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Satire is a kind of writing which is especially elusive. The enormous variety of its forms and the wide range of its tones have always made any single definition difficult; for, as Dryden observes, "considering satire as a species of poetry, here the war begins amongst the critics". Not surprisingly then, there is no one entirely satisfactory definition. For the purpose of this study, the word 'satire' refers to verse collections and drama of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and it may be defined in this restricted context as words of amusement or scorn directed against objects which fail to accord with some ideal or norm. Certainly, in this period satire cannot be defined in terms solely of form. Its existence can perhaps best be confirmed by seeking the emotion which Gilbert Highet sees as the final test

The distinction between complaint and satire is an important one to bear in mind when describing the nature of the satire which began to appear in the last five or so years of the sixteenth century. As described by John Peter complaint is a quite distinct kind of writing from satire, and some important distinctions between them are that "Complaint is usually conceptual, and often allegorical, Satire tends rather to work in the concrete particularity of real life; Complaint is impersonal, Satire personal; ... the range of Satire is usually wider than the range of Complaint, [in that] being personal, Satire can range over a scale as wide as human personality itself; [whereas Complaint] is tied to a system rather than a personality; ... Satire tends to be scornful, often reflecting only a token desire for reform, whereas Complaint is corrective and clearly does not despair of its power to correct;... Satire is usually specific, and sometimes so specific that it does in fact elect to deal with an individual;... but Complaint is vague, concerned with the abuse rather than the abuser;...Satire is a comparatively sophisticated mode and Complaint is not". Three points are particularly relevant. Firstly, that Complaint always has an object of criticism in the real world, as


opposed to the imaginative, literary world. The objects of criticism of Spenser's *Mother Hubberd's Tale* (1591), for example, are the ignorance of priests and the corruption of the court which entertains them; and the object of attack in Stephen Gosson's *School of Abuse* (1579) is the effect of the theatre and plays on public morality. Secondly, complaint appeals to the established moral authority of Christianity for its justification, and for the standard by which to judge the objects of its criticism. Complaint's purpose is a serious, social one, and that purpose is to effect social reform by the description and denunciation of follies and vices judged by the standard of Christian morality. Satire, on the other hand, usually makes appeal to no formalised, pre-existing morality outside itself, depending for judgement instead on the satirist's personal, moral responses. The third point is that in complaint the personality of the speaker is not stressed, and not directly employed as a means of obtaining satirical effects. *Mother Hubberd's Tale*, for example, is cast as an allegory told by Mother Hubberd to the speaker of the poem, and this distances the story from the speaker, separating the speaker completely from the supposed inventor of the tale, and by implication the satire in the tale. There is another more general distinction, not made by Peter, which is relevant here. Complaint, although frequently conventionalised as a style of writing, nevertheless retains a direct relation between itself and the world outside itself. It seeks to establish a relationship between literature and reality, in which the former will influence the latter. The satire written in the 1590's under the influence of classical satire does not seek to maintain such a relationship. It exists primarily within the bounds of the literary realm. The objects of its attack may be reflections of what exists in the real world, but satire does not set out to achieve a
direct relationship between life and art; on the contrary, it sets out to create an imaginary world which is separate and different from the real world, in short, a fiction. The author of satire creates in his satire a fiction in which the satirist persona, and what he attacks, and the morality by which he judges reflect a general intention to produce a self-sufficient literary artifact loosely based on classical models.

The characteristics of Elizabethan satire have often been described, and it is only necessary to draw out here the points relevant to the chapters which follow. The nature of the speaker of verse satire was determined to a large extent by the confusion between 'satyr' and 'satura' as derivations for the word 'satire'. Associating satyrs with the speaker of satire had two consequences. Firstly, it supplied an explanation of the satirist's roughness of manner and speech, and occasional violence and concupiscence. The derivation was drawn from Horace's Art of Poetry, and employed as an explanation of satire's origin and nature in Puttenham's Arte of English Poesie (1589). In Jonson's translation of the Art of Poetry satyrs are described as "th'obscene, and petulant Satyres" (1. 340), as "rough rude Satyres (1. 321), and as "scoffing" (1. 329). The idea of satyrs also supplied a possible rustic scenario for satire, an alternative fiction to the city settings of Horace and Juvenal. William Rankins it in his Seauen Satyres

---


5 Herford and Simpson, VIII. 297-355.

(1598), for example, employs such a fiction, telling how "My shaggy Satyres doe forsake the woods, / Theyr beds of mosse, their vnfrequented floodes" ('Induction', 11. 3-4 ), and threatens with "sauage ... sport" (Satyr I, 1. 40) those who have done wrong, saying "My Satyres vow to gall them at the heart" ('Induction', 1. 8). The second consequence of this mistaken origin for satire was to confirm the idea of satire as a low or humble genre, although this had no influence on satirist figures in drama. Another influence on the style of speech of the satirist was again the result of a mistaken interpretation of the styles of classical writing, this time of Juvenal and Persius especially. It was assumed that their style was more obscure and 'darker' than for contemporary Romans it actually was; and it was further assumed that obscure styles were adopted in order to veil the satire's meaning and protect the author. Thus obscurity, difficult allusions, sudden twists of thought, and so on, were seen as part of the style of a satirist speaking in the manner of classical satire.

The Elizabethan thought of satire above all as having a corrective function. As Puttenham puts it, 7 the purpose of "those verses of rebuke" was "to reforme the euill of [the listener's] life, and to bring the bad to amendment by those kinde of preachings." In verse satire it is the satirist persona in the poem, however, and not the author, as in complaint, who attempts the task of reform. The author of the satire need have no reforming intentions at all. From his point of view what the satire presents is a vision of life, and a way of reacting to human experience, rather than a way of

ameliorating the human condition. The direct relationship in complaint between the poem and the reader is not possible in satire because the satirist persona stands between the author and the reader. What absorbs the attention of a reader of verse satire is the total fiction of the satire, and particularly one part of it, the satirist persona. What is most important for the understanding of the kind of satirist persona in Elizabethan satire, and what distinguishes it from Juvenal, is the self-consciousness of the speaker that he is behaving as a satirist. The satirist personae of, say, Hall and Marston, both declare themselves to be a certain kind of satirist. The consciousness of imitation does not remain with the author, as it does with Donne or Wyatt, but extends down, as it were, to enter into the consciousness of the persona of the poem. In other words, the imitation of Juvenalian models is not merely a part of the author's consciousness, but enters into the consciousness of the persona that he creates and becomes part of that persona's role.

The development of the satirist persona from the humble, modest kind of speaker of complaint to the demonstrative, self-regarding one of satire can be clearly seen in a number of satirical works written in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. In George Gascoigne's *Steele Glas* (1576), it is the persona's plainness and humility which are emphasised. The steel glass is his plain poetry which he uses to reflect reality undistorted, and which enables people to see themselves exactly as

---

they are. The persona makes no ambitious claims for his satire, and towards the end of the work even describes his ability to see things accurately as accidental, and almost as an affliction:

> And pray for me, that (since my hap is such
> To see men so) I may perceive myselfe

*(The Steele Glas, p. 172)*.

Just as significant as the speaker's modesty, is the fact that he presents a coherent critical view of society, surveying in turn the four estates of "The King, the Knight, the Pesant, & the Priest" (p. 150), and supplying descriptions of good and bad examples of each type. The poem comes to rest in Christian thought when he asks the priests to pray for him and his worthless verse.

This book is rightly described by John Peter as "a swan-song, the valediction of Complaint". 9

Thomas Lodge's collection of Satyres, Eclogues, and Epistles, *A Fig for Momus* (1595), 10 seems to approach a new satiric style without actually committing itself to it. K. W. Gransden states that "Lodge is important in the history of verse satire because he began in the homiletic manner and ended in the classical". 11 The first mode is visible in "Truth's Complaint over England," for example, from *An Alurum Against Usurers* (1584). The speaker there claims to be a simple poet who was picked out by Truth "to tell this woeful tale" (1. 9), and who believes that "The finest heads would thinke it [his poetry] very stale" (1.11). This self-

---

9 *Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature*, Oxford, 1956, p. 130.


effacing speaker relates Truth's words which are a lament for England's decline. In *A Fig for Momus* the forms of classical satire are imitated in England for the first time, and the speaker adopts a firm, direct address to the reader, though the alternative he proposes to the world's injustice, in this case slander, is a kind of Christian quietism:

If these be true, reforme them; if vntrue,  
Take them for warnyngs what thou shouldst eschue:  
What ere they be, now thinke vpon thy graue,  
And leaue thy wordly drudging to thy knaue

('Satyre 4', p. 48).

Sir John Davies's *Epigrammes* (1598), 12 on the other hand, quite clearly emerge from a wholehearted commitment to the new style. Described by Everard Guilpin as "our English Martiall", 13 his epigrams present a witty and detailed version of London and its contemporary types, such as the gull, the spendthrift, and the courtier. The speaker calls an epigram that "Which taxeth, under a peculiar name, / A generall vice, which merits publick blame" ('Ad Musam', I), but this is too solemn a description of the *Epigrammes*, and also false since he goes on to make hits at fellow poets such as Daniel (XXX; XLV), Drayton (XXV), and Heywood (XXIX). The persona's real purpose is to exercise his "idle Muse" (XLVIII), in the hope that it will "Fall in betweene their hands that loue and praise thee, / And be to them a laughter and a jest" ('Ad Musam', I). The persona is sophisticated and displays his wit for the amusement of other sophisticates; the desired effect is comic. Reference to

---


13 *Skialetheia, or A shadowe of truth in certain Epigrams and Satyres*, [Shakespeare Association Facsimiles] London, 1931, 'Epigram 20'.
mortality is a mere gesture. The speaker also expresses disdain of those who reprove his work, and declares his superiority to "my goose-headed Judge, the multitude" ('Ad Musam', XLVIII), advising himself to "Disdain their wits, and think thou one the best" ('Ad Musam', I). The persona assumes that his satire as an easy acquisition easily discarded, along with his black feather, when the fashion changes. For Davies, his epigrams are purely a display of wit.

Everard Guilpin makes the persona of his collection, Skialetheia, (1598), not comic like Davies's, but angry and pessimistic, disregarding the world, and conscious that his poems are "rude, harsh, and vnsauory rimes: / Fit to wrap playster, and odd vnguents in" ('Epigram 70', "Conclusion to the Reader"). Guilpin's close imitation of Donne and Marston is evident in the overall conception and in details. However, like Davies, he makes the gesture towards the morality of his poems: "I care not what the world doth think, or say, / There lies a moral vnder my leane play" ('Epigram 70', "Conclusion to the Reader"). Guilpin has arrived at the point where the satirist persona dominates the poems by the insistent presence and complexity of its personality.

There are other kinds of writing which should be mentioned as exercising an important influence on satire, although not specifically on the satirist figure. Robert Greene's cony-catching pamphlets (1591-92), for example, influenced satire by the realism of their setting and their detailed descriptions of the tricks.

and more generally by the moral stance they implied. The pamphlets depict things as they are, rather than as they ought to be, although Greene did claim a useful social function for them as expositors of evils. This is a convenient fiction, but it is easy to see how the pamphlets lend themselves to conveying another kind of moral significance which could be, and indeed was, exploited by writers of satire, particularly Jonson. In *The Blakke Bookees Messenger* (1592) and *The Defence of Conycatching* (1592) Greene moves away from the depiction of practical cony-catching tricks to the kind of tricks which depend upon the gullibility or malice of mankind in general; so that he sees that "there is no estate, trade, occupation, nor mistery, but liues by Conny-catching, and that our shift at cards compared to the rest, is the simplest of all" (XI. 103.). This is very close to a satirical reaction.

There was also a vigorous and widespread tradition of character-writing at this period which both influenced and was influenced by satire. Although it was not until Joseph Hall's *Characters of Vertues and Vices* (1608) that the Theophrastan character was imitated in English there were many close approximations to it. There was a continuous tradition of character-writing from medieval writers, but at the end of the sixteenth century, probably under the influence of classical satire, that tradition


16 In the 1617 edition of Theophrastus, *Characteres Ethici, Notationes Morum*, ed. Isaac Casaubon, [1st ed. 1592] Lugduni, a passage from Horace, *Satires*, I. ix., is printed as "Garruli hominis character", p. 79, suggesting that a close affinity was seen between satire and the character. This is confirmed by a note, p. 80, which begins, "Similes hic alios characteres poteramus adiungere e diversis scriptoribus", and goes on to cite Petronius Arbiter and Lucianus, among others.
flowered; for example, in *Pierce Penilesse* and Jonson's plays. Certainly the practice of character-writing is an important aspect of the style of both verse satire and satire in drama.

Although there were no satirist figures based on the personae of verse satire before 1598, there was a long tradition in drama of characters with very similar functions. From the earlier times there was satire in drama. In the *Second Shepherd's Play* of the Towneley cycle (first half of the fifteenth century), for example, the shepherds express their grievance at social and natural hardships, but the author qualifies our sympathy for them by depicting them as querulous and selfish. In Nicholas Udall's *Respublica* (1553), a children's play, there is a great deal of attention paid to the vice figure, Avarice alias Policy, who supplies a vivid demonstration of the deleterious effects of protestant religious developments on England, as well as much comic by-play. The play approaches a satiric climax when Avarice is first exposed by Verity, then judged and condemned by Nemesis (that is, Queen Mary), and sent off to punishment, although it stops short of reformation. John Lyly's sophisticated comedies, written for acting by children, frequently present an ironical, if not satirical, vision. In *Campaspe* (1580-84) there is a proto-satirist figure in Diogenes, a cynic who disputes with Alexander and fellow philosophers, and at one point (IV. i) actually berates the populace. Diogenes is decorative rather than functional, but he represents an important dramatic development. More functional is the character of Will Summers in Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (1592) who is on stage for a large part of the play commenting ironically and mockingly on the action. Another play in which developments towards the creation of a fully-formed satirist figure
are evident is Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* (c. 1589-90), in which the Jew is endowed with a battery of dramatic techniques which ridicule and expose his enemies. These points indicate the appearance of characters who are used to create satirical or related effects. The existence of other conventional types of characters like the deceiving servant from New Comedy, the fool, and the vice, provided a tradition into which the satirist, when he appeared, fitted easily.

There were kinds of satirical writing before the appearance of the nineties' satire which presented fully formed satiric personae. Two such bodies of writing, the tracts of 'Martin Marprelate' and the prose pamphlets of Thomas Nashe represent interesting instances of the exploitation of personality in satire. Martin Marprelate as a satiric persona is multifarious, supple, and variable. The key to his character is the speed and variety of the changes from one role to another. The roles are distinct and do not attempt to be coherent: for example, a clown enjoying the humour of his own remarks; a simple Anglican supporter of John Bridges; a denouncer of episcopal vice, and so on. The important thing is not that these roles fail to add up to a coherent impression of an individual; on the contrary, abrupt shifts of role, involving sudden disjunctions of tone and satiric technique, are precisely the effect which is aimed at. Martin's full enjoyment of his roles and his manipulation of them for maximum satirical effect is only possible because he does not absorb the roles into his personality; in fact, each role is an act, kept at a distance from the 'real' Martin, and the space created, as it were, allows the reader to appreciate the roles and the satirising. Martin announces his roles, tries them out, puts
them aside in rapid succession. As one critic observes, 17
the personae "are momentary and superficial masks suited to the
occasion; the author continually makes his presence felt." In this
respect Martin is quite distinct from the personae of verse satire,
whose repertory of effects is intended to give the illusion of
real personality. He does supply a model, however, for the
most complex versions of the satirist figure such as Hamlet and
Malevole.

Several features of Martin's satirical style differ from
the style of later satire: the sentences are short, paragraphs are
logically constructed and connected, the words used are simple.
It is towards the creation of an extraordinarily kaleidoscopic
satirical character that the writing energies are mainly directed.
But this multiple personality is not presented for its own sake;
it is functional, being the instrument by which Martin satirises his
religious opponents. He wins over his readers not just by the
arguments he uses or by the force of the evidence he produces, but
by the satirising effect of his roles. The satire is a triumph
of personality. Martin's roles are used as rhetorical weapons in
imagined arguments, debates, or slanging matches, and the effect of
all of them is to demean or attack Bridges or the bishops. All the
manipulations of roles are, however, secondary to the author's primary
and overriding, serious purpose of puritan propaganda. The persona
is not a raison d'etre for the tracts, as is the case with some verse
satire, but the strictly controlled instrument of a political-religious

17 R. A. Anselment, "Rhetoric and the Dramatic Satire of Martin
Marpurate", Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 10,
case. The strategy is explained in a passage from *Hay any Worke for Cooper* (1589): 18

I saw the cause of Christ's government, and of the Bishops' antichristian dealing to be hidden. The most part of men could not be gotten to read anything written in the defence of the one, and against the other. I bethought me, therefore, of a way whereby men might be drawn to do both; perceiving the humours of men in these times (especially of those that are in any place) to be given to mirth. I took that course ... Other mirth I used as a covert, wherein I would bring the truth to light ... My purpose was, and is, to do good.

Martin exploits the possibilities of personality for satirical purposes and also has puritan ideals in mind as the basis of his satire. Nashe represents one step nearer the verse satirists in that, like Martin, he exploits personality, but unlike him he makes appeal to no coherent morality. Even in *Pierce Penilesse His Supplication to the Divell* (1592), which appears to be complaint with its framework of the Seven Deadly Sins, there is no morality visible except residual conservatism, and, as one critic has pointed out, 19 "Nashe's method is that of a comedian rather than a moralist; an entertainer rather a preacher". There is one major difference between Nashe's persona in, for example, *Pierce Penilesse* or *Have With You*, and the personae of verse satire: Nashe's persona is detached from what he is describing, the personae of verse satire are usually deeply involved in what they describe.

Nashe appeals only intermittently to outside morality; the writers of verse satire make appeal to no established morality. A satirist persona rails against moral deformities, or anything which

---


strikes him as reprehensible, and the appeal is to the moral sense of the satirist himself. A morality existing outside the poem itself, as in complaint, provides a set of ideals to which the speaker can appeal for justification for his speaking at all, and a means whereby he can judge what he is criticising. Without an extrinsic morality, verse satire depends entirely on the character of the speaker for its sense of moral values. This works satisfactorily in verse, but when satirist figures are transferred into drama problems of morality are raised which work to undermine the satirist's declared position. Verse satire holds the satirist fixed in its form and fiction: that is to say, the satirist reacting to what passes before his eyes in the street, or before his eyes in imagination, but being able to do nothing about it. The fixity and helplessness of that position are conventions of the form. Released from these restrictions in drama, set loose to put into effect the reform he says he wants, then problems are created of authority, and motive, and satirical method.

The argument of this thesis is based upon an extension of two critical assumptions. The first is the argument put forward in O. J. Campbell's *Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida"* (San Marino, California, 1938), that there is a continuity of style between satire of the 1590's and drama in the early years of the seventeenth century. Campbell discusses satire as a well-defined literary form, and seeks to establish continuity of formal features between one and the other. The argument here, however, is concerned mainly with the character and function of
the satirist figure in the overall fictions of verse satire and drama. The second critical assumption is established in A. Kernan's book *The Cankered Muse, Satire of the English Renaissance* (New Haven, 1959), namely that satire is a distinct artistic genre with a number of marked characteristics, one of the most important in late Renaissance satire being the nature of the satirist figure. This study goes on to examine in some detail the use and development of satirist figures in the drama of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Marston up to about 1615. In particular, it examines the dramatic opportunities which satirists afford, and the dramatic problems which they create; how these problems are analysed, exploited, or resolved; how satirists are integrated into larger satirical structures, called here 'dramatic satires'; and how satirists, after about 1605, develop into other kinds of characters, or are subordinated to other uses, or how their characteristics appear intermittently in plays not primarily satirical.

Shakespeare was chosen for study because so many of his plays contain satirical material, and actual satirist figures; and because after employing satire and satirists in different kinds of plays for extremely subtle and complex effects, the issues raised by satire and the satirist figure are confronted directly in *Timon of Athens*, where the logic of the satirist's proclaimed position is extended to its end point. Jonson was chosen because in his early plays there are attempts to present a valid satirist figure, and a credible dramatisation of the satirical process; and at the same time there is a continuing intellectual analysis of the fiction of the satirist, and of how a satirist can operate effectively in a social context. Marston was chosen because in *The Scourge of
YiHanie there is the most extreme version of the nineties' satirist persona, and in his plays there are several satirist figures and much satirical material derived from this persona.

Chapter two shows how Marston takes the required elements for his satirist personae and develops them to an extreme point at which they become incoherent and apparently out of control. Marston employs satirist figures in his plays before *The Malcontent*, discussed in Chapter three, in a way which suggests that he is aware of the contradictions surrounding them, yet ignores these contradictions or carelessly exploits them as just one more incoherence in play-worlds which are radically incoherent. In *What You Will* he invents another kind of critic character, a sophisticated libertine, who criticises the existing satirist type. In *The Malcontent* he finds a strategy for exploiting and controlling his style of satirist. In the plays after *The Malcontent*, discussed in Chapter seven, Marston develops satirist figures who have characteristics better suited to effect reformation, and who use the lessons of experience rather than railing to produce reformations.

Chapter four discusses how Jonson attempts to create moral justification and authority for satirist figures in his plays before *Volpone*; that is, how he takes the fiction of the persona of the satirist at face value and tries to validate it in drama. In the "comical satyres" he experiments to find a way of dramatising a satirist who has authority, who can detect and expose vice, make the vicious accept their guilt, and effectively neutralise them or reform them to good. He analyses the problems of the satirical process in most detail in *Cynthia's Revels*, at the same time as
trying to dramatise a valid version of it. Jonson's solutions in the "comical satyres" are shown to be unsatisfactory because the satirists cannot sustain the contradictions generated by their aspirations and actions. The question of authority for satirical actions becomes an acute one for Jonson, and his analysis ends unsatisfactorily in the 'Apologetical Dialogue' appended to Poetaster. Jonson does not satisfactorily solve these problems until in Sejanus he puts the satirist figure back into a position of helplessness like that of the persona of verse satire, restoring the satirist, as it were, to the fiction from which he emerged.

Chapter eight discusses Jonson's plays after Volpone and shows how in those plays the type of satirist figure derived from verse satire is gradually replaced by a new type of character who is intelligent, witty and a moral realist rather than idealist. The chapter shows that a new type of critic arises along with new conceptions of authority and judgement in the plays as a whole.

Chapter five discusses satirist and related figures in Shakespeare's plays up to and including Hamlet. The first satirist proper is admitted into As You Like It, and the critical treatment of him there indicates that Shakespeare is aware from the start of the moral and personal inconsistencies in the satirist's position; that is, he does not accept the satirist's own account of himself. In most of his plays where satirists appear they are implicitly or explicitly criticised. The discussion in Hamlet shows how the contradictions and inconsistencies of the satirist's position are exploited, without yet having been resolved, and made an essential part of the hero's dilemma, turning what may be a dramatic problem for the author wishing to present a valid
satirist figure into a problem for the hero wishing to act truthfully and consistently. Chapter nine discusses Shakespeare's plays after *Troilus and Cressida* and shows how in *Timon of Athens* the problems raised by satire and the satirist are made the central concern of the play and explored fully to their end point, demonstrating the possibilities and limitations of the satirical outlook.

In the work of each dramatist there are certain plays in which the emotions and attitudes of satire are pervasive. In these plays, experiments in dramatising satirists helped to provide a stock of satirical techniques, language, and attitudes which contributed to the creation of drama which is totally styled and structured as satirical. They are described here as 'dramatic satires' (and three are discussed in Chapter six). They are Jonson's *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* and *Timon of Athens*, and Marston's *The Malcontent*. Surprisingly however, satirist figures in these plays play a relatively unimportant part. The satire has been redirected out of this specific kind of character and into other parts of the plays. These plays are notable too for the level of generality they achieve in their satirical attack and satirical vision. At its lowest level of generalisation satire directs amusement and contempt at persons; on a higher level at social types; on a higher level still at human nature as a whole; and at its highest level at the values or systems of values on which life is founded. Satire at this highest level is made possible in the 'dramatic satires' because satirist figures in these plays form part of larger-scale satirical structures. It can be expressed another way: that the controller of the satirical structure is the author, not the satirist; that the
controlling fiction exists at the author's level above the play, rather than the satirist's inside it; and that the satirist is under the control of the author as part of his total fiction. The three 'dramatic satires' are examined in order to discover the workings of their satirical strategies and techniques, and also to find what general features they have in common.

The arrangement of the material, except in the chapter which discusses 'dramatic satire', is chronological because the use of the satirist figure by each dramatist, especially in certain periods, forms a continuous exploration and argument.
The rejection by Donne, Hall, Marston, and other writers of verse satire in the 1590's of the accepted styles and tones of contemporary poetry reflects a shift in sensibility which occurred in that decade. "Preliminary to all else is their rejection of the literary past" which included "the Petrarchan love tradition, the tradition of sonnet and romance, and sweet musical poetry these traditions had nourished". ¹ These poets were extremely conscious that they were breaking with the English literary past, and because that involved changes in subject matter and style, part of their new subject matter was the nature of satirical poetry itself. This partially accounts for the inward-looking nature of verse satire, and the real or factitious conflicts among writers as to the most correct satiric style. Self-consciousness was intensified by the fact that in their imitation of Horace, Juvenal, and Persius, Elizabethan satirists strove to recreate the tones, attitudes, and moral responses of these poets. They perceived the character of the satirist as one element of classical satire which they had to

imitate in order to achieve similar poetic effects. There existed therefore in verse satire, especially in Hall's and Marston's, two separate and to some extent incompatible influences which led to the development of the figure of the satirist: on the one hand the poet's concern to justify his break with literary tradition; on the other his attempt to recreate the classical satirist's character. These aims operate contradictorily insofar as the former refers to reality, and the latter refers to a fiction.

The genre of verse satire itself emphasises the voice of the satirist - everything is made visible through the satirist, and his reactions determine those of the reader. It is not surprising then if Donne, Hall, and Marston become interested in the fictional satirist himself. Indeed in some verse satire and drama the response of a satirist figure to evils and follies is given more weight than the evils and follies themselves.

In verse satire one might expect the relations between the poet, the satirist persona, and the scene to be reasonably clear - a fictional satirist describes follies or evils and presents his reactions to them. However, the tendency in all writers of verse satire to exploit aspects of their own personality in creating their satirist-persona makes it difficult to maintain consistently the strict distinction between satirist-persona and poet. The distinction is clearest in drama where playwright and satirist figure are unambiguously separate. This allows an objective presentation of the satirist. It also introduces complications such as the social or personal relationships of the satirist, and

---

2 A. B. Kernan's terms are employed here in discussing verse satire: scene; satirist; satiric plot. A. B. Kernan, The Cankered Muse, New Haven, 1959, chap. i, 'A Theory of Satire'.

the reformation of the fools or villains, and these will be
explored in later chapters. In this chapter I shall examine the
nature and development of various satiric personae.

Donne - *Satyres* (1593-98)

The *Satyres* written between 1593 and 1598 and circulated
privately in manuscript, are strikingly original in form,
content, and tone and nothing in earlier English poetry prepares us
for them: "here for the first time in English is a sustained
'imitation' of a Latin genre, the consistent adoption of the
techniques and tones of Roman satire". The elements of style
which are imitated are an uncompromising realism and terse
vigour; an urban setting; a dark, harsh style of writing;
conversational directness and ironic allusiveness; humour and scorn;
and the blending of moral reflection, narrative, and direct
denunciation.

Donne's *Satyres* are unique in their great poetic power,
but they adumbrate the development of English satire in their
setting and subjects, and in the stress which falls on the
singular personality of the satirist-persona. Because of their
uniqueness however, and because they were circulated privately,
their influence on other writers of satire is hard to assess.
They have a coherence which comes from the use of a theme or simple

---


5 Ibid.
narrative for each poem, in contrast to Hall's and Marston's satires which have only an intermittent or spurious coherence. Donne's satires also give the impression of a coherent personality as their speaker, whereas Hall's satirist-persona is indistinct or unformed, and Marston's contradictory.

The setting is contemporary London and the things satirised come from city life: social parasite, lawyers, religion, the Court, and the law-courts. The background of everyday life is suggested by many details - "a velvet Justice with a long / Great traine of blew coats, twelve, or fourteen strong" (Sat. I, 21-22); the reference to the man at Westminster "that keepes the Abbey tombes, / And for his price doth with who ever comes, / Of all our Harries, and our Edwards talke" (Sat. IV, 75-77).

The wide range of subjects sets Donne apart from his immediate successors in satire. In Satire I, a walk in the street with a wearisome companion, the action is presented in dramatic fashion, largely through direct speech:

Now leaps he upright, Joggs me, & cryes, Do you see Yonder well favoured youth? Which? Oh, 'tis hee That dances so divinely; Oh, said I, Stand still, must you dance here for company? Hee droopt, wee went, till one (which did excell Th'Indians, in drinking his Tobacco well) Met us; they talk'd; I whispered, let'us goe, 'T may be you smell him not, truely I doe

(Sat. I, 83-90).

6 Donne's satires were not written as a whole, unlike Hall's and Marston's and so it is inaccurate to discuss 'the persona', implying that Donne had such a creation in mind from the start. However there is sufficient continuity and coherence among the personae to justify the shorthand designation.

The tone derives from the model, Horace Satires, I, ix - sophisticated and ironical - and the companion is judged not by a system of morals such as Christianity, but is set against an implied code of intelligent, sensitive social behaviour which is embodied in the speaker of the satire. The reader's response to the fop is therefore largely determined by the character of the satirist. The speaker also states explicit ethical standards -

Why should'st thou (that dost not onely approve,
But in ranke itchie lust, desire, and love
The nakednesse and barenesse to enjoy,
Of thy plume muddy whore, or prostitute boy)
Hate vertue, though shee be naked, and bare

(Sat. I, 37-41) -

and goes on to declare "Mans first blest state was naked, when by sinne / Hee lost that" (Sat. I, 45-46), but the important measure of judgement is the character of the speaker himself. The other satires are closer to Juvenal's severity of tone as befits the more serious subjects and the closer involvement of the speaker in what he discusses. The opening of Satyre III demonstrates this, the pressure of feeling being reflected in concentrated phrasing and syntax:

Kinde pitty chokes my spleene; brave scorn forbids
Those teares to issue which swell my eye-lids;
I must not laugh, nor weepe sinnes, and be wise,
Can railing then cure these worene maladies?
Is not our Mistresse faire Religion,
As worthy of all our Soules devotion,
As vertue was to the first blinded age

(Sat. III, 1-7).

Satyre III is the most serious of the five, dealing with the speaker's search for the true religion. Although the poem, like Complaint, takes as its subject the true religious life, it is fundamentally distinct from the Complaint tradition by its absence of certainty on the subject - indeed the uncertainty is
the poem's real subject. Complaint represents a protest at behaviour violating ideals of conduct derived from Christian morality. Donne's *Satyre* III on the other hand takes the absence of an accepted moral framework as the starting point for demonstration of a mind grappling with a problem central to its existence. It shows satire treating important intellectual problems in a serious critical spirit, and this is one line of development that can be seen in drama, most notably in *Hamlet* and *Troilus and Cressida*, and Jonson's political tragedies. The standard by which the satirist-persona attempts to evaluate the different kinds of religions is a personal one - he has to depend on his own understanding and judgement:

> To adore, or scorne an image, or protest,  
> May all be bad; doubt wisely; in strange way  
> To stand inquiring right, is not to stray;  
> To sleepe, or runne wrong, is. On a huge hill,  
> Cragged, and steep, Truth stands, and hee that will  
> Reach her, about must, and about must goe;  
> And what the hills suddennes resists, winne so;  
> Yet strive so, that before age, deaths twilight,  
> Thy Soule rest, for none can worke in that night.  
> To will, implyes delay, therefore now doe:  
> Hard deeds, the bodies paines; hard knowledge too  
> The mindes indeavours reach, and mysteries  
> Are like the Sunne, dazling, yet plaine to all eyes.  
> Keepe the truth which thou hast found

(Sat. III, 76-89).

Donne's satires show the response of a sensitive, intelligent, lively character to a variety of experience. Their value and originality lies in the depiction of the satirist-

---

8 W. Milgate ed., *Satires*, attributes the comparative failure of *Satyre* V to the fact that "The tones of homily and complaint are too often heard to permit the achievement of a forceful and cumulative satiric effect", p. 165.
persona's response, not the ills he responds to, and this response is distinct from the urge to reform. That is left to the clergy:

Preachers which are
Seas of Wit and Arts, you can, then dare,
Drowne the sinnes of this place, for, for mee
Which am but a scarce brooke, it enough shall bee
To wash the staines away

(Sat. IV, 237-41).

Hall - Virgidemiae (1597, 1598)

The first three books of Hall's Virgidemiae were published in 1597 and the second three in 1598, and their importance in the development of satire lies in the fact that "the true Juvenalian mode of satire was being attempted for the first time". 9 Hall's imitations of the classical style are less successful than Donne's, but their publication made them more influential on other writers of satire. The features of satiric style established by Hall are repeated (with variations) by all other writers of verse satire.

Hall's consciousness of striking out in a new direction is suggested by his rejection in the first two satires of older conventions as "those shamelesse lies, / Mask'd in the shew of meal-mouth'd Poesies" (Lib. I; 'Prologue', 17-18). Sonneteering is scorned by contrasting its conventions with what he takes as harsh reality:

9 The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall, ed. A. Davenport, Liverpool, 1949, (from which all quotations are taken) p. xxv.
Be shee all sootie-blacke, or bery-browne,
Shees white as morrows milk, or flaks new blowne.
And tho she be some dunghill drudge at home,
Yet can he her resigne some refuse room
Amids the well-knowne stars

(Lib. I; VII, 21-25).

Hall is acutely conscious of the conventions of writing satire on classical models, and one of these concerns the speaker of the satires. Hall gives the satirist a distinctly rustic flavour; the persona is described as being similar to the woodland satyr:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The ruder Satyre should goe rag'd and bare;} \\
\text{And show his rougher and his hairy hide;} \\
\text{Tho mine be smooth, and deckt in carelesse pride}
\end{align*}
\]

('His Defiance to Emuie', 76-78).

Prompted by the corrupting effects of vice he adopts an aggressive, high-principled stance and hopes that his satirising will expose vice:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Goe daring Muse on with thy tanklessse taske,} \\
\text{And do the vgly face of vice vnamaske}
\end{align*}
\]

(Lib. I; 'Prologue', 19-20).

The first three books "Of Tooth-lesse Satyrs" present an unconvincing picture of social decline. The objects of its attack cover only a narrow range: Liber I covers poets of the theatre (Sat. III), emulators of classical metre (Sat. VI), and love poets (Sat. VII); and Liber II describes the sorry lot of doctors, clergy, lawyers, scholars, a tutor to a squire's son, astrologers, in circumstances which foreshadow the unhappy careers of the students of The Return of Parnassus. The standard by which present times are judged is however the authentically Juvenalian one of the Golden Age -

10 For Juvenal's version of this ideal see Satires, VI, 1-25. Davenport points out that Juvenal may have suggested the writing of a satire on the Golden Age and set the tone, but the picture of it is derived mainly from the descriptions in Seneca's Hippolytus and Octavia; The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall, pp. 183-184 notes.
Time was, and that was term'd the time of Gold,
When world & time were yong, that now are old.
(When quiet Saturne swaid the mace of lead,
And Pride was yet vnborne, and yet vnbred

(Lib. III; I, 1-4)

That is spoiled by man's corrupting desire for wealth:

And base desire bad men to deluen low,
For needesse mettals: then gan mischiefe grow,
Then farewell fayrest age, the worlds best daies,
Thriuing in ill, as it in age decaies

(Lib. III; I, 38-41).

This notion is vague enough to serve as a moral ideal and to
modivate the speaker's regret and indignation, which sometimes take
odd turns - "Thy Grandsires sauord of thrifie Leekes, / Or manly
Garlicke: But thy fornace reekes / Hote steams of wine" (Lib. III;
I, 58-60). 11

Hall seems to express others' dissatisfaction that his work
does not present a convincing English version of classical formal
satire:

Some say my Satyres ouer-loosely flow,
Nor hide their gall inough from open show:
Not ridle-like obscuring their intent:
But packe-staffe plaine vtrring what thing they ment:
Contrarie to the Roman ancients,
Whose wordes were short, & darkesome was their sence

(Lib. III; 'Prologue', 1-6);

He declares his intention of writing henceforth in a more crabbed
style and with greater violence (Lib. III; 'The Conclusion of all',
3-6). He attempts this in the 'Byting Satyres' by intensifying
the character of the satirist-persona, and by introducing some
obscurity.

11 Davenport notes that Hall's Stoic tendencies led him to prefer
a version of the Golden Age that was"'hard', physically harsh,
but morally pure", p.184n.
In the second collection the persona is made more self-conscious and assigned the beginnings of perverse characteristics which were to be taken up and developed by Marston. The sins which are attacked are presented vividly - an adulteress, for example: 12

The close adultresse, where her name is red
Coms crauling from her husbands lukewarme bed,
Her carrion skin bedaub'd with odours sweete,
Groping the postern with her bared feet

(Lib. IV; I, 144-147);

and the folly of a lustful old man:

He thaw's like Chauers frostie Ianuere
And sets a months minde vpon smiling May.
And dyes his beard that did his age bewray;
Byting on Annis-seede, and Rose-marine,
Which might the Fume of his rot lungs refine

(Lib. IV; IV, 115-119).

The satirist's stance is aggressive -

Go to then ye my sacred Semones,
And please me more, the more ye do displease

(Lib. IV; I, 80-81) -

and his function, he declares, is combative -

The Satyre should be like the Porcupine,
That shoots sharpe quils out in each angry line,
And wounds the blushing cheeke, and fiery eye,
Of him that heares, and readeth guiltily

(Lib. V; III, 1-4).

Hall's awareness of the unfamiliarity for his audience of the genre prompts him to explain and justify its style and purpose, as Jonson was to do with 'comical satyre'. In 'A Post-script to the Reader' he specifies what he expects his audience to find unusual:

12 This passage imitates Juvenal, Satires, VI, 116ff.
It is not for every one to relish a true and natural Satyre, being of it selfe besides the native and in-bred bitterness and tartnes of particular, both hard of conceipt, and harsh of stile, and therefore cannot but be vnpleasing both to the vnskillfull, and ouer Musicall eare ... so that I well foresee in the timely publication of these my concealed Satyres, I am set vpon the racke of many mercilesse and peremptorie censures

(A Post-script to the Reader', 1-8).

The satirist persona bemoans the fact that generally
"... men or know, or like not their estate" (Lib. IV; VI, 2) and
"No one but holds his native state forlorn" (Lib. IV; VI, 4). This is a conventional response to social change of any kind and reflects one of Juvenal's most persistent and deeply-felt themes. The past to which the speaker refers, however, is English in its social relations and details of life. The ideal of generous, free-hearted aristocracy and faithful, compliant peasantry emerges in the descriptions of the sadly declined present -

Will one from Scots-banke bid but one grote more,
My old Tenant may be turned out of doore,
Tho much he spent in th' rotten roofes repayre,
In hope to have it left vnto his heyre;
Tho many a loade of Marie and Manure led,
Reuiu'd his barren leas, that earst lay dead

(Lib. V; I, 101-106) -

and the picture of a tenant attempting to win his landlord's favour with "crammed Capons euery New-yeares morne, / Or with greene-cheeses when his sheep are shorne" (Lib. V; I, 75-76). The links with Complaint in such passages are strong both in the reference to a set of idealised social relationships which measure the rottenness of the present, and in the immediacy of the rustic setting. The appeal to older country values is derived from native English traditions in satire and takes Hall a long way from the exclusively city setting of Juvenal. One critic asserts that "in following ancient satirists Hall led himself away from what should have been his
proper mode, the bucolic", 13 and another notes that Hall "wants his satires to be simultaneously lowly, and hairy, and Juvenalian; and as a result is continually having to admit failure", 14 and even Hall himself realised that he had failed to capture the authentic Roman mode:

...concerning the manner, where is perhaps too much stouping to the lowe reach of the vulgar, I shalbe thought not to haue any whit kindly raught my ancient Roman predecessors, whom in the want of more late and familiar presidents I am constrained thus farre of to imitate

('A Post-script to the Reader', 52-56).

Marston - The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image and Certaine Satyres (1598)

Marston's first collection of poems, published in May 1598, attempted to exploit two late Elizabethan literary fashions - the erotic epyllion and the verse satire. 15 The satires display more clearly than any earlier ones the conscious imitation of Juvenalian models, and the element in this imitation which is stressed is the personality of the speaker of the poems. Although compared to the speaker of The Scourge of Villanie (1599) that of Certaine Satyres seems mild, he does represent nevertheless the first important example of those features of a satirist which Marston considered important, and which were to influence the satirist figure in drama.


15 Marston's later claim that The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image was intended as a parody of the genre (SV; VI) is supported by K. G.W. Cross, "Marston's Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image: A Mock-Epyllion", Etudes Anglais, 13, 1960, 331-36, and A. Caputi, John Marston, Satirist, p. Cf. M. S. Allen, The Satire of John Marston, Columbus, Ohio, 1920: "No one reading the poem would for a moment suspect that it was meant as satire or contained any hidden meaning at all", p. 89.
The nature of the persona which Marston adopts for *Certaine Satyres* is summed up in the pseudonym 'Epictetus', the Stoic philosopher, who sees men's follies and evils but preserves his own peace of mind. His reaction to folly is laughter, as in this passage describing the amorist Lucian:

> Then with a melting looke he writhes his head
> And straight in passion riseth in his bed;
> And hauing kist his hand, stroke vp his haire,
> Made a French conge, cryes. *O cruell feare*
> To the antique Bed-post. I laught a maine
> That down my cheeks the mirthful drops did raine

*(CS; III, 67-72).*

This persona combines an attitude of stern reproof with a sense of the ridiculousness of the follies he sees. With heavy irony he describes the age:

> O then thrice holly age, thrice sacred men!
> Mong whom no vice a Satyre can discerne,
> Since Lust, is turned into *Chastitie,*
> And Riot, vnto sad *Sobrietie*

*(CS; V, 155-58).*

On one level Marston uses the persona to document and castigate the follies of the time; on another, however, it is a disingenuous guise to launch attacks on Joseph Hall and his *Virgidemiae.*

Satyre IV, 'Reactio', accuses Hall of uncovering sins which are best left alone -

> Cannot some lewd, immodest beastliness
> Lurke, and lie hid in iust forgetfulness,
> But *Grillus* subtile-smelling swinish snout
> Must sent, and grunt, and needes will finde it out

*(CS, IV, 29-32)*

---


17 For an account of this literary quarrel and its ramifications see A. Davenport, "The Quarrel of the Satirists", *MLR*, 37, 1942, 123-30; and the Introductions to A. Davenport's editions of Hall's and Marston's poems.
of being over-critical and extreme in his satire, and of employing
an uninspired, academic style. Hall is advised to cease raging -

Striue not to soile the freshest hewes on earth
With thy malitious and vpraiding breath

(CS; IV, 161-62) -

and in anticipation of this change is offered the hand of
friendship. This must have been galling to Hall, and it does
demonstrate that Marston at least had no qualms about literary and
personal insults despite protestations about attacking the vice
and ignoring the individual. The poems' effects are confused by
combining impersonal attacks on vice with personal insults, but this
confusion is ignored by Marston. The persona of quick-eyed,
sharp-tongued satirist has no connection with the speaker
(Marston) who attacks Joseph Hall. Where the fiction of the
satirist is maintained we can see the beginnings of the more
complex creation which appears in The Scourge of Villanie.

Marston - The Scourge of Villanie (1598)

In The Scourge Marston attempts to write satire in the
authentic Juvenalian manner, 18 emphasising the obscurity of
style and moral indignation of his model. The difference in tone
from the earlier book can be seen in two contrasting passages
describing the braggart soldier Tubrio. In Certaine Satyres the
speaker describes Tubrio's lust, cowardice and extravagance, but
laughs at him:

--

18 A. Stein, "The Second English Satirist", MLR, 38, 1943,
273-278, examines the Hall-Marston conflict, and concludes that
it was probably of Marston's invention; he also argues that
Marston's literary debt to Hall was substantial and
included the elements of his Juvenalian manner.
Oh hold my sides, that I may breake my spleene,  
With laughter at the shadowes I haue seene

(CG; I, 123-124).

The description of Tubrio in The Scourge is quite different - the scorn is intense, and instead of laughing at his harmless stupidity, the speaker condemns him as a lustful degenerate who has lost the spark which made him human:

That Westphalian gamon Cloue-stuck face?  
Why, he is nought but huge blaspheming othes,  
Swart snowt, big lookes, mishapen Swizers clothes,  
Weake meager lust hath now consumed quite,  
And wasted cleane away his martiall spright,  
Infeebling ryot, all vices confluence,  
Hath eaten out that sacred influence  
With make him man

(SV; VII, 115-122).

Marston's energies in The Scourge are directed almost exclusively into the satirist-persona, not the scene which he describes. The persona is the most extreme version of the character of the satirist in verse or drama. The satires present a composite image of an angry, high-minded satirist in whom there are the seeds of many later developments and expansions of the character. The primary quality of 'W. Kingsayer' is an intense self-consciousness, and he is well-suited to declare the aims, methods, and reactions of a satirist. It makes The Scourge much more complicated than other verse satire, and it is likely that Marston deliberately made Kingsayer inconsistent and confused in order to alienate the reader from his words. 19 Certainly the corrective function of satire was abandoned: "That he was inspired by any very serious desire of promoting reform ... it is

19 See J. Peter, Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature, Oxford, 1956, p. 174: "If we come to [Marston's] satires (as I think we come to most reprobative literature) with the expectation of coherence and consistency it is only to be flabbergasted by the wildness of his uncertainties and contradictions".
difficult to believe". Marston's apparent indifference to the
effect on the reader of his persona and of the general poetic
style is a game of his own played against the reader. Kinsayerd's
self-consciousness is complicated by the fact that Marston adds a
further layer - consciousness of the artifact of the poem itself.
This foreshadows some satirist figures in drama - Hamlet, Malevole,
Mosca - who are conscious of the role they have to play. But
in The Scourge the effect is confusing. The dichotomy of writer
and persona virtually disappears in the seemingly endless
complication, and this is Marston's intention.

Kinsayerd is monstrously and openly egotistical:

To his most esteemed, and best
beloued Selfe,
DAT DEDICATQUE
(SV; 'Dedication');

and no criticism can affect his opinion of himself:

Spight of despight, and rancors villanie,
I am my selfe, so is my poesie

(SV; 'To Detraction I present my Poesie', 24-25).

His stance is defiant and aggressively self-sufficient,
disdaining those who will read and condemn his "darke reproofes"
(SV; 'In Lectores prorsus indignos', 79), yet at the same time
depreciating his own "scraps of poesie" (SV; 'In Lect.', 30). He
claims that his poetry is "the very Genius of the soule"

Classical Influence, (1st edition, Philadelphia, 1899) reprinted
are obviously lacking in personal conviction"; Elizabethan
(SV; 'In Lect.', 26) and that it expresses truth of a most exalted kind, addressing it to "Ye sacred spirits, Mayas eldest sonnes" 21 (SV; 'In Lect.', 83). His anger at its being exposed to the ridicule of the ignorant raises notes of defiance and scorn:

What though the sacred issue of my soule
I heare expose to Ideots controule?
What though I bare to lewd Opinion
Lay ope to vulgar prophanation
My very Genius

(SV; VI, 105-109).

In the contrast between the poet's genius and the reaction of the multitude, 'Opinion' is a key term.

Marston dedicated his first book "To the Worlds Mightie Monarch, Good Opinion" hoping that it would "Protect an Orphane Poets infancie" (MPI and CS; 'To the Worlds.', 15). In The Scourge 'opinion' is seen as the fickle, groundless judgement of the multitude, contrasting with true judgement which is guided by reason. 22 'Opinion' is one aspect of deceiving appearance which mistakes the shadow for the substance. Peter Ure describes

the special pejorative meaning which these writers attach to Opinion and how it is bound up with their Stoic and Calvinist emphasis on inward discipline and virtue, to which Opinion is an exterior ill. 23

21 Hermes, son of Maia, was the god of eloquence; see A. Davenport, The Poems of John Marston, p. 256 note.

22 Cf. Everard Guilpin's description of 'Opinion' in Skialetheia, [Shakespeare Association Facsimiles], London, 1931, Satire VI: Opinion is as various as light change,
Now speaking Court-like friendly, strait-ways strange;
She's any humours perfect parasite,
Displeas'd with her, and pleas'd with her delight,
She is the Echco of inconstancie,
Soothing her no with nay, her I with yea.

Kinsayder sees 'opinion' as the threat to true appreciation of his poetry and so aggressively rejects its verdicts - "Yet know my poesie / Doth scorne your vtmost, rank'st indignitie" (SV; VI, 109-110). In Satyre X the popularity won by Hall for his verse satires is attributed to 'opinion' in lines which show Marston's poetry at its most vigorous in images of corruption:

Shame to Opinion, that perfumes his dung,
And streweth flowers rotten bones among,
Insulging Opinion, thou inohaunting witch,
Paint not a rotten post with colours rich

(SV; X, 63-66).

Because of 'opinion' Kinsayder despairs of the effectiveness of his words -

But I forget; why sweat I out my braine,
In deepe designs, to gay boyes lewd, and vaine

(SV; IV, 167-168) -

claiming that he is writing poetry of high moral seriousness, yet finding that those whose corruption caused it to be written in the first place and to whom it is directed cannot respond to it because of their corruption. This leaves the satirist in an impasse to which he reacts by adopting an extravagantly truculent attitude. Despising them for being lewd or slaves to fashion and unable to appreciate his poetry he says that their attacks on him will only add to his honour and fame:

So you will raile, and find huge errors lurke
In euery corner of my Cynick worke.
Proface, reade on, for your extreamst dislikes
Will add a pineon, to my praises flights

(SV; 'In Lect.', 69-72).
The strange, violent, contradictory characteristics of Kinsayder have a medical or psychological origin in his melancholy. The speaker of *Certaine Satyres* was free from melancholy; in fact he satirised Bruto for affecting melancholy ravings:

> O thou corrupted age,  
> Which slight regard'st men of sound carriage,  
> Vertue, knowledge, flie to heauen againe  
> Daine not mong these vngratefull sots remaine

*(CS; II, 133-136).*

It is terms similar to Bruto's that Kinsayder adopts when he invokes melancholy to inspire his scourging:

> Thou nursing Mother of faire wisedoms lore,  
> Ingenuous Melancholy, I implore  
> Thy graue assistance, take thy gloomie seate,  
> Inthrone thee in my blood; Let me intreate  
> Stay his quicke iocond skips, and force him runne  
> A sadde pac'd course, vntill my whips be done

*(SV; 'Proemium in librum primum', 9-14).*

Kinsayder's melancholy accounts for some features of his character: his pessimism; the disgust he feels at lust; and his sudden changes of mood -

> What cold black frost congeales my nummed brain?  
> What enuious power stops a Satyres vaine?

*(SV; V, 105-106).*

At times, it appears, his outpourings are a way of easing the pangs of melancholy -

> My pate was great with child, and here tis eas'd,  
> Vexe all the world, so that thy selfe be pleas'd

*(SV; VI, 111-112).*

His melancholy seriously undercuts his claim to be a disinterested scourger of vice for it is evident that some of his virulence results from disease.

Kinsayder claims that he has been driven to satire because of "the snottery of our slimie time" *(SV; II, 71).* His
attack on it is, he claims, general and disinterested - "I hate no man, but mens impietie" (SV; II, 6) - but that claim is immediately disproved by his rage - "... who'le stay my itching fist / But I will plague and torture whom I list" (SV; II, 9-10).

This is a fundamental tension in Kinsayder - and reappears in satirists in drama including Hamlet and Feliche - the moral fervour which makes them react to corruption also drives them to violent or self-destructive responses which are morally indistinguishable from the evil at which they protest. The declared determination to attack vice goes along with the realisation that it may lead to ruin, like Juvenal's Egyptian exile:

No gloomie Juvenall,  
Though to thy fortunes I disastrous fall  
(SV; III, 195-196).

Marston's satiric persona insists that his satire is in a higher style than most:

O how on tiptoes proudly mounts my Muse,  
Stalking a loftier gate then Satyres vse.  
Me thinkes some sacred rage warmes all my vaines,  
Making my spright mount vp to higher straines  
Then wel beseems a rough-tongu'd Satyres part  
But Art curbs Nature, Nature guildeth Art

(SV; IX, 5-10)

The high style appears in passages of sustained invective and philosophical reflection which are an important feature of the book's style. In Satyre VIII, for example, the effects on the soul of abandonment to sensuality are fully explained. Kinsayder believes that the rational faculty in men has been damaged by lust:
Lust hath confounded all,
The bright glosse of our intellectuall
Is fouly soyl'd

(SV; VIII, 165-167).

The soul's function of guiding action according to the rules of reason has been usurped by baser drives:

But now affection, will, concupiscence,
Haue got o're Reason chiefe preheminence

(SV; VIII, 177-178).

The rational soul has been driven out of the body by the body's abandonment to sensual gratification, and its "dungie, brutish, sensuall will" (SV; VIII, 188). This is presented as a paradigmatic incident:

Now here-vpon our Intellectuall,
Compact of fire all celestiall,
Invisible, immortall, and diuine,
Grewe straight to scorne his Land-lordes muddy slime.
And therefore now is closely slunke away
(Leauing his smoakie house of mortall clay)...
His parts diuine, sacred, spirituall
Attending on him, leauing the sensuall
Base hangers on, lusking at home in slime,
Such as wont to stop port Esqueline

(SV; VIII, 189-200).

This is the explanation offered by Kinsayder for the scenes of incontinence, hypocrisy and immorality around him. The theological analysis supports his claim for the high seriousness of his satire. Kinsayder's attempt to offer an intellectual analysis of vice's causes set a precedent for later satirical writing and encouraged dramatists to aspire to the philosophical level in their attacks.

In Satyre IV Kinsayder rejects the idea which should be most helpful to a satirist that a man can become virtuous by the deliberate practice of good actions:
I smile at thee, and at the Stagerite,  
Who holds the liking of the appetite,  
Beeing fedde with actions often put in vre  
Hatcheth the soule, in qualitie impure,  
Or pure

(SV; IV, 99-104).

He takes a more severe view:

Sure Grace is infus'd  
By divine favour, not by actions vs'd.  
Which is as permanent as heauens blisse  
To them that have it, then no habite is

(SV; IV, 117-120).

He denies that behaviour can determine the state of a man's soul. Man depends on God's grace for that, and that flows or not by divine will which is outside human influence. Man is therefore stripped of the power to control the state of his soul; and, as a consequence, of his independent moral status. Man suffers a drastic loss of responsibility for his moral state because he can do nothing which will alter it. All man can do is humbly pray for a share of that soul-saving grace, which is just what Kinsayder advises:

To day, to day, implore obsequiously,  
Trust not to morrowes will, least utterly  
Yee be attach'd with sad confusion,  
In your Grace-tempting lewd presumption

(SV; IV, 163-166).

This grim Calvinism contradicts orthodox views of the soul, but more importantly it contradicts one of the satirist's stated justifications, that of reforming the fools and villains he scourges, which implies a belief that they can recognise the evil of their ways through reason and can set themselves on a right path through free will. If men have lost their reason because of sin, and the only hope for their reform comes through the operation of God's grace, then the satirist's activity is useless. A
Calvinist belief in grace as the sole means of human reform runs completely counter to Kinsayder's activity as a satirist. He becomes therefore merely an impotent voice raging at human folly.

Kinsayder finds it hard to accept that body and soul should have to cohabit:

That in the bodies scumme all fatally
Intombes the soules most sacred faculty

(SV; VI, 21-22)

Loving the soul, he hates the body; and he protests that the boundless power of the soul should be subject to the body's control. The form which the body's tyranny takes is lust, which can destroy the soul. Tubrio's soul, for example, has been worn away by whoring, drinking and swearing, though he retains an ingenuity for devising novel debauches:

Infeebling ryot, all vices confluence,
Hath eaten out that sacred influence
Which made him man.
That divine part is soak'd away in sinne,
In sensuall lust, and midnight bezeling.
Ranke invndation of luxuriousnes,
Haue tainted him with such grosse beastlines,
That now the seate of that celestiall essence
Is all possest with Naples pestilence

(SV; VII, 120-128).

The Scourge of Villanie contains many words and images which imply a division between body and soul, and the insistence throughout on the opposition of matter and essence reflects Marston's persistent mode of thought. Davenport notes that a "person composed of mere matter without informing soul" is "a completely Marstonian idea". 24 The opposite of this, the wholly spiritual, also plays an important part in the poem.

The poem reaches a climax in the vision of the Universal Soul:

That soules of men, from that great soule ensue,
And of his essence doe participate
As't were by pypes, when so degenerate,
So aduerse is our natures motion,
To his immaculate condition:
That such foule filth, from such faire puritie,
Such sensuall acts from such a Deitie,
Can nere proceed

(SV; VII, 189-195).

The relationship of body and soul is presented in a strikingly mechanistic image. With intense sincerity on Kinsayder's part and irony on Marston's, the working of these pipes is detailed:

But if that dreame were so,
Then sure the slime that from our soules doe flow,
Haue stop't those pipes by which it was conui'd,
And now [we are] no humane creatures, once disrai'd
Of that fayre iem

(SV; VII, 196-200).

This passage achieves a bizarre originality in its treatment of the ideas of body and soul. Its tone of "serious iest, and iesting seriousness" (SV; 'Proemium in librum tertium', 1) depends upon the fundamental idea that spirit and matter are incompatible.

'Satyra Nova', added to the second edition of 1599 and addressed to Marston's friend Everard Guilpin, strikes a more subdued, personal note from the other poems. The mask of raging satyr is dropped, and Marston seems to speak in his own voice:

From a sickly bed,
And from a moodie minde distempered,
I vomit foorth my loue, now turn'd to hate,
Scorning the honour of a Poets state

(SV; X, 74-76).
He claims to be exhausted having spent his energy in writing poetry, and complains that he has wasted his time "Playing the rough part of a Satyrist" (SV; X, 14). This is not Kinsayder, but it may be another mask adopted by Marston to tease his audience further. He claims to be disgusted with the reception of his poetry, and takes the chance of attacking Joseph Hall again, this time for having attached a ridiculing epigram to copies of Pygmalion which reached Cambridge. In fact Marston is quick to attack actual people. Under the thin disguises of Curio and Phrigio, Sir John Davies and Thomas Lodge are satirised. Personal satire is a feature of almost all satire of the period involving real or invented quarrels, often literary, and has no connection with the fiction of the satirist as he appears in the poems. It does serve to point up however the confusion which could exist between the fictional satirist and the author. The declared intention of the fictional satirist is "vnder fained priuate names, to note generall vices" (SV; 'To him that hath perused me', 9), and this may be contradicted within the fiction by his itching to torment fools for his own satisfaction. The author's literary snipings are a separate matter.

25 See The Poems of John Marston, ed. A. Davenport, p. 101, "An Epigram which the Author Virgidemiarum, caused to be pasted to the latter page of every Pygmalion, that came to the Stationers of Cambridge" -
   I Ask't Phisitions what their counsell was
   For a mad dogge, or for a mankind Asse?
   They told me though there were confections store
   Of Poppie-seede, and soueraigne Hellebore,
   The dog was best cured by cutting and kinsing,
   The Asse must be kindly whipped for winsing.

26 For references to Davies see SV; XI, 15-36; VIII, 1-6; and Lodge see SV; VIII, 122-125; and Davenport, Poems, notes passim.
It does raise the question - How like Kinsayder was Marston?

"Marston is evidently a malcontent himself" 27 writes one critic, and G. B. Harrison concurs, commenting that "there is every indication that Marston was morbidly sincere and perhaps even an idealist". 28 More recent criticism has introduced the idea of the speaker of formal satire embodying certain conventions of the genre and so has ceased to shake its head over Marston's parlous state of mind. The relationship of persona to author is accurately described by Antony Caputi as a "cartoonlike extension of Marston the man". 29 Marston certainly found the pose congenial but his interest in writing was as much in producing a piece of literary self-advertisement as in expressing moral indignation at the depravity of the times. It is designed to appeal to the clever young men of the Inns of Court who could no doubt appreciate his poetry for its philosophy as much as for its obscenity and harsh wit. Combining descriptions of sexual depravity with Calvinist theories of grace did produce a daring extension of the *genre* formal satire.

Marston wrote in the newest ways on subjects which were often of serious moral concern to himself and his audience. This is the formula which characterises his early plays: a wish to be entertaining; a self-conscious toying with the medium itself; a

concern with serious moral problems. The monstrous creation Kinsayder provided the stock of characteristics which appear again and again in the satirists of Marston's later plays.

The speaker of the poem is an independent, fictional creation and though there may be reflection of the author's personality in the speaker, the distinction between them is central in understanding the nature of the formal satires. The persona follows the logic (or illogic) of its own character and situation which owe more to literary convention than the personality of the author, and Marston and his audience were aware of these conventions:

I will not deny there is a seemely decorum to be observed, and a peculiar kinde of speech for a Satyres lips, which I can willinglier conceiue, then dare to prescribe; yet let me haue the substance rough, not the shadow

(SV; 'To those that seeme judicall perusers' 28-32).

The style of The Scourge follows Elizabethan notions about the style of satire and takes them to an extreme point: passages of moralising, semi-dramatic descriptions of corrupt characters and their sins, personal attacks on individuals, sudden violent changes of tone or direction, extraordinary vocabulary, harsh, irregular metre, and a satirist persona stern in speech and judgement. The persona claims a curative function for his verbally attacking fools and villains, and attempting to reform them through the persuasiveness of his words. To do this he adopts a blunt, downright approach and disregards politeness. This is conventional, but Marston exaggerated these qualities to an extreme and added the element of melancholy thereby producing a character of
extraordinary violence, hatred, and self-loathing. The distinction must be kept in mind between the stated reforming intention of the persona and the more complex aesthetic and moral concerns of the author. Kinsayder operates on a fictional level, as a first person narrator in his own world; Marston manipulates his character, providing his audience with entertainment or edification.

Summary

In Marston's verse satires the characteristics of the satirist persona, added to and developed through Donne's and Hall's satires, are presented in their most extreme forms. Marston presents two distinct responses in the satirist: in Certaine Satyres the laughter and ridicule of Epictetus; in The Scourge of Villanie the hysteria and violence of Kinsayder. The former laughs at folly and vice, enjoying it for the confirmation it gives to his low opinion of human nature; the latter angrily scorns and condemns folly and vice, seeing it as evidence of the deep corruption of humanity, and loathing himself for his inability to change it. The two attitudes - one comic and Horatian, the other tragic and Juvenalian - appear again and again through the satirist figures in drama in the first decade of the seventeenth century. A. Kernan notes that the satirist persona "after 1600 ... in printed formal satire is merely a standardised version of the figure defined by Nashe, Hall and Marston". After that date the important developments take place in drama.

Verse satire presents the voice of a satirist engaged in satirising — everything comes through the satirist, so that the reader's reactions are determined by the satirist's. In drama, however, the situation is more complex. Both the satirist and those he satirises have an independent existence and so the audience has its own perspective and can judge both sides for itself. The satirist is subject to an appraisal independent of his own view of himself. Opportunities for freer manipulation of the satirist are greatly increased, especially the possibility of ironic handling. The three levels of satirical scene, satirist, and author, implicit in verse satire, are explicit in drama. The types of characters satirised remain constant throughout Marston's verse satires and the early satiric plays; and the emphasis falls, as in the verse satires, on the reactions of the satirist. To begin with at least, the satirist in drama owes much to the prototype in verse.
Histriomastix (1598 - 99)

Probably written soon after Marston's formal satires, 1 Histriomastix is generally believed to be a reworking by Marston of an older University or Inns of Court play, 2 with fresh satirical material, including the satirist figure Chrisoganus. The structure of the play, which Chambers calls a "political morality", 3 is determined by the change from act to act of the ruling allegorical figures, beginning with Peace then changing to Plenty, Pride, Envy, War, Poverty and back to Peace, a progression almost identical to that contained in a late medieval poem: 4

Pees maketh plente,
Plente maketh pride,
Pride maketh plee,
Plee maketh povert,
Povert maketh pees.

In each act the influence of the ruling figure is exemplified in three levels of society: aristocrats and their wives, bourgeois and their wives, and workers turned players. Resemblances between passages of Histriomastix and Marston's satires are clear in matters of style and subjects of satirical attack; and Chrisoganus is very similar to the persona of The Scourge of Villainie.


2 For a general discussion of this question, and details of passages attributed to Marston see R.A.Small, The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters, Breslau, 1899, pp. 67-77; M.Allen, The Satire of John Marston, Columbus, 1920, pp. 23-30; Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, I, 382; IV, 17.

3 The Elizabethan Stage, I, 382.

Chrisoganus is a scholar, entrusted by Peace to teach the nobles "of every Art the misterie" (Act I, p. 249), but he fulfils this by launching into a pedantic philosophical speculation on the nature of knowledge, possibly a passage surviving from the older play. In Plenty's reign the aristocrats spurn "this Idle contemplation" (Act II, p. 257) and turn to "pleasing sportes, / To fit the Plentuous humor of the Time" (Act II, p. 257). Mavortius, the chief aristocrat, addresses Chrisoganus using terms employed in *The Scourge of Villanie*: 6

> How you translating-scholler? you can make
> A stabbing *Satyr*, or an *Epigram*,
> And thinke you carry just *Rhamnueia's whippe*
> To lash the patient; goe, get you clothes,
> Our free-borne blood such apprehension lothes.


These similarities make it clear that Marston intends Chrisoganus to be the same kind of savage satirist as Kinsayder. Act III, the reign of Pride, is almost all Marston's writing and it resembles the satires in its method of stringing together a series of incidents, each portraying the moral decline of a type, or in this case a social class. Pride voices the common selfishness -

> Then use your wisedome to enrich your selves,
> Make deepe successe high Steward of your store.
> Enlarge your mighty spirits, strive to excede,
> In buildings, ryot, garments, gallantry

(Act III, p. 269) -

and Marston exemplifies the principle in, for example, the players' demanding ten pounds for a performance (Act III, p. 275), and the

---

5 *Histriomastix* is in volume III of *The Plays of John Marston*.

6 Cf., SV, 'Proemium in librum primum', 1-2:
> I Beare the scourge of iust *Rhamnueia*,
> Lashing the lewdnes of *Britania*. 
noble wives' absorption in jewels and clothes (Act III, pp. 272-73).
The points in the dramatic argument, that social and personal
morality interpenetrate and that both are corrupted by money, are
established by means of emblematic incidents. This technique is
used for similar satiric effect by, for example, Jonson in Catiline
and Shakespeare in Timon of Athens, both plays whose
satirical vision includes a social dimension. 7

In Histriomastix the social decline justifies Chrosoganus's
satirical attacks. He rails at the debasement of poetry at the
players' hands in terms similar to those used in The Scourge: 8

Chri[soganus]. VWrite on, crie on, yawle to the common sort
Of thickskin'd auditours: such rotten stuffs,
More fit to fill the paunch of Esquiline...
O age when every Scriveners boy shall dippe
Prophaning quills into Thessaliaes Spring...
And windy froth of bottle-ale doth fill
Their purest organ of invention.


Envy, who at one point describes how "Fat Ignorance, and rammish
Barbarisme, / Shall spit and drivell in sweete Learnings face" (Act
III, p. 227), prompts Chrisoganus into a diatribe on "This ideot
world" (Act IV, p. 281) in the manner of verse satire. Chrisoganus
is virtually a direct rendering of the satiric persona of Marston's
satires. Both Chrisoganus and Kinsayer adopt the same position -
a self-consciously virtuous man upholding ideals which a world,
driven awry by selfishness and materialism, spurns. The difference

7 See Catiline, I, 505-12; IV, 1-10; and the incidents comprising
the opening scene of Timon of Athens.

8 Cf., SV, VIII, 198-200:
...leauing the sensuall
Base hangers on, lusking at home in slime,
Such as wont to stop port Esqueline.
between them lies in what they satirise, for Chrisoganus bemoans mainly the triumph of "sluggish Ignorance" over "liberall Art" (Act IV, p. 282), while Kinsayder fixes his gaze almost exclusively on sexual excess.

In Act V Chrisoganus is on stage throughout to comment on the action. He fails to separate the warring lords by appeals to reason, and this induces melancholy reflections on "this vulture, (vile Ambition,)" which "devoures, / their bleeding honours, whilst their empty names, / Lye chain'd unto the hill of infamie" (Act V, p. 288). Chrisoganus's satire fits well into a play whose whole structure is directed against deviations from the inherited framework of things. In the midst of confusion, with the multitude in rebellion, Chrisoganus "scaping from among them" (s.d., p. 291), moralises:

Thus Heaven (in spite of fury) can preserve, The trustfull innocent, and guiltlesse Soule; O, what a thing is man, that thus forgets The end of his creation; and each houre Strikes at the glory of his maker thus.


He is a thoroughly conservative satirist, and like Kinsayder he deplores man's tendency to besmirch his divine part, his soul.

Chrisoganus does not influence events which follow the cycle into Poverty; and Poverty reforms the aristocrats where Chrisoganus could not. Mavortius says he wishes to learn how to endure "The falling sicknesse of sad Poverty" (Act VI, p. 295), and Chrisoganus is quick to point the stoic lesson:

9 Only the nobles are reformed; the players have to pawn all their belongings and are then shipped abroad by the Constable (Act VI, pp. 299-300); the bourgeois characters fall to misery and lamentation (Act VI, pp. 295-97).
Looke uppon me (the poorest slave in shew, 
That ever fortune buried in mishappe:) 
Yet this is Natures richest Jewell-house... 
First entertaine submission in your soules 
To frame true concord in one unity. 
Behold the faire proportion of a man, 
Whome heavens have created so compleate, 
Yet if the arme make warre against the head, 
Or that the heart rebell against the braine, 
This elementall bodie (thus compact,) 
Is but a scatted Chaos of revenge... 
For law is that which Love and Peace maintaine.

(Act VI, pp. 295-96).

The cyclical action of the play is confirmed by the nobles freely following Chrisoganus to learn his stoic contentment.

Like all of Marston's satirists, Chrisoganus finds his diatribes useless to effect moral reform. Experience teaches the truth of Chrisoganus's words to those who were previously deaf to them; but experience is determined by laws of social change, and so outside Chrisoganus's control. The satirist is, however, a repository of ideals and principles, and his small part in the action is validated by the structure of the play as a whole.¹

Even in this makeshift creation, Marston severely limits the influence of his satirist.

¹ A. Kernan, "John Marston's Play Histriomastix", MLQ, 19, 1958, 134-40, argues that Chrisoganus's decline from academic tutor to satirist parallels the deterioration of the other groups, and concludes that Chrisoganus is "perhaps the most vicious" character for he fails to discover his mistake.
This play is a hodge-podge of romantic, comic and satiric ingredients frankly designed to entertain its audience. The scorn expressed in the "Introduction" for "mouldy fopperies of stale Poetry, / Unpossible drie mustie Fictions" (p. 179) is thought to refer to the plays with which Paul's Boys opened in the autumn of 1599, one of them possibly being Histriomastix. Marston, an Inns of Court intellectual and writer of outrageous satires, attempts a close identification between his audience and himself, promising to please "this generous presence" so that "you our pleasures, we your loves may share" (p. 179). The wish to please, even flatter, the audience goes some way to account for the play's oddities of style and substance. The contrast with Ben Jonson's stern didactic attitude to the audience which received Every Man out of his Humour in the autumn of 1599 could hardly be greater, nor indeed the differences between the two plays themselves.

The fact that this and Marston's next two plays were written to be acted by boys considerably alters their dramatic effect, and strengthens their satiric impact. Anthony Caputi in a discussion of this subject emphasises that the boys' talents for

11 *Jack Drum's Entertainment* is in volume III of *The Plays of John Marston*.

12 Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, 135, assumes that *Histriomastix* is one of these "mouldy fopperies"; Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple*, p. 126, on the other hand, believes that the phrase refers not to *Histriomastix* but to the first plays put on by Paul's boys. He goes on to argue convincingly that *Jack Drum's Entertainment* is Marston's first contribution to the professional stage, predating both the *Antonio* plays, pp. 269-70.

caricature were ideally suited to satirical comedy, producing a
general burlesque of the adult world. R. A. Foakes \textsuperscript{14} extends this
idea and points out the pervasiveness of burlesque in the Antonio
plays, concluding that the satire is mainly directed not at folly or vice
but at conventional literary and theatrical modes and attitudes. \textsuperscript{15}
Certainly, in his next three plays Marston came to exploit the
aptitudes of the boy actors for increasingly subtle and far-reaching
satirical effects.

In \textit{Jack Drum's Entertainment} Marston adopts the conventions
of popular drama and language and renders them absurd through
exaggeration and deflation. The importance of this lies in the clear
indication it gives of the attraction for Marston of the burlesque
mode, and of his use of it for satiric effect. At the beginning
of Act II, for example, Katherine is wooed at a balcony in rapid
succession by Puffe, Mamon and Pasquill, each addressing her
extravagantly in his own kind of fustian. The climax comes when
Pasquill pours forth exaggerated compliments, and Katherine responds
in kind:

\textit{Pasquill}. This is no kisse, but an Ambrosian bowle,
The Nectar deaw of thy delicious sowle:
Let me sucke one kisse more, and with a nimble lip,
Nibble upon those Rosie bankes, more soft and cleare
Then is the Jeweld tip of \textit{Venus} eare.

(Act II, p. 199).

\textsuperscript{14} "John Marston's Fantastical Plays: Antonio and Mellida and

\textsuperscript{15} Foakes underestimates the importance of the statement of
ideas as a serious element in these plays, and sometimes sees
burlesque unjustifiably.
Balcony love scenes, like that in *Romeo and Juliet*, are mocked by the extravagant action and language; and romantic love itself is mocked by the hints of wantonness in their speech, and by the unexpected appearance of elements of style from *The Scourge of Villanie*:

Katherina. Let the unsanctified spirit of ambition
Entice the choyse of muddy minded Dames
To yoke themselves to swine, and for vaine hope
Of gay rich trappings, be still spurd and prickt
With pining discontent for nuptiall sweetes.

(Act II, p. 199).

Planet is the play's satirist, his name implying unchanging things. At his first appearance he indulges in witty, self-conscious cross-talk in several keys:

Brahant Jr. Love hath no reason.

Planet. Then is love a beast.

Brahant Jr. O my Camelia is love it selfe.

Planet. The divel she is: Hart her lips looke like a dride Neats-tongue: her face as richly yeallow, as the skin of a cold Custard, and her mind as setled as the feet of bald pated time. (Act I, p. 190).

This is merely wit display, and the complex plot is manipulated throughout to allow opportunities for displays of wit, burlesque passion, farce or satire. Plot credibility is discarded in favour of a concatenation of diverse theatrical elements designed to

16 Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple*, p.133, notes the echo of the hawk image in particular:

Juliet. 0! for a falconer's voice,
To lure this tassel-gentle back again (II.ii. 158-59),

Katherine. Even with like swiftnes, tho not with like heart:
As the fierce Fawcon stoupes to rysing fowle
I hurrey to thee

(Act II, p. 198).
achieve local contrasting effects. 17

Planet is the chief commentator on the characters. He announces with good-natured irony the origins of his detached, critical response to life:

Planet. Let me busse thy cheeke sweete Pugge, Now I am perfect hate, I lov'd but three things in the world, Philosophy, Thrift, and my self. Thou hast made me hate Philosophy. A Usurers greasie Codpeece made me loath Thrift: but if all the Brewers Jades in the town can drug me from love of my selfe, they shall doo more then e're the seven wise men of Greece could: Come, come, now I'le be as sociable as Timon of Athens.

(Act I, p. 190).

He and Brabant Jr. draw 'characters' of some of the fools;

Planet describing Brabant Sr., for example, as

... the Prince of Fooles, unequald Ideot, He that makes costly suppers to trie wits: And will not stick to spend some 20. pound To grope a gull: that same perpetuall grin That leades his Corkie Jests to make them sinke Into the eares of his Deryders with his owne applause.

(Act I, p. 190).

The point of such comments is not their moral content, but rather their wit. Planet is interested in fools for the amusement they afford; he has no intention of punishing them for their folly, far less reforming them. His attitude is like that of the laughing satirist of Certaine Satyres: "In, in, in, in, I long to burst my sides and tyer my spleene with laughter."

(Act I, p. 191).

17 H. Harvey Wood has said that "few more wretched and uninspired productions have ever been presented on the stage." 
The Plays of John Marston, III, xxvi.
Planet's comments are sometimes sharp and angry. When he and Brabant Jr. watch Brabant Sr.'s encounter with Puffe in a display of compliment, Planet ridicules Brabant Sr. in an aside - "Hart thy brother's like the Instrument the Merchants sent over to the great Turke: you need not play upon him, heele make musicke of himselfe, and hee bee once set going" (Act III, p. 209) - and dismisses them by saying "complement is as much as fustian" (Act III, p. 209). And when Brabant Sr. presents his wife to the lustful John fo de King as a courtesan, in order to demonstrate her faithfulness, Planet expresses hate for such a misplaced sense of superiority:

... o that twere lawfull now
To pray to God that he were Cuckolded.
Deare Brabant I do hate these bumbaste wits,
That are puft up with arrogant conceit
Of their owne worth, as if Omnipotence
Had hoysed them to such unequald height,
That they survaide our spirits with an eye
Only create to censure from above,
When good soules they do nothing but reprove.

(Act IV, p. 229).

Brabant Signior delights in assembling fools so that he can laugh at them, and is an example of a spurious critic. But Planet is himself guilty of a similar proud "censure from above", as he decides to reject Camelia because she was fickle to his friend:

---

18 Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 21, comments, "There is little doubt that the critical Brabant Senior is Jonson, and that the play is that in which he told Drummond that Marston staged him"; O.J.Campbell, Comical Satyre, p.163, comes to the more cautious conclusion that Marston "expected at least part of his audience to detect in this stage figure certain of Jonson's shortcomings. But that is a quite different intellectual process from identifying the two".

19 O. J. Campbell, Comical Satyre, p. 160, classifies Brabant Sr. as a "typical buffoon". 
Pla[net]. Thus my deare Brabant, am I thy revenge,
And whip her for the peevish scorne she bare
To thy weake yonger birth: o that the soules of men
Were temperate like mine, then Natures painte
Should not triumph o're our infirmities

(Act IV, p. 229).

It seems clear that Planet is guilty of the very fault for which he
condemns Brabant Sr. — an excessive sense of the superiority of
his own nature. In a play which contains so many reversals,
this may constitute an attack on Planet's credibility as a satirist.
However, in what is essentially a lively, fast-moving entertainment
this contradiciton is not important. It does demonstrate, though,
Marston's limited range of satirical expression.

The implications of transferring the satirist from formal
satire to drama begin to emerge. Even in Histriomastix, where
Chrisoganus is a very toned-down version of Kinsayder and his
reactions are supported by everything that happens, his angry
railing has been interpreted as Marston's implicit
criticism of the satirist. When he becomes angry the
satirist appears to lose himself in moral outrage just as the fools
he attacks are lost in their folly. The contradiction in the
character of Planet appears more sharply than in Chrisoganus, but
it is overridden by the complexities of the plot, and perhaps by the

20 O.J. Campbell, Comical Satyre, p. 165, explains this confusion
in the portrayal of Planet by splitting it into two parts:
"despite his boasted emotional control, follies force from
him utterances hot with scorn and detestation. Therefore,
whenever he exercises his duties as commentator and castigator,
the structure and the spirit of the drama are like those of
comical satire".

21 See A. Kernan, "John Marston's Play Histriomastix", MLQ, 19,
1958, 134-40.
audience's accepting a righteous satirist as one of a set of stock characters. For the moment, Marston ignores or cannot control the inherent contradictions in a righteous, indignant satirist.

Planet not only denounces from the sidelines, he initiates actions with a satirical intent. His plot to demonstrate Camélia's fickleness to Brabant Jr. adumbrates the main plot of *The Dutch Courtesan*, and shows the readiness with which Marston's satirists seek to point satirical lessons by means of their victims' experience rather than by their own denunciations. Planet relishes the prospect of success in his plot against Camélia, crying "Laughter, triumph, for ere the Sunne go downe, / Thy forehead shall be wreath'd, with pleasures crowne" (Act III, p. 213), but laughter changes to stern satirical attack when he rejects Camélia's advances. Declaring himself to be "the scourge of light inconstancie" (Act IV, p. 229), he expresses undying loathing for women as "corrupters of affection" (Act IV, p. 228), who are like "rotten poasts / That are but gilt with outward garnishment, / O how my sould abhorrres them" (Act IV, p. 229). Planet is transformed, for no apparent reason except to titillate the audience, from a mocker of Camélia's folly to a savage scourger of it, a shift corresponding to that between the persona of *Certaine Satyres* and that of *The Scourge*.

Like *Every Man in his Humour*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*'s exceedingly complicated plot is designed to further short-term dramatic effects. The creation of a logical, or even probable, sequence of events is treated as less important than immediate, startling effects. Jonson's plot is complex, but nevertheless
logical, and part of the audience's pleasure comes from appreciating the skillful interweaving of separate strands. Marston, typically, is more high-handed. He also adopts a complex plot, but he deliberately creates trivial, farcical connections of cause and effect, delighting in their implausibility. Camélia changes lovers at Winifred's behest; Mamon plots to kill Pasquill, then Pasquill decides to feign dead anyway; Katherine is cured of madness by a witch, Pasquill by gazing on her face and listening to music. The logic of the play is summed up in the words of two pages:

Page 1. Why do'st thou crie?

[Page] 2. Why do'st thou laugh?

[Page] 1. I laugh to see thee crie.

[Page] 2. And I crie to see thee laugh.

(Act I, p. 191).

The fools of the play are brought out of their folly by the experiences they undergo, and these experiences arise out of the complex plot. Pasquill's madness is cured when Planet reminds the company that "the soule of man is nought but simphonies" (Act V, p. 235), and music is played. The fullest exposure and chastisement of folly is of Brabant Sr. who discovers that he has been cuckolded at his own request. Planet censures the censurer, and declares him a subject for mirth:

Come heer's thy Cap of Maintenance, the Coronet Of Cuckolds. Nay you shall weare it, or weare My Rapier in your guts by heaven.
Why doest thou not well deserve to be thus usde?
Why should'st thou take felicitie to gull
Good honest soules, and in thy arrogance
And glorious ostentation of thy wit,
Think God infused all perfection
Into thy soule alone, and made the rest
For thee to laugh at? Now you Censurer
Be the ridiculous subject of our mirth

(Act V, p. 240)
Brabant Sr. happily accepts his folly ("Ile weare this Crowne, and triumph in this horne" (Act V, p. 240)) and remains unreformed. Marston is not interested in achieving the kind of rigorous satiric denouement which Jonson effects in *Every Man out of his Humour*. Consequently the satirist Planet is unmethedical in drawing satiric lessons or meting out punishments. Jonson's satiric justice in *Every Man out of his Humour* is systematic and cruel; Marston's haphazard and morally unemphatic. *Jack Drum's Entertainment* ends on the note of *Certaine Satyres*.

*Antonio and Mellida* (1600)  

In the Dedication ("To ... the most honorably renowned No-body") Marston confesses, "...it hath flow'd with the current of my humorous bloods, to affect (a little too much) to be seriously fantastical" (p. 2).  

*Antonio and Mellida* is a purposeful production, the first play in which Marston convincingly establishes one area of his dramatic interests - the mixture of satire and philosophy. The setting in a corrupt court serves for this play and the following three, including *The Malcontent*.

The Induction heightens the audience's consciousness of the artifice of the play itself. In it the fools who populate Piero's court are characterised accurately: Forobosco the parasite;

---


23 *Antonio and Mellida* is Vol. I of *The Plays of John Marston*.
Balurdo the fop; Matzagenthe the braggart. The technique of character-writing forms one of the lasting constituents of satirical drama both inside the plays and outside, as here and more formally in the prefatory 'characters' of Every Man out of his Humour. Feliche, the play's satirist, is described in the Induction as

so impregnably forrest with his own content, that no envious thought could ever invade his spirit: never surveying any man so unmeasuredly happie, whom I thought not justly hatefull for some true impoverishment: never beholding any favour of Madam Felicity gracing another, which his well bounded content perswaded not to hang in the front of his owne fortune: and therefore as farre from envying any man, as he valued all men infinitely distant from accomplisht beatitude. These native adjuncts appropriate to me the name of Feliche.

(Induction, p. 8).

Like Planet and Chrisoganus he is part of the society he criticises, although at its edges. There is no reason to believe that the 'character' of Feliche in the Induction is ironical.

At the first entrance of the court (Act I, p. 14) Feliche delivers a caveat against pride to Piero, exultant after his victory over Andrugio. His theme is that Piero is human and therefore limited, and unless he realises this he will be destroyed. Feliche thus places himself, like his satirist predecessors, among the conservative and rational:

Feliche.

0, she's ominous,
Inticeth princes to devour heaven,
Swallow omnipotence, out-stare dread fate,
Subdue Eternitie in giant thought,
Heaves up their hurt with swelling, puft conceit,
Till their soules burst with venom'd Arrogance:
Beware Piero


24 See O. J. Campbell, Comical Satyre, p. 139, for an analysis of the fools appearing in the play.
Feliche's stoicism is the source of his content, as the boy playing the role explains in the Induction. Stoicism also supplies his view of human nature, deviations from which prompt satirical comments. Piero brushes Feliche's warnings aside, but he does allow him the freedom of a licensed fool:

*Piero.* ... the publick power makes my faction strong.

*Feliche.* Ill, when publick power strengthneth private wrong.

*Piero.* Tis horse-like, not for man to know his force.

*Feliche.* Tis god-like, for a man to feel remorse.

*Piero.* Pish, I prosecute my families revenge,
Which Ile pursue with such a burning chace
Till I have dri'd up all Andrugios bloud

(Act I, p. 15).

The tone of the exchange is considerably modified when we remember that it was played by boy actors. Piero and Feliche would then be less realistic and threatening, and their confrontation would point to the gap between their high-flown sentiments and the ridiculousness of their persons to comic and satiric effect.

Feliche's involvement in the court is seen in the romance plot in his relationship with Antonio. He tries to comfort the despairing Antonio with some sensible advice, but when this fails he aids his escape, telling him to "Slinke to my chamber, looke you; that is it: / There shall you find a suite I wore at sea; / Take it, and slippe away" (Act III, p. 40). This gesture confirms Feliche as a character involved in his society, and

---

25 This stichomythia is adapted from Seneca, *Octavia*, 453ff.
prepared to stand against the dictates of Piero his prince for a cause he considers righteous. 26 Again Marston supports and validates his satirist. Feliche is on stage during nearly all of Acts II and III, and even when he is not moved to explicit comment his presence implicitly criticises the action. However, the interaction between Feliche and the fools, an important part of the play's satire, diminishes in the last two Acts and achieves no resolution. No fool is changed, either by Feliche's words or actions. For example, when Alberto, in despair at his failure to get anywhere with Rosaline, seeks Feliche's help, Feliche replies in exasperation:

Goe and hang thy selfe, I say, goe hang thy selfe:
Ile rime thee dead, or verse thee to the rope.

(Act V, p. 53).

Feliche's words have no effect on Alberto who goes off still uttering exaggerated love complaints. Alberto's parting lines - "Farewell deare friend, expect no more of mee, Here ends my part, in this loves Comedy" (Act V, p. 54) - maintain the tone of comic excess, and the comic awareness that the action is like a play.

26 O. J. Campbell, Comicall Satyre, p. 145, assigns Feliche three roles - the serene stoic, the denunciatory Marston, and the wit-intriguer - but he goes on to argue that Feliche's violence "causes the disintegration of all the roles he has assayed". p. 146.

27 Cf. the echo in the "Apologetical Dialogue" of Jonson's Poetaster (ll. 160-64):
I could doe worse,
Arm'd with ARCHILOCHVS fury, write Iambicks,
Should make the desperate lashers hang themselues.
Rhime 'hem to death, as they do Irish rats
In drumming tunes.
As a satirist, Feliche makes the same claim for himself as the persona of *The Scourge*, 28

*I hate not man, but mans lewd qualities*

(Act III, p. 42).

His satirical utterances should be free of personal spite, and this is often so. His relations with other characters are amiable; his purpose is not to prompt the fools into displaying their folly, because they do that already, but merely to express his reaction to it. A stage direction sums this up:

"Enter Forobasco, with two torches: Castilio singing fantastically; Rossaline running a Caranto pase, and Balurdo: Feliche following, wondring at them all" (Act II, p. 22). The carefully contrived spectacle is sufficient to point scorn at the participants.

When the amorists' adoration of Rossaline reaches the point of prizing her spit, Feliche breaks out, in a soliloquy, in angry denunciation of the amorists, in terms recalling Kinsayder's "snottery of our slimie time":

0 that the stomack of this queasie age
Digestes, or brookes such raw unseasoned gobs,
And vomits not them forth! 0 slavish sots.
Servant quoth you? faugh: if a dogge should crave
And beg her service, he should have it straight:
Shee'd give him favours too; to licke her feete,
Or fetch her fanne, or some such drudgery:
A good dogs office, which these amorists
Tryumph of: tis rare, well give her more Asse,
More sot, as long as dropping of her nose
Is sworne rich pearle by such low slaves as those


Most critics have seen that this angry speech of Feliche's, and others like it, clash with the conception of his character as inwardly contented. Finkelpearl notes the disparity between Feliche's

28 *Cf.* SV, II, 5-6: Preach not the Stoickes patience to me, I hate no man, but mens impietie.
sentiments and his actions, adding that he clearly lacks the quality on which he most prides himself, contentment. Campbell sees the instability in the character of Feliche reflecting a corresponding instability in Marston's attitude to the fools. Another critic attempts to resolve the contradiction by including Feliche in the same category as the fools, seeing him as yet another humour character, obsessive in pursuit of an extreme. This has the merit of allowing Marston a firm attitude to his satirist, but it clashes with the 'Induction's' approving description of him. Anthony Caputi gives the most convincing view of the character and his satiric speeches, seeing them as standing in counterpoint to the moral disorders of the play. Caputi's view implies that Feliche (and Andrugio too) are embodiments of order in the play, helpless to influence what happens and themselves struggling at times unsuccessfully to practise what they preach. Their failures only make their ideals seem more desirable. This is the most coherent view of a very muddled situation, but the facts still jostle uncomfortably.

29 John Marston of the Middle Temple, p. 142.
30 Comicall Satyre, pp. 140-41.
33 See also A. Kernan, The Cankered Muse, New Haven, 1959, p. 208: "This [description in the Induction] is the public personality of the satirist ... But the difficulty comes, as always, when the satirist begins to get down to the vicious work of actual satire."
against the hypothesis. There is a contradiction at the heart of the characterisation of Feliche, and no amount of interpretative manoeuvering can resolve it. Claiming the stoic's contentedness of soul and disdaining envy, Feliche should be calm and balanced. But when he encounters folly he breaks into the familiar tones and attitudes of *The Scourge of Villanie* — bitter, violent, and cruel. It is Marston's effort, continued from his first two plays, to combine both aspects in a single authoritative and effective satirist that gives rise to the fundamental contradiction.

Feliche's satirising may be viewed in another way — as one of the elements contributing to the comic effect of the scenes. Seen this way his violent outburst is no more serious than the folly of the amorists he threatens; both are exaggerated, conventional, and hence ridiculous. Consistency of characterisation is regularly subordinated in both *Antonio* plays to achieving an unexpected reversal, or explosion, or collapse of the action. What primarily interests Marston are the surprises he can produce for the audience by manipulating the surface of the play. In the context of the chiaroscuro of folly (at Piero's court) and philosophical exploration (by the seashore), Feliche's switch from contentment to indignation is less difficult to understand.

All the characters, except Mellida, are undercut: Antonio by being disguised as an Amazon and collapsing at critical moments; Rossaline by the licentiousness of her speech and her participation in the amorists' folly; Piero by his lapse into stuttering incoherence when he discovers Mellida's escape.
In any case, Marston is writing satire in *Antonio and Mellida* in only two tones—*saeva indignatio* derived from *The Scourge*; and good-natured mockery derived from *Certeine Satyres*. Feliche alternates from one to the other, but this inconsistency fits perfectly with the play's overall pattern of reversal and shock. G. K. Hunter places Marston's interest not in "the way that one attitude forms itself out of another, but how one collapses to reveal the unexpected coexistence of another (coexistence, need I add, involving no need for cooperation)". 34 The pattern of assertion and collapse operates through the entire play, and Feliche forms a part of it. This is Marston's version of satirical comedy, and the satirist is seen to be subject to the same laws as everyone else. It is a vision "that stressed the incapacity of any single attitude to sustain itself against the bitter ironies of incessant betrayal". 35 It is through this vision that Marston's satirical protest is registered. The incoherence of the world of *Antonio and Mellida* is the whole point about it. Marston communicates the incapacity of conventional attitudes to cope with the exigences of reality by showing the incapacity of play conventions to cope with the demands put on them. Probability of plot, continuity of character and emotion, even the survival of speech itself are all sacrificed in the creation of a satiric world.


Antonio's Revenge (1600-01)  

The satirist Feliche does not survive into Antonio's Revenge. The satirising which in Antonio and Mellida comes mostly through Feliche, is dispersed in Antonio's Revenge. It appears in speeches of Piero, Antonio, and Pandulpho, and, most importantly, in the dramatic construction itself. Perhaps one reason for the absence of a satirist here is that Marston wished his tragedy to be judged seriously by the criterion of "what men were, and are" ('Prologue', p. 69). In addition, a satirist, whether treated ironically or not, provides a touchstone of judgement for the action, and in this play Marston is concerned primarily with presenting a variety of responses to experience and allowing ironic interaction between them. A satirist would be too insistent a voice, and would not fit into the play's tragic tone.

However, the style and attitudes of The Scourge of Villanie do appear, and Kinsayer's pessimism and bitterness accord easily with the play's dark tone. When Piero, for example, bewails Mellida's supposed unfaithfulness he describes the world as bereft of reason in a style reminiscent of Kinsayer's:

Foro[bosco]. Keepe league with reason, gratious Soveraigne.

Piero. There glowe no sparkes of reason in the world; All are rak't up in ashie beastlinesse. The bulke of man's as darke as Erebus, No branch of Reasons light hangs in his trunke: There lives no reason to keepe league withall. I ha no reason to be reasonable

(Act I, iv. p. 81)

36 Finkelpearl, John Marston of the Middle Temple, p. 270, dates the production of Antonio's Revenge some time during the period late 1600 to 1601.

37 Antonio's Revenge is in vol. I of The Plays of John Marston.
Although there are satirical speeches, there is no one satirist figure. When Antonio is considering how best to disguise himself in Piero's court, he specifically rejects the role, of "a spitting Critick, whose mouth / Voids nothing but gentile and unvulgar / Rheume of censure" because then, he says, "should I put on the verie flesh / Of solid folly" (IV. i. p. 109). Instead he adopts "a fooles habit, with a little toy of a walnut shell, and sope, to make bubbles" (IV. i. p. 109), and in reply to Alberto's objections to this disguise, he claims a paradoxical wisdom for the fool:

Alb[erto]. You can not press among the courtiers,  
And have acces to ---

An[tionij]. What? not a foole? Why friend, a golden asse,  
A babl'd foole are sole canonical,  
Whil'st pale cheekt wisdome, and leane ribd arte  
Are kept in distance at the halberts point:  
All held Apocrypha, not worth survey.  
Why, by the genius of that Florentine,  
Deepe, deepe observing, sound brain'd Macheveil,  
He is not wise that strives not to seeme foole

(IV. i. p. 109).

However, Antonio does utter sentiments very like Kinsayder's, but in circumstances which place them in an ironical light. Just before his murder of Julio, for example, in soliloquy he imagines mankind as worse than beasts, in terms which recall The Scourge: 38

0, you departed soules,  
That lodge in coffin'd trunkes, which my feet presse  
(If Pythagorian Axiomes be true,  
Of spirits transmigration) fleete no more  
To humane bodies, rather live in swine,  
Inhabit wolves flesh, scorpions, dogs, and toads,  
Rather then man...  
Still striving to be more then man, he prooves  
More then a divell.

(III. ii. pp. 101-02).

38 Cf. SV, VII, 7-8: But rather I dare sweare, the soules of swine Doe liue in men.
Antonio goes on to murder the innocent Julio, while uttering gruesome revenge platitudes which echo the bestial references of his previous speech but now spoken with a kind of joy:

Now barkes the Wolfe against the fulle cheeckt Moone.
Now Lyons half-clamd entralts roare for food.
...
Now gapes the graves, and through their yawnes let loose Imprison'd spirits to revisit earth:
And now swarte night, to swell thy hower out,
Behold I spurt warme bloode in thy blacke eyes

(IV. ii. p. 104).

Clearly, Antonio's satirical speeches are implicitly criticised as part of his mad, or near-mad, revenge. Like Hamlet, whose situation Antonio's resembles, Antonio expresses his anger and frustration in quasi-philosophical disquisitions on man's place in society and the universe. In Act IV, for example, he inveighs against the indifference of supernatural powers, again with echoes of *The Scourge*:

I Heaven, thou maist, thou maist omnipotence.
What vermine bred of putrifacted slime,
Shall dare to expostulate with thy decrees!

(IV. iv. p. 118).

*Antonio's Revenge* is, among other things, a study of the possible responses to personal loss and political tyranny. The play consists partly of argument and debate concerning possible lines of action in extreme situations, much like *Troilus and Cressida* and

---


40 For an analysis of the play along these lines see J.W.Lever, *The Tragedy of State*, London, 1971, chap. ii: "The play is not much concerned with his [Antonio's] character, or with the intricacies of character in general, but with the presentation of attitudes towards tyranny and the rallying of all forces that oppose it". p. 24.
Sejanus. All three plays present dramatisation, and also discussion by the characters themselves, of the alternative responses to given circumstances. Judgement on the separate responses are supplied, in Antonio's Revenge at least, not by an authoritative satirist but by Marston's ironic dramaturgy.

One response may be set against another within a scene.

In Act I, for example, Pandulpho reacts to Antonio's expressions of despair at Feliche's death with an outburst of laughter:

\begin{quote}
Antonio. Confusion to all comfort: I defie it...
If there be any horror yet unfelt,
Unthought of mischiefe in thy fiendlike power,
Dash it upon my miserable heade---
Make me more wretch, more cursed if thou canst---
O, now my fate is more than I could feare:
My woes more weightie than my soule can beare.
\end{quote}

Exit.

Pan[dulpho]. Ha, ha, ha.

(I. v. pp. 82-83).

The continuity of tone of the scene is broken by this unexpected development, as Pandulpho's laughter acts as a deflationary comment on Antonio's speech. The implicit commentating function of Pandulpho's laughter is made explicit when Pandulpho bids Alberto "come on: thou and I / Will talke as Chorus to this tragedie" and requests that "the musick straine their instruments" (I. v. p. 83). He then describes and defends his critical reaction to Feliche's death:

\begin{quote}
Pan[dulpho]. ... would'st have me turn rank mad,
Or wring my face with mimic action;
Stampe, curse, weep, rage, & then my bosom strike?
Away tis apish action, player-like.
If hee is guiltlesse, why should teares be spent?
Thrice blessed soule that dyeth innocent.
If he is leapred with so foule a guilt,
Why should a sigh be lent, a teare be split?
The gripe of chaunce is weake, to wring a teare,
From him that knowes what fortitude should beare
\end{quote}

(I. v. p. 83).
The speeches aim at a serious effect: to present contrasted reactions to suffering. Marston does two things in the scene: firstly he draws attention to the limited acting range of the boys of Pauls in order to forestall criticism; and, secondly, he uses the theatrical spectacle and its discontinuities as a metaphor for the limitations of any one response to suffering. The references in Pandulpho's speech to exaggerated acting, "apish action, player-like", as a description of false emotion emphasises by ironic contrast the sincerity of Pandulpho's feelings. In the case of both Antonio and Pandulpho, Marston exploits the limitations of the boys' acting range to dramatise the plight of his characters. By the last lines of the scene the distinctions between scene and character, and theatrical setting and theatrical convention, are completely lost:

Pan[dulpho]. Sound lowder musick: let my breath exact,
You strike sad Tones unto this dismall act.

(I. v. p. 84).

Slightly different satirical effects are produced in other scenes by ironic dramaturgy. After Piero has pledged himself to villainy at Feliche's graveside, he calls for Balurdo who enters "with a beard, halfe of, halfe on" (II. i. p. 86). This destroys the dignity of Piero's speech by breaking the dramatic illusion, and by reminding us of the follies of Piero's court. Moreover, Balurdo's incessantly trotting out ridiculous phrases disturbs the seriousness of the scene. In this case, however, seriousness and ridiculousness are coexistent, not contrasted, to produce a grimly humourous effect:
Bal[urdo].  Indeere, and intimate: good, I assure you. I will indeere and intimate Mellida into the dungeon presently.

Pie[ro].  Will Pandulfo Feliche waite on me?

Bal[urdo].  I will make him come, most retort and obtuse, to you presently. I thinke, sir Jeffrey talks like a counsellor. Go to, gods neaks, I thinke I tickle it

(II. i. p. 86).

The satiric effect of the play as a whole, as in Antonio and Mellida, proceeds more from ironical dramaturgy than from a satirist figure or even satirical speeches from other characters. The techniques of juxtaposing incongruous actions or emotions, or deflating something essentially serious are akin to the technique of ironically or forcefully setting the view of a satirist figure against the views, implicit or explicit, of those he satirises. By these means Marston is able to achieve a range of tones, forcing detachment in the audience, and inducing in it the kind of critical response which he at other times used a satirist to achieve. In later plays, notably The Malcontent, techniques used here were refined and extended for satirical effects. The tragic flaw in Antonio's Revenge is in the world it presents, not in any of its characters.
What You Will (1601)\(^{41}\)

In this play Marston discovers one way of presenting an indignant satirist and criticising him at the same time. It is an ironical comedy in the style of *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, with song, dance, and a large varied cast of social types. The criticism of satire begins in the "Induction":

Doricus. Ile here no more of him, nay and your friend the Author, the composer: the *What You Will*: seems so faire in his owne glasse, so straight in his owne measure that hee talkes once of squinting Critickes, drunken Censure, splay-footed Opinion, juicles huskes, I ha done with him, I ha done with him

(Induction, p. 233).

Lampatho Doria, an indignant satirist, appears in the subplot. Beginning as a scholar, like Chrisoganus, he studied long in the attempt to discover the nature of man's soul, but the philosophers' disagreements made him first doubt, then rail:

Lampatho. A company of odde phreneteci
Did eate my youth, and when I crept abroad,
Finding my numnesse in this nimble age,
I fell a railing, but now soft and slow,
I know, I know naught, but I naught do know

(II. i. p. 258).

Along this well-worn route to melancholy \(^{42}\) he has arrived at the

---

\(^{41}\) A conjectural date; it was probably written between winter 1600-01 and early summer 1601, when *Poetaster*, Jonson's reply to Marston's attack on him was produced, see M.S.Allen, *The Satire of John Marston*. *What You Will* is in Vol.II of *The Plays of John Marston*.

\(^{42}\) Cf. Hall, *Virgidimiae*, Lib.II; II,29-38, which describes years spent in study proving fruitless:

Great gaines shall bide you sure, when ye haue spent
A thousand Lamps: & thousand Reames haue rent
Of needlesse papers, and a thousand nights
Haue burned out with costly candle lights.
Ye palish ghosts of *Athens*; when at last,
Your patrimonie spent in witlesse wast,
Your friends all wearie, and your spirits spent,
Ye may your fortunes seeke: and be forwent
Of your kind cosins: and your churlish sires,
Left there alone mid the fast-folding Briers.
point of angry scepticism. The play's involvement in the War of the Theatres partly determined the character of Lampatho who is identified with Jonson. Lampatho echoes Asper's boast that despite threats of violence or treachery against him he will "with a fraughtlesse resolution, / Rip up and launce our times impieties" (III. i. p. 265). But then he decides not to rail, instead delivering a speech on the fact that railing is "the straine that chokes the theatres" (III.i. p. 266), which is presumably a hit at Jonson.

Criticism of Lampatho comes from Quadratus, a new kind of Marstonian character. Described as "faire, gallant, rich, neate as a Bride-groome, fresh as a new-minted six-pence" (II. i. p. 245), he is an urbane man who specifically embraces the valuation of opinion that Kinsayder so emphatically rejected:

... (o that thy narrow sence,  
Could but containe me now) all that exsists,  
Takes valuation from oppinion:  
A giddy minion now

(I. i. p. 237).

Quadratus in the first scene explains his philosophy, which amounts to philosophical nihilism combined with moderate epicureanism:

Hate all things, hate the world, thy selfe, all men ...  
Love onely hate, affect no higher  
Then praise of heaven, wine, a fire.  
Suck up thy daies in silent breath,  
When their snuffs out come Sinior death.  
Now Sir adieu runne mad and twilt,  
The worst is this my rimes but spilt


---

43 See R. A. Small, *The Stage-quarrel between Jonson and the So-called Poetasters*, Breslau, 1899, pp. 101-14. For another account of this quarrel see Herford and Simpson, I, 24-31; IX, 399-406.
There is the possibility of a more pessimistic outlook here, but Quadratus has rejected abstractions, and accepted instead ordinary life and the folly that is part of it. As an "Honest Epicure" (II. i. p. 257) he recommends the enjoyment of physical pleasures as an antidote to "the tide of sorrow" (II. i. p. 250); the rest is fooled by death.

Act II (except for the section involving the school-boys) consists of conversation between Lampatho, Quadratus, and Simplicius on the subject of their respective outlooks on the world. Quadratus expresses amazement at the compliments exchanged by Lampatho and Simplicius, and scornfully describes it:

```
Yon Chamblet youth,
Simplicius Faber that Hermaphrodite,
Party par pale, that bastard Moungerell soule,
Is nought but admiration and applause,
Of yon Lampatho Doria, a fustie caske,
Devote to mouldy customs of hoary eld.
Doth he but speake, O tones of heaven it selfe,
Doth he once write, O Jesu admirable
Cryes out Simplicius: then Lampatho spittes,
And sayes faith 'tis good
```

(II. i. p. 246).

This description, like the best in verse satire, describes their folly in action. Quadratus also denounces Lampatho when Lampatho threatens him with angry satirising:

```
Lampatho. So Phæbus warme my braine, Ile rime thee dead,
Looke for the Satyre, if all the sower juice
Of a tart braine can sowse thy estimate,
Ile pickle thee...
```

```
Quadratus. Away Idolater, why you Don Kinesayer
Thou Canker eaten rusty curre, thou snaffle
To freer spirits -
Think't thou a libertine, an ungiv'd breast
Skornes not the shackles of thy envious clogges?
```

(II. i. p. 248).
The allusion to Kinsayder suggests that Marston is criticising his own past satiric personae. "Through his ridicule of Lampatho, Marston seems to repudiate the 'malcontent' critic and all his ways." Lampatho is criticised in other ways. When Laverdure the fop refuses to abandon his affectations even when railed at by Lampatho, Quadratus applauds his refusal.

Even when Lampatho renounces the scholarly life for "beautie feminine" (IV. i. p. 279), Quadratus still mocks him for his ineptitude as a lover. In opposition to Lampatho's satirical outlook on life, Quadratus recommends the quality of Phantasticness which he sees as creative and humanising:

Phantasticness,
That which the naturall Sophysters tearme
Phantusia incomplexa, is a function
Even of the bright immortall part of man...
By it we shape a new creation,
Of things as yet unborne, by it wee feede
Our ravenous memory, our intention feast:
Slid he thats not Phantasticall's a beast

(II. i. p. 250).

By the end of the play Quadratus has reformed Lampatho from raging satire to an acceptance of the society of Venice, including its fools. The satirical method is new - instead of railing he encourages the fools in their folly until they are defeated by their own excesses. This technique of reforming is used more forcefully by the satirist figures of The Dutch Courtesan

---

44 O. J. Campbell, Comical Satyre, p. 175.

45 As R. A. Small notes, The Stage Quarrel, Breslau, 1899, p. 106, a "large part of the character of Quadratus, indeed, is an answer to Jonson's attacks upon 'fantasticness', in Cynthia's Revels".
and *The Fawn*. However, Marston's next satirist, Malevole in *The Malcontent*, does not take up where Quadratus left off. The strain of satire represented by Lampado and deriving from *The Scourge* was too strong to be abandoned. One critic describes this phase of Marston's writing as "full of odd mixtures, of beginnings and endings, and ... bound to be a passing one". This certainly applies to Marston's use of the satirist-character, but in *The Malcontent* the two strains of satire represented by Quadratus and Lampado are triumphantly combined in Malevole, the central figure in Marston's most successful satirical play.

46 R. A. Small, *The Stage Quarrel*, Breslau, 1899, p. 110, believes Marston rewrote *What You Will* between its production in early 1601 and its publication in 1607, eliminating almost all the words laughed at by Jonson in *Poetaster*, and radically altering the last two acts. This may account for the fact that Quadratus's satirical method with Lampado foreshadows similar methods used by Freevill in *The Dutch Courtesan*, and Hercules in *The Fawn*.

Summary

In Marston's early plays satirist figures appear as one of the elements of the different play-worlds. The characteristics of the two types of satirist persona of verse satire, derived from *Certaine Satyres* and *The Scourge of Villanie*, are transposed directly onto the satirist figures of the plays. The result is that the contradictions surrounding Epictetus and Kinsayder stand out more starkly, particularly the contradiction between a professed inner contentment and the anger involved in satirising. This is clearly seen in Planet and Feliche. The dramatic problem facing Marston is how to give validity and authority to the satirists' words. One solution is to change the character of the satirist. In *What You Will* Lampatho Doria, an indignant satirist, is exposed by Quadratus, a libertine critic, and won over to his point of view. It is satirists of Quadratus' type that appear later in *The Dutch Courtesan* and *The Fawn*. But in Marston's next play, *The Malcontent*, another solution was found which enabled him to employ the *saeva indignatio* type of satirist. The solution involved the combining of a stylistic and a thematic feature of his early plays.

In none of the early plays are the satirist's words effective in producing reformation in those they satirise, nor indeed is Marston much interested in this theme, as Jonson was. Even in *Histriomastix* the fools' reformation is achieved through their own experience, and what the satirist says is clearly much less effective than what happens. In *The Malcontent* satirised reformations are achieved through experience. Validity is assigned to the satirist by making him manipulate events to produce reforming experiences. In *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, Antonio and Mellida
and *Antonio's Revenge*, Marston employs extensively an ironic dramaturgy, which performs part of the function of the satirist in exposing vice. But the ironies in the burlesque mode of the play also operate to destroy the satirist's authority. In *The Malcontent* this difficulty is turned to brilliant advantage by placing the satirist himself in a position to control the ironic unfolding of events. Malevole therefore stands in the same relation to the action of *The Malcontent* as does Marston to *Antonio and Mellida*, as it were, and thereby acquires almost complete validity and authority. In this way Marston can employ the *Scourge of Villanie* type of satirist to coherent and powerful dramatic effect.
Jonson creates in the Epigrammes a satirist persona which prefigures the satirists of his early plays in its rejection of anger and indignation in favour of calm and moral security, and in its attempt to create a relationship between satirist and scene so that the satirical effusions have a morally ameliorating effect on those who read.

Jonson's conception of the epigram was unusually wide and serious, including epistle and lyric as well as verse satire.¹ His avoidance of the word "satire" is meant to set him apart from

---

¹ The usual contemporary distinction between satire and epigram is made by Guilpin, Skialetheia, [Shakespeare Association Facsimiles], London, 1931, 'Satyre Preludium':

...an Epigrame,
For though it be no cates, sharpe sauce it is,
To lickerous vanitie, youths sweet amisse.
But oh the Satyre hath a nobler vaine,
He's the Strappado, rack, and some such paine
To base lewd vice; the Epigram's Bridewell,
Some whipping cheere: but this is follies hell.
contemporaries like Donne, Hall, and Marston, and in other
respects too Jonson dissociated himself from prevailing conventions
of verse satire. "To my Booke" (II) makes clear that he rejects
the style and stance of the angry satirist for what he calls a
"wiser temper":

It will be look'd for, booke, when some but see
   Thy title, Epigrammes, and nam'd of mee,
   Thou should'st be bold, licentious, full of gall,
   Wormewood, and sulphure, sharpe, and tooth'd withall;
   Become a petulant thing, hurle inke, and wit,
   As mad-men stones: not caring whom they hit.
   Deceiue their malice, who could wish it so.
   And by thy wiser temper, let men know
   Thou are not couetous of least selfe-fame,
   Made from the hazard of anothers shame

(II,11, 1-10).

"To my mere English Censvrer" (XVIII) specifies the authors whose
styles Jonson is rejecting and claims for his epigrams the
authority of classical precedent:

To thee, my way in Epigrammes seemes new,
   When both it is the old way, and the true.
   Thou saist, that cannot be: for thou hast seen
   DAVIS, and WEEVER, and the best haue beene.
   And mine come nothing like. I hope so

(XVIII, 11, 1-5).

Jonson's model for the collection was mainly Martial's
epigrams. Herford and Simpson believe that Jonson "was
extremely conscious of these precedents; that he was, in fact,
very willing to be regarded as the Martial of his time and
country." 2 An important difference between the Epigrammes and

2 Herford and Simpson, II, 349.
the verse satire discussed in Chapter 2 is that in the *Epigrammes* the satirist persona is not thrust forward into the reader's attention. On the contrary, Jonson presents an idealised speaker with virtues which approach a Roman ideal of gravity, judgement, moral seriousness, manliness. Far from cultivating extremes of personality in his persona, as Marston and to some extent Hall and Donne do, Jonson stresses moderation and balance following "the Horatian convention of a man talking in private to a friend, rather than shouting indignantly in public." This sets the *Epigrammes* apart from most other verse satire. The satirist of *Epigrammes* sees folly and vice clearly, and it is partly due to his calm response to them that the poems have moral authority. Jonson focuses on the subjects satirised rather than on the satirist satirising. The moderation of the satirist prefigures the calm and moral security of Crites and Horace, and indeed the emphasis placed in the delineation of those characters on their positive moral qualities is present in *Epigrammes* in the poems of praise. David Wykes  notes the poems' concern with morals and society and sees blame and praise as being two sides of this concern. The poems of praise address real persons as exemplars of the virtuous life: for example, those addressed to Donne (XXIII, XCVI) see him as embodying true judgement:


That so alone canst iudge, so 'alone dost make:
And, in thy censures, euenly, dost take
As free simplicitie, do dis-auow,
As thou hast best authoritie, t(o) 'allow

(XCVI, 11, 3-6);

and that addressed to Sir Thomas Overbury (CXIII) assigns him a function in his court like Crites' in Cynthia's court:

I thinke, the Fate of court thy comming crau'd,
That the wit there, and manners might be sau'd:
For since, what ignorance, what pride is fled!
And letters, and humanitie in the stead!

(CXIII, 11, 5-8).

Jonson's speaker is at the opposite pole from Marston's pyrotechnic Kinsayder. Jonson presents poems which praise the upright by name, and ridicule and condemn the vicious by type; thus by implication strengthening good and weakening evil in society. The implied serious social intention of Epigrammes anticipates the articulated intentions of the satirists of the "comicall satyres", Asper, Crites, and Horace, to judge and reform society.

Jonson deliberately went against the prevailing mode of satire; his intention was completely different. "The epigram, like any other form that he touched, was written to last." 5 The weightier effect aimed at indicates the moral seriousness which Jonson attributes to the social critic. This is a conception which lies at the root of the Epigrammes, and which surfaces in the plays most notably in Crites. Even here though, some critics have detected

falsity: "No doubt Jonson, as his habit was, overdid the role, so congenial to him, of unus contra mundum". The satirist-poet of *Epigrammes* can sustain the stance he has adopted towards the world because it is static. Problems arise the moment he stops blaming the vicious and praising the virtuous from a detached point of view, and moves out among them to judge, castigate, and reform. Some of these problems are examined in the following sections.

**The Case is Altered (1597)**

Although it contains no satirist figure, this play is interesting for some anticipations of the burlesque satirical style of Marston's *Jack Drum's Entertainment* and *Antonio* plays. In *A Tale of a Tub* (1596-97, later revised) Jonson is mainly concerned with the plot; in *The Case is Altered*, on the other hand, there are the first signs of interest in satirical subjects and styles.

As in *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge*, the playwright is very aware of his audience; but whereas Marston indulgently stimulates his audience into a sense of their exclusiveness, Jonson directs blame and praise at certain sections of his. In Act II, scene vii, Valentine entertains his fellow

---

6 Herford and Simpson, II, 347.
servants with an account of the reception of plays in Utopia, telling them that the sport at a new play is "to obserue the sway and variety of oppinion that passeth it. A man shall haue such a confus'd mixture of judgement, powr'd out in the throng there, as ridiculous, as laughter it selfe" (II. vii. 41-44). Valentine, a man of judgement, describes two kinds of "persons that most commonly are infectious to a whole auditory" (II. vii. 63-64). The first is "the rude barbarous crue, a people that haue no braines, and yet grounded judgements, these will hisse any thing that mounts aboue their grounded capacities" (II. vii. 68-71); the second are "a few Caprichious gallants" (II. vii. 74):

And they haue taken such a habit of dislike in all things, that they will approue nothing, be it neuer so conceited or elaborate, but sit disperst, making faces, and spitting, wagging their vpright eares, and cry filthy, filthy. Simply uttering their owne condition, and vsing their wryed countenances in stead of a vice, to turne the good aspects of all that shall sit neere them, from what they behold

(II. vii. 76-82).

Jonson satirises two extreme kinds of bad audience - the willfully ignorant and the willfully knowing; by implication, a reasonable audience is somewhere between them. Jonson's stance here is characteristically combative, satirising certain types in his audience.

The action of The Case is Altered is"preoccupied with the pursuit or loss or recovery of three precious things: Ferneze's sons, Rachel, and Jaques's treasure". 7 The three

---

7 Herford and Simpson, I, 314.
lines of development allow a wide variety of action and tone, and while nowhere approaching the disjunctions of action and tone which Marston was to employ, the play does present a world of reversal and surprise which anticipates the radically unstable worlds of the Antonio plays. The atmosphere of the play is generally light and witty, with touches of satire. Aurelia, for example, mocks her sister's solemnity with frank-spokenness (II. iii) - "Judgement is fit for Judges, give me nature" (II. iii. 37) - and indulges in wit-combat with Angelo (II. iv). Jaques the miser, a life-denying-character with no notion of human love, like Morose of Epicoene, addresses his gold with Volpone-like admiration - "5 wondrous pelfe, / , , That which makes all men false, is true it selfe" (II. i. 30-31) - then later in the play, burying it in his garden and covering it with horse-dung, curses those who covet it, with intensity anticipating Timon of Athens's:

Rot all hands that come neere thee,
Except mine owne. Burne out all eyes that see thee,
Except mine owne. All thoughts of thee be poyson
To their enamor'd harts, except mine owne.

(III. v. 18-21).

This wide range of tone overall produces an effect partly humourous, partly satirical.

Onion, the Groom of the Hall, is instrumental in ridding Jaques of his miserly obsession by stealing his gold. His intentions are not satirical however; he steals the gold with "an eye to the maine chance" (IV. ix. 21-22), buys fine clothes, and ends by being sent off to "strict inquisition" (V. xiii. 34). Herford and Simpson note that Onion and Juniper in their "radical influence upon the action ... resemble the clever slave of Plautus
and Terence rather than the Elizabethan servingman, whose function was habitually jest, not stratagem", and they draw the important line of demarcation between the clown-jester such as Launce and Speed, Lancelot or Touchstone, and the witty schemer such as Brainworm or even Buffone. Jonson largely replaced the clown-jester with the gull. The gull is a particularly suitable object for a satirist to expiate upon and attempt to reform, and this theme is developed in Jonson's next play.

*Every Man In His Humour* (1598)

The innovation of the play was indicated by its title; Jonson "deliberately turned from the comedy of romantic adventure to the comedy of 'humourous' character-types". The idea of humours was not of course new, and 'humourous' characters had even appeared in drama: in George Chapman's *Humourous Day's Mirth* (1597), for example, where such characters are rudimentary in conception and not integral to the play, Jonson's play, on the other hand, has each character in the grip of a humour, and an elaborate plot designed to display and dispel each humour.

A recent editor of the play states that only Kitely is a true humour character, that is a character suffering from a

---

8 Herford and Simpson, I, 324.

9 Herford and Simpson (I. 298) note that the only unequivocal specimen of the clown-jester in the Jonsonian drama is Hannibal Puppy of *A Tale of a Tub* whose part consists of "the quips, puns, wilful 'misunderstandings', and humorous freedoms of various kinds, which formed the professional jester's repertory".

10 Herford and Simpson, I, 306.
recognizable medical condition, and that with the other characters
"'humour' [is] shorthand for 'identifying aspect of self'. "
Other characters are representations of ordinary emotion or
behaviour exaggerated: Lorenzo Senior, Guilliano, Hesperida.
And others again are types which are satirised in verse satire:
Bobadilla a swaggering soldier, Matheo an aspiring gallant,
Stephano a bumpkin straining to be a gentleman.

One unifying principle in the complex system of multiple
plots is that "Each character undercuts the absurdities of the
other, to be exposed for his own failings in turn". This
applies to some but not all of the characters who observe and
comment on others. None of the commentators is a satirist such as
Marston or Hall created in verse, nor a judicious critic such as
the speaker of Jonson's Epigrammes. Lorenzo Junior and Prospero,
Lorenzo Senior, Musco, and Dr. Clement all comment and indirectly
satirise only as part of larger dramatic functions. Musco's
motives in adopting disguise are not satirical - he intends to
"insinuate with my young master" (II. i. 10-11) in the hope of
being "made for euer" (II. i. 17). A forerunner of Mosca, his chief
delight is deception and confusion, and he revels in his disguise:

S'blood, I cannot chuse but laugh to see my
selfe translated thus, from a poore creature to
a creator; for now must I create an intolerable
sort of lies, or else my profession looses his grace
(II. i, 1-4).

---

11 Every Man in His Humour, ed. G. B. Jackson, [Yale] New Haven and

12 J. W. Lever, in his edition of the play, sees social ambition as
"the real impulse behind the cultivation of pseudo-humours",
and the "key word ... not 'humour' but 'gentleman'", [Regents
Renaissance] Lincoln, Nebraska. 1971, p. xvi.

13 Ibid., p. xvii.
He has none of Mosca's malicious pleasure in satirical exposure; his interest is primarily manipulation. At the end Musco is driven by circumstances Volpone-like to uncover (V. iii. 125-29), but suffers no rebuke; on the contrary Dr. Clement commends Musco's wit for creating the confusion that he himself has disentangled:

    I admire thee, I honor thee, and if thy maister, or any man here be angry with thee, I shall suspect his wit while I know him for it

    (V. iii. 212-14).

Musco is dis-humoured like the other characters because, as G. B. Jackson puts it, "the manipulator ... is still rigid in acting his conviction that he defines the universe ... and that events are arrangeable for his exclusive benefit". ¹⁴ He has merely an illusion of being in control. Other characters occasionally perform one of a satirist's functions; comment on others; or make a generalised statement about human nature; or express an intention to reform their fellows. Lorenzo Senior, for example, sets off to observe his son, like Hercules in Marston's Fawn, intending "to reduce him from affected will / To reasons manage" (II. ii. 4-5). This sets him considering "the difference of mans estate" (II. ii. 8), and man's great "varietie of mind" (II. ii. 20), which he attributes to ignoring "Reason (as a king) / Here in the head, to haue the marshalling / Of our affections" (II. ii. 13-15). The pseudo-humourous characters of the play can be considered as suffering from the sway of passion over reason. Two inferences can then be made:

firstly, that such characters are morally responsible for their 
mental state; \(^{15}\) secondly, that there is an ideal mental state 
towards which each character ought to aim, and against which 
deviations can be measured. The ideas contained in this speech 
(II. ii. 1-36) are taken up and developed in *Cynthia's Revels* and 
*Poetaster*, particularly through the characters of Crites and 
Horace, whom Lorenzo Senior might here be describing:

> But as that land or nation best doth thriue,  
> Which to smooth-fronted peace is most proclivue,  
> So doth that mind, whose faire affections rang'd  
> By reasons rules, stand constant and vnchang'd

(II. ii. 27-30).

In *Every Man In His Humour*, however, there is no character 
who acts out this ideal. In fact Lorenzo Senior's serious moral 
care concerned with his son's irresponsibility is authoritatively 
rebuked by Dr. Clement:

> What? your sonne is old inough, to gouerne himselfe;  
> let him runne his course, it's the onely way to  
> make him a stay'd man: if he were an vnthrift, a  
> ruffian, a drunkard or a licentious liuer, then  
> you had reason: you had reason to take care: but being  
> none of these, Gods passion, and I had twise so many  
> cares, as you haue, I 'Id drowne them all in a cup of  
> sacke

(III. iii. 133-39).

Clement's advice is permissive, that Lorenzo Junior will reach 
reason and moderation after having lived through his folly and 
worked it out of his system.

---

\(^{15}\) See J.D.Redwine Jnr., "Beyond Psychology: The Moral Basis of 
Jonson's Theory of Humour Characterisation", *ELH*, 28, 1961, 
315-34, who says that if Jonson's theory of humours "begins with 
psychology, it gets rather quickly into moral philosophy", p. 325.
What appears to Lorenzo Senior as folly and unreason in his son, appears to the audience as intelligence, liveliness, a sense of fun, sound sense. One way in which these qualities are manifested in the gallants is in their observing and mocking the gulls. When Prospero writes to Lorenzo Junior requesting a visit, one of the baits is the prospect of enjoying two gulls, and Lorenzo Junior thinks of adding a third, Stephano. When all five meet each gallant comments aside on the fools, intensifying the ridicule against them; for example, Prospero on Matheo's papers:

Would they were kindled once, and a good fire made, I might see selfe loue burnd for her heresie

(II. iii. 92-93).

They also exchange asides as connoisseurs of folly; for example, on Stephano:

Lo[renzo] iu[nior]. Sirra how doost thou like him?

Pros[pero]. Oh its a preetius good foole, make much on him: I can compare him to nothing more happily, then a Barbers virginals; for every one may play vpon him

(II. iii. 182-85).

The gallants are by no means severe satirists. They point up the folly freely displayed before them. In Act III, scene ii they enjoy the spectacle of Stephano's practising oaths and courtesies to a post, like Onion in The Case is Altered (IV. iii). Their wit is very self-conscious, and they appreciate wit in others; Lorenzo Junior describes Musco's disguise in appreciative, fantastical terms:

S'blood man, he had so writhen himselfe into the habit of one of your poore Disparuteur's here, your decaled, ruinous, worme-eaten gentlemen of the round: such as haue vowed to sit on the skirts of the city, let your Prouost & his half dozen of halberders do what they can; and haue
translated begging out of the olde hackney pace, to a fine easy amble

(III. ii. 8-14).

In Act III, scene iv there are displays of folly from all the gulls, and mocking comments on them from the two gallants, Musco, and even Giuliano ("Oh heares no foppery, sblood it freates me to the galle to thinke on it" (III. iv. 37-38). The gallants observe delightedly as Matheo reads his poems to Hesperida, but Giuliano reacts indignantely to the scene and eventually provokes an affray which is merely ridiculous. Lorenzo Junior's understanding of the workings of "humour" makes him a more effective punisher of folly. In Act IV, scene ii he prompts Bobadilla into a grossly exaggerated account of his martial prowess, which is immediately followed by Giuliano's entrance and beating of Bobadilla. Lorenzo Junior scorns Bobadilla and makes a general observation characteristic of an angry satirist:

sblood and these be your tricks, your passados, & your Mountauntos, ile none of them: oh God that this age should bring foorth such creatures

(IV. ii. 129-31).

In the last Act the atmosphere of jollity is considerably sharpened by the two final long speeches. Lorenzo Junior's eulogy and defence of poetry contains both sides of a formula which Jonson develops in the "comicall satyres": on the one hand an intellectual or moral ideal, and on the other a severity of judgement on deviations from it. Poetry is "Blessed, æternall, and most true deuine" (V. iii. 317), an idealisation of poetry developed in Poetaster (I. ii. 240ff.). Lorenzo's speech also contains satirical commonplaces reminiscent of Marston's Kinsayder:
Or that their slubberd lines haue currant passe,
From the fat judgements of the multitude,
But that this barren and infected age,
Should set no difference twixt these empty spirits,
And a true Poet

(V. iii. 338-42).

And Dr. Clement too refers to obstructions to the genius of poetry
in metaphors echoing Kinsayder:

I Lorenzo, but election is now gouernd altogether
by the influence of humor, which instead of those
holy flames that should direct and light the soule
to eternitie, hurles foorth nothing but smooke and
congested vapours, that stifle her vp, & bereave
her of al sight & motion. But she must haue store
of Ellebore giuen her to purge these grosse obstructions

(V. iii. 344-50).

The tone of parts of these final speeches is unusually
severe for Every Man In His Humour which deals with follies not
crime. The fools are not seen as endangering the society in which
they live, as they come to be in the "comical satyres". The
gulls are ridiculous figures, and those who criticise them (the
gallants) and punish them (Dr. Clement) are characters who have
successfully achieved a level of wit, awareness and enjoyment to
which the gulls unsuccessfullly aspire.

16 Cf. SV, VIII, 189-200.
Every Man Out Of His Humour (1599)

Jonson called Every Man Out of His Humour and his next two plays "comicall satyres", indicating the bold dramatic innovations which they embodied. He not only presented a new kind of play, but also explained its novel conventions to his audience through Mitis and Cordatus. Satirical plays of the period needed new kinds of response from the audience, and Jonson characteristically explicated this need.

The Induction to the play introduces Asper, "of an ingenious and free spirit", who launches into an impassioned tirade against the wickedness of the world, in a style like the recently banned formal satires. Asper is Jonson's first satirist figure cast in the current mould of indignation and aggression. He is angry in the familiar Juvenalian manner at seeing "the earth, crackt with the weight of sinne" (Induction, 1.8), and is impelled to express his indignation, declaring,

*Ile strip the ragged follies of the time,
Naked, as at their birth*

(Induction, 11, 17-18).

Also like the satirist Asper declares his fearlessness of private malice aroused by his zeal "t'vmmaske a publicke vice" (1.22). Both Mitis and Cordatus warn Asper off this violence, and also put forward an argument showing conclusively why his rage is ineffectual:

---

17 For a full and detailed discussion of the points of similarity between the play and formal satire see O.J.Campbell, Comicall Satyre, pp. 54-81.
Asper is the first satirist Jonson created. His primary intention is to achieve satirical exposure coupled to moral reform. The situation dramatised for Asper has a complexity similar to Kinsayer's, for both not only discuss their own position as satirists but also the status of their satirical creations. "In Asper, Jonson for the first, but by no means for the last, time drew his ideal poet", and Asper speaks in the Induction as a writer of satirical plays, that is as someone in exactly Jonson's position or Marston's. Jonson is presenting in Asper not merely a fully-fledged example of a particular type, that is an angry, railing satirist, but an angry railing satirist who wishes to write satirical plays which will expose and cure vice in their audience. And Jonson does not merely present such a character but also examines him critically. Asper's position is found to be inconsistent. Asper discusses the relationships between the satirical artifact and the audience which views it, not the relationship in a satirical artifact between the satirist and the fools. This latter subject is taken up in interspersed comments through the play proper by Mitis and Cordatus. Asper promises to present an accurate representation of folly and vice:

Well I will scourge those apes;
And to these courteous eyes oppose a mirror,
As large as is the stage, whereon we act:
Where they shall see the times deformity
Anatomiz'd in every nerve, and sinew,
With constant courage, and contempt of fear.

(Induction, 11. 117-22).

18 Herford and Simpson, IX, 410.
Warned by Mitis that "The dayes are dangerous, full of exception, / 
And men are growne impatient of reproofe" (Induction, 11, 124-25), 
Asper replies that the only persons "That eyther will, or can except against me" (Induction, 1, 130) are 

None, but a sort of fooles, so sicke in taste, 
That they contemne all phisicke of the mind 

(Induction, 11, 131-32).

On the other hand, 

Good men, and vertuous spirits, that lothe their vices, 
Will cherish my free labours, loue my lines, 
And with the feruour of their shining grace, 
Make my braine fruitfull to bring forth more obiects, 
Worthy their serious, and intentiue eyes 

(Induction, 11, 134-38).

Asper describes the people on whom his satire will work, and how it will work as follows: 

If any, here, chance to behold himselfe, 
Let him not dare to challenge me of wrong. 
For, if he shame to haue his follies knowne, 
first he should shame to act 'hem: my strict hand 
Was made to ceaze on vice, and with a gripe 
Squeeze out the humour of such spongie natures, 
As licke vp every idle vanitie 

(Induction, 11, 140-46).

In other words the only people on whom his satire will be effective are those who first recognise themselves in it, and then, presumably, submit voluntarily to its correction. If the world really is as bad as Asper says then few, we can conclude, will submit themselves like patient to doctor to be cured. This undercuts Asper's position as a reforming satirist, and Jonson's too if we take Asper to be in loco auctoris. However, if Asper represents, say, Marston then Jonson may be criticising his position by this cool analysis of it. It might be the case that in creating Asper, Jonson was not primarily concerned with analysing the
position of a satirist; perhaps Asper was intended primarily to establish from the start the combative, satirical temper, and to win the audience's approval for the play to come. Nevertheless, the contradictions in his position remain. Asper's declared intentions are, however, not tested because he does not appear in the play after the Induction; Jonson sidesteps the problem raised by turning him into Macilente.

Asper, outside the play, is transformed into Macilente, inside the play. Righteous moral indignation appropriate to satirist Asper, an observer of the human scene, becomes the humour of envy appropriate to a participant in the action. Envy is an emotion more likely to lead to action than indignation, and so more amenable to dramatic exploitation. More important, however, Macilente's humour of envy places him in the same category as the other characters; he too is possessed by "one peculiar quality" which makes "his powers, / In their confuctions, all to runne one way" (Induction, 11, 105-08). Envy renders his criticising others morally doubtful, and prevents an identification between him and the audience. More than this, however, Asper is implicitly criticised by the nature of his alter ego, the implication being that apparently disinterested moral indignation rests on a layer of disreputable envy, and that it is envy which fuels the business of satirising.

Cordatus instructs Mitis in the true nature of Macilente's envy: "he enuies [Sordido] not as he is a villaine, a wolfe i' the commonwealth, but as he is rich, and fortunate" (I. iii. 162-64). Envy, he says, is "to haue our eyes continually fixt vpon another mans prosperitie, that is, his chiefe happinesse, and to grieue at that" (I. iii. 165-67). Cordatus distinguishes envy from hate, which we experience "if we make his monstrous, and abhord actions our obiect" (I. iii. 167-68). By this definition Asper experiences hate, Macilente envy. Cordatus points out the subjective, selfish source of Macilente's urge to satirise, and contrasts him with Asper whose revulsion is objective and disinterested.

This play, like The Case is Altered and Marston's early plays, sets out to establish a special intimate relationship with its audience, part critical, part flattering. Details establish a closeness: Fungoso is a student at the Inns of Court (to which the play is dedicated), and at II. vi. 184. Cordatus places the action in Paul's yard. The sophisticated, witty attitude expected of the audience towards the play is present in the characters of the play itself. At the end of the Induction, Carlo Buffone enters and tells the audience about the ridiculous habits of the author, and defies him to "get me out of the humour hee has put mee in" (Induction, II. 245-47). The mood of critical sophistication produced in performance by the Induction is produced in reading by the witty 'characters'. Having a character discuss his part in the play raises the audience's awareness of the conventions and style of the play itself, the self-consciousness of the play demanding a concomitant self-consciousness in the audience. Mitis and Cordatus
and Carlo Buffone act as commentators on other characters; Asper comments in general terms outside the play; Macilente comments generally and particularly and also arranges exposure of humours. Only the last two can be described as satirist figures although all of these characters contribute to the play's flow of critical comment. 20

Macilente, envious that Sogliardo should be prosperous, cannot restrain himself from an outburst of anger and grief, complaining that Fortune should favour the jumped-up Sogliardo and ignore him (I.ii. 157-63). Sogliardo's pretensions to gentility are also satirised indirectly when Carlo's conscienceless advice on how to be a gentleman reveals the sham involved: "You must endeouer to feede cleanly at your Ordinarie, sit melancholy, and picke your teeth when you cannot speake: and when you come to Playes, be humorous, looke with a good startch't face, and ruffle your brow like a new boot" (I. ii. 55-59). The entertainment of this scene, and much of the play, lies not in moral reproof of demonstrable folly but in exuberant cross-currents of humourous behaviour and expression.

Macilente's reactions as a satirist are unpredictable. He laughs bitterly at Sordido's avarice (I. iii. 65) then chides himself for envying his prosperity. Macilente's situation pulls him in different directions: he is angered by fools and rails at them, but because of his envy not their folly. He chides himself for his

20 Cf. O. J. Campbell, Comical Satyre, p. 79: "The convention that became most distinctive of the new genre was the presence of at least one commentator, and usually two, upon the characters and the dramatic action". According to Campbell the first is a buffoon; the second represented the author in his newly assumed role of satirist.
envy and seems to stand apart from the others, but in fact is involved in the world of folly as they are. Macilente adapts to the present moment. His advice to Deliro on winning and keeping a wife's love is cynical ("When women doubt most of their husbands loues, / They are most louing" (II. iv. 62-63); then he himself is enraptured by Fallace and this prompts an envious outburst and a wish for the destruction of the foolish world:

Would to heaven
(In wreake of my misfortunes) I were turn'd
To some faire water—Wynth, that (set vpon
The deepest whirle-pit of the rau'nous seas,)
My adamantine eyes might head-long hale
This iron world to me, and drowne it all

(II. iv. 161-66).

Carlo Buffone and Macilente act in a complementary way to satirise and punish the other characters. In Act II, scene i, for example, Carlo makes fantastical comments on Fastidious (II, i. 93-102) which mock by their ridiculousness; and makes puncturing comments on Puntarvolo's address to his lady. In this same scene Cordatus and Mitis also comment (II. iii. 39-42), so there are two sets of commentators keeping the critical level high. Carlo's humour of detraction, however, makes him mock and detract; he does not make moral comments.

When Macilente's dis-humouring schemes start operating in Act V they exploit the humour of one character to dis-humour another. Macilente himself is dis-humoured by this process which simultaneously brings about the comic/satiric dénouement. The problem is that Macilente has no authority for his schemes, nor is there any reason why he should escape a dis-humouring as unpleasant as the others. In Act V, scene iv, Macilente prompts Carlo into torrents of verbalising which drive Puntarvolo into sealing his lips with wax. As the scheming proceeds Cordatus
says of Macilente, "I, you shall see the true picture of spight anon" (V. viii. 79). Finally, Macilente declares himself to be out of his humour which "(like a flame) no longer lasts / Then it hath stuffe to feed it" (V. xi. 57-58). It might be objected that total depopulation is a high price to pay for putting the satirist's mind at rest, but the pleasure of the ending is in its intellectual neatness.

Jonson never again depicted an angry moral satirist like Asper, a figure derived from verse satire. However, the struggle against folly and vice continues to be a major concern of Jonson's plays and the attempt to form characters to speak and act against these forces similarly continues. The two most important problems for such characters come to be the need for a valid source of authority for satirising, and the need to arrange effective satirising which includes exposure, punishment, and reform. In his next play Jonson presents a new formulation in his satirist figure.

_Cynthia's Revels_ (1600)

_Cynthia's Revels_, written for the Children of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, departs from the realistic mode of _Every Man Out_; set in the imaginary land of Gargaphie it includes allegorical figures and divine personages as well as mortal. Harry Levin points out that "Jonson's comedies, from first to last, have a tendency to crystallise, whenever opportunity offers, into a series of games, ceremonies, shows, songs ... and every sort of masque-like
Cynthia's Revels displays this tendency in its fullest form. The linear construction of Every Man Out, consisting of a string of episodes designed to illuminate a humour, has become attenuated and the episodes themselves tumescent. Consequently, the play has no dramatic tension.

The problem which Jonson avoids in Every Man Out, that of setting a satirist (Asper) among fools to criticise, judge, and reform them, he confronts in Cynthia's Revels. There are several characters who act as commentators: Arete and Crites, Mercury and Cupid, and Cynthia herself. Crites, the play's satirist figure, is described by Mercury, in one of the play's eight 'characters', as being ideal:

A creature of a most perfect and divine temper.
One, in whom the humours and elements are peaceably met, without emulation of precedencie:
... in all, so composed & order'd, as it is cleare, Nature went about some ful worke, she did more then make a man, when she made him.

(II. iii. 123-25, 128-30).

Or perfect disposition and clear vision, Crites has an inner contentment for "Fortune could neuer breake him, nor make him lesse" (II. iii. 139-40). He is Jonson's idealised satirist figure. His perfection, however, denies him dramatic life, and more important, effectiveness as a reformer. Crites is satisfied with being virtuous: "He doth neyther couet, nor feare; hee hath too much reason to doe eyther: and that commends all things to him" (II. iii. 143-45). Such lofty contentment is not the stuff from
which stinging satire comes. Macilente's envy is a necessary transformation from Asper's moral anger to bring about reforming action. Crites' composure sits uneasily with his other functions as a satirist.

Crites is most impressive in a static situation. Act III, scene iv, for example, takes the form of a verse satire: prompted by Arete's question, "where haue you drawne forth the day?" (III, iv. 1), Crites launches into a description of "The strangest pageant, fashion'd like a court, / (At least I dream't I saw it)" (III. iv. 4). He follows the method of verse satire by describing foolish courtiers one after another:

He past, appeares some mincing marmoset
Made all of clothes, and face...
   A third comes giuing nods
To his repenting creditors

(III. iv. 22-23, 35-36).

In Act I Crites makes satirical asides on Amorphus' wish to be described to Asotus: "O heauen! that any thing (in the likenesse of man) should suffer these rackt extremities, for the uttering of his sophisticate good parts" (I. iv. 46-48); and comments aside when they encounter, intensifying the audience's scorn of the fools, who are untouched by it. Crites closes the act with a long monologue on vanity, in which he reflects upon the fact that men may be clearly suffering from folly (he calls it vanity)

and yet be persistent in it. He observes that those who are gripped with vanity cannot see it in themselves because they "greet her with lockt eyes" (I. v. 50); if they could see it the sight would "fright the'enamor'd dotards from themselues" (I. v. 54); but the perverseness of human nature prevents men from seeing their vanity because they choose "rather not to see it, then auoide it" (I. v. 59). Although not explicit, it can be reasonably inferred that Crites wishes to open those locked eyes so that the very sight of their own folly will cure them of it. This is the analysis of human folly and its operation underlying Crites' position as critic and reformer. At its centre is the conviction that men will reform themselves if their folly is revealed to them. The primary task of Crites as a satirist then is revelation; reformation is secondary.

Crites' analysis of folly is cool, but his motivation for such an intense interest is uncertain, varying from revulsion at folly to personal indifference to it. When he over hears Hedon and Anaides planning to slander him, for example, his reaction is pitying, and he places his trust in the expectation "That the best iudgements can report me wrong'd; / Them lyars" (III, iii.10-11). Crites sees himself as a disinterested physician (III. iii. 33-36); but the trouble with this notion is that the foolish courtiers will not quietly submit to his medicine. His declared position is not consistent.

Mercury has a part in bringing about the kind of satirical exposure, punishment and reform which Macilente achieved in Every Man Out. He gives several satirical "characters", as does Cupid, of the false courtiers of the court, in a remarkably
self-conscious way:

*MERCURY*. Peace, CVFID, here comes more worke for you, 
another character or two

(II. iii. 186-87).

The device of having one set of characters commenting on another 
as they pass over the stage produces a powerful satirical effect. 
It is one of the pieces of satirical dramaturgy that is used in 
later satirical plays, by Jonson notably in *Sejanus*, and also 
by Shakespeare and Marston. In reply to Mercury's query if the 
persons they have just watched and described are the nymphs of 
Cynthia's court, Cupid says not: "These are privately brought in 
by MORIA in this licentious time, against her [Cynthia's ] 
knowledge: and (like so many meteors) will vanish, when shee 
appeares" (II. iv. 109-11). At one blow this information deprives 
the confrontation between fools and commentators of any real 
conflict or suspense. Cynthia has absolute power to dispel instantly 
the false courtiers, who are in any case merely intruders. The 
play is deprived of even the dramatic life of *Every Man Out*, 
where the world the fools inhabit is their own and in which they 
live with tremendous vigour. What action *Cynthia's Revels* 
has is of a peculiarly indirect kind: awaiting the water of the 
Fountain of Self-Love, they pass the time in games such as 
"Substantiues, and Adiectiues" (IV. iii. 88); Amorphus gives 
advice to Asotus on how to become a fine courtier, but typically it is 
not foolish or corrupt court behaviour itself that they display, 
merely the rehearsal of it. There is no convincing vice or folly 
present in the play, nor is vice and folly allowed force or 
vitality.

Mercury takes an active part in exposing the court ninnies,
indicating the plot against the fools, and seeking Crites' help; in the hope of achieving "a high straine of laughter" (IV. v. 150-51). Crites agrees to Mercury's plan because it is suggested by a divine creature, though he is reluctant to associate with such unequal (low) natures. Just as Asper's moral indignation issues in action through Macilente's envy, so Crites' issues in action through Mercury's divine authority. In Every Man Out Jonson's satirist is activated from below, as it were, by envy, the morally repugnant nature of which necessitates splitting the character into Asper (ego) and Macilente (id), and having the former outside and the latter inside the action. In Cynthia's Revels the satirist (corresponding to Asper, but not identical) remains in the action and is activated by an absolute authority above, giving the different formula Crites (ego) and Mercury (superego). Mercury's purpose is specific. He intends to expose the fools' deformed natures, measured against an ideal of dignified human behaviour, both to the virtuous and to themselves. The fools will be punished and reformed by the laughter of the virtuous. Crites declares his dependence on Mercury's divinity to "make all things good" (V. i. 24), but protests again at his involvement in such a plan (V.i. 23-29). Mercury reassures him that the virtuous in court will approve of their planned rebuke and provide protection. It is thus made quite clear that Crites' participation in the climactic, satirical masque is reluctant, and that he relies on a greater authority than his own.

The first fruits of their "ironical confederacie" (V. i. 29) are very trivial indeed: Crites helps Mercury, fantastically dressed, to discomfit the pseudo-gallants; Crites delivers sharp
insulting asides to the bystanders during the compliment-combat of Mercury and Amorphus; and later Crites satirises Anaides by 'wooing' Philautia in his style, thus depriving him of his ridiculous expressions. All this leads to Mercury's conclusion that the fools are hardly human anyway:

Who sees not now their shape, and nakednesse,
Is blinder then the sonne of earth, the mole:
Crown'd with no more humanitie, nor soule

(V. iv. 622-24).

However, the false courtiers are not to be let off lightly. Arete orders Crites to arrange a masque, and when he objects that "So many follies will confusion proue" (V. v. 10), Arete explains that the fools will be assimilated into order and regularity at the sight of Cynthia, the embodiment of all virtue. Cynthia, Mercury goes on to explain, hearing what follies have entered her palace has decided to order various entertainments in order to have the fools publicly display themselves so that she can "Effect the reformation shee intends" (V. v. 46). Cynthia, not Crites, is assigned the function of moral reformer. After the masques Cynthia's order to unmask is swiftly followed by punishment and reward. In language reminiscent of verse satire, Cynthia accuses the fantastic courtiers:

In stead of med'cines, haue we maladies?
And such impostumes, as PHANTASTE is,
Grow in our palace, we must lance these sores,
Or all will putrifie

(V. xi. 66-69).

Power to reform or punish offenders is devolved from Cynthia to Arete and Crites. Happily for Crites the fools agree to their being punished, and he recommends a course of penance followed by draughts from the well of knowledge. The efficacy of Crites' reforming plans is not seen.
The realisation of Crites' moral vision depends on the fact that virtue and power are co-existent, indeed co-extensive, in the world of the play. Cynthia is absolute in judgement and power, and so is Arete, and it is Crites' happy situation to be recognisable to them as one of them. Indeed Crites is represented as another kind of being from the fools. In Poetaster Jonson dramatises again an unshakeable pact between the man of political power and the discriminating moralist, and there too there is a separation of being between the satirist and the satirised.

One passage suggests a pessimism underlying the bland conclusion, when Cynthia justifies her position as dictator of virtue:

But if that Deities with-drew their gifts,
For humane follies, what could men deserue
But death, and darknesse? It behooues the high,
For their owne sakes, to doe things worthily

(V. vi. 33-36).

The implications of this speech are not treated dramatically by Jonson until Sejanus.

The attempt to create in Crites a convincing critic and agent of reform can hardly be considered a dramatic success. The scenario of ideal man befriended by a divine figure in opposition to vacuous, feeble fools whose folly is not allowed to exercise itself, in the court of a virtuous, omnipotent monarch does not provide a persuasive image of either satirist against fool, or knowledge against ignorance, or love of virtue against self-love. Jonson tries to provide Crites with all the powers and motivations necessary for a satirist but without presenting him as an angry,
indignant satirist like Asper, in order to avoid the contradictions surrounding such a satirist. Without indignation, however, it is difficult to motivate Crites to act at all, and it is only thanks to Mercury's prompting and Cynthia's extensive powers that he plays any part at all in ridding the play of its fools.

**Poetaster (1601)**

Poetaster, Jonson's main contribution to the so-called War of the Theatres, ended the attacks from the rival playwrights, Marston and Dekker. Nevertheless, despite its important role in the poetomachia, Poetaster embodies some of Jonson's central literary notions and his further developed views of an authoritative, effective satirist figure. In the last of the "comicall satyres" Jonson escaped the overblown verbalisation of Cynthia's Revels, and brought his attention to bear on the subject of the place and function of the satirist as poet in society. Poetaster is replete with historical and fictitious poets, and through them images of the true and false poet emerge. "An armed Prologue" (Prologue, 1, 6) establishes Jonson's combative stance, declaring that "'tis a dangerous age" (Prologue, 1, 6) because of "the conjuring

---

23 For a full account see R. A. Small, *The Stage-Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters*, Breslau, 1899; and for critical discussions of the whole matter see Herford and Simpson, I, 24-31, 432-36, IX, 399-406; and R. W. Berringer, "Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and the War of the Theaters", *Philological Quarterly*, 22, 1943, 1-22.

24 Berringer, *op. cit.*, concludes that the "only two plays really involved are Poetaster and Satiromastix, with What You Will acting as a catalyst." Most modern scholarship has narrowed the bounds of the stage quarrel, and limited its importance in shaping the plays involved.
meanes / Of base detractors, and illiterate apes" (Prologue, 11, 8-9) who twist the general application of his work to the personal. There is disingenuousness in Jonson's appeal to the audience to consider the vices not the persons. Crispinus and Demetrius are identified with Marston and Dekker respectively, Horace with Jonson himself, and the play has other possible personal references. 25

While this must be kept in mind, it is nevertheless true that "personal portraiture is altogether secondary to symbolism". 26 Jonson's attacks on his rivals have a general level of application which transcends the personal quarrels which provoked them.

Horace is Jonson's least engaged satirist. He does not appear until Act III, and even then suffers greatly from fools before he breaks into a satirical attack. Horace is not simply a satirist, but a character who is a satirist because he writes satire. He is therefore more indirect a satirist than Asper and Crites, and he seldom satirises fools directly. R. C. Jones 27 describes a progression evident in the series Asper, Crites, Horace, from a raging combative stance towards folly, through disinterested indignation towards it, to aloofness combined with vulnerability towards it. Each stage represents an increasing withdrawal by the satirist from the fools.

25 See O. J. Campbell, "Comicall Satyre", p. 123: "Histrio is obviously meant to suggest a member of the rival Chamberlain's Company".

26 C. R. Baskervill, English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedies, Austin, Texas, 1911, p. 303.

Horace is first displayed in his encounter with the bore, Crispinus; a scene based, like Donne's *Satyre I*, on Horace's Satire I, ix. In *Poetaster* Horace is firm but polite in attempting to rid himself of Crispinus, but is defeated by his total effrontery. Eventually, goaded beyond endurance, he breaks into angry reproof in defence of Mecænas and his house:

> Gods, you doe know it, I can hold no longer;  
> This brize hath prickt my patience: Sir, your silkenesse  
> Cleerely mistakes MECÆNAS, and his house;  
> To thincke, there breathes a spirit beneath his roofe,  
> Subject vnto those poore affections  
> Of vnder-mining enuie, and detraction

(III. i. 247-52).

Horace's moral superiority does not protect him from the social horror of fools; but his satirising merely encourages Crispinus, and Horace is only saved by the arrival of the Lictors to arrest Crispinus for debt.

Horace is present very seldom to satirise the fools. When he sees Crispinus again he exits hastily. He has one satirical outburst against Lupus and Histrio, calling them "The bane of empires; and the dregs of courts" (IV. vii. 45), and accusing them of maliciously defaming others in order to gain employment, but his usual reaction is superior indifference. He is kept in reserve for the final exposures and punishments.

The fools are mostly left to expose themselves, although Tucca's speeches, expressing like Carlo Buffone's the spirit of detraction, have a satirical effect. His encomium of Crispinus, for example, in fact exposes the poetaster (III. iv. 159-63).
The plot centering on Ovid satirises corrupt Roman society. Ovid's slavish adoration of Julia, and his dedication of his poetry to her praise marks him out as dangerously sensual and self-indulgent:

O, in no labyrinth, can I safer erre,
Then when I lose my selfe in praysing her
(I. iii. 47-48).

His false notion and practice of poetry represent his failure to fulfil the social responsibilities of a poet, and are the direct cause of the ruinous behaviour of the group round him. Drawn to Ovid's court are the poetaster, the misguided bourgeoisie Chloe and her uxorious husband Albius. They feebly ape the behaviour of Ovid's courtly group just as Crispinus apes Ovid by depending on Chloe's love and beauty to make him a poet. The socially degenerating effect of Ovid's behaviour is condemned as wholeheartedly as his poetic heresies. O.J. Campbell observes that in "effecting this relationship, Jonson fuses social and literary satire better than he had in earlier comedies". Ovid's banishment from Rome indicates the unregenerate nature of his folly; and his last farewell to Julia shows he has not learned from his mistake, as he embraces the madness caused by love in preference to the sanity possible without it. The persistence of Ovid's folly is underlined by the action of the farewell scene (IX. ix). Played by the children, the exaggerations of speech and action burlesque the emotion of the lovers and satirise the characters.

28 Cf. Herford and Simpson, I, 430: the Ovid plot "so far surpasses in dramatic potentiality all the events in which more important persons are engaged, that it seems to demand a more important function."


30 Comical Satyre, p. 120.
Horace has only a limited amount of direct satirical expression. Tucca's comment, "Hang him fustie satyre, he smells all goate" (III. iv. 367), is belied by the contemplative, even introspective tone of some speeches. In Act III, scene v, Horace discusses the kind of poetry he should write. This scene is part of Jonson's attack in the *poetomachia*; it also establishes Horace's poetic principles and sets him up as a true satiric poet and a virtuous man, in contrast to Ovid and the poetasters. Rejecting epic or verses flattering to Cæsar, Horace declares he must write satire, but adds that he will only turn his "sower" style against a "malicious thiefe / [who] Robs my good name" (III. v. 69-70). He "will write satyres still, in spight of feare" (III. v. 100), motivated not by personal rage against viciousness, but from a stern adherence to the good. Pausing to criticise "lewd verses; such as libels bee, / And aym'd at persons of good qualitie" (III. v. 130-31), Horace rounds off the discussion by declaring support for "sharp, yet modest rimes / That spare mens persons, and but taxe their crimes" (III. v. 133-34). Alvin Kernan comments that Horace's high moral character may be admirable, and Crites' too, but "their probity and stern sense of decorum prevent them from making any very cutting attack on foolishness". Their inner calm sets them both far distant from the rogues and fools they criticise, and consequently there is little contact between satirist and satirised.

31 This scene is a free rendering of Horace, *Satires*, II.i.

If Horace represents the poet striving towards an ideal, Virgil is the embodiment of it. Act V demonstrates Virgil's genius and shows Cæsar's supreme regard for both poetry and the poet; and the service they can do the state:

Shee can so mould Rome, and her monuments,
Within the liquid marble of her lines,
That they shall stand fresh, and miraculous,
Euen, when they mixe with innouating dust

(V. i. 21-24).

This expresses a deeply-felt hope on Jonson's part. Crites is the obedient servant of Cynthia; Virgil has transcended that role to become the acknowledged master of Cæsar in his practice of the immortal art. Jonson's interest in the figure of the satirist merges into the larger one of the poet's, particularly the satirical poet's, place in society, and the relationship of the poet to the politically powerful. Cæsar, the embodiment of worldly power, respects and adores the genius of Virgil, and this represents the ideal relationship between poet and man of power. The exploration of the theme of critic and ruler is a major interest of Cynthia's Revels and Poetaster and accounts partially for the strangely unsatirical nature of the two satirist figures descended from Asper.

In Act V, Virgil sitting in judgement distinguishes the true and false satiric spirits, the former being "the wholesome sharpe moralitie, / Or modest anger" (V. iii. 137-38), the latter being "the sinister application / Of the malicious, ignorant, and base / Interpreter" (V. iii. 140-42), adding that it is the latter which harms the state. Horace, now vindicated in every respect, is given free rein by Cæsar, just as Crites was by Cynthia, to arraign his accusers. The impulse to satirical action in both cases is imposed from above, and Horace like Crites accepts reluctantly. The weighty, grave tone of the discussion
about satire is not sustained in the final scene of exposure and punishment. Horace's pills are a ridiculous if ingenious device to purge Crispinus against his will, since Horace's words have been ineffective. Virgil recommends, like Crites, authors for Crispinus' long-term cure. As in Cynthia's Revels, the satiric climax proves the least convincing part. Horace declares throughout that he cannot be touched by the envy and detraction of fools yet he carries out the punishments at Caesar's request, but Caesar merely wants to "sit by, spectator of your sports" (V.iii, 163). These are inconsistencies which the play does not resolve.

The 'Apologetical Dialogue' appended to Poetaster presents Jonson's reasons for withdrawing from the postomachia and turning to tragedy. It is difficult to gauge exactly the degree of seriousness of both the 'Apologetical Dialogue' and Poetaster as a whole. The Author's claim, for example, that he always taxed the vice and not the person is clearly disingenuous. Also, the apparent disjunction of tone between Horace's grave speech and behaviour, and the ridiculous, crude punishments he administers raises difficulties. It must be kept in mind that Poetaster was originally played by children whose acting style tended to expose absurdity in adult behaviour. These factors, which are common to some extent to the satirical plays of both Jonson and Marston in the turn of the century years, make it extremely difficult to determine the exact tone of the plays. It has been suggested in Chapter three that Marston's audience had a capacity for accepting sudden, violent shifts of tone from, say, extremely exaggerated burlesque to extremely serious philosophical discussion, and giving both extremes their full value in their own terms. It is perhaps an aspect of the sophisticated sensibility of the time. In any case
it seems likely that Jonson's "comicall satyres", though nothing like so extreme in style as Marston's burlesque plays, also created and demanded a breadth and flexibility of response from their audience if their variety of tone was to be appreciated. *Poetaster* contains scenes as various as the emblematic struggle between Envy and the Prologue, Ovid and his circle dressed as gods planning to emulate the gods' sex lives, the learned dramatic reconstruction of Horace's *Satire* I. ix, the purging of Crispinus, and the honouring of Virgil. To be fully appreciated each of these scenes has to be considered separately as an aspect of the dramatic power and inventiveness which the "comicall satyres" represent, as well as being considered as part of the whole. This aspect of the play's style and its required response may explain how the final scene might have been acceptable and entertaining in performance; but nevertheless Jonson managed no better than Marston in creating a dramatically effective and logically consistent satirist figure.

In the 'Apologetical Dialogue' Jonson finds himself in a position exactly like Asper's inasmuch as he is a satirist playwright asserting the power of his satirical play to expose and cure fools (in this case Marston and Dekker) who are outside it in its audience. This is a separate concern from that of presenting a convincing dramatised action of satirist and victims in a play, since this is contained entirely inside the fiction. Asper and Jonson attempt to bridge the divide between fiction and reality. As the Author, Jonson is caught in Asper's dilemmas which he laid bare so acutely in the Induction of *Every Man Out*, and many of the arguments used by Cordatus and Mitis against Asper, and the self-justifications that Asper gave are here repeated by the Author. The Author claims,
It is the happiest thing, this not to be
Within the reach of malice; It provides
A man so well, to laugh of injuries

('Apol. Dial.' 11. 28-30).

To Polypus' remark that "It wil be taken / To be stupidity, or
tamenesse in you " ('Apol. Dial.', 11. 156-57) to withdraw from
the struggle with his detractors the Author gives the notable reply:

But, they that haue incens'd me, can in soule
Acquit me of that guilt. They know, I dare
To spurne, or baffull 'hem; or squirt their eyes
With inke, or vrine: or I could doe worse,
Arm'd with ARCHILOCHVS fury, write Iambicks,
Should make the desperate lashere hang themselves.
Rime 'hem to death, as they doe Irish rats
In drumming tunes

('Apol. Dial.', 11. 157-64).

He now admits to having been incensed and claims he could even destroy his enemies with the infinitely powerful weapon of his satire. But he has not done so, because "within his guilty brest / Each slanderer beares a whip, that shall torment him, /
Worse, then a million of these temporall plagues" ('Apol. Dial.',
11. 175-55). For the Author: to have punished them "were but a feminine humour, / And, farre beneath the dignitie of a man" ('Apol. Dial.'
11. 178-79). Now he will "leaue the monsters / To their owne fate"
('Apol. Dial.', 11. 221-22) and write only for the judicious: "If
I proue the pleasure but of one, / So he iudicious be" ('Apol. Dial.'
11. 226-27). The situation is that the Author has not punished his enemies, and they are still freely practising their folly; he is turning away from them and addressing himself to the judicious.

R. C. Jones detects in the 'Apologetical Dialogue' "the ambivalence of an author who wants to claim, on the one hand, that his art is too lofty to affect that bawd the world and, on the other, that he
can transform the world with his art". 33

The central problem in dramatising the complete satirical process using the satirists Asper, Crites, Horace, and indeed Jonson himself, is that of punishing and reforming fools in a way which is total and permanent and which does not expose the satirist himself to charges of ineffectiveness, maliciousness, or indignity. Jonson did not achieve this for reasons of which he was fully aware and himself analysed. After Poetaster he did not again present authoritative, powerful satirist figures.

The natural bond between satirical commentators and rulers in Cynthia's Revels and Poetaster arises from the fact that both commentators and rulers are virtuous and recognise virtue in each other. Their alliance ensures that their idea of a sound society will prevail. The path both plays trace is from the attempt of the fools to thwart this alliance and draw royal favour onto themselves, to the re-establishment of order by the rulers' endorsing the judgements of the commentators. With an ideal prince and an ideal critic virtue necessarily triumphs. The dramatic possibilities offered by such ideal commentators are severely limited, and Jonson exhausted them in the last two "comicall satyres", in Sejanus he overturned the alliance between ruler and satirist figure, breaking the concord and repositioning the satirist at the opposite pole from the ruler, in terms of both virtue and power.

Sejanus His Fall (1603)

Tiberius is the embodiment of political tyranny and personal viciousness, and his power breeds an atmosphere of treachery and fear. Jonson's portrayal of a totalitarian society is one of his finest achievements, and its fundamental characteristic as he shows it is its pervasive injustice. In this situation Tiberius and Sejanus struggle for power, watched by a number of supporters and opponents, one of whom is the satirist figure Arruntius.

D. C. Boughner observes that the "crowd of persons on the boards group themselves into three sharply differentiated bodies of men, each with a focal and unifying center. In order of appearance these are, we perceive, first Arruntius, then Sejanus, and finally Tiberius". This grouping makes possible one of Jonson's "most persistent and characteristic devices of stagecraft; the division of his characters into two distinct groups, one of which comments pungently on the actions of the other". The satiric possibilities of this technique can be seen in Act I. At line 20 Sabinus and Silius comment with satirical anger and scorn on Satrius and Natta, clients of Sejanus:

---

34 Critical judgement has moved strongly in the play's favour in the last decade. R. Orstein, The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy, Madison and Milwaukee, 1960, p.84, observes that "Time has not reversed the Jacobean verdict on Jonson's tragedies, nor is it likely that any vagary of taste will ever bring them into general favour". In 1965 J.A.Barish in his edition described it as "one of the neglected masterpieces of the English stage", [Yale] New Haven and London, p.2, although voicing reservations about its overemphasis on the ethical realm, p. 23; and J.W.Lever in his Tragedy of State, London, 1971, pp. 54-5, says that "Jonson's artistic energies were fully at work" in this tragedy "which exposes the fatal flaw in history, the pity and terror of the world of state" and is "like Shakespeare's for all time".


SIL[US].

There be two,
Know more, then honest councells: whose close breasts
Were they rip'd vp to light, it would be found
A poore, and idle sinne, to which their trunkes
Had not beene made fit organs

(I. 23-27).

When another pair enters (1.73) the dialogue shifts to Natta and Latiaris who discuss the new pair. Throughout Act I, and extensively in the rest of the play, there is a multiple action, several groups on stage carrying on separate plots and commenting on one another. The form of the stage spectacle presents an image of the hostile, fragmented operation of Roman politics of dictatorship.

Arruntius, the play's satirist-figure, "resumes the Asper-Crites-Horace of the Humour comedies", 37 but unlike them is treated critically by Jonson. Arruntius and his friends still cherish the old Roman ideals of virtue, but are powerless to destroy Tiberius. They comment on the actions of other characters, and make general reflections. Arruntius indeed is nearer to being an angry satirist of the type created in formal satire than the two previous satirists, Horace and Crites; because like the personae of verse satire he is utterly powerless to change what he attacks. Arruntius' powerlessness restores dramatic tension to his utterances as a satirist that Crites' and Horace's political security deprived them of. He is faced with dangerous, evil man, while they were faced with cyphers of folly. He is able to see evil clearly but powerless to defeat it, and the gap between his perception and his power charges his utterances with great passion. Arruntius understands the humiliating circumstances of

his position - "We, / That are the good-dull-noble lookers on, /
Are only call'd to keepe the marble warme" (III. 15-17) - but
suffers it by regarding himself with self-protecting irony.

His impotence is brought out in the trial scene of Act III where
he derides the grovelling Senators, with bitter irony, but cannot
prevent Silius' suicide:

TIBERIUS'. And, now I am the happy witnesse made
Of your so much desir'd affections...
How euer, to my labours, I intreat
(And beg it of the Senate) some fit ease.

(ARRUNTUS]. Laugh, Fathers, laugh: Ha' you no spleenes
about you?)

(III. 106-07, 110-12).

Jonson makes Arruntius "not so much an object of emulation
as the conscience of the play". 38 He displays primarily a
passionate and sometimes misguided moral intensity. In Act I
he can barely control his anger at the thought of Sejanus'
political corruption, and is restrained (I. 252-60). Later in the
Act following a serious political analysis by Silius, Arruntius
cries impetuously that Tiberius ought to be informed, and
again has to be calmed:

SABINUS]. Stay, ARRUNTIVS,
We must abide our opportunity:
And practise what is fit, as what is needfull.
"It is not safe t'enforce a soueraigne's eare:
"Princes heare well, if they at all will heare

(I. 430-34).

Discussion of the immediate political realities are assigned to
other characters, not Arruntius.

38 Sejanus, ed. J.A.Barish, New Haven and London, 1965,
Despite his political naivete, Arruntius voices the ideal of true Roman morality. His anger and derision maintain a severe and serious moral criticism of the action. They also provide an outlet for the emotions an audience experiences when faced with a dramatic action too serious for laughter but at the same time too ludicrous to be solemn. Jonson's extensive use of the aside for satirical purpose allows the integration of the commentator and the scene on which he is commenting. The audience's attention is constantly shifting from the scene to the commentator, so creating an intense moral awareness.

Sejanus knows of Arruntius' opposition to his ambitions but disregards him: "And ther's ARRUNTIVS too, he only talkes" (II. 299). Indeed Sejanus considers Arruntius useful. He responds to Tiberius' suggestion that Arruntius should be liquidated with the advice, "By any meanes, / preserue him", for "His franke tongue / Being lent the reines, will take away all thought / Of malice, in your course against the rest" (III. 498-500), and concludes "We must keep him to stalke with" (III. 501). Ironically, Arruntius is contributing to the pair's continuing ascendancy. Arruntius' position as an indignant, moral spokesman is severely undercut by Sejanus' exploiting him as a cover for plotting. Arruntius is not only helpless to act against evil, but actually aids it indirectly by the disturbance his exclamations create.

39 Cf. L. C. Knights, Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson, Harmondsworth, 1962 [1st ed. 1937], p. 152: "The most obvious device for determining the angle of presentation is found in the vein of farce that runs throughout: there is a violent juxtaposition of contrasts".
Arruntius is present to comment when Sejanus falls. With asides spoken during the reading of Tiberius' letter he creates satirical scorn and derision as Sejanus is destroyed by Tiberius:

\[
\text{(ARR[UNIUS]. The place growes hot, they shift.) ...} \\
\text{Gods! how the leaues drop off, this little winde!)...} \\
\text{O, the spie!} \\
\text{The reuerend spie is caught, who pitties him?} \\
\text{Reward, sir, for your seruice: now, you ha' done} \\
\text{Your propertie, you see what vse is made?} \\
\text{(V. 609, 618, 650-53).}
\]

Lepidus explicates the moral and political commonplaces he sees in Sejanus' fall (V. 705-20), and Arruntius prophesises that Macro, Tiberius' spy, "will become / A greater prodigie in Rome, then he / That now is falne" (V. 751-53). The future continues the brutal struggle for power of criminal politicians, and the helpless observation of this process by the virtuous. There is no attempt to provide Arruntius with the satirical functions of exposing, punishing, or reforming. His satirical function is limited to voicing angrily the old Roman morality. He is denied insight into political life.

\textit{Sejanus} presents a profoundly pessimistic vision of the world. The idealised pact between satirist and ruler precariously sustained in \textit{Cynthia's Revels} and \textit{Poetaster} has collapsed leaving Arruntius the satirist exposed and powerless in the face of unrestrained evil. Jonson never attempted again to re-establish the supremacy of the satirist. On the contrary, in \textit{Volpone} Celia and Bonario, like Arruntius helpless protesters at the violation of morality, are reduced further in dramatic significance.
Summary

Jonson's conception of the satirist was ambitious and unique. Eschewing the satyr-persona of much verse satire he developed a restrained authoritative persona in the Epigrammes, modest and secure in his own values.

In The Case is Altered and Every Man In there are no satirists, although in both plays there are characters who comment on others and arrange situations which have satirical effect. In Asper, Jonson presents for the one and only time a satirist on the angry, Juvenalian model, and at the same time as fully portraying the type he is also implicitly criticising it by the fact that an envious alter ego is required to effect Asper's desires. Faced with problems of the satirist's motive, authority, and involvement Jonson adopted various strategies in the attempt to produce a convincing satirist: with Crites and Horace the satirist's authority is derived from the virtuous rulers, and satirical functions (of judging, condemning, punishing, reforming) are distributed among several characters. The satirist/ruler pact is intrinsically unlikely and dramatically unsatisfactory when it attempts to depict successful satirical reform. When he has to act to eradicate the folly he condemns, the satirist exposes himself to criticism. Jonson only solved the problem by overturning it in Sejanus and making Arruntius powerless, and forced to appeal to an unrealised moral ideal. The satirist figures of the "comicall satyres" represent an experiment to depict a fully justified and successful satirist which Jonson did not repeat after Poetaster. The "comicall satyres" also represent an attempt to put into effect an absolute, idealistic morality. "Humour" in them is a morally
culpable deviation and as such to be extirpated. In the course of the three plays the forces of morality strengthen and the forces of folly fade until the struggle is hopelessly unequal - to the detriment of dramatic interest. The strategy of Dr. Clement to allow folly free rein to work itself out, and the value assigned to wit, are absent from the "comicall satyres". In Epicoene, wit reappears as a viable response to folly, along with characters similar to Lorenzo Junior with an urbane, pragmatic response to folly, quite distinct from the satirists.

In certain respects the style of Jonson's early plays prepares the way for Volpone and later plays. His audience is familiarised with certain kinds of responses: ironical, critical, and satirical. There is also a development of satirical techniques: one or more sets of commentators; use of asides; use of an ironical dramaturgy; and the rapid switching of tones. These techniques contribute to the making of Volpone, Jonson's most satirical play. Paradoxically it has no satirist figure.
Shakespeare wrote no verse satire nor plays specifically for children, as Jonson and Marston did. He did write plays, however, in which commentator and satirist figures play a part, sometimes a large part, and at least one play, Troilus and Cressida, which can be considered as dramatic satire. This chapter examines commentator and satirist figures in the plays before Troilus and Cressida.
Berowne is a critic of his fellow academicians. He swears to follow the strict inhibitions proposed by the King of Navarre but also voices scepticism about the venture, based on what he claims to be common sense. He declares he will study with the rest, "To know the thing I am forbid to know" (I. i. 60), but glosses this as a benign materialism:

... where I well may dine,
When I to feast expressly am forbid;
Or study where to meet some mistress fine,
When mistresses from common sense are hid

(I. i. 61-64).

Berowne's comments exemplify his sceptical character, and also contribute to the exploration of the theme of study through the use of fairly formalised debate-conversations. His judgement on study - "...all delights are vain, but that most vain, / Which with pain purchas'd doth inherit pain" (I. i. 72-73) - supplies the sharpest response to their venture. The King rebukes Berowne's tartness:

Berowne is like an envious sneaping frost
That bites the first-born infants of the spring

(I. i. 100-01).

1 This is the date given in Annals of English Drama, 875-1700, A. Harbage, rev. S. Schoenbaum, London, 1964. Unless otherwise stated the dates of all plays are taken from this volume. R. David, in the Arden edition, London, 1951, argues that the play was written in the autumn of 1593, p. xxviii.

2 Love's Labour's Lost, ed. R. David, London, 1951. I have used the Arden editions of Shakespeare wherever these are available. Other references, unless otherwise stated, are to The Complete Works of William Shakespeare, ed. W. J. Craig, Oxford, n.d.
The tone of the play, witty, gay and ridiculous, sounds through this first scene preventing it from becoming over-serious. Berowne's comments provide a contrast to the other lords and heighten the attitudes of both. He is fully involved in the action.

When he falls in love with Rosaline, he protests against Cupid's powers, and reflects on the loss of his previous role of critic:

Ber[owne]. O! and I forsooth in love!
  I, that have been love's whip;
  A very beadle to humorous sigh;
  A critic, nay, a night-watch constable,
  A domineering pedant o'er the boy,
  Than whom no mortal so magnificent ...
  What! I love! I sue! I seek a wife!
  A woman that is like a German clock,
  Still a-repairing, ever out of frame,
  And never going aright, being a watch...
  Well, I will love, write, sigh, pray, sue, and groan:
  Some men must love my lady, and some Joan

(III.i. 168-73, 184-87, 199-200).

The images in this speech are self-consciously bawdy and misogynistic and will later be used in satirical contexts, but the tone remains good-natured. Berowne is placed very firmly inside the courtly society, and that is how he sees himself. He differs from his companions in believing himself to have a more sensible approach to study and to women, but just as important, he believes himself to be the most witty. He expresses his superior wit through humourous and satirical commentary.

3 The image of the German clock was taken over by Jonson and used in a speech of Truewit's, Epicoene, IV. ii.97-101, producing a much harsher tone than Berowne's.
Harold Jenkins notes that *Love's Labour's Lost* is "the most formally constructed of all the comedies", and one manifestation of this is that "the characters always act in concert". Berowne falls in love, and in Act IV, scene iii, he enters melancholy. When in close succession the King, Longaville, and Dumain also enter in love, Berowne stands back and observes. The levels of dramatic irony thus set up are reinforced by Berowne's comments aside, addressed virtually to the audience:

Berowne. This is the liver vein, which makes flesh a deity; A green goose a goddess; pure, pure idolatry. God amend us, God amend! we are much out o' th' way

(IV. iii. 71-73).

The device of eavesdropping occurs in the comedies, in *Twelfth Night*, for example, where the observers are used for satirical ends. Berowne's comment above has a touch of satire not only in the wry comment on their waywardness but also in the sharp rejoinder his mention of flesh gives to Longaville's refined, Petrarchan sonnet, but his commenting is part of an assumed pose, one of many the characters display. In this scene there are three levels of awareness - the audience, Berowne, and the trio of lovers. This kind of ironic dramatic situation is used several times by Shakespeare to achieve a satirical effect, for example in *Richard III*, achieving its most complex affect in *Troilus and Cressida*, Act V, scene ii, in which Troilus and Ulysses watch Cressida's unfaithfulness.

---


5 *Twelfth Night*, II. v, where Toby, Sir Andrew and Fabian watch Malvolio being gulled by the letter.

6 *Richard III*, III. vii, where Richard appears on the walls of Baynard's Castle to be 'persuaded' to accept the crown by Buckingham speaking for Mayor and citizens.
with Diomede, the whole thing being observed by Thersites. Here, however, the emphasis is comic; the scene demonstrating the characters' compulsive role-playing. Berowne's role is to deplore their folly but he also shares it completely. Emerging from behind the bushes he assumes a stern critical air:

Now step I forth to whip hypocrisy...
But are you not asham'd? nay, are you not,
All three of you, to be thus much o'ershoot?

O! what a scene of foolery have I seen,
Of sighs, of groans, of sorrow, and of teen;
O! me with what strict patience have I sat,
To see a king transformed to a gnat...
And Nestor play at push-pin with the boys,
And critic Timon laugh at idle toys!
Where lies thy grief? O! tell me, good Dumain,
And, gentle Longaville, where lies thy pain?
And where my liege's? all about the breast:
A candle, ho!

(IV. iii. 148; 156-57; 160-63; 166-71).

The first line is a stock satirical metaphor adopted to reinforce the pose. His tone is virtue pained, like Subtle's when he discovers Mammon with Dol in her 'fit'. It is Berowne's big moment and he makes the most of it, continuing histrionically - "I, that hold it sin / To break the vow I am engaged in; / I am betray'd, by keeping company / With moon-like men" (IV. iii. 174-77). This is Berowne's climax as a satirist, and of course he is being consciously false and wittily exaggerated. Immediately after, Jaquenetta and Costard enter bearing Berowne's letter to Rosaline, and Berowne is exposed. The whole scene points up sharply the folly of attempting to criticise others. Berowne's exposure fits into the larger comic pattern of illusions shattered. Berowne accepts his exposure as a failure of wit rather than of morality and persuades his peers to accept their new situation:

Ber[owne]. Sweet lords, sweet lovers, O! let us embrace...
We cannot cross the cause why we were born

(IV. iii. 210; 214).
This is a return to the position that "common sense" (I. i. 57) should be the standard of behaviour.

Berowne's put-down does not prevent him from exercising his comic wit again, in his 'character' of "honey-tongu'd Boyet" (V. ii. 315-34), but in the last scene Rosaline gives a check to his wit which implies a more severe judgement:

Rosaline.

... the world's large tongue
Proclaims you for a man replete with mocks;
Full of comparisons and wounding flouts,
Which you on all estates will execute
That lie within the mercy of your wit:
To weed this wormwood from your fruitful brain,
And there withal to win me, if you please,
Without the which I am not to be won,
You shall this twelvemonth term from day to day,
Visit the speechless sick, and still converse
With groaning wretches; and your task shall be,
With all the fierce endeavour of your wit
To enforce the pained impotent to smile

(V. ii. 834-46).

Rosaline's attitude is supported by the play's ending which refuses happy betrothals, and it implies a severe distrust of Berowne's kind of wit which turns its attention "on all estates". She sees it as "wormwood" to be weeded from his "fruitful brain" before he is fit to join her in marriage.

Through the play Berowne's comments provide a critical, satirical reaction to the behaviour of his peers, but he shares their folly. In Berowne, writes Alden, "the satiric perception of the folly is incarnated, as well as the experience of it".  

his wit, intelligence and perception, and it is these qualities which give him a clearer view of the follies that the King's plan produces. He is a sound critic of folly, although when he becomes caught up in the folly he has been criticising his role of critic is comically exposed. Berowne's wit and mockery go along with a certain heartlessness, as his and his fellows' comments during the pageant of the Nine Worthies show. Rosaline's imposition of the task introduces reference to areas of experience not touched by the rest of the play and a set of moral values which is finally seen to overcome, if not defeat, valuation solely in terms of wit that the gallants have practised up to then. This implies a limitation in the critical, quasi-satirical outlook.

The other character in *Love's Labour's Lost* who is a kind of commentator is Moth, Armado's page. Descended from typical figures of the *commedia dell' arte*, Armado corresponds to the braggart soldier, and Moth to the *zanni* who often accompanies him. Moth is not a satirist nor a proto-satirist like Berowne. He is precursor of the Shakespearean fool like Feste, and the Fool in *King Lear*. Like all the fools he comments on other characters often with a satirical effect, but the fool is a distinct type from the satirist. The fool is a character "committed to a world-view at odds with that of society and powerless to effect acceptance by others of it. In the face of this powerlessness he will, deliberately or subconsciously, assume the mask of folly in order to protect

---

8 R. David, ed., *Love's Labour's Lost*, London, 1951, p. xxxi. The other correspondences are Holofernes (a pedant), Nathaniel (a parasie), and Costard (a rustic).
himself from it". The satirist may share some of these characteristics but he never has the distinguishing characteristic of the fool - the mask of folly for self-protection - except as a deliberately assumed disguise, as with Hamlet and Malevole. The satirist is extrovert, the fool introvert; the fool may punish himself, the satirist tries to punish his opponents; the fool has to accept things as they are, the satirist has to try and change them. Of course the two types overlap. Jaques, Feste, and especially Hamlet, all have features of fool and satirist, but the concern here is with the satirist as a separate type.

Romeo and Juliet (1591-97)

Mercutio embodies both the linguistic energy of the fool (like Moth) and the anti-romantic vision of Berowne. His 'Queen Mab' speech demonstrates the fertility and ingenuity of his imagination, and also a keen awareness of the realistic, physical aspects of love. Mercutio is aware too of society at large where selfishness is a driving force:

O'er courtiers' knees, that dream on curtsies straight;
O'er lawyer's fingers, who straight dream on fees;
O'er ladies' lips, who straight on kisses dream;
Which oft the angry Mab with blisters plagues,
Because their breaths with sweetmeats tainted are

(I. iv. 73-77).

Mercutio is a vigorous, critical character who presents one standard

by which to test the central love theme. He does not act as an outright commentator but as the 'Queen Mab' speech shows he has the necessary insight and animus for the role. The peculiar authority that he has derives from our sense of the clash between his fine, exuberant personal qualities and the embittered, self-absorbed society of Verona. In Mercutio's sense of alienation and in his cutting wit he resembles Hamlet. He presents a parody of romantic love: his wit-combat with Romeo (II. iv. 92-107) ends with a burst of obscene punning on "tale", "tail", "whole" and "hole" in which, significantly, Romeo does not participate. He brings romance down to earth and offers a test of Romeo's romantic feelings. But his attitude is not left uncriticised. When Mercutio teases and insults the Nurse because she is old, stupid, and crafty, Romeo tells her that Mercutio "loves to hear himself talk, and will speak more in a minute than he will stand to in a month" (II. iv. 155-58), and, more seriously says he is "One, gentlewoman, that God hath made for himself to mar" (II. iv. 124-5), highlighting that part of Mercutio's nature which is directed against itself. Mercutio's own behaviour and Romeo's comment on it qualify the audience's sympathy for him and deny him its complete approval.

Shakespeare also denies Mercutio support through structural means. Mercutio's ignorance of Romeo's affair with Juliet denies the comments he directs at Romeo's lovesickness their full effect. When Romeo enters at the start of Act II, after he has fallen in love with Juliet, Mercutio says,

"Why that same pale hard-hearted wench, that Rosaline, Torments him so, that he will sure run mad"

(II. iv. 4-5).
Mercutio's attempts to make Romeo admit that his love is doting necessarily fail because Romeo's experience of love is outside anything Mercutio can conceive. This divergence in their modes of experience leads to Mercutio's death. Mercutio defiantly accepts Tybalt's truculent challenge in a quarrel in which he has no real part, and Romeo, removed from involvement in the quarrel by his love for Juliet, intervenes to cause his friend's death.

Mercutio's death, like Hamlet's, is a consequence of his extraordinary character being locked into a world which is violent and arbitrary. His dying speech -

No, 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door; but 'tis enough, 'twill serve:
ask for me to-morrow, and you shall find me a grave man. I am peppered, I warrant, for this world.
A plague o' both your houses

(III. i. 101-05)

- with its grim, bitterly ironical understatement only emphasises his final alienation. T.J.B. Spencer finds Mercutio "most attractive in his dying speech ... but [he] has given his final curse ... [and] his departure immediately darkens the scene and the situation". 10

It guarantees a disastrous outcome for Romeo and Juliet, and with his wit and exuberance gone the tone of the last two Acts is darkened; by just how much can be seen from Romeo's words to the Apothecary:

There is thy gold, worse poison to men's souls,
Doing more murders in this loathsome world
Than these poor compounds that thou mayst not sell:
I sell thee poison, thou hast sold me none

(V. i. 80-83).

The common satirical idea that gold is a polluter of social relations is commonplace and not emphasised. Its function is to demonstrate the change that has taken place in Romeo and in the mood of the play.

Mercutio is employed to introduce the element of coarse and bawdy realism in contrast to the lovers' intensely romantic sexual love. This occurs as a result of his separate vision, itself a product of his character and situation, not out of a conscious desire to satirise or to be a satirist. In Mercutio, Shakespeare touches on some of the tragic undertones in a character whose peculiar vision sets him apart from his society. This theme is developed in *Hamlet*.

*King John* (1591-98)

Faulconbridge is a complex figure containing disparate elements from other dramatic types. E.A.J. Honigmann believes that "the Bastard's expository tirades and various other touches indicate his descent" from "the Honesty or Simplicity of the moralities". Freshly knighted by King John he reflects on his sudden rise to greatness:

But this is worshipful society,  
And fits the mounting spirit like myself;  
For he is but a bastard to the time  
That doth not smack of observation;  
And so am I, whether I smoke or no.  
And not alone in habit or device,

Exterior form, outward accoutrement,
But from the inward motion to deliver
Sweet, sweet, sweet poison for the age's tooth:
Which, though I will not practise to deceive,
Yet, to avoid deceit, I mean to learn;
For it shall strew the footsteps of my rising

(I. i. 205-16).

This shows a shrewd awareness that political advance for underlings depends on deceit and "observation" - but at the same time proclaims his rejection of it. He embodies the sturdy morality that Honigmann mentions, and is aware of the threats to it. Though he calls himself a "mounting spirit" he says he will try "to avoid deceit", but if "observation" is the general rule then he too must practise deceit. This contradiction in Faulconbridge's ambition appears fitfully throughout the play, despite Shakespeare's attempt to have it both ways by making him a politician and virtuous. Webster and Tourneur were later to exploit this contradiction when they make the awareness of the corrupting effects of policy on basically virtuous men the source of Bosola's and Vindice's powerful discontent. Faulconbridge is provided with characteristics which would make him a reliable commentator, insight and authority; but these same characteristics should also make him aware, but apparently do not, that he is subject to the same conditions for which he criticises others. This problem, however, is ignored in the play.

Faulconbridge never loses his sense of "outsideness" altogether, and it is from a position half in and half out of his world that he comments. Sometimes the comments are ironic, when for example he exposes royal rhetoric:

K[ing] John.. Does not the crown of England prove the king?
And if not that, I bring you witnesses,
Twice fifteen thousand hearts of England's breed -
Bast[ard]. Bastards and else.

K[ing] John. To verify our title with their lives.

K[ing] Philip. As many and as well-born bloods as those -

Bast[ard]. Some bastards too.

K[ing] Philip. Stand in his face to contradict his claim

(II. i. 273-80).

Sometimes his comments are direct; for example, after the inconclusive battle before the gates of Angiers he gives an objective, sardonic view of the grandeur of kings, and urges them on to greater things:

Cry "havoc!" kings; back to the stained field,
You equal potents, fiery kindled spirits!
Then let confusion of one part confirm
The other's peace; till then, blows, blood, and death!

(II. i. 357-60).

Directed at the audience in choric fashion, this speech scorns the kings with heavy irony and exposes their incompetence by its determination and courage. Una Ellis-Fermor sees this aspect of Faulconbridge as a contribution to the continuing quest in the history plays for the attributes of an ideal king; she specifies his "positive, if simple, ideal of service, a positive picture of kingly bearing and, incidentally, certain attributes that reappear in all Shakespeare's later successful kings; tenacity, resourcefulness, and shrewdness". At this point Faulconbridge is far from being a satirist figure.

The speech on "Commodity" shows most clearly Faulconbridge's descent from the Honesty or Simplicity of the moralities:

12 Honigmann describes the following speeches as "choruses": I. i. 182ff.; II. i. 561ff.; IV. iii. 140ff.; V. vii. 110ff.

Mad world! mad kings! mad composition!
John, to stop Arthur's title in the whole,
Hath willingly departed with a part:
And France ...

... rounded in the ear
With that same purpose-changer, that sly devil...
That smooth-fac'd gentleman, tickling commodity,
Commodity, the bias of the world,
The world, who of itself is peised well,
Made to run even upon even ground,
Till this advantage, this vile drawing bias,
This sway of motion, this commodity,
Makes it take head from all indifferency,
From all direction, purpose, course, intent

(II. i. 561-64; 566-67; 573-80).

This denunciation of self-interest or gain comes from direct
observation of John and Philip. The tone is blunt and downright
but lacks the note of personal animosity that would make it
satirical. Perhaps this is because of the Bastard's optimistic
belief that the world "of itself is peised well", and that only
the distorting operation of commodity perverts its natural, balanced
operation. Later satirists come to believe, and this emerges
clearly in formal satire, that the world is basically unjust, rotten,
and wholly governed by selfishness. The denunciation of Commodity
stems from the action but it is set back from it, supplying a valid
interpretation of events and a sound moral viewpoint. However,
he registers a sudden switch in his attitude to Commodity:

And why rail I on this commodity?
But for because he hath not woo'd me yet...
Well, whiles I am a beggar, I will rail
And say there is no sin but to be rich;
And being rich, my virtue then shall be
To say there is no vice but beggary.
Since kings break faith upon commodity,
Gain, be my lord, for I will worship thee!

(II. i. 587-88; 593-98).

This disarming display of self-knowledge, railing at self-interest
while being self-interested, does not make it easier to account for
the sudden switch. The character seems incoherent. The Bastard
also has elements of the fool in his make-up. Having just been knighted, he has a speech containing a dialogue between Question and Answer (I. i, 189-204) recalling similar dialogues acted out by Launce of The Two Gentlemen of Verona (c. 1590-98), and Launcelot Gobboe of The Merchant of Venice (1594-97). 14

Before Angiers, Faulconbridge plays the part of a fool:

_Aust[ria]_. Peace!

_Bast[ard]_. Hear the crier!

_Aust[ria]_. What the devil art thou?

_Bast[ard]_. One that will play the devil, sir, with you,
And a may catch your hide and you alone:
You are the hare of whom the prover goes,
Whose valour plucks dead lions by the beard.
I'll smoke your skin-coat, and I catch you right;
Sirrah, look to't; I'faith, I will, I'faith

(II. i. 134-40).

His replies to Austria, accompanied unlike the typical fool's with real threats, nevertheless depend for their effect on Faulconbridge's superior wit.

Like the other Shakespearean commentators so far examined, Faulconbridge has no monopoly of truth or insight. His superiority lies not in his omniscience but in his moral firmness. When Arthur lies dead from his leap from the castle walls the Bastard, like the lords Pembroke, Salisbury and Bigot, believes wrongly that he has been murdered by Hubert and admits confusion - "I am amaz'd, methinks, and lose my way / Among the thorns and dangers of this world"

(IV. iii. 140-41). His personal integrity and sincerity, like

14 See The Two Gentlemen of Verona (II. iii. 1-32) (IV.iv.1-39); and The Merchant of Venice (II. ii. 1-30).
Mercutio's, do not guarantee special insight into a confused world. O. J. Campbell notes that the Bastard's satirical speeches are confined to the first two acts; thereafter he is an embodiment of English patriotism. This change may be attributed to the fact that his "function is to embody England, to incorporate the English soul". He kneels in submission to Prince Henry and utters the play's patriotic final couplet:

Nought shall make us rue
If England do rest but true
(V. vii. 117-18).

This is a long way from the attitude of a satirist, and it is a measure of the extraordinary breadth of tone and function displayed by Faulconbridge.

None of Shakespeare's commentators is simple, but Faulconbridge's complexity results not from subtlety but from the concatenation of several disparate elements. He is "certainly not consistent in his stance, and as he switches from cynic to bewildered idealist, from worshipper of commodity and gain to true-blue loyalist and patriot, he leaves us groping". Faulconbridge is not a fully realised character; what he seems designed as is "a focal point and director of audience sympathies".

18 Ibid, p. 67.
Jaques is a subtly realised character, always seeming to be fully human even when the literary origins of his character are most evident. He is the first Shakespearean character with the features of the new satirists of the late 1590's, and he is interesting in illustrating Shakespeare's conception of the satirical vogue and his attitude to it. Satire and melancholy are combined in his character. Similar elements had appeared in *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598-1600) in two separate characters: Beatrice and Don John. Beatrice's wit, scorn of social custom, and outspokenness have affinities with the satirist. Hero describes her critical nature and the egocentricity of her wit:

> Disdain and scorn ride sparkling in her eyes,
> Misprising what they look on, and her wit
> Values itself so highly, that to her
> All matter else seems weak

(III. i. 51-54).

Beatrice's mockery springs from a highly developed sense of herself and of the unique value of her vision of the accepted social conventions of courtship and marriage. In the end, of course, Beatrice is brought within the social world to share its conventions, but not before she has discovered that her critical vision is inadequate to cope with being in love. Don John's melancholy egotism is so great, on the other hand, that he declares a wish entirely to satisfy his own nature. He cannot be accommodated to society, and his being thwarted makes him maliciously antagonistic to the world and an enemy of it. In the end he is confined and punished. Jaques is, as it were, balanced between Beatrice and Don John, embodying features of both - a heightened sense of self, egotism, wit and verbal energy, hostility to conventional society, melancholy. In addition, he has a specifically satirical urge.
It is perhaps surprising to find a satirist in what Helen Gardner calls "the most refined and exquisite of the comedies ... Shakespeare's most Mozartian comedy". But satire is only one aspect of Jaques' behaviour, which is determined by his melancholy. The connection between melancholy and satire, made by Marston in the 'Proemium' to The Scourge of Villanie, in a sense works against Jaques who is one of the satirists "mocked by being misplaced in comic words". We first hear of him from the First Lord who describes to Duke Senior how he found Jaques watching the wounded deer:

First Lord. Indeed my lord,
The melancholy Jaques grieves at that,
And in that kind swears you do more usurp
Than doth your brother that hath banish'd you

(II. i. 25-28).

Jaques is a critic here of Duke Senior's wholehearted pastoralism: "were they more perfectly pastoral ... they would not even hunt". He goes on to "moralize this spectacle" (II. i. 44), interpreting the deer's weeping and loneliness as yet another sign of the world's misery; and when the herd passes by ignoring the deer Jaques, as the First Lord reports, sees that as the cruelty of society:

'Sweep on you fat and greasy citizens,
'Tis just the fashion. Wherefore do you look
Upon that poor and broken bankrupt there?
Thus most invectively he pierceth through
The body of the country, city, court,
Yea, and of this our life, swearing that we
Are mere usurpers, tyrants, and what's worse,
To fright the animals and to kill them up
In their assign'd and native dwelling-place

(II. i. 55-63).


The words "invectively" and "pierceth" recall formal satire. Jaques moralises further about the sad state "of this our life" (II.1. 60), raising the level of his discontent from the social to general - the nature of man's life. Jaques' satirical vision is part of his larger melancholy vision, for which the causes lie deeper in his character than the moral indignation necessary for satire. Duke Senior is unperturbed by the report of Jaques' speech, regarding him as educative and entertaining: "I love to cope him in these sullen fits, / For then he's full of matter" (II. i. 67-68). This scene illustrates Shakespeare's treatment of Jaques in the play as a whole. The audience feels him to be a sympathetic character, enunciating necessary and healthy truths, but with a streak of the ridiculous in him. Jaques' criticism of the pastoral is a welcome counterweight to Duke Senior's self-indulgence, and the satire against wealthy citizens brings a dash of pleasing acerbity into the forest. On the other hand, Jaques' moralising on the sobbing deer is a self-conscious set-piece on Jaques' part and dissipates the pain in what he describes. Jaques' moralisations are therefore equivocal. He speaks truths which are a valid criticism of aspects of life in the forest, but he is indulgently regarded by those he criticises, and his expression of melancholy seems self-consciously indulgent.

Jaques is fully aware of the role he has adopted. When he calls on Amiens to sing again he is warned that it will make him melancholy, but he replies, "More! I prithee more. I can suck melancholy out of a song, as a weasel sucks eggs" (II. v. 11-12). Melancholy is in his nature, but he makes sure he finds it wherever he pleases. At the end of the scene he says, "I'll go sleep if I can; if I cannot, I'll rail against all the first-born of Egypt" (II. v. 57-58), again stressing his ingenuity by railing on the least promising subjects. In Act II, scene vii, he adopts the role of entertainer for the
Duke's benefit, repeating with superior amusement the wisdom of Touchstone the fool whom he met in the forest. The irony is also directed against himself for Touchstone's musings are themselves a parody of Jaques'.

*Jaques.* 'And so from hour to hour, we ripe, and ripe, And then from hour to hour, we rot, and rot, And thereby hangs a tale.' When I did hear The motley fool thus moral on the time, My lungs began to crow like chanticleer, That fools should be so deep-contemplative

(II. vii. 26-31).

Enthusiastic over the fool's supposed profundity, Jaques craves the privilege of motley for himself, and the scene turns into a debate on the uses Jaques would put the freedom of motley to. A recent editor suggests that "Shakespeare was writing impressionistically, to suggest in a short space a more thorough exploration of the subject than there is time for", and certainly issues are raised but not resolved. However this is the first example of Shakespeare's directly treating the subject of satire and the satirist:

*Jaques.* I must have liberty Withal, as large a charter as the wind, To blow on whom I please, for so fools have... Invest me in my motley. Give me leave To speak my mind, and I will through and through Cleanse the foul body of th' infected world, If they will patiently receive my medicine

(II. vii. 47-49; 58-61).


23 A. Latham notes the bawdy significance of 'dial', 'poke', 'hour', 'ripe', 'rot', 'tale', note to (II. vii. 26-28), *As You Like It*, London, 1975; and comments that Jaques "had good reason to admire the skill with which Touchstone conceals indecencies under a mask of moral gravity".

24 A. Latham, ed., *As You Like It*, London, 1975, note to (II. vii. 70.)
Jaques claims total freedom to speak his mind about whoever he pleases and predicts that his words will "cleanse the world". His authority is merely a personal desire for the role of corrective satirist. The satirist's weakness as a reformer is nicely pinpointed by the bathos of the last line: his success first requires quiescent subjects. Jaques claims he would do nothing but good, but Duke Senior replies with a commonplace counter-argument that he must be vicious to know vice so well:

Most mischievous foul sin, in chiding sin,
For thou thyself hast been a libertine,
As sensual as the brutish sting itself,
And all th' embossed sores and headed evils
That thou with licence of free foot hast caught
Wouldest thou disgorge into the general world

(II. vii. 64-69).

Jaques declares that he would achieve only good, Duke Senior that the results would be wholly evil, Jaques himself becoming a source of corruption not an agent of its eradication. This exchange undercuts Jaques' claims to the rights of reforming satirist, if what Duke Senior says of Jaques is true and not merely a debating point. But the Duke's point has a validity outside the play as a criticism of writers of satire who claimed moral privileges and then used them to flaunt obscenity. Marston provides the outstanding example. Replying, Jaques sidesteps the Duke's attack and gives the satirist's conventional defence to the charge of personal malice. Stepping fully into the role of a satirist he says that he only taxes sins in general terms, and if someone applies it to himself or herself that is their responsibility not his. This conversation is presumably the kind of matter which the Duke so enjoys from Jaques. Neither character clearly wins the debate. Jaques never becomes the kind of satirist he describes; the
discussion remains theoretical. It is merely one of several roles he finds congenial. This in itself implies a radical criticism of the satirist: that satire is the result of personal motives, not disinterested moral ones, and that it is a role easily put on and off.

The finest expression of Jaques' melancholy is the speech beginning "All the world's a stage, / And all the men and women merely players" (II. vii. 139-66). Jaques fulfils here for the exiled court the function of sad philosopher, in the same way as Amiens supplies sad or bitter songs: he is an entertainer.

Lawrence Babb notes that "the ages of man is a favourite theme of Renaissance moralists" and that "to the Elizabethan audience this speech would have seemed a thing of considerable worth and dignity". He is a serious entertainer, then, but this speech, like so many of Jaques', has the quality of prepared composition. The seven ages are consistently gloomy as befits the melancholic, but, as Harold Jenkins points out, though they end "with a description of man's final decrepitude ... it has not yet left the speaker's tongue when an aged man appears who is at once addressed as 'venerable'". The juxtaposition of Jaques' elaborate speech and Orlando's kind actions to Adam is a way of pointing to the limitations of Jaques' speech and its lack of human feeling. Berowne and Mercutio are implicitly criticised by similar structural devices; and indeed this is one of Shakespeare's most important ways of controlling the response to his commentators.


Jenkins notes another structural feature which implies an adverse judgement on Jaques: the wit-combat between Jaques and the hero (III. ii. 270-314) is matched an act or two later by a similar wit-combat between Jaques and Rosalind (IV. i. 1-40), and on each occasion Jaques is defeated:

In fact the discomfiture of Monsieur Melancholy... is the prelude to each of the two big love scenes of the play ... It makes it clear that, however we judge of them, the melancholy spirit of Jaques and the romantic emotion of Rosalind and Orlando cannot mingle. 27

Jaques' dismissal by Orlando occurs when he talks against love, praises Orlando's wit, and tries to persuade Orlando to join him in railing:

Jaques. Will you sit down with me and we two will rail against our mistress the world and all our misery

(III. ii. 272-74).

This is Jaques' idea of a good time but Orlando has more important things in mind. Jaques' pride in his solitary melancholy also emerges in his conversation with Rosalind. It is, he says, "a melancholy of mine own, compounded of many simples, extracted from many objects, and indeed the sundry contemplation of my travels, in which my often rumination wraps me in a most humorous sadness" (IV. i. 15-19). Rosalind seizes on his travels and taunts him mercilessly with the affectations of the type: 28

Rosalind. Farewell Monsieur Traveller. Look you lisp, and wear strange suits; disable all the benefits of your own country; be out of love with your nativity, and almost chide God for making you that countenance you are; or I will scarce think you have swam in a gondola

(IV. i. 31-36).

Rosalind like Orlando does not play Jaques' games, and her high-spirited mockery defeats Jaques who thrives best as an indulged star performer. The atmosphere of happiness and celebration is not to Jaques' liking, and at the end of the play he announces that he will join the reformed Duke Frederick in a monastery, saying "Out of these convertites, / There is much matter to be heard and learn'd" (V. iv. 183-84). Jaques' genuine melancholy is out of place in the celebration of love and new beginnings. His assessment of the four couples and his self-assessment are accurate: "I am for other than for dancing measures" (V. iv. 192).

Babb sees in Jaques "probably the kindliest portrait of the melancholy malcontent in Elizabethan and early Stuart literature".29 Jaques is gentle and unmalicious in contrast to Jonson's early satirical characters. On the one occasion when he acts by intervening in the impending marriage ceremony of Touchstone and Audrey (III. iii), he delays the marriage, but it allows the final pattern of betrothals to be all the more impressive. Jaques is immensely vivacious, reveling in the roles that his melancholy finds congenial, including that of the satirist. He changes nothing, and converts no one to his melancholy vision, because his reaction is almost wholly verbal, and also because the forest is a benign habitat. Apart from his final withdrawal, Jaques' melancholy is,

an active principle manifesting itself in
tireless and exuberant antics. Far from being a morose man, whether he is weeping with the stag

29 L. Babb, The Elizabethan Malady: A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642, East Lansing, 1951, p.73. He also calls Jaques "the best example in the drama of the malcontent in the role of philosophic critic", p.93. This description fits Hamlet, not Jaques.
or jeering at the huntsman, he throws himself into these things with something akin to passion.

Hamlet (1599 - c.1601)

Hamlet combines satire and revenge in a tragedy. Satire is concentrated in the hero who plays a commanding part. Like Jaques, Hamlet is sometimes presented for the audience's approval, sometimes for its criticism. Hamlet is a complex character who plays a variety of roles - revenger, satirist, melancholic, malcontent, scholar, fool, lover, madman - the role of satirist being one aspect of the negative side of his experience, though an important one. Many of Hamlet's speeches are in the style of satirical writing of the period - images of disease and disgust; realistic imagery from the everyday world. He has verbal ingenuity and can adopt obscurity as a satirical weapon. He acts at times as a commentator - in the first court scene, for example, or during "The Mouse-trap" - but Hamlet is not simply a satirist, nor a simple one. The role is used in the play as a means of exposing some of its most important concerns.

30 H. Jenkins, op. cit., p. 45. Helen Gardner's judgement of Jaques is clean contrary to Jenkins's. She contrasts Jaques with Touchstone the parodist, who "must love what he parodies", calling him "the cynic, the person who prefers the pleasures of superiority, cold-eyed and cold-hearted... He arrogates to himself the divine role. He has opted out from the human condition", op. cit., pp. 258-59. This ignores the fact that until the very end Jaques has a place in the society of Arden, and is happily accepted and accepting.

31 Cf. R. Ornstein, The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy, Madison, 1960, p. 235: "he is our moral interpreter ... we hate what he hates, admire what he admires".
Hamlet appears in Act I, scene ii as a malcontent without a cause. The audience has good reason for being suspicious of the court of Denmark. The appearance of the Ghost is unexplained, though several possible explanations are indirectly presented, and Claudius palpably smooths over the matter of his becoming king and remarrying with rhetoric that attempts to unite underlying contradictions. Hamlet sets himself apart from the court by his black clothes—a figure in black was an emblem of melancholy (like Jaques) or death (like Mercade)—and his bitter asides. His first speech to his mother expresses his discontent and makes a claim of every satirist:

Seems, madam! Nay, it is; I know not 'seems'. 'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother, Nor customary suits of solemn black... That can denote me truly; these indeed seem, For they are actions that a man might play: But I have that within which passeth show; These but the trappings and the suits of woe

(I. ii. 76-78; 83-86).

He asserts his honesty of feeling and declares that his "shows of grief" are a more sincere reflection of his state of feeling, than his mother's short-lived mourning which now seems hypocritical. But the speech also makes a more specifically satirical claim: that Hamlet has nothing to do with 'seems', that is, things appearing to be other than what they are. The immediate reference is to himself, but by implication the claim includes the hypocrisy of others. But this immediately thrusts him into a dilemma. His true feelings can only be expressed by means of those "forms, modes, shows of grief"

which he despises, and so to those looking on, and to himself, he
seems insincere. He is caught in a contradiction: despising false
appearances yet realising that his own behaviour must look
like a pose "a man might play" to those who cannot see beyond
appearances to what they signify. Hamlet's belief that he is not
deceived by 'seems' is a satirist's claim expressed in general
philosophical terms. The basic idea that obsesses Hamlet and
permeates the whole play is the disparity between inner and outer
realities, in this case feelings and their expression. As yet
the claim is untested; the basis of the tragedy is the testing of
Hamlet's claim to be able to distinguish true or false.

The basis of the play's action may be considered to be
satirical. It has been described as "an attempt to find out and
destroy the hidden "imposthume" poisoning the life of Claudius's
Denmark". What makes Hamlet a satirist as well as a revenger is
his desire to expose Claudius's vice as well as to punish it; and
in the play as a whole to expose hypocrisy wherever it occurs.
Hamlet is the "greatest instance of the combination of the two roles
of satirist and revenger", and these roles correspond respectively
to his attempting to discover the truth about Claudius, and to
acting on it. In the end Hamlet discovers that truth and action
are not separable.

33 F. Fergusson, "Hamlet: The Analogy of Action", Hudson Review, 2,
34 A. Kernan, The Cankered Muse, Satire of the English Renaissance,
New Haven, 1959, p. 220.
It is not only Hamlet who sets out to discover something; the play builds up a network of intrigue and counter-intrigue, Claudius, Gertrude, Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern all try to discover the cause of Hamlet's madness. All of them are confronted with evidence which they find baffling and uncertain. After witnessing Hamlet's encounter with Ophelia, for example, Polonius continues to believe that "The origin and commencement of his grief / Sprung from neglected love" (III. i. 186-87), while Claudius, discounting love, fears "something in his soul / O'er which his melancholy sits on brood" (III. i. 173-74). They have both seen the same thing yet their conclusions disagree. The world of Hamlet is one of shifting or puzzling appearances. Hamlet perceives the disparity between inner state and outward actions in almost everyone around him; "this breach between inner and outer stirs no special emotion in Polonius ... but it shakes Hamlet to the core". The shifting appearance of things denies Hamlet absolute certainty about the Ghost's story. His initial assertion that he does not know 'seems' is shown to be false, and consequently is driven in upon himself. In Act II, scene ii he examines, in a mood of bitterness and self-reproach, why he has done nothing:

35 Lawrence Babb, The Elizabethan Malady, A Study of Melancholia in English Literature from 1580 to 1642, East Lansing, 1951, p.107, notes that this is the only occasion that Hamlet's melancholy is referred to with its "full medical and psychiatric implications"; he concludes that it is a "purely intellectual phenomenon".

This is most brave
That I, the son of a dear father murder'd,
Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell,
Must, like a whore, unpack my heart with words,
And fall a-cursing, like a very drab,
A scullion

(II. ii. 619-24).

In Act II the crux for Hamlet is not the problem of action but the problem of knowing his own feelings. The underlying desire for distinguishing true from false has moved from the external world to Hamlet's internal world. His agonising experience of attempting to disentangle the appearance and reality of other people, and even himself, and finding them hopelessly tangled and incomprehensible is the source of the tragedy, and it leads beyond the bounds of satire and revenge.

The idea of an inner/outer dichotomy permeates the action, the imagery, and the language of the play. The assumption Hamlet starts with, that inner and outer realities can correspond, is shown by the play to be false.Appearances and reality are shown to follow unreasonable rules of their own. Claudius, for example, defies Laertes' rebellion by saying, "There's such divinity doth hedge a king, / That treason can but peep to what it would" (IV. v. 123-24), and the audience believes him although it also knows he is a murderer and usurper. He acts the part so well he is indistinguishable from the real thing. These ambiguities also extend

37 Examples are the images of clothes and cosmetics; and the many references to the deceptiveness of words, e.g.:

0! such a deed
As from the body of contraction plucks
The very soul, and sweet religion makes
A rhapsody of words

(III. iv. 45-48);

... her speech is nothing,
Yet the unshaped use of it doth move
The hearers to collection; they aim at it,
And botch the words up fit to their own thoughts

(IV. v. 7-10).
to acting – in both senses of 'doing' and 'playing a part'. The play suggests that the relationship between being and acting can be even more puzzling and indeterminate. The First Player, for example, 'acts' the speech about Hecuba (II. ii. 533-49), but by the end of it he is 'really' weeping. In other words, his imitation of emotion becomes the experience of real emotion, appearance merging imperceptibly into reality. This episode is a paradigm for much that happens in the play, particularly concerning Hamlet, whose feigned madness becomes at times a real madness of sorts. Given the inscrutable nature of appearance and reality in the world of the play, Hamlet's failure to achieve the certainty he seeks is inevitable. The fault lies not with him but in the nature of reality which confronts him.

Words as well as actions deceive in the play. Hamlet indicates while twitting Polonius that words can change while the thing being described remains the same:

Hamlet. Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?

Polonius. By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

Hamlet. Methinks it is like a weasel.

Polonius. It is backed like a weasel.

Hamlet. Or like a whale?

Polonius. Very like a whale

(III. ii. 400-06)

When Claudius is attempting to pray he can speak the words but he cannot summon the emotions to give them real meaning:

King. My words fly up, my thoughts remain below:

Words without thoughts never to heaven go

(III. iii. 97-98).
The irony is that to Hamlet watching the effect is the same. The episode neatly demonstrates both the deceptiveness of words and appearances, and the satirist's futile arrogance in trying to judge from them the nature of someone else's real inner experience. At one point Polonius unwittingly suggests that words are incapable of denoting anything:

_Pol(onius)._ Your noble son is mad:

> Mad call I it; for, to define true madness,
> What is 't but to be nothing else but mad?

(II. ii. 92-94).

Madeline Doran makes the point that the Elizabethans put a value on eloquence that we do not, because "discourse is the outward sign of man's peculiar property, reason". Hamlet is disabused of this notion; he finds that words as well as actions can be used to deceive and cover guilt and evil. At first he sees it only in others; as the play goes on he experiences it in himself.

Even before he has discovered his father's murder Hamlet projects his personal sorrow into general statements and gives them philosophical, satirical expression. The world seems "weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable" (I. ii. 133), and he imagines it with revulsion as

... an unweeded garden,
That grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature
Possess it merely

(I. ii. 135-37).

The Ghost's revelation of murder and its call to "Revenge his
foul and most unnatural murder" (I. v. 25), forces Hamlet into feeling
the necessity for action and destroys the certainty that for him
there is no split between inner and outer. But he cannot act
without being certain and so he is faced with the problem - is the
Ghost's story true or not? The play goes on to test Hamlet's claim
to be able to discover the truth and to act on it effectively, and
in this way it represents an investigation into the powers of a
satirist. In order to discover the truth of what the Ghost has
told him Hamlet assumes a false appearance - the "antic disposition".
This is the second contradiction that the play presents about the
satirist, for the character who claims to have no dealings with
false appearance now adopts a disguise himself. But there is a
further irony in that the mask of madness is employed so that Hamlet
can remain true to himself and can also deceive others. The
mask allows him both to conceal his purpose of revenge and also to
release his feelings in satirical speeches. It is in his
"antic disposition" that he is most like a satirist. His replies to
Polonius, for example, frustrate enquiries and allow him to vent
his frustrations:

... the satirical rogue says here that old
men have grey beards, that their faces are wrinckled,
their eyes purging thick amber and plum-tree gum, and
that they have a plentiful lack of wit, together with
most weak hams: all which, sir, though I most power­
fully and potently believe, yet I hold it not honesty
to have it thus set down; for you yourself, sir,
should be old as I am, if, like a crab, you could go
backward

(II. ii. 201-10).
The speech follows the satirical style in its disgusting physical
images and obscurity.

Hamlet's self-imposed task is to find the truth, and then
communicate that truth to the guilty. He is more interested in
catching "the conscience of the king" (II. ii. 642) and reaching his mother's hidden feelings than in simply punishing them. Without his making them realise exactly what they have done, revenge would be pointless. The first stage of the satirist's task, making the guilty acknowledge their guilt, becomes the important thing for Hamlet: He wants the king to be like one of those "guilty creatures" (II. ii. 626) who, supposedly, have been

... struck so to the soul that presently
They have proclaim'd their malefactions
(II.ii. 628-29).

Hamlet uses the play-within-the-play as the means of discovering Claudius's guilt. It works in two directions: it is "the means by which Hamlet objectifies uncertainties round his life, and it brings to Claudius a new sense of the meaning of what he has done". 39 Hamlet's purpose is satirical but his means are not. Just as he adopted the mask of madness in order to be true to himself, so he uses the illusion of the inset play to discover the truth. The play-within-the-play represents one of the play's climaxes. It is the only moment when Hamlet has absolute certainty of something; as a satirist he succeeds in penetrating Claudius's mask of hypocrisy. The irony is that in order to do so he has to resort to a kind of illusion - the elaborate and deceiving fiction of the inset play. Not only does Hamlet follow Polonius's dictum, "By indirections find directions out" (II. i. 66), but he goes against his declaration

---

that he knows not 'seems'. The impossibility for Hamlet of discovering anything directly is thus resolved by his resort to "The Mouse-trap", which has been rightly seen as "the focal point from which a preoccupation with appearance and reality, truth and falsehood, expressed in theatrical terms, radiates both backward and forward in time". The moment of triumph is short-lived because the play lets Claudius know that Hamlet knows, and Claudius instantly acts against him. From this point on Hamlet is drawn inextricably into the action. He loses the detachment he was seeking and has to react to situations of Claudius's making.

Hamlet's success with the play sends him fired with high excitement to Gertrude's chamber to perform a similar feat of revelation for her, telling her he intends to "set you up a glass / Where you may see the inmost part of you" (III. iv. 19-20). The traditional satirical metaphor of the glass emphasises the satirical purpose, and indeed Hamlet's speeches in this scene display a wide range of satirical imagery. He declares that her act of remarrying "takes off the rose / From the fair forehead of an innocent love / And sets a blister there" (III. iv. 42-44); and heightens the comparison of the brothers with another metaphor of disease: "Here is your husband; like a mildew'd ear, / Blasting his wholesome brother." (III. iv. 64-65). It rises to a terrible climax in imagining his mother in the sexual act, "honeying and making love / Over the nasty sty" (III. iv. 93-94). The strong physicality of the phrases "bloat king", "reechy kisses", "paddling in your neck" (III. iv. 182-85) suggests a highly-charged imaginative involvement in

his mother's sexuality which belies his declared objectivity.
Gertrude protests, and so does the audience. Hamlet falls into the
trap which lies in wait for every satirist, and which is displayed
most clearly by the satirist of Marston's Scourge; the obsession with
what is being described is so intense that it causes the satirist
to lose control of himself and invalidates the claimed status of
judge and observer. Hamlet's status as an objective exposers of vice
is clearly shown to have limits. Ironically, it is precisely in
this scene that he claims most explicitly the privileges of satire
and his language most resembles formal satire:

Lay not that flattering unction to your soul,
That not your trespass but my madness speaks;
It will but skin and film the ulcerous place,
While rank corruption, mining all within,
Infects unseen. Confess yourself to heaven;
Repent what's past; avoid what is to come;
And do not spread the compost on the weeds
To make them ranker.

(III. iv. 145-52).

Hamlet's horror at the thought that evil may lie below even
Ophelia's innocent appearance accounts for the violence of his reaction
to her. Satire against women and women's lust was a stock satirical
subject, but Shakespeare gives it a twist by blurring the moral
distinction between critic and criticised. Hamlet attacks what he
thinks is hypocrisy in Ophelia: "I have heard of your paintings too,
well enough; God hath given you one face, and you make yourselves
another" (III. i. 150-52). Hamlet is completely mistaken about
Ophelia though possibly right about Gertrude; what these scenes
demonstrate is that his fierce outrage at supposed female depravity
depends more on his sense of it than on its objective, verified
existence. His habit of generalisation turns his disgust at
Ophelia into a protest at human depravity as a whole:
...the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what it is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness: this was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof

(III. i. 112-16).

Again though, as in the scene with Gertrude, Hamlet's revulsion at what he imagines to be vice is so intense that it casts doubt on his reason and largely invalidates what he says.

Hamlet's depression about his own situation becomes in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern's presence a pessimistic view of the whole of existence: "this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why, it appears no other thing to me but a foul and pestilient congregation of vapours" (II. ii. 320-22). He contemplates the potential in man for reaching the ideal -

How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty!
in form, in moving, how express and admirable!
in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god

(II. ii. 323-27)

- but returns to man's actuality: "this quintessence of dust" (II. ii. 328-29). The power in this speech derives from a sense of the disparity between what man might be and what he is.

The ideal that Hamlet cherishes is expressed in a speech to Horatio (III. ii. 61ff.), and in his advice to the players. He tells them:

... suit the action to the word, the word to the action; with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature; for anything so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure

(III. ii. 20-28).
This injunction applies to 'acting' in both its senses, and it expresses Hamlet's longing to behave in a way that accords with how he feels, and yet remains within the bounds of reason. He desires the inner and outer aspects of personality, that is emotion and behaviour, to harmonise in a coherent whole. This is what he admires and wishes to emulate in Horatio, whom he describes as one "in suffering all, that suffers nothing", who can accept "fortune's buffets and rewards" because his "blood and judgement are so well commingled" that he is not "passion's slave" (III. ii. 71-76).

The ideal of stoic calm has the same appeal for Hamlet as it does for Feliche and Pandulpho, but in each case they fail to achieve the ideal.

On his return from England a change has come over Hamlet. Stridency has gone, and instead he faces things with resignation and calm. In Act V, scene i, he approaches the gravediggers with princely aplomb. His reaction to the skulls thrown up by the gravediggers is satirical in a general sense, but with no trace of bitterness; the sight of the skulls leads him to consider the vanity of court and city: 41

This might be my Lord Such-a-one, that praised my Lord Such-a-one's horse, when he meant to beg it, might it not?... and now my Lady Worm's; chapless, and knocked about the mazzard with a sexton's spade ...why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddities now

(V. i. 90-106)

41 O.J.Campbell, Shakespeare's Satire, [1st ed. 1943 ], reprinted London, 1963, p.156, notes that in Act V, scene i, Hamlet expresses the familiar "conservative reaction to the social results of the economic revolution of the later sixteenth century".
The absolute for which Hamlet has been searching presents itself in the form of a skull symbolising death. His attempts to penetrate layers of falsehood covering everything ends with Yorick's skull which cannot be disguised. Significantly the First Clown is the only character in the play who defeats Hamlet's wit, because the Clown's view of life and death is incontrovertible on any terms. The skull prompts Hamlet into further satirical reflections:

> Now get you to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come; make her laugh at that

(V. i. 211-14).

The tone of acceptance contrasts strongly with the fury and distraction of those speeches to Ophelia which express the same ideas. Here, however, the satire carries weight because the speaker is detached from what he is describing.

In the following scene Hamlet's new-found calm is confirmed by his conventional, relaxed satiric response to the fop Osric:

> Ham[let]. He did comply with his dug before he sucked it. Thus has he - and many more of the same bevy, that I know the drossy age dotes on - only got the tune of the time and outward habit of encounter, a kind of yesty collection which carries them through and through the most fond and winnowed opinions; and do but blow them to their trial, the bubbles are out

(V. ii. 195-202).

Hamlet's detached mocking satire contrasts with his angry satire in the previous three acts and remind the audience of his positive, likeable qualities. With a character with whom he is not involved he is witty, effective satirist; with people close to him he becomes an angry and unbalanced satirist. This can stand as Shakespeare's judgement on Hamlet as a satirist.
Hamlet submits fatalistically to whatever happens in the fencing match, and as events turn out just before he dies he stabs and poisons Claudius, saying,

Here, thou incestuous, murderous, damned Dane,
Drink off this potion; - is thy union here?
Follow my mother

(V. ii. 339-41).

Among the satisfactions this action gives is the satirical one of exposure effected and acknowledged between satirist and villain, and punishment achieved. Paradoxically, Hamlet achieves success as a satirist, killing the king and ridding the court of evil, when he has given up all hope of it. The causes of success are outside his control. But of course satire is part of the larger tragic movement of the play and Hamlet's success goes along with his death.

The problem for Hamlet is how to give his actions legitimacy, authority, and effectiveness. This is the problem faced by the dramatist attempting to present a satirist figure - particularly by Jonson who attempted to solve it in his early plays, and by Marston who was at least aware of it and exploited it. And it is a specific problem of the satirist. Hamlet as a satirist tries to find ways of defeating the vice he is faced with without being drawn into it; how to retain reason and moderation faced with vice and folly that drives him to anger and despair; how to act effectively against vice which seems ubiquitous, deceptive and powerful. Shakespeare perceived the problems of the satirist in drama but did not set out to solve them. Instead he internalised them in his play, making them the basis of the dilemmas the hero is faced with, and giving them expression in metaphors of the theatre where the problem first arose. The problems surrounding the satirist in drama which have been examined in the last three chapters were transformed by
Shakespeare from a problem of dramaturgy for the playwright to an existential problem for the hero. For the specifically satirical dilemma the play proposes no answer, indeed it implies that no answer is possible. The tragic ending sweeps up the dilemma and resolves it in a way inscrutable to the hero and the audience.
Summary

The commentators and satirists in Shakespeare's early plays are used for a wide and disparate variety of dramatic purposes. Shakespeare did not go along with Jonson and Marston in their efforts to break new ground with satirists in drama. He is conservative and cautious in his approach to satire. The commentators before Jaques perform some of the satirist's functions: commenting on others, providing a standard by which to judge them, helping to produce a critical tone. Jaques represents a turning point, being a satirist, not merely a commentator. Through Jaques and Hamlet Shakespeare sums up and judges the efforts of Jonson and Marston in dramatising satirists.

Each of these early commentators or satirists is 'placed', either explicitly or implicitly, or most interesting of all in the case of Hamlet by the character's own consciousness of the difficulties in his situation as satirist. None of them succeeds as a critic or satirist in changing his world. Satire is seen as emanating from a position detached from social life - Berowne may be drawn into marriage but only if his critical spirit is curbed; Jaques remains a melancholy satirist outside society, not sharing in marriage; Hamlet is effective as a satirist only when uninvolved in what he is satirising, and, in the tragic mode, his satirical vision destroys his love for Gertrude and Ophelia. What defeats Hamlet is the tragic flaw in the world itself; and Shakespeare goes on to examine this flaw in the world of Troilus and Cressida.
The plays discussed in this chapter have enough features in common to be considered as similar examples of a type which may be termed dramatic satire. They have been considered together as the first clear examples of plays which are satirical not merely in terms of containing satirist figures but in terms of tone, subject matter, structure, theme, and moral implications. This is not to suggest that they alone form a unique set - on the contrary, other plays might also be considered as dramatic satire, The Alchemist or Timon of Athens, for example.

The satirist figures who were the main vehicle for satire in the early plays of all three dramatists play a considerably diminished part in these plays.
Troilus and Cressida (1601-03)

Troilus and Cressida is suffused with the satiric spirit. Its treatment of the Homeric characters of the Iliad amounts in itself to a satiric comment on classical antiquity: the implicit contrast between the heroism of Homer’s characters and the baseness of Shakespeare’s produces a powerful ironic comment. For Shakespeare, and no doubt his audience, the "fall of Troy was a picture of tragic loss and horror", 1 but in the play this too operates as another ironical perspective on the action. The "prologue arm’d" (Prologue, 1. 23) makes clear that the story begins in médias res, and the knowledge of the city’s fate would be present even if specific reference were not made; for example: 2

Ulysses. My prophecy is but half his journey yet;
For yonder walls, that pertly front your town,
Yond towers, whose wanton tops do buss the clouds,
Must kiss their own feet

(IV. v. 217-20).

In fact there are three time scales operating in the play: present time in which the action takes place; historical time in the setting of the Troy story; and the repeatedly evoked prospect of eternity. The reference to these different time scales and the frequent personification of time make the audience aware of the different scales of evaluation which they entail; so that the action is constantly viewed in different perspectives, and an action significant in one perspective may be meaningless in another. The audience is thereby supplied with points of view which silently comment on the action and characters, and are sufficiently harsh to be called satirical.


2 See also (III. ii. 191-98); and Cassandra’s prophecy (V. iii. 59-62).
The three characters who act as commentators are Thersites, Pandarus and Ulysses. Thersites is Shakespeare's most extreme version of the railing satirist figure. He does not figure in the action, merely appearing in the Greek camp as a scurrilous entertainer for Ajax and Achillles, and later as a commentator on Cressida's exchange, and the battle. The style of his speech is angry and intemperate, employing images of disease and obscenity, as his first words show:

Thersites. Agamemnon, how if he had boils? full, all over, generally?

Ajax. Thersites!

Thersites. And those boils did run? Say so, did not the general run then? were not that a botchy core?

Ajax. Dog!

(II. i. 2-8).

Thersites rails against the Greek generals unrestrainedly, calling Ajax "sodden-witted lord" (II. i. 47) and telling him, "thou art here but to thrash Trojans; and thou are bought and sold among those of any wit, like a barbarian slave" (II. i. 50-52). Ajax is oafish, but the audience does not identify or sympathise with Thersites, whose style of speech is extreme and disgusting. His railing is an outpouring of general hatred whose source is obscure self-loathing. Challenged in battle he refuses to fight:

I am a bastard too; I love bastards: I am a bastard begot, bastard instructed, bastard in mind, bastard in valour, in every thing illegitimate. One bear will not bite another, and wherefore should one bastard?

(V. vii. 17-21).

Margarelon's retort, "the devil take thee; coward!" (V. vii. 25) has the audience's support. Much less subtly than Hamlet, Thersites is the critic of himself, but all Thersites' criticism is indiscriminate and destructive. He accuses Ajax of envying Achilles (II. i. 35-38), for example, then turns on Achilles who has been shielding him from
Ajax's wrath - "Hector shall have a great catch if he knock out either of your brains" (II. i. 109-11). Ruminating later he confesses that railing gives him no satisfaction and he wishes that "it were otherwise; that I could beat him, whilst he railed at me" (II. iii. 4-5). The satirical force of the earlier scene (II. i.) derives partly from Thersites' insults to Ajax, but also from the spectacle of their slanging match (II. i. 55-58), and Ajax's beating him ineffectually. Feliche beat Castilio in Antonio and Mellida and thereby made them both ridiculous; the effect here is to destroy completely the characters' dignity. The play itself supports Thersites' destructive vision, and he plays a large part in creating that vision for the audience through amusement, scorn, disgust, criticism; all emotions of detachment.

Thersites neither expects nor wants moral reformation of the fools he rails at; his speeches have no function except to express loathing of mankind. He is without admirable qualities except perhaps consistency in hating. He thus escapes the contradictory position of the satirist condemning mankind yet excepting himself from the condemnation, but the price of escaping from the dilemma and openly accepting that he is as vicious as those he satirises is that he is totally ineffectual as a satirist. He thus becomes trapped in a vicious circle of his own making. The result is that "Thersites does not so much expound Troilus and Cressida as epitomise it". 3

---

Thersites' acts as a scurrilous entertainer. Achilles calls him "my cheese, my digestion" (II. iii. 44), and tells Patroclus, "He is a privileged man" (II. iii. 61). But Thersites unlike Feste does not use his privilege to uncover folly; he makes vituperative speech an end in itself. For Achilles' amusement Thersites details the Greeks' folly, demonstrating forcefully their boredom and cynicism:

Thersites]. Agamemnon is a fool to offer to command Achilles; Achilles is a fool to be commanded of Agamemnon; Thersites is a fool to serve such a fool; and Patroclus is a fool positive.

Patroclus]. Why am I a fool?

Thersites]. Make that demand to the Creator. It suffices me thou art.

(II. iii. 67-74).

Under Achilles' protection Thersites provides his master with a satirical description of Ajax's pride, in semi-dramatic form:

I said, 'Good morrow, Ajax;' and he replies, 'Thanks, Agamemnon.' What think you of this man that takes me for the general? He's grown a very land-fish, languageless, a monster. A plague of opinion! a man may wear it on both sides, like a leather jerkin

(III. iii. 263-69);

and it becomes fully dramatic when he enacts "the pageant of Ajax" (III. iii. 276). Thersites disgustedly satirises Ajax by means which expose Achilles and Patroclus for enjoying the satire and himself for enacting it. In this play Shakespeare "associates the player with hollow pretension, negation and pride" and "uses the theatre to express part of that great theme of disorder". 4 As a performer Thersites is knowingly part of the corruption even as he satirises it.

4 A. Righter, Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play, London, 1962, p. 181. This is a more pessimistic conception of playing and the theatre than that in Hamlet, where playing, though sometimes deceptive or hypocritical, can also be a valid emotional release and a means of finding the truth.
Thersites reduces everything to its lowest factor. The war, he says, is being fought for a "placket" and everything is "lechery, lechery; still, wars and lechery: nothing else holds fashion" (V. ii. 192-94). His view of mankind is bitterly disillusioned, as his words to Patroclus indicate: "The common curse of mankind, folly and ignorance, be thine in great revenue" (II. iii. 30-32).

His direct comments on the action are always accurate - he greets the approach of the Greeks to Achilles' tent, for example, by saying, "Here is such patchery, such juggling, and such knavery!" (II. iii. 78-9). Thersites tells the truth as he sees it and the possible validity of what he says is supported by the fact that he "is unique in receiving no setback or corrective at the hands of his fellows, as do all Shakespeare's other cynics and railers".  

His interpretation of events stands as a possible one for the audience to follow; but Shakespeare emphatically dissociates himself from him by making him contemptible.

To Pandarus's main function of arranging the love affair is added the secondary one of "satiric observer and mordant commentator" on it. Pandarus is, however, completely without the self-consciousness necessary to make him a satirist, as Campbell's remark implies he is; and usually he is unaware of the satirical effect of his words.


6 "Comicall Satyre", p. 211.
Like Thersites he is a reductionist. At the beginning of the play he counters Troilus's impassioned lovesickness - "I am weaker than a woman's tear, / Tamer than sleep, fonder than ignorance, / Less valiant than the virgin in the night" (I. i. 9-11) - with the advice:

_Pandarus_. He that will have a cake out of the wheat must tarry the grinding.

_Troilus_. Have I not tarried?

_Pandarus_. Ay, the grinding; but you must tarry the bolting.

_Troilus_. Have I not tarried?

_Pandarus_. Ay, the bolting; but you must tarry the leavening.

(I. i. 15-22).

Pandarus's _double entendres_ puncture Troilus's exaggerated behaviour.

The habit of almost all the characters of frequently making cynical or ironical comments on each other contributes to the critical tone, and shows their essential detachment from each other. Pandarus and Cressida watch the Trojans returning from the battle and provide a kind of choric commentary reminiscent of Mitis and Cordatus. Pandarus eulogises the Trojans, while Cressida remains detached and mocks him, but his real purpose is to insinuate Troilus in Cressida's favour. This is typical of all plans in the play, employing fine sentiments to achieve disreputable ends. Typical too is the failure of his well-laid plan:

_Cressida_. What sneaking fellow comes yonder?

_Pandarus_. Where? yonder? that's Deiphobus. 'Tis Troilus! there's a man, niece! Hem! Brave Troilus! the prince of chivalry

(I. ii. 243-46).
The audience's attitude to the lovers is kept detached partly by the excesses of Troilus's behaviour, but mainly by Pandarus's comments on them. He does not mock them directly, but his view of the sexuality of the affair works against Troilus's romanticising:

_Pandarus_. Come, come, what need you blush? shame's a baby. Here she is now: swear the oaths now to her that you have sworn to me ... Nay, you shall fight your hearts out ere I part you. The falcon as the tercel, for all the ducks i' the river: go to, go to.

_Troilus_. You have bereft me of all words, lady.

_Pandarus_. Words pay no debts, give her deeds; but she'll bereave you of the deeds too if she call your activity in question

(III. ii. 40-42; 52-58).

The most severe and unequivocal comment on the love affair emerges when by a harsh inversion the trio unwittingly pass judgement on themselves:

_Pandarus_. ... let all constant men be Troiluses, all false women Cressids, and all brokers-between Pandars! say, Amen.

_Troilus_. Amen.

_Cressida_. Amen.

_Pandarus_. Amen

(III. ii. 210-15).

The irony here allows no sympathy for the characters. A similar irony operates in _Volpone_ when Volitore's description of Bonario's supposed wickedness perfectly describes his own. The condemnation in both cases is implicit, unrelated to direct satirical comment.

_Pandarus_ appears again only twice, to deliver a letter from Cressida to Troilus, and to speak the epilogue. The judgement on him is severe for he enters suffering from the diseases he has
worked so assiduously to promote - "a rheum in mine eyes too, and such an ache in my bones" (V. iii. 105-06). The epilogue confirms the pervasive feeling of disillusion and failure at the end of the play. Bemoaning the fate of "the poor agent" - "how earnestly are you set a-work, and how ill requited" (V. x. 36-38) - he addresses the audience directly, asking for its sympathy, and assuming that it contains many "Brethren and sisters of the hold-door trade" (V. x. 52). The audience is therefore forced into moral judgement, both of Pandarus and of itself.

Ulysses is the third commentator on the action. Occasionally his comments are direct, when, for example, Cressida first enters the Greek camp, and he recognises her whorishness:

Fie, fie upon her!
There's language in her eye, her cheek, her lip,
Nay, her foot speaks; her wanton spirits look out
At every joint and motive of her body...
... set them down
For sluttish spoils of opportunity
And daughters of the game

(IV. v. 54-57; 61-63).

Usually, however, Ulysses' comments are not made directly on the action. He is a figure of authority among the Greeks, and in the play itself, and he makes general statements in the grand style, which are "more in the nature of a choric comment on the whole play, than a revelation of his own feelings". 7

Through Ulysses we approach the central themes of the play, and its characteristic structural method. In the Greek council

scene he diagnoses the Greeks' failure to win back Helen - "The specialty of rule hath been neglected" (I. iii. 87). His elaborate and extended disquisition upon the theme of degree (I. iii. 75 - 137) takes the Greeks' particular problem as a starting-point for a magniloquent statement of conservative statecraft:

Take but degree away, untune that string,
And, hark! what discord follows; each thing meets
In mere oppugnacy

(I. iii. 109-11).

Ulysses wishes to reassert order and obedience among the Greeks, and sees that the way to do this is to connect the Greek leadership to an external system of values. The failure to enact this system of values is the basis of the confusion and frustration in the play, as in Sejanus, and Ulysses like Arruntius describes the problem, but is helpless to resolve it. He locates the flouting of degree in Achilles' refusal to fight.

... the seeded pride
That hath to this maturity blown up
In rank Achilles, must or now be cropp'd,
Or, shedding, breed a nursery of like evil,
To overbulk us all

(I. iii. 316-20);

and suggests a plan to "physic the great Myrmidon" (I. iii. 378), by devising a draw to ensure that "blockish Ajax draw / The sort to fight with Hector" (I. iii. 375-6). Instead of trying to translate his theory of degree into practice, Ulysses merely resorts to trickery:

Ulysses.  But, hit or miss,
Our project's life this shape of sense assumes:
Ajax employ'd plucks down Achilles' plumes

(I. iii. 384-86).

Troilus and Cressida continues the exploration of the theme of action treated in Hamlet, and like Hamlet it "insists on a lack of relation
between intention and event"; \(^8\) but its view of the gap between ideal and actual is severe and unsympathetic to the characters who demonstrate it.

Hector, whose position of authority among the Trojans corresponds to Ulysses' in the opposite camp, enacts a similar betrayal of his ideals. Hector's advice to the Trojans is as clear as Ulysses' to the Greeks - "Let Helen go" (II. ii.17), but then he changes his mind for the sake of spurious honour. Hector's reversal corresponds to Ulysses' abandonment of his principle, and both cases demonstrate harshly the weakness of ideals to alter action for the better. The satirical point is implicit in the structure of the scenes, and this is characteristic of the play as a whole.

In Act II, scene iii, the Greek generals led by Ulysses, visit Achilles' tent to try to persuade him to join them in the war, and the effect is entirely satirical. Ajax unwittingly satirises himself in his self-proclaimed humility -

> Why should a man be proud? How doth pride grow? I know not what pride is

(II. iii. 162-63)

- and this is emphasised by Nestor's aside, "Yet he loves himself: is't not strange?" (II. iii. 172-73). Achilles too invites derision by petulantly withdrawing as the generals approach, and delivering an insolent message through Patroclus. Ulysses fails to persuade Achilles to change his mind, and he comments explicitly and accurately on his pride:

---

... imagin'd worth
Holds in his blood such swoln and hot discourse,
That 'twixt his mental and his active parts
Kingdom'd Achilles in commotion rages
And batters down himself

(II. iii. 184-88).

Ajax too is stupid, and the satire directed at him is even more
derisory and destructive. His pride swells at the sight of
Achilles' uncooperativeness. At this the generals make satirical
comments in asides on Ajax, leaving him completely exposed and
ridiculous:

Ajax. A paltry, insolent fellow!

Nest[or]. [Aside.] How he describes himself!

Ajax. Can he not be sociable?

Ulyss[es]. [Aside.] The raven chides blackness.

Ajax. I'll let his humours blood.

Agam[emnon]. [Aside.] He will be the physician that
should be the patient

(II. iii. 222-28).

The careful and often elaborate shifting of characters into
positions representing critics and criticised is a feature of all
three plays considered here, and in every case it serves to distance
the audience from the action and encourage it to assume a critical
stance. The scene reaches a climax of derision when the generals
join together in ironic praise of Ajax:

Ajax. A whoreson dog, that shall palter thus with us! Would
he were a Trojan!

Nest[or]. What a vice were it in Ajax now, --

Ulyss[es]. If he were proud, --

Dio[medes]. Or covetous of praise, --

Ulyss[es]. Ay, or surly borne, --

Dio[medes]. Or strange, or self-affected!

Ulyss[es]. Thank the heavens, lord, thou art of sweet composure;
Praise him that got thee, her that gave thee suck

(II. iii. 247-55).
The satiric technique of praising him for being free of the vices he suffers from amounts almost to a negative catalogue, which Jonson uses to satiric effect particularly in *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*. Ajax laps up their words, and is so overcome that he gives himself into Ulysses' hands:

*Ajax.* Shall I call you father?

*Ulysses.* Ay, my good son.

*Diomedes.* Be rul'd by him, Lord Ajax

(II. iii. 270-71).

Ulysses also directs the generals in their behaviour in a later scene when they try to reform Achilles. Ulysses advises them to pass by Achilles slightingly, and says he will follow with

... derision med'cinal
To use between your strangeness and his pride,
Which his own will shall have desire to drink

(III. iii. 44-46).

Ulysses sees himself here as a reformer attempting to cure Achilles' pride with the satirist's weapon of unpleasant experience swiftly followed by moral lesson. The generals follow Ulysses' instructions and Achilles quickly grasps the moral -

What! am I poor of late?
'Tis certain, greatness, once fall'n out with fortune,
Must fall out with men too

(III. iii. 74-76).

Ulysses is at hand to press it home, repeating Hamlet's tactic with Polonius of supposedly enunciating a moral from a book. Ulysses' speeches on honour and fame expand in scope to include philosophical speculations, following the formula of combining satirical action and passages of philosophy. Ulysses presents a profoundly
pessimistic point of view:

That no man is the lord of any thing—
Though in and of him there be much consisting—
Till he communicate his parts to others

(III. iii. 115-17).

The two great themes of time and value are brought together in Ulysses' speeches in this scene. Like Malevole's set speeches, they are moving and serious in themselves, and their themes emerge from the action, but they are set in a dramatic context which introduces ironies. Ulysses' speech presents the destructive effects of time on human achievement, but it is also simply a device to persuade Achilles to act. The audience sees a double motive and this prompts it into questioning the sincerity of the speaker, and also the validity of his speech.

An important characteristic of these three dramatic satires is that they contain scenes which are elaborately constructed in order to present complex dramatic ironies. The best example in Troilus and Cressida is Act V, scene ii where Troilus and Ulysses watch Diomedes seduce Cressida, both groups being watched by Thersites. The audience watches all three sets of characters, and experiences all the ironies of the situation. The satirist figure's important function of presenting an interpretation of the scene he is observing which contrasts with that of the characters in it, is used here as the basis for a more complex effect. Thersites acts as a satirist, his asides supplying the most cynical interpretation of Diomedes' conversation with Cressida - "How the devil Luxury with his fat rump and potato finger, tickles these together! Fry, lechery, fry!" (V. ii. 53-55).

9 Other scenes which are constructed with intricate levels of illusion to produce satirical effects are (I.ii);(II. iii); (III.iii).
He also comments on Troilus for whom the sight of Cressida's unfaithfulness represents a kind of satiric exposure of his folly in putting his faith in her. The evidence of her lubricity could hardly be less incontrovertible, but he still struggles against accepting it:

Sith yet there is a credence in my heart,
An esperance so obstinately strong,
That doth invert the attest of eyes and ears,
As if those organs had deceptive functions,
Created only to calumniate

(V. ii. 117-21).

His refusal to understand what he has seen results merely in mental division: "this is, and is not, Cressid" (V. ii. 143). No satiric reformation is achieved. Thersites' comment supports what the audience itself has seen:

A proof of strength she could not publish more,
Unless she said, 'My mind is now turn'd whore'

(V. ii. 110-11).

The audience is supplied with a multiple viewpoint on the action with insights into the reactions of each character: Ulysses' comments to Troilus represent a common-sense, if cynical, reaction - "What hath she done, prince, that can soil our mothers?" (V. ii. 131); Cressida experiences hopeless pangs of conscience - "Ay, come: - O Jove! - / Do come: - I shall be plagu'd" (V. ii. 100-01); Troilus presents an interpretation which encompasses universal disorder:

Instance, 0 instance! strong as heaven itself;
The bonds of heaven are slipp'd, dissolv'd, and loos'd;
And with another knot, five-finger-tied,
The fractions of her faith, orts of her love,
The fragments, scraps, the bits, and greasy reliques
Of her o'er-eaten faith, are bound to Diomed.

(V. ii. 150-57).

The overall effect of the scene is rigorously satiric, but the intention is not to force the audience into accepting one correct
version of the action, but, as with the best dramatic satire, to stimulate it into a state of heightened moral awareness.

Satire appears in the commentating characters but more importantly in the structure of the play itself. In *Hamlet* the hero starts out by attempting to establish the principle that he knows not 'seems', and gradually realises that the attempt is failing in the face of experience. *Troilus and Cressida* repeats the same pattern in various forms, with both sides at the beginning consciously trying to discover the principles or values which should govern their behaviour, then finding these values inadequate to cope with reality. A simple form of the same pattern is the basis of the hero's experience in *Timon of Athens*. The structural method in *Troilus and Cressida* is to follow one scene with another which destroys the first's validity. This method owes a great deal to Marston's *Antonio* plays, and indeed *Troilus and Cressida* might be described as Shakespeare's most Marstonian production.  

J. M. Nosworthy  

10 analyses the play as being "about one half ... tragedy or near-tragedy, the other half a mixture of comedy and burlesque", and says that no serious attempt is made to reconcile these mutual contradictions; and he hypothesises a change of purpose half way through its writing to account for them.  

The problem

10 A. Walker, ed., *Troilus and Cressida*, Cambridge, 1957, believes that there is "so much parody of chronicle play style in these closing scenes, that what took place was probably farcical", p.xvi.


12 Ibid. p.79: "In terms of the present hypothesis, a half-written tragedy, the apparent relics of which are maturely and consistently Shakespearean, was converted into a pasquinade which borrowed much from John Lyly and possibly from his imitators*. Nosworthy admits that the hypothesis rests on a "small body of concrete evidence".
which this hypothesis sets out to solve appear as non-problems if the play is seen in the context of the technique and mood of contemporary satirical drama. In fact the nature of the play's characters, its moral outlook, and its structure all derive from its deep-rooted satirical conception.

The action itself contains abrupt changes of direction which show the instability of the world of the play. It has already been noted that the argument of Ulysses' degree speech promises a rational approach to the Greeks' problem, but that this expectation is disappointed when Ulysses resorts to scheming. Similarly, Hector's decision to stake his future on honour is shown to be worthless when he kills a warrior in battle for his "sumptuous armour" (s.d. V. vi. 26). The pattern of expectation followed by disappointment is repeated throughout the play. The scene in which Troilus and Cressida meet to consummate their love, for example, is followed immediately by the scene in which Calchas arranges the exchange of Cressida for Antenor. All this constitutes the play's insistence on the discontinuities and frustrations of experience, "but with no sense of divine rescue from human muddle", as there is even in Hamlet's detecting providence in the fall of a sparrow. There are also glaring inconsistencies in the portrayal of character. Troilus appears in the first scene filled with revulsion against the war but this is contradicted when he argues most strongly in the council scene (II. ii.) for Helen's retention. Cressida above all exhibits a constantly shifting personality. Indeed, she seems

---
to have no personality of her own; she consists of a bundle of contradictory reactions to contradictory circumstances. 14 Almost all the characters make declarations which later statements or actions contradict, and so the audience comes to expect disappointment and betrayal. These discontinuities of character and action need not be seen as mistakes or the left-overs from earlier drafts, but may well be a deliberate attempt to represent an absurd world in which "the structure of reality ... is essentially valueless". 15

The presentation of reversals and betrayals without psychological or circumstantial explanations for them puts the interest not on an individual's suffering the vagaries of such a world but on the nature of that world itself which is continually treacherous, contradictory and defeating. Una Ellis-Fermor calls it "that impression of disjunction which the art of the play, in major or minor form, is ceaselessly at work to enforce upon us"; 16 and another critic makes the link with the play's themes: "On a rather abstract level, we have the 'infidelity' of the play's unfolding as contrasted with its promise as a seemingly conventional work dealing with a familiar story". 17 The play operates on all levels to present

---

14 J. Bayley, "Shakespeare's Only Play", in Stratford Papers on Shakespeare, 1963, ed. B. W. Jackson, Toronto, 1964, p. 63, argues that "Cressida's refusal to be a character with a past and a future reaches the point where she is only a voice - and an actress's voice - speaking in the theatre".


the audience with a satirical vision.

**The Malcontent (1600-04)**

In Marston's earlier plays the double nature of the satirist was not reconciled: on the one hand inner contentment which laughs at folly, and on the other anger at folly or wickedness expressed in bitter railing. The double nature of the satirist is present in Marston's work from the start in the contrast between the personae of *Certaine Satyres* and *The Scourge of Villanie*. All the satirists Marston creates have the characteristics of these two types in varying proportions; but the contradictions which arise when moral security and inner contentment are combined with powerful, effective satirising are not resolved in the early plays. In the figure of Malevole, Marston combines the roles by endowing him with two distinct and contrasted personalities, indicated by his double name Altofronto-Malevole.

The purpose of all that Malevole does and says is revenge; his intentions are clear but limited, to regain his dukedom and become Altofront again, but not to kill his enemies. Revenge is his primary purpose and the role of satirist is one element in it. His actions as a satirist therefore acquire a moral justification denied to all Marston's earlier satirists, and the problem of the moral illegitimacy of the external satirist is thus solved. Jonson anticipated this solution when he created a 'double' character, turning Asper into Macilente. Marston's solution is more satisfactory because more functional: Malevole has the real grievance of his deposition on which to brood malcontentedly, but he is not a 'real' malcontent. He acts the part, just as Hamlet acts the part of a
madman, and for similar reasons: to conceal his real intentions, to give expression to emotions, and to attack vice and corruption around him. In Hamlet however the impulses of revenge and satire are subtly interrelated; in Malevole the two roles are quite separate. The dramatic advantages are that both as revenger and satirist Malevole has moral justification. The familiar role of the satirist is fitted into a context which gives it what it habitually lacked - an explanation of its origin, a definition of its purposes, and a moral justification for its aggressiveness. The clear division of Malevole's roles sets him furthest from Hamlet in whom the source of greatest interest is his inability to distinguish the limits of his roles.

After the audience discovers Malevole's origin - "Behold for ever banisht Altocfort" (Act I, p. 151)\(^\text{18}\) - it knows all the facts all the time, mainly through Malevole who stands like Hamlet between the action and the audience as the moral interpreter of the action, explicating moral judgements and providing sympathetic emotional reactions.

Early in the play Malevole tells his confidante Celso why he lost the throne of Genoa:

I wanted those old instruments of state, 
Dissemblance, and suspect: I could not time it Celso, 
My throane stood like a point in midd'st of a circle, 
To all of equall neerenesse, bore with none: 
Raind all alike, so slept in fearlesse vertue, 
Suspectles, too suspectles; till the crowde: 
(Still liquorous of untried novelties) 
Impatient with severer government: 
Made strong with Florence: banisht Altocfront

(Act I, p. 151).

\(^{18}\) The Malcontent is in volume I of The Plays of John Marston. This chapter was written before the publication of G.K. Hunter's edition of the play, [Revels] London, 1975.
He brought about his own downfall because his virtue though pure was too simple, failing to take account of evil in the form of hypocrisy, dissemblance and treachery. This suggests that something more than virtue was necessary, and this points to a new and unexpected direction in Marston's ideas away from idealism.

The court of Genoa exudes an "atmosphere of overpowering, nearly irresistible corruption", in order to achieve this, as Finkelpearl points out, the "cramped claustrophobic atmosphere of the private theatre was essential to Marston's purpose". The Malcontent contains the same kinds of characters as appeared in Antonio and Mellida and Jack Drum's Entertainment, derived from formal satire. But in Antonio and Mellida the satirised characters, like Balurdo and Castilio, are mere appendages to the play's main business of melodramatic action and passionate exclamation; in Jack Drum's Entertainment the satirised characters form one of the strands of the action and contribute to the tone of farcicality, but are also subsidiary. In The Malcontent, on the other hand, though there are the same types they do not appear as a separate element; on the contrary they are fully integrated into the play, and indeed are the world in which Malevole operates. It is a fully dramatic realisation of the corrupt world of formal satire. Like all the dramatic satires it takes familiar material and exploits its full potential by fitting it into a larger scheme.

19 Finkelpearl, John Marston of the Middle Temple, p. 180.
The minor figures are flat and exaggerated. Bilioso, for example, descended from figures like Tubrio in the satires, fawns compulsively before the powerful. As in Troilus and Cressida the play's common parlance is satire; though with closer reference to the style of formal satire:

Belioso. Madam, I am going Embassador for Florence, twill be great charges to me.

Bianca. No matter my Lord, you have the lease of two mannors come out next Christmasse; you may lay your tenants on the greater racke for it

(Act III, p. 175).

This conversation goes on to cover a wide range of satiric subjects - the court, extravagant clothes and fashion, sexual promiscuity, disregard for social responsibility - and they create a concrete representation of corruption. Bilioso and Biancha embody the vices of irresponsible courtiers, but there is an advance in Marston's satirical method here since they satirise themselves - speech and mutual display prompting satiric condemnation.

The many references to religion are less successfully integrated. Genoa is a godless world and the allusions to English religious history are surprising and discordant, for example Malevole's reply to Pietro:

Piet[ro]. And what doost thinke makes most Infidels now?

Mal[evole]. Sects, sects, I have seene seeming Pietie change her roabe so oft, that sure none but some arch-divell can shape her a new Peticote

(Act I, p. 146).

Religion does not emerge from the court as a subject for satire, and is only relevant insofar as it leads into the theme of Christian repentance.

21 The Scourge of Villanie, VII, 100ff.
In Act I, scenes ii-iii, Malevole runs the gamut of well-worn satirical postures. He rails at Ferrardo - "shadowe of a woman, what wou'dst Weesell? thou lambe a Court: what doost thou bleat for? a you smooth chind Catamite!" (Act I, p. 145) - and announces his intention to discomfit - "Ile come among you, you Gotish blounded Toderers, as Gum into Taffata, to fret, to fret: Ile fall like a spunge into water to suck up; to suck up" (Act I, pp. 145-46). Pietro gives a 'character' of Malevole describing his discontentedness, envy, and roughness of speech, and complacently describing his value to himself as an antidote to flatterers:

This Malevole is one of the most prodigious affections that ever conversst with nature ... for tis his position, whosoever in this earth can be contented is a slave and dam'; therefore do's he afflict al in that to which they are most affected ... I like him faith, he gives good intelligence to my spirit, makes me understand those weaknesses which others flattery palliates

(Act I, p. 146).

Malevole satirises the courtiers directly; Bilioso, for example -

And how do's my olde Muckill overspread with fresh snow: thou halfe a man, halfe a Goate, al a Beast: how do's thy young wife old huddle?

(Act I, p. 147)

- but he also satirises the court indirectly by supposedly recounting his dreams, in a style of speech sometimes as obscure and allusive as Kinsayder's:

Piet[ro]. Dreeame, what dreamst?

Mal[evo]le. Why me thinkes I see that Signior pawn his footcloth: that Metresa her Plate: this madam takes phisick: that that tother Mounstieur may minister to her:

... here a Paris supports that Hellen: theres a Ladie Guinever bears up that sir Lancelot. Dreeames, dreeames, visions, fantasies, Chimeras, imaginations, trickes, conceits

(Act I, pp. 147-48).
What Malevole describes as visions is the real corruption that the others cannot see. From the start his superior wit and perception gain the audience's support.

Malevole acts as agent provocateur, setting going the complex revenges and counter-revenges by disclosing Aurelia's infidelity to Pietro, ensuring that Pietro's revenge roots deeply by schooling him in the horrors of adultery:

Whilst she lispes, & gives him some court quelquechose,
Made onely to provoke, not satiate:
And yet even then, the thaw of her delight
Flowes from lowde heate of apprehension,
Onely from strange imaginations rankenes,
That formes the adulterers presence in her soule,
And makes her thinke she clips the foule knaves loines

(Act I, p. 149).

The conventional satire against lust has its own validity but by means of it Malevole also manipulates Pietro, explaining with absurd logic that "Adultery is often the mother of incest" (Act I, p. 149), and prompting him into a response he can exploit:

Malevole. ...every page sporting himselfe with delightfull laughter, whilst he must be the last must know it; Pistols and Poniards, Pistols and Poinards.

Pietro. Death and damnation!

Malevole. Lightning and thunder!

Pietro. Vengence and torture!

Malevole. Catzo!

Pietro. O revenge!

(Act I, p. 149).

His handling of Pietro demonstrates his important function of directing the characters into directions he wants. It is similar to Mosca's function in Volpone, and in both cases it serves as a method of satirical exposure.
As in *Troilus and Cressida* the satire comes as much from structure as from characters. The scenes are short and follow one another rapidly, registering the shifts and reversals of the plot in a way that maximises the irony. Mendoza's apostrophe to female perfection, parodies Hamlet's on man (II. ii. 23ff.):

...in body how delicate, in soule how witty, in discourse how pregnant, in life how wary, in favours how juditious, in day how sociable, and in night, how? O pleasure unutterable

(Act I, p. 155).

It is immediately followed by Aurelia, prompted by Maquerelle, turning furiously against Mendoza who thereupon changes his mind:

Women? nay furies, nay worse, for they torment onely the bad, but women good and bad. Damnation of mankinde, breath, hast hou praised them for this?...their wordes are fained, their eyes forg'd, their sights dissembled, their lookes counterfeit, their haire false, their given hopes deceitful, their very breath artificiall: Their blood is their onely God: Bad clothes, and old age are onely the Divels they tremble at: That I could raile now


What is emphasised is the switch from one extreme position to another with minimum motivation. There is a clear resemblance to the reversals of *Troilus and Cressida*, and in both plays the technique is used to emphasise the instability of their respective worlds. This is achieved by the consistent use of an ironical dramaturgy. Constant reversals of expectation for almost every character (except Malevole) in a highly patterned way distance the audience and prevent it from sympathising with the characters at almost every point. When Malevole reveals Pietro's cuckolding to him the audience's attention is focused on the way Malevole manipulates Pietro into a mental collapse rather than on sympathy for the victim.

The technique of the *Antonio* plays - startling and often irreconcilable disjunction between scenes, character and action - has
mellowed in *The Malcontent* to produce a coherent satiric mode.
The audience remains disengaged by the ironies produced, even though the emotions expressed are often very intense. For example, Pietro collaborates with Mendoza to kill Aurelia's new lover Ferneze; Mendoza and Aurelia thereupon make up their differences and decide to kill Pietro:

*Mendoza*. Why we are both but dead, the Duke hates us,
"And those whom Princes doe once groundly hate,
Let them provide to dye; as sure as fate,
Prevention is the heart of pollicie."

*Aurélia*. Shall we murder him.

*Mendoza*. Instantly?

*Aurélia*. Instantly, before he casts a plot,
Or further blaze my honours much knowne blot,
Let's murder him

(Act II, p. 171).

Mendoza then persuades Malevole to kill Pietro. But then Ferneze stirs, not dead after all, and Malevole takes him off to be kept in reserve till the moment when he springs his counter-coup, moralising on his narrow escape:

Such is of uncontrolled Lust the curse.
Think what it is in lawlesse sheets to lye,
But **Ferneze**, what in lust to die


This demonstrates the rapidity and complication of the plot, and the principle of reversal which operates in it. As Mendoza thinks he is becoming more and more secure, Malevole is building up stronger forces against him. The rigorously ironical structure is ideally designed to express and to contain a wide range of emotion, from rage and despair to sexy badinage (and Marston's talent is best suited to depicting extremes). It also establishes the possibility of a successful outcome for Malevole. As in *Measure for Measure* the fools and villains display their distorted nature in the light of the disguised duke's judgement which is latent but will reveal
itself. In this way the exhibition of folly and wickedness is fitted into a moral framework.

Through the use of deception Marston creates scenes of complex dramatic irony, in which various responses to experience, including satire itself, are treated critically. Such scenes are a characteristic of the three plays considered here. Act IV, scene v illustrates the technique and its effects. Aurelia, rejected by Mendoza, is contrite:

I can desire nothing but death, nor deserve any thing but hell.
If heaven should give sufficiencie of grace
To cleere my soule, it would make heaven gracelesse

(Act IV, p. 194).

Pietro has lost everything, and is plunged into melancholy. He describes his hermit's cave:

There Usherlesse the ayre comes in and out:
The reumy vault will force your eyes to weeps,
Whilst you behold true desolation:
A rocky barrennesse shall pierce your eyes,
Where all at once one reaches, where he stands,
With browes the roofe, both walles with both handes

(Act IV, p. 194).

The feeling that the ordinary human world is meaningless approaches the tragic, but our response to their suffering is distanced partly by the fact that Pietro, disguised as a hermit, is unrecognised by Aurelia, but largely by the guiding presence of Malevole who is observing the scene with an eye to his own advancement. The audience always shares Malevole's point of view, holding its reactions in balance between sympathy and amusement. Malevole leads Pietro to an understanding of his predicament as a dispossessed prince, and hence of the universal human predicament:
Malevole's speech is a turning point in the play. It presents powerfully a deeply pessimistic view of the universe as a place of death and decay, recalling Hamlet's speech which expresses his idea of the world as "a vile and pestilent congregation of vapours" (II. ii. 22). Hamlet's speech, like Malevole's, has its own validity, but it is also meant to put Rosencrantz and Guildenstern off his trail. In both cases there are ironies. Malevole wishes Pietro to believe that the loss of a dukedom counts for nothing, and so to renounce it. The greatest irony is in Malevole's arguing that dukedoms are worthless as a step in regaining his own; the emotional impact of the speech is therefore complicated. The nihilistic vision is the coup de grace in ridding Pietro of his worldly ambition, and it works:

Pietro. I heere renounce for ever Regency:
  0 Altofront, I wrong thee to supplant thy right

(Act IV, p. 197).

Malevole takes the hint and "Undisguiseth himself" (s.d. Act IV, p. 197); Ferneze and Celso appear and the four go off to plan their revenge. Malevole moralises on the scene for the audience's benefit:

Who doubts of providence,
  That sees this change, a heartie faith to all

(Act IV, p. 198).
In its rapid alternations from one extreme emotional atmosphere to another, and in its strange blend of satirical, comic, absurd and tragic expressions, this scene epitomises the play which creates an unstable, treacherous world for its characters, and a constantly changing stage spectacle for its audience.

For most of the play Malevole has a view of life in which vicissitude is normal and expected, and he is successful as a satirist insofar as his vision accords with 'reality' in the play:

Malevole,... only busie fortune towses, and the provident chaunces blends them together; Ile give you a symilie: did you ere see a Well with 2. buckets, whilst one comes up full to be emptied, another goes downe emptie to be filled; such is the state of all humanitie:why looke you, I may be the sonne of some Duke, for beleve me intemperate lascivious bastardie makes nobilitie doubtfull, I have a lusty daring hart Mendoza.

(Act III, p. 181).

However, Malevole is forced to reassess this world view when he confronts the loyalty of the Captain, and his wife Maria's steadfast resistance to blandishments of marriage from Mendoza:

Malevole, 0 heavens, that a christian should be found in a buffe jerkin! captaine Conscience:
I love thee Captaine


The Christian terms contribute to the increasingly Christian overtones of the last act. Malevole sees Maria's acceptance of misfortune as an alternative to the world of deception and vicissitude in which he is so successful; she is an image of true constancy against the world's flux:

Malevole. Sooner earths fire heaven it selfe shall waste,
Then all with heate can melt a minde that's chaste

(Act V, p. 204).
The presentation of two opposed world views sums up the play's philosophical theme most clearly. The method is a refinement of the philosophical debates of the Antonio plays, but there is no attempt at a resolution in purely philosophical terms.

Malevole's reaction supplies a kind of solution for him; the steadfastness of the Captain and Maria makes him realise the limits of his own revenger-satirist role, and he undergoes a kind of reformation. Turning in disgust from his mask, he is rejecting facile satirising. The key to the last act is education through experience. Pietro undergoes an educative process at Malevole's hands; now Malevole does so at Maria's, realising that sound human values still exist in the world. An important theme of the play is how a man may live virtuously and successfully in a corrupt world. Malevole has succeeded in beating the villains at their own game, but now Maria presents a real alternative to out-viceing vice. The view Malevole rejects is neatly expressed by Maquerelle - "Pish, honesty is but an art to seeme so" (Act V, p. 203). The qualification wrought by Maria in Malevole's position turns him away from a purely satirical response.

The climax of the play comes in the masque to celebrate Mendoza's success, in which illusion and reality are presented in a most ironic form, and consists of a universal unmasking. Mendoza celebrates his dastardly cleverness, having just 'killed' Malevole - "Now is my trechery secure, nor can we fall: / Mischief that prospers men do vertue call" (Act V, p. 208) - but Malevole promptly jumps up and effects his counter-coup. This ironic juxtaposition satirises Mendoza without the need for explicit comments. Mendoza is baffled by the throwing-off of disguises:
Are we surprizde? What strange delusions mocke
Our sences, do I dreame? or have I dreamt

[They seize upon Mendoza.
This two daies space? where am I?

(Act V, p. 213).

There is none of Antonio's Revenge's stabbing and strangling, but as in a comedy everyone is restored to his rightful place. Malevole's judgements are lenient: Mendoza is treated like the rogue in comedy and kicked out; Maquerelle is confined to the suburbs, and Bilioso allowed to live. None of the villains is reformed at the end; and indeed among the virtuous Ferneze takes his chance in the masque to seduce Biancha. The tone is satirical to the end:

Maquerelle]: On his troth la, beleve him not, that kinde of cunnicatching is as stale as Sir Oliver Anchoves perfumde jerkin: promise of matrimony by a yong gallant, to bring a virgin Lady into a fooles paradise: make her a great woman, and then cast her off

(Act V, p. 213).

Unlike Shakespearean comedy there is no promise of a revitalised society; the world of The Malcontent stays the same. Altofront will have Celso and the Captain as political allies, and Maria as a personal one: "You two unto my breast: thou to my hart" (Act V, p.215). Malevole's speech on reacquiring his dukedom establishes a new outlook. Virtue may not be enough, as Altofront discovered; it may have to be supported by the show of virtue. This is a qualified acceptance of hypocrisy, and is a step away from the ideal that appearance and reality should be always in agreement. Through his experience of the satirist's and revenger's role, Altofront comes to a more sophisticated but dangerous philosophy.
Volpone (1605-06)

Volpone is the first of Jonson's plays since Every Man In
(except for the collaboration Eastward Ho (1605)) not to have a
satiric commentator in the main plot, yet it is the most profoundly
satiric of any.

Jonson avoids the problems surrounding a satirist figure
by dividing the satirist's functions and reallocating them: the
appeal to a moral ideal is assigned to Celia and Bonario; insight
into fools and villains to Mosca, Volpone and Peregrine; exposure
also to Peregrine, Volpone, and Mosca; punishment to the Avocatori.
In addition ironically structured speeches and scenes produce
satirical effects. The contradictions and ironies which Jonson
was at pains to try to resolve in the early plays are here fully
accepted and indeed become the ironies which play over almost every
utterance that the play contains.

Like Troilus and Cressida and The Malcontent, Volpone
contains passages of satire directed against subjects not directly
involved in the main action. Mosca's speech against lawyers (I. iii.
51-66), for example, stands as a self-contained satire. It contains
sentiments common to critics of lawyers who objected to their
facility of speaking,

To every cause, and things mere contraries,
Till they were hoarse againe, yet all be law
(I. iii. 54-55),
and their usual practice of giving "forked counsell" and taking
"prouoking gold" (I. iii. 58). These charges are traditional, but
the effect of the speech is not simple, because of its dramatic
placing. Mosca pretends that he is presenting Voltore (a lawyer)
with Volpone's praise of the profession, which cited these common-places not as condemnation of lawyers but as evidence of "their humilitie", their peculiar consistency in refusing to "Wag, nor scarce / Lie still, without a fee" (I. iii. 60; 64-65). The original satire against lawyers is given fresh force by a context where its operation as flattery reveals new layers of corruption and self-deception in Voltore. A similar complicating effect is created during Corbaccio's first visit to Volpone, which is punctuated by a series of comments initiated by Mosca on the wickedness of the medical profession who "kill, / With as much licence, as a judge" (I. iv. 32-33), and "flay a man, / Before they kill him" (I. iv. 27-28). The irony is that Corbaccio is itching to give Volpone an opiate to send him to "his last sleepe" (I. iv. 18), as Mosca guesses. Both these speeches extend the scope of the play's attack and support its biting wit; but more important they create a picture of complex deception and insight, which destroys any simple distinction between the good and the bad.

One of the satirist's claims is that he possesses superior insight into mens' real motives and desires. Jonson supports Crites' claim to be able to discern the folly of the false courtiers; Crites shares the author's point of view and so possesses perfect understanding. The support Jonson allows the satirising of Volpone and Mosca is changeable, but frequently they have the author's sanction for their exposure of folly. A recent editor points out that "the excitements of the play and the nature of its insights owe much to the wit and understanding displayed by Mosca and Volpone as it were on Jonson's behalf". 22 Their accurate analyses

of character, however, place them firmly alongside Jonson's idealised satirical commentators. Jonson endows Volpone and Mosca with the same ability to spot fools as Crites and Horace, but not all the time, and never unreservedly. Their understanding of the hopeful legatees is accurate but, unlike Horace's of the poetasters or Arruntius' of the Senate, it has no moral authority. Jonson has broken the connection between virtue and insight in the commentator that existed in all his previous plays.

Mosca comes closest to being a satirist figure. Like his simpler prototype Musco of Every Man In His Humour, he wreaks confusion upon the legacy hunters by disguises and misdirections, but he also acts as a satiric spokesman. He tells Volpone what Voltore is imagining as he waits to greet the magnifico; exposing Voltore's greed and establishing his own superior understanding:

How he should worship'd be, and reuerenc'd;  
Ride, with his furres, and foot-clothes; waited on  
By herds of fooles, and clients...  
Be cald the great, and learned Aduocate:  
And then concludes, there's nought impossible

(I. ii. 104-06; 108-09).

In a situation where everyone is trying to dupe everyone else, insight into another's motives amounts to the power to manipulate them. Mosca's exposure of Voltore is carelessly amoral; he despises him only because of the simple-mindedness of his desires. Volpone's and Mosca's exposure of the suitors derives not from moral authority but from their superior awareness.

Mosca's insight extends to the good as well as the wicked characters. When he reveals to Bonario his father's plan to disinherit him, Bonario appears to have his measure, but he is easily deceived: Mosca pretends to weep and Bonario changes his mind -
What? do's he wepe? the signe is soft, and good!
I doe repent me, that I was so harsh

(III. ii. 18-19).

Jonson never followed Marston's achievement of making virtue, in Altofront-Malevole, more interesting than vice. Mosca easily outwits the virtuous Bonario by a masterly double-bluff, winning Bonario's sympathy with a confession of his "too much obsequie" (III. ii. 22), thus giving the formula of a knave feigning innocence to trick a gull a new twist, since Mosca's speech accurately describes his parasitical crimes. The motif of a character employing truth in the service of falsehood recurs throughout the play, and is one of the factors making Volpone a more subtle and penetrating variation on familiar satirical themes. When Mosca employs his understanding of the gulls for his own manipulative ends, he sounds like the satirist. In this way Jonson makes the satire that Mosca speaks subservient to his purpose of gulling, just as Marston makes Malevole's satirising subservient to his purpose of revenge. The advantage in both plays is that the satire retains its force while avoiding the ambiguities surrounding a satirist uttering it directly. In addition these passages in both plays of 'inset' satire become one element in the play's structure which itself demonstrates satiric themes. Mosca, like Malevole, skilfully blends truth and falsehood; his statement, "This verie houre, your father is in purpose / To disinherit you" (III. ii. 43-44), comes in the same flow of apparently honest confession that prompted his "obsequie". The audience, unlike the dupe, is sharply aware of Mosca's shifts and the purposes to which he puts truth and falsehood, and has therefore the opportunity to make moral judgements on him.

Mosca's soliloquy at the beginning of Act III, a celebration
of his triumphant powers of transformation, contains lines which might be taken from a formal satire:

...those
With their court-dog-tricks, that can fawne, and fleere,
Make their reuennue out of legs, and faces,
Eccho my-Lord, and lick away a moath

(III. i. 19-22)

...almost
All the wise world is little else, in nature,
But Parasites, or Sub-parasites

(III. i. 11-13).

But Mosca is not speaking from a satirist's point of view - he accepts and revels in the universality of parasitism, and indeed claims superhuman descent for its higher forms. Jonson's ironies play over this speech: he does not endorse Mosca's notion of the parasite, but does make Mosca's enormous vitality and wit attractive. The audience, therefore, has a much more complex impression from the soliloquy than it would from the same ideas expressed in formal satire. An audience generally accepts a satirist's vision of the world to the extent that it identifies with the satirist presenting it. Here, however, the audience, while admiring Mosca's exuberance, nevertheless rejects his ideas and is thus stimulated into a state of moral sensitivity. Jonson's practice in *Volpone* of placing satiric speech in a context which complicates its effect produces complex but never confused effects.

In the sub-plot Peregrine acts as a commentator on Sir Politique. He has something of the sophistication and awareness of the young man of *Every Man In*, and the same superior enjoyment, though more caustic, in the discomfiture he causes. Sir Politique and Lady Would-be are examples of folly conceived in humour terms. The *satirical* method of the sub-plot is that of the humour comedies,
and it contrasts clearly with the more complex methods of the main plot. Sir Pol's folly is the attempt to ape the sophistication of Venice; a misguided absorption in and reliance on useless and trivial signs. Indeed he declares his rejection of

That idle, antique, stale, grey-headed proiect
Of knowing mens minds, and manners, with VLYSSES

(II. i. 9-10),

and follows instead "a peculiar humour of my wiues, / ... to obserue, / To quote, to learne the language, and so forth" (II. i. 11-13).

Peregrine's relationship with Sir Pol is quickly established when Sir Pol asks news "of a rauen, that should build / In a ship royall of the Kings", and Peregrine says in an aside, "This fellow / Do's he gull me, trow? or is gull'd?" (II. i. 22-24). He asks his name, and again in an aside decides, "O, that speaks him" (II. i. 26). Having established his superior awareness Peregrine proceeds. Peregrine and Mosca both succeed as manipulators, and consequently satirists, because of their accurate awareness of the gulls.

As a further satirical technique, Jonson includes unobtrusive passages of satirical diatribe. Bonario and Celia both intermittently express the play's moral positives. They represent the shrunken remains of the type of idealised moral commentator. Generally, wickedness is displayed in action condemning itself; passages of direct protest occur only when the context gives them justification, and they merge almost imperceptibly into the total effect of the scene. Celia's outcry against Corvino provides an example. Corvino's attempts to persuade Celia to serve Volpone turn the values of marriage on their head. When she resists him, he cries, "Will you disgrace me, thus? do'you thirst my'vndoing?" (III. vii. 114), calls her "whore" (III. vii. 118), and
threatens the most horrible violence for the "dishonour" she is causing him in refusing to make him a cuckold. Celia's protest makes explicit the conventional morality which Corvino and the other characters pervert, and at the same time shows the weakness of that morality against its perversion:

_CELIA_. Are heauen, and saints then nothing? Will they be blinde, or stupide?

(III. vii. 53-54).

This recalls Arruntius' outcry against the impotence of the gods, and indeed both Celia and Arruntius are good but powerless. Celia then delivers a diatribe against the wickedness of the times:

0 god, and his good angels! whether, whether Is shame fled humane breasts? that with such ease, Men dare put off your honours, and their owne? Is that, which euer was a cause of life, Now plac'd beneath the basest circumstance? And modestie an exile made, for money?

(III. vii. 133-38).

The audience supports the ideas expressed, not only because Celia is a passionate and sound critic, but also because her husband's hypocrisy and cruelty justifies them. Jonson is not interested in her as a character; he merely wishes to register how wicked the world can be, along with an unequivocal response from conventional morality. Celia voices the play's ultimate standards but is utterly helpless to establish them. Her helplessness indicates that _Volpone_, like _Sejanus_, is concerned with a world where power is in the hands of evil men.

The function of commentating is implicit in Voltore's speech to the Avocatori. In the fabricated account of Celia's and Bonario's crimes are set general statements about vice which exactly describe the lawyer's wickedness:
VOLTORE. I pray your father-hoods,
To observe the malice, yea, the rage of creatures
Discouer'd in their euils

(IV. v. 49-51).

Voltore's plea before the court turns innocence and guilt upside down, and judging by appearances the Avocatori endorse his question "if their plots / Have any face or colour like to truth?" (IV. vi. 44-45). As in The Malcontent truth and falsehood assume unlikely disguises. Voltore's conclusion,

That vicious persons when they are hot, and flesh'd
In impious acts, their constancy abounds:
Damn'd deeds are done with greatest confidence

(IV. vi. 51-53),

has ironic force in its double application to Bonario and Celia, and to the suitors themselves.

The themes of the play are closely-connected group: greed, lust, deception, acting. Consequently the speech of a character manifestly referring to one situation may, as the previous example shows, refer equally or more powerfully to another, as happens in Hamlet. In this way the play becomes a network of statements which have a wider satirical relevance by their reflection of other themes. They are ironies operative outside the world of the play, available only to the audience. When Volpone cries,

Poore wretches! I rather pittie their folly,
and indiscretion, then their losse of time, and money; for those may be recovered by industrie; but to bee a foolse borne, is a disease incurable

(II. ii. 157-59),

Cf., A. Kernan ed., Volpone, [Yale] New Haven and London, 1962, p.11: "The idea of 'playing' is the central theme of Volpone, and ultimately all the other details of the intricately wrought play feed into this master image"; and H. Levin, "Jonson's Metempsychosis", PQ, 22, 1943, 231-39, p. 234: "Now the main theme of Volpone is a comic distortion of a theme that is tragic in Hamlet and tragicomic in The Malcontent, the pervasive Jacobean theme of disinheritance".
it might apply to the suitors; in fact it is part of his mountebank speech and refers to alchemists who have tried and failed to make elixir like his.

Jonson uses another satiric technique in exposing Lady Would-be's character in a short dramatic *vignette* (III.iv.1-38). As she titivates herself before meeting Volpone her vanity is revealed, and the audience's mockery is assured by the series of caustic asides from Nano.

Jonson uses techniques other than explicit comment to embody the play's moral positives; in general terms "action and speeches are constructed in a way which reveals the values that gold is obliterating ... Irony is thus Jonson's chief satiric technique". Volpone's opening speech, for example, implies the presence of Christian morality by the calculated inversion of it. Volpone's perception of its paradoxical qualities suggests by its religious language that gold, like grace, can transform men into anything:

That canst doe nought, and yet mak'st man doe all things;
The price of soules; euen hell, with thee to boot,
is made worth heauen! Thou art vertue, fame, Honour, and all things else! Who can get thee,
He shall be noble, valiant, honest, wise
(I. i. 23-27);

The satire has philosophical implications: that gold is at the root of the human metamorphoses we witness; that it obliterates good and evil; that it is the creator of a "new world into a new orbit". One critic makes the point that the play "commends the


virtues - of wit, generosity and vitality - that Volpone and Mosca both embody and pervert. 26

In the last Act Volpone takes over the initiation of the plots from Mosca. While "Mosca's plays present the fools with flattering images of themselves", 27 Volpone's feigned death and his disguise as a soldier is designed to confirm his superiority to the stupid and corrupt inheritance seekers. When the suitors gather for the 'kill', in a comic variation on the supplications of Act I, Volpone is hiding behind a traverse, acting as commentator on them and wringing the last drop of malicious revelation from their hope, confusion, and anger. The scene displays a threefold hierarchy of deception - Volpone, Mosca, and the suitors - and its subtle and intricate organisation, combined with a fierce satirical tone, places it alongside Act V, scene ii of Troilus and Cressida, and Malevole's scene with Pietro in Act IV of The Malcontent as being thoroughly satirical. Describing their reactions as they enact them, Volpone reduces them to absurd automatons: 28

My advocate is dumb, looke to my merchant,
Hee has heard of some strange storme, a ship is lost,
He faints: my lady will swoone. Old glazen-eyes,
He hath not reach'd his despair, yet

(V. iii. 23-26).

Volpone like Mosca displays insight into the suitors' motives and so exposes them to satiric ridicule:

VOLP[ONE]. 'Tis true, 'tis true. What a rare punishment
Is avarice, to itselfe?

(I. iv. 42-43).

28 Cf., a similar technique used for comic effect in Eastward Ho (IV. i. 1-32) where Slitgut describes the shipwreck of Securitie on the Thames.
In the scene with Celia, he exposes Corvino's hypocrisy to Celia and to the audience:

Assure thee, CELIA, he that would sell thee,
Onely for hope of gaine, and that vncertaine,
He would haue sold his part of paradise
For ready money, had he met a cope-man

(III. vii. 141-44).

Volpone despises "such earth-fed mindes" (III. vii. 139), but his appeal to Celia in Christian terms is merely a front to the fulfilment of his own fantasies. But Volpone's real purpose lies elsewhere, for when he and Mosca gleefully celebrate their escape from punishment he declares, "Good wits are greatest in extremities" (V. ii. 6), and accounts the deception of the Scrutineo "O, more, then if I had enioy'd the wench" (V. ii. 10). Whereas Mosca only wishes to practise his parasitical talents, Volpone does have a genuinely satirical desire to expose and humiliate the clients. He does not crave great wealth as an end in itself, but craves rather the thrills that the process of acquiring brings:

Yet, I glory
More in the cunning purchase of my wealth,
Then in the glad possession; since I gaine
No common way

(I. i. 30-33).

This craving is more subtle than the clients' avarice, but like the honour which Ulysses describes to Achilles (Troilus and Cressida, III. iii. 95ff) it is by its nature insatiable. Volpone's desire to practise deception necessarily involves the exposure of those he deceives, and so he produces the maximum of satirical exposure with the minimum of the satirist's self-consciousness. In this way Jonson avoids the contradictions surrounding a satirist figure. The clients' final humiliation comes in Mosca's series of excoriating and accurate 'characters' addressed to each in turn.
As Volpone and Mosca end the duping of the clients, Mosca initiates the duping of Volpone, and his words to Voltore acquire an irony Volpone is unaware of:

But, I protest, sir, it was cast vpon me,
And I could, almost, wish to be without it,
But, that the will o' th' dead, must be observ'd

(V. iii. 85-87).

Mosca is established as the character with supreme perception; as such he operates, momentarily at least, as an authoritative satirist. His insight is evident in, for example, the analysis of the mind of the gull:

... they will not see't
Too much light blinds 'hem, I thinke. Each of 'hem
is so possesst, and stuft with his owne hopes,
That any thing, vnto the contrary,
Neuer so true, or neuer so apparent,
Neuer so palpable, they will resist it

(V. ii. 22-27).

The problem of satirical punishment is solved in *Volpone* by separating the functions of exposure and punishment, and effecting punishment in stages corresponding to the levels of awareness in the characters from the lowest up. Power to punish is vested in the Avocatori, but they have no power to discover, and expose; discovery and exposure are produced in the case of the gulls by Volpone and Mosca, and then in their own case by the self-defeating nature of their own folly. Volpone's desperate undisguising before the Scrutineo, "I am VOLPONE, and this is my knave" (V. xii.89) represents his final assertion of superiority. Jonson devolves his prerogatives as a dramatist onto his protagonists to satirise the gulls, giving them similar authority to Macilente, in the style of the "comicall satyres"; then allows Volpone and Mosca to overreach themselves and cause their own exposure and punishment.
Summary

In these dramatic satires all three dramatists employ a wide range of dramatic techniques to produce plays whose pervasive effects are satirical. They are masterpieces of satirical drama, yet surprisingly perhaps the part played by satirist figures in them is limited. This chapter has tried to show that the plays' satirical themes and attitudes are expressed not so much through satirist figures as through structural and other stylistic means. By these means the audience comes to experience the action with a mixture of amusement and scorn, Gilbert Highet's test for the presence of satire, and reacts to the action it sees on stage from a satirical point of view, and indeed as if it were itself a satirist.

Satirical emotions are produced in the audience not by the words or actions of a satirist figure, but by the implicit comment which emerges from the structure and style of the play itself. The audience is left free to draw whatever moral inferences it wishes. The author's control of the total play-fiction also allows highly generalised thematic implications to emerge. The similarities of style and thematic implication which these plays manifest may be summarised as follows:

1 The satirised characters are flat, which places the emphasis on their movement and interaction rather than on their individuality.

All three plays display different levels of illusion through acting and disguise, and this is used for satirical effect.

Each play contains scenes of complex dramatic irony.

There are no reformations; the world remains the same at the end as the beginning, implying a pessimistic vision.

The world of each play is solely human; there is no sense of divine interest in human depravity.

Each play extends to reaches of satire which do not merely expose single fools or villains, or even humanity as a whole, but cast a searching and destructive light over conventional systems of moral authority and evaluation.
In *The Malcontent* satirical exposure and punishment are not accompanied by reformation; for example, Mendoza, Bilioso, and Maquerelle are not reformed. It is through the lessons of experience that reformation takes place, as with Pietro, Aurelia, and Malevole/Altofront. In his later plays Marston dramatises satirical actions which lead towards reformation through experience. This shift of interest reflects Marston's changing idea of human nature, its possibilities for moral improvement, and the ideal to which it should aspire. These changing ideas are reflected in the changing nature of the satirist figures Freevill and Hercules/Faunus who are represented as being more concerned with the satirical function of reformation than with that of diatribe.

Marston's shift of thought was perhaps crystallised by his
reading Florio's translation of Montaigne's *Essayes* (1603). \(^1\) Montaigne did not lead his thought in new directions; on the contrary, he "expressed memorably certain ideas and attitudes which Marston had held at one time or another, and he suggested relationships among these ideas which Marston had not previously perceived". \(^2\) One of these ideas is that experience is a better teacher than books; another idea, or set of ideas, concerns the natural and moral conditions of human sexuality. \(^3\)

The tone of *The Dutch Courtesan* and *The Pawn* is generally comic rather than satiric. Marston proclaims in the Prologue of *The Dutch Courtesan* that his desire is to please: \(^4\)

```
Yet thinke not, but like others raile we could,
(Best art Presents, not what it can, but should)
And if our pen in this seeme over slight,
We strive not to instruct, but to delight
```

(Prologue, 11. 3-8).

*The Malcontent*'s method of directing satire at the characters by systematic structural parallels and juxtapositions appears only fitfully in these two plays. In *The Dutch Courtesan*, for example, the sentimental reunion of Beatrice and Frewill has a comic strain with Beatrice's logical but mistaken conviction, coming out of a faint, that she is in heaven. Similarly in *The Pawn*, Gonzago's speech

---


\(^2\) Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple*, p.199.

\(^3\) K.G.W. Cross, "Marston, Montaigne, and Morality: *The Dutch Courtesan* Reconsidered", *ELH*, 27, 1960, 30-43, observes that "'Sur des vers de Vergile' ... furnishes Marston with his major theme as well as most of his illustrative material", p. 33.

\(^4\) *The Dutch Courtesan* is in Volume II of *The Plays of John Marston*. 
praising his cunning in supposedly defeating Tiberio's designs is spoken while Tiberio and Dulcimel are consummating their love, thus directing derision at Gonzago. However, neither play aims to achieve the overall satirical atmosphere that the consistent use of multiple ironies does in *The Malcontent*.

Freevill and Hercules/Faunus are similar types to Quadratus of *What You Will*, who rejected extremes of belief and behaviour and advised Lampatho Doria to "affect no higher / Then praise of heaven, wine, a fire" (I. i. p. 239). Neither is an idealist.

*The Dutch Courtesan* (1603-04)

The exchange between Malheureux and Freevill in Act I, scene i, sets the tone of frivolous indecency, which is pervasive throughout, and would have been intensified when spoken by the original boy actors. Freevill's attitude to sex is like Lucio's in *Measure for Measure*, seeing it as a strong, natural impulse unamenable to strict control. Malheureux, on the other hand, attempts to repress sexuality. His indignation at Freevill's attitude is shown when he tries to persuade him not to visit Francischina in the language of *The Scourge of Villanie*, language which, as has been seen in *What You Will*, is now suspect in Marston's work:

*Malheureux*. Know Sir, the strongest argument that speaks against the soules eternitie is lust, That Wisemans folly, and the foole's wisedome: But to grow wild in loose lasciviousnesse, Given up to heat, and sensuall Appetite... ...to the stale use, The common bosome of a money Creature, One that sels humane flesh: a Mangonist

(Act I, p. 73).

Malheureux's position, like Angelo's in *Measure for Measure*, crumbles
the moment he encounters Francischina, and turns instantly into its opposite, lust. The inference is that the rabid hostility towards sex that Malheureux exhibits is merely the obverse of the lust he claims to detest. Freevill, overhearing, greets the reversal as a joke - "By the Lord hee's caught, Laughter eternall!" (Act I, p. 79). Freevill makes no attempt to rail at Malheureux's folly or Francischina's wantonness, regarding both as beyond his influence. His attitude to the world round him is more than tolerant, it is libertine. His defence of whores (Act I, pp. 73-74) argues for their necessity for financial and sexual reasons, and it parallels Cocledemoy's set-piece defence of bawds (Act I, pp. 76-77). Freevill and Cocledemoy are clever manipulators in their spheres of action, exposing folly by their plots. Cocledemoy is a trickster like Musco in Every Man In His Humour, but his tricks are specifically those of Greene's cony-catchers.

Freevill is least like Kinsayder of all Marston's satirist figures. As much expression of satirical feeling comes through other characters in the other plots. Cocledemoy, for example, following the satirist's reductive method, tells Freevill, who is off to the brothel, that he will look a fool because, ...

... according to the old saying, A begger when he is loweing of himselfe lookes like a Philosopher, a hardbound Philosopher, when he is on the stoole, lookes like a tyrant, and a wise man, when hee is in his belly act, lookes like a foole

(Act I, p. 77).

Crispinella gives a coprological description of being kissed, in which the imagery of putrefaction is as strong as anything in The Scourge:
Marry if a nobleman or a knight with one Locke vissit us though his uncleane goose-turd green teeth, ha the palsy, his nostrrels smell worse then a putrified maribone, & his loose beard drops into our bosome, yet wee must kisse him

(Act III, p. 98).

Crispinella, the critical intelligence in her part of the play, the comic courtship with Tysefew, is given like Freevill and 'Cocledemoy, a set-piece speech on a sexual subject. Like Freevill she accepts her sexuality, and her place in her world, but displays an ironic, realistic awareness of the local discomforts of husbands and marriage:

Fayth strive against the flesh, marry? no fayth... A husband generally is a careles dominering thing that growes like coroll which as long as it is under water is soft and tender, but as soone as it has got his branch above the waves is presently hard stiffe, not to be bowed but burst

(Act III, p. 100).

In the grip of passion, Malheureux is quickly reduced to being a fool and almost a villain. Significantly, he is aware of the emotional and moral changes taking place in him, and comments on them himself:

Mal[heureux]. I can not centaine; he saw thee not that left thee, If there be wisedome, reason, honor, grace Or any foolishly esteemed vertue, In giving o're possession of such beautie, Let me be vitious, so I may be lov'de, Passion I am thy slave

(Act II, p. 90).

Malheureux's own intelligence and moral sensitivity allows a recognition and analysis of lust as detailed and as morally comitted as any satirist's. With this degree of awareness and articulation in the victim, an angry satirist's moralisings would be redundant. Malheureux agonises over the contradiction that man should be unable to enjoy sex freely while animals can:
Malheureux. O you happy beastes
In whome an inborne heat is not held sinne,
How far transcend you wretched man
Whom nationall custome, Tyrannous respects
Of slavish order, fetters, lames his power
Calling that sinne in us, which in all things els
Is natures highest virtue.

(Act II, p. 83).

Freevill regards Malheureux's misunderstanding of his sexuality
good-humouredly and delivers worldly comments:

Malheureux. I would but imbrace her, heare her speake,
and at the most but kisse her.

Freevill. O frend he that could live with the smoake
of roast meate might live at a cheape rate

(Act II, p. 84).

Freevill's analysis is accurate, and this gives his moral
statements authority. He says of Malheureux's passion, for example,
"why frend, / Philosophie & nature are all one, / love is the
center in which all lines close / the common bonde of being"
(Act II, p. 84), and warns him without trying to restrain him:

...since you needs must love, you must know this,
He that must love, a foole, and he must kisse

(Act II, p. 85).

The tragicomic development of the main plot extends
Malheureux's emotional and moral dilemma from the limited sexual
area to wider areas. He states, for example, a number of ingenious
reasons for murdering Freevill, then realises how much he has erred,
his reason driven awry by lust, from the dictates of faith:
"O wit how vile, / How hellish art thou, when thou raisest nature /
Gainst sacred faith" (Act II, p. 43). Malheureux swings to another
extreme, the Stoic position, declaring that he must rise above
passions: "'Not he that's passionles but he 'bove passion's wise,'
/My friend shall know it all" (Act II, p. 93); but he still suffers
the contradictory experience of desiring Francischina desperately
and knowing her to be damned:

_Freevill._...you ha vow'd my death?

_Malheureux._ My lust, not I, before my reason would, yet I must use her, that I a man of sense should conceive endless pleasure in a body whose soule I know to be so hideously blacke

(Act III, p. 104).

Malheureux's extreme deviation from normal virtue exemplifies the total unreliability of human reason.

It is only at this point that Freevill announces a satirical intention, of allowing Malheureux to feel the full consequences of his vice, and so be brought to repentance:

_Now repentance the fool's whip seize thee..._  
_I le force thee feel thy errors, to the worst_  
_The wildest of dangers thou shalt sinke into_

(Act IV, p. 115).

His motives, he says, are not purely virtuous, and he goes on to gloss the state of normal virtues as a mixed one:

_Nothing extremely best with us endures, _  
_No use in simple purities, the elementes Are mixt for use, Silver without alay _  
_Is all to eager to be wrought for use: Nor precise vertues ever purely good Holdes usefull sije with temper of weake bloud_

(Act IV, pp. 115-16).

Freevill hopes that Malheureux will stop veering from one extreme to another, and come to rest in the moral middle ground where he himself stands. This speech specifically renounces the moral superiority sometimes claimed by satirists. Freevill's motives for so acting are based not on abstract moral position but on personal friendship. Freevill therefore assumes the role of witty intriguer, even deciding not to reveal himself to Beatrice in order to enjoy the spectacle of her constancy (Act IV, p. 120). But
Despite his confidence in a happy outcome - "providence all wicked art ore-tops" (Act IV, p. 120) - he is still shocked at the extremity of Francischina's wickedness, and this finally makes him realise "The difference betwixt the love of a Curtesan, & a wife" ("Fabule argumentum", p. 69).

The tragicomic development of the plot brings Malheureux to "the wildest of dangers" (Act IV, p.115), the gallows, as Freevill intended. At that point Malheureux declares his loathing of Francischina whereupon Freevill discovers himself and explains everything. Malheureux announces his return to a presumably wiser self, and points the moral of his experience:

I am myselfe, how long wast ere I could Perswade my passion to grow calme to you? Rich sence makes good bad language, and a friend Should waigh no action, but the actions end. I am now worthie yours, when before The beast of man, loose bloud distemperd us, "He that lust rules cannot be vertuous."

(Act V, p. 134).

In Marston's verse satires and early plays the possibility of human reformation, though asserted, was implicitly denied. In The Dutch Courtesan Marston finds means of convincingly dramatising reformation. Malheureux's initial mistake is in believing that he is not subject to universal human passions. This error is righted by knowledge acquired through experience in a situation deliberately set up by Freevill. Freevill himself undergoes a minor shift in attitude by a similar process of knowledge through experience in his revised opinion of courtesans and wives. Freevill is rooted in the action as a result of seeing himself as part of the common human experience, and he claims no superior power of insight or authority, making him likeable as no earlier satirist is. Malheureux's self-awareness makes outside commentary on his condition unnecessary.
Freevill's words provide a witty, amused, morally orthodox accompaniment to Malheureux's self-confessed vice:

Malheureux. I rest your self, / each man hath follies.

Freevill. But those worst of all,
"Who with a willing eie, do seeing fall."

Malheureux. Tis true, but truth seemes folly in madnesse spectacles,
I am not now my selfe, no man : Farewell.

(Act IV, p. 115).

Freevill gives the laughing response to folly and vice, deriving in Marston's oeuvre from Epictetus of Certaine Satyres; but Freevill's laughter, unlike Epictetus', is rooted in a valid idea of human nature. Freevill is so different from Marston's early satirist figures that he may be considered as belonging to another type. At least, he is transitional. K.G.W.Cross describes what he is moving towards: "Montaigne's 'natural man', forerunner of the libertine or honnete homme who features so largely in later seventeenth century literature". 5

The Fawn (1604-06)

In this play Marston continues the development of the satirist figure away from the angry, railing satirist. Hercules, the satirist figure, travels disguised to Urbino with the initial intention of ensuring that his son Tiberio woos the lady Dulcimel (for his father) with appropriate vigour. The duke-in-disguise situation follows Measure for Measure (c. 1603-04), but one reason for Hercules' disguise, unlike Vincentio's, is to have some fun, and escape the constrictions that being duke imposes: 6

---

5 "Marston, Montaigne, and Morality: The Dutch Courtesan Reconsidered", ELH, 27, 1960, p. 36.
6 The Fawn is in volume II of The Plays of John Marston.
But we must once be wild, tis auncient truth...
To have that fellowe crie, O marke him, grave,
See how austeerely he doth give example,
Of repressed heate and steddy life
Whilstt my forc'd life against the streame of bloud
Is tugg'd along


Hercules as the Fawn operates as an agent of release both for
the fools locked in their self-deception, and for Tiberio
unwilling to give himself in love. This is quite different from
the operation of a severe moral satirist, like Jonson's Macilente
or Marston's Planet, who tries to stamp out vice or folly and
impose his own moral rules.

At Urbino, Hercules encounters the court fools, entering
one after another in established satiric fashion, and at the end of
Act I realises with shock how pervasive flattery is in princes'
courts, reflects that as Duke he suffered from it, and that it
is harmful to the state by preventing self-knowledge in the prince:

Thou gratefull poyson, sleeke mischiefe Flatterie,
Thou dreamefull slumber (that doth fall on kings
As soft and soone as their first holy oyle,)
Be thou for ever dam'd

(Act I, p. 158).

He repents the prohibitions that he put on "some sharpe stiles"

(Act I, p. 158):

Freenes, so't grow not to licentiousnes
Is gratfull to just states

(Act I, p. 158).

He decides therefore to be revenged on flatterers. The method he
chooses is not to scourge vice by denunciation, because, he says,
that has become inefficacious; instead he will become a
flatterer and undo flattery with greater flattery:
I will revenge us all upon you all
With the same strategem, we still are caught,
Flatterie it selfe : and sure all knowes the sharpenesse
Of reprehensive language is even blunted
To full contempt...
I vow to wast this most prodigious heat
That fals into my age, like scorching flames
In depth of numb'd December, in flattering all
In all of their extreamest vitiousnesse

(Act I, p. 158).

This plan accommodates Hercules' desire for fun (Act I, p. 148)
and his desire to be revenged on flattery. His plan is to combat
folly, using the subtle psychological stratagem of feeding
each folly until it destroys itself from its own excess.

Faunus moves to the heart of the court, by means of flattery.
From this position he acts as an agent provocateur. He tells
the court fools what they want to hear, demonstrating all the time
"the total moral vacuum in which flattery operates": 7

_Her[cules]_. I perceive Knight you have children, oh tis
a blessed assurance of heavens favour, and
long lasting name to have many children.

_Sir Amor[o]so_. But I ha none, Fawne, now;

_Her[cules]_. 0 that's most excellent, a right speciall
happinesse, hee shall not bee a Drudge to his
cradle, a slave to his childe...

(Act II, p. 162).

At the end of Act II Hercules breaks into a satirical lamentation on
the times:

I am left
As on a rock, from whence I may discern
The giddie sea of humour flowe beneath ...
...o mightie flatterie
Thou easiest, commonst, and most gratefull venome
That poysons Courts, and all societies...

7 Finkelpearl, _John Marston of the Middle Temple_, p. 231.
Free speech gaines foes, base fawnings steale the heart,
Swell you impostumbd members till you burst
Since tis in vaine to hinder, on ile thrust
And when in shame you fall, ile laugh from hence,
And crie, so end all desperate impudence.
An others court shall shew me where and how
Vice may be cur'de

(Act II, pp. 174-75).

Stepping outside his disguise involves a shift from the role of fawn
to indignant moralist, and an accompanying shift to satirical
metaphors of disease and lancing. 8 Hercules speaks as a bitter
satirist too when the foolish ladies enter, commenting aside
on Garbetza:

O, I will acknowledge this is the Lady made of outwork
and all her body like a sand boxe, full of holes, and
contains nothing but dust

(Act III, p. 179).

As well as manipulating the fools, and commenting explicitly
on them, Hercules also contrives to make Tiberio fall in love
with Dulcimel, with witty cooperation from the lady herself:

Her[cules]. Your father I may boldlie say, hee 's an Asse,
To hope that youle forbeare to swallow,
What he cannot chew, naye 't is injustice truelie,
For him to judge it fit, that you should starve

(Act III, p. 190).

The Fawn is the central intelligence in both the play's plots.

Hercules' methods of exposure and reformation are exemplified
in Act IV when first he prompts Zuccone into confessing responsibility
for his cuckoldry, and then into advertising it:

when he states that we meet Marston's "harsh satiric style less
and less frequently until, in *The Fawn*, it disappears", p. 215;
the harsh style greatly diminishes but never altogether disappears.
Even in *The Insatiate Countess* (1610) there are remnants of
the old style; for example, Massino's satire on women (Volume II,
p. 51).
Hercules... for there is few of us but hath made some one cuckold or other).

Zuccone. True I ha don't my selfe.

Hercules. Yet ---

Zuccone. Yet I hope a man of wit may prevent his owne mishap or if he can [not] prevent it. ---

Hercules. Yet ---

Zuccone. Yet make it knowne yet, and so knowne that the world may tremble with onely thinking of it. Well Fawne whome shall I marie now? (Act IV, p. 201).

Then, when Zoya enters, supposedly having given birth, Hercules drops that mask and attacks him with satirical denunciation:

Hercules... that beauty more freshd then any coole and trembling wind, that now only wish of a man is delivered, is delivered.

Zuccone. How?

Hercules. From Don. Zuc. that dry skalines, that sarpego, that barren drouth and shame of all humanity (Act IV, p. 202).

Hercules brings Zuccone to a full realisation of his stupidity, as Mosca does to the suitors in Volpone. Zuccone's comical sufferings, like theirs, comes as much from realising that he has been manipulated as from his folly itself. In this manner Zuccone's guilt is exposed, and he repents it: "we are miserably, tho justly wretched" (Act IV, p. 206).

Hercules virtually takes over the last act with the masque of his devising, and the arraignment of the defiers of Cupid's decrees in "Cupid's Parliament". Hercules condemns the fools and banishes them, the whole thing frankly contrived so that offences conveniently fit laws. Hercules' ascendancy is sealed when he provides demonstrable proof to Gonzago that his attempts to thwart his daughter's
wooning have had the opposite effect to the one he intended: "you were ranckly guide, / Made a plaine naturall" (Act V, p. 223). Gonzago declares he is ashamed of himself for having been in such a slumber, and with that Hercules' success is complete.

In *The Fawn* Marston takes the development of the satirist figure one more step away from railing, morally intense satire. Hercules becomes "the witty practitioner of the vices he wishes to expose", undoing others with an inflated version of their own vice. Like Freevill, Faunus brings about reformation not by railing but by the therapy of experience. This function of the satirist reduces the gap between the fools and the satirist since both are engaged in the same process of acquiring self-knowledge through experience. The satirist does not set himself above or even apart from those he exposes or reforms. Montaigne provides a useful gloss on what is implicit in these plays: 10

> I have said all this, to maintain the coherency and resemblance, that is in all humane things, and to bring us unto the generall throng. We are neither above nor under the rest: what ever is under the coape of heaven (saith the wise man) runneth one law, and followeth one fortune.

Along with these satirist figures who emphasise the actual and the possible, as against the ideal and the impossible, goes a kind of virtuous character who is intelligent, self-aware, and active in promoting his own interests. The clearest examples are female (Crispinella and Dulcimel, for example), and they represent a sympathetic, humanly possible form of virtue similar to


that of the satirists themselves. Through these characters Marston attempts to energise virtue and present it as both attractive and effective. Hercules' first soliloquy concludes with the *sententia*: "Ther's nothing free but it is generous" (Act I, p. 148); and in *The Dutch Courtesan* Crispinella says, "vertue is a free pleasant buxom qualitie" (Act III, p. 99). As Finkelpearl notes, "Marston comes to link generosity and virtue". 11

Although in *Sophonisba, or the Wonder of Women* (1605-06) there is no satirist figure or quasi-satirist, there is satire. The play shows returns to earlier themes and techniques. Sophonisba's chastity, for example, has "a free pleasant buxom qualitie": before her marriage with Masinissa she discusses her sexual feelings frankly and expresses regret that women should be so constrained by ceremony (I. ii. p. 11-12). 12 Sophonisba is a rarity of chastity just as Syphax is a rarity of lust. It is as if the terms which denoted Marston's obsessions throughout his career, lust/purity and body/soul, finally spring apart and stand opposed in the tragedy, after the resolution achieved in *The Dutch Courtesan*. Though Marston claims in the "Epilogus" that *Sophonisba* is without ribaldry and personal satire, there are reminiscences of Marston's satirical style. Asdruball's speech regretting his connivance at a plan to poison Masinissa, echoes *The Scourge* (Act II, p. 28). More significantly, a satirical dramaturgy ensures that Syphax's lust is exposed to the audience's derision when he twice leaps into bed expecting to enjoy Sophonisba, the first time finding

11 Finkelpearl, *John Marston of the Middle Temple*, p. 258.
12 *Sophonisba* is in volume II of *The Plays of John Marston*. 
his dead Negro servant, and the second enjoying the witch Erictho appearing as Sophonisba. In copulating with Erictho, Syphax receives his gruesome, ludicrous reward and punishment in one.

---

13 This point contradicts Peter Ure, "John Marston's Sophonisba: A Reconsideration", *Durham University Journal*, 10, 1949, pp. 81-90, who states that "lust-in-action finds a convincing embodiment in Syphax, which only the elimination of satire made possible", p. 88; he describes the Syphax-Erictho scenes as "moral allegory", *ibid.*
In *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster* the satirist figures have no political power to judge and punish, but their relative position in the power structure to those with power ensures that justice is done to fools and villains. The rigidity of this position is overcome in *Sejanus* by reversing the relation of the satirist and those with political power, making Arruntius and his friends powerless and cutting them off from those with power. Arruntius shares Crites' and Horace's ability to perceive folly and crime and to inveigh against it, but has no contact with a powerful figure who would act on his behalf. In *Sejanus* vice is punished by its own self-destructiveness. This resolution of the problem of the satirist and power opens up new dramatic possibilities, but it denies the satirist any part in destroying vice. In *Sejanus* Jonson makes it clear that corruption lies not only in Sejanus but also in Roman society, and that its destruction in the hero is effected by characters who represent its continuing existence in society. This
emphasis on vice in society rather than vice in an individual, as in the "comickall satyres", further emphasises the satirist's impotence.

The comedies after Sejanus plot a steady descent of the social scale: Volpone treats the moneyed bourgeois of Venice; Epicoene gentility and tradesmen; The Alchemist a trio from the lowest social strata, with a knight representing the highest class; Bartholomew Fair characters of the Jacobean underworld, the bourgeois characters being outsiders. As the plays descend the social scale the problems involved in a satirist's relations to the powerful diminish as the powerful disappear out of sight. Furthermore, when the seeds of vice's destruction are located in vice itself and not in its critic, the need to establish a convincing relation between the satirist and the powerful gradually disappears. In these later plays characters with power or characters who judge become sometimes subtlely corrupt (the Avocatori), or foolish (Justice Overdo), or downright evil (Tiberius). The emphasis shifts from concern with society's satirist as the representative and agent of an idealistic morality, towards a concern with the conditions in society in which a realistic morality may operate. Given this interest in the workings of power and justice in a wider context than simply a satirist and his victims, Jonson is much concerned in his later plays to present a kind of character who can live freely and successfully in society while maintaining a critical sense of value and judgement. Truewit in Epicoene represents the first attempt to depict such a character.

In Jonson's plays after Volpone and up to Bartholomew Fair the activities and functions of the satirist figure are absorbed into
the fabric of the plays, as in *Volpone*, although there are characters who represent the continuation of one or more aspects of the satirist. Techniques of simple and complex irony take over some of the criticising functions previously carried out by satirist figures.

**Epicoene (1609)**

In *Epicoene* the idealised moral satirist, whose last vestiges were seen in Bonario and Celia, has vanished. Instead, there is a new kind of character - the wit. Clerimont, Dauphine, and Truewit (especially) all engage in deceptions, tricks, and verbal manipulation which satirise fools, but their main aim is to amuse themselves and advance their self-interest. *Volpone*’s Peregrine is a less developed example of a wit, but his exposure of Sir Pol is motivated by purely satirical reasons, whereas the wits of *Epicoene* satirise for self-advancement as well as a desire to expose and condemn. Truewit and the others have Peregrine’s superior awareness and his power to manipulate. In *Cynthia’s Revels*, when Crites’ position as satirist was fully explicated the contradictions in it were exposed; in *Epicoene* the position of the wits as satirists is not explicated and so no contradictions are apparent. In fact, Truewit’s satirising emerges from a moral and personal stance quite distinct from Crites’. The conjunction of virtue and insight (in Crites and Horace) is transformed to villainy and insight (in *Volpone*) which is modified to wit and insight in Truewit. This entails, however, certain ambiguities.

The range of satiric techniques which Jonson had developed by the time he came to write *Volpone* was virtually
constant thereafter. However, the practice in *Volpone* of embedding satire in contexts which produce complex ironic effects appears only fitfully in *Epicoene*, whose sophistication lies mainly in its plotting. This results in a drop in the play's moral seriousness, as compared with *Volpone*, and this is reflected in the 'Prologue' where Jonson renounces the "sect of writers... / That, onely, for particular likings care, / And will taste nothing that is populare" (ll. 4-6), and turns to the "guests entreaty" (1.11), that is to the taste of the audience for entertainment. The fact that the play was written for and first performed by the Children of the Queens Revels,¹ and that the effect of its being played by boy actors would be generally humourous and ironical, and that the resolution of the plot depends upon one master trick, confirm the play's emphasis on entertainment. Although it is not the "pure entertainment" which L. C. Knights suggests,² *Epicoene* does show an abandonment of the itch to edify its audience, and this represents a move away from Jonson's established satirical mode. One critic sees the "spirit of satire, alive and incarnate in the person of Morose, who is an Asper thrown amidst fools ... and a living object-lesson in the absurdity of looking for perfection in a corrupt world".³ Morose is indeed in search of an impossible ideal like some satirists, but he is also too self-obsessed and negative, and lacking in that element of aggression to make him even a satirist-descendant. He is conceived, rather, as a humour character.

¹ Herford and Simpson, V, 153.
Epicoene stands at a significant point in Jonson's dramatic development, with some aspects looking back to his earlier works, and others anticipating The Alchemist and later works. Epicoene, like Cynthia's Revels, depends on verbosity for much of its comic effect, in, for example, the Latinate rantings of Otter and Cutbearcj, and Otter's game with the cups. The college of ladies recalls the group of female courtiers of Cynthia's Revels, as Daw and La Foole recall Amorphus and Asotus. Cynthia's Revels, however, manifested idealistic moral concerns as well as comedy; Epicoene, with its "ineradicable triviality of motive, ... decidedly crossed the threshold of farce". In its mode of farce it anticipates The Alchemist. More significant, however, is the moral relativism of some of its characters and themes which adumbrates Bartholomew Fair.

The first scene establishes Truewit's superior awareness. He delivers a moral judgement on Clerimont's wasting time:

well, sir gallant, were you strooke with the plague this minute, or condem'n'd to any capitall punishment to morrow, you would beginne then to thinke, and value every article o' your time, esteeme it at the true rate, and give all for't

(I. i. 27-31).

We never learn, though, Truewit's idea of "the true rate", for when he is challenged to say what a man should do, he replies, "Why, nothing: or that, which when 'tis done, is as idle" (I. i. 33-34).

Truewit says he has learned not to waste his morality on those who


5 Herford and Simpson, II, 89.
are superficial and unlikely to learn from it, thus specifically rejecting a satirical intention:

CLE[RIMONT]. Talke me of pinnes, and feathers, and ladies, and rushes, and such things: and leaue this Stoitie alone, till thou mak'st sermons.

TRV[EWIT]. Well, sir. If it will not take, I haue learn'd to loose as little of my kindnesse, as I can. I'le doe good to no man against his will, certainly

(I. i. 64-69).

This exchange serves to establish Truewit's superior insight, but it also shows up the two disparate sides of his character: the serious thinker, and the superficial wit. The discontinuity between his stated beliefs and his actions suggests either that Jonson failed to resolve the words and actions of the character into a unified whole, or that his intentions were other than character consistency. This point is elaborated by J.A.Barish who believes that the whole structure of the play is troubled by ambiguities of tone which flow from Truewit; that the attempt to present in him "an indulgent, 'realistic' account of the world" fails because of the clash of Juvenalian and Ovidian attitudes in his speeches. ⁶

Truewit is not a self-conscious satirist; he makes no claims for his moral vision, or his right to punish and expose. It is the wish to exercise and enjoy his wit which motivates him to arrange situations whose consequences are satirical. In Act IV he explains his libertine philosophy and its pleasures:

TRV[EWIT]...come abroad where the matter is frequent, to court, to tiltings, publique showes, and feasts, to playes, and church sometimes: thither they come to shew their new tyres too, to

---

see, and to be seen. In these places a man shall find whom to love, whom to play with, whom to touch once, whom to hold ever. The variety arrests his judgement

(IV. i. 57-63).

This could not be further from the stern reliance on reason of Jonson's traditional moral spokesmen, and it sets Truewit on a different branch of the family tree from the satirists. His advocacy of a changeable kind of social behaviour to suit the occasion or the lady - "You must approach them in their own height, their own line ... If she loves wit, give verses, though you borrow them of a friend ... Take more care for the ornament of your head, then the safety: and wish the commonwealth rather troubled, then a hair about you" (IV. i. 94-108) - is only one step from hypocrisy, and miles from the "Stoicité" advocated in the first scene. With Truewit as the play's moral arbiter there is necessarily a moral vacuum at its centre.

Truewit's tirade against women and marriage, spoken to Morose, incorporates materials freely adapted from Juvenal's Satire VI, and expresses a common stock of complaints:

TRV[EWIT]. If rich, and that you marry her dowry, not her; she'll reign in your house, as imperious as a widow. If noble, all her kindred will be your tyrants. If fruitful, as proud as May, and humorous as April; she must have her doctors, her midwives, her nurses, her longings every hour: though it be for the dearest morsell of man

(II. ii. 70-76).

Truewit's purpose is to turn Morose into "a post, or a stone, or what is stiffer, with thundering into him the incommodities of a wife, and the miseries of marriage" (II. iv. 11-13). His belief in the speech is secondary to his use of it as a way of stopping Morose's proposed marriage. The satirical tirade does not emerge from the action, but
is a set-piece left to float in an indeterminate moral and thematic relation to the action. As J.A. Barish states, Truewit "resembles a disembodied intelligence flickering over the action and lighting up its dark corners".  

The results of Truewit's speech are unexpected: Morose's intention to marry is strengthened, believing Truewit's torments to have been the result of Dauphine's plot. It appears temporarily that Truewit's witty tactic threatens Dauphine's and Clerimont's strategy, and that his wit works in a direction opposite to that he intended, as he failed to take account of Morose's deep suspiciousness. Truewit's degree of manipulative skill clearly falls below Mosca's. And as a demonstration of the folly of trying officiously to do good to others, it foreshadows the sharper lesson learned by Surly when he attempts to warn Dame Pliant of the tricksters' evil intentions. Truewit, however, has wit enough to escape the mockery of Clerimont and Dauphine, when they hear of his attempts, by claiming that he knew his plan could not turn out otherwise than it did. Truewit is deprived of the power faultlessly to manipulate, a function attributed to satirists in plays like Volpone and The Malcontent, and this represents a reduction of authority and control for such figures.

Truewit and the other wits act in the play to satirise the fools. In Act III, scene iii, for instance, Clerimont and Dauphine persuade La Foole and Daw of the existence of a quarrel between them. The quarrel is factitious, but the knights' belief in

---

it places them under the wits' control. This prompts some satiric moralising from Dauphine, who takes for granted that he and his fellows have power to manipulate and expose the fools:

Tut, flatter 'hem both (as TRVE-WIT sayes) and you may take their vnderstandings in a purse-net. They'll beleue themselves to be iust such men as we make 'hem, neither more nor lesse. They haue nothing, not the vse of their senses, but by tradition

(III. iii. 95-99).

The 'quarrel', fabricated by Truewit, is spun out of nothing for the entertainment of a multiple audience; the wits and the ladies inside the play, and the audience proper outside. The audience supports Truewit in his playmaking, since it identifies him as the character with highest awareness; and it criticises to different degrees the other participants. The 'quarrel' is arranged to expose the knights as cowards, and the ladies as fools, but also as an exercise of wit. Truewit's consciousness of its play-like artificiality is stressed by his use of theatrical metaphors. While the effect of the scene is satirical, Truewit does not make moral condemnations. He regards it with detachment for the entertainment it provides:

Doe you obserue this gallerie? or rather lobby, indeed? Here are a couple of studies, at each end one: here will I act such a tragi-comoedy betweene the Guelphes, and the Ghibellines, DAW and LA-FOOLE - which of 'hem comes out first,will I seize on: (you two shall be the chorus behind the arras, and whip out betweene the acts, and speake.) If I doe not make 'hem keepe the peace, for this remnant of the day, if not of the yeere, I haue faileld once - I heare DAW comming: Hide, and doe not laugh, for gods sake

(IV. v. 28-37).

The illusory nature of the 'quarrel' is maintained by the fact that the protagonists do not come face to face. The dramatic analogy is maintained by calling "the ladies to the catastrophe" (IV. v. 241), and they survey the scene from above and discover in
its illusion the essential cowardice of Daw and La Foole. Jonson could ask no more from an audience of his: to infer the folly of characters from scenes in which their folly is enacted. Truewit acts as Jonson's agent in the play, heightening the folly by means of his wit, and encouraging others to perceive folly thus revealed. This satirical function is accomplished without the use of railing.

As the play's most aware character, Truewit comments authoritatively on the action. When in Act IV, scene vi, Mavis and Haughty turn their attention from the exposed knights towards Dauphine, Truewit exposes their vacuity for Dauphine's benefit and brings a final judgement to bear:

Why, all their actions are governed by crude opinion, without reason or cause; they know not why they do anything; but as they are informed, believe, judge, praise, condemn, love, hate, and in emulation one of another, do all these things alike. Only, they have a natural inclination sways 'em generally to the worst, when they are left to themselves.

(IV. vi. 64-70).

He comprehends their worthlessness, but his final remark to Dauphine, "But, pursue it, now thou hast 'em" (IV. vi. 71), reveals again a separation between his notion of the values which ought to underlie behaviour, and the absence of values in common life. As in the first speech to Clerimont, Truewit is content to accept the gap between how things should be and how they are. The character of Truewit represents an attempt to present a satirist of judgement and wit who lives in the world he criticises, but idealism and realism jostle uncomfortably for precedence in him. It is not until The Alchemist that Jonson settles the matter in favour of realism.
Reformation is not one of Truewit's intentions. The scene in which Mrs Otter is brought in to witness her husband's railing about her, ends with no one changed, and Truewit's commenting, "His humour is as tedious at last, as it was ridiculous at first" (IV. ii. 149-50). When Daw and La Foole confess their pretended knowledge "oarnaliter" of Epicoene, which shocks the Collegiates, Truewit is quick to point out, "You see, what creatures you may bestow your favours on, madames" (V. iv. 126-27). Again no reformation occurs. In both cases his manipulations have exposed fools; then he asks the onlookers to see for themselves what is true.

In the last scene Truewit delivers final judgements and banishments on Daw and La Foole:

Goe, travaile to make legs and faces, and come home with some new matter to be laught at: you deserue to liue in an aire as corrupted, as that wherewith you feed rumor

(V. iv. 240-43).

The Collegiates too are reprimanded, "Take heed of such insectas hereafter" (V. iv. 245-46). But Truewit produces no moral conversions.

Morose's bizarre humiliation and pain culminate in Dauphine's revealing his trick with Epicoene, which catches out both Truewit and the audience. Truewit is the most aware character but Dauphine's master-trick defeats him. The play's witty ploys are distributed between Dauphine, Clerimont, and Truewit, and Truewit's kind of satirical response is seen finally as only one possible response. The last word in the play is given to deception and trickery.
Truewit does not suffer from the contradictions of a moral satirist; the difficulties with him are of a different order. Jonson attempted to go beyond the moral satirist in depicting a character as synthesising urbanity and acceptance of humanity's and his own foibles, on one side, and a sense of moral values on the other. The two aspects of Truewit are placed side by side but not integrated. The master-trick of the play, Epicoene's sex, does not have moral implications as do the final trickeries of Volpone and The Alchemist. For these plays the audience must respond nimbly to their moral complexity; in Epicoene on the other hand, the audience is finally tricked along with Truewit. Epicoene requires the audience throughout to focus momentarily on a series of attitudes and ideas, but refuses it a stable point of view. Jonson resolves the ambiguities of the play's morality by a final coup de théâtre which sweeps away the audience's doubts, asserts the illusory nature of the whole play, and establishes a firmly comic resolution.

The Alchemist (1610)

The Alchemist may be described as a dramatic satire in the terms set out in Chapter six. It shares features of style with Volpone, particularly in the practice of placing satirical utterances in contexts which create complex, manifold ironic and satiric effects. Some of these are detailed below. In Surly and Lovewit it also presents an old-style moral commentator and a new-style wit, and in the outcome of their confrontation a resolution of the incompatability of morality and style they represent.

The opening scene, beginning where Volpone leaves off with
the rogues in open conflict, indicates similarities and differences
in satirical technique between this play and *Volpone*. The
histories of Face and Subtle are sketched in by means of their
mutual abuse. The tone is fierce, but this is invective
rather than satire since there is no clear moral standpoint,
either from the rogues or from Jonson:

DOL. (0, this'll ore-throw all.)

FACE. Write thee vp bawd, in Paules; haue all thy tricks
Of cosning with a hollow cole, dust, scrapings,
Searching for things lost, with a siue, and sheeres,
Erecting *figurae*, in your rowes of *houses*,
And taking in of shadowes, with a glasse,
Told in red letters

(I. i. 92-98).

In *The Alchemist* comic effects are as widespread as satiric ones,
and this is achieved by relaxing the relentless moral scrutiny of
*Volpone*. The conflict of Face and Subtle is more
significant as an ever-present comic threat than as a satiric reminder
of vice's self-destructiveness.

Smaller structural features show continuity of
satirical subjects and methods from *Volpone*. The dupes enter one
after another displaying their folly; and the habit of
characterisation continues too. When Face introduces Dapper to
Subtle, for example, he describes him as,

...a speciall gentle,
That is the heire to fortie markes, a yeere,
Consorts with the small poets of the time,
Is the sole hope of his old grand-mother,
That knowes the law, and writes you sixe faire hands...
...and can court
His mistris, out of OVID

(I. ii. 50-54, 57-58).

The 'characters' in *Volpone* have a consistent moral effect which is
to expose vile motives underlying polite behaviour; those in
The Alchemist have a slightly different effect. Face's description of Dapper is apparently objective and accurate; its irony lies in its implicit comparison of Dapper's petty respectability and Face's insight and control, to the former's detriment. The audience judges Dapper in Face's terms, that is to say in terms of quick-wittedness, rather than morality, and its reaction includes satiric scorn. 'Characters' from figures other than the central trio also produce satiric effects. Drugger's description of Kastril, for example, creates derision judged by the standard of awareness and wit established by Subtle and Face:

...a gentleman, newly warme in'his land, sir, Scarse cold in'his one and twentie; that do's gouerne His sister, here: and is a man himselfe Of some three thousand a yeere,  and is come vp To learne to quarrell, and to liue by his wits, And will goe downe againe, and dye i'the countrey

(II. vi. 57-62),

Drugger in turn is described by Face as "A miserable rogue, and liues with cheese, / And has the wormes" (II. vi. 81-82). The play is suffused with mockery, contempt, and derision which produce its satirical tone.

There is 'inset' satire too in speeches whose apparent purpose is not satiric. When Subtle describes the powers the Stone will give the Puritans he satirises not only the Puritans but also a wide area of social corruption:

A Lady, that is past the feate of body, Though not of minde, and hath her face decay'd Beyond all cure of paintings, you restore With the oyle of Talok; there you haue made a friend: And all her friends

(III. ii. 33-37).

And Subtle's catalogue of Puritan practices which may be abandoned once the Stone is theirs satirises the Puritans in
particular (III. ii. 69-97).

Ironically, it is Ananias who most resembles the angry moral satirist like Asper, in his firm adherence to principles whatever the situation. He asserts "All's heathen, but the Hebrew" (II. v. 17), and his zealous references to Puritan principles endanger the impending transaction until Tribulation and Subtle smother them:

**ANA[NIAS]**. Please the prophane, to grieue the godly: I may not.

**SVE[TLE]**. Well, ANANIAS, thou shalt ouer-come.

**TRI[BULATION]**. It is an ignorant zeale, that haunts him, sir.
But truely, else, a very faithful Brother,
A botcher

(III. ii. 109-12).

But Ananias is possessed by principles as by a humour, and lacks imagination, and so Subtle can easily manipulate him.

In Mammon's scene with Dol as the mad lady, asides are used to sharpen the mockery, and point up satirical exposure. Face comments aside on Mammon's pretensions - "(0, we shall have most fierce idolatrie!)") (IV. i. 39); and on Dol - "Her father was an Irish costar-monger" (IV. i. 57). In the same scene Mammon tells Dol of the delights the Stone will bring, which are more exquisite and refined than those Volpone offers Celia. Mammon promises to,

...haue our cockles, boild in siluer shells,
Our shrimps to swim againe, as when they liu'd,
In a rare butter, made of dolphins milke,
Whose creame do's looke like opalls

(IV. i. 158-61).

The speech aspires to being a vision of luxury and delight, but its over-refined sensuality, shot through with touches of grossness, betrays it as the projection of a ruthless, acquisitive imagination.
As L. C. Knights observes of Volpone's speech to Celia, "There is indeed an exuberant description of luxury ... But at the same time, without cancelling out the exuberance, the luxury is 'placed'." As in Volpone's scene with Celia, judgement is derived from the scene itself. However, the difference in the subjects whom the speeches are intended to persuade produces different moral effects. Celia is utterly helpless and therefore pitiable; Dol is unmoved, and in fact sets up counter-pressure on Mammon by interpreting his speech (correctly) as an attempt to seduce her. Celia's reactions sharpen the audience's moral interpretation of the scene; Dol's reactions, on the other hand, since they are clever, amusing, and as amoral as Mammon's, work to break down moral distinctions. Judgement becomes more equivocal than in the similar scene of Volpone, and satire, which depends on sharp moral differentiations for the intensity of its effects, is consequently diminished in intensity. This scene is one small indication of the increasing moral relativity of Jonson's plays, and the concomitant increase in comic effects.

Surly is a character whose "function in the plot connects him with Asper, [and whose] name associates him with Morose". Surly declares that he "would not willingly be gull'd" (II. i. 78), and he punctuates Mammon's speeches with grim, sometimes obscene remarks attesting his disbelief in the rogues' promises. He speaks out in protest, in the manner of a satirist, and does his best to puncture the pretensions of Subtle and Face, but they are unharassed.
by his sniping:

MAM[MON]. How much?

SVB[TLE]. Give him nine pound: you may gi' him ten.

SUR[LY]. Yes, twentie, and be cossend, doe.

MAM[MON]. There 'tis.

(II. iii. 93-94).

He criticises the rogueS openly and accurately:

Rather, then I'll be brai'd, sir, I'll beleue,
That Alchemie is a pretty kind of game,
Somewhat like tricks o'the cards, to cheat a man,
With charming

(II. iii. 179-82).

Subtle's challenging rhetoric easily overcomes him however. Surly's attempts to make anyone change his behaviour all fail, even though his perceptions are all accurate. He fails to dissuade Mammon from a determination to possess the Stone, and converse with "A lords sister" (II. iii. 221), and so "make hard means / To gull himselfe" (II. iii. 281-82). The barely disguised struggle between Surly and the rogues for Mammon's trust emerges into action with the planned meeting with Captaine Face "i'the Temple-church" (II. iii. 289). Surly rightly convinced that "Don FACE ... do's appoint / Who lyes with whom; and at what houre" (II. iii. 301, 304-05), is determined to discover "The subtilties of this darke labyrinth" (II. iii. 308). By the end of Act II, scene iv, Surly and the knaves understand each other, and a struggle begins.

The conflict continues when Surly enters as a Spanish Don. His ridiculous costume makes him foolish, and it quickly becomes uncertain who is duping whom:
Yes, the Casa,
My precious DIEGO, will prove faire inough,
To cossen you in. Doe you marke? you shall
Be cossened, DIEGO.

Cossened, doe you see?
My worthy Donzel, cossened.

Doe you intend it? So doe we, deare Don

(IV. iii. 36-41).

Each side thinks it is tricking the other, but Surly does not
reckon with their bravado, and they do not realise the Don's
identity. Both the rogues and their intended exposzer appear foolish.
Surly, who has a satirist's belief in his own clear sense and
virtue, and in his ability to expose the cheaters, becomes a dupe
like the rest.

When Surly reveals the rogues' villainy to Dame Pliant,
tells her what danger he has saved her from, and promptly proposes
marriage, she treats his words with indifference. His pretensions
to morality are implicitly satirised firstly by Dame Pliant's
complete absence of appreciation of them, and secondly by his own
proposal of marriage which is not altruistic. Herford and Simpson
note the correspondence between Surly and Bonario, and Dame Pliant
and Celia, and also that Surly is denuded of heroic quality as
Dame Pliant is of pathos. The punishment Surly imagines for the
rogues seems inappropriate and unjust, as did the punishment Volpone
received:

A good cart,
And a cleane whip

(IV. vi. 29-30).

10 Herford and Simpson, II, 106.
In both plays the judgements of a strict morality seem inadequate to cope with exuberant, even creative, criminality. Surly fails as a moral critic through lack of imagination and wit.

Lovewit's return precipitates the catastrophe. Lovewit possesses the very qualities which Surly lacks to make him successful in his satirical functions and his worldly ambitions. Like Truewit, Lovewit has a sophisticated awareness of the world. When he first returns to his house, for example, he immediately suspects roguery, and runs over the schemes Jeremy alias Face may have devised:

Sure he has got
Some bawdy pictures, to call all this ging;
The Frier, and the Nun; or the new Motion
Of the Knights courser, couering the Parsons mare;
The Boy of sixe yeere old, with the great thing

(V. i. 20-24).

Lovewit's reaction to the roguery, once Face has informed him of it, is notable in having no moral content whatsoever. In fact, Lovewit cooperates with Face ("my braine"; V. v. 7), and accepts his explanation in exchange for the widow he is offered. He turns the situation to his further advantage by laying claim to the goods which he finds in his house, thereby duping both the knaves and the gulls. One critic feels that the end of the play "where Lovewit ... snaps up Dame Pliant ... and turns a blind eye to Face's misbehaviour, is not far above the level of Bartholomew Fair". 11 Certainly, the audience is surprised not to be faced with a climax which asserts severe moral judgement, and to find instead Lovewit's morally permissive self-interest. Surly finds himself duped too and mocked by Lovewit for his nice treatment of Dame Pliant:

LOV\[EWIT\]. Good faith, now, shee do's blame yo'extremely, and sayes
You swore, and told her, you had tane the paines,
To dye your beard, and vmbre o'er your face,
Borrowed a sute, and ruffe, all for her loue;
And then did nothing. What an over-sight,
And want of putting forward, sir, was this
(V. v. 50-55).

Lovewit takes on the satirical function at the end of
revealing the gulls' folly to themselves and dispensing judgement.
Surly, however, still harbours illusions, for although he believes
that "that same foolish vice of honestie!" (V. v. 84) defeated
him, he still intends to find Face and be revenged on him. The
conception of Lovewit's character is an extension of Truewit's.
He has no high hopes of the world and so is not disappointed, and
he is ready to take advantage of it while remaining detached. His
insight and above all his wit ensure that in competition with the
moral critic he is successful.

Catiline (1611)

In Jonson's earlier plays his concerns with the satirist
figure are insight, judgement, authority and effectiveness.
In Catiline these concerns are still evident, although not through
a satirist figure. Catiline, like The Alchemist, employs many
satirical techniques which are employed in Volpone, and there are
also characters related to satirists. As many critics have noticed,
one striking effect of Jonson's tragedies is satirical. John Dryden,
for example, speaks with disapprobation of the element of farce in
Sejanus and Catiline producing "this oleo of a play, this unnatural
mixture of comedy and tragedy". 12 Edmund Wilson speaks

12 An Essay of Dramatic Poesy in English Critical Essays, Sixteenth,
Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ed. E. D. Jones, London,
distastefully of Jonson's Romans, who are "mostly the envious rogues, the merciless prigs, and the treacherous sluts with whom we are familiar in his comedies, and [who] make a more unpleasant impression for not being humorously treated." And Herford and Simpson observe that "The temper of Jonson's comedy is, in truth, not so remote from the temper of such tragedy as his that the transition from the one to the other is difficult or startling". One of the play's conspirators reveals the purpose of the conspiracy, saying, "Rome will be sack'd, her wealth will be our prize; / By publique ruine, priuate spirits must rise" (II. 361-62); and this describes Catiline's theme of "lust for private gain at the expense of public good" in a way which links it to Volpone and The Alchemist. This section examines some of its techniques and themes as parts of Jonson's developing treatment of satirical concerns.

Throughout the play Rome is insistently personified. Sylla's Ghost begins it by threatening Rome with destruction:

Do'st thou not feele me, Rome? not yet?
...shake not the frighted heads
Of thy steepe towers? or shrinke to their first beds?

(I. 1; 5-6).

Cicero too personifies Rome - "O Rome, in what a sicknesse art thou fall'n" (III. 438) - referring to its political corruption as a disease, a common satirical metaphor, and implying that it may be


14 Herford and Simpson, II, 127.

curable like a human organism. And Catiline too thinks of Rome as a body; imagining that his fieriness will work on her "till Rome be left as bloodless, / As ever her fears made her, or the sword" (I. 493-94). By strongly personifying Rome, Jonson implicitly attributes to it the characteristics of an individual. What is at stake in the tragedy is the survival of Rome, and this is the focus of the audience's concern. The action consists of the struggle of several groups for possession of the body politic. The state is necessarily passive, a passivity represented by the Chorus. As J. A. Bryant states, the "larger action turns out to be a tragic action, with the state itself taking the role of tragic protagonist". ¹⁶ The political premises underlying the play are firstly, as in Marston's *Histriomastix*, that a society can become corrupt and immoral by the same process that applies to an individual; secondly, that public and private morality interpenetrate, and that decline in private morality leads to decline in public. Several scenes demonstrate these beliefs.

The Chorus is perfectly suited to comment on the action. The choric function of Cordatus and Mitis in *Every Man Out* was designed to comment more on the experimental features of the play's method than on its content. *Catiline* 's Chorus is classical in its function of representing the Roman people and their reactions of hope and fear to the action. By using a Chorus, Jonson can provide authoritative commentary on the action without having to account for it in the action, thus avoiding the problematic moral and personal implications which surround such a figure as Arruntius. In *Catiline* 

the Chorus's commentary stimulates a critical response in the audience, and invites speculation on the issues raised. The Chorus breaks into a scene only once to inform the audience at a crucial point that "The voice of CATO is the voice of Rome" (III. 60); otherwise it merely comments from outside.

At the end of Act I the Chorus reflects upon Rome's decline, asking "Can nothing great, and at the height / Remaine so long?" (I. 531-32). Its answer is simple, Rome's "simple pouerty" (I. 575) first enforced the virtue which is now destroyed by material excess. Romans now plunder the earth for riches, in the way in which Volpone prided himself on avoiding: 17

They hunt all grounds; and draw all seas; 
Foule euery brooke, and bush; to please
Their wanton tasts

(I. 569-71).

Rome's enemies are within her borders, and she has become "Both her owne spoiler, and owne prey" (I. 586). The Chorus at times echoes the indignation of a speaker of formal satire:

Her women weare
The spoiles of nations, in an eare, 
Chang'd for the treasure of a shell; 
And, in their loose attires, doe swell
More light then sailes, when all windes play:
Yet, are the men more loose then they!
More kemb'd, and bath'd, and rub'd, and trim'd, 
More sleek'd, more soft, and slacker limm'd; 
As prostitute: so much, that kinde 
May seeke it selfe there, and not finde

(I. 555-64). 18

17 Cf. Volpone, I. i. 33-35.
18 Cf. Milton's description of Dalila approaching Samson, in Samson Agonistes, II. 713-19:
Comes this way sailing
Like a stately ship
Of Tarsus, bound for th' isles
Of Javan or Gadire,
With all her bravery on, and tackle trim,
Sails filled, and streamers waving,
Courted by all the winds that hold them play.
As so often in satires, the idea of moral and political disorder "is most immediately presented as a reversal of roles in man and woman; as an abdication of power and choice by the former, a usurpation of private and public control by the latter." What distinguishes this traditional attack on disorder in sex roles from similar attacks in verse satire, is that here root causes are suggested in economic and social terms.

As political conflict develops, the Chorus reflects on the "tumult...in our eares" (III. 845-46), and moralises on it, seeing Rome's evils as self-generating and self-perpetuating until the time comes when they are so huge they must be recognised:

For guiltie states doe euer beare
The plagues about them, which they haue deserued.
And, till those plagues doe get aboue
The mountayne of our faults, and there doe sit;
Wee see 'hem not. Thus, still we loue
The 'euill we doe, vntill we suffer it

(III. 854-59).

The pattern of guilt, self-deception, and punishment in these lines links them directly to the pattern traceable in the experience of the gulls of *The Alchemist*. Jonson clearly sees the course of individual and social folly as identical. There are two consequences of this: firstly, that the cure of social folly is likely to be similar to the cure of individual folly; secondly, that moral responsibility for social folly is borne by the society, just as responsibility for individual folly is borne by the individual. In the pattern of events it dramatises, then, *Catiline* has important similarities to *The Alchemist*. The pattern is fundamentally a

---

satirical one, involving the practice, discovery, and punishment of folly or evil. In underlying structure of plot, Catiline is satirical.

Catiline's first speech to the conspirators is a tour de force of political manipulation, in the same fashion as speeches of Mosca or Subtle to their gulls, and it produces ironies for the audience some of which are sufficiently harsh to be satirical. He moves from subject to subject and from one adopted role to another, and the audience is left to judge the validity of his words independently, free from any direct or indirect comment. In fact, some of what Catiline says is validated by other parts of the play: the morally corrupting effect of riches, for example, is demonstrated in a scene in Act II with Fulvia and Sempronius. Catiline adopts a variety of roles in his speech to the conspirators. He is in turn the castigating moral critic, the spokesman of political freedom, the tempter offering riches and the willing servant. As an indignant moral satirist he castigates the clique in power for their wasteful luxury, which rivals Mammon's in its excess:

\[\text{CATILINE}.\]

\[\text{Circei, too, is search'd}\]
\[\text{To please the witty gluttony of a meale!}\]
\[\text{Their ancient habitations they neglect,}\]
\[\text{And set vp new; then, if the eccho like not}\]
\[\text{In such a roome, they pluck downe those, build newer,}\]
\[\text{Alter them too: and, by all frantick wayes,}\]
\[\text{Vexe their wild wealth, as they molest the people,}\]
\[\text{From whom they force it}\]

(I. 390-97).

This critique is supported by the Chorus, and the dramatic vignettes of corruption, but Catiline himself is driven by the same lust for wealth, and suffers the same moral disease as those he criticises. In fact, he embodies Roman corruption in its most extreme form. Catiline offers the conspirators the power and wealth of Rome,
assuming Mosca's role of compliant helpmate:

You share the world, her magistracies, priest-hoods,
Wealth, and felicitie amongst you, friends;
And CATILINE your servant

(I. 463-65).

At the same time he spurs on the conspirators by feeding their
greed and ambitions as Face, for example, does:

Whose wife, which boy, whose daughter, of what race,
That th'husband, or glad parents shall not bring you,
And boasting of the office?

(I. 476-78).

Catiline's appeal to the conspirators to "redeeme our
selues to libertie, / And break the yron yoke, forg'd for our
necks" (I. 344-45), is really a call for the destruction of the
laws and customs which preserve order in the state. Catiline is
a malcontent writ large whose exclusion from the privileges he
feels should be his motivates a machiavellian display of
dissimulation and hypocrisy, rivalling in its skill and complexity
similar displays by Subtle. One of the roles Catiline adopts,
one of the voices he speaks in, is that of bitter satirist
anatomising Roman decadence. His motivation for such passages is the
opposite of what it appears to be, but he nevertheless produces a
diagnosis which the play as a whole validates.

Cicero's usefulness to the state lies in his understanding
of men and the world. His pessimistic principle is "So few are
vertuous, when the reward's away" (III. 480), which accords with
Rome's materialism. He reveals his political skill when he
secures Antonius' loyalty by bestowing a province on him:

I must with offices, and patience win him;
Make him, by art, that which he is not borne,
A friend vnto the publique;

(III. 474-76).
Significantly the same Antonius is described by Catiline as "one, no
lesse engag'd /By 'his wants then we: and, whom I'haue power to
melt, / And cast in any mould" (I. 447-49). Both Cicero and
Catiline display a shrewd, cynical awareness of political
realities, and this is not the only similarity between them.
Cicero in private and with his friends is shown as an angry,
virtuous man expressing himself as an indignant moral satirist.
Astonished at Catiline's "prodigious, and vnheard-of fierceness!"
(III. 265) he all but despairs of "neere-wretched Rome, / When
both thy Senate, and thy gods doe sleepe" (III. 238-39). There are
similarities in ideas and expression between Cicero's speech here
and Catiline's in Act I.

The action of plot and counter-plot, bluff and double-bluff,
follows the pattern of an intrigue comedy like The Alchemist.
Implicit in the depiction of political intrigue is the satirical
observation of the grimly humourous contortions of human folly and
evil.

The interpenetration of public and private is illustrated
by the scene in which Fulvia first hears of the conspiracy (II.
216-363). The scene starts with Fulvia's attempting to
dismiss her lover Curius, but he is insistent, so much so that
he threatens her with violence, and she draws a knife to retaliate.
Curius then tries another tack by telling Fulvia what she will miss
if she is not his lover after the riches from the conspiracy have
come to him:

But, when you see the vniuersall floud
Runne by your coffers; that my lords, the Senators,
Are sold for slaues, their wifes for bond-women,
...
And you haue none of this; but are still FVLVIA,
Or perhaps lesse, while you are thinking of it:
You will advise then, Coynesse, with your cushion,
And looee o' your fingers

(II. 312-314; 317-20).

Curius then exits, leaving Fulvia to ponder on his prospects, and she, of course, immediately calls him back. Act II ends with his saying that he will tell her of the conspiracy in bed. The promise of this political confidence is suffused with sexual innuendo:

CVRIUS. I see, the way to bend you
Is not with violence, but service. Cruell,
A lady is a fire: gentle, a light.

FULVIA. Will you not tell me, what I ask you?

CVRIUS. All,
That I can thinke, sweet loue, or my brest holds,
Ile poure into thee

(II. 352-57).

This phase of the plot is concluded in Act III, where Cicero learns of the conspiracy from the witless Fulvia, who tells all in order to spite Sempronia who would have had precedence in the conspiracy over her. The scene is constructed with multiple ironies which ensure that the audience is kept aware of the hypocrisies and follies displayed on the personal level, and how they are the means of allowing political corruption to flourish. Again personal and public are connected. Cicero thanks Fulvia with heavy irony, invisible to her but seen by the audience: "You haue learn'd the difference / Of doing office to the publicke weale, /
And privatre friendship" (III. 301-03). Curius is won over to Cicero's side by subtle blackmail and covert bribes in speeches again shot through with irony (III. 315ff.), and is persuaded to act as a double-agent for Cicero: "Kkeepe still your former face: and mixe againe / With these lost spirits" (III. 414-15). Cicero's
manipulation of Fulvia and Curius resembles the manipulation of gulls by Face and Subtle, or Volpone and Mosca. This kind of manipulation depends on the manipulator's awareness of the motives of the gulls. In this scene Cicero's manipulations produce satirical exposure.

Catiline's and Cicero's political methods are curiously similar. Both use rhetoric and role-playing as prime political weapons, and both despise their followers. The same political tactics are used by both. Cicero's machinations leave him tainted with duplicity. One critic says "the deepest irony in the play is the total lack of naivete in Cicero's motives and in his acceptance of a partial victory over the forces that threaten Rome". Certainly, by using Curius as an informer, by advising the Allobroges to feign support for the conspirators (IV. 676-702), and by using a network of spies, Cicero is disqualified from moral idealism, but not from political effectiveness.

Cicero's proposed course of action for dealing with Catiline (IV. 411ff.) is a radical one. He asks for Catiline's banishment so that his evil can flourish to its full extent, in full view, so that the entire growth in all its parts can then be destroyed. This plan resembles what is arranged by Volpone and Mosca, and Lovewit and Face for their gulls, and shows again the similarities in dramatic satirical strategies between Catiline and the preceding comedies.

Cicero's lack of idealism in political matters makes him an unsuitable character to utter the moral verities which he and his party seek to uphold. For this purpose Cato is employed. Cato is an outspoken moralist similar to Arruntius, and he delivers explicit commentary on Catiline and his party. In Act III, for example, he denounces Catiline, saying that Catiline will be judged by the gods, "who, with fire, must purge sick Rome/ Of noisome citizens, whereof thou art one" (III. 213-14). Cato embodies and expresses the values of selflessness, service to the state, and virtue, which Catiline opposes.

In its exploration of the theme of authority, Catiline exploits insights gained in The Alchemist and developed in Bartholomew Fair. When the Allobroges see the Senators flee in fright, they scorn their cowardice in the familiar technique of having one character comment on others passing across the stage:

Of all that passe, I doe not see a face Worthy a man; that dares looke vp, and stand One thunder out: but downe-ward all, like beasts, Running away from euery flash is made

(IV. 7-10).

However, the Allobroges go on to establish a profound insight concerning the nature of political control, namely that power is a kind of illusion - the illusion of greatness on one side and belief in that illusion on the other - and that power continues its hold on its subjects only for as long as its subjects accord it credibility. At its most cynical, this principle describes the relationship between the rogues and gulls in The Alchemist which is a confidence trick. The Allobroges describe power as a trick perpetrated by the subjects of it upon themselves:
ALLOBROGES. ...a meere clothed Senate, whom our folly
Hath made, and still intends to keepe our tyrannes?
It is our base petitionarie breath
That blowes 'hem to this greatnesse; which this pricke
Would soone let out, if we were bold, and wretched

(IV. 15-19).

The dramatic context hardly gives this insight justification here.
The full implications of this discovery are not, however, fully
explored until Bartholomew Fair, and there they transform the
satirical action. In Catiline the illusions of power
are maintained, for there are virtuous rulers at hand. When Cato,
Catullus and Cicero approach, the Allobroges say, "I, these men /
Seeme of another race; let's sue to these" (IV. 35-36).

Cicero's acceptance of the discontinuity between
political ideals, expressed in public rhetoric, and political
actualities, expressed in private contemplation, shows him to be,
like Truewit, a moral relativist who accepts the gap between the
ideal and the actual. This creates ambiguities in the play's
resolution, in the final balance struck between Cicero and Catiline.
Cicero is reduced in stature by the methods he uses to win a
victory for Rome, while Catiline is afforded a death of "prodigal
heroism...passing to extinction fitly with no last cry or confession
or despair, but in the marble silence of Medusa's victims". 21
His absolute wickedness is more thrilling than Cicero's compromise.

The acceptance of the breach between ideal and actual may
lead to one of two conclusions; it may result in a contented
acceptance of the imperfection of human existence, or it may lead

21 Herford and Simpson, II, 125.
to a pessimistic abandonment of concern for the moral life of men as hopeless. In either case it involves a shift away from the satirical outlook which depends for its intensity on a clear morality against which to set what it views. These possibilities are explored in *Bartholomew Fair*.

*Bartholomew Fair* (1614)

In this play Jonson treats themes and characters which have appeared in various forms in earlier plays. The characters examined here are those which, while not being satirist figures proper, are nevertheless the descendants of satirists in their functions of exposing, judging, condemning, and reforming. The themes, closely associated with such characters, are those of authority, idealistic versus realistic morality, and magnanimity versus pusillanimity. As one critic points out, "a fair provides an ideal bringing-together of the most diverse types...in a situation which is itself an obvious symbol for the 'vanity of human wishes'." 22 In this context Jonson treats dramatic concerns first raised by the inclusion of satirist figures in his plays, and reaches conclusive resolutions. The characters who comment on others can be divided into two groups; Quarlous and Winwife form one, and Overdo, Waspe, and Busy form the other.

Quarlous and Winwife represent a continuation of the type of witty sophisticated morally permissive character first exemplified in Truewit, and then in Lovewit. Quarlous' and Winwife's

---

The purpose is to achieve pleasure in the exercise of their wit, and in their criticism and mockery of others, and to advance their self-interest. In Act I they comment wittily on the characters who visit John Littlewit's house. On Wasp and Cokes, for example, they exchange mocking aside:

**QVAR[LOUS]**. Well, this *dry-nurse*, I say still, is a delicate man.

**WIN-W[IFE]**. And I, am for the Cosset, his charge! Did you euer see a fellowes face more accuse him for an Asse?

**QVAR[LOUS]**. Accuse him? it confesses him one without accusing. What pity 'tis yonder wench should marry such a Cokes?

(I. v. 48-53).

Quarlous also mocks Littlewit's linguistic eccentricities by mimicry "...if you haue that fearefull quality, *John*, to remember, when you are sober, *John*, what you promise drunke, *John*; I shall take heed of you, *John*"(I. iii. 33-35). Quarlous is established as an intelligent, critical character by the speech to Winwife aimed at dissuading him from marrying the widow Dame Purecraft, and thereby "raking himselfe a fortune in an old womans' embers" (I. iii. 78-79). Ranging over the ugliness of old widows, the difficulty of satisfying them sexually, and the torments Winwife will suffer from Purecraft's puritan brethren, the speech has the forthrightness, scorn, and obscenity of the Juvenalian mode of satire: "There cannot be an ancient *Tripe* or *Trillibub* i' the Towne, but thou art straight nosing it, and 'tis a fine occupation thou'lt confine thy selfe to, when thou ha'st got one" (I. iii. 64-66). Quarlous' 'character' of Zeal-of-the-Land Busy accurately describes his essential qualities of hypocrisy and eccentricity, further confirming Quarlous' insight: "A notable hypocriticall vermine it is; I know him. One that stands vpon his face, more
then his faith, at all times; Euer in seditious motion, and
reprouing for vaine-glory: of a most lunatique conscience, and
splene, and affects the violence of Singularity in all he do's" (I. iii. 135-39). Winwife decides to leave his widow, in the
meantime, and go to the fair where he and Quarlous expect to enjoy
"excellent creeping sport" (I. v. 141) from the fools they
encounter. Qualous and Winwife are the play's most self-conscious
characters, with wit, a sense of superiority, and a desire to enjoy
the spectacle of others' folly. Most important, they have no wish
to punish or reform the fools, for they do not stand apart and
condemn them. J.A. Barish sees in the "heatedness and syntactic
density" of Quarlous' language, as compared to Truewit's, a
reflection of the closer "identification of the satiric commentator
with the world and the abandonment of his special position". 23

Quarlous' lively commentary on other characters and
his switches from one style of speech to another are both
aspects of his delight in himself and others. The successes he
achieves in the play are the result of luck and adroit self-regard.
When, for example, he delivers a second satirical tirade against
puritans, he achieves an unexpected reformation, and a wife.
Disguised as Trouble-all, he is approached in amorous terms by
Dame Purecraft, and exasperated at losing Grace to Winwife, he
condemns all puritans:

Away, you are a heard of hypocriticall proud
Ignorants, rather wilde, then mad. Fitter for
woods, and the society of beasts then houses, and
the congregation of men

(V. ii. 41-44).

23 J. A. Barish, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy*,
Purecraft promptly confesses her puritan hypocrisy. Ironically, Quarlous had no intention of reforming her; and the satire operates indirectly and ironically to his advantage, in spite of himself.

In Justice Overdo, Jonson returns to a character combining two features, the desire to expose folly and crime, and the power to punish them, not combined in one character since Horace of Postaster, but only more thoroughly to discredit him. Overdo represents not merely Jonson's abandonment of the attempt to depict in one character ideal judgement and power, for that was effected after Postaster, but, more importantly, Jonson's exposure and mockery of the very idea. However, Overdo is not a 'real' satirist, but a character determined to act out the role in a self-conscious way. For this reason the revelation he finally experiences at Quarlous' hands is a comic deflation rather than a satiric exposure, since his failure is not so much one of morality, though it is that too, as an error of style, a failure to find the appropriate role to express his personality. Overdo's mission in the fair is as much an attempt to achieve self-expression as to effect moral reform.

As a judge of the "courts of Pye-pouldres" (II. i. 42), Overdo represents the highest authority in the fair, and he sets out to discover the crimes committed there, combining the roles of detector and punisher of vice. The soliloquy which opens Act II reveals his character: his self-congratulation, "thus hath the wise Magistrate done in all ages" (II. i. 10-11); his spurious self-awareness, "wee heare with other mens eares; wee see with other mens eyes" (II. i. 29-30), and his essential self-delusion:
This wee are subject to, that live in high place, all our intelligence is idle, and most of our intelligencers, knaues... I Adam Overdo, am resolu'd therefore, to spare spy-money hereafter, and make mine owne discoveries

(II. i. 36-41).

Overdo's main fault is self-deception, and this places him in the category of the Jonsonian gull. His inability to perceive and deduce is quickly demonstrated when he solemnly takes Leatherhead's insults about Trash's gingerbread as enormity. The threat to take her before "the Piepouldres" sets the Justice priggishly congratulating himself, "I am glad, to heare, my name is their terror, yet, this is doing of Justice" (II. ii. 27-28).

Overdo exhorts Edgeworth and Nightingale to shun "bottle-ale, and tabacco" (II. vi. 1), eagerly adopting the role of a formal satirist publicly exhorting his audience to change their ways. Their offences are venial and so Overdo's reaction appears foolish. The harangue proves, more seriously, to be a social threat because in the confusion it causes the innocent Cokes' purse to be picked. Overdo is beaten by Waspe for this, and although he realises that he "the said Adam, was one cause (a by-cause) why the purse was lost" (III. iii. 3-5), he accepts the immediate defeat in expectation of the eventual triumph. The greater folly, the desire to perceive and judge truly, sustains the lesser, in this case the desire to preach abstemiousness, and obscures the obvious conclusion that his beating is the result of his folly:

I had thought once, at one speciall blow he ga' me, to haue reveuled my selfe; but then (I thank thee, fortitude) I remembred that a wise man (and who is euer so great a part o' the Common-wealth in himselfe) for no particular disaster ought to abandon a publick good designe

(III. iii. 21-26).
Overdo is the epitome of the gull. In *Volpone* Jonson created a more subtle type of gull, who is not merely a simpleton duped or cheated by a cony-catching trick, but a gull whose folly lies in believing in some delusion with which a knave tempts him. The knave merely stimulates and exploits a pre-existing condition. The gull's overriding desire to actualise the preferred delusion makes him dupe himself. In Overdo, Jonson completes the process of internalising the stages of duping. Overdo is his own knave by conceiving and planning the scheme of disguise and discovery; he is his own gull by feeding his own delusion, resolutely convinced of the scheme's wisdom despite contrary evidence. He is a self-contained system of delusion. In him are revealed the absurdities of discovering, perceiving, and judging. These are the very functions of a satirist figure which Jonson took such pains to dramatise uncritically and supportively in Crites and Horace, and criticism of them here represents Jonson's final and explicit repudiation of them.

The puppet-play is the climax of the play's satiric action. In Littlewit, playwrights are burlesqued, in Leatherhead, commentators in plays are burlesqued. Leatherhead calls himself "the mouth of 'hem all" (V. iii. 78), and he stands between the play and its audience, interpreting its actions for the simple Cokes. But his intention is not to satirise, it is to control Cokes's reactions and allow him to enjoy the play. Leatherhead's puppet theatre is described by Trash as specialising in burlesque mimicry of players and other puppets, and having put down "Coriat, and Cokesley" (III. iv. 126) by its mockery. At first sight, then, the puppet theatre might be seen as being satirical, employing the devices of reduction and caricature to reduce love to lust and friendship to self-interest.
But its function is not satirical. The puppet play does establish the lowest common denominator of human experience, representing the most debased and crude versions of love and friendship, in the most unsophisticated way, but then goes on to assert the value of even such coarse artless stuff. Its crude version of lust and selfishness is not condemned on moral grounds; on the contrary, its value is asserted as a manifestation of the free, active human spirit. This is a position beyond the satirical.

The spirit of mockery and imaginative release is asserted in the puppet play as opposed to the spirit of moralising, which is embodied in Busy. The confrontation of Busy and 'Dionysius' represents the confrontation of two attitudes - the open acceptance of human nature, and the closed, moralising control of it, the latter deriving from satire. Busy is defeated by 'Dionysius', and this represents moralism defeated by celebration. On another level it represents reality defeated by illusion, or, more accurately, the illusion of Busy's hypocritical, misconceived version of reality defeated by the reality of even such a debased illusion as the puppet show.

The puppet play is a microcosm of the fair, as the fair is of the world; and the puppet play is also a microcosm of the play, standing in the same relation to the play as the play does to the audience. The crudity of the puppet play's representation of reality measured by the world of *Bartholomew Fair*, corresponds to the degree of crudity of *Bartholomew Fair*'s representation of reality measured by the real world of the audience. Busy's attempt to condemn the simple artifact of the puppet play on moral grounds is defeated by the puppet himself, and should warn the audience
of the folly of judging *Bartholomew Fair* on moral grounds; similarly, the attempts of Busy and Overdo to judge the other characters of their world (the play world) should warn the audience of the folly of judging other characters of their world (the real world). Jonson sets up a system of correspondences inside and outside the play by which the audience is drawn into consideration of the themes of valid and invalid morality, and the theme of illusion and reality. The ultimate value asserted in *Bartholomew Fair* is that of "true delight" ('Prologue', 1. 12), the emotion Jonson hoped King James would enjoy watching it. The puppet play is set up "in the name of wit" (V. i. 2), and the play itself is "made to delight all, and to offend none, "Provided they haue either, the wit, or the honesty to thinke well of themselues" ('Induction', 11. 83-84). Since human desires are seen to be resistant to religious, moral and judicial pressures to force them into preconceived moulds these desires are accepted as basic and irremediable. Attempts to change them are thus misconceived and foolish. The true and sensible attitude is one of joyful acceptance. 'Dionysius' triumph is complete when Busy admits not only that he is defeated but also that he is converted to the merriment of the puppet play: "For I am changed, and will become a beholder with you!" (V. v. 116-17). This is a transformation from one mode of being to another, from moralising to celebration.

The solutions in several of Jonson's plays to problems of exposure and judgement raised by satire, and centred on satirist figures, are presented in theatrical terms. In *Cynthia's Revels*, for example, the action is brought to the heightened and moralised level of the masque just before the
exposure and punishment of the fools is effected; in *Poetaster* exposure and punishment are presented as quasi-theatrical spectacles, with the comic indignity of the climax contrasting sharply with the preceding gravity of tone. In *Volpone* the climactic court scene almost acquires the status of an inset play, and the harshness of its punishments has to be softened by Volpone's epilogue. All of these plays employ theatricality as the means by which the play's (often the satirist's) morality is effected, although sometimes with unease as in *Poetaster* and *Volpone*. After *Volpone*, theatricality and morality become increasingly opposed. In *Epicoene*, Dauphine's trick whereby Epicoene is discovered to be a boy, is also a trick played on the audience whereby a theatrical convention, that women are played by boys, proves not to operate, and the boy actor turns out to be a boy in the play too; that is, the categories of illusion and reality are not kept separate in the usual way, and this serves to remind the audience of the play's illusory nature, and so of the illusory nature of the material from which its moral conclusions are drawn. In *The Alchemist*, the plot is resolved by use of the simple convention of the master returning to his house; but Lovewit brings too an unexpected, permissive morality which resolves the moral conflicts by turning them in a new direction. In *Bartholomew Fair*, theatricality is used explicitly as the means of achieving a solution, but the theatricality is in a burlesque mode, and theatricality and morality are clearly opposed. At the end of *Bartholomew Fair* moralising is firmly rejected in favour of celebration and enjoyment. The method of the heightened and moralised endings of the "comicall satyres" is finally overturned in the low burlesque and unmoralised ending of *Bartholomew Fair*. 
The relationship between critics and criticised, first established in *Every Man Out of his Humour*, and brought to sharpest focus in *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster*, in which the critics are untouched in the accuracy and authority of their criticisms and the fools purged of folly or punished for it, is also finally overturned in *Bartholomew Fair*. In this play the criticised are untouched but the critics are systematically stripped of their pretensions. Waspe and Busy both suffer reversals, but the most complete reversal is Overdo's. When he finally, publicly reveals his identity he does so in a self-consciously theatrical gesture:

> Now, to my enormities: looke uppon mee, O London! and see mee, O Smithfield; The *example of Justice*, and *Mirror of Magistrates*; the true top of formality, and scourge of enormity

(V. vi. 33-36).

Overdo self-consciously chooses a moment which will maximise the dramatic impact of his revelation, seeking to achieve for himself a satiric climax and resolution involving surprise, reversal, and the re-establishment of order. But the play denies him the chance to play the part of a Crites or a Horace; instead, Quarlous confounds him by pointing out his wife and explaining what has really happened. The reality of the fair proves resistant to having pre-conceived patterns, originating in the theatre (in fact, Jonson's plays themselves), imposed upon it by Justice Overdo. He is denied his satirical-cum-theatrical triumph, like those afforded Crites and Horace. The play's satire, then, is directed not merely at the folly of setting out to judge and punish, but also at such motifs as they are employed in plays. The climax of the play occurs in two anti-theatrical actions: firstly, the burlesque puppet play; secondly, the destruction of Overdo's satirical revelation.
Quarlous' awareness, success, and amoral acceptance of the fair establishes him as the type epitomising the play's outlook. He exposes the Judge to himself, "remember you are but Adam, Flesh, and blood!" (V. vi. 96-97), and accomplishes Overdo's real education by showing him the real effect of the fair on the visitors. Overdo accepts the lesson, "this pleasant conceited Gentlemen hath wrought upon my judgement, and prevail'd" (V. vi. 106-07). Overdo's authority is reduced, not destroyed, by the intractable reality of the fair, and in the end "it turns out to be the fair (or, more strictly, their reaction to it) that exposes the outsiders who come there." 24 The fair is established as the final touchstone of judgement. Overdo's invitation to dinner establishes celebration and communal pleasure as the play's final symbol, but unlike Every Man In, where Matheo and Bobadill were excluded, the invitation here is all-encompassing.

Summary

There is no character in Jonson's plays from Epicoene to Bartholomew Fair who is a satirist figure based on the prototype Asper, but there are several characters who display one or more functions of the satirist figure. There is also extensive use made of the techniques and practices of dramatic satire to produce satirical effects, and furthermore, these plays all show an interest

in a group of themes which originate as issues raised by the operation of a satirist figure in the "comicall satyres", and are diffused throughout these later plays. The themes are the operations of power and authority, idealistic versus realistic morality, judgement and punishment, and the possibility of moral reformation.

In *Epicoene*, Jonson introduces Truewit, the first example of a character who performs certain satirical functions such as judging, exposing, and manipulating, but who does not have the satirist's self-conscious claims to a finer morality, or the right to punish and reform. Truewit represents the type of intelligent, witty, manipulating man-of-the-world which replaces the moralistic, idealistic, satirist figure. However, the morality with which Truewit is endowed, apparently designed to agree with his limited satirical intentions, is an uneasy union of two incompatibles: cognisance of an ideal morality on the theoretical level, and acceptance of a limited, realistic morality on the practical level. The play indicates the direction of Jonson's developing notions about satirists and moral reformation, with severe moral judgements dropped in favour of acceptance, and little emphasis on the possibility of reforming fools.

*The Alchemist* reflects Jonson's increasing moral leniency. It embodies techniques of dramatic satire, although its moral relativism makes it yield up as many comic as satiric effects. Lovewit is a more developed example of the morally relaxed wit Truewit. He makes no pretensions to an ideal morality, even an imagined one like Truewit's. In Lovewit's success over Surly, who represents a stump of the satirist figure in his wish to expose villainy, the ascendancy of the wit over the moralist is
confirmed. Surly is ineffective because he lacks wit and imaginativeness, qualities which become increasingly necessary for success in Jonson’s play-worlds. No reformations occur in *The Alchemist.*

*Catiline* also employs the techniques of dramatic satire to produce satirical reactions in the audience towards the action. Although the action is in the tragic mode, nevertheless there are close correspondences with the previous satirical comedy. *Catiline* also presents explicitly an analysis of the operation of power—that power is a kind of illusion between the powerful and their subjects. As men of power Catiline and Cicero have to act in remarkably similar ways, employing methods of role-playing and manipulation based on an exact awareness of the motivation of their subjects which allies them with the manipulators of *Volpone* and *The Alchemist.* Cicero corresponds to Lovewit, and Catiline to Subtle, and these correspondences point up what was implicit in *The Alchemist,* that great criminals and their worthy opponents have more in common with each other than with the simple helpmates whom they employ to gain their ends. The play presents the awareness and magnanimity of Catiline and Cicero as being at least as significant as their moral opposition. The emergence of these new terms, unrelated to moral considerations, represents a fundamental reorientation of Jonson’s satirical vision.

*Bartholomew Fair* employs the insights gained in *The Alchemist* and *Catiline* to present a radical critique of the satirist and the satirical vision. It presents the real and the ideal not merely as divided, but, more seriously, as irreconcilable and indeed opposed. The relationship between the satirist and
the fools he works against, established in the "comicall satyres" and progressively modified in the plays following, is now overturned, with the fools and villains of *Bartholomew Fair* remaining untouched by those trying to reform them, and the morally idealistic critics and figures of authority who set out to change them themselves changed and reformed. The insight gained in *Catiline* that power is a kind of illusion is applied here to each of the characters seeking to use his power, and it is shown that none of the three moralists has any moral authority for his attempts to exercise power over others since each is vitiated by folly, or hypocrisy, or self-delusion. Furthermore, none of them has the awareness of himself and of others necessary for success in the play-world. Awareness and success is assigned to the wits, Quarles and Winwife.

Taking the "comicall satyres" as Jonson's attempts to validate the satirist figure, and *Bartholomew Fair* as his renunciation of satire and the satirist, the following changes are most striking: real power, available to the satirists of the "comicall satyres" is transformed to illusory power, located in Overdo's imagination; true judgement in Crites and Horace is transformed to false judgement in Overdo; ideal morality as the final touchstone of judgement is replaced by relative morality tested by the actualities of the fair.

What replaces moral idealism in Jonson's plays are the human qualities of magnanimity and imaginativeness. These are expressed finally in *Bartholomew Fair* in theatrical terms in the burlesque puppet play. The value of the puppet play's debased action is asserted against the condemnations of the puritan moralist. The
grounds of this final assertion are significantly shifted from the "comicall satyres": that the puppet play is an illusion, and so not subject to moral categories; and that the delight of the spectator is more important than the moral scrupulousness of the play. In the burlesque puppet play Jonson seems to be renouncing the necessity of making his plays representations of morally correct actions, and to be pointing instead to delight as their necessary quality. This is Jonson's final abandonment of moral satire.
Jonson often dramatises satirical actions in his plays: folly and vice in action observed by a satirist who sets about to expose, punish, and reform them. In some plays folly or vice is eradicated by the operation of its own self-destructiveness, but still the action follows a satirical pattern. Shakespeare, on the other hand, dramatises satirical actions on the Jonsonian plan on only three occasions, and then with considerable qualifications. His treatment of satire and the satirist figure is based on the perception of certain attitudes, casts of mind, ways of thinking and feeling behind satirical actions or speeches, and on the dramatisation of these, generally in play-worlds which are not primarily satirical. *Troilus and Cressida* and *Timon of Athens* are exceptions to this generalisation, since their actions are based upon a satirical pattern of idealism transformed to disillusionment.
The only characters in all of Shakespeare's plays who can be classified as satirist figures based on the styles and attitudes of the speakers of verse satire of the 1590's are Jaques, Hamlet, Thersites, the Duke in *Measure for Measure*, and Timon. Even in this set it is quite clear that 'satirist figure' does not serve as a total description. The term is valid because some or all of the actions of these characters can be considered as seeking to achieve one or more of the satirical purposes of perception, exposure, judgement or punishment of other characters who fail to live up to some ideal or norm, or because their vision becomes suffused with the satirical emotions of amusement and scorn.

Satirist and related figures in Shakespeare's plays do not perform a clearly defined set of dramatic functions. They are usually presented as one part of a large and complex dramatic artifact, and their functions are related subtly to the rest of the play. In order to describe them as satirists it is necessary to relate them to the plays as a whole in which they appear. The plays discussed in this chapter show some of the uses to which the satirist figure or his adaptations could be put. By the early years of the seventeenth century the satirical style was established and available, and it could be adapted for a wide variety of purposes, and in contexts which were not primarily satirical. *Measure for Measure* and *Timon of Athens*, however, both contain a character, the Duke in one and Timon in the other, who is closely related to the satirist figure, and who plays a central part in the action.

Shakespeare dramatises satirical actions following the Jonsonian humour model in three sub-plots: those involving Pistol in
Henry V (1599), Malvolio in Twelfth Night (1600-02), and Parolles in All's Well That Ends Well (c. 1601-c.1604). These actions are largely self-contained, and their satire does not spread into other parts of the plays. The satirical exposure of Parolles is something of an exception to this rule. In each case, however, important qualifications are implied on the satirical action. Unlike Jonson, Shakespeare presents no reformations achieved by satirical exposure. All's Well That Ends Well indicates even greater scepticism about satirising by fleetingly satirising the satirisers, and grudgingly accommodating the unchangeable nature of the folly it portrays in Parolles.

From the start Parolles's real nature is known; Helena says of him: "I know him a notorious liar, / Think him a great fool, solely a coward" (I. i. 106-07). ¹ Parolles, unlike Jonson's gulls who do not know what they are until the climactic moment of their exposure, displays considerable self-knowledge. Waiting for time to pass while he is supposed to be retrieving his drum he says to himself, "my tongue is too foolhardy, but my heart hath the fear of Mars before it and of his creatures, not daring the reports of my tongue" (IV. i. 30-32). In the scene of his exposure, Act IV, scene iii, there is an extensive use of asides to show the reactions of Parolles's satirisers. At first all the scorn and condemnation is directed at Parolles, but the satire begins to turn on those watching as the Interpreter encourages Parolles to describe the lords, including Bertram, who are thereupon discomfited.

The First Lord, Dumaine, expresses another interpretation of Parolles's detractions, declaring, "He hath out-villain'd villainy so far that the rarity redeems him" (IV. iii. 264-65), and provides a view of Parolles, unconnected to morality, which to some extent prevents total condemnation of him and allows for his final self-assertion:

Captain I'll be no more,
But I will eat and drink and sleep as soft
As captain shall. Simply the thing I am
Shall make me live. Who knows himself a braggart,
Let him fear this; for it will come to pass
That every braggart shall be found an ass...
...being fool'd, by fool'ry thrive.
There's place and means for every man alive.
I'll after them

(IV. iii. 320-25; 327-29).

Parolles, like Pistol and Malvolio, is unreformed by exposure and shame, and he continues as before.

In the main plot by contrast, Bertram undergoes a moral reformation, by a method which was used particularly by Marston in The Dutch Courtesan and The Fawn, that of education through experience. When the King and Helena contrive to confront him with the full weight of his misdeeds, the potential for a satirical reaction to Bertram is contained by the severe moral tone adopted by the King. The tone of comic lightness is sacrificed in order to achieve a convincing dramatisation of Bertram's moral conversion. As M. C. Bradbrook states, "the likeness with the later play of Measure for Measure, which was evidently modeled in part on All's Well That Ends Well, is particularly strong in this judgement scene, with charge and countercharge piled up in bewildering succession till they are resolved as if by magic in the appearance of the central figure. The ingenuities of Hellai, like those of the Duke, are
Measure for Measure (c. 1603-04)

This play resembles The Malcontent (1604), in the duke-in-disguise convention, and in the themes of justice and authority. A recent editor has observed that it may be a "conscious experiment in the new medium of tragicomedy ... with its blend of serious and comic, extreme peril and happy solution, mixed characters and 'well-tied knot'", suggesting another link with The Malcontent which was first entered in the Stationers' Register as 'An Enterlude called The Malcontent Tragiecomedia'. Both Altofront and the Duke, once they have gone into disguise, see corruption in their respective courts which previously they were ignorant of; and their plans to stalk their courts in disguise produce similar possibilities for satire. However, the problem of the motivation and authority of a satirist figure which Marston solves by the double figure of Altofront-Malevole is not solved by Shakespeare. Altofront's roles are distinct and clearly separated; the Duke's roles are subtle and interpenetrating. Consequently, there are ambiguities surrounding the Duke.

Measure for Measure employs some of the dramatic techniques used for satiric effect in Troilus and Cressida. Like that play, Measure for Measure presents a number of contrasted and opposed views on a related group of themes: sexuality, authority, justice, mercy, grace. By means of multiple points of


view on the action, implicitly and explicitly presented, the audience is kept constantly vigilant on the moral questions raised by the action. It is also made aware of ironical and satirical views of the action. The play's two satirical commentators are Lucio and the Duke. Lucio, a 'fantastic', supplies a good deal of satiric comment throughout the play. He is a "gay and ribald cynic like Carlo Buffone", and his comments arise not from a wish to expose vice but from a wish to express his own view of things. He is licentious and intelligent, and his comments are sometimes detraction, sometimes exposure of folly. In Act II, scene ii, for example, Lucio's comments stand side by side with Angelo's and Isabella's speeches, and this allows the audience to evaluate the differing attitudes of each. The satiric temper of this scene is indicated by the presence of satiric imagery of corruption - "authority, though it err like others, / Hath yet a kind of medicine in itself / That skins the vice o'th'top" (II. ii. 135-37), and by a speech of Isabella's which denounces the spiritual pretensions of man in indignant, general terms:

But man, proud man,
Dress'd in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd -
His glassy essence - like an angry ape
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As makes the angels weep; who, with our spleens,
Would all themselves laugh mortal

(II. ii. 118-24).

The underlying conception of the scene is satirical in that it is written so as to bring out gradually the gap between what seems and what is. When Isabella pleads with Angelo for her brother's life,

Lucio's comments, full of sexual double entendre, imply that Isabella is in the position of a wooer, and they culminate in grossly sexual implications - "You are too cold" (II. ii. 56); "Ay, touch him: there's the vein" (II. ii. 70); "O, to him, to him, wench! He will relent; / He's coming: I perceive't" (II. ii. 125-26). These comments supply a sharp contrast to Angelo's and Isabella's abstract debate on justice and mercy, and more importantly, suggest an undertone of sexuality in the exchange, which is realised with Angelo's passion for Isabella. However, once Angelo has become aware of his lust for Isabella he himself supplies analysis and moral commentary on himself. Like Hamlet he sees the evil of his position quite clearly, and to this limited extent he is sympathetic:

Is this her fault, or mine?  
The tempter, or the tempted, who sins most, ha?  

(Il. ii. 163-64),

O, let her brother live!  
Thieves for their robbery have authority,  
When judges steal themselves  

(Il. ii. 175-77).

The tone of Measure for Measure, like that of The Malcontent, switches rapidly between scenes and within single scenes. In Act I, scene ii, for example, Lucio's tone begins as coprolitic, when he charges the First Gentleman with being "sound”,

Nay, not, as one would say, healthy: but so sound as things that are hollow; thy bones are hollow; impiety has make a feast of thee  

(I. ii. 51-53).

The tone changes drastically when Claudio enters on his way to prison, and, in reply to Lucio's queries, replies that his plight comes from "too much liberty" (I. ii. 117). Lucio answers wittily but with underlying seriousness:
If I could speak so wisely under an arrest, I would send for certain of my creditors; and yet, to say the truth, I had as lief have the foppery of freedom as the morality of imprisonment.

(I. ii. 118-22).

Switches of tone, and contrasts of ideas form a kind of continuous debate on the play's themes.

The Duke is an enigmatic character for several reasons, and is far from being simply a satirist figure. He has accurate perceptions of other characters' emotional and moral states, understanding them and sympathising with their predicament in a way that a satirist never does. Allied to his sympathy is the fact that he does not explicitly judge others; instead, he offers sound moral principles or reactions, but almost always expressed in general terms. He does not openly state that his intentions is to effect moral reformation in the main protagonists, although this is what all his actions are designed to do. The respect in which the Duke most resembles a satirist figure is in his manipulation of others.

The Duke temporarily abandons his throne as part of his strategy to eradicate vice in Vienna, but he has another purpose which is closely related to a satirist's, to see if Angelo is indeed the virtuous man he appears to be:

Duke. 

...to behold his sway,
I will, as 'twere a brother of your order,
Visit both prince and people...
Lord Angelo is precise;
Stands at a guard with Envy; scarce confesses
That his blood flows; or that his appetite
Is more to bread than stone. Hence shall we see
If power change purpose, what our seemers be

(I. iii. 43-45; 50-54).

To achieve his double purpose the Duke, like Altofront, uses several forms of deception. He assumes many roles in the play, some of
which are used for satirical purposes (intriguer, manipulator); and some of which are tangentially or not at all satirical (educator, comforter, confessor). If the Duke is an embodiment of genuine virtue and correct authority then he can be seen in a simple and straightforward way as having his every action validated. But if he is seen as a character seeking to establish true virtue and true authority by the means open to him, rather than an embodiment of these qualities, then his actions are opened to criticism. At those times when the Duke performs a simple satirical function, the fiction of the prince-in-disguise supports him adequately; when, for instance, he makes a direct denunciation of Pompey the bawd:

Fie, sirrah, a bawd, a wicked bawd;  
The evil that thou causest to be done,  
That is thy means to live. Do thou but think  
What 'tis to cram a maw or clothe a back  
From such a filthy vice

(III. ii. 18-22).

At the end of the same scene he delivers judgement on Angelo, in choric fashion, the different metre suggesting the impersonality of the judgement:

Twice treble shame on Angelo,  
To weed my vice, and let his grow!  
O, what may man within him hide,  
Though angel on the outward side!...  
Craft against vice I must apply

(III. ii. 262-65; 270).

Unless the Duke is thought of as operating as a symbol of justice, authority and goodness, then his actions involve him in the same contradiction as constantly traps a satirist: that in order to assert his moral ideals he has to use morally unjustifiable

---

means. Thought of and judged in purely human terms many of the Duke's actions appear callous, cruel, and morally unjustifiable. In Act III, scene i, for example, the Duke's manipulation of Claudio and Isabella is extensive. He asks the Provost to place him where he can overhear Isabella's conversation with Claudio, steps forward when the conflicting desires of brother and sister are at an impasse, tells Claudio he must prepare for death because "Angelo had never the purpose to corrupt her; only he hath made an essay of her virtue, to practise his judgement with the disposition of natures" (III. i. 160-63), and then reveals the plan involving Mariana to Isabella. Later in the play the Provost declares, "It is a bitter deputy" (IV. ii. 76), but the Duke refuses to condemn Angelo publicly, and instead establishes a general moral principle for a judge's actions, and incidentally tests the Provost's loyalty to the Duke:

Not so, not so; his life is parallel'd
Even with the stroke and line of his great justice...
... were he meal'd with that
Which he corrects, then were he tyrannous;
But this being so, he's just

(IV. ii. 77-78; 81-83).

In terms of plot it is unnecessary to tell Claudio that Angelo is merely testing Isabella and so his release is impossible; in any case the Duke has already conceived the plan involving Mariana. Similarly, there is no need in the plot to put the Provost to a test. The Duke's manipulations operate on two levels: on the physical one, such as, for example, the night-time assignation between Angelo and Mariana, and the delaying of Claudio's execution; and on the psychological one, involving the creation of experiences for his subjects designed to change their moral consciousnesses. The Duke not only wishes to have the right people where and when he wants them, he also wishes to have them in a suitable state of mind. His speech to Claudio in prison (III.i. 5-41) shows this
clearly. The Duke delivers this *memento mori* speech for a particular purpose, to pacify Claudio and make him accept the fact that he is about to be executed. Like Malevole's speech to Pietro, the Duke's is an instrument in a larger strategy; and it also contributes to the scene's and the play's complex congregation of attitudes and feelings on its themes. There are significant differences between Altofront/Malevole and the Duke/Friar here. Malevole's manipulations are always clearly part of his plan to regain his throne; the Duke's are more subtle, usually more risky, and consequently ambiguous. The most extreme example of the Duke's duplicity is his decision not to tell Isabella that Claudio is still alive:

> But I will keep her ignorant of her good,
> To make her heavenly comforts of despair
> When it is least expected

(IV.iii. 108-10).

Considered in human terms the Duke's deceptions, lies, and disguises are subject to implicit moral reproof. The Duke is also subject to explicit criticism. Lucio's scurrilous unjustified description of him which he speaks to his disguised face (III. ii. 120ff) reflects on the speaker's shamelessness, but it also subjects the Duke to the audience's amusement. More serious is the criticism implied in Barnardine's flat refusal to be hanged at the Duke's suggestion. It is the only occasion when he encounters resistance from his human material, and "for a vivid moment the Duke, elsewhere the paragon of rulers, is revealed in his fallibility and exposed to the laughter of comedy".  

---

In Act V the Duke enters, disguised as the Friar, and delivers a direct satirical rebuke:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{My business in this state} \\
\text{Made me a looker-on here in Vienna,} \\
\text{Where I have seen corruption boil and bubble} \\
\text{Till it o'errun the stew: laws for all faults,} \\
\text{But faults so countenanc'd that the strong statutes} \\
\text{Stand like the forfeits in a barber's shop,} \\
\text{As much in mock as mark}
\end{align*}
\]

(V. i. 314-19).

This has no effect on anyone, and only gets him condemned to prison. The real satirical process of rebuking the wicked and foolish, and reforming them is effected in a quite different way. Revealed as the Duke, "the demonstration of justice becomes at the same time 'an assay of virtue'. Angelo is made to undergo a subtle re-enactment of the psychological drama in the first part of the play". And not only Angelo, but Isabella too is placed in circumstances which demonstrate that she has learned charity when, believing Claudio to be dead, she begs for Angelo's life. The reformations are achieved by the characters undergoing, at the hands of the Duke, a process of education through experience.

*Measure for Measure* employs some of the techniques of dramatic satire, especially its juxtaposition of scenes containing similar actions, and contrasted speeches on similar subjects. But the play does not employ the flat characterisation of dramatic satire. Rather, it is notable for the depth and intensity of its characterisation, especially of Angelo and Isabella, the pair in whom moral problems are experienced most intensely. This introduces purely human considerations of judgement from the audience that

dramatic satire does not demand; in fact, which it excludes by its flat, unrealistic method of characterisation. For this reason, the audience's reaction to the central characters is drawn, on the one side, towards identification and understanding produced by deep characterisation, and, on the other, towards detachment and criticism provoked by both the Duke's manipulations and by constructional means. The audience's reaction is not predominantly satirical; it is poised between satire and sympathy.

Enobarbus in *Antony and Cleopatra* (c. 1606-08) is one of those characters in Shakespeare's later plays who performs some of the functions of a satirist figure. He is not a satirist figure; he is rather, what A. C. Sprague calls a chorus character, that is "one of the *dramatic persona* - often not a principal - who sums up a number of episodes in the play or whose remarks have obvious appropriateness as an interpretation of the play as a whole". 8 He is not separate from what he comments on, as a satirist usually is; he speaks as friend and close associate of Antony, and this gives his words their authority. Sometimes, however, his comments have an effect close to those of a satirist.

In the scene of Antony's reconciliation with Caesar, Enobarbus's interjections lay bare the realities obscured by political rhetoric, and provide a satirical response to the solemn proceedings (II. ii. 103 – 10 ). In a later scene Enobarbus's comments point up the hypocrisy in the shows of feeling at Antony's and Octavia's departure from Caesar, and also supply a derisive

---

account of the public emotion of politicians. This is the closest

Enobarbus comes to producing a purely satirical response:

Enobarbus. [Aside to Agrippa.] Will Caesar weep?

Agrippa. [Aside to Enobarbus.] He has a cloud in's face.

Enobarbus. [Aside to Agrippa.] He were the worse for that
were he a horse,
So is he being a man.

Agrippa. [Aside to Enobarbus.] Why, Enobarbus?
When Antony found Julius Caesar dead,
He cried almost to roaring; and he wept
When at Philippi he found Brutus slain.

Enobarbus. [Aside to Agrippa.] That year, indeed, he was
troubled with a rheum;
What willingly he did confound, he wail'd,
Believe't, till I wept too

(III. ii. 51-59).

The important satirical figure in Coriolanus (1605-
c. 1610) is the hero, partly because his speeches show features of
satirical style, and partly because the structure of his experience
forms a critique of the satirical stance.

After Marcius's great feat of courage in the battle with
the Volscies in single-handedly entering the gates of Corioli, he
receives Cominius's praise and the soldiers' adulation with a
speech which makes use of the satirical subjects of flattery and
hypocrisy in courts to establish his point of view:

May these same instruments, which you profane,
Never sound more! When drums and trumpets shall
I' the field prove flatterers, let courts and cities be
Made all of false-fac'd soothing!
When steel grows soft as is the parasite's silk,
Let him be made a coverture for the wars!...
You shout me forth
In acclamations hyperbolical;
As if I lov'd my little should be dieted
In praises sauc'd with lies

(I. ix. 41-46; 50-53).

The speech's satirical comparisons indicate Coriolanus's moral fervour
and like the satirist he is so determined to avoid hypocrisy that he adopts the extreme opposite stance of blunt aggressiveness. Coriolanus's passion for sincerity, however, is directed towards himself not towards actual flatterers or hypocrites, and expresses his determination to adhere absolutely to it. Ironically, these qualities which make him a successful soldier prove disastrous when he is consul.

When Coriolanus has to seek the people's approval of his nomination as Consul in the market place, he has moved from a soldier's world to a politician's, and the rules are different. "Coriolanus makes quite clear what is only implicit in Timon: the political nature of the scrutiny to which these later heroes are subjected". The question raised by the action is not one of Coriolanus's worthiness but of whether he can adopt the manners of a politician, that is, accept the hypocrisy and flattery of a public face. The question is summed up by two Officers before the crucial market-place scene. The Second Officer observes, "Faith there have been many great men that have flattered the people, who ne'er loved them" (II. ii. 8-10), but excludes Coriolanus from their number: "for Coriolanus neither to care whether they love or hate him manifests the true knowledge he has in their disposition; and out of his noble carelessness lets them plainly see't" (II. ii. 13-17). The First Officer draws the conclusion: "to seem to affect the malice and displeasure of the people is as bad as that which he dislikes, to flatter them for their love" (II. ii. 23-26). The judgement is not made on moral grounds but on practical, political

---

ones. The judgement on Coriolanus is that his passion for his own kind of moral integrity, comparable to a satirist's severe moral stance, renders him an ineffective politician, and in the end an enemy of the state. On a personal level, the rigidity of his moral stance renders him an outcast from human society. The implications of the theme of an extreme adherence to a moral stance are fully developed in Timon of Athens.

Timon of Athens (c. 1606-c.08).

Satirical motifs appear in several of Shakespeare's Jacobean plays, but after Troilus and Cressida, Timon of Athens is the only one to be satirical in theme and structure. In it Shakespeare takes satire and the satirist figure as his central subjects and explores them exhaustively and finally. The play represents a narrow but profound investigation of the emotions, morality, and intellectual consequences of satire. No other dramatist extends the logic of the satirist so far along the line of negation which ends in self-hatred, hatred of society, man, and finally the universe itself. 10

Several of the features of dramatic satire are evident in Timon: the structural devices of juxtaposition of scenes, repetition of scenes with similar action illustrating a moral point, and generally formalised and bare action. The fact that the play is very likely unfinished 11 may account to some extent for its

10 Moliere's Le Misanthrope presents, in a different spirit, a satirist driven by his passion to see and speak the truth who ends up as a solitary outcast from society. Moliere, however, is interested in the individual's response to society; Shakespeare goes further and shows a similar individual's rejection of society and the whole universe.

starkness, but its peculiarities of construction and character owe more to its exploration of the satirical vision.

The characters tend to embody qualities rather than display individuality; Flavius is loyal and honest throughout; Timon's friends treacherous and hypocritical; Apemantus cynical; Alcibiades honourable. Timon too gives little impression of a full character: he "fails to leave a deep, coherent impression of his personality ... Timon here is negative. There is no individuality". 12 Flat characterisation offers advantages in satirical writing: the core of each character is immediately visible, and can be manipulated to make moral or satirical points unobscured by details of personality.

The secondary characters, Alcibiades, Flavius, Apemantus "speak and clash with Timon, with the play's nonentities, but do not stand in any sort of relationship to each other", 13 and this focusses the audience's attention on Timon and the central satiric concerns which he illuminates. The structure too in its stylisation is designed to make satiric points. 14 Outside Athens Timon receives the same visitors in turn as he received in Act I and each of them is exactly as he was. A clearer example of structural schematism is the friends' refusal to lend money (III. i; ii. iii) where the

14 M.C. Bradbrook, Shakespeare the Craftsman, London, 1969, chap. viii, accounts for the play's structural and character peculiarities by suggesting that it is an experiment based on "court shews", like Nashe's Summer's Last Will and Testament, written for the move to Blackfriars theatre in 1609, with "a seasonal theme, processional movement, a mixture of monologue and scholastic debate or invective; division in contrasted halves; structure by means of apposition, rather than development of a plot", p. 163.
"procession of figures similarly ridiculous or base shifts the emphasis from their individualities to the folly they all represent". 15

The simplicity of the main plot and sub-plot allows the full didactic weight of actions to emerge. Alcibiades' scene before the Senate (III. v.) is connected to the main plot by contrast, in its demonstration of true friendship in Alcibiades, and of ingratitude in the Senators' rejection of his plea. The wrong Alcibiades suffers does not result from his folly, as Timon's does, and his reaction to it, attempting to revenge himself on Athens and root out the city's corruptors, contrasts with Timon's nihilistic one. Alcibiades comments bitterly on the Senate's ingratitude:

Now the gods keep you old enough, that you may live
Only in bone, that none may look on you!
I'm worse than mad: I have kept back their foes,
While they have told their money, and let out
Their coin upon large interest; I myself
Rich only in large hurts. All those, for this

(III. v. 105-10). 16

There is a great deal of overt comment on the action from many sources. The Strangers in Act III act as a chorus, condemning the friends and praising Timon, and crystallising the audience's responses to the action:

First Stran[ger]. Why, this is the world's soul,
And just of the same piece
Is every flatterer's sport. Who can call him his friend

That dips in the same dish?...
For mine own part,
I never tasted Timon in my life;
Nor came any of his bounties over me,


To mark me for his friend. Yet I protest,
For his right noble mind, illustrious virtue,
And honourable carriage...
I would have put my wealth into donation

(III. ii. 65-68; 78-85).

The servants sent to ask for money also comment on the refusals they meet (III. i. 55-67; III. iii. 27-42), and Flavius too condemns false friendship when he sees Timon in the woods (IV. iii. 467-81). The frequency with which characters stand aside and comment on the action indicates the intensely critical spirit of the play.

Timon's experience in the play falls into two distinct and contrasted halves. To begin with he dispenses gold and enjoys what he thinks to be heartfelt and generous friendship in return; in the second half he has discovered that his ideal of friendship was a mistaken one and he pours on mankind his loathing and his wish for its destruction. In a simple sense this is a satirical experience: there is discovered to be a gap between things as they are and things as they ought to be, and the perception of this gap leads to anger, scorn, and loathing. Timon is a satirist in this fundamental sense, as well as being a satirist because he attacks particular vices, like those of the Poet. In this respect he is similar to other of Shakespeare's tragic heroes, notably Hamlet and King Lear, but unlike them, Timon pursues his satirical vision to the end.

There is no doubt of Timon's nobility, and his desire to be virtuous and create happiness in the opening scenes. He gives gold to free Ventidius from prison; and gives gold to one of his servants so that he can marry; and entertains his friends with food, wine, music, a masque, acting as a patron of poetry and painting. There is the independent judgement of the First Stranger
whose choric comment confirms his nobility:

For in my knowing
Timon has been this lord's father,
And kept his credit with his purse;
Supported his estate; nay, Timon's money
Has paid his men their wages

(III. ii. 67-72).

But nevertheless Timon's generosity is presented in an equivocal way. His extravagance defies common sense and financial prudence, as the Steward points out. But when Timon's vision of human relatedness is embodied in the exchange of money, then the laws of money defy and contradict that vision. G. Wilson Knight makes a similar point: "Timon's love, itself an infinity of emotion, was first embodied into finite things; finite humanity, the sense world of entertainment and art." 17 Timon attempts to achieve self-transcendence by means of material things which follow material laws. The Poet describes how Timon's flatterers treat him as a god, and how Timon is happy enough to be so treated:

...his lobbies fill with tendance,
Rain sacrificial whisperings in his ear,
Make sacred even his stirrup, and through him
Drink the free air

(I. i. 82-85).

In the masque Cupid flatters Timon by describing him as the patron of the senses:

The five best senses acknowledge thee their patron, and come freely to gratulate thy plenteous bosom

(I. ii. 119-21).

The Third Lord exclaims as Timon gives away more gifts - "Oh, he's the very soul of bounty" (I.ii.207). But there is evidence that this proclaimed transcendence is illusory and indeed the opposite of what

it seems. The Poet reveals the monetary interest of Timon's followers when he says,

> You see how all conditions...
> ...tender down
> Their services to Lord Timon: his large fortune,
> Upon his good and gracious nature hanging,
> Subdues and properties to his love and tendance
> All sorts of hearts

(I. i. 53; 55-59).

The Poet fixes on Timon's "large fortune", "hanging" on his "gracious natrue" like fruit ready to be plucked. The lines reveal what the Poet is really interested in, but they also imply that it is Timon's fortune which wins the love of his friends as if their love were a thing to be "subdued and propertied". The exploitation, then, works in both directions. Timon sees himself acting generously as it were on behalf of the gods, and he sentimentalises this idea of friendship - "O what a precious comfort'tis to have so many like brothers commanding one another's fortunes. O joy's e'en made away ere't can be born" (I.ii.101-04). But neither freedom nor reciprocity exist in Timon's relations with his friends. By refusing to accept gifts from them he ensures that all the obligations flow from his friends to him, and that his love operates as a kind of power over them. He is always in emotional credit with them.

This is seen in the two exchanges concerning Ventidius. In the first scene Timon gives a Messenger the money needed to free Ventidius saying, "I'll pay the debt and free him" (I.i. 106), and the Messenger replies, "Your lordship ever binds him" (I.i.107); the contradiction sharply focused in the words 'free' and 'binds'. In the next scene Ventidius offers to return the money to Timon but the offer is refused:

> Ventidius. Then as in grateful virtue I am bound
> To your free heart, I do return those talents,
> Doubled with thanks and service, from whose help
> I deriv'd liberty.
Timon.

0 by no means,
Honest Ventidius. You mistake my love;
I gave it truly ever, and there's none
Can truly say he gives, if he receives

(I. ii. 5-11).

Timon does not act according to his own principle that "there's none / Can truly say he gives, if he receives"; he does not allow his friends to give without his giving something in return. As one of the Senators says, "If I want gold, steal but a beggar's dog / And give it Timon - why, the dog coins gold" (II.i.5-6). Timon forces his friends to become both his debtors (they can get money from him whenever they wish), and also his usurers, (they give him a sum of money and they receive a greater one in return). The ideal of brotherly love and easy exchange of fortunes is not merely impractical and sentimental, it is in opposition to the actual circumstances as Timon himself creates them. Two similarities with the opening scene of *King Lear* are evident in that King Lear also fails to realise that human relatedness is dependent on freedom; and he too demands love out of a situation structured to call forth self-interest.

The gap between the actual and imagined relations between Timon and his friends is discovered when Timon is not treated by his friends with generosity. The illusion of reciprocity is instantly dispelled and Timon sees the friends as entirely mercenary. He sees the world transformed to its opposite: "Courteous destroyers, affable wolves, meek bears" (III. vi. 91). The trauma of discovering ingratitude directs Timon's attention to the disparity between how things really are and how he imagined they were. The change in the hero is sudden and complete. It marks the turning point in the action of the play. It is essentially satirical because it emphasises through Timon the disparity between the ideal
and the real, from an imagined community of relatedness of friendship, to an isolated individual who feels no relation to anything else and can see no relatedness in the universe at large.

The other character through whom satire comes is Apemantus, and his kind of satirical reaction to the world is contrasted with Timon's. Apemantus is a self-conscious satirist figure who observes and comments on the action from the outside. His name means "feeling no pain", and in this respect he stands at the opposite extreme from the passionate Timon. He is defiantly detached from Timon and his friends and proud of his isolation, but his personal unpleasantness does not alter the fact that his criticism of Timon and his friends is correct. He declares that he wishes to observe:

Let me stay at thine apparel, Timon;  
I come to observe: I give thee warning on't

(I. ii. 33-34).

When the masque begins he presents an accurate view of it, generalising from it that men are all depraved, both the flatterers and the flattered:

Hoy-day!  
What a sweep of vanity comes this way...  
We make ourselves fools, to disport ourselves,  
And spend our flatteries to drink those men  
Upon whose age we void it up again  
With poisonous spite and envy.  
Who lives that's not depraved or depraves

(I. ii. 128-29; 132-36).

Apemantus's view of humanity is cynical and pessimistic. He allows validity to no human values, and he describes man as a creature degenerated to the animal level:

That there should be small love amongst these sweet knaves,  
And all this courtesy! The strain of man's bred out  
Into baboon and monkey

(I. i. 248-50).

---

He is a sharp-fanged satirist whose vision is consistently cynical and reductive. In the first Act then, there is presented two sharply-opposed views on the action, Apemantus's and Timon's. "Apemantus's mood seems at first to run counter to that of the play, in churlish opposition. But when the crisis has turned the tide, it is found to be the dominant stream that carries all with it". Timon as a satirist is derived ultimately from the satirist personae of verse satire, because his satirising is fuelled by his perception of how far human life falls short of its ideal. Apemantus is not idealistic; rather, his scorn derives from seeing nothing as being valuable.

Timon's first action as a satirist is to arrange the banquet of stones and water. The banquet is a carefully contrived emblematic scene with deliberate moral intentions. In it he attempts the role of expositor, revealing to the flatterers the true nature and significance of what they have done. Just as Hamlet may be considered a satirist in forcing Gertrude to examine the twin portraits of two husbands, and in making Claudius feel the significance of his crime by re-enacting it in the play-within-the-play, so Timon's second banquet presents the Athenians with an image of the sterility of their friendship. And just as Hamlet in the closet scene and after the "Mousetrap" cannot contain his anger and glee so Timon too fails to control his powerful revulsion. He starts by addressing his guests with bitter irony:

You great benefactors, sprinkle our society with thankfulness. For your own gifts, make yourselves praise'd; but reserve still to give, lest your deities be despis'd...

For these my present friends, as they are to me nothing, so in nothing bless them, and to nothing are they welcome. Uncover, dogs, and lap

(III.vi. 69-71; 79-82);

but before the feast is over he breaks out and attacks his betrayers directly:

Live loath'd, and long,
Most smiling, smooth, detested parasites...
Burn, house! Sink, Athens! Henceforth hated be
Of Timon, man and all humanity

(III. vi. 89-90; 100-101).

Timon fails like Hamlet in the role of moral truth-teller, attempting to expose vice to itself. The friends are uncomprehending and untouched by the display, and dismiss Timon's moral spectacle as the overflow of madness. So he moves one step further in his satirical reaction. His anger and disillusionment place him outside society, and once outside the city he turns in hatred against it, praying for its destruction. By now he is attacking not just false friends or ingratitude; the attack is widening, and goes on widening. Having discovered falsehood in one part of life he assumes that falsehood must underlie every form of social life, and so he prays for the destruction of every form of society:

Lust and liberty
Creep in the minds and marrows of our youth,
That 'gainst the stream of virtue they may strive,
And drown themselves in riot! Itches, blains,
Sow all th' Athenian bosoms, and their crop
Be general leprosy! Breath infect breath,
That their society, as their friendship, may
Be merely poison! Nothing I'll bear from thee
But nakedness, thou detestable town...
The gods confound - hear me, you good gods all -
Th' Athenians both within and out that wall;
And grant, as Timon grows, his hate may grow
To the whole race of mankind, high and low!
Amen

(IV. i. 25-33; 37-41).

Like his fantasy of ideal social relations, Timon's vision of the hatefulness of mankind is intense, passionate and exclusive. His
friends' falsity hardly justifies his fury, but that is not the point. Timon's satirical speeches have scant justification, and they come to stand as expressions of an analytical, destructive imagination that is purely and entirely satirical. Timon epitomises the Renaissance satirical vision.

By the harshest of ironies, Timon finds gold as he is digging for roots. This development is another example of the play's non-realistic mode. It almost seems like part of a controlled dramatic experiment. In any case, it provides an opportunity for Timon to philosophise with cold anger on the paradox of gold: that it is simultaneously inert and omnipotent:

O blessed breeding sun, draw from the earth
Rotten humidity; below thy sister's orb
Infect the air...
Gold? Yellow, glittering, precious gold?
No, gods, I am no idle votarist.
Roots, you clear heavens! Thus much of this will make
Black, white; foul, fair; wrong, right;
Base, noble; old, young; coward, valiant...
This yellow slave
Will knit and break religions, bless th' accurs'd,
Make the hoar leprosy ador'd, place thieves,
And give them title, knee and approbation
With senators on the bench

(IV. iii. 1-3; 26-30; 34-38).

This speech does not simply rail against the power of money but presents an exact and profound analysis of it as a source of corruption. Timon's vision expands to a scrutiny of nature itself which he also sees as totally corrupt:

The sun's a thief, and with his great attraction
Robbs the vast sea; the moon's an arrant thief,

 Cf. K. Muir, "Timon of Athens and the Cash-Nexus", *Modern Quarterly Miscellany*, 1, 1946, 57-76, who discusses this speech and (IV. iii. 384-95) as "an appropriate criticism of a society which is dominated by the acquisitive principle", p. 68.
And her pale fire she snatches from the sun;
The sea's a thief, whose liquid surge resolves
The moon into salt tears; the earth's a thief,
That feeds and breeds by a composture stol'n
From gen'r al excrement; each thing's a thief...
Love not yourselves; away,
Rob one another

(IV. iii. 439-45; 447-48).

Like Hamlet, Timon sees the universe as an expanded version of the wrongs he has suffered personally. M. C. Bradbrook comments, "As in Part I, the flesh he had nourished turned against him, so now the sun, moon, sea, earth live by mutual theft. This is a vision of total depravity." The world is remade in his imagination not as it is but as he sees it through the new-found truth that men may be treacherous. The subject of his satire passes well beyond friends' ingratitude, while still reflecting the ugly truth he discovered in that relationship, proceeding from questioning human relationships in society, to questioning the basis of human values, to the nature of the universe itself.

The audience, however, does not give its assent and approval to Timon's vision of a destructive, predatory universe. His nihilistic vision is an illusion just as his fantasy of fellowship was at the start; and both proceed from Timon's passionate, extreme nature. The critic is himself criticised. In As You Like It, Jaques's speech of the seven ages of man which is materialistic, reductive, and pessimistic, is implicitly criticised by Orlando's kindness in supporting old Adam. Timon's idea of total human depravity is similarly criticised by the arrival in his exile of Flavius, whom Timon at first fails to recognise:

I never had an honest man about me, I; all
I kept were knaves, to serve in meat to villains

(IV. iii. 481-82).

This is clearly not so, and Timon reluctantly has to concede that
there is indeed an exception to his universal condemnation of
mankind:

Forgive my general and exceptless rashness,
You perpetual-sober gods! I do proclaim
One honest man. Mistake me not, but one.
No more, I pray - and he's a steward

(IV. iii. 499-502).

He is careful to get the arithmetic and the class distinction
exactly right, and the implication is that Flavius hardly counts.
Timon begins to look ridiculous in his attempt to have it both
ways, "But all, save thee,/I fell with curses" (IV. iii. 504-05),
and he only wishes Flavius well on condition that he live and act like
Timon:

Go, live rich and happy,
But thus condition'd: thou shalt build from men;
Hate all, curse all, show charity to none,
But let the famish'd flesh slide from the bone
Ere thou relieve the beggar

(IV. iii. 529-33).

Flavius is the one character in the play who gives love and loyalty
freely, and with no wish for recompense. In this respect he
corresponds to Maria in The Malcontent whose example turns Malevole
away from acting unthinkingly as a satirist, and provides him with
another model response to experience. Flavius also corresponds to
Cordelia in King Lear whose existence in that play makes real at
least the possibility of grace which may redeem the cruel, torturing
bleak world. Malevole's satirical vision, and Lear's, which at
many points is like Timon's, are transformed by recognition and pity
for others. No such recognition or pity occurs in Timon, and this
marks one of the boundaries between tragicomic and tragic drama on
the one hand, and satirical drama on the other. Timon is not turned aside from satire by Flavius' loyalty; he continues to believe in humanity's general depravity. The discrimination which as a satirist Timon claims operates only with evil and ugliness not good, and this increases the audience's criticism of him.

The confrontation of Apemantus and Timon in the woods outside Athens has little purpose in terms of plot or character, but as part of the play's investigation into satirical experience, it is of the utmost importance, representing as it does the clash of two distinct and opposed versions of the satirical outlook.

Apemantus visits Timon to pursue his exposure of him. 22 The scene presents two satirists of opposed types each struggling to prove the superiority of his point of view; on the one hand Apemantus the cynic, on the other Timon the misanthrope. Apemantus is convinced that his cynicism is superior to Timon's passion, and he accuses Timon of reacting pathologically:

This is in thee a nature but infected,
A poor unmanly melancholy sprung
From change of future

(IV. iii. 204-06).

Apemantus is angry that Timon appears to be copying him in rejecting mankind, ("Do not assume my likeness"; IV. iii. 219). Apemantus objects because Timon's disillusion with life, unlike Apemantus's, was caused by his own stupidity. The implied contrast is that Apemantus has derived his cynicism from rational and disinterested observation of mankind. He derides Timon's misanthropy

and implies that Timon is as alienated from the harshness of nature as he once was from the flatterers:

Thou hast cast away thyself, being like thyself
A madman so long, now a fool. What, think'st
That the bleak air, thy boisterous chamberlain,
Will put thy shirt on warm?...
Call the creatures
Whose naked natures live in all the spite
Of wreakful heaven, whose bare unhoused trunks,
To the conflicting elements expos'd,
Answer mere nature; bid them flatter thee

(IV. iii. 222-25; 229-33).

There are similarities here with themes in *King Lear*, but Lear experiences what it is to be a naked nature exposed to the conflicting elements, and through the experience enlarges his humanity; Apemantus merely accepts the miserable condition of man and nature as an excuse for remaining perpetually outside experience. According to his view, Timon's present hatred of mankind is as misguided as his former love because both fail to accept the actual miserable condition of life; Timon is railing at mankind because he suffered a reversal of fortune, but really he has not changed:

*Apem[antus]. Thou'dst courtier be again
Wert thou not beggar

(IV. iii. 243-44).

Apemantus tells Timon where he thinks he has gone wrong - "The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but the extremity of both ends" (IV. iii. 301-02) - and goes on to recommend his own formula, a passive acceptance of man's miserable condition:

Willing misery
Outlives uncertain pomp, is crown'd before;
The one is filling still, never complete,
The other, at high wish

(IV. iii. 244-47).

Timon's aspirations to greatness in both fortune and misfortune are the signs of his folly; according to Apemantus he would be much wiser if, like Apemantus, he were satisfied with nothing.
In Apemantus' attitude to Timon, H. J. Oliver detects "something of the contempt of the professional for the amateur", and certainly Timon refuses to accept advice in philosophical resignation from one he considers mean-spirited, bitter and socially inferior. He asserts the validity of his transformation into *Misanthropos*, and counter-attacks:

Thou art a slave, whom Fortune's tender arm
With favour never clasp'd, but bred a dog.
Hadst thou like us from our first swath proceeded
The sweet degrees that this brief world affords
To such as may the passive drugs of it
Freely command, thou wouldst have plung'd thyself
In general riot, melted down thy youth
In different beds of lust

(IV. iii. 252-59).

This is the same charge by which Duke Senior attempts to undermine Jaques's satire. Timon's main point is that his sensibility is more tender, therefore his abandonment by his friends was felt as all the more terrible:

I, to bear this,
That never knew but better, is some burthen

(IV. iii. 268-69).

And so, he claims he has more justification for his satire than Apemantus who has never suffered such a loss, and in any case is hardened to misfortune:

Thy nature did commence in sufferance, time
Hath made thee hard in't

(IV. iii. 270-71).

The essence of Timon's attack on Apemantus is in the lines,

Why shouldst thou hate men?
They never flatter'd thee. What hast thou given?
If thou wilt curse, thy father (that poor rag)
Must be thy subject, who in spite put stuff
To some she-beggar and compounded thee
Poor rogue hereditary

(IV. iii. 271-76),

and the essence of Apemantus' in,

The middle of humanity thou never knewest, but
the extremity of both ends

(IV. iii. 301-02).

The confrontation of two opposed satirical world-views shows up
the strengths and weaknesses of each: Timon's misanthropy is
passionate because his nature is so, but it results from an experience
of human wickedness created by his own folly. He is totally
immersed in his hatred and though it is passionate and magnificent
at times it does not present the whole of man's nature as he claims.
Apemantus, on the other hand, has a consistent view of mankind,
but it is narrow and reductive and denies the possibility of
value in anything. It too is partial and incomplete.

The debate reaches an impasse and degenerates into an
exchange of insults and stones which encourages the audience to feel
detached and scornful of both:

Timon. Away, thou tedious rogue, I am sorry I shall lose
a stone by thee. [Throwing a stone at him.

Apemantus. Beast!

Timon. Slave!

Apemantus. Toad!

Timon. Rogue, rogue, rogue! (IV. iii. 371-77).

There is no conclusion to their wrangle. Neither viewpoint is
finally supported by the play.

One very important reason for calling this play dramatic
satire is that in the figure of Timon we are presented with the
embodiment of a satiric reaction to life - savage indignation at the wickedness and hypocrisy of mankind. The criticising functions that satire performs are secondary to Timon's experience of satiric anger and malevolence. Untouched by any other feeling he proceeds with impeccable logic to act out the inevitable consequences of his declared position. Timon assumed relatedness with his friends when there was none; in the woods he projects a vision of unrelatedness into the universe after his friends have failed him, and absolutely refuses to establish relationships with those he might, the Steward or Alcibiades. His only wish, often repeated, is for universal destruction. And with great consistency he includes himself among those who should be destroyed:

...all's obliquy;
There's nothing level in our cursed natures
But direct villainy. Therefore be abhor'd
All feasts, societies, and throngs of men!
His semblable, yea, himself, Timon disdains.
Destruction fang mankind

(IV. iii. 18-23).

The structure of Acts Four and Five is determined (except for the Alcibiades scenes) by Timon's hatred of all things and his refusal to relate to anyone. Wave after wave of visitors is given gold and sent off to destroy itself. There is no plot progression, and the Timon plot comes to an end with Timon's death. The structure of the last two acts, which is a series of short scenes of similar action is determined by the subject, Timon's misanthropy. Its sudden anticlimactic end is Timon's death. In the last two acts, then, the form is a function of the subject.

For himself Timon longs for oblivion:

My long sickness
Of health and living now begins to mend,
And nothing brings me all things

(V. i. 185-87).
But in fact the final image that Timon leaves is not of total negation or extinction. Even though in his last speech he calls for the extinction of language, and graves to be mens' only work, he has deliberately arranged for his tomb to be built "Upon the beached verge of the salt flood", (V.i.215), and the gravestone of it to be an oracle to those still living. This last action prevents total extinction for Timon. He will relate to posterity by means of the artifact of the tomb, leaving it behind as an emblem signifying a moral and didactic lesson; the tomb and epitaph a symbol of his intense, monotonous suffering and anger and hate, and a reminder of it. If Timon achieves any transcendence which lifts him out of the realm of satire and marks him as a tragic protagonist, then it is through the true art of the tomb. The play may hover on the boundaries of satire and tragedy but it comes down finally on the side of satire.

Summary

In Shakespeare's plays after Troilus and Cressida there are two identifiable satirist figures, the Duke and Timon, and several other characters whose dramatic functions relate them to satirist figures. Shakespeare in all his plays is consistently sceptical of the satirist and his activities in two specific aspects: in the effect a satirist has, and in the nature of the satirist. Firstly, Shakespeare never presents a moral reformation brought about by railing or explicit satirical action. In the three sub-plots dramatising explicit satirical exposures, in Henry V, Twelfth Night and All's Well That Ends Well, the fools are not reformed, and even continue more foolish than before.
In *Measure for Measure* the central problem of satire, moral reformation, is treated in another way. The strategy adopted by the Duke is education through experience. However, the Duke has to employ short-term manipulations of such inhumanity that doubt is cast upon the entire enterprise, and he is exposed to the audience's criticism. After *Measure for Measure*, moral reformation in the plays is only one part of the much larger structures in which apparently miraculous transformations are brought about by much suffering and patience over a long period of time. This process, the result of no conscious human agency, may achieve what the conscious, explicit efforts of the satirist usually fail to achieve.

The other aspect of Shakespeare's criticism is of the satirist himself, his motives, emotions, and the consequences of his situation. Shakespeare's commentators and satirists are always implicitly or explicitly criticised as limited or partial, but in the later plays a more radical criticism is implied. *Coriolanus* is, at least partially, a satirist, and his experience follows a satirical pattern of initial moral idealism followed by disillusionment and bitterness. The play implicitly criticises him by showing that the intensity of his moral absolutism entails a certain inhumanity. Exploration of the satirical vision along these lines is continued in *Timon of Athens*.

*Timon* represents Shakespeare's exposé of satire and the satirist. The criticism is implicit in the action: firstly, the disaster in Timon's fortunes is the direct result of his own folly; secondly, his railing against Athens and its corruption is as extreme and futile as was his celebration of his community of relatedness; thirdly, his satirising degenerates his capacity for
real human relatedness, shown when he fails to respond to Flavius; fourthly, the negativism of his position drives him inevitably towards death and extermination. For these reasons, Timon is discredited and satirised by Shakespeare himself. *Timon of Athens* embodies many features of dramatic satire, and these operate to induce a satirical reaction in the audience, which is detached, critical, and amused. In *Timon*, Shakespeare depicts the passionate satirist figure as embodying emotions and thoughts which are radically anti-social and anti-life. Timon's reactions are not the result, as he claims, of the rational inferences of experience, but of a passionate, and almost tragic, satirical vision, which is distinct, limited, intense, and ultimately destructive and self-destructive. Shakespeare, like Jonson, finally rejects the satirist.

All three dramatists studied here employ the satirist figure in many forms and variations, as the protagonist in satirical actions, or as commentators on the action, or as the focus of feelings and attitudes associated with him. The satirist is an enormously adaptable figure, and his characteristics flow easily into other characters not specifically satirists. But certain plays of all three dramatists, particularly the "comicall satyres" of Jonson, and Marston's so-called burlesque plays, show that it is not possible to present a convincing dramatic depiction of the fiction of the satirist, especially his claims for his right to satirise, and the efficacy of that satirising. The central contradiction is that the methods the satirist has to employ to attack vice or folly disprove his own claim that he is well above what he attacks. The fiction of the satirist in all its aspects is not sustainable in drama. Where the dramatist does want
to present not the actions of a satirist but the vision of the satirist, it is effected by reducing the satirist's prominence in the play, and by making the fiction of the satirist part of a larger fiction controlled by the author, and employing the structural and other stylistic resources of drama to produce in the audience emotions and attitudes akin to the satirist's. One of the conclusions to emerge from this study, then, is that the satirist's vision is only translatable into drama if the satirist, from whom it first comes, is diminished or even rendered invisible, and made part of a larger fiction.

In the later plays of each dramatist there are characters who derive from satirists but whose functions are only one of those claimed by the satirist. Marston, for example, is concerned to depict possible ways of achieving moral reformation, and so he stresses the satirist as manipulator, and attributes to him a generous, virtuous nature, quite unlike the angry satirist's, to enable him to achieve his reformation. Both Shakespeare and Jonson make specific rejections of the satirist figure, in *Timon* and *Bartholomew Fair*, based on analyses of the satirist's position and nature. One contrast between their final treatments of the satirist is that Jonson solves the troublesome implications of the fiction of the satirist by resolving it into theatrical terms, whereas Shakespeare treats it in *Timon* directly in moral terms.
Although it proved extremely difficult to translate into drama those parts of the fiction of the satirist figure which aimed at punishment and reformation, and although in the end the satirist proved to be a fairly short-lived dramatic type, nevertheless the appearance of such a figure in drama brought with it certain valuable effects. The problems raised by the satirist were one of the forces at work which went towards the creation of plays, called here dramatic satires, which presented a coherent, powerful satirical vision. But perhaps the more important effect of the vigorous experimentation with and exploitation of satirist figures during these years was the escape they allowed from the styles and attitudes of complaint, particularly a means of escaping from the moral rigidity of complaint to the moral expediency of satire, and, in terms of the speaker, from the sincerity of complaint to the insincerity and role-playing of satire. The main instrument of this transformation was the satirist in verse and drama. The satirist figure was useful to dramatists as the means of giving expression to certain feelings, attitudes, and ways of seeing, and it is, finally, as the vehicle of a new sensibility that the significance of the satirist figure lies.
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