affair as the main plot[10], while in Herford's view, the plot which involves Horace and the poetaster Crispinus and is based on a purely fictional set of events, ranks as the more important one[11]. Since the play itself offers sufficient evidence that the two plots are thematically related and almost equally represented in the dramatic body, it stands to reason that both developments are equally important.

It must be admitted, however, that in structural terms the two plots do not appear to be closely linked. For one, they are seen to be juxtaposed in consecutive acts and Jonson seems to have avoided the device of shifting from one plot-line to another in consecutive scenes — a method that he had

made use of in his early plays which also had double plots, The Case is Altered and E.M.I. As has also been pointed out by Talbert, Ovid who is the central character in one plot-line is prominent only in Acts I and IV (having only fourteen lines in Act II), while Horace, his counterpart in the other plot-line, is dramatically active only in Act III (where he appears for the first time in the play), and in the final act[12]. This clearly indicates a separateness of the two plots in terms of a division of acts between Ovid and Horace. Secondly, minor characters such as Crispinus, Captain Tucca, Lupus, Albius, and Chloe are not seen to be operating equally in both plot-lines-another difference from Jonson's early plays based on the Terentian model. In the course of the dramatic action in Poet. all of these characters appear in the presence of Ovid, but Crispinus and Tucca are much more active in the Horace plot, while Albius and Chloe remain exclusively in Ovid's circle.

In view of these features, it is reasonable to agree with Knoll that the structure of Poet. is more Elizabethan than Terentian[13]. For, as Hosley has observed, the double plot in such plays of Terence as the Adelphoe the Andrian, and the Eunuchus are closely knit and unified, while its reflection in the Elizabethan plays is more in the nature of a "double-action" that is linked but displaying separateness, and being "more distinct in respect of atmosphere, characterisation, theme, and conduct of action than the two

plots of a Terentian double-plot play..."[14]. The distinctness described above is similar to that between the two plots in Poet. The Ovid-Julia plot consists of scenes presenting, first the domestic conflict between the young Ovid and his father, then the circle of Elegiac poets (Tibullus, Propertius, Gallus) with their mistresses headed by Ovid and Julia, and the whole group being accompanied by parasites such as a fake poet (Crispinus), a rich but ignorant jeweller (Albius), his socially ambitious but gullible wife (Chloe); all displayed in an atmosphere of wit and courtly manners both genunine and fake. The final scenes constituting this plot include the mock-banquet at which the same group assume the roles of the Olympian deities in a spirit of libertinism. Augustus' sudden intrusion prompted by a libelous informer (Lupus) and the banishment of Ovid from the court bring the banquet and this plot-line to an end in the fourth act.

The Horace - Crispinus plot on the other hand, representing the more topical conflict between Jonson and his opponents Marston and Dekker, begins with the satirist's encounter with the poetaster Crispinus, continues with the conspiracy of the latter with another poetaster (Demetrius) to write a lampoon on Horace. The conspiracy is arranged by an actor (Histrio) and a braggart soldier-turned stage critic (Tucca), and is concluded in the final act of the play in which a political informer (Lupus) accuses Horace of

of treason, but is ousted along with the conspiring poetasters by Augustus, Virgil and other eminent members of the court.

Given the fact that Jonson had already proved his ability for a more skillful presentation of the double-plot in the early plays, The Case is Altered and E.M.I., the reason for the particular dramatic structuring in Poet. must surely lie in Jonson's satiric purpose. This purpose is to a certain extent manifest in the title of the play. Poetaster or His Arraignement makes it clear that as in the preceding "comicall satyres", Jonson's final intention is to pass judgement on his chosen satirical target as well as to expose it. Yet in Poet. the identity of the satirical objec t is not as clear as it appears to be, because there are two successive judgement scenes in the fourth and fifth acts: the first one on Ovid and Julia, and the second one on Crispinus and Demetrius. The question implicit in this and in the equal emphasis placed on Ovid and Horace in the general arrangement of the play is whether, in Jonson's view, Ovid too is a kind of poetaster. At this point, it seems reasonable to consider the two judgement scenes as a clue to Jonson's reservations about Ovid, and to the particular juxtaposition of the double-action involving him and Horace. It appears that Jonson has treated each action as distinct, with its own set of characters confined to their own plot-line, since for his satiric purposes each set seems to have required separate judgement. The first of these, pronounced

exclusively by Augustus at the end of the banquet scene, is very serious and harsh in tone, bordering almost on the tragic. It dooms Ovid to banishment from the court and Julia to imprisonment, thus separating them forever. Surprisingly, however, Albius and Chloe, the satirical figures belonging to this set, are left unpunished. In the second scene of judgement, on the other hand, the penalties imposed upon the impostors Crispinus, Demetrius, Lupus, and Tucca are meant to correct their vices rather than to punish them and display a highly comic quality; in fact, the whole scene is presented as a mock-trial very much in the spirit of comedy. The dissimilarity in the nature of these judgements and in the characters involved in each is an indication that Jonson has conceived of each set of characters in different terms, although in the final analysis both are complementary and present a meaningful unity in Jonson's satiric point of view.

Proceeding with the discussion on the two judgement scenes mentioned above from a structural view-point, it will be remembered that passing sequential judgement, as displayed in Poet., is a major characteristic of Greek Old Comedy where such scenes are usually grouped in the episodic final section of the plays. The device had been used in E.M.O. but not in C.R. where the group of impostors presented a fairl homogeneous character in their dominant folly, self-love. But

in Poet. Jonson's satiric strategy seems to have gained a complexity which cannot be observed in either of the preceding plays. This complexity is reflected both in the characters and in the structure of the play, and accounts for the peculiar combination of devices from Greek Old Comedy and Roman Comedy: the double-plot with its antecedents in the Terentian play and the sequential judgement scenes from the comedies of Aristophanes.

It is obvious that the combination of these different dramatic conventions is the result of Jonson's efforts to unite certain principles of Aristophanic comedy which serve his purpose of castigation, with the formal principles of historical drama for which the ideally coherent construction is provided by the Terentian plot structure with its protasis, epitasis and catastrophe. Consequently, the final product does not succeed in achieving coherence in terms of structure. But it must be noted that if, as in C.R., the structure does not serve in achieving coherence the themes do. For, as will be explained further on, the two plot-lines in the play with their separate endings complement each other when related thematically. One represents a poet's moral irresponsibility in the person of Ovid, while the other seeks to emphasise the poet's moral obligations to society in the persons of Horace, Virgil, and Caesar[15]. Following Townsend, it is also possible to see a hierarchy of poets beyond the

lines of plot-division in "the perfect Virgil, the urbane and more human Horace, the good poet but less good man Ovid, and Crispinus, the poetaster"[16].

Before any further discussion, however, other structural characteristics of Poet. must be studied to see if they display a continuity with the preceding "comicall satyres". As in E.M.O. and C.R., the action proper in Poet. is introduced by an induction, but by one which is shorter and far more antagonistic than its counterparts in the other plays. As Baskervill correctly observes, it dangerously assumes "a personal animosity between the author and the audience or critics"[17]. Unlike those of E.M.O. and C.R. this Induction is not cast in the form of a dialogue but of two long speeches, the first delivered by Envy, representing presumably the hostility and detraction on the part of Jonson's opponents in the stage quarrel, and the second by an "armed Prologue" in defense of the dramatist. Furthermore, apart from mentioning Rome as the setting, it offers no explanation of the plot, of the author's intention, or of his method.

Baskervill has given earlier parallels in English drama for the personification of Envy in inductions to plays, and has also pointed out that such a device belongs to the convention of "defying envy and detraction" which culminated in the works of English formal satire[18]. Greenfield, on the other hand, draws attention to the fact that Envy is the only non-realistic character in any of Jonson's inductions,

concluding that her appearance in such a context is unusual[19]. But it must be remembered that Poet. like most works of English formal satire is unusually topical - a point which distinguishes it from Jonson's other works and one that may explain the hostile and highly defensive features of the Induction. The topicality may also explain why it is so similar in its tone of contempt to the parabasis of Aristophanes' Wasps. in which the playwright complains against the detractors of his former play, Clouds[20]. Needless to repeat, one of the fundamental characteristics of Aristophanic comedy was its topical satire,- a feature which among Jonson's dramatic works can most distinctly be observed in Poet. and one that accounts for the presence of an unusual "Apologeticall Dialogue" at the end of the play.

As mentioned earlier, Jonson appended this Dialogue while the play was still running, to vindicate himself against the accusations of lampoonery and to appease his opponents. But evidently it did not succeed in its purpose. On account of its highly self-righteous and indignant satirical tone it "was only once spoken upon the stage" (To the Reader, 3-4), thus being destined to appear in the folio edition of 1616, only to be read[21].

Set in the form of a dialogue between the Author[22] who represents Jonson and two fictional characters, Polyposus and Nasutus who are not so favourably disposed howards their

interlocutor, this apology, like the Induction to E.M.O., functions in a manner similar to the Aristophanic parabasis. It combines a defense of the dramatist's satiric method with a spirited attack on those who would disagree with it, distinguishing the well-intentioned exposures of vice from libelous personal attacks. This distinction between genuine and pseudo satire echoes the claims made by Horace in Act III to his dedication to morally responsible satire as opposed to "lewd verses" and "libels". But what is particularly significant in the Dialogue is the Author's reply to the charge that his writing is "meere rayling":

> "... If all the salt in the old comoedy
> Should be so censur'd, or the sharper wit
> Of the bold satyre, termed scolding rage,
> What age could then compare with those, for buffons?
> What should be said of Aristophanes?
> Persius? or Iuvenal? whose names we now
> So glorifie in schooles, at least pretend it".
>
> (Apologeticall Dialogue, 186 - 192)

In citing as justification the practices of Greek old Comedy and Roman satire, Jonson clearly indicates that besides assuming a close connection between the two genres, he is also identifying his own technique with that of Aristophanes and the Roman satirists.

Regarding the structural features of Poet., it may be concluded that since the Induction is unlike its precedents in the other "comicall satyres" and the Apologeticall Dialogue is a unique division as such, these do not indicate close

continuity with E.M.O. and C.R. except by complementing each other in a defense of the author's conception of satire - a point which appears as a common characteristic of the previous Inductions. The reason underlying the differences between the above-mentioned structural divisions of Poet. on the one hand and the Inductions of E.M.O. and C.R. on the other, may be attributed to the topicality of the play in question. But the difference between Poet. and the plays prior to it is not confined to those stated above. The construction of the dramatic action proper of the third "comicall satyre" is in the line of the Elizabethan double-action play rather than of the loose episodic structure of E.M.O. and C.R., though the final judgement scenes, apparently a sine qua non of Jonson's satiric technique, appear in all three.

What then remains to be investigated is whether there exist differences also in characterisation, themes, and methods of satiric exposure that may be considered among the innovations in Poet. As pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, one of the major innovations in Poet. is its historical setting which calls for a method of characterisation that cannot be very similar to that applied in E.M.O. and C.R. where most of the characters were cast as "humours" types. Baskervill, commenting on the characters of Poet. divides them into three classes: Augustus, Maecenas, and Virgil as "purely classic figures" who are not fully developed

characters but are important in setting up the classical atmosphere; "historical Roman characters who have become Elizabethan in part, by virtue either of their manners or of their identification with the individuals engaged in the stage quarrel"—a group which includes Ovid, his father, and his fellow Elegiac poets, thus constituting the largest in the play; and finally, "pure Elizabethan types" like Tucca, Albius, Chloe, and Histrio, who are Romans only in name[23]. As indicated by this classification, the range of characterisation in Poet. is much wider than that in either of the preceding "comicall satyres". But before discussing its special features, it will no doubt be illuminating to observe that certain characters in Poet. bear similarities to those in E.M.O. and C.R.

Horace, for one, is such a character. His historical authenticity as satirist makes him particularly appropriate to fill the role of satirist, corrector, and judge in the play, and enables him to continue the line of Asper and Crites in these functions as well as in that of the poet-artist. But it must be pointed out that he is far less active than his counterparts as satiric commentator on the folly and vice displayed in the play, and is generally assigned speeches and conversation that are drawn from his own works. The greater part of the third act, for instance, centering on Horace and Crispinus, is a dramatisation of Satire I, ix, which relates Horace's encounter with a boring would-be poet.

Among the other characters, Horace's contemporaries Augustus, Maecenas, and Virgil are presented as the historical counterparts of the set of virtuous allegorical figures in C.R. This circle of literati, foreshadowed by the ideal court of C.R. obviously represented for Jonson the supreme historical example of the ideal union of political authority with an appreciation of the arts and responsible patronage of worthy poets.

The set of main satirical figures such as Crispinus, Captain Tucca, Albius, and Chloe offer yet another parallelism with previous plays. Tucca, for instance, combines the distasteful satiric scurrility of Carlo Buffone in E.M.O. and the features of the braggart soldier, a stage-type represented by Captain Shift in E.M.O. and Captain Bobadill in E.M.I., while Albius, the wealthy citizen and uxorious husband, and his wife Chloe, the would-be court lady, are depicted as the more elaborately treated dramatic extensions of Deliro and Fallace in E.M.O. Baskervill observes that the characters of Tucca and Chloe show an improvement in Jonson's technique by providing "fresh studies in humour"(24). As may be readily deduced from the discussion above, Tucca, Albius and Chloe continue the line of "humorous" impostors extending from E.M.I., as does Crispinus the chief poetaster. Although Crispinus does not have a direct counterpart in the former plays, he affects courtly manners, is highly self-infatuated and regards poetry as a kind of social grace

on the same level with courtly manners and fine apparel, thus displaying an affinity with Amorphous and Asotus in C.R. As Campbell observes, his aim is to "arrive at pseudo poetry by way of pseudo gallantry"(25). It must also be mentioned that the character of Crispinus, of Demetrius Fannius the other poetaster, and of Tigellius the musician, owe some of their peculiarities to figures ridiculed by the same names in Horace's Satires: However, it is probable that in creating the character of the chief poetaster Jonson was also influenced by the first and fourth Satires of Juvenal, which are concerned with a vicious social pretender called Crispinus(26).

In the use of Roman names Jonson may also be regarded as following the practice of contemporary English formal satirists who either invented Roman names or borrowed them from the classical works of satire for characters embodying vice and folly. Thomas Lodge, for instance, in his preface to a Fig for Momus, comments on his "satyres" as follows:

> "In them (under the names of certain Romaines) where I reprehend vice, I purposely wrong no man, but observe the lawes of that kind of poeme: if any repine there at, I am sure he is guiltie, because he bewrayeth himself(27).

These lines reflect the same type of defense of satire and of the satiric method that is to be found in Poet. which shares with the banned works of English formal satirists the characteristic of being topical.

However the nature of the topical satire in Poet. remains yet to be examined. Regarding the lampoonery on Marston and Dekker in the figures of Crispinus and Demetrius as the only topical issues of the play is to confine the topicality of Poet. to the shallowest kind of satire and to overlook certain fundamental concerns of Jonson in writing this play. The topicality of the play resides only secondarily in personal satire, since one of Jonson's main concerns is with the dramatisation of the problem of libel against poets and poetry. From the evidence of the play, the reasons for lampooning his stage opponents are seen to arise from the notion that such poetasters are not only bad poets but also detractors who fail to do justice to genuine poets and poetry out of ignorance and malice. It is this theme that is introduced in the Induction, repeated in the Apologetical Dialogue, and treated dramatically in the body of the play, thus making it evident that Jonson's topical satire in anticipation of Dekker's Satiromastix is closely related to an evaluation of poetry. Therefore, it seems best to examine it in the larger context of the relationship of the dramatic characters to poetry, to satire, and to satiric drama in particular, as it is through the characters that such an evaluation may be made in the play.

According to Talbert, the real hero of Poet. is poetry[(28)]. It is difficult not to agree with this because, when viewed from this standpoint, the structure of the play

with its double plot-line ceases to distract attention as to whether the protagonist is Ovid or Horace and becomes a meaningful entity. For Jonson's argument both Ovid and Horace are of primary importance. In fact, all the characters of Poet. are seen to represent a certain relationship to poetry, and the major ones are portrayed as approximations or degradations of a poetic ideal. A close examination of the play reveals that it is the theme of the status of poetry in a civilised society which provides coherence to scenes that otherwise appear disconnected and which leads us to connect the two judgement scenes instead of considering the second one an appendage, as Campbell does[29]. Hence, it seems that a thematic consideration of the play will also offer the means for an assessment of Jonson's strategy in regard to structure and characterisation. In view of this, it is plausible to approach the character of Ovid, and the other characters for that matter, in the context of their association with poetry or the poetic ideal.

As evidenced by the critical works on Poet., Ovid appears as the most controversial character in the play by virtue of what he represents as a poet in Jonson's opinion. The essential question is whether Jonson meant him to stand for a kind of poetaster. Although at the beginning of the play he is depicted as a worthy poet, at the end he is condemned by Augustus on the grounds of moral irresponsibility

and failure to set up an example of virtue. A point that is generally missed by the critics is that here Jonson has attempted at a different method of characterisation so far as Ovid is concerned - a method by which the character in question gains in complexity parallel to the development of the dramatic action, thus transcending the limitations of an "humourist" such as Tucca, or even of the ideal satirist such as Horace, and acquiring in the process the status of an ambivalent character. This feature of Jonson's characterisation which does not appear in any of the former plays is one of the most interesting innovations in Poet. and one that is more fully developed in the later plays of Jonson's maturity.

Poet. begins with a dramatic presentation of young Ovid in the act of writing the last two lines of his 15th Elegy, (Amores, I)[30] and shortly after, the whole poem is read out by Ovid, in Jonson's translation. The choice of this elegy is significant in that it introduces themes which are vitally important for Jonson's argument in the play. In his poem Ovid reproaches Envy for calling his verses "idle" and defends poetry. The link with the foregoing Induction with Envy personified in it is obvious. Thus Ovid's stance is shown to be in line with Jonson's, in his defense of poetry as the highest of all pursuits and in his faith in the immortality it bestows on the true poets:

"Enuie, the living, not the dead doth bite:
For after death all men receiue their right.
Then, when this bodie fals in funerall fire,
My name shall liue, and my best part aspire".

(I,i, 81-85)

Moreover, this elegy is a masterly epitome of the classical literary tradition, of the appreciation of the eternal quality of poetry ranging from Homer, Hesiod, Sophocles, Menander, to Ennius, Varro, Lucretius, Virgil, the older Roman poets, down to Tibullus, Gallus, and Ovid himself, the poet of "sad louers"(80). Since all of these poets are evoked in relation to particular aspects of nature and of the society of men and women, the praise of poetry suggests a praise of creation, thus offering a conception of poetry as an outstanding mode of human sensitivity and achievement.

Ovid's recitation of his elegy constitutes his main defense in the play against the detractors of his character as a poet. It is also a defense of his poetic vocation against his railing father Ovid Senior and his company consisting of Captain Tucca and Lupus, a tribune who will later reveal himself as a libelous informer against both Ovid and Horace. Ovid Sr. and his companions who have overheard the recitation of the elegy, attack young Ovid for having neglected his studies in the law and abuse his vocation as a poet. One of the purposes of this scene is evidently to satirise the philistine materialism of Ovid Sr. and Tucca,

who go as far as berating Homer on the grounds that "he was a poore, blind, riming rascall, that liu'd obscurely up and downe in boothes and tap-houses, and scarce ever made a good meale in his sleep" (I,ii, 84-87). Thus, in warning the young poet to save his reputation by giving up poetry and becoming a rich lawyer instead, Ovid Sr. and his ignorant spokesmen are seen to reduce themselves to buffoonery.

In the Apologetical Dialogue (120-121, 123-124) Jonson makes reference to this scene by quoting from Ovid's Tristia (IV, Eleg. 10) and Amores (I, Eleg. 15) as evidence to substantiate the quarrel between Ovid and his father over poetry and law, but it is clear that Jonson remolded it to intensify Ovid Sr.'s abuse of Homer for the purpose of turning the old man into a more ridiculous butt of satire.

It must also be pointed out that the prototype of Ovid's father is Lorenzo Senior (in the quarto version of E.M.I.)[31] who is cast as one of the main stage-types of Roman comedy: the egocentric old man bent on imposing his will on his young and headstrong son. The fact that Lorenzo Junior his son, is dedicated to poetry like Ovid and faces his father's antagonism on account of it, shows that this theme is not new to Jonson's plays.

In the scene of conflict in Poet., young Ovid is presented as a good-natured and well-intentioned son who cannot but write poetry. He is made to protest for poetry in

poetry, in contrast to his father's prose:

> Sir, let me craue you will, foregoe these moodes;
> I will be anything, or studie any thing:
> I'le proue th'unfashioned body of the law
> Pure elegance, and make her ruggedst straines
> Runne smoothly, as Propertius' elegies.
>
> (I,ii, 103-107)

That these lines reflect the historical truth about Ovid's inborn talent for poetry is confirmed by a passage from the Tristia in which, commenting on his father's opposition, he writes:

> I was influenced by what he said and wholly forsaking Helicon I tried to write words freed from rhythm, yet all unbidden song would come upon befitting numbers and whatever I tried to write was verse (32).

Hence, it is observed that Jonson makes use of his classical learning in more ways than one in his argument for Ovid's standing as a true poet. Furthermore, Ovid's earnest dedication to poetry calls for sympathy when set against the contemptible arguments of his opponents. Ovid Sr. and his companions are shown not only as intellectually inferior to young Ovid in their upholding of ignorance, but also as morally culpable since they advocate immoral conduct which, in their view, will happily accompany the pursuit of the profession of law. The following passage from the 1616 folio edition, which appeared with additions to this scene[33], is an example of the satiric duologue containing Lupus' and Tucca's defense of ignorance and immorality in practising the

law:

> Lupus: ...Why, the law makes a man happy, without respecting any other merit: a simple scholer, or none at all may be a lawyer.
>
> Tucca: He tells thee true, my noble Neophyte: my little, Grammaticaster, he do's: It shall neuer put thee to thy Mathematiques, Metaphysiques, Philosophie, and I know not what suppos'd sufficiencies: If thou canst but haue the patience to plod inough, talke, and make noise inough, be impudent inough, and 'tis inough.
>
> Lupus: Three bookes will furnish you.
>
> Tucca: And the lesse arte, the better: Besides, then it shall be in the power of thy cheu'rill conscience, to doe right, or wrong, at thy pleasure, my pretty Alcibiades.
>
> Lupus: I, and to haue better men them himselfe by many thousand degrees to obserue him, and stand bare.
>
> (I,ii, 120-134).

This scene drew much hostility on Jonson from lawyers who regarded it as a satirical attack on their profession. But in the "Apologetical Dialogue," Jonson denies such charges and professes nothing but "reuerence" both for the law and for its "iust ministers" (125-127). Indeed an examination of his satiric technique shows that the values upheld by such satirical characters are false. The fact that they are made to voice the opinions based on false values is the fundamental means of displaying their follies and vices. Thus the views of Tucca and Lupus on lawyers reflect their own debased

conception of the profession. But it must also be pointed out that Tucca, as the counterpart of Carlo Buffone in E.M.O. functions as the main satiric voice set in contrast to the honest and morally upright satirist, Horace. This voice is meant to uphold what is morally uncommendable in society and in this case it evidently focuses on those lawyears who abuse their profession. That all lawyers should be reduced to the same ignoble status, but that this should not be recognised as such by Tucca, serve to point out that he is conceived as a figure of contemptible ridicule. It is this aspect, in fact, shared by Lupus and to some extent by Ovid Sr. that is branded as "prodigious ignorance" (236) and "adultrate braines" (239) by Ovid in his indignant speech following the exit of his antagonists.

This speech is a second apology for poetry, which is seen to run parallel to that of Lorenzo Jr. in the original version of E.M.I.. Both condemn fake poets, "those jaded wits/That runne a pase for common hire" (I, ii, 241-242) and eulogise the true ones who follow the Muse of true inspiration disdainful of material concerns. But Ovid also deplores the degenerate values of his time as exemplified in his opponents' workship of money and indifference to virtuous qualities (I, ii, 253-256). What is of even greater significance is that Ovid also expresses his belief that by making a proper distinction between true and fake poetry it would be possible for them to cultivate a correct sense of values: "They

would admire bright knowledge/... "they would dread farre more/To be thought ignorant than be knowne poore (249-252). It may be said that in this speech, Jonson has succeeded in characterising Ovid in line with the indignant satirists of the former "comicall satyres", and even more favourably than Asper and Crites, since Ovid has also proved himself a veritable poet on the stage.

Only when this scene is over and has made its point does Jonson cast a new light on Ovid's character as a poet. In his conversation with Tibullus in the following scene, he is given the opportunity to declare his love for Julia in idolatrous terms. His eloquence in expressing his passion shows that for him Julia has become the essence of life and of poetry (I,iii,38-43). Thus it is to be understood that poetry holds its value for Ovid so long as it will serve his love for his mistress:

> ...Hencefoorth, I promise faith,
> And all my serious houres to spend with you Muses :
> With you, whose musicke striketh on my heart,
> And with bewitching tones steales forth my spirit,
> In Iulias name: faire Iulia: Iulias love
> Shall be a law, and that sweet law I'le studie,
> The law, and art of sacred Iulias loue:
> All other obiects will but abiects prooue.
>
> (I,iii, 51-58)

In the same scene, however, by introducing the story of the unfortunate Propertius, a fellow poet, Jonson has evidently

meant to imply that grave errors may be committed in transforming love for a mortal woman into an absolute value. For Propertius is reported to have lost himself in grief over the death of his mistress, to which news Ovid reacts by asserting that he would follow his friend's suit if he were to suffer a similar loss.

Thus in the first act of the play, Jonson has presented Ovid in the context of certain threats to his poetic vocation. He has been observed to resist external threats such as of ignorance, petty monetary concerns, and dishonesty, but has shown himself vulnerable to the inner threat posed by his dedication of poetry exclusively to the service of love. It is this dedication, in fact, that serves as the basis for his tolerance of the fake poet Crispinus and other impostors such as Cloe and Tucca in Acts II and IV. In these acts, Jonson presents Ovid and Julia in the company of fellow-poets Tibullus and Gallus, with their mistresses, accompanied by Crispinus, Albius, Chloe, and in Act IV also by Tucca. Commenting on this aspect of Jonson's dramatic presentation. Herford and Simpson conclude that "Ovid is depicted as a shallow libertine, powerless to vindicate poetry against such a pretender to it as Crispinus"(34). Although the qualifying epithet "shallow" does not do justice to Jonson's characterisation of Ovid, the poet is certainly portrayed as a libertine in the presence of his mistress Julia, especially in the banquet scene in Act IV. It is also true that the values

which he has set up for himself as such, prevent him from offering a morally plausible example of conduct as a virtuous poet either to Crispinus or to others in his company. Indeed it is this point that appears to be of greater significance than anything else for Jonson in his dramatic treatment of the banquet scene. For, as has been noted by Gifford, Herford and Simpson, Jonson has distorted what appears to be the historical truth about the incident of the "banquet of the gods" and has substituted Ovid for Augustus who, according to Suetonius' account, took an active part in impersonating the gods in such a banquet instead of condemning it as licentiousness as he does in Jonson's version[35]. The change effected by Jonson clearly indicates that he conceived of Ovid as a poet deserving to be condemned, and of Augustus, as the morally responsible head of state who should pronounce the condemnation. As demonstrated by the following passage, the charges brought against Ovid by Augustus are rooted in the notion of the moral responsibility of the poet and are significantly precipitated by Crispinus' identification of himself as "parcell-poet" (IV, xvi, 29):

> O, who shall follow vertue, and embrace her,
> ...
> Who shall, with greater comforts, comprehend
> Her unseene being, and her excellence:
> When you, that teach, and should eternize her,
> Liue, as shee were no law unto your liues:
> Nor liu'd her selfe, but with your idle breaths?
>
> (IV,vi, 39-47)

This view of the poet as teacher of high morals constitutes the basis of the hierarchical conception of poets in Poet.[36]. As mentioned earlier, supremacy is given to Virgil, whose reading of the fourth book of the Aeneid in Augustus' presence in Act V receives an almost divine reverence. Horace, who is observed to enjoy the favours of his patrons Augustus and Maecenas almost equally, ranks very close to Virgil, while the poetasters Crispinus and Demetrius, with their pseudo-patrons Albius, Chloe and Tucca are placed at the bottom. In between these two extremes we find the circle of Elegiac poets headed by Ovid whose poetry, judging by the evidence of the first act, is rated as far closer to the poetry of Horace than to that of Crispinus. It seems quite impossible for Jonson the classicist to have ignored their status as the exponents and ancestors of a mode of refined poetic expression centering on love and beauty, a mode which is known to have had a dominating influence on the medieval and Renaissance love lyric. But Jonson, who held, the view of a Renaissance moralist, seems to have assessed this poetic mode with its concern for "passions" rather than for "truth" and "reason" as a type of poetry which could be considered as constructive as that of Virgil and Horace unless it were guided by those two main principles underlying the concept of virtue.

This point of view is inferred from Jonson's characterisation of the two poets representing for him the highest

standards of poetic achievement. Of these two, Virgil appears only in the last act of the play and more in the function of the highly revered poet and authoritative judge supervising the trial of the poetasters than as a fully developed character. Horace, on the other hand, appears both in the role of the historical satirist and as the dramatic personification of Jonson himself in the topical stage quarrel with the supposed poetasters, Marston and Dekker.

As mentioned before, most of Act III and the whole of Act V is devoted to Horace, so as to counterpoint the dramatic presentation of Ovid in the other acts. Just as Ovid's relationship to lyric poetry is displayed largely through the dramatisation of aspects of his autobiographical poems, so is Horace's relationship to satiric poetry exhibited by an even more masterly dramatisation of two of his Satires (I, ix and, II,i),[37] the first of which serves as an appropriate setting for his confrontation with the poetaster Crispinus[38]. The purpose in such a treatment of Ovid and Horace lies in the satiric exposure of the opponents of each poet, as well as in the delineation of the character of each as a poet. Needless to say Horace's character remains consistent throughout the play and does present an ambivalence as in the case of Ovid.

The original Satire by Horace, dramatised in Act III, is basically a report of a dialogue unhappily forced upon the poet by a casual acquaintance who professes himself a poet

and a scholar, and is eager to have himself introduced to Maecenas' circle of literati. In reference to this work, Paulson rightly claims that it "presents the basic situation of his (Horace's) satire, "by focusing exclusively on the "fool" who represents in the Horatian view, "any one ... who fails to see his own best course of action, who mistakes a false for a real good"(39). This observation serves to confirm that Jonson's choice of material for dramatic adaptation is a particularly judicious one in view of his aim to represent Horatian satire correctly.

In the stage version of the Satire Jonson amplifies Horace's encounter with the poetaster to cover several scenes, and expands the character of "the bore", evidently to fit in with his own conception of the "poetaster". Thus, Jonson's Crispinus, in his attempt to secure Horace's favour is made to list as many of his accomplishments as he possibly can and consequently to reveal nothing but vain and foolish postures:

> ... We are a scholer, I assure thee... Nay we are new turned Poet too, which is more; and a Satyrist too, which is more then that! I write iust in thy veine, I. I am for your odes or your sermons, or any thing indeed: wee are a gentleman besides! our name is Rufus Laberius Crispinus, we are a prettie stoick too.
>
> (III, i, 20-27)

The listing above is also significant in that while it represents imposture on Crispinus' part, it stands for genuine qualities that belong to Horace. An important point to be

observed about this scene and many others in Poet. is that exposure depends largely on dramatic dialogue as opposed to the more expository type witnessed in E.M.O. and C.R. But in this scene, the dialogue also provides indirect instruction in the virtues of the Horatian satirist: good nature, modesty, tolerance and the ability to laugh at oneself as well as at others, all of which may be readily observed in Horace's manner of subjecting himself, though in exasperation, to Crispinus' endless talk(40).

It may also be said that in favouring such an attitude on the part of the satirist, Jonson has undergone a change since his characterisation of Asper/Macilente as the harsh Juvenalian critic, - a change that was already noticed in the predominantly Horatian character of Crites in C.R. In Poet. a more urbane method of satiric exposure which is typical of Horace has replaced the harsh reproof and flagrant ridicule of vice and folly as witnessed in E.M.O. and has thereby succeeded in increasing the comic quality in the satire(41). In this scene, for instance, the comic exaggeration of the tediousness of Crispinus' talk serve sufficiently to highlight his ludicrous behaviour. But when Crispinus insinuates that he and Horace could form an alliance to calumniate against such poets as Virgil in Maecenas' circle and oust them from their patron's favour, Jonson makes the most of the satirist's reply in an outburst of reprimand:

> Gods, you doe know it, I can hold no longer:
> This brize hath prickt my patience: Sir, your silkenesse
> Cleerely mistakes Mecoenas, and his house:
> To thinke, there breathes a spirit beneath his roofe,
> Subiect unto those poore affections
> Of under-mining enuie, and detraction,
> Moodes, onely proper to base groueling minds:
> That place is not in Rome, I dare affirme,
> More pure, or free, from such low common euils.
> There's no man greeu'd, that this is thought more rich,
> Or this more learned: each man hath his place,
> And to his merit, his reward of grace:
> Which with a mutuall loue they all embrace
>
> (III, i, 247-259).

Crispinus' vicious assumption that the relationship between Horace and his generous patron is based on purely selfish interests has given a chance for the satirist to expose an inherent moral earnestness and to uphold a flawless model of human behaviour in defending Maecenas' generosity and virtue. The community of poets thriving under the patronage of Maecenas is thus represented as an ideal model of society where every one is judged according to his own merit. Jonson provides a dramatic demonstration of this ideal in Act V, when Horace, Tibullus, and Gallus are asked by Augustus to evaluate Virgil's poetry. As pointed out earlier, such a community was depicted by Jonson in a purely idealistic setting in the court of Cynthia in C.R. But in Poet. the author's intention is to emphasise that such a vision had an historical precedent in classical Rome and to substantiate his argument for a virtuous relationship between poets themselves and their patrons. Envy and detraction (for the absence of which the Maecenean circle is eulogised) is, in fact, a major topical concern for

Jonson and, in his view, the cause of the antagonism between himself and his stage opponents. The rejection of these vices by the historical Horace evidently stands in Jonson's opinion as a model of behaviour for the true satirist to follow.

But the scenes with Crispinus constitute only an introduction to Horace's exposition as a satirist. No doubt it was because Jonson recognised the insufficiency of those scenes that he adapted another Satire by Horace (II,i) and appended it in the same act of Poet. in the folio edition of 1616(42). In this well-known Satire, Horace holds a dialogue with Trebatius Testa, a famous lawyer, asking him for legal advice on the problem of libel in satirical writing. Generall regarded as a "model" apology for satire, it is evident that Jonson chose to incorporate it for its concern with libel and with the nature of Horatian satire and satirist.

The fundamental idea underlying Jonson's adaptation, which is dramatised in the manner of an expository dialogue in the Induction of E.M.O., is the true satirist's commitment both to his innate ability to write satire and to proper judgement in writing it. An equally important and related notion is that of the satirist's unwillingness to harm any person underserving of attack. Having first declared that his works have been criticised on the grounds of being offensive and even libelous to some, Horace professes that

he cannot sleep at night unless he writes satires. But as the following lines indicate, he also takes pains to explain that he is not undiscriminating in his choice of satirical targets:

> But this my stile no liuing man shall touch,
> If first I be not forc'd by base reproch;
> But, like a sheathed sword, it shall defend
> My innocent life; for, why should I contend
> To draw it out, when no malicious thiefe
> Robs my good name, the treasure of my life?
> O Iupiter, let it with rust be eaten,
> Before it touch, or insolently threaten
> The life of any with the least disease;
> So much I loue, and woe a generall peace.
> But, he that wrongs me (better, I proclame,
> He neuer had essai'd to touch my fame).
> For he shall weepe, and walke with euery tongue
> Throughout the citie, infamously song.
>
> (III, v, 65-78).

The implication of this passage is that since Horace's spontaneous satire does not apparently arise from self-interest or malice, ultimately it is virtue itself which he defends like Lucilius, his model, who "Durst pull the skin ouer the eares of vice:/And make, who stood in outward fashion cleare/Giue place, as foule within.../But vertue, and her friends did still protect/" (III, v.104-112). Hence, he announces his determination to continue his satiric vocation disregarding fear, for he is confident that "if they shall be sharp, yet modest rimes/That spare mens persons and but taxe their crimes/Such, shall in open court, find currant passe" (III, v, 133-135). In the judgement scene at the end of the play Horace is in fact vindicated of charges of libelous satire made by the poetasters Crispinus, Demetrius, and

their helpmate Lupus, the informer. This incident is, of course, purely fictional and intended to show how much Jonson identified his own satire with that of Horace and how much he insisted on being vindicated of the allegedly topical charges of libel.

It is observed that in the dramatised version of Horace's Satire II,i, Trebatius the lawyer, who has coaxed the satirist to give up satire or to beware of the risk of legal action, is at last obliged to accept the validity of Horace's statement quoted above. What Horace has argued for so far is that writing satire stands as a matter of moral necessity for him. This, of course, is a major point of contrast between him and Ovid, for whom the pursuit of his vocation, though spontaneous like Horace's, is presented by Jonson more in terms of personal and emotional necessity. Judging by the dramatic presentation of both poets, this difference is certainly an important one in Jonson's view, and one that becomes apparent in the dramatic juxtaposition of each poet with the poetaster Crispinus and the other satirical figures that accompany him.

As mentioned before, Crispinus' first appearance in the play is in Act II, before his famous encounter with Horace. There he is exposed in the mixed milieu of Ovid's and Julia's company of poet-gallants and their mistresses in the house of Albius and Chloe, the rich citizen and his wife

of courtly pretensions. Thus it is not only Crispinus who is the object of satiric exposure, but Albius and Chloe as well. These three characters are exhibited in foolishly obsequious attendance on their intellectual and social superiors, while the latter, encourage them to expose their follies by means of a display of humourous wit. A point of particular significance is that Ovid should be shown to mix willingly with such company while Horace in the next scene is presented as desperate to rid himself of the poetaster. Jonson's purpose in setting up such a contrast may have been to imply Ovid's moral inferiority to Horace(43).

It is indeed made obvious in the play that the morality and the poetic motivation of each poet is different. But the technique by which Jonson makes each confront the poetaster is quite similar. Both function like the "ironical man", the eiron of Aristophanic comedy, in adopting the role of the unassuming, self-effacing poet to allow the poetaster to display his folly. The full display is reserved for the encounter with Horace, the master of ironic wit, while in the previous act and also in the banquet scene, Crispinus has to share the ironic attention of Ovid and his fellow poets with Albius, Chloe and Tucca.

Another point to be observed about Crispinus' first meeting with the Ovidian circle in Act II is that the language of the Elegiac poets and their ladies possesses a

genuine quality which is revealed in their conversation with Propertius and which is set in contrast to the exchange of banalities between Crispinus and his friends. When, for instance, Chloe discovers that the gallants in the Ovidian circle are poets and wishes that her husband Albius be also made a poet by the Emperor, Crispinus replies: "No ladie, 'tis loue, and beautie make Poets", (II,ii,75). This is true, of course, as far as Ovid and his fellow-poets are concerned. For the relationship between Ovid and Julia, and that between Tibullus, Gallus, Propertius and their mistresses have been presented to validate this assumption. But when Crispinus subsequently suggests that he himself can be made a poet by Chloe's love and beauty, the contrast between the genuine and the affected is revealed beyond argument. Taken in by Crispinus' words, Chloe enquires if such a change can turn him into one like the young poets in her presence:

> Crispinus: I, and a better then these: I would be sorry else.
>
> Chloe : And shall your lookes change? and your haire change? and all, like these?
>
> Crispinus: Why a man may be a Poet, and yet not change his haire, ladie.
>
> Chloe : Well, wee shall see your cunning: yet if you can change your haire, I pray, doe.
>
> (II, ii, 79-83).

The shallowness exposed in this passage is also

reflected in the manner in which the two impostors make use of language. While the true poets render language as meaningful as possible, for the poetaster and his would-be mistress, dedicated as they are to mere appearances, language is fundamentally an imitative use of words regardless of meaning(44).

It is also interesting to note that the adeptness of Ovid, Tibullus, and Gallus at irony, or at what may be termed artistic imposture, arises from their mastery over the meaning of words. It is this feature that is exploited by Jonson in Act II where the poets are made to assume ironic imposture so that they may serve to expose the awkwardness and pretension of the real impostors. The same device is applied again in the banquet scene in Act IV, but on a more spectacular scale. The poets and their mistresses disguise themselves as Olympian gods and goddesses(with Ovid as Jupiter and Julia as Juno) and the pretenders Crispinus, Chloe, Albius, and Tucca are invited to impersonate Mercury, Venus, Vulcan and Mars respectively.

This scene recalls the masque in C.R. in which disguise and impersonation also served n exposing the imposture of the courtly pretenders before a scene of judgement. But in Poet. these features are treated not in the form of a masque but a masquerade, a mythological travesty, invested with the wit and irony of Lucianic dialogue(45).

The mock-banquet staged by Ovid functions not only as a comic-satiric exposure of the impostors, Chloe, Tucca and Crispinus (with the latter being given a chance to offer a sample of his verse which is immediately detected as a plagiarism from Horace) but also as an ironic self-exposure of the poets. For, as shown by the following lines spoken by Gallus, they have assumed divinity to assert their intellectual superiority as poets:

> Why... may not poets (from whose diuine spirits, all the honours of the gods haue beene deduc't) intreate so much honor of the gods, to haue their diuine presence at a poeticall banquet?
>
> (IV, ii, 28-31)

But in their comic role-playing they are also engaged in self mockery for having assumed godhead as poets -which is an aspect of their artistic imposture that is made evident by Julia-Juno quarelling with Ovid-Jupiter:

> I will find fault with thee, King cuckold-maker: what, shall the King of gods turne the King of good fellowes, and haue no fellow in wickednesse? This makes our poets, that know our prophanenesse, liue as prophane, as we: By my god-head, Iupiter: I will ioyne with all the other gods, here: bind thee hand and foot: throw thee downe into earth: and make a poore poet of thee, if thou abuse me thus.
>
> (IV, v, 96-103)

Hence, in the following judgement scene they are condemned by Augustus on the grounds of impiety to the gods but condoned by Horace who as a poet finds their entertainment "innocent mirth,/and harmlesse pleasures, bred, of noble wit" (IV, vii,

41-42).

Indeed, the dramatic juxtaposition of Ovid the poet with Crispinus the poetaster has revealed as much about Jonson's conception of Ovid as about his satiric evaluation of Crispinus. But since the poetaster is fundamentally conceived as Horace-Jonson's adversary, the dramatic juxtaposition of Horace with Crispinus is seen to be of greater importance for Jonson. Nevertheless it is Tucca (serving as a patron and manipulator of Crispinus as well as of Demetrius, the other poetaster) who is observed to be the main exponent of views against Jonson's high conception of poetry and satire and who is consequently made to stand judgement along with the poetasters at the end of the play. As from Act I, despite the fact that he is type-cast as a "braggart soldier", Tucca functions mainly as a scurrilous critic not only of Homer and poetry, but also of a type of drama which bears very close resemblance to the "comicall satyres". Thus, in support of Lupus who complains that respectable men are made butts of stage-ridicule which corrupts the morals of the youth, Tucca joins in the attack on actors, with the following remarks:

> Your courtier cannot kisse his mistris slippers, in quiet, for 'hem: nor your white innocent gallant pawne his reuelling sute, to make his punke a supper. An honest decayed commander, cannot skelder, cheat, nor be seene in a bawdie house, but he shall be straight in one of their wormewood <u>comoedies</u>.
>
> (I, ii, 47-52)

This passage, with its description of certain Jonsonia satirical figures among whom we find Tucca himself as the "honest decayed commander", provides a debased conception of satiric comedy which reduces it to personal lampoon regardles of its morally instructive quality. Tucca who has been introduced as such a critic at the beginning of the play, can very well be accepted as Crispinus' patron in Act III, in which he recommends the poetaster to Histrio, a player, to collaborate with Demetrius, another poetaster, on a play attacking Horace. But before discussing that part of the play which contains the most topical satire on poetasters and players, it must be noted in reference to the passage quoted above that it constitutes in fact an indirect defense of those players who succeed in exposing vice as effectively as implied by Tucca.

The player Histrio, however, introduced in Act III is presented as the opposite of the kind upbraided by Tucca. In the scene containing one of the most topical attacks on Marston, Dekker and the play Satiromastix, as well as on the players who readily make themselves available for the staging of such plays, Jonson very aptly presents Tucca, the exponent of bad taste and bad morals, in alliance not only with Crispinus but also with Histrio. The latter exposes himself for what he is worth in announcing his distasteful intentions:

> ...We haue hir'd him (Demetrius) to abuse Horace and bring him in, in a play, with all his gallants: as, Tibullus, Maecenas, Cornelius Gallus and the rest... It will get us a huge deal of money, and wee have need on't
>
> (III, iv, 322 - 328).

Here the allusion is to Dekker and his Satiromastix that would presumably be a lampoon on Jonson in the character of Horace. But considered in the context of the whole scene which includes burlesque recitations[46] from various popular plays of the time (obviously as degenerate samples of drama catering to vulgar taste such as that of Tucca), Jonson's satirical attack cannot be confined to the lampoon on Dekker. For it is clear that Jonson's allusion to Satiromastix is not only a self-defence but an attack on those who intend to present libel on the stage under tha name of satire. The serious problem implicit in it is evidently the forsaking of social and moral responsibility on the part of certain dramatists and actors in their attempt to cater to degenerate tastes in pursuit of material advantages. Thus the parodies recited by the child actors in Tucca's service are meant to serve as an indirect attack on those like Tucca, the self-appointed critic, Histrio the unscrupulous player, and Demetrius the poetaster who enjoy and applaud the debasement of themes and genres belonging to great drama, in the burlesque versions.

As pointed out earlier in the chapter in reference to

Tucca's function as a satiric voice similar to that of Carlo Buffone in E.M.O., it is observed that Tucca performs the same function in this scene by voicing the basest type of criticism of what Jonson considers constructive and the highest praise for what in Jonson's view is worthless. He condemns the actors who play "nothing but humours, reuels, and satires, that girde, and fart at the times" (III, iv, 190-191), which is an obvious allusion to Jonson's "comicall satyres", but recommends Crispinus to Histrio on the grounds that the poetaster "pens high, loftie, in a new stalking straine, bigger then halfe the rimers i'the towne" (III, iv, 161-162). Thus, what Jonson has intended as "profit and delight" in his "comicall satyres" is reduced to scurrility by the depraved Tucca, while the poetaster's supposed ability to debase the true tragic style "in a new stalking straine" is considered by him to be a reason for praiseworthiness.

As opposed to Crispinus poetastering, however, Jonson calls attention to his own merit as a satirist when he presents Tucca scoffing at those who will satirise him on the stage in a prospective "play" obviously by Jonson (III, iv, 198-199). Thus the dramatist is seen to be qualifying his satire as a "mirror of life" and pointing to his commitment to reflect the truth. In contrast to Jonson's concept of the earnest and truthful satirist, the view unheld by Tucca and Histrio is that of the satirist merely as an envious railer. In questioning Histrio as to whether Demetrius (Dekker)

will be able to "abuse Horace" in his play "impudently inough," Tucca receives the following reply:

> O, I warrant you. Captaine, and spitefully inough, too; hee ha's one of the most overflowing ranke wits, in Rome. He will slander any man that breathes, if he disgust him.
>
> (III, iv, 337-340)

The very fact that Jonson allows Tucca and Histrio to favour malicious libel shows how much he himself condemns it. It is interesting to note, furthermore, that in Tucca's opinion Horace represents a similarly abusive satirist:

> Hang him fusty satyr, he smells all goate: hee carries a ram, under his arme-holes, the slave.
>
> (III, iv, 367-368)

In such a description of Horace, Tucca is evidently made to allude to the Elizabethan misconception of satire as a descendant of the obscene Ancient Greek satyr play. However, one of the main arguments of Jonson in Poet. is that Horatian satire constitutes the model for all high-minded satirists and is of a very different nature from that implied by Tucca's words. The fact that at the end of the play he should have assigned the most complete apology for satire to Virgil, the most authoritative of all spokesmen, shows how much emphasis he placed on this argument. Virgil's defense of satire in the following passage is meant not only against Lupus, who has gone as far as accusing Horace of treason on account of a satirical emblem,

but also against Tucca, Crispinus, and Demetrius who have likewise been exposed as slanderers of Horace:

> Tis not the wholesome sharpe moralitie,
> Or modest anger of a satyricke spirit,
> That hurts, or wounds the bodie of a state:
> But the sinister application
> Of the maliciou s, ignorant, and base
> Interpreter: who will distort, and straine
> The general scope and purpose of an authour,
> To his particular, and private spleene
>
> (V, iii, 137-144)

Naturally, this speech is meant to vindicate Jonson's satiric art as much as Horace's. For in the subsequent scene of "arraignement" which takes the form of a mock-trial of the poetasters Crispinus and Demetrius, the topical aspect of the play becomes conspicuous once more. The poetasters are indicted "upon the Statute of Calumny ... for having most ignorantly, foolishly, and ... maliciously, gone about to depraue and calumniate the person and writings of Quintu s, Horacius Flaccus, ... taxing him, falsly, of selfe-loue, arrogancy, impudence, rayling, fliching by translation" (V, iii, 225-232). In spite of the seriousness of the charges, the penalties imposed are highly comic in nature. In a scene that is reminiscent of Aristophanic humour but based on Lucian's satirical Lexiphanes[47], Crispinus is given pills by Horace to purge him literally of his affected language, whereby he is made to vomit words that are known to belong to Marston's vocabulary[48]. Demetrius is condemned to be branded as slanderer but upon Horace's intervention his punishment is extenuated. Lupus is made to wear asses' ears

and Tucca, a "vizard" or a Janus-mask for his double-dealing during the trial as a self-appointed member of the jury, acting at the same time surreptitiously as the poetasters' advocate.

At the end of the play the former serious tone is resumed. The poetasters are required to take a solemn oath never to slander Horace or his works and are lectured by Virgil on how to train as genuine poets by studying genuine poetry. The final pronouncement is Augustus': admonishing all poets against envy and detraction and encouraging them to mutual love and respect.

The ending of Poet. bears close resemblance to that of C.R., in which similar themes were treated. Satire has once more been placed and evaluated in the larger context of poetry. In fact all the dramatic features of Poet. are almost exclusively intended to ensure a proper understanding of the true nature of satire as a mode of elevated poetry inducing the individual and the society to adopt genuine values and virtuous conduct. Jonson has even exploited non-dramatic devices such as recitations of poetry ranging from the admirable to worthless, and as many as the structure of the play could possibly allow (Ovid's elegy in Act I, a libertine lyric adapted from Martial[49] in Act II, burlesque recitations in Act III, Crispinus' poem in Act IV, and finally a lengthy passage from Vergil's Aeneid in Act V) so as to

indicate the scope in which Horatian satire may be assessed in terms of its relation to other modes or imitations of poetry - his ultimate purpose being to instruct his audience to distinguish the genuine and the beneficial from the false and the harmful. These features and the final alliance of the supreme poet Virgil with the model satirist Horace serve to present Jonson's ideal in more emphatic and impressive terms in Poet. than in C.R. Horace's voice of moderation, his "constructive and humane irony"(50) have served to ensure a reconciliation with his opponents instead of a punishment for them. It is on account of this beneficial function of the satirist that Virgil is led to pronounce that "the honest Satyre hath the happiest soule" (V, iii, 376). This dictum and Augustus' "thankes" to Horace for his "free and holsome sharpnesse" (V, i, 94) are the conclusive statements that vindicate and elevate the satirist's art as Jonson ideally conceived it.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the foregoing study it is observed that the innovative dramatic genre initiated in the "comicall satyres" represent Jonson's formation of a satiric strategy which is dependent on an assimilation of diverse influences deriving from Aristophanic comedy, Roman Comedy, Roman formal satire, the native morality play and the courtly allegory. The specific influences assimilated in each play vary in kind and degree but those of classical sources outweigh the others in pervasiveness. It is also clear that among the classical sources, Aristophanic comedy is far more influential on the shaping of the "comicall satyres" than has been general granted by Jonsonian critics.

The major native influence on the "comicall satyres" is that of character portrayal in terms of "humours". However, Jonson's method of characterisation in these plays is such tha the "humourous" characters acquire a dramatic function which, is according to the present author is closely aligned to that of the impostor and his relation to the satirist of Greek Old Comedy. This is an important indication of the fact that

the assimilative process underlying the formation of Jonson's strategy is largely governed by his initial choice of a dramatic form which he described as "somewhat like Vetus Comoedia." Viewed in the context of the Renaissance conception of satire as well as in the context of the plays themselves the term vetus comoedia is significant in that it can be associated not only with Aristophanic comedy but also with the satiric tradition that extended from Greek Old Comedy to Roman formal satire. This implies that Jonson used the term to refer essentially to Old Comedy, and at the same time to acknowledge and justify the influence of Roman formal satire on the "comicall satyres".

The influence of Old Comedy is most conspicuous in E.M.O. where Jonson made specific reference to the innovative form of the play in terms of vetus comoedia. The evidence of this influence on the form, structure, and characterisation of E.M.O. may be summed up as follows:

a) The parabatic function of the Induction, of the choric characters comprising the Grex, and of Asper the satirist;

b) The general dramatic function of the dual satiric persona in Asper/Macilente and of the "humourists" as impostor-characters;

c) The functional relationship of the impostors to the satirist as eirôn (Macilente) and as buffoon (Carlo Buffone

d) The display of this relationship in the serial

arrangement of episodic scenes, especially in the final scenes of punishment and purgation;

e) The absence of a plot-line in the general course of the dramatic action, as a result of which unity in the play is achieved through thematic coherence.

The interrelationship of the above-mentioned features constitute the fundamental similarity between E.M.O. and Aristophanic comedy. While this influence is seen to operate in the basic framework of the Terentian five-act structure, there is no plot development in the play except in the last act to which the terms protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe may be properly applied. Thus Terentian influence in the play is confined to the intrigue laid out in the final act.

The influence of Old Comedy is evidenced also in certa aspects of the method of satiric exposure used in E.M.O. such as the serial or sequential display of the impostors for the purpose of ridicule, and exposure by means of choric commenta as well as through the interaction of the eirôn or the buffoon with the impostors. These features are assimilated with those bearing the influence of formal, especially Juvenalian satire: namely, the descriptive quality of the expository comments voiced by the Grex and Asper/Macilente, and the device of the "full scene" to satirise the figures of folly and vice collectively.

The themes which arise from the social and economic

conditions of the times are treated with the moral intent of corrective satire that is fundamental to all classical satirists. Although Jonson adopted the didactic role of the poet-dramatist of Old Comedy, he did not resort to the typical Aristophanic devices of farce and personal invective. Hence, the ethical view-point inherent in E.M.O. gained a seriousness that is more in line with that of Horace and Juvenal. The Horatian precept of comedy offering profit and delight forms the basis of Jonson's dramatic conception and the voice of moderation which is typical of Horace is not absent in the play. However, the predominant satiric tone and attitude in E.M.O. bear the quality of fierce indignation that is the characteristic of Juvenalian satire. Thus the Ciceronian concept of comedy as "imitation of life, image of truth, mirror of customs accomodated to the correction of manners" which evidently was the principle underlying the formation of Jonson's first comedy of humours E.M.I. is seen to have been assimilated in E.M.O. with the satiric intent and tone of Juvenal.

In C.R. Jonson's satiric strategy is seen to have developed with further innovations in the genre initiated in E.M.O. The dramatic form adopted for the second "comicall satyre" is that of the courtly allegory in the Lylyean tradition with some of its features such as the balanced structure of the paired opposites bearing also the influence of the native morality plays. The emphasis on allegorical

abstraction indicates a modification in Jonson's concerns in writing satiric drama and reflects an increasing preoccupation with the theoretical aspect of satire. Accordingly, C.R. is narrower in its range of "humourists" and in its focus on the society of the times when compared to E.M.O. Although as such it is different from the preceding play, C.R. possesses a sufficient number of characteristics which indicate a continuity with E.M.O. and an assimilative process similar to that underlying the composition of the first "comicall satyre".

In the treatment of impostor-characters it maintains the same strategy applied in E.M.O. by depending on the "humours" theory for character portrayal and on Aristophanic principles for the manner in which the "humourists" function in relation to the central figure of the satirist. Similar to E.M.O., the general construction of the dramatic action in C.R. is loose, episodic, and equally unconcerned with a Terentian type of plot development despite its five-act structure. The final act of relatively concentrated action covering the contests and the masque stands as a counterpart to the fifth act in E.M.O. which similarly results in a judgement of the "humourists" for the purpose of their correction. Unity in C.R. is likewise achieved through the coherence of themes rather than of structure. Thus it has been observed that the formal features of the courtly allegory and the morality play have merged with certain Aristophanic features of structure and characterisation that were also

present in E.M.O. Further indications of the process of assimilation of various influences which also reveal a development in Jonson's satiric strategy from the first "comicall satyre" to the second may be summed up as follows:

a) The introduction of a set of ideal characters into the dramatic action proper, which includes the figure of the satirist conceived almost totally in Horatian terms and the allegorical figure of supreme courtly power representing the moral and social responsibility of the ideal head of state.

b) The treatment of the character of the satirist as a serious and virtuous poet embodying the ideal "mean", with special emphasis on his high moral function in society - as a consequence of which the satirist is largely divested of the role of the Aristophanic dissimulator or eirôn and this dramatic function is transferred to a character who can conveniently assume it.

c) The modification in the method of satiric exposure whereby preference is given to the Horatian mode of ironic exposure to suit the disposition of Crites the satirist, while the sequential display of the "humourists" and the descriptive/expository commentary of the choric figures which bear the influence of Aristophanic and Juvenalian methods of exposure are maintained in accordance with the practice in E.M.O.

d) The treatment of themes from an ethical point of view which is predominantly Juvenalian in its intensive focus on the responsibility of the court to set up a positive example for the rest of society, but which also places great importance on the concept of poetry and satire as a means of fulfilling the same responsibility in the service of the court.

The interrelationship of these features peculiar to C.R. gives prominence to Jonson's concern for the elevation of the status of satire and the poet-satirist on account of their salutary moral function in society. This concern is very closely related to the influence of the Horatian principles of decorum and moderation on Jonson's satiric strategy. In the formal framework of allegorical drama, Jonson is seen to have adopted these principles as the guide-line in his dramatic exposition of the ideal satirist as an artist of absolute virtue and of ideal satire as a source of absolute moral and social benefit, the virtuous and beneficial qualities of both being dependent on decorum and moderation. Thus the main innovation in Jonson's satiric strategy in C.R. is to be found in the application of the aesthetic and ethical precepts of the Roman formal satirists to the allegorical display of virtue confronting vice and folly. While the dramatist's practical concern in the display and exposure of vicious and foolish characters is equally prominent in both "comicall satyres", his primary theoretical

interest in E.M.O. is in the explication and justification of the satiric technique of the new genre identified as "comicall satyre", whereas in C.R. the predominant theoretical concern lies in the exposition of the ideal artistic and moral function of satire and of the satirist.

The close association of the function of satire with that of poetry, brought to attention at the end of C.R. as the ultimate reason for Crites the satirist's triumph, is observed to have become a major issue in Poet., the third "comicall satyre". This is a significant indication of an organic development in Jonson's satiric strategy from one "comicall satyre" to another. The various innovations which are the products of a continuous process of assimilation complement each other and point to an ever-widening conception of satire that is reflected in the composition of the plays in question. The complementary nature of these innovations and the vitality inherent in the assimilative process can be best observed in Poet.

One of the major innovations in this play is Jonson's choice of a dramatic form which in its broad outline approximates that of an historical drama. Furthermore, Poet. is structured on the model of the Elizabethan double-plot play with two separate plot-lines, thereby displaying a much stronger affinity with Terentian plot structure than the earlier "comicall satyres". Yet the loose and episodic manner

of construction peculiar to E.M.O. and C.R. as a characterist influence of Aristophanic comedy has also been allowed to penetrate into the structure of Poet., especially in the plot-line involving Horace and Crispinus. Thus the unity of dramatic action is disrupted as much by the episodic arrangement as by the presence of two plot-lines running parallel to each other. Consequently unity in the play is maintained through thematic coherence as in the previous "comicall satyres." The reason for the episodic construction is seen to arise from Jonson's insistence on displaying the characters of ridicule in scenes of serial arrangement: a method which he evidently thought indispensable for his strategy. This feature and the final scene of judgement, (collective in C.R. and sequential in E.M.O. and Poet) are to be regarded as the fundamental influences of Old Comedy on the structure of the "comicall satyres" and as the basic characteris tics of genre. In other respects, however, Jonson's satiric strategy in Poet. exhibits modifications that are largely dependent on the dramatic form of historical drama.

Characterisation, for one, has grown wider in range and more complex. Although "humourous" characters are just as indispensable for Jonson's strategy in each of the "comicall satyres" as the Aristophanic features mentioned above, and in Poet. include topical personalities depicted as "humourists", their importance is balanced and, at times, outweighed by historical characters drawn from Augustan Rome. It has been

ascertained that while Jonson took some liberty with the historical matter of the play, by and large he maintained fidelity to historical truth - a point which has considerably affected his method of characterisation in Poet. The character of Horace as the satirist of the play presents no great novelty because Jonson had already used him as the model for the character of Crites the satirist of C.R. However, the fact that Horace is identified with Jonson in the topical stage quarrel against the alleged poetasters Marston and Dekker, and that the characterisation of Horace is largely based on the dramatic adaptations of his Satires appear as new features in the assimilation of classical influence with Jonson's contemporary needs.

The character of Ovid is also to a certain extent determined by his own works of poetry. However, a comparison with the earlier plays shows that Ovid as an ambivalent character is an entirely new venture in Jonson's satiric strategy and one that mainly accounts for the complexity of the method of characterisation in Poet. Ovid is presented neither as a "humourist" nor a satirist (though he does occasionally function as a satiric and ironic voice) but as a poet in his own right separate from the satirist, with different intentions, representing different moral values, and subjected to different treatment from the rest of the poets. This may be assessed as a splitting-up of the joint function of the poet-satirist as embodied in Crites in C.R.; hence an

interesting development from the earlier play which reflects the expansion of Jonson's concept of the function of poetry and as well as of satire in society. The conception of poetry underlying Ovid's characterisation is seen to have necessitated contrasting representatives of the poetic vocatic such as Ovid's fellow-Elegiac poets on the one hand, and Virgil as the example of perfection, on the other. The introduction of these classical figures and of the historical counterparts of the ideal figures in C.R. into the set cast of characters consisting of the satirist and the "humourists" is an important indication of how the process of assimilation of a variety of influences has affected the method of characterisation in an unprecendented manner in Jonson's works.

Accordingly, the method of satiric exposure in Poet. has also undergone modification and development. Descriptive and expository commentary in the manner of formal satire is almost non-existent. While the serial scenic display of the figures of ridicule similar to that in the earlier plays continues to be dominant, exposure through ironic dialogue has gained prominence. Horatian irony is pervasive not only in Horace's confrontation with the impostor-characters but also in the manner of communication between Ovid and the impostors exclusive to his circle. The dramatic function of the Aristophanic eirôn or dissimulator as satiric expositor has been transferred to the exponents of the more sophisticat

and dialogue-based Horatian irony - a feature which was first discerned in C.R. A further development in satiric exposure is to be found in the method by means of which an impostor-character such as Tucca serves as a spokesman of distorted and false values in continuous confrontation with the ideal values represented in genuine poetry, serious satire, and proper moral conduct, thereby foregrounding the discrepancy between the false and the genuine. Although Tucca is an extension of Carlo Buffone in E.M.O., his function as a complex satiric voice is unparalleled in the former "comicall satyres".

All the features of Poet. which have been assessed as innovative and complex are necessitated by Jonson's thematic concerns, the coherence of which ensure the unity of the play. Apart from certain aspects of structure and characterisation, the continuity between the previous "comicall satyres" and Poet. is displayed essentially in theme. The exhibition, exposure, and correction of folly and vice as depicted in the "humourous" characters who ultimately represent the foolish and the vicious in the society of Jonson's time, constitute the dramatist's fundamental purpose in composing the "comicall satyres". However, the substance of folly and vice vary from one play to another. The variations indicate a development from the social and economic corruption in E.M.O. to the abstractions of courtly vice and virtue in C.R., and finally in Poet., to a concrete representati

of vice and virtue in the practice of poetry, satire, and drama as exemplified by the lively combination of topical "humourous" and historical characters. The strongest connection among the plays is the importance placed in each on the corrective function of the satirist, initiated by Asper in E.M.O. and assumed successively by Crites in C.R. and Horace, the supreme example, in Poet. What gains in emphasis in C.R. and Poet. is the conception of the satirist as a poet and artist engaged in a struggle to assert himself as such in society and to be accepted as a morally salutary force in his attempts to correct false values and false conduct. As the topical features of Poet. indicate, Jonson's personal involvement in such issues underlie his concerns in C.R. and the last "comicall satyre". This involvement can even be considered the major force motivating him to produce in Poet. what may be termed a 'dramatic manifesto' of his theory and practice of satire. So far as method, function, and purpose are concerned this theory is expounded entirely in terms of Horatian satire while the underlying ethical conception is influenced as much by the serious intensity of Juvenal as by the humane constructiveness of Horace. Presented in the general context of its relationship to poetry, Jonson's theoretical concern is essentially governed by a necessity for a defense of satire. Such a defence is intended to rectify the contemporary misconception of the genre as a descendant of the coarse satyrplay and thereby to elevate it to a higher status, as well as to correct false practices in satiric

writing, especially satiric drama, as exhibited by the ridiculous poetasters in the play.

Thus Poet. is not only a satiric comedy but also an elaborate exposition and serious defense of satire. In the process of reaching this point in his dramatic career, Jonson is seen to have evolved a satiric strategy which must be assessed as the product of his own interests and as a dramatist and an assimilation of influences the most formative of which are classical - a point of major importance that is demonstrated in Poet., Jonson's outstanding tribute to classicism.

Since the process of assimilation was continuous and the wide-ranging influences were constantly subject to selection and modification according to the needs and the purpose of the dramatist in each play, the final assessment must be made in terms of the major influences on the entire context of the "comicall satyres". Thus while Aristophanic comedy which was the predominant shaping influence in the initiation of the genre of the "comicall satyre" left its imprint on the structure and the extra-dramatic devices of the subsequent plays, and the "humours" which served as the basis of characterisation were particularly influential in the first two "comicall satyres", the joint influence of the Roman satirists, Horace and Juvenal remained pervasive on al dramatic features other than structure.

The features of Jonson's satiric strategy as formed in the process of the composition of the "comicall satyres" evolved in time to produce comedies such as Volpone, The Alchemist, Epicoene, and Bartholomew Fair which were outstanding in dramatic quality and structural excellence. Although these plays of maturity were not identified by Jonson as "comicall satyres" their predominantly satiric nature display a fundamental similarity to the genre initiated in 1599, so much so that D.Farley-Hill in The Comic in Renaissance Comedy (1981) feels justified in identifying The Alchemist as a "Comical Satire". The unity in Jonson's strategy extending from the "comicall satyres" to later works, is epitomised in his dedicatory preface to Volpone: "For if men will impartially and not asquint look toward the offices and function of a Poet, they will easily conclude to themselve the impossibility of any man's being the good Poet without first being a good Man." The continuity between the "comicall satyres" and the later play is explicit: the moral and aesthetic function of the poet-satirist are seen as one and are thus conceived in terms of the satiric strategy formed during the composition of the "comicall satyres."

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1- The following list of Jonson's sixteen extant plays in chronological order (the so-called "dotages" excluded) is based on the information given in C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds., Ben Jonson, 11 Vols. (Oxford: Clarend n Press, 1952).

A Tale of a Tub (1596c)
The Case is Altered (1597c)
Every Man in His Humour (1598)
Every Man Out of His Humour (1599)
Cynthia's Revels (1600)
Poetaster (1601)
Séjanus his Fall (1603)
Volpone (1605)
Epicoene (1609)
The Alchemist (1610)
Catiline his Conspiracy (1611)
Bartholomew Fair (1614)
The Devil is an Ass (1616)
The Staple of News (1626)
The New Inn (1629)
The Magnetic Lady (1632)

2- Although Jonson's use of linguistic resources contribute to his satiric method, a discussion of this subject falls outside the scope of this study on account of the fact that linguistic features cannot be evaluated in terms of classical or native influence in the same manner as the other features of the drama. For an exhaustive treatment of the subject see J.A.Barish's Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy (1970).

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1- See e.g. Douglas Bush, English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century: 1600-1660 (London: Oxford University Press, 1962, Second edition, revised) pp.107-108.

2- Charles R. Baskervill, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1911) p.1

3- Sir Philip Sidney, The Defense of Poesie, in The Prose Works of Sir Philip Sidney, Vol.III, ed. Albert Feuillerat (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912; rpt. 1962) p.11.

4- Bernard Weinberg, A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance 2.Vol. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p.146.

5- Weinberg, pp.102-103.

6- Weinberg, p.176.

7- Timber or Discoveries, 141, in C.H.Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, ed., Ben Jonson, Vol, VIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952). All subsequent line citations of Jonson refer to the appropriate volumes of the Herford and Simpson edition (henceforth abbreviated as HS) of his complete works.

8- G.Gregory Smith, ed., Elizabethan Critical Essays (London: Oxford University Press, 1904) I, pp.196-97.

9- Smith, p.59.

10- T.S.Eliot, Elizabethan Essays (London: Faber and Faber, 1934) p.11.

11- Eliot, p.85.

12- No source is mentioned in the commentary in HS XI, p.282

13- HS XI, p.282. Sources indicated are Strabo's Geographica and possibly Aristotle's Politics.

14- HS XI, p.286. The source is given as Cicero's De Oratore.

15- HS XI, p.280-81. The passage is traced to Erasmus' defense of his Praise of Folly in one of his epistles.

16- HS XI, p.281. The corresponding passage in Aristotle's Poetics is cited in the commentary.

17- HS XI, p.291.

18- John Dryden, "Essay of Dramatic Poesy", ed. W.P.Kerr Essays of John Dryden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900), p.83.

19- Samuel Taylor Coleridge in Coleridge's Literary Criticism ed., J.W.Mackail (London, 1908), p.153.

20- HS, I, p.45.

21- John B.Bamborough, Ben Jonson (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1970) p.20.

22- See HS, VIII, pp.305-355 for two versions of Jonson's translation of the Ars Poetica.

23- Henry L.Snuggs, Shakespeare and the Five Acts (New York: Vantage Press, 1960), p.38.

24- Paul Wessner, Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti (Leipzig: B.G.Teubner, 1902). The structural parts of a comedy listed in Donatus' essay follow the sequence of prologue, protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe. The prologue precedes the dramatic action proper and contains the poet's or the actors' direct communication to the audience; the protasis is the exposition and the beginning of the dramatic action; the epitasis covers the progress of commotion (turba) and the knot of error (nodus erroris) and the catastrophe is the reversal to a happy end through the exposure of the whole action.

25- T.W.Baldwin, Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1947), pp.228-251.

26- Coburn Gum, The Aristophanic Comedies of Ben Jonson (The Hague: Mouton, 1969), devotes one half of his study to a listing of these borrowings.

27- HS Vol.IX, p.680.

28- Gum, p.13; HS, give a list of books in Jonson's library in Vol.I, pp.250-71, and in Vol.XI pp.593-603.

29- Frederich S.Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p.386; Katherine Lever, "Greek Comedy on the Sixteenth Century English Stage", Classical Journal, 42 (1946), pp.169-174; Arthur Tilley, "Greek Studies in England in the Early Sixteenth Century" English Historical Review, 53 (1938), pp.220-239, 438-456

30- Louis Lord, Aristophanes: His Plays and His Influence (New York: Cooper Square, 1963), p.107; T.W.Taylor, p.154.

31- Horace, Satires I, IV, 1-6 in Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica, Trans.H.Rushton Fairclough, (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1966).

32- Oxford Classical Dictionary, p.795.

33- John Higginbotham, ed. Greek and Latin Literature: A Comparative Study (London: Methuen and Co Ltd., 1969), pp. 223-261.

34- Oscar J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1938), p.1.

35- Wessner, I, pp.15-18.

36- George Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie, ed. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p.31.

37- Alvin B.Kernan, The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), p.54.

38- Kernan, p.57, 113.

39- Alvin B.Kernan, The Plot of Satire (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), p.7.

40- Campbell, p.1.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1- Edward B. Partridge,"Ben Jonson: The Makings of the Dramatist (1596-1602)", in Elizabethan Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 9 (London: Edward Arnold, 1966), p.229.

2- Every Man Out of His Humour and Every Man in His Humour henceforth cited as E.M.O. and E.M.I. respectively.

3- HS, I, p.375.

4- John B.Bamborough, Ben Jonson (London: Hurchinson University Library, 1970), p.20.

5- For an interesting survey of the character-types covering their earliest antecedents see Engin Uzmen, Plautus ve Terentius'un Shakespeare Öncesi ve Shakespeare'in Komedileri Üzerindeki Etkileri (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, Sayı 186, 1969) pp.45-56, 91-96.

6- HS, I, p.343.

7- Charles R.Baskervill, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1911), p.40.

8- In the folio edition of 1616, this character is in fact identified as Justice Clement. HS, III, p.302.

9- HS, III, p.303.

10- Paul Wessner, Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1902), I, p.22.

11- HS, IX, p.408.

12- "Conversations with Drummond", 410, HS, I, p.143.

13- Oscar J.Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1938), p.4.

14- Baskervill, pp.212-213.

15- HS, I, 376 n.

16- M.C.Bradbrook, The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (London: Chatto and Windus, 1955), p.110.

17- Campbell, pp.6-7.

18- HS, IX, p.408.

19- Horace, Satire I, ii, 24 (Dum vitant stulti vitia, in contraria currunt.-In avoiding a vice, fools run into its opposite), in Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, trans. H.Rushton Fairclough (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1966).

20- Wessner, pp.15-18.

21- F.H.Sandbach, The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1977), p.43-44; Coburn Gum, The Aristophanic Comedies of Ben Jonson (The Hague: Mouton Press, 1969), p.85.

22- Gum, p.110.

23- John,A. Symonds, Ben Jonson (London: Longman, Green, 1886) pp.29-30.

24- It is possible to find deviations from this general pattern: Acharnians and Thesmophariazusae contain no agôn (contest) while Knights and Clouds each have double contests; the last two plays of Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae and Plutus have no parabasis, but earlier works such as Knights, Clouds, Wasps, Peace and Birds have two instead of one. For a detailed analysis of the parts see. K.J.Dover, Aristophanic Comedy (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972) pp.49-51, 53-55, 66-68.

25- The structure of the parabasis follows an elaborate but fixed pattern in anapaestic, lyric, and trochaic meters in three successive parts: (a) the anapaestic part, (b) ode, (c) epirrhema, the last two of which are duplicated in the proper order as (d) antode, (e) antepirrhema in the rest of the parabasis.

26- Dover, p.50.

27- Aristophanes, Acharnians, (628-658) in The Acharnians The Knights, The Clouds, The Wasps, trans. Benjamin B.Rogers (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1960), p.61-65.

Now doff we our robes,
our own anapaestics beginning.
Since first to exhibit his plays he began,
our chorus instructor has never
Come forth to confess in this public address
how tactful he is and how clever.
But now that he knows he is slandered by foes
before Athens so quick to assent,
Pretending he jeers our City and sneers
at the people with evil intent,
He is ready and fain his cause to maintain
before Athens so quick to repent.

Let honor and praise be the guerdon, he says,
of the poet whose satire has stayed you
From believing -he orators' novel conceits
wherewith they cajoled and betrayed you;
Who bids you despise adulation and lies
nor be citizens Vacant and Vain...
...By this he's a true benefactor to you,
and by showing with humor dramatic
The way that our wise democratic allies
are ruled by our State democratic
And therefore their people will come oversea,
their tribute to bring to the City,
Consumed with desire to behold and admire
the poet so fearless and witty,
Who dared in the presence of Athens to speak
the thing that is rightful and true.
And truly the fame of his prowess, by this,
has been bruited the universe through,
When the Sovereign of Persia, desiring to test
what the end of our warfare will be,
Inquired of the Spartan ambassadors, first,
which nation is queen of the sea
And next, which the wonderful Poet has got,
as its stern and unsparing adviser
For those who are lashed by his satire, he said,
must surely be better and wiser
And they II in the war be the stronger by far,
enjoying his counsel and skill
And therefore the Spartans approach you today
with proffers of Peace and Goodwill,
and nought do they care for the islet
But you of the Poet who serves yon so well
they fain would despoil and beguile
But be you on your guard nor surrender the bard;
for his Art shall be righteous and true
Rare blessings and great will be work for the State,
rare happiness shower upon you,
Not fawning, or bribing, or striving to cheat
with an empty unprincipled jest,
Not seeking your favor to curry or nurse,
but teaching the things that are best.

28 Dover, p.52.

29- Aliki Lafkidou Dick, Paideia Through Laughter: Jonson's Aristophanic Appeal to Human Intelligence (The Hague: Mouton Press, 1974) stresses the influence of the didacticism of Aristophanes on Jonson but does not make any specific references to E.M.O.

30- Campbell, p.70; HS, IX, p.399.

31- Robert E.Knoll, Ben Jonson's Plays (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p.47.

32- Campbell, p.18.

33- Douglas Duncan, Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) p.134. qualifies E.M.O. as "one of the most astonishing experiments in all Renaissance drama which shows Jonson practicising 'alienation' more insistently than Brecht ever does...".

34- HS, I, p.387.

35- Campbell, p.69.

36- Alvin B.Kernan, The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959) p.161-162; Gabriele B.Jackson, Vision and Judgement in Ben Jonson's Drama (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p.43.

37- Juvenal, Satires in Juvenal and Persius, trans. G.G.Ramsay (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1965).

38- Kathryn A.McEuen, "Jonson and Juvenal", RES, XXI (1945) p.109.

39- Kernan, p.162.

40- Knoll, p.47.

41- Freda Townsend, Apologie for Bartholomew Fayre: The Art of Jonson's Comedies (New York: Modern Language Association, 1947), p.47.

42- Campbell, p.56.

43- Kernan, p.143.

44- Kernan, p.25.

45- Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book IV, trans. R.W.Browne (London: Bell and Daldy, 1871), pp.109-114.

46- Lane Cooper, An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922), p.122.

47- F.M.Cornford, The Origin of Attic Comedy 2nd ed.rev., ed. Theodore Gaster (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1961) p.120, 137-138.

48- Aristophanes, Clouds, (439-451) in The Acharnians The Knights, The Clouds, The Wasps, trans. B.B.Rogers, p.309.

So now, at your word, I give and afford
My body to these, to treat as they please,
To have and to hold, in squalor, in cold,
In hunger and thirst, yea by Zeus, at the worst,
To be flayed out of shape from my heels to my nape
So along with my hide from my duns I escape,
And to men may appear without conscience or fear,
Bold, hasty, and wise, a concocter of lies,
A rattler to speak, a dodger, a sneak,
A regular claw of the tables of law,
A shuffler complete, well worn in deceit,
A supple, unprincipled, troublesome cheat;
A hang-dog accurst, a bore with the worst,
In the tricks of the jury-courts thoroughly versed.

49- Campbell, p.57.

50- Knoll, p.43-44.

51- Campbell, p.57.

52- Cooper, p.263.

53- Cornford, p.154.

54- Cornford, p.156.

55- Aristophanes, Birds (904-1057) in: The Peace, The Birds The Frogs, trans. B.B.Rogers (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1968), Vol.II, pp.219-233.

56- Gum, p.24.

57- Katherine Lever, The Art of Greek Comedy (London: Methuen, 1956), p.114.

58- Baskervill, pp.40-41.

59- Campbell, p.72.

60- Campbell, p.75.

61- Campbell, p.70-71.

62- F.M.Padelford, trans. Select Translations From Scaliger's Poetics (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1905), p.43.

63- A.W.Pickard - Cambridge, Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), p.308.

64- Knoll, p.44, 47.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1- Henceforth cited as C.R.

2- Charles R.Baskervill, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1911), p.217.

3- HS, III, pp.420-421; IV, pp.25,33.

4- M.C.Bradbrook, The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (London: Chatto and Windus, 1955), p.95.

5- HS, IV, p.33.

6- Baskervill, pp.237-238.

7- Oscar J.Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1938), p.84.

8- Ralph W.Berringer, "Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and the War of the Theatres", PQ, XXII (1943), p.19.

9- Baskervill, p.258; Berringer, p.19; R.E.Knoll, Ben Jonson's Plays (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p.53.

10- Baskervill, p.239, notes that the characterisation of Cynthia in this play is a close parallel to that in Lyly's Endimion in which Cynthia is a similar allegorical figure representing Oueen Elizabeth.

11- Campbell, p.83.

12- Knoll, p.54.

13- Baskervill, p.214.

14- Thelma Greenfield, The Induction in Elizabethan Drama (Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1969), p.70.

15- Knoll, p.56.

16- William Gifford, ed. The Works of Ben Jonson (London: Nicol, 1816), I, p.204.

17- "A Study of Ben Jonson", in The Complete Works of Algernon Charles Swinburne, eds. E.Gosse and Thomas Wise, 20 vols. (London, 1926), II, pp.14-15.

18- HS, I, p.396.

19- David Daiches, A Critical History of English Literature, 2nd ed. (New York: Ronald Press, 1969), I, p.314.

20- Knoll, p.53.

21- Ernest W.Talbert, "The Classical Mythology and the Structure of Cynthia's Revels", PQ, XXII (1943), pp.193-210.

22- See David M.Bevington, From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), p.49, for a discussion of symmetry in the morality plays. The Platonic aspect of Jonson's "vision of life" is discussed by Gabriele Bernhard Jackson, Vision and Judgement in Ben Jonson's Drama (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), p.8-9.

23- See n.10.

24- Baskervill, p.238,249-258.

25- Johan Huizinga, Homo Ludens: A Study of Play-Elements in Culture (Boston: Beacon Press, reprint 1950), p.8-11, 154.

26- John C.Meagher, Method and Meaning in Jonson's Masques (South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1966), pp.6-10.

27- Allan H.Gilbert, "The Function of the Masques in Cynthia's Revels", PQ XXII (1943), p.221.

28- Baskervill, p.246; Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book II, trans. R.W.Browne (London: Bell and Daldy, 1871), pp.33-53.

29- Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Book II, p.50.

30- John B.Moore, The Comic and the Realistic in English Drama (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), p.110.

31- Samuel H.Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art 4th ed.(London: Macmillan 1923), pp.381-382.

32- Alan C.Dessen,Jonson's Moral Comedy (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1971), p.162.

33- Baskervill, p.261.

34- Campbell, p.86.

35- W.S.Anderson, "The Roman Socrates: Horace and His Satires" in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire, ed., J.P. Sullivan (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p.26.

36- Gilbert Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, (New York: 1961), p.50-51; Alvin B.Kernan, The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), pp.7-8.

37- Juvenal, Satire III, 74-78; 132-133; 100-102; in Juvenal and Persius, trans. G.G.Ramsay (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1965), pp.37,43,39.

38- Juvenal, Satire I, 74-75, in Juvenal and Persius, p.9: "If you want to be anybody nowadays, you must dare some crime that merits ... a gaol".

39- Juvenal, Satire II, 93-95, in Juvenal and Persius, p.25.

40- Juvenal, Satires III, 93-95; VIII, 185-193; in Juvenal and Persius, pp.39,173.

41- Jonas A.Barish, Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy (New York: The Norton Library, 1970), p.117.

42- See n.49 to Chapter Two.

43- Benjamin Boyce, The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947) pp.102-105.

44- HS, IX, pp.492-493; Lucian, Dialogues of the Gods, vii and xxiv in The Works of Lucian, Vol.VII, trans. M.D. Macleod, (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1961), pp.293-297, 255-257. Douglas Duncan notes that C.R. is the first of Jonson's plays to exhibit traces of Lucian and that in later plays Lucianic influence becomes more conspicuous: Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p.130.

45- Juvenal, Satires III, VI, VIII, in Juvenal and Persius.

46- HS, IV, p.33.

47- Gilbert, p.230.

48- Campbell, p.105.

49- Talbert, p.209.

50- Gilbert, p.230.

51- Talbert, p.204; Knoll, p.56.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1- Henceforth cited as Poet.

2- See HS, I, pp.406-410; 415-418, for a discussion of the identification of Hedon and Anaides with Marston and Dekker, and of the consequences of the "stage quarrel". The origins of the quarrel go back to Marston's attacks on Jonson after the production of E.M.O.

3- HS, I, p.417.

4- HS, I, p.437.

5- Robert,E.Knoll, Ben Jonson's Plays (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p.58.

6- Oscar J.Campbell, Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1938), p.110-111.

7- Jonas A.Barish, ed., Ben Jonson: Sejanus, The Yale Ben Jonson (New Haven: Yale University Pres, 1965), p.4. Barish's observations on the use of history in Sejanus apply also to Poet.

8- William Gifford pointed out that since Ovid was banished from Rome after the age of fifty, his alleged love affair with Julia could not have led to this incident, unless the person in question was Augustus' grand-daughter who was banished at the same time with Ovid for licentiousness. The Works of Ben Jonson (London: Nicol, 1816), Vol.I, p.243-244. Herford and Simpson have drawn attention to another unhistorical feature in the play which concerns the grouping of the Elegiac poets: Although it is known that Ovid was friends with Gallus and Propertius (who did not commit suicide but lived well into his fifties) and was

an admirer of Horace, he had never known Tibullus personally. HS, IX, p.534.

9- Knoll, p.58.

10- Campbell, p.113; Gabriele B.Jackson, Vision and Judgement in Ben Jonson's Drama (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), pp.20-24.

11- HS, I, 430.

12- Ernest W.Talbert, "The Purpose and Technique of Jonson's Poetaster", Studies in Philology, 42(1945), p.227.

13- Knoll, p.58.

14- Richard Hosley, "The Formal Influence of Plautus and Terence," Elizabethan Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9 (London: Edward Arnold, 1966), p.133.

15- Eugene Waith, "The Poet's Morals in Jonson's Poetaster", Modern Language Quarterly, 12 (1951), p.19.

16- Freda Townsend, Apologie for Bartholomew Fayre (New York: Modern Language Assn. 1947), p.54.

17- Charles R.Baskervill, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1911), p.286.

18- Baskervill, p.286.

19- Thelma N.Greenfield, The Induction in Elizabethan Drama (Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1969), p.75.

20- Aristophanes, Wasps (1015-1050) in The Acharnians, The Knights, The Clouds, The Wasps, trans. Benjamin B.Pogers (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1960), pp.505-509: 1043-1050 from the parabasis:

Yet although such a champion as this ye had found
to purge your land from sorrow and shame,
Ye played him false when to reap, last year,
the fruit of his novel designs he came,
Which, failing to see in their own true light,
ye caused to fade and wither away,
And yet with many a deep libation,
invoking Bacchus, he swears this day
That never a man, since the world began,
has witnessed a cleverer comedy.
Yours is the shame that ye lacked the wit
its inwinite merit at first to see.
But none the less with the wise and skilled
the bard his accustomed praise will get,
Though when he had distanced all his foes,
his noble Play was at last upset.

21- HS, IV, p.317.

22- Herford and Simpson note that A.W.Ward, English Dramatic Literature, ii, p.360 compared the "Apologeticall Dialogue" to the Aristophanic parabasis and suggested that Jonson himself appeared on the stage to speak the Author's part. HS, IX, p.581.

23- Baskervill, p.289-290.

24- Baskervill, p.285.

25- Campbell, p.120.

26- Horace, Satires: Crispinus, a stoic writer despised by Horace (I, i: I, iii; I, iv; II, vii); Fannius, a vain poet (I, iv; I, x); Tigellius, a well-known musician (I, ii; I, iii) in Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica, trans. H.Rushton Fairclough (London: Loeb Classical Library

1966). Juvenal's Crispinus in Satires I and IV, has nothin to do with literature or the arts, but is a social pretender, a libertine and a time-server like his namesake in Poet.

27- Thomas Lodge, Works, ed., Hunterian Club (Glasgow: Robert Anderson, 1883), III, p.6.

28- Talbert, pp.225-226.

29- Campbell, p.115.

30- HS, IV, p.207.

31- HS, III, p.197.

32- Ovid, Tristia, IV, 23-26 in Ovid: Tristia and Ex Ponto trans. Arthur L.Wheeler (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1924), p.199.

33- HS, IV, p.187-196.

34- HS, IX, p.533.

35- Gifford, p.243; HS, IX, p.567; Suetonius, The Lives of Caesars, Book II, LXX, in Suetonius, trans. J.C.Rolfe (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1924), Vol.I, p.231.

36- See n.16.

37- HS, IV, p.233.

38- Horace gave no name to the character appearing in Satire I, ix; hence, he is generally referred to as "the bore".

39- Ronald Paulson, Fictions of Satire (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1967), pp.21,22.

40- Paulson, p.23, comments on the same points as characteristic features of Horatian satire.

41- Paulson, p.23, distinguishes Juvenal's satire from Horace's by its lack of comic element.

42- HS, IX, p.561.

43- Waith, p.16.

44- Jonas A.Barish, Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy (New York: The Norton Library, 1970), pp.122-123.

45- HS, IX, p.567; Talbert, p.242-243.

46- HS, IX, p.554-558.

47- HS, IX, p.578. In Lucian's Lexiphanes, the protagonist is given medicine to cure him of his vocabulary. The Works of Lucian, trans. A.M.Harmon (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1955), Vol. V, p.293-327.

48- HS, IX, p.579.

49- HS, IX, p.548.

50- W.S.Anderson, "The Roman Socrates: Horace and His Satires" in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire, ed., J.P. Sullivan (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p.27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson,W.S.: "The Roman Socrates: Horace and His Satires", in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire, ed. J.P.Sullivan. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Aristophanes: The Acharnians, The Knights, The Clouds, The Wasps. trans. Benjamin B.Rogers. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1960.

Aristophanes: The Peace, The Birds, The Frogs. trans. B.B. Ragers. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1968.

Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics, trans. R.W.Browne. London: Bell and Daldy, 1871.

Baldwin,T.W.: Shakespeare's Five-Act Structure. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1947.

Bamborough,John,B.: Ben Jonson. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1970.

Barish,Jonas,A.: ed. Ben Jonson: Sejanus, The Yale Ben Jonson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Barish,Jonas,A.: Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy. New York: The Norton Library, 1970

Baskervill,Charles,Read: English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1911.

Berringer,Ralph,W.: "Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and the War of the Theatres". PQ, XXII, 1943.

Bevington,David,M.: From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Boas,Frederich,S.: University Drama in the Tudor Age. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Boyce,Benjamin: The Theophrastan Character in England to 1642. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Bradbrook,Muriel,C.: The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy. London: Chatto and Windus, 1955.

Bush,Douglas: English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century: 1600-1660. London: Oxford University Press, 1962. Second edition, revised.

Butcher,Samuel,H.: Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art. 4th ed. London: Macmillan, 1923.

Campbell,Oscar,James: Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1938.

Coleridge,Samuel,Taylor: Coleridge's Literary Criticism. ed. J.W.Mackail, London, 1908.

Cooper,Lane: An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922.

Cornford,F.M.: The Origin of Attic Comedy. 2nd ed.rev. Theodore Gaster. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1961.

Daiches,David: A Critical History of English Literature. 2nd ed. New York: Ronald Press, 1969.

Dessen,Alan,C.: Jonson's Moral Comedy. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1971.

Dick,Aliki,Lafkidou: Paideia Through Laughter: Jonson's Aristophanic Appeal to Human Intelligence. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Dover,K.J.: Aristophanic Comedy. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972.

Dryden,John: "Essay of Dramatic Poesy". ed. W.P.Kerr Essays of John Dryden. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900.

Duncan,Douglas: Ben Jonson and The Lucianic Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Eliot,Thomas,Stearns: Elizabethan Essays. London: Faber and Faber, 1934.

Farley-Hills,David: The Comic in Renaissance Comedy. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1981.

Gifford,William.: ed.: The Works of Ben Jonson. 2 vols. Oxford: Nicol, 1816.

Gilbert,Allan,H.: "The Function of the Masques in Cynthia's Revels". PQ XXII, 1943.

Greenfield,Thelma: The Induction in Elizabethan Drama. Eugene: University of Oregon Books, 1969.

Gum,Coburn: The Aristophanic Comedies of Ben Jonson. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.

Herford,C.H. and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds.: Ben Jonson: The Man and His Works. 11 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-1952.

Higginbotham,John. ed.: Greek and Latin Literature: A Comparative Study. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. 1969.

Highet,Gilbert: Juvenal the Satirist. New York: 1961.

Highet,Gilbert: The Anatomy of Satire. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica. trans. H.Rushton Fairclough. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1966.

Hosley,Richard: "The Formal Influence of Plautus and Terence, Elizabethan Theatre. Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9. London: Edward Arnold, 1966.

Huizinga,Johan: Homo Ludens: A Study of Play-Elements in Culture. Boston: Beacon Press, reprint 1950.

Jackson,Gabriele,Bernhard: Vision and Judgement in Ben Jonson's Drama. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Juvenal: Juvenal and Persius. trans. G.G.Ramsay. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1965.

Kernan,Alvin,B.: The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Kernan,Alvin,B.: The Plot of Satire. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Knights,L.C.: Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. London: Chatto and Windus, 1962.

Knoll,Robert,E.: Ben Jonson's Plays. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Lever,Katherine: The Art of Greek Comedy. London: Methuen, 1956.

Lever,Katherine: "Greek Comedy on the Sixteenth Century English Stage", CJ.42, 1946.

Lodge,Thomas: Works. 4 vols. ed., Hunterian Club. Glasgow: Robert Anderson, 1883.

Lord,Louis: Aristophanes: His Plays and His Influence. New York: Cooper Square, 1963.

Lucian: The Works of Lucian. trans. A.M.Harmon. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1955.

Meagher,John,C.: Method and Meaning in Jonson's Masques. South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1966.

Moore,John,B.: The Comic and the Realistic in English Drama. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

McEuen,Kathryn,A.: "Jonson and Juvenal", RES, XXI, 1945.

Ovid: Tristia and Ex Ponto, trans. Arthur,L. Wheeler. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1924.

Padelford,F.M.: trans. Select Translations From Scaliger's Poetics. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1905.

Partridge,Edward,B.: "Ben Jonson: The Makings of the Dramatist (1596-1602)", Elizabethan Theatre. Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 9. London: Edward Arnold, 1966.

Paulson,Ronald: Fictions of Satire. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1967.

Pickard-Cambridge,A.W.: Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.

Puttenham,George: The Arte of English Poesie, eds. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Sandbach,F.H.: The Comic Theatre of Greece and Rome. London: Chatto and Windus, 1977.

Sidney,Sir Philip: The Defense of Poesie. Albert Feuillerat, ed., The Prose Works of Sir Philip Sidney, Vol.III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912; rpt. 1962.

Smith,G.Gregory, ed.: Elizabethan Critical Essays. 2 Vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1904.

Snuggs,Henry,L.: Shakespeare and the Five Acts. New York: Vantage Press, 1960.

Suetonius: The Lives of Caesars, trans. J.C.Rolfe. London: Loeb Classical Library, 1924.

Swinburne,Algernon Charles: "A Study of Ben Jonson", in The Complete works of Algernon Charles Swinburne, eds. E. Gosse and Thomas Wise. London, 1926.

Symonds,John,A.: Ben Jonson. London: Longmans, Green, 1886.

Talbert,Ernest,W.: "The Classical Mythology and the Structure of Cynthia's Revels". PQ, XXII, 1943.

Talbert,Ernest,W.: "The Purpose and Technique of Jonson's Poetaster". Studies in Philology. 42, 1945.

Tilley,Arthur: "Greek Studies in England in the Early Sixteenth Century", English Historical Review. 53, 1938.

Townsend,Freda: Apologie for Bartholomew Fayre: The Art of Jonson's Comedies: New York: Modern Language Association, 1947.

Uzmen,Engin: Plautus ve Terentius'un Shakespeare Öncesi ve Shakespeare'in Komedileri Üzerindeki Etkileri. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, Sayı 186, 1969.

Waith,Eugene: "The Poet's Morals in Jonson's Poetaster", Modern Language Quarterly, 12, 1951.

Weinberg,Bernard: A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance. 2. Vols. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1961.

Wessner, Paul: Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1902.