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Introduction

Ben Jonson's famous dispute with Marston and Dekker fell just at the end of Elizabeth's reign and aroused animosities which found expression in a number of closely related, satirical plays. It was no uncommon thing for a dramatist in those rich years to make his contemporaries objects of ridicule; but until the formidable Jonson took umbrage stage warfare had not been waged on so large a scale. Fleay perhaps exaggerates when he says that any criticism of any play produced 1599 to 1601 is of no utility unless it takes the quarrel into account, but he has a point. As a significant incident in the development of two important dramatists (for the third, Dekker, seems to have escaped effect) the Stage Quarrel justifies whatever scholarly effort has been spent on it; but aside from this, it has a strong independent interest to the student of Elizabethan attitudes. The plays involved reflect the general satiric spirit at work in the times; and what we can judge of their reception deepens our insight into the theatre-goer of the day. Thus, an investigation of this curious poet's war ought, happily, to reward the investigator and such readers as he might find, with a clearer understanding of the historical context, and a subtler appreciation of the central personalities.
Before I outline the tack this study will take, I should like to make a swift and general summarization of the events I shall be discussing. I can best begin by fixing the terminal dates, and then proceed to a broad resume of the conflict and a brief evaluation of the major pieces of Quarrel scholarship. Then my own intentions can easily be made clear.

For the moment, at least, the dating need not be rigid. The Quarrel proper may have been of a relatively short duration (in my opinion less than three years) and may have directly involved only three or four plays; but in the interest of thoroughness, considerably more area must be examined. Jonson's early play *The Case Is Altered* was performed between September of 1598 and January of 1599, and as this play in its present form contains an unmistakable attack on the playwright Antony Munday, some discussion of it will be necessary. Its chief relevance is the light it throws on Jonson's testy frame of mind. Curiously enough, another important document with a similar relevance appeared at about this same time. *The Scourge of Villanie*, a verse satire by John Marston, was entered on the Stationers' Register for September 8th, 1598. For years more imaginative scholars saw Jonson in the *Scourge*, but the identification can no longer be entertained. However, the satire itself was made an object of satire in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, and a fuller discussion of it will be reserved for the chapter on its author.
About a week after *The Scourge of Villanie* was entered, *Every Man In His Humour* had its premier at the Curtain.\(^4\) Jonson enjoyed his first notable success, but the celebration was short-lived. On the 22nd of September he had his regrettable run-in with Gabriel Spencer; the affair cost Spencer his life and Jonson a month's imprisonment.\(^5\)

The following summer Jonson finished *Every Man Out of His Humour*, the play which marked the beginning of his long coolness with the Chamberlain's Men. In the fall and winter of the same year, Marston completed three plays for the Paul's Boys.\(^6\) The plays were *Histriomastix, Antonio* and *Mellida*, and *Antonio's Revenge*, produced in that order.\(^7\)

Then in June of the following year (1600) Marston produced a fourth play, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*. Jonson, at this time, was trying to get *Every Man Out of His Humour* into print; and having no luck. His next play, *Cynthia's Revels*, was not played until December,\(^8\) though that was soon enough. By Christmas of 1600 the Theatre War was on in earnest. By this time Jonson and Marston had each produced four plays, and it is obvious even on cursory reading that the plays are primarily satiric. Allusion after allusion seems earmarked for some contemporary; but unfortunately for the scholar time has rendered ambiguous what may once have been clear. If we listen only to tone, it is impossible not to feel that a great many of the witty, depreciating remarks in these plays were meant to scorch something more specific than the follies of the times.
But if, on the other hand, we remain empirical and objective and accept as fact only the verifiable readings, it is as impossible to prove the remarks specific as it formerly was to trust their generality. This is true even of *Cynthia's Revels*. Anaides and Hedon are pitilessly caricatured, but when it becomes a question of quoting chapter and verse to make one of them unmistakably Marston and the other Dekker, the process breaks down. In Marston's fifth play, *What you Will*, performed in the spring of 1601, there is a perfect illustration of the problem. Professor Small quotes passage after passage identifying Jonson with Lampatho Doria; in his mind, at least, there is no doubt. Yet years later G. B. Harrison, in his *Elizabethan Plays and Players*, quotes the same passages to prove a different identification. Professor Small's contemporary, Professor Penniman, had seen in these same lines proof that Jonson was Quadratus and Lampatho Doria none other than Marston himself. At times the problem of identification seems omnipresent, but fortunately there are at least two plays to be considered in which the identifications are unmistakable, and the opinions regarding them all but unanimous.

*The Poetaster*, Jonson's one admitted contribution to the Quarrel, was performed early in the summer of 1601. In his conversations with Drummond Jonson says plainly that he wrote this play on Marston, and we have no valid reason for doubting the authenticity of his statement. Crispinus, Demetrius, and Horace are virtually the only characters in the literature of the conflict whose iden-
titles need not be laboriously established or disproved. Since Dekker laid hands on all three and used them in the satiric portions of Satiromastix, that play is equally pleasing to work with. It was performed in the autumn of 1601, and marks the end of actual combat between the two dramatists.

The crucial year was 1601. In the spring Marston made his final contribution, and the two climactic plays followed in the summer and fall. Chester's Love's Martyr appeared shortly after Satiromastix and contained poems by both Marston and Jonson; then at Christmas time the second Return From Parnassus was performed at Cambridge. This play drew Shakespeare's name inextricably into the Quarrel, though by the time it was performed the two main participants were probably in the process of forgetting how the whole thing started. Three years later Marston lauded Jonson in his grandiloquent dedication to The Malcontent; however, though they never again projected their disagreements dramatically, we can be fairly certain the friendship was short lived. If we except some ambiguous remarks by Dekker, Jonson's conversations with Drummond stand as the last references made to the Quarrel by a participant.

Now I should examine some of the problems which will be germane to my whole discussion. To begin with, there are the many questions concerning dates. In my brief summary I dated without discussion, but in actuality the dating is not so cut and dried. That the dates of initial
performances are of great importance should be obvious, though for decades this fact was overlooked. Of all the scholars who have worked on the Stage Quarrel, only Small and Van Keuren attempt elaborate dating. Small's work, on the whole, was very good. In a few instances exact dating is impossible, but most of Small's conjectures stand; and many of them have been reinforced by Sir E. K. Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage*. U. M. Ellis-Fermor was perhaps the first to point out that one major problem is the chronological order of the plays after *Every Man Out of His Humour*. ¹¹ We cannot even say absolutely that *Poetaster* follows *What You Will*, and obviously it is dangerous to maintain that Jonson's play is a reply to Marston's, unless Marston's was the first to be performed.

Happily this problem is not insurmountable. Scholars have been at work these centuries, and so thoroughly that by now almost every date has been attended to by someone. The arguments for dating, however, are often long and tedious; and what is more important, they often have no close relevance to my subject. Consequently, I will accept what seems to me the most accurate date in each case, and in order to spare the reader innumerable pages of straight stage history, ordinarily will not trace the dating arguments through. Some of the questionable dates, that of *Troilus and Cressida* for example, are so acutely pertinent that a thorough investigation will have to be made. For the most part, however, I will rely upon my authorities and include whatever discussion seems necessary in the notes.
The problem of identifications is more pervasive than the problem of dates; indeed, identification is the most pernicious aspect of the whole subject. The War of the Theatres might well have become a dead issue three centuries ago had it not been for the tantalizing nature of the dramatic characterizations; and it is precisely because of its numerous ambiguities that the War remains something of a no-man's land for the scholar. The longer one pores over these curious plays, and the equally curious scholarship devoted to them, the less one is apt to be satisfied with previous interpretations. Even the most excellent of these, Professor Small's, leaves much to be desired. Scholarship has acquitted itself well with the external evidence; we may be confident that few more facts will be added to the already substantial corpus. But the internal matters, in this case, are more important, and the internals of the Theatre War seem to encourage almost endless re-evaluation.

The dates can be quickly set down, but the identifications must be handled directly and thoroughly. Identifications will bear most directly on my thesis; and if an opinion seems to have even an elementary foundation in judgement and sound scholarship it will be reported and fully considered. However, I do not pledge myself to discuss every identification that, in the course of three centuries, has been offered as proven fact. When a scholar claims, as one 19th century writer did, that Iago was surely
Ben Jonson (though disdaining to produce the least scrap of textual evidence in support of his delirium) I feel justified in passing lightly over his arguments.

The scholarship on the Quarrel is so varied in quality that I might comment on it briefly before stating my aims and purposes. In many instances the scholarship is every bit as "literary" as the pieces considered; and in several cases it is considerably more fascinating. Charm is everywhere apparent in the amusing and whimsical work of scholars of the last century; around the turn of the century Theatre War scholarship lost some of its grace, but the loss was balanced by portentous gains in accuracy.

The beginnings of Quarrel scholarship belong to the 18th century, at which time the investigation extended only to Jonson's supposed enmity toward Shakespeare. Rowe's edition of Shakespeare appeared in 1709, and he ended by exonerating Jonson. But when Malone and Chalmers took up the question toward the end of the century, Jonson did not fare so well. Their charges, though often laughably inaccurate, enraged a contemporary Jonson-lover and drew from him what is to my mind the most truly delightful of all the papers on the Shakespeare-Jonson feud. I refer to An Examination of the Charges Maintained by Messrs. Malone, Chalmers, and Others, of Ben Jonson's Enmity, &c. towards Shakespeare, published by Octavius Gilchrist in 1808. Mr. Gilchrist ended by finding Jonson as innocent as his previous detractors had found him guilty, and I
really believe he had the best of the argument.

In the course of this critical fray, Jonson’s attacks on Marston and Dekker were brought forth as proof of his malice toward Shakespeare. Gilchrist, for all his charm, was not really interested in the details of the affair; so Jonson was generally held to be a living Iago until his most famous 19th century editor took charge of his defense. The editor, William Gifford, published his edition of Jonson’s works in 1816. He was openly furious with everyone who had said a word that might blacken Jonson’s character, and he prepared to set the world right. In attempting to vindicate Jonson, Gifford wrote the first really valuable study of the Stage War; but his case was damaged severely by his ferocity of tone. He white-washed Jonson so ridiculously that today the bulk of his discussion is unacceptable. Since most of what was valuable about Gifford’s study has long since been incorporated into the work of more temperate scholars, I will seldom need to refer to his edition directly. He marked the beginning of a renewed interest in all the circumstances of the conflict, and many of the points we now take for granted were first argued in his pages; but fuller and more accurate accounts soon superseded him.

Gifford’s work was the best of his time, and his opinions were not seriously questioned until Frederick Gard Fleay swept into the field in the 1880s. His *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, and the two volume
Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama which followed it, were immensely important books. Even today they are of absorbing interest. Professor Small, writing of the Biographical Chronicle, has provided a balanced evaluation of Fleay's contribution.

His Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama is a truly monumental work, because it forms a storehouse of information about men and the drama from 1559 to 1642 which is nowhere else equalled, and because Fleay possesses an astonishingly acute mind and has read an enormous amount of Elizabethan literature. Nevertheless, a careful student of any definite question in Elizabethan drama will inevitably find himself compelled to start practically anew; for Fleay's book, capitally important as it is, is both confusing and untrustworthy. Small is right when he calls Fleay untrustworthy, but he is not particularly explicit. Fleay was possessed of enormous energy, and it sometimes damaged his accuracy. If he had applied himself strictly to the Stage War he might have unravelled the tangled strands once and for all, for his knowledge of Elizabethan literature was certainly vast. Indeed, it was almost too vast to be manageable. The Stage War was only a minor interest which he commented on when he saw the opportunity. He continually makes intricate associations, and leaves his pages full of unresolved detail; but he was ambitious enough to want to encompass the period, and so cannot be blamed for refusing to linger on one question. Unfortunately his reasoning was often as hurried as his prose; and like many of his 19th century colleagues he was more apt to settle questions by assertion rather than reasoned argument.
But as Small said, he is a rich store-house of information for the student who will use him carefully.

Fleay's loose method and notably Victorian style stand in sharp contrast to the work of the two young scholars who turned their attention to the Theatre War in the late 1890s. The monographs of Josiah Penniman and Roscoe Addison Small are economically written, narrowly limited in scope, and as accurate as the authors knew how to make them; the emphasis has suddenly shifted from comprehensiveness to pertinency, from the broad survey to the minute empirical analysis.

Penniman's monograph, *The War of the Theatres*, was published by the University of Pennsylvania in 1897. When it appeared it was by far the best thing ever written on the subject, but it was not to hold this eminence for long. The one enduring virtue of Professor Penniman's study is its clarity; he manages to be readable, even graceful, and yet not shallow. But like Fleay (whose opinion he too often takes as fact), he is not always trustworthy. He seems to have written too hastily, without sifting his material sufficiently. His work contains too many obvious inconsistencies which should have sorted themselves out in preparation. He plays fast and loose with chronology, and to make matters worse, organized the study chronologically. When his chronology breaks down, his organization cannot hold. At the same time, I feel he was over-generous with the work of his delirious predecessors. It really seems wasteful
to spend page after page refuting Cartwright's genteel arguments about Shakespeare and King William. As an introduction to the conflict and the questions it raises, Professor Penniman's work is clear and useful, but in the final analysis he provides very few answers.

In 1899 a far better scholar than Penniman made his appearance. The most lamentable aspect of Roscoe Small's invaluable study was the fact that it had to be published posthumously. Had Professor Small lived to continue his investigations there might be no need to make this present study. He was an extremely acute scholar, and the War of the Theatres was his province.

To my knowledge, the most concise evaluation of Professor Small's importance appeared in the *Athenaeum* a few months after his monograph appeared. It read simply: "No doughtier combatant has been seen."¹⁴ Fifty years have passed and a doughtier has still to come in sight. Small's knowledge of Elizabethan literature was perhaps less full than Fleay's, but his capacity for analysis and concentration exceeded the latter's by several powers at least. He organized his work well and sustained his organization by remarkably accurate scholarship. His masterful presentation of the external evidence is particularly valuable; and it is to his painstaking study of the chronology that we owe most of our knowledge about the dates. The evidence had been available for some time, but Small was really the first able interpreter.
Only three defects mar the excellence of Professor Small's effort, and his defects are perhaps as characteristic as his virtues. Stylistically his work is somewhat too tight and labored. There is no doubting the pertinency of the material he presents, but the presentation itself is not always perfectly lucid. Perhaps this flaw is trivial, but he has another, more serious imbalance. Like Penniman and all their 19th century forebears he has an almost obsessive need to establish specific identifications. Small is better about this than most, but even he is too often convinced by general similarities rather than proven facts. Once convinced, he is immovable; and his third error, in my opinion, is attributable to this rigidity of conviction. I refer to his conclusion about Shakespeare's part in the Quarrel. He became convinced that Shakespeare intended Ajax in *Troilus and Cressida* as a direct representation of Jonson; and he devoted thirty-eight of his two hundred and five pages to supporting his conviction. In this one instance I think his surety clouded his judgment. His conclusion, as several scholars have shown, was again based on nothing more substantial than a general resemblance. But these three deficiencies aside, Small is a model of judgment and thoroughness. If I refer to him constantly in these pages, it is because he alone, of all the scholars reviewed, is irreplaceable.

My survey can be quickly concluded. Professor Penniman
had the opportunity to supersede himself in 1913, when he edited *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix* for the "Belles-Lettres" series; but unfortunately he failed to make the most of a valuable second chance. If he had integrated Professor Small's findings with his own previous studies, he might have produced something definitive. Instead, he chose to stand stubbornly behind his own opinions, and the result is an introduction whose inaccuracies are almost identical with those of his monograph.

Since 1913 there has been only one full length discussion of the Quarrel, that of E. C. Van Keuren. His study was submitted as a doctoral thesis at Cornell in 1931. Some of his work is very good, but he has two serious flaws. In the first place, he wastes time going over dates and arguments that Small had already settled; and in the second, he too goes far astray on the Shakespeare question. In addition, he tries to be unnecessarily comprehensive, and wastes more time dating documents such as Jonson's *Sejanus* or Dekker's *Raven's Almanack* which have only the most nominal relation to the Quarrel. On the whole he is nowhere near as accurate as Small, but he does correct a few of Small's mistakes. If I refer to him infrequently, it is because too much of his time is spent going over well-plowed ground.

Van Keuren's thesis was the last long study, but a number of valuable articles are strewn through the scholarly periodicals of the last half-century. The most important of these, in my judgment, is Professor J. S. P. Tatlock's
essay on "The Sèige of Troy In Shakespeare and Heywood."
This article virtually closed the Shakespeare question; at least it kept it closed from 1915 until 1931, when Van Keuren reopened it.

Any review of Theatre War scholarship reveals two important areas of disagreement. Scholars have never satisfactorily settled the matter of duration, or the matter of identification. When did the participants really begin to quarrel, and when were they merely jesting? Did Jonson begin his attack with Every Man In His Humour, with Cynthia's Revels, or with Poetaster? Disagreement on this point has been pervasive because the identifications upon which a valid answer must be based have been so indefinite and so vaguely supported. Scholars have been too slow to admit that chance allusion or a general resemblance do not necessarily prove that the playwright cast a whole character as an exact representation of a living enemy. More often, I suspect, it was the other way around. An author may see where one of his characters, created without reference to any living person, might, for a passage or a scene, be made to remind the audience of a contemporary. If the allusion pleases the audience, the play will be that much more apt to succeed. To suppose that every dramatic allusion implies a specific satiric intention on the part of the author is to radically misrepresent the creative process.

In this study I propose to show that the majority of
the disputed Stage Quarrel identifications are founded upon allusion only, and cannot be made to support the great satiric weights that scholars have laid upon them. I also propose to show that the War of the Theatres directly involves only four plays, instead of the ten or twelve commonly connected with it. My discussion, then, will be largely negative. I intend to examine all of the plays in question, and to show that their relation to the Quarrel is more casual than has previously been supposed. Finally, I intend to review thoroughly the question of Shakespeare's enmity toward Jonson, in order to show that such disagreements as the two men may have had resulted in no identifiable dramatic representation. To accomplish these ends I shall waive Professor Penniman's chronological organization and devote a chapter to each of the dramatists, taking Marston first, and proceeding to Jonson, Dekker, and Shakespeare in that order. The results of my investigation will be drawn together and summarized in a short conclusion.
John Marston's life is now fairly well documented. For many years his birthplace was in question, but Dr. R. E. Brettle cleared the matter up in 1927; we can now be assured that Marston was born in Oxfordshire, during the month of September, 1576. His mother was the daughter of Andrew Quarsi, an Italian surgeon; his father, a sometime lecturer of the Middle Temple. Young Marston matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford on the 4th of February, 1591/2, and was graduated B. A. three years and two days later. He was admitted as a student of the Middle Temple in 1592, and lived there off and on until 1606. In 1607 he gave up the drama and became a divine; by 1616 he acquired the living of Christchurch, Hampshire, a position he held until 1631. Two years later, in the dedication to the first collected edition of his plays, he was said to be "in his autumn and declining age;" and on the 25th of June, 1634, he died in Aldermanbury parish. At the beginning of his literary career he wrote these strange lines, scorning immortality:

Let others pray
For ever their fair poems flourish may;
But as for me, hungry oblivion,
Devour me quick, accept my orison,
My earnest prayers, which do importune thee,
With gloomy shade of their still empery
To veil both me and my rude poesy.
Apparently John Marston never changed his mind, for his gravestone bears the inscription "Oblivioni Sacrum."

Marston began his literary career as a verse-satirist. His first published work was a satiric piece called The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image, entered 27 May, 1598. Though Marston later claimed the piece was a parody of poetic licentiousness, the Metamorphosis is openly imitative of Venus and Adonis; its literary merit is completely nil.

With his next work, The Scourge of Villanie, entered 8 September 1598, Marston started the first of the two literary quarrels in which he was involved. Marston apparently felt that Bishop Hall had abused him in his Virgildemiarum; at any rate, he filled the Scourge with snarling, well-nigh unintelligible attacks on Hall, licentiousness, and the human race in general. He deliberately adopted a distorted, disfigured style, and a phraseology so monstrous that his strained allusions must have baffled even his contemporaries. However, several of his fellow poets thought they saw themselves in the Scourge, and the air was soon full of equally muddy replies. Marston had signed the piece W. Kinsyder, but the pseudonym fooled no one. Almost immediately ripostes such as The Whipping of the Satire, The Whipper of the Satire, and No Whippinge, nor Tripping, but a Kinde Friendly Snippinge (this last by Nicholas Breton) appeared.

I mention these early efforts, worse than negligible in themselves, only to illustrate Marston's affinity for argument. He seemed to have no talent at all for getting
along with his companions. Unmistakable contemporary references to his character are not frequent, but the passage describing him in the Return From Parnassus can not easily be misconstrued.

What Monsieur Kynsader, lifting up your legge
And pissing against the world, put up man,
put up for shame.
Me thinks he is a ruffian in his stile,
Withouten bands or garters ornament,
He quaffes a cup of Frenchmans Helicon,
The royster doyster in his oylie tearmes,
Cuts, thrusts, and foines at whomsoever he meets,
And strewes about Ram-ally meditations.
Tut, what cares he for modest close cought tearmes,
Cleanly to gird our looser libertines.
Give him plaine naked words stript from their shirts
That might beseeme plain dealing Aretine:
I, there is one that backes a paper steed
And manageth a penknife gallantly.
Strikes his poinade at a buttons breadth,
Brings the great battering ram of tearmes to towns
And at the first volley of his cannon shot,
Batters the walles of the old fustie world.7

Marston cuts, thrusts, and foines at whomsoever he meets, and it was probably about this time that he met Jonson. Years after the War of the Theatres was literary history, Jonson added his one direct comment on their turbulent relationship. As Drummond quotes him: "he had many quarrells with Marston beat him & took his Pistol from him, wrote his Poetaster on him the beginning of ye were that Marston represented him on the stage in his youth given to Venerie."8 Professor Small is no doubt correct in placing a period after "stage;"9 thus, "in his youth given to Venerie" is another sentence, and does not mean that Marston represented Jonson as given to Venerie. The "Venerie" clause fits perfectly with the passage which
follows: "In his youth given to venerie. he(now in his
mature age) thought the use of a maide nothing in com-
parison to the wantoness of a wyfe, and would never have
any other mistress." Jonson and Marston were both young,
arrogant, aspiring writers; their ambition and their com-
mon lack of humility made them natural opponents.

The student who concerns himself with the Theatre War
is immediately confronted with the question of origin.
Who started the fight, and when? Marston, the author of
a particularly virulent satire, was for many years the scho-
lar's choice. The nature of The Scourge of Villanie led
them on; its one hundred pages were literally full of
dubious but interesting references. Jonson himself had
pointed the finger at Marston, though he specified a stage-
representation as the cause of the argument. But, it was
argued, Jonson wrote twenty years after the Quarrel ended;
he could have forgotten how it all started. Moreover, a
close examination of the Scourge revealed that the charac-
ter Torquatus was made to use three words, "reall,"
"delphic," and "intrinsecate," that appear in Jonson's
work. It was never demonstrated that Jonson was the only
Elizabethan to use these words, but the evidence, such as
it was, was enough to convince Grosart, Bullen, and Penniman
that Torquatus was Jonson. Small pronounced against this
conclusion, but it remained for H. C. Hart to finally
disprove the identification. He showed that the Torquatus
references were aimed at Gabriel Harvey; in his 1913 edition
Penniman accepted his correction, and it has not been questioned since. Consequently, it is impossible to regard *The Scourge of Villanie*, or any other Marston satire, as the real cause of the Quarrel. Small and Van Keuren were surely close to the mark when they maintained that artistic jealousy and professional rivalry were the causes of the Quarrel; but we must look further than the satires of Marston for its beginnings.

Perhaps Jonson was correct when he mentioned a stage-representation as the cause of the War; but if there is such a representation it is by no means easy to find. The first play to bear clear evidence of Marston's hand was a weak, half-allegorical comedy called *Histriomastix*, published by Thomas Thorpe in 1610. Small and Penniman agree that the play we have is a Marstonian revision of a somewhat earlier production; but I am concerned only with those portions of the play which are pertinent to my topic, and those portions, it has long been agreed, are without exception the work of Marston. Fortunately, the arguments over a divided authorship need not detain us here.

Small shows, by pin-pointing a reference to the expected Spanish invasion, that the play must have been performed in August of 1599. By September 4th the danger had passed; there is little chance that the play was premiered after that date. Small and Penniman both conclude that *Histriomastix* contains the offending representation, but I cannot agree. They see two identifications in the play:
Posthaste as Antony Munday, and Chrisoganus as Jonson.

The proofs for these identifications are pitifully thin. Professor Penniman, in his introduction to *Poetaster*, openly admits their ambiguity:

The reasons for the identification of Posthaste with Monday, and Chrisaganus with Jonson, are not absolutely conclusive because there are in *Histriomastix* no allusions in connection with either character which might not be true of some one else besides Jonson or Monday, but, taken all together, they justify us in making these identifications.

I do not believe such optimism can be sustained. Even so doughty a combatant as Professor Small allowed himself to be convinced, in Munday's case, by nothing more solid than a second-hand resemblance. He notes the similarities between Jonson's Antonio Balladino (*The Case is Altered*) and Marston's Posthaste, points out that both, like Munday, were dramatists, politicians, and ballad-writers, and thus is forced to his conclusion. Penniman questions Small's decision only in the passage quoted above. However, it should be pointed out that Munday was not the only dramatist, politician, or ballad writer alive in that time; and even if he had been, I distrust the validity of so complete an identification drawn from parallels between two created characters. Thus I suspect Small's conclusion as I suspect the route that brought him to it.

Turning from Small to Marston's Posthaste, I find even less to go on. The characterization of Posthaste is perhaps the vaguest in a play notable only for its vague
characterizations. *Histriomastix*, as Sharpe pointed out, is primarily a satire against the adult actors companies, and it was performed by Paul's Boys, a children's group. Posthaste is a playwright for Sir Oliver Owlet's company. He appears early in the first act, maintaining vigorously that he is a poet. After the first act, he appears but three times, and each time briefly. Clout refers to him once as "goosequillian Posthaste," and implies that he is prolific. The only passage in the play which lends any support to the Munday identification is the argument between Belch, Glush, Gutt, and Clout, in Act IV.

Bel. In my booke for Slow-pace, twelve pence on's pate, for staying so late.
Gut. Prologue begin; rehearse 'sc.
Gentlemen this envious age we bring Bayard for Bucephalus: if mierd, bogg'd, draw him forth with your favours, So promising that we never meane to performe Our prologue peaceth.
Bel. Who but Maister Post-hast.
Gul. It is as dangerous to read his name at a play-dore as a printed bill on a plague dore. Perhaps Marston had Munday in mind when he wrote the "peaking pagenter" phrase; perhaps he had him in mind again when Posthaste makes his farewell appearance and says: "Ile boldly turn to ballading againe." Even these suppositions cannot be verified, and if they could, we would still not be able to say that Marston had Munday in his mind's eye when he created Post-haste. It is exactly such vaguely supported identifications as Posthaste-Munday that this
paper hopes to disallow. Students of the quarrel might take to heart these words of G. B. Harrison:

The history of the Stage War is, in the main, simpler than has always been realized. Except for *Poetaster* and *Satiromastix*, there was very little personal attack on each other in the plays written either by Marston or by Jonson during these years; and a reader who was not aware of the controversy might quite easily overlook even those passages which were intended to be personal. At first it was simply a matter of gags and sly hits -- no more. Neither Marston nor Jonson created characters as a whole to satirize the other.  

In my opinion the satire on Munday in *Histriomastix* is only a matter "of gags and sly hits -- no more." I believe it will be possible to show that the personal satire in all the plays prior to *What You Will* is also of that nature.

The Chrisoganus-Jonson identification is no easier to substantiate than the Posthaste-Munday, but it is somewhat more difficult to disprove. Fleay, Penniman, Small, and the majority of scholars felt that Chrisoganus was a complimentary portrait of *Jonson which the playwright misunderstood*. Drummond's words on Jonson have some pertinence here.

He is a great lover and praiser of himself, A contemner and scorrer of others, given rather to lose a friend, than a jest, jealous of every word and action of those about him (especially after drink) which is one of the elements in which he liveth . . . he is passionately kind and angry, careless either to gaine or keep, vindicative, but if he be well answered, at himself . . . he interpreteth best sayings and deeds often to the worst.  

Still, admitting all that Drummond says, it is hard to believe that a writer-scholar with a mind as acute for
the pith in literature as Jonson's was could have so
mis-read Chrisoganus. Jonson would have had to be very
much out of control of his faculties not to perceive that
Chrisoganus is the one fully admirable character in a play
full of boobies and sycophants.

At this time Jonson, so far as we know, had no quarrel
with Marston. They may or may not have been friends, but
it seems reasonable that Marston would have admired the
older man. Chrisoganus' shining virtue was his unwilling¬
ness to write for the vulgar appetite; he possessed the
high respect for art and knowledge which was clearly one
of Ben Jonson's admirable characteristics. The play hit
at the adult acting companies, and at the flimsy, burlesque
dramas they produced. The actors were buffoons, eager to
betray art for a handful of coins or a round of applause.
Chrisoganus stands apart as the poet-scholar who will not
prostitute his art. He discourses learnedly on arithmetic,
astrology, the relation of the sciences, etc.; when Mavortius
and Philarchus try to turn him from his books in Act II,
he cleaves to his learning fiercely. Mavortius tries a
goad:

How you translating-scholler? you can make
a stabbing satir, or an Epigram,
And thinke you carry just Ramnusia's whippe
To lash the patient; goe, get you clothes,
Our free-borne blood such apprehension loathes.25

Chrisoganus makes a loyal reply.

Proud Lord, Poore Art shall weare a glorious crowne,
When her despisers die to all renowne.26
Jonson might have reason to take offense to the first quotation, were it not so neatly cancelled by the second. Mavortius it is who despises art, Chrisoganus who defends it. The passage will yield no other interpretation.

As the play progresses, Chrisoganus becomes the ideal artist. He steadfastly refuses to sell his plays for less than ten pounds each, and when Gutt asks him if his dramas will serve the multitude, he is justly outraged.

Write on, crie on, yawle to the common sort
Of thickskin'd auditors: such rotten stuffs,
More fit to fill the paunch of Esquiline,
Than feed the hearings of judicall eares,
Ye shades tryumph, while foggy ignorance
Clouds bright Apollos beauty: Time will cleere,
The misty dullness of Spectator's eyes,
Then woeful hisses to your fopperies,
0 age when every Scriveners boy shall dippe
Prophaning quills into Thessaliaes Spring,
When every artist prentice that hath read
The pleasant pantry of conceits, shall dare,
To write as confident as Hercules.
When every Ballad-monger boldly writes:
And windy froth of bottle-ale doth fill
Their purest organ of invention:
Yet all applauded an puft up with pryde,
Swell in conceit, and load the Stage with stuffe,
Rakt from the rotten timbers of stall jests:
Which basest lines best please the vulgar sense
Make truest rapture lose preheminence.

Jonson might be moved to censure the style of that passage, but he would surely have agreed with the content. It is worth mentioning here that his famous reference to the "petulant stiles" of his tormentors might be taken more literally than it usually has been. Jonson had a high regard for the literary stylist, and it could well be that half his reason for writing Poetaster was to show his own superiority in that respect. An inferior style is always
provoking to a master stylist, and I think it might be
that Jonson's annoyance with Marston grew out of a hatred
of stylistic crudities, rather than from a stage representa-
tion. At any rate, it is obvious from the passage just
quoted, that Chrisoganus is spouting Jonsonian sentiments.
They would, however, be the sentiments of almost any dedi-
cated literary man of the period; they were undoubtedly
Marston's own. Later, Chrisoganus says:

... . . . . . . . . . . O I could curse
This ideot world! This ill nursed age of Peace,
That foster all save vertue; comforts all
Saving industrious art, the soules bright gemme,
That crusseth down the sprowting stemmes of Art,
Blast forward withs with frosty cold contempt,
Crowning dull clods of earth with honors,
Wreath guilding the rotten face of barbarisme...for
Liberall art gives up the goale to sluggish Ignorance.

He is feverish in his detestation of the players and their
standards, and he grows more impassioned as the play nears
its end:

See, see this common beast the multitude,
(Transported thus with fury) how it raves;
Threatening all states with ruine, to englut
Their bestiall and more brutish appetites.

As the play ends, Chrisoganus is trying to lead the plague-
ridden citizens along happier paths.

First entertaine submission in your soules
To frame true concord in one unity...
This elemental bodie (thus compact),
Is but a scattred Chaos of revenge;
Your lawes appointed to be positive,
(By Warre confounded) must be brought againe.
For law is that which love and peace maintain.

As the chastened style would indicate, this passage is
from the non-Marstonian section of the play; I quote it
only to show that there is nothing in the character of Chrisoganus that would offer Jonson reasonable cause for offense. That he may have failed to see the play and then been told that Marston abused him is possible, but unlikely. It takes a great deal of reading-in to find anything in Histriomastix which would have put Jonson at odds with Marston. There is always the possibility that Marston revised the play between 1601 and 1610, and deleted the offending passages; but unless some proof is unearthed this can never be more than supposition.

That Chrisoganus was a satire on Jonson is extremely unlikely, and in my opinion it is just as unlikely that the character was any sort of representation of the playwright at all. Again, there is nothing more substantial than similarities on which to base even a complimentary identification. Chrisoganus is an idealized and abstract character, the figure of the Poet; no physical description is given to help the investigator out. Muriel Bradbrook's general statement sums up this particular identification very well.

The War of the Theatres resolved itself into an attempt to define the Poet, and to establish his superiority to his employers, the Players, whose economic control of the situation supplied them with the most effective form of retort. 31

Chrisagonus is a feeble attempt to epitomize the Poet, but he is more understandable in those terms than as a representation of Jonson, complimentary or otherwise. Had
Marston intended to ridicule Jonson, he would no doubt have been more specific. The character cannot be satisfactorily identified with any Elizabethan personality, and I think it safe to conclude that the Theatre War did not begin with *Histriomastix*.

When he finished the revision of the play just considered, Marston apparently considered his apprenticeship at an end. He immediately set about writing an ambitious two-part tragedy. The first part, *Antonio and Mellida*, was written for the Paul's Boys, and was performed by them in the fall or winter of 1599. As a dramatic construction, the play is exceedingly inane; it opens strong but the playwright's inspiration soon deserts him. The only scene that demands examination is the famous painter scene in Act V. A painter enters bearing two pictures, and Balurdo asks him if they are the workmanship of his hands. The painter replies: "I did lymne them." Balurdo takes this up and answers:

Lymne them? A good word, lymne them: whose picture is this? Anno Domini 1599. Beleeve me, master, Anno Domini was of a good settled age when you lymn'd him. 1599. Yeares old? Lets see the other. *Etatis suae 24*. Byrlady he is somewhat younger. Belike master *Etatis suae* was Anno Domini's son. 34

Fleay, with his usual exuberance, concludes that the use of the word "lymne" marks the painter as a sure representation of Jonson, but his assertion belongs to imaginative thought, not scholarship. The passage is chiefly important for the "1599" and the "*Etatis suae*" references
which enabled Professor Small to date the play. Fleay was the last scholar to claim an identification in *Antonio and Mellida*; scholars since Penniman unanimously agree that the play has no relation to the Theatre War.

The same may confidently be said of Marston's sequel, *Antonio's Revenge*, which was acted by the same company in the same year. Both plays were on the boards before *Everyman Out of His Humour*. In that play Jonson attacks Marston's vocabulary, though I believe he spares his person. Prior to the satire in *Everyman Out of His Humour* Marston had no reason to attack Jonson, and so far as we know, he did not. Jonson's play was produced early in 1600, and after its performance, Marston had some slight reason to be miffed.

*Jack Drum's Entertainment*, his own next play, was produced by the Paul's Boys in June of 1600. At one time or another almost every writer of the age has been identified with some character in *Jack Drum*, though usually on the most figurative evidence. Only three of these speculations need delay us here: Marston-Mellidus, Jonson-John fo de King, or Jonson-Brabant Senior. Small and Penniman agree on the first, Fleay and the old school on the second, and Small, Penniman, and Van Keuren on the third.

Fleay advanced the theory that Jonson was John fo de King; 36 Penniman agreed with him in his first study but corrected his opinion in 1913. Fleay argued that John fo de King was Marston's representation of Jonson as given to venery; whereas Small's repunctuation makes it clear
that Jonson did not say Marston so represented him. In the play, John fo de King is a Frenchman whose only concern is to find a willing wench. He is an instrument of cuckoldry, and a profligate. He does not seem to resemble Jonson in any way; no does he resemble the satiric representations of Jonson. Since what little evidence there is against the identification, I do not see how it can be sustained.

Mellidus does not appear in the play, so there is no necessity for disproving any identification in his case. Brabant Senior refers to him one time, in Act IV, when he is discussing the modern wits. According to Brabant Senior, he is a "slight bubbling spirit, a cork, a husk." Mellidus is a fairly obvious reference to Antonio and Mellida, but it is only a reference, and its significance need not be exaggerated.

The question of Jonson-Brabant Senior is something else again. At times the character does seem to resemble Jonson, or at least, to make remarks with which Jonson might sympathize. At other times Brabant Senior and Jonson are strikingly dissimilar, and the former seems no more than a broadly caricatured fool. I think the character has some aspects which were meant to remind the audience of Jonson, but I do not think Brabant Senior was by any means a full-scale representation.

Before Brabant Senior appears on stage at all, he is introduced by Ned Planet.
Oh the Prince of Fools, unequal'd Ideot,
He that makes costly suppers to trie wits:
And will not stick to spend some twenty pounds
To grope a gull: that same perpetuall grin
That leads his Corkie jests to make them sink
Into the eares of his Deryders with his owne applause. 38

This passage has been widely cited as proof of the Jonson identification, but as a proof, it is inadequate. The only part of it which reminds us of Jonson is the applause Brabant Senior supposedly gives his own jokes. Jonson was not noted for his costly suppers, nor was he known to wear a perpetual grin. In fact, he was most often satirized for his ill-humour. Brabant Senior is entirely too cheerful, and entirely too stupid, to represent Jonson. Ben was ridiculed for the use he made of his learning never for his lack of it.

Brabant Senior makes infrequent appearances during the first three acts. Planet makes another short speech about his general savoir-faire which may be of significance:

By the Lord fustian, now I understand it:
complement is as much as fustian. 39

The meaning of the passage is not clear, but I suspect it refers to Jonson's satire of Marston's fustian language. However, it does not alter the character of Brabant Senior. His function in the play is to get John fo de King his wench. Brabant plans to make the Frenchman an assignation with Mrs. Brabant. The Frenchman will be in anticipatory ecstasies, and Mrs. Brabant will presumably give him a cruel disappointment. Brabant is a cocky clown, and the affair
has its obvious conclusion in Act V; but before commenting on it the "Mellidus" scene in Act IV requires some examination. It is that scene which most strongly supports the Jonson identification, and I give it entire.

Bra. Jr. Brother, how like you of our modern witts? How like you the new Poet Mellidus?
Bra. Sr. A slight bubling spirit, a Corke, a Huske.
Pla. How like you Musus fashion in his carriage?
Bra. Sr. O filthily, he is as blunt as Pawles.
Bra. Jr. What thinke you of the lines of Decius?
Writs he not good cordial sappie stile?
Bra. Sr. A surreinde Jaded wit, but a rubbes on.
Pla. Brabant, thou art like a pair of Ballance, Thou wayest all saving thy selfe.
Bra. Sr. Good faith, troth is, they are all Apes & Gulls, Vile imitating spirits, dry heathy turffes.
Pla. Erre, he cannot erre man, for children & fools speake truthe alwaies. 40

Brabant Senior's surly, critical attitude certainly resembles Jonson's; and there is no doubt that in this one passage the character expresses opinions with which Jonson would have agreed. Still, it is but one passage, and the only one in the play in which personal satire is so strongly implied. Brabant Senior is not primarily a critic and a censor; he is instead a jolly, foolish man, given to bragging and exaggeration, but at all obnoxious. I think once more the distinction must be drawn between a quick hit, and a deliberately contemplated representation such as we have in Poetaster and Satiromastix. The audience may have thought of Jonson when Brabant Senior delivered the lines quoted above, but throughout the bulk of the play he would remind
them only of a certain type of laughable, slightly boring braggart.

Marston does, I believe, make one more hit at Jonson as direct as the Mellidus scene. Planet expresses the hope the Brabant will get his cuckold's horns, and says:

Deare Brabant I do hate these bumbaste wits,
That are puff up with arrogant conceit
Of their own worth, as if Omnipotence
Had hoysed them to such unequal'd height,
That they survaide our spirits with an eye
Only create to censure from above,
When good soules they do nothing but reprove. 41

If Marston speaks through any of the characters directly, it is through Planet, who makes a running commentary on the action from first to last without really figuring in it. In the passage just quoted I believe Marston is mildly reproving Jonson for the vocabulary satire in *Every Man Out of His Humour*.

In the end Brabant Senior is made a cuckold by John fo de King, and Planet gets to see him crowned with horns.

Pla. Come heer's thy Cap of Maintenance, the Coronet of cuckold's. Nay you shall weare it, or weare my rapier in your futs 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 soul alone and made the rest for thee to laugh at? Now censurer be the ridiculous subject of your mirth. 42

Brabant is made fun of, but he is not defeated. In a fully planned satire he would scarcely have got off so easily.

I think there is evidence in *Jack Drum's Entertainment* that Marston was offended by Jonson's scorn and disapproval,
but apparently he was still more hurt than angry. In the
passages quoted he gives warning, but he had not yet
declared all-out war. As we shall see, the declaration
was not long in coming. I agree with Vén Keuren, who con-
cludes that Brabant Senior is a partial attack on, not a
complete representation of Jonson.

The last play of Marston's within the area of the
Theatre War is the comedy, What You Will. It was not pub-
lished until 1607, and there are good reasons for believing
that the text we have is in a revised form. The play
assuredly stands between Cynthia's Revels (February-March
1601) and Poetaster (June, 1601), for it makes no mention
of the latter. Marston would scarcely have passed up the
insults in Poetaster to answer the relatively light Jonson
attacks which preceded it. What You Will was performed
sometime in the spring of 1601, by Marston's old favorites,
the Boys of Pauls.

That the text is a revision is fairly obvious. In
the first place, there is a confusion of names. Albano's
wife Celia is called Lucea in the first scene; the name
of Celia's brother is sometimes Adrian, sometimes Andrea.
But there is more important evidence of revision in the
style. None of the typically Marstonian words which
Crispinus is made to vomit up in Poetaster are found in
What You Will. Further, of the thirty words Crispinus
vomits, only fourteen can be found in Marston's early
work. It is logical to suppose that Jonson took the
other sixteen words from the original version of What You Will, and that during the period of good fellowship which the two playwrights enjoyed in 1604-5 Marston revised the play for publication and struck out much of what was offensive to his friend.

There have been but two arguments of significance in regard to the personal satire of What You Will, and one of the two has long since been abandoned. Penniman held that Lampatho Doria, the foolish poet, represented John Marston. He took his stand on a speech in the first scene of Act II, in which Quadratus calls Lampatho "you Don Kynsader! Thou canker eaten rusty cur!" Since Marston signed The Scourge of Villanie W. Kynsader, and since he is several times referred to by that name in the Parnassus trilogy, Penniman argues that Lampatho must be the playwright's representation of himself. With only this one piece of evidence to sustain him, Professor Penniman is hard put to explain why a playwright would ridicule himself instead of his bitterest enemy, and in 1913 he prudently changed his mind. Professor Small's convincing argument that "Kynsader" was a household word for "satirist" in Elizabethan times contributed to Penniman's conversion, and to the consequent abandonment of the Lampatho-Marston identification.

Unfortunately, the second argument, that Lampatho is Jonson, cannot be so easily disposed of. There is some evidence from the first that Marston is preparing a satiric attack. In the Induction, Atticus, Doricus, and Phylomuse
speculate upon the play's reception. Atticus and Doricus fear it will be hotly received and express concern for the author, but Phylomuse silences them. The author (Marston) is not afraid of ridicule:

...Believe it Doricus, his spirit,
Is higher blouded then to quake and pant
At the report of Skoffes Artillery;
Shall he be crestfalne if some looser braine,
In flux of witte uncively befilth his slight composure? 47

Apparently Jonson's arrogance has annoyed the young author. Yet a little later, when Phylomuse speaks again of the forthcoming play, he is not only humble, but deprecatory. When asked if it is a comedy or a tragedy, he replies with a surprisingly accurate description of the play:

Faith perfectly neither, but even
What You Will, a slight toye, lightly composed,
too swiftly finist, ill plotted, worse written,
I feare me worst acted, and indeed What You Will. 48

In the prologue which follows the Induction, Marston immediately takes the defensive, and says:

Nor labours hee the favor of the rude,
Nor offers sops unto the Stigian Dogge
To force a silence in his viperous toungs:
Nor cares he to insinuate the grace,
Of loathed detraction, nor persues the love
Of the nice Criticks of this squeamish age,
Nor strives he to beare up with every saile,
Of floting Censure: nor once dreads or cares
What envious hand his guiltles Muse hath struck...49

The speech is admirable and modest, perhaps the best in the play; but it is impossible to miss the tone of slightly wounded dignity which it conveys.

Lampatho is absent from the first act, but he is brought in with a vengeance in the first scene of Act II.
When introduced to Monsieur Laverdure, he addresses him with much flourish and false humility. Quadratus tells him off in no uncertain terms, calling him a fusty cask and a hyena, and warning the Frenchman to beware. Lampatho has an admirer with him, one Simplicius Faber, who greets his windy effusions with compliments. "O Jesu, admirably well spoken, Angelical tongue!" Simplicius says. "Gnathonicall Coxcombe," Quadratus replies. He and Lampatho argue, and the latter makes a threat:

So Phoebus 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.52

They argue for pages; then Quadratus has a speech which clearly echoes Jonson:

A man can scarce put on a tuckt up cap, 
A button'd frizado sute, scarce eate good meate, 
Anchovies, caviare,hee's Satyred 
And termed Phantasticall by the muddy spawne 
Of slymie Neughtes, when troth, Phantasticknesse, 
That which the natural sophysters tearme 
Phantusia incomplexa, is a function 
Even of the bright immortal part of man.53

In effect, Quadratus accuses Lampatho of holding the attitude of Hedon, in Cynthia's Revels. Hedon says: "...He doth learn to make strange sauces, to eat anchovies, macaroni, bovoli, fagioli, and caviare, because he loves them."54

Then in Act III Lampatho comes out with a speech that reminds us even more strongly of Ben:

Durt upon durt, feare is beneath my shoe, 
Dreadlesse of rackes, strappados, or the sword, 
Mauger Informer and slie intelligence,
Ile stand as confident as Hercules,
And with a frightlesse resolution,
Rip up and launce our times' impieties.55

It might almost be Asper speaking, in the Induction to Every Man Out of His Humour, when he offers to "strip the ragged follies of the time, Naked, as at their birth."56 Lampatho will be the executioner of vice, a role Jonson also liked to play; he, like Jonson, sets up as a critic of the age and the stage.

There is nothing in the last two acts to strengthen the case for Lampatho-Jonson, but by that time, very little was needed. Quadratus was a sound critic, if a fop, and he had a definite function in the play's meagre plot. Lampatho had no such function. He is a foolish, often maliciously conceited poet, in turn envious, servile, and bullying. Instead of lancing his time's impieties, he broadcasts his own. His ambition makes him hypercritical; his own conceit befuddles him. I would not argue that he is a minutely specific representation of Jonson, but Marston must have had the arrogant Ben in mind when he created the character. Curiously, Marston does his most effective satirizing through Quadratus. Just as he used Ned Planet to deflate Brabant Senior, he makes Quadratus pick away at Lampatho's vanity. Quadratus is angry and unmerciful. The things he says remind us of Jonson's offenses much more readily than do Lampatho's rather insignificant vanities. At any rate, Marston almost certainly intended the similarities between Lampatho's beha-
viour and Jonson's to be noted by the audience; consequently, *What You Will* is integrally connected to the Theatre War.

In summing up Marston's contribution, several things ought to be reiterated. He certainly participated in the Quarrel, but so far as we can know, he was not the initiator or the aggressor. He was undoubtedly a quarrelsome man, and there is every evidence that he relished his earlier duel with Bishop Hall; he was never the man to take criticism, much less insult, sitting down. But there is no evidence to prove that he attacked Jonson in his verse-satires, and if he mentioned him at all in *Histriomastix* it was to compliment him. Only the grossest oversight on Jonson's part could have convinced him otherwise. Marston's essential good will was still intact as late as *Jack Drum*, although in that play I believe he does mildly reproach Jonson for the criticism of *Every Man Out of His Humour*. When Jonson's distemper became too much to ignore, Marston struck back at him in *What You Will*. Prior to that play he had produced no recognizable representations of his rival. Lampatho Doria is an inept and partial caricature of Jonson; Marston vents most of his spleen through the more articulate Quadratus. After *What You Will*, Marston is heard no more directly. The reprisal for *Poetaster* is left to his friend Dekker.

Taken as a whole, Marston's contribution was not large. What attacks he made are contained in two plays, *Jack Drum's Entertainment* and *What You Will*; they probably
do not add up to more than one hundred lines. They were undoubtedly the least effective lines connected with the Quarrel, and to make matters worse, they were set in two very poor plays. Only the most dedicated of audiences would have been awake to hear them spoken. Had the Quarrel come a few years later, when Marston was in his prime, he might have acquitted himself more memorably. Jonson's arrogant, high-handed criticism prompted Marston's attack, though in fairness, both men were so intemperate in literary matters that the Quarrel would probably have come about soon enough without it. And in spite of the dedication to the Malcontent, it is doubtful that their reconciliation was really lasting. Marston certainly got the worst end of the dispute; for whatever revenge or satisfaction he had, Dekker secured for him with Satiromastix.
Jonson's biography is so well known that only the briefest outline need be given here. He was born near London, in 1572, about a month before his father died. He attended Westminster school, and studied under Camden, the great historian and antiquary; when his school was ended he worked for a time as a bricklayer, but gave this up to become a soldier in the Flanders campaign. On July 28th, 1597, he turns up in Henslowe's diary. From Henslowe we learn that he was a player and a playwright. When Francis Meres published his Palladis Tamia in 1598 he placed Jonson's name at the end of his list of the English tragedians. In the same year Jonson scored his first popular success with Every Man In His Humour, performed at the Curtain. Shortly thereafter he had his fight with Gabriel Spencer and escaped the gallows only by resorting to benefit of clergy. Upon his release he resumed his activities as a playwright and a defender of poetry; in the estimation of many he became the finest comic writer of his age. His First Folio was published in 1616; his writing career extended over four decades. When he died in 1637 he was an exemplar of his age, and by his own example, the very figure of the Poet which he so eloquently described.
Jonson's character cannot be summarily circumscribed. That he was basically good-natured, generous, and even soft-hearted there can be no doubt; he had many friends, and lived to write tributes to most of them. But for all his good nature he was often irascible and quick to take offense. He had the most earnest interest in and devotion to literature, and was for most part a very acute appraiser of the writing produced in his time; here his honesty made him enemies. He was always perhaps too well aware that his own work was far superior to much of what was being produced around him; when the public ignored his tragedies and gave their applause to what he correctly judged to be less meritorious productions, Jonson was angered and hurt. When he saw poor work he seldom tried to conceal his scorn. His critical harshness was understandable, but his arrogance cannot always be excused.

In the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to the Quarto edition of *Volpone* (1607) Jonson had some telling words to say about poetry and poetic practice. Since his attitude toward poetry and art is so very central to his participation in the Stage Quarrel, I feel justified in quoting this Epistle rather fully.

It is certayne, nor can it with any fore-head be oppos'd that the too-much license of Poetasters, in this time, hath much deformed their mistris; that, every day, their manifold, and manifest ignorance, doth flicke unnaturall reproches upon her: But for their petulancy, it were an act of the greatest injustice, either to let the learned suffer; or to divine a skill (which indeed should not be attempted with uncleane hands) to fall under the least contempt. For, if men will impar-
ially, and not a-squint, looke toward the offices, and function of a Poet, they will easily conclude to themselves, the impossibility of any mans being the good Poet, without first being a good man.  

Plato and John Ruskin would no doubt have agreed to that. Jonson goes on to say that in stage poetry particularly nothing but ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy, and license is practiced. Then, in exonerating himself from these practices, he says:

I would ask of these supercilious politiques, what nation, societie, or generall order, or state I have provok'd? What publique person? Except to a mimick, cheater, bawd, or buffon, creatures (for their insolencies worthy to be tax'd? ... if my Muses be true to me, I shall raise the despis'd head of poetrie againe, and stripping her of those rotten and base rags, wherewith the Times have adulterated her form, restore her to her primitive habit, feature, and majesty, and render her worthy to be embraced, and kist, of all the great and master-spirits of our world. As for the vile, and slothfull, who never affected an act, worthy of celebration, or are so inward with their owne vicious natures, as they worthily feare her; and thinke it a high point of policie, to keepe her in contempt with their declamatorie, and windy invectives: shee shall out of just rage incite her servants (who are genus iritabile) to spout inke in their faces, that shall eate, farder then their marrow, into their frames; and not Cinnamus the barber, with his arte, shall be able to take out the brands, but they shall live, and be read, till the wretches die, as things worst deserving of themselves in chiefe, and then of all mankind.

His claims may be as extravagant as his wording, but there is no doubting the depth of the man's passion for what was good in art. Nor is there doubt but that his very sincerity and passion, coupled with his considerable artis-
tic conceit, led him at times to be over-zealous and hypercritical. All these qualities, passion, sincerity, hypersensitivity, and conceit are stressed in the discussion of Jonson's work which follows, because they brought him into the Stage Quarrel and kept him there. He was certainly the aggressor, and would have been proud to be recognized as such, for what he attacked was bad art. Unfortunately he was not one to draw a sharp distinction between bad art and the sometimes quite likeable men who produced it.

Had Jonson been a more temperate man the Quarrel might not have occurred; but had he been temperate we might have lost all of his contribution to our literature. He was the catalyst. From time to time he acted maliciously and offended his fellow dramatists, but I think it is clear that he himself thought his attacks were necessary if poetry was to be preserved and honored. The Stage Quarrel was a very natural extension of his humours comedy (which was a dramatic vehicle admirably suited for personal satire) and his militant dedication to art.

The first Jonson play to be examined is The Case Is Altered, which had its initial performance in 1598. Nashe mentions the play in Lenten Stuffe (entered 11 January 1599); so does Meres in Palladis Tamia (entered 7 September, 1598). The scene Meres mentions is the one in which Antony Munday is held up to ridicule as Antonio
Balladino; for my purposes it is the only scene of importance. Herford and Simpson, Jonson's most recent editors, feel that the scene was written a year or two after the bulk of the play, and Van Keuren agrees. The date of the one scene is of no particular relevance here; a glance at the scene will suffice.

When Balladino comes in he is chattering with a cobbler. He is "Pageant Poet to the City of Millaine," and frankly admits his lack of originality.

"\ldots such things ever are like bread, which the staler it is, the more wholesome...\nWhy, I'le tell you M. Onion, I do use as much stale stuffe, though I say it myself, as any man does in that kind I am sure. Did you see the last Pageant I set forth?\"  

He goes on to further belittle himself:

**Anto.** Why looke you sir, I write so plaine, and keepe that old decorum, that you must of necessitie like it...they'le give me twenty pound a play, I'le not raise my vaine...Tut, give me the penny, give me the penny, I care not for the gentlemen I, let me have a good ground, no matter for the pen, the plot shall carry it.

**On.** Indeed that's right, you are in print already for the best plotter.

**Anto.** I, I might as weel ha been put in for a dumb show too.

In *Palladis Tamia* Munday is mentioned as the best plotter, so there is little doubt that he is the man Balladino represents. The attack, however, is not vicious or elaborate; it reads like an amused afterthought. Meres' statement was absurd enough, and Jonson probably went out of
his way to make a deprecatory comment on it. The scene
is worth quoting to make one point: the representation
is unmistakable. Besides the Meres reference, the name
itself is suggestive. Antonio and Anthony are cognates,
while the surname, Balladino, reminds us that Munday was
a prolific ballad-writer. Trivial though the representa-
tion is, no one but Munday could have been intended.
Henry Gray has written pertinently, "It was apparently
not necessary in the Theatre War to hold to the facts;
you need only identify the characters by some obvious
traits and then add whatever insults you will." 9 True,
but if the insults are to have their full effectiveness,
the "obvious traits" must be unequivocably presented.
Jonson made his share of snide allusions, but when he
cast a character in the image of a contemporary, he was
careful to make the correspondence obvious. Crispinus
(Poetaster) could be no one but John Marston; Demetrius,
no one but Dekker; and Balladino no one but Munday.
Indeed, these portraits are so obvious that no scholar
of our own century has mis-read a single one of them.
Thus, where the references are persistently shadowy and
ambiguous, we may suspect that Jonson intended no frontal
attack. On occasion he would criticize an author's style,
as he criticized Marston's in Every Man Out of his Humour,
without personifying the author at all. He was a skilled
satirist. When he aimed at the work, he concentrated on
it; when he aimed at the man, he hit him.
It is no great inaccuracy to say that *Every Man In His Humour* is too good a play to have been connected with the Theatre War. Certainly none of the plays directly involved are of its quality. Some scholars, however, included it in the Quarrel canon. Brinsley Nicholson thought he saw Munday in the play; and Professor Penniman tries to identify both Munday and Samuel Daniel. Small admits one reference to Munday, but he disproves the general identification. Penniman attempts to show that Master Matthew is Samuel Daniel, resting his case upon a scene in Act V. Matthew reads a poem which is an obvious parody of the first sonnet in the Delia sequence. Jonson himself made it clear that he had no great admiration for Daniel when he told Drummond that the man was honest, but no poet. No doubt Jonson is making light of Daniel's sonnetry when Matthew reads his parody; but it is impossible to show that Matthew, the type-character, is an extended caricature of the poet. Professor Small ably demonstrates that Jonson was not interested in or offended by the author of *The Civil Wars*. Thus *Every Man In His Humour*, his first popular success, cannot be connected to the Theatre War.

His next play, *Every Man Out of His Humour* is something else again. As Small conclusively shows, it was first performed in February or March of 1599/1600. As a Quarrel document, the play offers interpretative difficulties second only to those of *Cynthia's Revels*. With *Cynthia's Revels* and Marston's *Jack Drum*, it lies in a
fringe area which has kept scholars in constant disagreement to this day.

Small sees two identifications in *Every Man Out*: Jonson-Asper, and Chester-Carlo Buffone. Professor Penniman, as usual, is more extravagant, finding no fewer than five completely identifiable caricatures: Asper-Jonson, Marston-Buffone, Daniel-Brisk, Lodge-Fungoso, and Munday-Puntarvolo. The most recent, and in my opinion, most accurate student of the play, G. B. Harrison, sees no identifications at all; but he does point out that Jonson introduced Clove and Orange as a means of ridiculing Marston's vocabulary. I am prepared to seek some middle ground. Penniman's identifications are almost entirely unfounded; Small has already disproved most of them, and with comparatively little effort. On the other hand, Mr. Harrison's attractive arguments are too brief and incomplete. I believe the play contains more personal elements than he detects. Small, again, is closest to the mark, but even his careful position can stand some emendation.

The character descriptions prefixed to *Every Man Out* make excellent approaches to the various identifications. Alphabetically Asper's is the first. It reads:

He is of an ingenious and free spirit, eager and constant in reproofs, without feare controuling the worlds abuses. One, whom no servile hope of gaine, of frosty apprehension of danger, can make to be a Parasite, either to time, place, or opinion.
So Jonson liked to consider himself. As the Induction begins, Asper launches into a violent attack on the iniquities of the times.

> Who can behold such prodigies as these,  
> And have his lips seal'd up? Not I: my language  
> Was never ground into such oyly colours,  
> To flatter vice and daube iniquities:  
> But (with an armed, and resolved hand)  
> Ile strip the ragged follies of the time,  
> Naked, as at their birth:  

Such, we know, was Jonson's avowed intention. Indeed, there seems to be no end to Asper's courage and high-mindedness. When Cordatus cautions him to tread lightly lest he be trod upon, he haughtily replies:

> I feare no mood stamp'd in a private brow,  
> When I am pleas'd to unmaske a publicke vice.  
> I fear no strumpets drugs, nor ruffians stab,  
> Should I detect their hatefull luxuries...  
> O how I hate the monstrousnesse of time,  
> Where every servile imitating spirit  
> (Plagu'd with an itching leprosie of wit)  
> In a meere halting fury, strives to fling  
> His ulc'rous body in the Thespian spring,  
> And straight leaps forth a Poet.  

He intends to seize on vice and squeeze the humour out of "spongie natures." He raves about the classic comedies of Terence, and promises to chastise all who flaunt the unities. Finally, he proposes to write a play that will satisfy every dramatic requirement; and if it fails it will only be because "Arte hath an enemy call'd Ignorance."

> Every Man Out of His Humour is the play he promises; so it is reasonable to conclude that Asper and the author are in some sense identical. Asper's aggressive speeches
echo Jonson's attitudes exactly, and there is little doubt that the playwright intended the sentiments to be recognized as his own. The identification can be further substantiated by Dekker's remark in *Satiromastix*, that Jonson must be called Asper, Criticus, and Horace. 18 Professor Small's conjecture is sustained, but it should be remembered that Asper appears only in the Induction; he is not really a character in the play.

The other characterizations, unfortunately, are not so easily handled. Carlo Buffone, for example, seems to be one of the great untraceables. In the introductory sketches he is described as:

> A publike, scurrilous, and profane Jester; that (more swift that Circe) with absurd similie's will transforme any person into deformity. A good Feast-hound, or Banket beagell, that will scent you out a supper some three mile off... A slave that hath an extraordinary gift in pleasing his palate, and will swill up more sacke at a sitting, then would make all the guard a posset. His religion is rayling, and his discourse ribaldry. They stand highest in his respect, whom he studies most to reproach. 19

Macilente also accuses him of free-loading, which seems to be his characteristic fault. In the play, Carlo talks of dining and table manners; he is arch, vulgar, and affected. He is never connected with literature or the stage in any way, a fact which would almost disprove the Marston identification. Fleay and Penniman rest their case on a scene in Act II, in which Puntarvolo calls Carlo the "Grand Scourge and Second Untruss of the time." 20 I believe, however, that Professor Small is correct when
he concludes that the remark, like the Kynsader reference in What You Will, is no more than a nom de guerre whose equivalent is "satirist." Carlo does not at all resemble Jonson's one established caricature of Marston. Furthermore, Dekker refers to Carlo Buffone in Satiromastix, and his reference is much more ambitious than it would have been had Buffone been a representation of Marston. In fact, Marston-Crispinus is present when Vaughn mentions Buffone\(^2\), proof at least that if Buffone was meant for Marston, Dekker knew nothing about it.

We know that Carlo was a habitual free-loader; apparently his wit secured him invitations. Working from this general description, Small tries to show that the character was supposed to represent an actual Elizabethan gourmand, one Charles Chester. His evidence, however, is embarrassingly scanty. Aubrey described Chester as "a perpetual talker;" he was also the first to claim that Chester was the model for Buffone.\(^2\) Aubrey wrote in 1680, and his evidence may have been as vague and conjectural as our own. Chester was said to have kept company with Walter Raleigh in that gentleman's "youthful time,"\(^2\) which would have made him an old man by Jonson's day. Jonson may have seen Chester a time or two, and may even have adapted an incident from Chester's career in his play; it would not be an unusual thing for an author to do. But it is impossible to recognize Charles Chester in Every Man Out, and would very likely have been so in Elizabeth's day.
We are given only a few details about him, and those so general as to be virtually worthless for the purposes of deduction. Thus it is possible to say definitely that Carlo is not a representation of Marston; but of Chester's candidacy I can only report that the evidence is inconclusive.

Professor Penniman's three remaining identifications (Lodge-Fungoso, Daniel-Brisk, and Puntarvolo-Munday) can be dealt with briefly. He attempts to establish Puntarvolo-Munday on the basis of the resemblance between Puntarvolo and Amorphus (Cynthia's Revels), who he also sees as the luckless pageant-poet. When Small shows that Puntarvolo is not personally satiric at all, Penniman's case crumbles. It would seem that Puntarvolo is merely a character in a play.

Penniman's Fungoso-Lodge identification is equally speculative. It rests on the broadest similarities. Lodge once studied law, as did Fungoso; and both were once in debt for clothes. Lodge's law-studies took place almost twenty-five years prior to the performance of Every Man Out; and certainly he was not the only Elizabethan to go in debt. Moreover, no one has produced any evidence of enmity between Jonson and Lodge. Once again it seems probable that Professor Penniman was trying too hard.

Frederick Gard Fleay was the first scholar to identify Fastidious Brisk with Daniel, but Penniman eagerly followed suit. In fact, Penniman had an obsessive desire to prove
that Jonson attacked the harmless Daniel; whereas so far as we know the strongest remark Jonson ever made against him was to say that he was no poet. Brisk's character is not at all similar to Daniel's. Samuel Daniel was a sober family man, while Brisk is a courtier, and even something of a fop. Brisk does quote Daniel, but that in itself is no very damaging evidence; all these plays are full of quotes, some obviously satiric, some not. The sonnets to Delia must have been eminently quotable pieces in their day, and Brisk, small time literateur that he was, may naturally be expected to have known and quoted them. In short, Fleay's identification will not hold water; and if we are to find personal satire in Every Man Out of His Humour, we must look beyond Fastidious Brisk.

When we do look beyond Brisk, there remain the two inseparable coxcombs, Clove and Orange. These characters have no intrinsic connection with the action, nor are they elaborately characterized. It is thus reasonable to assume that their scenes are interpolations, put in for a purpose. They appear only in the first and third scenes of Act III, and are, in my opinion, the only vehicles of purely personal satire in the play. Orange speaks scarcely a dozen words in the whole play, and has, as far as I can see, only one function: to prime Clove. Once Clove is started, he runs on in this line:
Now, sir, whereas the Ingenuitie of the time, and the soules Sunderisus are but Embirions in nature, added to the paunch of Esquiline, and the Inter-vallum of the Zodiack, besides the Eclipticke line being opticke, and not mentall, but by the contemplative & theorikc part thereof, doth demonstrate to us the vegetable circumference, and the ventositie of the Tropicks, and whereas our intellectuall, or mincing capreall (accordings to the Metaphisicks) as you may read in Plato's Histriomastix---you conceive me, sir?

As Herford and Simpson, Jonson's most recent editors, have been at some pains to show, all these "fustian terms" come from The Scourge of Villanie or Histriomastix; and the latter is pointedly referred to by name, in case there were dullards in the audience who needed the satire clarified. I believe that these passages constitute the extent of Jonson's attack on Marston in Every Man Out of His Humour, but I do think, as I said earlier, that he took a somewhat broader slap at poetasters in general by allowing the character of Asper to voice his opinions. Clove and Orange, the coxcombs, appear in the play only long enough for Clove to deliver his two speeches, after which they vanish as quickly as they came. If Jonson had intended to ridicule Marston more elaborately he would no doubt have created a character to represent him, as he did in Poetaster, and have made the character spout fustian; in which case Clove and Orange would have been unnecessary. I do not believe that he was seriously angered with Marston at this time; though he probably considered him a bad writer (which he was). In Every Man Out of His Humour, then, he criti-
cized the diction, but he let the man alone.

Jonson's next play, *Cynthia's Revels*, was first acted by the Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars, probably in December of 1600. So far as the War of the Theatres is concerned, it is undoubtedly his most ambiguous and difficult play. Indeed, it is a difficult play by any standard, tortuously plotted and stylistically tight. Certainly the characterizations are not the least of its complexities, and Quarrel scholars, despite their learned efforts, have never been able to fix its place in the Quarrel satisfactorily, or to banish it from the canon altogether.

The scholars have, however, performed one service of inestimable value: they have made clear the questions which remain to be answered. Only three of the characters -- Crites, Anaides, and Hedon -- need be considered in connection with the War. So far as we know, the War never involved more than three people anyway, and Professor Penniman's attempts to double that number become decidedly tiresome after awhile.\(^{27}\) His contention that Daniel, Munday, and Lodge are again represented in *Cynthia's Revels* is so absurd (since he was never able to prove that they were represented the first time or the second) that I will not take time to examine them here. We are left then with Jonson, Marston, and Dekker, the essential trio. It has been suggested that Jonson appears in the play as Crites, Marston as Hedon, and Dekker as Anaides; the suggestion has, however, been stren-
uously debated. What I shall do here is review the debate, set beside the review a short examination of the play, and tabulate, as it were, the results. I think it sufficiently plain that only the arguments relating to these three characters are worth considering. The wilder identifications I leave peacefully entombed.

As it happens, Professor Small is the first critic to be examined. He held categorically that Crites was Jonson, basing his conviction on the following speech of Mercury's:

Crites. A creature of a most perfect and divine temper. One, in whom the humours and elements are peaceably met, without emulation or prece-dence: he is neither too phantastikely melancholy, too slowly phlegmaticke, too lightly saùguine, or too rashly cholericke, but in all, so composed & ordered, as it is cleare, Nature went about some ful worke, she did more than make a man, when she made him. His discourse is like his behaviour, uncommon, but not un-pleasing; hee is prodigall of neyther. He strives rather to bee that which men call judi-cious, then to bee thought so; and is so truly learned, that he affect not to shew it. Hee will thinke, and speake his thought, both freely: but as distant from depraving another man's merit, as proclaiming his owne. For his valour, tis such, that he dares as little to offer an injurie, as receive one. In summe, he hath a most ingen-uous and sweet spirit, a sharp and season'd wit, a straight judgment, and strong mind. Fortune could neither breake him, nor make him less. He counts it his pleasure, to despise pleasures, and is more delighted with good deeds, then goods. It is a competencie to him that hee can be ver-tuous. He doth neyther covet, nor feare; he hath too much reason to do eyther; and that com-mends all things to him. 28

This is the chief characterizing passage so far as Crites is concerned. Professor Small notes in it those character-
istics which Crites has in common with Asper and Horace, the two partial Jonson portraits, and concludes: "All these portraits, ridiculously flattering as they are, were undoubtedly meant for Jonson." I admit many of Small's points, but I do not entirely agree with his conclusion. No doubt Jonson has Crites deliver some rather personal sentiments, as he does in numerous passages of this nature:

O vanitie,
How are thy painted beauties doted on,
By light, and empty ideots! How pursued
With open and extended appetite.

But I do not think Jonson was so vain, or so incautious, that he would represent himself on the stage as perfect. Besides, Crites does not have the sound or the tone of Ben Jonson himself. I agree with Oscar Campbell and Charles Read Baskervill that Crites is "a kind of equivalent of Aristotle's 'high-minded man', but transliterated, as it were, into the alphabet of the physiological psychology of Jonson's age." That, I think, states the case for Crites very accurately. Throughout his discussion of Cynthia's Revels Professor Small places too much emphasis on the resemblances between characters in three plays (Every Man Out of His Humour, Cynthia's Revels, Poetaster), when the resemblances really amount to no more than parallel satiric types. The characters I discussed in Every Man Out, Carlo Buffone and Fastidious Brisk, are much finer dramatic creations than any of the characters in Cynthia's
Revels. For all the satire levelled at them, Brisk and Buffone do not entirely shed humanity; whereas Hedon and Anaides are never more than shadows. Professor Small, I feel, lets his zealous search for information blind him at times to the fact that he is dealing with imaginative literature. The characters in Every Man Out are not the same as those in Cynthia's Revels. Asper, in the earlier play, was not completely Jonson; Crites, in the later, is even less so. He is high-minded, and a critic: no more. He does not even sound like a person. Herford and Simpson remark only that he is Jonson's "mouthpiece and antitype." I believe their view is correct; but at any rate, I am more concerned here with Jonson's satiric representations of his enemies than with his complacency and self-flattery.

In my opinion the crux of the play is the character Hedon. If Hedon can be shown to be John Marston, then it is logical to assume that Anaides may be the doughty but somewhat disreputable Thomas Dekker. If Hedon was not meant for Marston the case for Anaides falls through, for it is unlikely that Jonson would by-pass Marston, with whom he was obviously willing to quarrel, to get at Dekker, who, at this time, had done nothing to offend him. Professor Small believes that Hedon is Marston insofar as his character accords with that of Crispinus in Poetaster; otherwise, Small would put him with Fastidious Brisk as a representation of the general class of dandies.
He feels much the same way about Anaides. He is Dekker insofar as he resembles Demetrius, and a peer of Carlo Buffone when he does not. Small’s work, as always, is heavily documented, but in this case the documentation is largely ineffective. He was trying to show why Dekker, in Satiromastix, mentioned both Every Man Out of His Humour and Cynthia’s Revels; and there is one perhaps too subtly psychological reason that he overlooks. I will advance it for what it may be worth. In the “Apologeticall Dialogue” affixed to Poetaster Jonson said that his reason for writing that play was to stop those persons who, for three years, had provoked him with their petulant styles. His remark, in effect, makes Marston and Dekker the aggressors. In order to dodge the charge Dekker might have offered Every Man Out and Cynthia’s Revels as evidence that he and Marston were attacked first. Whether or not they really were is a matter apt to remain eternally unclear.

Since Professor Small’s monograph was published, learned opinion on Cynthia’s Revels has changed; scholars have practically read the personal satire out of the play. Penniman, however, was not the man to start this trend. In his 1913 essay he went on raving about Lodge, Daniel, and Munday, an apparently incurable victim of scholarly delusion. And this in spite of contemporary scholarly evidence against his position. Swinburne, years before, had maintained that Hedon was a type character, a court
dandy, and a fop. Less than years before Penniman wrote, Tucker Brooke, in his *Tudor Drama*, reinforced Swinburne's position. Charles Read Baskervill, working independently of Brooke, but in the same year (1911), expressed the same general view; though he maintained that Jonson added a few personal strokes to the portrait. It is Baskervill's view which I hold to be most correct. One year later Albert C. Judson edited *Cynthia's Revels* for the Yale Studies in English series, and agreed substantially with Swinburne, Baskervill, and Brooke. All these investigations preceded Penniman's last essay, but he completely ignored them; for which oversight we may now ignore him. In 1925 Herford and Simpson made clear that the "typical generality of the Jonsonian Humour" clung to Anaides and Hedon; and twelve years later Oscar James Campbell further exonerated the playwright by showing how *Cynthia's Revels* fits into a general pattern of comical satire which Jonson was writing in those years. He too read Hedon as a type. But it remained for a young scholar of the World War II generation, then-Lieutenant Ralph Berringer, to write the definitive analysis of Hedon and Anaides.

Lieutenant Berringer's essay was published in the *Philological Quarterly* in January of 1943, a most unlikely time for a study of the Theatre War to appear. He argued that Jonson intended no individual poet in his characterization of Hedon, the foppish courtier, and that there was
nothing in the play which would have prompted a contemporary to think otherwise. His first and perhaps most telling point is one which I mentioned in connection with *The Case Is Altered*. I quote Lieutenant Berringer:

"It is a suspicious sign at the outset that Jonson's satire, habitually neither subtle nor diffident, should have missed its mark so widely in the painting of Hedon that after three quarters of a century of intensive research scholars are still sharply divided on the question of the portrait. When Munday appeared as Antonio Balladino in *The Case Is Altered*, or Marston and Dekker as Crispinus and Demetrius in *Poetaster*, no Londoner who knew his city could well have missed the application; the vocation, literary sins, and personal idiosyncrasies of each culprit were represented in detail. But Hedon has no such identifying traits."

Those are my sentiments exactly. Berringer goes on to show clearly the fallacy of Professor Small's argument by parallel. It does not follow that the characteristics Hedon shared with Crispinus were also characteristic of Marston, because Crispinus was a satiric caricature, a lampoon, and Hedon a realistic portrait. The characteristics which Hedon does share with Crispinus are not the highly particular thrusts which identified the later character with John Marston. Crispinus, as Berringer shows, is the least like Marston when he is most like Hedon. Professor Small for once was not seeing straight.

Berringer goes on to point out that Dekker does not refer to Anaides and Hedon by name in *Satiromastix*; he merely quotes a line which Crites had used to refer to
them. The line reads: "The one a light voluptuous Reveler, the other, a strange, arrogating puffe, both impudent, and arrogant enough." Horace speaks these words the first time he comes on the stage (*Satiromastix*, I, 11). The quote is a parody of the following speech by Crites:

'Tis Hedon, and Anaides: alasse, then,
I think but what they are, and am not stirr'd.
The one a light voluptuous reveller,
The other a strange arrogating puffe,
Both impudent, and ignorant enough.

In my opinion Dekker was too inexplicit. Surely his audience would not have been so familiar with *Cynthia's Revels* as to recognize these slight lines, unless they were given extraordinary emphasis by the actors. Brooke and Berringer are no doubt right to conclude that the passage was put in for purposes of ridicule, not purposes of identification. Dekker was merely slapping at Jonson for his habit of using a quasi-representation of himself as a hero-narrator capable of putting the other characters down.

It has been ably brought out that there is no single stroke or reference in *Cynthia's Revels* which unmistakably identifies any character with any real person, Hedon included. Thus Hedon cannot be definitely said to represent Marston; but he is, on the other hand, a beautifully drawn portrait of the Elizabethan fop. Consider this passage:
These are his (Hedon's) graces. He doth (besides me) keep a barber, and a monkie: He has a rich wrought wast-coat to entertaine his visitants in, with a cap almost sutable. His curtaines, and bedding are thought to bee his owne: his bathing-tub is not suspected. He loves to have a fencer, a pedant, and a musician seen in his lodgings a mornings."44

Impressed, Cupid asks if Hedon is not a poet, and Mercury replies:

Fye no: himselfe is a rimer, and that's thought better than a poet. He is not lightly within...no, though he come when he takes physicke, which is commonly after his play. He beats a tailor very well, but a stocking-seller admirably: and so consequently, any one he owes monie to that dares not resist him. Hee never makes generall invitement, but against the publishing of a new sute, marie then, you shall have more drawne to his lodgings, then come to the lanching of some three ships; especially if he be furnished with supplies for the retyring of his own wardrobe from pawne: if not, he does hire a stocke of apparell, and some fortie, or fiftie pound in gold, for that fore-noone to show. He is thought a verie necessarie perfume for the presence, and for that onely cause welcome thither: sixe millaners shops afford you not the like scent. He courts ladies with how many great horse he hath rid that morning, or how oft he hath done the whole, or the halfe pomado in a seven-night before: and sometime ventures so farre upon the vertue of his pommander, that he dares tell 'hem, how many shirts he has sweat at tennis that weeke, but wisely conceales so many dozen of balls he is on the score. Here he comes, that is all this.45

As a fop he is brilliantly drawn, but I find nothing in the above speech that suggests Marston. Marston was cer-tainly never noted for the extravagance of his dress. As the play progresses the characterization of Hedon is strengthened, but it becomes no less general. Jonson was
more concerned with this play as a drama, than as a weapon; and he was more interested in the perfection of his dramatic method than in satirizing Marston. That he was especially preoccupied here with literary merit is plain enough from his famous defense of the play: "By God, 'tis good, and if you lik't, you may." I am inclined to agree with Professor Baskervill that some of the snide remarks made about Hedon may be sly digs at Marston. But the remarks admit to no exact interpretation. As for Anaides, there is nothing to bear out the argument that he is Dekker except his association with Hedon, which obviously is not enough. We cannot even be sure that Dekker did associate with Marston at this time. So, prior to Poetaster, Jonson's name was virtually clear. His conscience, however, may not have been so clean. He can be accused of snide remarks, exaggerated literary criticism, and extravagant self-flattery; but these offenses were the extent of his aggression before Poetaster.

When the Children of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel performed Poetaster in the summer of 1601, the tenor of the conflict immediately changed. Marston, it is true, had made some angry remarks about Jonson in What You Will, performed in the five to six month interval between Cynthia's Revels and Poetaster, but these remarks were nothing compared with Jonson's attack. After a long period of snarling and sulking, Jonson publicly declared
himself provoked, and set out, in *Poetaster*, to drive his opponents from the field. This task, of course, was more than he could accomplish; but he satirized them thoroughly nevertheless.

It is something of a relief to come at last to a play that requires no elaborate identification-quarrel. In the case of *Poetaster*, there is no doubt whatever that Jonson meant Horace to represent himself, Crispinus to represent Marston, and Demetrius Fannius to represent Dekker. Crispinus comes in for the most ridicule; and Jonson plainly told Drummond that he wrote his play against Marston; the identifications are all as obvious as personal satire can be and no scholar with the slightest pretensions to soundness has ever disagreed with a one of them. Thus the emphasis of my discussion will be on the nature and extent of the satire -- something I have touched perhaps too lightly so far.

Envie opens the play with a long speech. Almost immediately he says:

...these fifteen weekes  
(So long as since the plot was but an embrio)  
Have I, with burning lights, mixt vigilant thoughts,  
In expectation of this hated play:  
To which at last I am arrived as Prologue.  

From these words we may judge that the play was written in fifteen weeks, much faster than Jonson's accustomed rate of composition. Such unusual haste leads us to suspect that Jonson had some news of *Satiromastix*, and worked
furiously to beat his enemies to the punch. His opponent's counterpunch, however, would indicate that his fears were largely groundless. Perhaps he did hear that the Chamberlain's men were preparing a satire on him, but he could have had only the vaguest inkling, because Dekker obviously did not begin the satiric parts of Satiromastix until after Poetaster was performed. All his satiric characters are transferred directly from Jonson's play into an incomplete tragedy which he must have had on hand.

The scene of Poetaster, we soon find out, is to be Rome. Envie says:

Rome, Rome? O my vexed soul,
How might I force this to the present state?
Are there no players here? No poet-apes,
That come with basilisk eyes, whose forked tongues
Are steeped in venom, as their hearts in gall?
Eyther of these would help me; they could wrest,
Pervert, and poison all they hear, or see,
With senseless glosses, and allusions. 48

Envie goes on to call up devils to corrupt and traduce the author of the play, but they refuse to rise. Then the Prologue appears and sets his bolder foot on Envie's head. In this prologue, Jonson vehemently makes clear his disgust with the contemporary stage.

If any muse why I salute the stage,
An armed Prologue; know, 'tis a dangerous age:
Wherein, who writes, had need present his Scenes
Forty-fold proof against the conjuring means
Of base detractors, and illiterate apes,
That fill up rooms in faire and formal shapes.
Gainst these have we put on this forc't defense:
Whereof the allegorie and hid sense
Is, that a well erected confidence
Can fright their pride, and laugh their folly hence. 49
Then the Prologue, who may be said to double as the Author, speaks frankly of himself:

...he (the Author) doth implore,
You would not argue him of arrogance:
How ere that common spawne of ignorance,
Our frie of writers, may beslime his fame,
And give his action that adulterate name.
Such ful-blowne vanitie he more doth lothe,
Then base dejection: There's a meane twixt both.
Which, with a constant firmnesse he pursues,
As one, that knowes the strength of his owne muse.
And this he hopes all free soules will allow;
Others, that take it with a rugged brow,
Their moods he rather pitties, then envies:
His mind it is above their injuries.

There the Prologue ends, and the action commences. In the short Dialogue appended to the play, Jonson says he "chose Augustus Caesar's times,/ When wit and artes were at their height in Rome,/ to shew that Virgil, Horace, and the rest/ of those great master-spirits did not want/detractors, then, or practisers against them..." When Jonson cast himself as Horace he was well aware that the great Latin poet had himself suffered defamations when he was Jonson's age; and though the parallel was imperfect, it was enough to give the playwright his guiding principle. Since my primary concern is with the satirical invective, I will confine my discussion to the three person's mentioned, Horace, Crispinus, and Demetrius Fannius. Poetaster does, however, have a unity and a significance apart from its personally satiric aspect; and I will say something about the play as a whole after considering the germane parts.
Horace has his first clash with Crispinus in Act II, scene 1. Horace is composing as he walks along, and Crispinus, fawning at the very sight of the poet, falls in with him and begins his flattery:

Nay, we are new turn'd Poet too, which is more; and a Satyrist too, which is more than that: I write just in thy veine, I.....our name is Publius Laberius Crispinus, we are a prettie stoick too.  

Horace is annoyed and remarks \textit{sotto voce} that Crispinus doubtless has an eloquent tongue when he sleeps. He further remarks that Crispinus' sleeve is ravelling, a rather unkind hit at the none-too-prosperous Marston, but one which probably delighted the audience.\textsuperscript{53} He tries to get away from Crispinus, but finds it difficult; angered beyond control he bursts out in a long aside:

Death! I must crave his leave to piss anon...  
This tyrannie is strange, to take mine eares up by commission,  
(Whether I will or no) and make them stalls  
To his lewd soloecismes, and worded trash.  
Happy thou, bold Bolanus, now, I say;  
Whose freedome, and impatience of this fellow,  
Would, long ere this, have call'd him foole, and foole,  
And ranke, and tedious foole, and have sung jests  
As hard as stones, till thou hadst pelted him  
Out of the place: whil'st my tame modestie  
Suffers my wit to be made a solemn asse  
To bear his fopperies.\textsuperscript{54}

The passage is a plain enough statement of Jonson's view of the situation; and it may adequately represent the many similar passages which occur throughout the play. Horace is persistent in avowing his own modesty, patience,
innocence, etc., and in praising his own compositions above all others. His extreme holier-than-thou attitude, even were it justified, would considerably weaken the effect of his criticisms, which is precisely what it does. He is much gentler with Demetrius-Dekker than he is with Marston; possibly because Dekker had been his friend and collaborator until the Quarrel separated them. Dekker is made to appear stupid, but never vicious.

Crispinus soon begins to malign Harace behind his back; it is this particular form of treachery which leads to his downfall. Horace refuses to introduce the flattering ape to his own friends, and goes away determined to "pull the skin over the eares of vice..."55 His friends warn him not to risk libel, and he professes great shock that anyone should think him capable of lewdness.

I, with lewd verses; such as libel bee,  
And aym'd at persons of good qualitie.  
I reverence and adore that just decree:  
But if they shall be sharp, yet modest rimes  
That spares men's persons and but tax their crimes,  
Such, shall in open court, find currant passe;  
Were Caesar judge, and with the makers grace.56

Meanwhile, the poetasters plot against him. Captain Tucca, the liveliest character in the play, calls Horace a "sharp thornie-toothed satyrical rascal;"57 and even the mild Demetrius concludes that he is "a meere spunge; nothing but humours and observations."58 They belittle Horace for his arrogance, his impudence, his criticism, and his translation; in short, for everything. Then they hatch a
plot to untruss him. But the court of Caesar is just, and the emperor himself is quick to rule against those who "distort and straine/ the generall scope and purpose of an author,/ To his particular, and private spleene."\(^5^9\) The plot is unsuccessful and Crispinus and Demetrius are arraigned and tried for their slanderous talk. The charge against them is Calumny. The court maintains that Horace was falsely accused of self-love, arrogance, and plagiarism. Demetrius at once pleads guilty, and when they ask him why he attacked Horace, he makes a mild reply:

> In troth, no great cause, not I; I must confesse: but that he kept better company (for the most part) then I: and that better men lov'd him, then lov'd me: and that his writings thrived better then mine, and were better lik't and grac't: nothing else.\(^6^0\)

Crispinus, meanwhile, has been given a pill to purge him of his fustian terms. After Demetrius confesses, Crispinus begins to vomit words. The list is worth giving complete: retrograde, reciprocall, incubus, glibbery, lubricall, defunct, magnificate, spurious, snotteries, chilblaind, 'clumsie, barmy froth, puffy, inflate, turgidous, ventositous, oblatrant, furibund, fatuate, strenuous, conscious dampe, prorumped, clutcht, snarling gusts, quaking custard, and obstupefact.\(^6^1\) With this load of Marstonian English off his stomach, Crispinus feels better. He is sternly admonished to watch his dialect in future. Virgil himself warns him.
...let your matter run before your words:
And if at any time, you chance to meet
Some Gallo-belgick phrase, you shall not straight
Racke your poore verse to give it entertainement.

Crispinus is locked up for a week or two, but at Horace's
instigation, is not branded. Horace shows he can be merci-
ful and merely asks that an oath of good behaviour be admin-
stered to the poetasters. Caesar's speech thus closes the
play.

It is the bane and torment of our eares,
To heare the discords of those jangling rimers,
That, with their bad and scandalous practices,
Bring all true artes and learning in contempt.
But let not your high thoughts descend so low,
As these despised objects; let them fall,
With their flat groveling scules: Be you yourselfes.
And as with our best favours you stand crown'd:
So let your mutuall loves be still renown'd.
Envy will dwell, where there is want of merit,
Though the deserving man should cracke his spirit.

In the 1616 Folio the play was followed by the curious
"Apologeticall Dialogue," which I have mentioned several
times already. It was spoken on the stage but once, pro-
bably at the first performance of Poetaster given after
the staging of Satiromastix. The Dialogue contains Jonson's
fullest and most direct statement about the Quarrel, so I
will quote it liberally. As he tells us in his opening
remarks, the Dialogue

...was all the answere I ever gave, to sundry
impotent libells then cast out (and some yet
remaining) against me, and this play. Wherein
I take no pleasure to revive the times, But
that Posteritie may make a difference, between
their manners that provoked me then, and mine
that neglected them ever. For, in these strifes,
and on such persons, it were as wretched to af-
fact a victorie, as it is unhappy to be committed
with them. Non annorum canicies est laudanda,
sed morum.
The remark about libels may be stretched to include all Jonson's troubles of that period; for as Herford and Simpson point out, *Poetaster* brought a storm of retaliatory abuse down on Jonson's head. The play was full of satire on lawyers and soldiers, and we may be sure that those two classes did not take the lampooning gracefully. The soldiers might well have taken offense, for Jonson chose to represent them by the obscene Captain Tucca. Fortunately for Jonson, the retaliatory pressures never came to a head.

In the Dialogue, Jonson professes amazement that the poetasters should be so foolish as to imagine that he would bother with them personally. "I can profess," he says, "I never writ that piece more innocent, or empty of offence. Some salt it had, but neyther tooth, nor gall, Nor was there in it circumstance, Which in the setting down, I could suspect Might be preverted by an enemies tongue." His remark does not ring true. He could not have written *Poetaster* without a full awareness of the way he would appear to enemy eyes, and to pretend less awareness than he had was foolish. When it was reported to him (still in the Dialogue) that he taxed soldiers, lawyers, and players by name, he replied:

...It is not so.
I used no name. By Bookes have still beene taught To spare the persons, and to speake the vices. These are mere slanders, and enforc'd by such As have no safer wayes to men's disgraces, But their own lyes and lacke of honesty... three yeares,
They did provoke me with their petulant stiles
On every stage: and I at last, unwilling,
But weary, I confess, of so much trouble,
Thought I would try if shame could win upon 'him. 66

A little later he amends his statement slightly:

Now, for the players, it is true, I tax'd them,
And yet, but some; and those so sparingly,
As all the rest might have sate still, unquestioned,
Had they but had the wit or conscience,
To think well of themselves. But, impotent, they
Thought each man's vice belong'd to their whole
tribe:

And much good doo't them. What th' have done
against me,
I am not mov'd with. If it gave them meat
Or got them clothes. 'Tis well. That was their end.
Onely amongst them, I am sorry for
Some better natures, by the rest so drawne,
To run in that vile line. 67

This speech is more honest, and more perceptive than those
earlier ones. Jonson is certainly accurate when he claims
to have taxed only a few; and he is probably more than
half right when he said that food and clothes were the
real motives behind the satirizing. There is not much
doubt that the Theatre War, like any literary controversy,
fattened the purses of those who participated in it. The
reference to the better natures has long been thought to
mean Shakespeare, but I cannot agree that it does. It
could as well refer to Dekker, or to any friend of Jonson
who went over to Marston's side.

Jonson goes on to say that he will not attempt to
revenge himself further; posterity may attend to that chore
for him. He maintains that his play was not mere railing,
but broad and accurate satire, a claim which I shall exam-
ine a little later. The Dialogue ends with a long and impassioned soliloquy in which the playwright speaks about the discipline and labor of the dedicated poet, and of the art "borne, when none but the still night, And his dumb candle saw his pinching throes." I quote the final passage in its entirety.

Were not his owne free merit a more crowne
Unto his travailes, then their reeling claps.
This 'tis that strikes me silent, seales my lips,
And apts me, rather to sleepe out my time,
Then I would waste it in contemned strifes,
With these vile Ibides, these unclean birds,
That make their mouths their clysters, and still purge
Their hot entrails. But, I leave the monsters
To their own fate. And, since the Comick Muse
Hath prov'd so ominous to me, I will trie
If Tragedie have a more kind aspect.
Her favours in my next I will pursue,
Where, if I prove the pleasure but on one,
So he judicious be; He shall be alone
A theatre unto me: Once, I'le say,
To strike the ear of time, in those fresh straines,
As shall, beside the cunning of their ground,
Give cause to some of wonder, some despight,
And unto more, despaire, to imitate their sound.
I, that spend halfe my nights, and all my days,
Here in a cell, get a darke, pale face,
To come forth worth the joy, or the bayes,
And in this age can hope no other grace --
Leave me. There's something come into my thought,
That must, and shall be sung, high, and aloofe,
Save from the wolves black jaw, and the dull asses hoofe.

The Quarrel clearly left its mark on Jonson. Here he vows to turn to tragedy, and to write only for himself and the one judicious reader who, alone, will be his theatre. His dedication to the cause of good poetry was not shaken; rather it was intensified by his struggle.

Before I summarize Jonson's contributions to the Theatre
War I might mention some of the less personal aspects of *Poetaster*. It is, of course, the central document so far as the War is concerned; and nothing is likely to oust it from its place. But a fuller understanding of the play as a dramatic whole gives us a clearer conception of Jonson's part in the Quarrel, and of his reasons for entering it. In spite of the personal applicability of some of the portraits, *Poetaster* is a well-constructed play, a play in no sense about Marston and Dekker. Thematically, it is about the real Poet, as opposed to the fraud and the fake. In a sense it is possible to say that the whole of Jonson's effort in the War was directed against the same thing: bad poetry and bad poets. The satiric portraits which he drew were no doubt a great satisfaction to him, but they were integrally connected with a somewhat more ambitious plan.

The scholar who has done the most to get *Poetaster* properly read and to give its extra-personal elements the proper emphasis is Oscar James Campbell. His study, *Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida*, was published by the Huntington Library in 1938. In the study, he attempts to show that Jonson, in *Every Man Out*, *Cynthia's Revels*, and *Poetaster*, was trying to re-establish a tradition that had been abolished by official edict in the last years of the sixteenth century. The bishops of England ordered the destruction of a great number of prose (and verse) satires in the year 1599; they further ordered
that no more satires of a like nature should be published.  

The order, however, was never effectively enforced. Jonson in the three plays mentioned, Marston in *Jack Drum* and *What You Will*, and Shakespeare in *Troilus and Cressida* were really writing the type of comical satires which were forbidden. In this case, Campbell maintains that Jonson was the originator; the others were merely copying his form. Professor Campbell's thesis may or may not be valid, but he does manage to show that the three Jonson plays, as dramatic constructions, are very similar. From this similarity he concludes that the "comicall satyre" was Jonson's primary concern. Such a scheme, of course, allows Professor Campbell to ignore the personal satire in the plays, and ignore it he certainly does. Yet his arguments are valuable. Just prior to the publication of his book, he contributed to the *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* a particularly fine article on the dramatic construction of *Poetaster*. He believes the Ovid-plot to be the essential thing in *Poetaster*, and argues thus:

> The drama is fundamentally a social satire. The climbers are displayed with all their now familiar pretentious ineptitude. To be sure, not so much time as formerly is devoted to their exhibition. It is to the society formed by the adepts that more critical attention is given. They are shown to have created an organization the grace of which is not only hollow but also an expression of moral nihilism. The new element added to the picture is the deleterious influence exerted by the ideals of the coterie upon the poets and dramatists associated with it. The poetasters are depicted as parasites upon the creatures at the lower levels of their social structure. Their characters have been
distorted by their eager servility to the ideals of the profligate world. It is the crash of this rotten edifice that the play represents. Ovid, as the leader of this fin de siecle society, and Julia as his half-willing, half-reluctant victim, are properly given the most condign and spectacular punishment. Their fall and their suffering provide Jonson's ethical spirit with its clearest utterance in this play. Thus conceived, the Ovid plot, far from being "a mere disturbing incongruity," becomes the structural center of the play. 71

Anyone who is familiar with the play will recognize the accuracy of what Professor Campbell says. About the personal elements, he concludes:

Once embarked upon his imaginative project, he (Jonson) inevitably used the devices that he had employed in his earlier satiric plays and adhered to the literary principles that had governed all writers of satire, at least from the time of Horace. Consequently, the mood of personal hostility which clearly appears at intervals in Poetaster is restrained and generalized according to the accepted rules of literary behaviour. Hence, even Crispinus and Demetrius represent, most of the time, types of intellectual incompetence and fraud, and only occasionally display the unmistakably individual characteristics of Marston and Dekker. Similarly in the case of Horace, type qualities of a satiric decorum predominate over those intended to suggest the man Ben Jonson. Moreover, the orthodox satiric temper is carefully preserved throughout the comedy. The occasional outbursts of farce and hilarious ridicule do not diminish the stern ethical disapproval which is the emotional justification for all the various sorts of laughter aroused by the comic action. 72

I will allow Professor Campbell his point, but here I think he slightly over-stresses it. The personal elements in Poetaster are extremely important; and it is a tribute to Jonson's power as an artist that they are not the whole
of the play's importance. For the moment, that is enough
to say.

The scholarship of the last thirty years, perhaps
following Professor Campbell's lead, has tended to empha-
size the architectonics of these questionable plays, and
to ignore almost completely their personal aspects. Conse-
quently, most of the recent scholarship has no particular
pertinence to this discussion; I will content myself with
a very brief and general mentioning of the major pieces.
Henry Gray argues in a provocative article that Poetaster
was a full-scale attack on the Chamberlain's Men. His
article is interesting, but he makes numerous unwarranted
identifications, and I do not think the piece merits anal-
ysis. John Palmer, in his biography of Jonson, says the
War was only important because it turned Jonson to tragedy.73
John J. Enck, in his really excellent book Jonson and the
Comic Truth, mentions the poetomachia only to assert that
Jonson was careful to separate vice and man.74 Nothing
of real significance has appeared since Lieutenant Berringer's
article on Cynthia's Revels, in 1943.

A good deal has been said about Jonson as a defender
of poetry, but so far very little has been quoted. One
of his most famous apostrophes comes in the first act of
Poetaster. Ovid is speaking:

O sacred poesie, thou spirit of artes,
The soule of science, and the queene of soules,
What prophane violence, almost sacrilege,
Hath here been offered thy divinities!
That thine owne guiltless povertie should arme
Prodigious ignorance to wound thee thus!
For thence, is all their force of argument
Drawn against thee; or from the
Abuse of thy great powers in adulterate braines:
When, would men learn but to distinguish spirits,
And set true difference twixt those withs
That run a broken pace for common hire,
And the high raptures of a happy Muse,
Borne on the wings of her immortal thought,
That kicks at earth with a disdainful heel,
And beats at heaven gates with her bright hooves;
They would not then with such distorted faces,
And desperate censures stab at poesie.
They would admire bright knowledge, and their minds
Should never descend on so unworthy objects,
As gold, or titles: they would dread far more,
To be thought ignorant, then be knowne poore...

Another passage, perhaps more to our purpose, is Horace's
defense of satire in Act III. Trebatius has just warned
him to tread softly, lest some rich and powerful man have
him silenced by assassins. Horace replies:

What? When the man that first did satyrise,
Durst pull the skin over the ears of vice;
And make, who stood in outward fashion clear,
Give place, as foul within; shall I forbear?
Did Laelius, or the man, so great with fame,
That from sackt Carthage fetched his worthy name,
Storme, that Lucilius did Metellus pierce?
Or bury Lupus quick, in famous verse?
Rulers, and subjects, by whole tribes he checkt;
But virtue, and her friends did still protect:
And when from sight, or from the judgment seat,
The vertuous Scipio, and Wise Laelius met,
Unbrac't, with him in all light aports, they shar'd;
Till, their most frugal suppers were prepar'd.
What ere I am, though both for wealth, and with,
Beneath Lucilius, I am pleas'd to sit;
Yet, envy (spight of her empoisoned brest)
Shall say, I liv'd in grace here, with the best;
And, seeking in weake trash to make her wound,
Shall fine me solid and her teeth unsound:
Lesse, learn'd Trebatius censure disagree.

To these defenses I add three of Jonson's epigrams. Many
of the epigrams touch some aspect of art, but the three
I have chosen seem particularly germane. All three are on the playwright; the first is his forty-eighth.

Play-wright convict of publicke wrongs to men,
Takes private beatings, and begins againe.
Two kinds of valour he doth shew, at ones:
Active in's braine, and passive in his bones. 77

The second is obvious directed against the incompetent dramatist, or the poetaster:

Play-wright me reades, and still my verses dammes,
He says, I want the tongue of Epigrammes;
I have no salt: no bawdrie he doth meane.
For wittie, in his language, is obscene.
Playwright, I loath to have thy manners knowne
In my chaste book: professse them in thine owne. 78

The last is on the plagiarist:

Play-wright, by chance, hearing some toyes I had writ,
Cry'd to my face, they were th'elixir of wit:
And I must now believe him: for today,
Five of my jests, then stolne, past him a play. 79

With these quotations, so broadly illustrative of Jonson's attitude toward the hack-writer of his day, I close my survey of his works. The plays which follow Poetaster are outside the area of the Theatre War. So far as I know only one effort to connect a later play with the Quarrel has been made, and that, by Freda Townsend, was neither ambitious nor successful. 80 (The play in question was Bartholomew Fair.) It is probable that Jonson's own rigid views on the uses of poetry and satire soon made him regret his attacks in Poetaster -- the "Apologeticall Dialogue" seems to indicate such a regret -- and if he continued unfriendly to Marston, he at least refrained from writing
plays which contained satiric portraits. Poetaster was his first play of that nature, and the last.

Nothing connected in any way with Ben Jonson's complex personality can be easily summarized, and thus it is difficult to fix with precision his relation to the Quarrel. It is accurate, however, to say that the central role was his. He was the only major figure involved, and his contributions were by far the best literature the Quarrel produced. Had the War involved, for example, Marston, Dekker, and Nathan Field, scholarly interest might have died out a century ago. Rare Ben Jonson provides the essential fascination; and his supposed disagreement with Shakespeare gave Quarrel scholarship its start.

What then was Jonson's contribution? Would there have been a War without him? Why should Jonson, with his perpetual concern for poetry and the honor of poets, have been drawn into a prolonged quarrel with his fellow poets? The answers to such questions would require a summary of much more than Jonson's part in the Quarrel, but the answers can, for the moment, be abbreviated. Jonson was definitely the catalytic agent. The intensity of his passion for good poetry, compounded with his own conceit or artist's pride, plus his encompassing scorn of whatever was artistically imperfect were, in my opinion, responsible for most of the trouble. Jonson's vanity was pricked in 1598, when Meres called Munday the best plotter; his vanity prompted him to write the scene in The Case Is Altered, a scene in
which envy, contempt, and amused disbelief are curiously mingled. From the first Jonson seems to have been well aware of his own genius; but unfortunately he was aware of it much earlier than were his contemporaries. He simply could not conceal his own sense of superiority; indeed, there is no evidence that he tried. In some cases he thrust his wit and learning into his rivals' faces like the red taroumachial flag. That he had his moments of true humility, we know from his writings; but these moments generally came upon him in his study, when he was confronted directly with the excellence of the Greek and Latin dramatists. When he was about in the taverns of Elizabethan London it was conceit, rather than humility, which possessed him. The lesser playwrights could not help observing this conceit, and they were not quick to excuse it. Marston was a young, aspiring playwright himself, and though he no doubt had a writer's respect for Jonson's ability, he was not of an age or a temperament to take high-handed criticism lightly. The conflict of personalities caused the quarrel which inspired the plays; and Jonson was in my opinion the aggressor. In Every Man In His Humour he was too busy writing well to dabble in personality; but by the time Every Man Out appeared he had considered the contemporary scene reflectively, and was beginning to display his irritation. Perhaps he let the model poet Asper too directly parrot his own beliefs — beliefs which he probably expounded in the taverns regularly —;
and he certainly singled out Marston as an example of the inferior stylist. Clove and Orage parody Marston's diction mercilessly. Of course Jonson may not have intended to give offense; he may have been so naive as to think that the younger man would welcome his criticism. If so, he misread human nature. Marston took offense whether it was intended or not, and got in some sly digs at Jonson in his own Jack Drum. Ben withheld his reply for over a year. Cynthia's Revels has no direct representations. Marston may have read himself into Hedon, we do not know. But he did strike out in What You Will, and he did, apparently, commence negotiations with Dekker for Satiromastix. Jonson got wind of the proposed play, and decided to "see if shame could win upon them." He began furious work upon Poetaster. Perhaps by this time the friends of the two men had begun to take sides; if so we can be sure that the War was waged every night in the bar-rooms of London. I suspect, personally, that the real insults were delivered informally, at these more or less subterranean encounters, and that it was probably some personal jibe long lost to us that finally set Jonson off. Marston's two plays (Jack Drum and What You Will) had been too poor and the satire in them too mild for Jonson to build so elaborate a reply. I believe he finally grew weary of the bickering and the insults and decided to strike a telling blow, and have done with it once and for all. His own attitudes may have started the squabble, but there is much to be said in his
defense. He had a fierce sincerity, and I do not believe he doubted for a moment the legitimacy of what he did. For a time he did manage, as he claimed, to separate the man from the vice. Excepting *The Case Is Altered*, which really belongs to another quarrel, he only used the lam­poon once: in *Poetaster*. Even there he was still doggedly proclaiming that the Artist was the acme of things accom­plished, and that anyone who befouled the character of an artist deserved no leniency, but exposure and punish­ment instead. He attacked persons in defense of art, but also in defense of himself. His attack was open. It would have been better if he had dispensed with denials entirely and admitted all along that he was out to silence the poetasters, for that is the gist of what he finally admitted in the "Apologetical Dialogue." Once he struck the major blow, he was through. He saw that the Dialogue got in the First Folio, and he mentioned Marston to Drummond, but otherwise he stuck to writing better plays and left his quarrels for after hours. He caused the Quarrel, and he was the most affected by it, but after his attack was made it remained for another playwright, Thomas Dekker, to deliver the quietus.
We do not know a great deal about the life of Thomas Dekker. He was born in London, the city he addresses in one of his fine apostrophes as the "...beautifullest daughter of the two united Monarchies! From thy womb received I my being; from thy breasts my nourishment."¹ He himself was vague about his birthdate, but it can probably be set within a year or two of 1570.² After 1597 his name appears frequently in Henslowe's Diary; and we know that by 1602 he had written nine plays of his own, and had had a hand in over a dozen more. During this period he collaborated with Jonson, Drayton, Wilson, Chettle, Haughton, Day, Munday, Hathaway, and perhaps others. He was always poor, but his ability to turn out plays and pamphlets almost without number kept him, for the most part, out of debt. He was almost proverbially prolific, but a large part of what he wrote was ephemeral. As a consequence, his canon has never been satisfactorily established; if it were it might challenge that of the voluminous Daniel Defoe. The older Dekker grew, the more shadowy his biography becomes. Fleay would have him dead in 1632; Bullen not until 1641. Fortunately I need examine only one of his plays in this discussion, and that,
Satiromastix, from the relatively well-documented year 1601.

Dekker and Jonson knew each other, but that is practically the only thing about their relationship which is not open to considerable doubt. In 1599 they collaborated on two plays, The Page of Plymouth, and The Scot's Tragedy; and apparently they were fairly friendly until 1601, the final year of the action. Dekker by all accounts was a mild, genial man, a person of considerable humility. So far as we know he labored under no illusions as to the quality of a large part of his writing; at least he was not given to self-flattery. His plays show him to have been a man of quick sympathy and gentle humour. Even in Satiromastix his satire is without sting. His keen ear for the accent and rhythm of his time was perhaps his greatest literary asset; and a forceful simplicity was his most prominent artistic virtue. In many ways he was Jonson's opposite. The latter was fairly prolific, but he was seldom facile and almost never simple. Dekker was a strange mixture of genius and hack (a mixture which may be observed in many writers before and since), while Jonson's vein was purer, more obscure, and less perishable.

We do not know when Jonson and Dekker began to quarrel; and indeed it has not been proven that they ever did. Dekker was probably drawn into the conspiracy against Jonson early in 1601, shortly after the performance of Cynthia's
Revels. Marston may have persuaded him that Jonson lampooned him as Anaides, but that is only conjecture. A more likely possibility, in my opinion, is that the Chamberlain's Men, mad at Jonson and probably inflamed by Marston, simply hired Dekker to satirize the unpopular playwright. Jonson's relations with the Chamberlain's men grew increasingly hostile after they refused Every Man Out; but Dekker was apparently always friendly with that company. He may still have felt friendly to Jonson, or he may have lost patience himself; we do not know. But in either case he was too proficient a hack to let a commission get away from him. He took the job, but as I pointed out earlier, did not particularly exert himself. He must have waited until Poetaster appeared before going to work. At this time he had an unfinished tragedy on his hands, about William Rufus; the tragedy had a subplot involving Vaughan, Prickshaft, and the Widow Minever. When Poetaster appeared he merely borrowed four of Jonson's characters -- Horace, Crispinus, Demetrius Fannius, and the unruly Captain Tucca -- and transferred them to his own play. The result is the extremely ineffective dramatic construction we know as Satiromastix, certainly not one of Dekker's memorable plays. In my opinion Jonson's famous reference in Poetaster to the "better natures" is a somewhat rueful afterthought which refers to Dekker and this play. It was performed in the autumn of 1601, once by the Chamberlain's Men and again by the Boys of Paul's.
The prologue is a long argument in prose addressed to "the World." Since it accurately outlines Dekker's opinion on the whole affair, I quote it liberally.

I care not much if I make description (before thy universality) of that terrible Poetomachia, lately commenc'd betwene Horace the second, and a band of leane-witted Poetasters. They have bin at high wordes, and so high, that the ground could not serve them, but (for want of Chopins) have stalk't upon Stages.

In this passage Dekker sounds detached. He speaks of the band of poetasters as if he were not one of them. His use of "stages," plural, would indicate that more than one play figured in the Quarrel: Poetaster and What You Will. He makes a further comment on Horace:

Horace hal'd his Poetasters to the Barre, the Poetasters untruss'd Horace: how worthily eyther, or how wrongfully, (World) leave it to the Jurie: Horace (questionles) made himself believe, that his Burgonian wit might desperately challenge all commers, and that none durst take up the foles against him: It's likely if he had not so believ'd, he had not bin so deceiv'd, for hee was answer'd at his owne weapon: And if before Apollo himselfe (who is Coronator Poetarum) an Inquisition should be taken touch¬ing this lamentable merry murdering of Innocent Poetry: all mount Helicon to Bun-Hill, it would be found on the Poetasters side Se defendo.

Curiously, this passage makes it sound as if the prologue were written after the play; for how had Horace been untruss'd before Satiromastix? Now Dekker is definitely on the side of the poetasters, but he is still not one of them. Like Jonson, he laments the damage such friction does to poetry.
Notwithstanding, the doctors think otherwise. I meete one, and he runs full Butt at me with his Satires hornes, for that in untrussing Horace, I did onely whip his fortunes, and condition of life, where the more noble Reprehension had bin of his mindes deformatie, whose greatness if his Criticall Lynx had with as narrow eyes, observ'd in himselfe, as it did little spots upon others: without all disputation Horace would not have left Horace out of Everyman In His Humour...A second cata- mounte mewes and calls me barren, because my braines could bring forth no other Stigmaticke than Tucca, whome Horace had put to making, and begot to my hand...Ist not as lawfull then for me to imitate Horace, as Horace Hannam? ...neyther was it much improper to set the same dog upon Horace, whom Horace had set to worrie others.  

Dekker goes on to say that he did not wish the least disgrace to any man, save only the new Horace. He defends himself against the charge of barrenness or lack of imagination by claiming that he only used Horace's characters to give that poet a taste of his own medicine. He gently reprimands Jonson for being hypercritical of others and uncritical of himself.

Horace appears first in the second scene of Act I. He is in his study, deep in the throes of composition:

To thee whose fore-head swels with roses,  
Whose most haunted bower,  
Gives life and scent to every flower;  
Whose most adored name incloses,  
Things abstruse, deep and divine,  
Whose yellow tresses shine  
Bright as Eoan fire.  
O me thy priest inspire.  
For I to thee and thine immortall name,  
In -- in -- in golden tunes,  
For I to thee and thine immortall name,  
In -- sacred raptures flowing, swimming, swimming:
In sacred raptures swimming,
Immortall name, game, dame, tame, lame, lame, lame,
Fox, ha it, shame, proclaime, oh --
In Sacred raptures flowing, will proclaime, not --
O me thy Priest inspyre!
For I to thee and thine immortall name,
In flowing numbers fild with spright and flame,
Good, good, in flowing numbers fil'd with spright
and flame.

Horace-Jonson is here laboriously composing an epithalamium
for Sir Walter Terril's wedding. Dekker, who wrote
*Satiromastix* in considerably less than the fifteen weeks
Jonson spent on *Poetaster*, was poking fun at his ex-colla-
borator's halting method of composition.

Horace soon finds out that Tucca has been making fun
of him, and that Crispinus and Demetrius Fannius have sworn
to bring him upon the stage in a play. Horace echoes
the speech of Crites and calls one a "light voluptuous
reveler," the other "a strange arrogating puffe." As
soon as Crispinus and Demetrius come on the scene, Horace
begins to complain about the false interpretations which
are constantly put on his work:

Oh heaven to see,
That when my lines are measur'd out as straight
As even Parallels, tis strange that still,
Still some imagine they are drawne awry.
The error is not mine, but in theyr eye,
That cannot take proportions.

Crispinus and Demetrius listen calmly. Crispinus decides
not to let the remark pass, though his eventual comment
is mild.

...innocence
May with a feather brush off the foulest wrongs.
But when your dastard wit will strike at men
In corners, and in riddles folde the vices
Of your best friends, you must not take to heart,
If they take off all gilding from their pilles,
And only offer you the bitter core.\(^{12}\)

Once he gets started, Crispinus warms to the argument,
and continues:

Say that you have not sworne unto your paper,
To blot her white cheekes with the dregs and botome
Of your friends private vices: say you sweare
Your love and your aleageance to bright vertue
Makes you descend so low, as to put on
The office of an Executioner,
Onely to strike off the swolne head of sinne,
Where ere you finde it standing; say you sweare,
And make damnation parcell of your oath,
That when your lashing jestes make all men bleed;
Yet you whip none. Court, city, country, friends,
Foes, all must smart alike; yet Court, nor city,
Nor fow, nor friend, dare winch at you; great pity.\(^{13}\)

Then Demetrius enters the argument, and the two of them try to get Horace to admit his guilt; but he stands firm. They tell him they come to cure, not to punish.

Demetrius says:

In troth we doe, out of our loves we come,
And not revenge, but if you strike us still,
We must defend our reputations:
Our pens shall like our swords be alwayes sheath'd,
Unlesse too much provoict, Horace if then
They draw blood of you, blame us not, we are men:
Come, let thy Muse beare up a smoother sayle,
Tis the easiest and the basest art to rayle.\(^{14}\)

Horace begins a noble speech, in which he swears loyalty:

Deliver me your hands, I love you both,
As deare as my owne soule, proove me, and when
I shall traduce you, make me the scorne of men.\(^{15}\)

Before he can really get warmed up, the explosive Tucca
comes in. He will have none of the truce; after calling Horace a "thin-bearded Hermaphrodite," he goes on to recount his sins. He reminds Horace that he wronged Crispinus by saying his satin doublet was ravelling; and that he also abused the innocent Demetrius. Horace is as meek as can be as long as the three are present, but when they leave he says: "They have choakt me with mine owne disgrace, Which (fooles) I'le spit again even in your face."  

In the next act (II) Horace immediately begins to slander Crispinus and Demetrius, and to compose derogatory epigrams on Captain Tucca. He refers to the former two as Poet-apes, a name Jonson used in the induction to *Poetaster*. By the end of the act Tucca has heard the epigrams and he vows the poet shall be untrussed.

The satiric plot does not figure in Act III, but early in Act IV Tucca confronts Horace with the slanderous epigrams he had composed. In his fury he reels off a long speech which is full of references to Jonson's literary biography:

...thou callest Demetrius Jorneyman Poet, but thou putst up A Supplication to be a poore Jorneyman Player, and hadst been still so, but that thou couldst not set a good face upon't: thou hast forgot thou amblest (in leather pilch) by a play-wagon, in the high way, and took'st mad Ieronimoes part, to get service among the Mimickes: and when the stagerites banist thee into the Ile of Dogs, thou turn'dst Ban-dog (villanous Guy) and ever since bitest, therefore I aske if th'ast been at Parris-garden, because thou hast such a good mouth, thou baitst well; read lege, save thy selfe and read.
This passage refers, of course, to Jonson's hand in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, and to his scrape with the law after the performance of Nashe's lost drama *The Isle of Dogs*. Horace refuses to admit that the epigrams are his; he is entirely too cowardly to stand up to Tucca.

A little later, Tucca refers to Jonson's fight with Gabriel Spencer.

Art not famous enough yet, my mad Horastratus, for killing a Player, but thou must eate men alive? Thy friends? Sirra wilde-man, thy Patrons? Thou Anthropophagite, thy Mecaenasses.

Horace tries his best to flatter Tucca into a better humour, but the soldier goes away mad. As soon as he leaves the stage Horace renews his vow to cut him with his pen. The next time Tucca encounters Horace he stabs at him with his dagger, and the poet thinks he is done for. Sir Vaughan joins in the fun and asks Horace how he came to swap the honest craft of bricklaying for the vile craft of railing, referring, of course, to Jonson's early life. The two decide to toss the luckless poet in a blanket, to repay him for his false arraignment of the poetasters. Then Horace protests indeed:

What could I doe, out of a just revenge
But bring them to the stage? They envy me
Because I hold more worthy company.

Demetrius immediately makes a just reply:

Good Horace, no; my cheekes doe blush for thine,
As often as thou speakest so, where one true
And nobly-vertuous spirit, for thy best part
Loves thee, I wish one ten, even from my heart.
I make account I put up as deep share
In any good man's love, which they worth earnes,
As thou thy selfe; we envy not to see,
Thy friends with Bayes to crown thy Poesie.
No, here the gall lies; we that know what stuffe
Thy very heart is made of, know the stalk
On which thy learning growes, and can give life
To thy (once dying) baseness; yet must we
Dance antickes on your Paper. 24

The speech is moderate, sincere, and it rings true.

Crispinus immediately seconds it.

This makes us angry, but not envious,
No, were thy warped soul, put in a new mould,
Ide weare thee as a Jewel set in golde. 25

Sir Vaughan, who takes a great deal of amusement from
Horace's discomfort, decides to forgo the blanket and
carry the playwright to court, there to have him dipped
in liquor and dyed the color of a poet. But his design
is saved for the concluding act.

In the second scene of Act V, Crispinus begs the king
for permission to try Horace, whom he calls a "humourous
dreadfull poet..." 26 Crispinus goes on to say that Horace
sets himself up to whip men; the King is prompted to in-
quire:

If a cleare merit stand upon his praise,
Reach him a Poets crowne (the Honour'd baye)
But if he claime it, wanting right thereto,
As many bastard Sons of Poesie doe)
Race downe his usurpation to the ground.
True poets are with arte and nature crowned. 27

He then gives Horace over to Crispinus. Tucca drags the
captive in. Horace now wears satyr's horns, and Tucca
carries a wreath of nettle for good measure.
Sir Vaughan asks Horace why he is dressed like a satyr, and when the flustered poet tries to stammer a reply, Tucca cuts him off:

But to bite every Motley-head vice by th'nose, you did it Ningle to play the Bug-beare Satyre, and make a Campe royall of fashion-mongers quake at your paper bullets; you Nastle Tortois, you and your Itchy Poetry breake out like Christmas, But once a year, and then you keepe a Revelling, and Araigning, and a Stratching of mens faces, as tho you were Tyber the long-tailed Prince of Rattes, do you?  

The line about "Itchy Poetry" breaking out but once a year is another of the excessively frequent references to Jonson's slow composition. Prior to Poetaster his deliberation led him to produce only one play a year.

Soon Crispinus hails Horace to the bar:

Under controule of my dread soveraigne, We are thy judges; thou that didst Arraigne, Art now prepared for condemnation; Should I but bid thy Muse stand to the Barre, Thyself against her would give evidence: For flat rebellion gainst the sacred lawes, of divine Poesie: herein most she mist, Thy pride and scorne made her turne Saterist, And not her love to vertue (as thou Preachest) Or should be minister strong pilles to thee: What lumps of hard and indigested stuffe, Of bitter Satirisme, of Arrogance, Of selfe-love, or Detraction, of a blacke And stinking Insolence should we fetch up? But none of these, we give thee what's more fit, With stinging nettles crowne his stinging wit. 

On top of this, Tucca has "layed roddes in Pisse and vinegar," and intends to use them on Horace for his conceit in usurping the name of the great Latin poet. As Tucca points out:
...Horace had not his face punched full of Oylet-holes, like the cover of a warming-pan: Horace lov'd poets well, and gave Coxcombes to none but fools; but thou lov'st none, neither Wisemen nor fools, but thy selfe: Horace was a goodly corpulent gentleman, and not so leane a hollow-cheekt scrag as thou art... 30

Then Horace is made to swear a long and complex oath.
First, he swears not to hang himself just because he hears of a poet who can write plays and rhymes as well-favoured as his own. Second, he must not sit in the gallery when his own plays are being produced; or if he sits there he must refrain from making horrible faces at every line, because such practice distracts the gentlemen and makes actors fear to take his parts. Third, he must not rush on stage after the play and exchange compliments with the young gallants. Fourth, he must not invite friends to the marriage of some poor couple and then pretend later that the guests were kings and nobles come to pay homage to him; when some courteous knight gives him money he must not go around mouthing jests about the knight's ancestry. Fifth, when his plays happen to be disliked at court, he must not go strutting about claiming that he is glad to write over the courtier's heads. Sixth, and last, I quote:

In briefynes, when you sup in Tavernes, amongst your betters, you shall sweare not to dippe your Manners in too much sawce, nor at Table to fling epigrams, Emblemes, or Play-speeches about you (lyke haile-stones) to keepe you out of the terrible danger of the Shot, upon payne to sit at the upper ende of the Table, at the left hand of Carlo Buffone: sweare all this by Apollo and the eight or nine muses. 31
Horace quickly swears, and the play ends. But it is Tucca, after all, who has the last word.

...if you set your hands and seales to this, Horace will write against it, and you may have more sport: he shall not loose his labour, he shall not turne his blanke verses into waste paper: No, my poetasters will not laugh at him, but will untrusse him agen, and agen, and agen. Ile tell you what you shall do, cast your little Tucca into a Bell: doe, make a bell of me, and be all you my clappers, upon condition we may have a lustie peale, this colde weather: I have but two legs left me, and they are both yours: good night my two penny tenants, good night. 32

With that inaccurate prophecy, the Theatre War was properly ended. Jonson's exact reactions to the play would be hard to judge, but we know he gave the poetasters no opportunity to untruss him again. His "Appologetical Dialogue" is an attempt on Jonson's part to make his own intentions clear, but it is not an answer to Dekker.

Satiromastix is much milder in tone than Poetaster; but at the same time it is weaker both as drama and as poetry. Dekker's arraignment lacks the sting that Jonson's had. I do not believe that the difference was entirely due to differing poetic abilities; I think Dekker had the gentler intentions. On the other hand, the fine eulogistic poetry that spots Poetaster is completely missing in Satiromastix; so are the many impressive passages Jonson devotes to the art of poetry. Theatrically, Dekker's play is a hodge-podge, whereas Jonson's was a capable dramatic construction. Satiromastix is, however, the more important
play from the point of view of the Quarrel historian, because Dekker goes to some trouble to comment on the history of the conflict.

*Satiromastix* was Thomas Dekker's only contribution to Quarrel literature, and when one considers its nature and the circumstances of its composition, his position is certainly curious. Of the three principal combatants, he was the one least affected. It is not too inaccurate to say that only his pocket-book was affected at all. He wrote after *Satiromastix* much as he had before the Quarrel began, producing a great deal that was good and a great deal more that was indifferent. In the play, the speeches of Demetrius, who represented Dekker himself, bear an unmistakable sincerity, and exhibit so warm a concern for Jonson that I find it hard to believe Dekker could have been on really bad terms with him. No doubt he was provoked that Jonson behaved in such a haughty fashion; also, he must have resented being summarily lumped with the poetasters. If Jonson had caricatured him for money, Dekker might not have minded; but as Jonson did it out of pride and contempt, Dekker could but find it irritating.

We may assume the poetasters made Dekker a business offer which he had no qualms about accepting. When he got around to writing the play he took an obvious delight in showing Horace untrussed. His emotions, however, were never deeply involved; he was more amused than otherwise.
Satiromastix is the least malicious of performances, and the Horace of Dekker's play is less distasteful as a person than Jonson's representation of himself. Dekker's Horace has human potentialities; his only crime is his high self-regard. Indeed, the Horace of Satiromastix is so foolish that his conceit is a little improbable. The center of the comic plot is Tucca, not Horace. Horace is only the nominal target for Tucca's bombast; if Horace were lifted out Tucca would rail at the soldiers, the lawyers, or the ladies.

Dekker's part in the War can be briefly summed up. He was friendly with the Chamberlain's Men in 1601, when Jonson was decidedly their enemy. He seems to have associated with Marston about this time, which alone was enough to make him the object of Jonson's scorn. Moreover, Jonson knew that Dekker had been approached to write a play satirizing him. As a consequence, Jonson hurried his own production, and cast Dekker as the harmless Demetrius Fannius, companion to Crispinus. Dekker was mildly angered, if he was angered at all; but he went to work and had Satiromastix ready by late summer of 1601. Probably Dekker forgot the play and the Quarrel the night after Satiromastix was played. He and Ben Jonson continued to live and write in London for more than a quarter of a century after the Quarrel, and so far as we know, their relations were entirely amiable.
V
William Shakespeare

As I have shown, the Stage Quarrel was at its height in the summer of 1601. Poetaster appeared in June of that year, and Satiromastix was on the boards by September. Then, their resentments somewhat relieved, the three principals -- Marston, Jonson, and Dekker -- fell silent. For them at least, the war was over.

Their contemporaries, however, did not immediately lose interest in the Quarrel. Around Christmas time of that same year, 1601, the students of St. John's College, Cambridge put on the trilogy of Parnassus plays; the last of the plays contained a speech which bore directly, though mysteriously, on the famous dispute. Kempe is speaking to Burbage:

"Few of the university pen plaies well, they smell too much of that writer Ovid, and that writer Metamorphosis, and talke too much of Proserpina & Juppiter. Why heres our fellow Shakespeare puts them all down, I and Ben Jonson too. O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow, he brought up Horace giving the Poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him beray his credit."

The "pill" of course refers to the regurgitation scene in Poetaster, but the following lines are more important here. Because of them, Shakespeare's name has been drawn inextricably into the Quarrel. The speech indicates that
Shakespeare struck some telling blow at Jonson, a blow that Jonson, and presumably, most theatre-goers of the day would recognize as such. Yet in spite of vigorous scholarly effort on the part of Professor Small and others to establish the exact nature of the purge Shakespeare delivered, nothing substantial has been agreed upon. The most persistent notion is that the character Ajax in *Troilus and Cressida* is a satiric representation of Jonson; but the notion is so ill-supported that it can justly be given no more dignified name. The scholarship of the last two centuries has shed very little light on Shakespeare's supposed contribution to the Quarrel, though, to do it justice, it has made available all the evidence there is ever likely to be. In this chapter I propose to review the evidence and the scholarly opinion concerning it; and then to examine closely the Ajax-character as he appears in the play. I hope to demonstrate the improbability of the Ajax identification, and further, to show that any active animosity between Shakespeare and Jonson was an extreme unlikelihood.

Shakespeare's name had been tenuously linked to the Stage War quite apart from his mention in the Parnassus play. The scholars of the nineteenth century were apt to offer Jonson's prologue to *Every Man In His Humour* as clear evidence that Jonson and Shakespeare quarreled. To make reference more convenient, I quote the prologue in its entirety:
Though need make many poets, and some such
As art and nature have not bettered much;
Yet ours for want hath not so loved the stage,
As he dare serve the ill customs of the age,
Or purchase your delight at such a rate,
As, for it, he himself must justly hate:
To make a child now swaddled, to proceed
Man, and then shoot up, in one beard and weed,
Past threescore years; or with three rusty swords,
And help of some few foot and half-foot words,
Fight over Lancaster's long jars,
And in the trying house bring wounds to scars.
He rather prays you will be pleased to see
One such today as other plays should be;
Where neither chorus wafts you o'er the seas,
Nor creaking throne comes down the boys to please:
Nor nimble squib is seen to make afeard
The gentlewoman; no rolled bullet heard
To say, it thunders; nor tempestuous drum
Rumbles, to tell you when the storm doth come;
But deeds, and language, such as men do use,
And persons, such as comedy would choose,
When she would show an image of the times,
And sport with human follies, not with crimes,
Except we make them such, by loving still
Our popular errors, when we know they're ill.  

The various attempts to show that this prologue was aimed
at Shakespeare have deservedly failed. Indeed, the prologue
does not seem to be connected with the Stage Quarrel at all.
As Penniman shows, the tenor of criticism which the prologue
contains was common at the time, and certainly cannot be
said to apply exclusively to the works of any one playwright.  
It is evident that some of the criticisms do apply to
Shakespeare; but what is more important, none of them can
be shown to apply only to Shakespeare. Jonson accuses his
fellow playwrights of wholesale dramatic extravagance; and
for each of the specific charges he makes there are several
eligible offenders. "Where neither chorus wafts you o'er
the seas," for example, could refer to Henry V; but it could,
just as logically, refer to The Life and Death of Stukely (1600), or to The Winter's Tale. Even if all such allusions did refer to Shakespearean plays, the problem of dating would remain. The Prologue was not printed in the Quarto edition of Every Man In, which was published in 1601. Its date of composition is unknown. If the Prologue was written in 1605, or later, as it may well have been, it falls outside the Quarrel area entirely. If it was written earlier than 1605 it can scarcely be expected to contain references to King Lear and The Tempest. It is a critical prologue, no doubt of that; but it does not seem to be personally satiric, and needs no further discussion.

The second attempt to draw Shakespeare into the Quarrel involves Marston rather than Jonson. The sub-plot of Marston's Histriomastix is a play on Troilus and Cressida which contains the following suspicious lines:

Thy knight his valiant elbow wears
That when he shakes his furious speare
The foe in shivering fearful sort
May lay him down in death to snort.  

Later, in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida, Ulysses speaks these lines:

...then weare confident
When ranke Thersites opes his Masticke jawes,
We shall hear musicke, wit, and oracle.  

As Small has shown, the fact that Marston's sub-plot had to do with Troilus and Cressida means nothing. The story
was well known in 1599; and if the sub-plot refers to a contemporary version it might just as well refer to a lost play on the same theme which Henslowe attributes to Dekker and Chettle. There is evidence that Shakespeare's version of the story was not even in existence when *Histriomastix* was written; so Marston's "shakes his furious speare..." may have been accidental. At any rate, *Histriomastix* was a very bad play, one which would scarcely have attracted much attention. It is most unlikely that Shakespeare, after three years, would remember such a trivial allusion, or bother answering it if he did.

One suspects that *Histriomastix* came in for much more attention in the nineteenth century than it got in its own day. Fleay and one or two of his colleagues thought that Posthaste was meant for Shakespeare. Small and Penniman, in agreement for once, make short work of this opinion. Posthaste was a poet, a ballad-writer, and a pageant-maker; never an actor. Shakespeare was poet and actor, but neither ballad writer nor pageant-maker. Small and Penniman conclude sensibly that if Posthaste was personally satiric at all he was a hit at Antony Munday.

I might mention that during the nineteenth century attempts were made to identify Shakespeare in several of the plays connected with the War — *Every Man In His Humour*, *Jack Drum*, *Poetaster*, to name only the familiar few. The arguments for these identifications were highly subjective to begin with, and the conclusions they produced, though
often amusing, were pathetically inaccurate. They were one and all disproved so conclusively as to render superfluous any re-examination here. To my knowledge, no scholar of the last fifty years has given such identifications the slightest credence.

Now consider Ajax, in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*. He is a big man, fumbling and stupid, but personally brave. He has an inflated opinion of himself, and he cannot conceal his envy of Achilles. In short, he is earnest, vain, and somewhat simple-minded. He is introduced to us by Cressida's man, Alexander, in a somewhat misleading fashion:

This man, Lady, hath rob'd many beasts of their particular additions, he is as valiant as the Lyon, churlish as the beare, slow as the Elephant; a man into whom nature hath so crowded humours, that his valour is crusht into folly, his folly sauced with discretion; there is no man hath a vertue, that he hath not a glimpse of, nor any man an attaint, but he carries some staine of it. He is melancholy without cause, and merry against the haire, hee hath the joynts of every thing so out of joynt, that he is a gowtie Briareus, many hands and no use; or purblinded Argus, all eyes and no sight.

Alexander's introductory speech makes Ajax seem much more complex than he is really shown to be. It does not fit the Ajax we see in the play; nor can I see that it applies, as Small thinks, to Jonson. Small claims that "no Elizabethan could hear Alexander's description of Ajax without at once thinking of Jonson." I do not agree with him, but the claim will be examined in detail a little later.
At present it is enough to say that Ajax and Jonson had three qualities in common: courage, peevishness, and inordinate self-esteem.

_Troilus and Cressida_ was originally published in 1609, in two quarto editions. A play of _Troilus and Cressida_ had, however, been entered on the Stationer's Register for 7 February, 1602/3, a play which was almost certainly Shakespeare's. The entry shows that the play was acted by the Chamberlain's Men, Shakespeare's company. If the play was not his, two plays on the same subject were acted by the Chamberlain's Men within half a dozen years, a most unlikely circumstance. The 1602 _Troilus and Cressida_ seems to contain at least one reference to _Poetaster_, which would make it date sometime after the summer of 1601. Then, in January of 1603/4 the same _Troilus and Cressida_ is referred to, at least by association, in a poem called "Saint Mary Magdalens Conversion."

The reference reads:

Of Helens rape and Troyes beseiged towne,
Of Troylus faith, and Cressids falsitie
Of Rychards stratagems for the English crowne,
Of Tarquins lust and Lucrece chastitie,
Of these, or none of these my muse now treates,
Of greater conquests, warres, and loves she speaks.

Thus the entry in the Stationer's Register indicates that _Troilus and Cressida_, coming between _Poetaster_ and the poem just quoted, was probably written as Small argues in the last months of 1601. 

The text of the play itself presents problems which
ought to be mentioned. One of the quarto editions states that the play was denied license, and scholars have hastened to conclude from this that some particularly slanderous personal attack was back of the denial. There is no way of being sure that such was the case; but it is possible that the version we have is a revision, with the objectionable passages expunged. In addition to the textual problem, there has been a question raised about the authorship. Small feels that portions of the play are not in Shakespeare's hand, and he constructs an elaborate verse test to prove his point. Luckily, the scenes which he particularly doubts (Act V, scenes 7-10) do not bear upon the Ajax question; so the disputed authorship need not detain us.

The first, and perhaps the only, sure allusion to Jonson comes in the Prologue. It reads:

...and hither am I come,
A Prologue armed, but not in confidence
Of Author's pen, or actors voyce; but suited
In like conditions, as our Argument.

These lines contain a fairly obvious echo of the prologue to Poetaster. Jonson is levelling his first charges against the poetasters, when Envy says:

If any muse why I salute the stage
An armed Prologue; know, 'tis a dangerous age;
Wherein who writes had need present his scenes
Forty-fold proof against the conjuring means
Of base detractors and illiterate apes,
That fill up rooms in fair and formal shapes.

(The underlining is mine.) The fact that Shakespeare mentions an armed prologue is not evidence at all that
he was at odds with Jonson. All we can infer from the echo is that Shakespeare was reasonably familiar with *Poetaster*. The prologue to *Troilus and Cressida* is of a purely utilitarian nature; it outlines rather incompletely the intentions of the play, but it contains no satiric threats at all.

Ajax is not mentioned in the Prologue, and he does not appear on stage at all in Act I. He is mentioned but three times in the whole first act. In the second scene Alexander introduces him with the speech already quoted; and in the next scene, when the Greek generals are plotting their strategy, Nestor gives a description which applies much more accurately than Alexander's to the Ajax who appears in the play:

> Ajax is grown self-will'd, and bears his head
> In such a rein, in full as proud a place
> As broad Achilles; keeps his tent like him;
> Makes factious feasts; rails on our state of war,
> Bold as an oracle, and sets Thersites,
> A slave whose gall coins slander like a mint,
> To match us in comparisons with dirt,
> To weaken and discredit our exposure,
> How rank soever rounded in with danger.  

Later in the same scene the generals hatch a plot to trick Ajax into fighting Hector in 'Achilles' place. Ulysses calls him blockish, dull and brainless; Nester had called him quarrelsome and envious. If these insults to Ajax are supposed to represent consistent satire of Jonson, they point a new and unexpected tack. In the earlier satiric representations Jonson was made to appear foolishly erudite, but never stupid.
Act II opens with a scene between Ajax and Thersites. Ajax beats Thersites and curses him heavily; Thersites replies in his fashion that Ajax is stupid and envious. He speaks of Ajax in these words:

...thou sodden witted lord! thou hast no more brain than I have in mine elbows; an assinego may tutor thee: thou scurvy-valiant ass! thou art here but to thrash Trojans; and thou art bought and sold among those of any wit, like a barbarian slave. If thou use to beat me, I will begin at thy heel, and tell what thou art by inches, thou thing of no bowels, thou!

Thersites goes on to say that Ajax wears his wit in his belly and his guts in his head, and that what little wit he has would not stop the eye of Helen's needle. These criticisms themselves do not allow us to infer much about Ajax, because Thersites damns indiscriminately, and says essentially the same things about everyone. We learn more about Ajax from Ajax himself. His replies are slow and consist in the main of curses. Only in one speech, that near the end of Act II, does Ajax sound like a caricature of Jonson. Agammenon has been flattering him outrageously, telling him what a humble man he is, and Ajax meekly replies:

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

Ajax goes on to say that he hates a proud man as he does the engendering of toads. His Jonsonian inability to see, or to admit pride in himself, is perfectly consistent with Ajax's character, however; it is not a quality loosely
tacked on to remind the audience of Jonson. A general refusal to falsify character for satiric purposes is one marked difference between Shakespeare and the other dramatists who participated in the Quarrel. Jonson, Marston, and Dekker were none of them above the lampoon; whereas Shakespeare was. If he hit at individuals at all, he hit more subtly.

Ajax next appears in the third scene of Act III. He is only on stage for a moment, and as soon as he is gone, Ulysses, his severest critic, makes this speech behind his back:

Heavens, what a man is there! A very horse
That he knows not what. Nature, what things
there are
Most abject in regard and dear in use!
What things again most dear in the esteem
And poor in worth! Now shall we see tomorrow —
An act that very chance doth throw upon him —
Ajax renown'd... shy, even already
They clap the lubber Ajax on the shoulder,
As if his foot were on brave Hector's breast
And great Troy shrieking.

A moment later, Achilles calls in Thersites, intending to send him on an errand. Thersites tells him that Ajax is even then strutting about before the walls of Troy, boasting of his coming victory over Hector. He holds forth on Ajax at some length:

Why he stalkes up and downe like a Peacock,
A stride and a stand: ruminates like an hostesse,
that hath no Arithmatique but her braine to set
downe her reckoning: bites his lip with a polit-
tique regard, as who should say, there was wit
in his head and twoo'd out; and so there is:
but it lyes as coldly in him, as fire in a flint,
which will not shew without knocking. The mans
 undone forever; for it Hector breake not his necke i' the combat, heele break't himselfe in vaineglory. He knows not mee: I said, good morrow Ajax; and he replyes, thankes Agamemnon. What thinke you of this man, that takes me for the general? Hee's gowne a very land-fish, languagelesse, a monster: a plague of opinion, a man may it on both sides like a leather jerkin. 18

Thersite's speech applies to Jonson no better than Ulysses'. Jonson's wit did not lie within him coldly; indeed, very little provocation was needed to call it forth.

Ajax gets almost no attention throughout the rest of the play. He comes on stage in Act IV, armed to fight Hector; but the latter has discovered that Ajax is his cousin, and after one furious round of battle, refuses to fight any more. He and Ajax embrace, and part good friends. Thersites continues to snipe at Ajax when the opportunity offers, but his attacks diminish in violence as the action with the Trojans becomes more dangerous. Ajax appears intermittently in Act V, always looking for a Trojan to fight. The Greek generals leave off sneering at him and even become grudgingly appreciative of his efforts. When news reaches him that Achilles has killed Hector, he says, "If it be so, yet braglesse let it bee: Great Hector was a man as good as he." 19 There is nothing at all in the last two acts to suggest the Jonson identification.

It should be obvious from this summary that the textual evidence alone offers no very strong support for the Ajax-Jonson theory. On the basis of Troilus and Cressida as we have it, the identification simply cannot be estab-
lished. Obviously Ajax and Jonson did have things in common; but surely Jonson was not the only Elizabethan who was conceited and envious. Besides, it can easily be shown that Ajax differed from Jonson in several significant respects. If Shakespeare is to be indicted, more evidence must be found. To date none has turned up. Before speculating further about the elusive purge, I shall briefly review the scholarship concerned with Shakespeare's part in the War.

The first scholarly attempts to draw Shakespeare into the Quarrel were made in the 1860s, and their ambitious authors may be nameless here. Isaac Disraeli had discussed the Quarrel somewhat earlier, in his *Calamities and Quarrels of Authors*, but his discussion was too broad to be very helpful. His colleagues of the nineteenth century were often more specific. Suffice it to say that they found personal satire of the most vicious personal nature in *Much Ado About Nothing*, *As You Like It*, *Othello*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and *Hamlet*. Dr. Cartwright, as I reported in my introduction, set the high-water mark for imagination and inaccuracy when he said: "Who can doubt that Iago is malignant Ben." Another sees Malvolio as John Marston. Professor Penniman had a good deal of fun with these arguments; Professor Small could not conceal his scorn.

Penniman himself does very little with the Shakespeare question. He ties the play in with the *Histriomastix*
subplot as best he could, and spends the rest of the time refuting the amazing arguments of his predecessors. He does not bear down upon Ajax-Jonson at all. All he would argue is that if the purge referred to is a play by Shakespeare, the only possible candidate is *Troilus and Cressida*. He concludes, finally, that the purge simply cannot be pinpointed, a conclusion with which I heartily agree.

Small's monograph was published two years after Penniman's *War of the Theatres*. Unlike Penniman, Small was convinced that Shakespeare took part in the Quarrel; and he was willing to give the question an exhaustive examination. His discussion of Shakespeare takes up almost forty pages of a two hundred page book.

Professor Small assumes, to begin with, that the purge must have been a play. Then, following Penniman's lead, he concludes that the play could only have been *Troilus and Cressida*. Small was an extremely astute scholar, and his vision for the most part was extremely clear. But when he came to the Shakespeare question, he came with a pre-conceived conclusion, and set out rather single-mindedly to prove it. He gives *Troilus and Cressida* a very keen reading, and writes many pages of valuable scholarship; but his conclusion is nevertheless unsatisfactory. I believe it is based upon an unwarranted assumption: that the purge must have been a play. He takes as proven fact what is pure conjecture; the purge
might just as well have been some superb bar-room jest. Once started, Small's strong conviction clouds his vision somewhat.

Small gathers and synthesizes all the available external evidence, and succeeds with fair certainty in dating the play well within the Quarrel area. Then, in order to demonstrate that Troilus and Cressida could have contained personally satiric elements, he launches into a lengthy discussion of the play's sources. Earlier critics had argued that Shakespeare had dutifully followed classical sources in drawing his characters, and that consequently his Ajax was essentially a reproduction of Homer's character. Thus, if Shakespeare's character was taken from Homer, any similarity between Ajax and Jonson would have been purely coincidental. Small's refutation of that argument is much more elaborate than it need have been, probably because he hoped by the process of refutation to establish his own position. He points out that Shakespeare drew heavily from three sources: Chaucer, Caxton, and Chapman. He maintains, not with complete accuracy it would seem, that Ajax is the only character in Troilus and Cressida who differs radically from his classic prototype. The difference, he says, is precisely that personal element which reminds us of Jonson. Professor Small is sure, but cautious. He does not say that Ajax is Jonson, he merely says that the representation is a partial hit, but a hit which might be taken as a purge.
Small's minute investigation suffers from his determined effort to prove a foregone conclusion. For once he fails to give the evidence against his argument a thorough consideration. A scholar named Boyle reviewed Small's work shortly after it appeared, and took him sharply to task for his treatment of the Shakespeare problem. Boyle points out that if *Troilus and Cressida* was performed even a few months later than Small supposes, all Small's arguments fall to pieces. Unless the play was available before Christmas of 1601, the Parnassus reference could not have been to it. Boyle points out in conclusion that no one has given any reason for Shakespeare's sudden parody of Jonson, and that the whole Ajax-Jonson identification is based upon nothing solider than general similarities.

After Boyle's review (1902), the question of Shakespeare's participation in the Quarrel was abandoned for well over a decade, until Professor J. S. P. Tatlock took it up again in 1915. Professor Tatlock was writing on "The Sgíge of Troy in Shakespeare and Heywood," but he wrote some valuable pages on the Quarrel in the process. He begins by disputing Small's theory of sources. Tatlock points out that Shakespeare's Ajax did have his classical precedents, in Ovid, and Apuleius. In these authors, Tatlock says, Ajax is a dull-witted arrogant boaster, just as he is in *Troilus and Cressida*. Moreover, Tatlock demonstrates how such a conception of Ajax could have filtered down to Shakespeare through a number of contemporary writers,
among them Harington, Gosson, and Nash. The traits of Ajax which were familiar to Shakespeare's audience were valor, physical and mental heaviness, pride, insolence, and jealousy. Since the Ajax Shakespeare presents has all these qualities, the characterization is sufficiently accounted for. Here Professor Tatlock does what Professor Small neglected: he takes Alexander's speech apart and shows that it is paradoxical and ambiguous, rather than specific. Tatlock allows that Jonson was arrogant, railing, and egotistical; but he does not think that Shakespeare would have represented him as heavy or stupid. Shakespeare's Ajax was a heavy man, probably pot-bellied; whereas Jonson, at the time of Troilus and Cressida, was just the reverse. Professor Tatlock establishes physical disparity between Ajax the character and Jonson the man by reference to Small's own argument:

Dr. Small says of a character in Marston's What You Will, "Quadratus is an epicure and fat... this alone is enough to prove that Quadratus is not, as Penniman says, Jonson." (p. 112). Horace in Satiromastix, who represents Jonson, has a scanty beard, with a face "like a rotten russet apple, when 'tis bruised," is "a lean, hollow-cheeked scrag" "All this," says Doctor Small, accords exactly with what we know of Jonson from other sources." It is necessary to remember that at the date of Troilus Jonson (1573-1637) was under thirty, and not at all the ponderous figure he became later. All this makes it illicit to urge that Ajax's make-up might have imitated him. It is impossible, of course, to prove that Ajax is not Jonson. All one can hope for is to show that what evidence there is does not favor the idea. To strengthen his arguments about the physique of Ajax,
Tatlock also quotes an anonymous play called *Mucedorus*, published in 1606. In it, Jonson is referred to as a "lean and hungry meagre cannibal." What Tatlock says is certainly valid and significant. None of the proven satirical representations of Jonson give the impression of physical heaviness, but Shakespeare's Ajax visibly lumbers across the stage. In conclusion, Professor Tatlock makes the provocative suggestion that Achilles is a more accurate reproduction of Jonson physically and otherwise than is Ajax. Achilles does have characteristics in common with Jonson, but so do a thousand other characters in the Elizabethan drama. Professor Tatlock's argument severely damages the Ajax-Jonson theory; but his real interests in the essay lay elsewhere, and he does not press his conclusions.

Oscar James Campbell, writing in 1938, considers the Ajax question very briefly. He agrees with Tatlock that a heavy, stupid character such as Ajax would not have reminded the Elizabethans of the lean, shrewd-tongued dramatist at all. Campbell, however, is attempting to fit *Troilus and Cressida* into a general satiric tradition, and his discussion of the Quarrel is only incidental. He spends more time investigating Shakespeare's supposed lampoon on Essex (in the play, Campbell says, Achilles) than he does on Shakespeare and Jonson.

Van Keuren's investigation, also made in the 1930s, suggests a double purge. He believed that Shakespeare
wrote one scene in *Satiromastix*, which one scene constitutes half a purge. The other half, as Van Keuren has it, is a passage in the Folio version of Hamlet. Rosencrantz says, "There was, for a while, no money bid for argument unless the poet and player went to cuffs in the question." The passage, in which Rosencrantz and Hamlet discuss the merits of common actors and children's companies, does remind us of Jonson's criticism of actors; but the whole exchange is so brief that I do not think it would amount to even one half of a purge.

The most recent examination of this question was made by William Elton, in 1948. He argues that Shakespeare had good reason to hit at Jonson, who, Elton says, had attacked Shakespeare by implication when he wrote *Poetaster*. Elton's argument assumes that *Poetaster* was written primarily as an attack on the Chamberlain's Men. *Poetaster*, I believe, attacks poor poetry, and two poor poets in particular; it is not possible to demonstrate that the play implicates a whole theatrical group. Mr. Elton's principle argument is that:

...since "beray" in the Parnassus plays has the meaning of "befoul" the method by which Shakespeare gave Jonson a purge "that made him beray his credit" would seem to be obvious: Shakespeare befouled Jonson's credit or reputation by naming him Ajax, a common low pun of the time signifying "privy." 26

Ingenious as Elton's explanation is, it must be admitted to lack force and comprehensiveness. In the first place
it fails to establish a valid motive for attack, and in the second, it in no way accounts for the many dissimilarities between Jonson and Ajax. The argument may be taken as a suggestion, but it is not a proof.

Several scholars, finding no play which could adequately constitute a purge, have suggested other possibilities. Some believe that Shakespeare's great superiority as a playwright was the purge. E. K. Chambers thinks that the author of the Parnassus play might have been so ignorant of what was really going on in London as to suppose that Shakespeare wrote Satiromastix.27 R. B. Sharpe agrees with Chambers. Sharpe feels that the purge may have been a lost actor's version of Hamlet; but he suggests that the more likely possibility is that the author of the Parnassus plays was unaware of Dekker's secret work for the Chamberlain's Men and merely assumed that Satiromastix was the work of their number one dramatist, Shakespeare.28 (Dekker's work must not have been so very secret, if Jonson found out about it before Dekker began his play.) Henry Gray suggests that Shakespeare's intervention stopped the court performance of Cynthia's Revels, a suggestion I find decidedly far-fetched.29 Van Keuren, as I said, felt that Shakespeare may actually have written some of Satiromastix; I doubt that Shakespeare could have written so poorly. Perhaps the mere fact that Satiromastix was performed by Shakespeare's company at Shakespeare's theatre (the Globe) constituted a purge.
It is possible that Shakespeare may have taken the part of Horace in *Satiromastix*, but that is only a guess. In my opinion the general argument that Shakespeare was in some way associated in the public mind with *Satiromastix* is the most satisfying of all the purge-theories, but unfortunately it cannot be substantiated. What is more to the point, perhaps, is the fact that it cannot even be proven that Shakespeare wished to deliver a purge.

Every discussion of Shakespeare's relation to the Quarrel with which I am acquainted is inadequate and inconclusive. Professor Small, the most determined investigator, finds *Troilus and Cressida* only a partial hit. So far as I know, no one has correlated the textual evidence with what we know of Jonson's personal relations with Shakespeare. Such oversight is curious, because the biographical evidence is accessible and may be summarized rather briefly.

In Fuller's *Worthies* we find that Shakespeare and Jonson frequently amused themselves in the taverns by carrying on wit-combats. As Fuller has it:

> Many were the wit-combats betwixt him (Shakespeare) and Ben Jonson, which two I behold like a Spanish great gallion and an English man of War; Master Jonson (like the former) was built far higher in learning; Solid, but slow in his performances. Shakespeare with the English man of War, lesser in bulk, but lighter in sailing, could turn with all tides, tack about and take advantage of all winds, by the quickness of his Wit and invention.

These combats took place between 1602 and 1610, just after the time that Shakespeare was supposed to have put Jonson
down. There is no knowing how famous these debates were, but it is at least conceivable that the purge was delivered in one of them. In his conversations with Drummond, Jonson mentions Shakespeare only twice, both times reflectively. He merely says that Shakespeare lacked art, and that he ought not to have put a sea-coast in Bohemia. We know that Shakespeare often teased Jonson about his erudition, and about his labored composition. Archdeacon Plume mentions that Shakespeare was god-father to one of Jonson's children; at the christening Shakespeare told Ben that he was giving the child some Latin spoons, which the proud father must translate. Audrey notes that Jonson and Shakespeare went around together speculating on the possible humours of the people on the street. Indeed, the Parnassus reference is the only contemporary document which suggests that Shakespeare and Jonson quarreled. The accounts I have quoted leave the impression that the two writers' arguments were of the kind that pass between good friends.

Besides the two items in the Drummond conversations, Jonson mentions Shakespeare only three times. In his formal lines on the Droeshout portrait he says:

This figure that thou here seest put,
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut,
Wherein the graver had a strife
With nature, to out-do the life;
O could he but have drawn his wit
As well in brass, as he hath hit
His face; the print would then surpass
All that was ever writ in brass;
But since he cannot, Reader, look
Not on his picture, but his book.
Later, in his *Discoveries*, he adds these comments:

I remember, the players have often mentioned it as an honour to Shakespeare, that in his writing (whateversever he penned) he never blotted out a line. My answer hath been, Would he had blotted a thousand. Which they thought a malevolent speech. I had not told posterity this, but for their ignorance, who choose that circumstance to commend their friend by wherein he most faulted, and to justify mine own candour; for I loved the man, and do honor his memory on this side idolatry, as much as any. He was (indeed) honest, and of an open and free nature; had an excellent fancy, brave notions and gentle expressions; wherein he flowed with that facility, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopped...but he redeemed his vices with his virtues. There was ever more in him to be praised than to be pardoned. 

The third mention is his great epitaph, written after the appearance of the First Folio. Surely it is one of the most sincere and generous tributes ever paid by one creative artist to another.

Now we might reconsider the pernicious reference which, in my opinion, cannot support the weighty scholarly edifices that have been erected upon it.

...O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow, he brought up Horace giving the poets a pill, but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him beray his credit.

In the first place, there is no certain guarantee that *Troilus and Cressida* had been performed when the above passage was written. In the second place, its author had his tongue in cheek. He was making fun of the speaker, Kempe; and since his opinion did not coincide with Kempe's, he may very well have considered Shakespeare's purge a
slight thing -- slighter by far than a play may be supposed to have been. In the third place, the author of the Parnassus plays was a university man, and would probably have championed the learned classicist, Jonson, over the self-made artist, Shakespeare. In the fourth place, the rivalry the quotation implies may be between companies, rather than individuals, in which case any successful play of Shakespeare's would, in Kempe's opinion, put down an unsuccessful play by Jonson. We know that the theatre-people of the day were interested in the Quarrel; most of them would probably have been glad to see the then-unpopular Jonson get his come-uppance. The man who put him down would surely have received a good deal of mention for it; but except for that one sentence, Shakespeare received none.

Taking the other side, for a moment, and stating the case for a Shakespeare-Jonson feud as strongly as possible, what can be said? Two young men of reasonably high spirits may be expected to quarrel now and then, to be sure. Shakespeare and Jonson may have had a falling-out in the autumn of 1601, and when Shakespeare sat down to write *Troilus and Cressida* he may have toyed for an act or so with the idea of satirizing his somewhat conceited friend. But even granting an unproven feud, I cannot imagine that Shakespeare carried out any real program of satire against Jonson. He may have alluded to his learned friend in *Troilus and Cressida*; allusion is one thing. But carrying
a satiric representation through a whole play is quite another; in *Troilus and Cressida* particularly, such a program would have resulted in extreme disunity. The satiric representations which Jonson and the poetasters used were laughable, ridiculous figures; whereas Ajax, Achilles, Thersites are not ridiculous; they are mean, downright unworthy. Even Ajax, the miles gloriosus, is not really funny; he is arrogant, stupid, and cruel. I do not believe that Shakespeare would have so represented Jonson.

My conclusion, then, is that Shakespeare took no traceable part in the War of the Theatres. The one or two possible allusions in *Troilus and Cressida*, the general similarities between Jonson and Ajax, the single reference in the Parnassus play, taken in combination, are simply not enough. Without the Parnassus reference no one sane enough to be taken seriously would have connected Shakespeare's name with the Quarrel in the first place. The whole Jonson—Shakespeare controversy, as I see it, is an outgrowth of the misguided and now insupportable claim that Jonson was envious of Shakespeare's success. So far as we know, Shakespeare had no reason to quarrel with Ben Jonson. If they had quarreled significantly the fact would scarcely have escaped contemporary notice, and would have been substantially recorded. As the case stands now, we can accept at face value Jonson's statement that he loved Shakespeare almost to idolatry.
VI
Conclusion

I have traced in detail the course of hostilities between Ben Jonson and the "so-called poetasters," Marston and Dekker, from the earliest foreshadowing in The Case Is Altered (1598) to the eventual conclusion in the presentation of Dekker's Satiromastix (late summer, 1601). I have also noted all the important contemporary references to the Quarrel, beginning with the ambiguous passage in The Return From Parnassus (1601) and ending with the remarks Jonson made to William Drummond of Hawthornden in 1619.¹ Now I should like to close my investigation with a short summary of the scope, development, and significance of the Quarrel. The summary will embody my conclusions.

I believe, to begin with, that only Jonson, Marston, and Dekker played any traceable part in the conflict. That statement requires only slight qualification. All three dramatists were active in the literary life of their time, and all of them had friends who obviously must have taken sides in the dispute. Moreover, during years when the Quarrel was hottest, all three men wrote for different, and in some sense rival, dramatic companies. Jonson's favorite company in the years just following 1600 was the
Chapel Children; Marston's choice was the Paul's Boys; and Thomas Dekker preferred the Chamberlain's Men. The Quarrel was well known, probably much commented on, and there is little doubt that a number of the dramatists' contemporaries took part in the tavern bickering which attends such controversies. But nevertheless, so far as we know only Jonson, Marston, and Dekker exercised their dramatic talents in the dispute. The many scholarly attempts to show that Shakespeare, Daniel, the Burbages, Munday, Lodge, Lyly, Donne, Rowlands, Henslowe, Chapman, Harington, and Drayton took a direct hand in the controversy have been at best conjectural and at worst malicious. All of these men no doubt had opinions on the feud, and it is even safe to bet that the majority of their opinions were unfavorable to Jonson; but the extent of their actual participation in the Quarrel, so far as we know, was verbal only. With the single curious exception of Antony Munday$^2$ their portraits cannot be found in the literature pertaining to the War, and if any of them were moved to write commentaries on the action their commentaries have been literally destroyed, or have been rendered unidentifiable by the passage of time.

The actual duration of the feud was quite short. The ill-feeling between Jonson and Marston may have smouldered for years, but it flamed into active antipathy only briefly, and when it did the flame was quickly extinguished. All three of the plays which carry the real
weight of anger -- Marston's What You Will, Jonson's Poetaster, and Dekker's Satiromastix -- were performed between March and October of 1601. As I have repeatedly said, the reference was as limited as the duration. Again excepting Munday, the only full-scale satiric representations are those of the three principals. An extremely high percentage of the staggering number of identifications which earlier scholars made cannot be sustained; most of them rest on unwarranted inferences. It is true that in four of the earlier plays -- Marston's Histriomastix and Jack Drum, Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humour and Cynthia's Revels -- personal references do occur; such references certainly have a bearing on the Quarrel. But the passages I refer to amount, as I have several times said, to no more than allusions and jokes; they do not represent full-scale caricature, whereas the portraits of Jonson, Marston, and Dekker clearly do. When the participants were in earnest, the portraits were elaborate and unmistakable.

The approach to the Quarrel was begun in The Case Is Altered (1598), the play in which Jonson took his slap at Munday. Jonson, in 1598/9, was clearly in an irritable frame of mind. In 1599, Marston paid Jonson a poorly-timed and apparently unintelligible compliment by putting Jonsonian sentiments into the mouth of Chrisagonus (in Histriomastix). Jonson misunderstood the compliment, and even had he understood it he would have strongly disapproved of the language in which it was couched. When he wrote
Every Man Out of His Humour (1600) he inserted the coxcombs Clove and Orange for the specific purpose of parodying Marston's style. Clove and Orange deliver the Marstonian parody effectively, but they do not attack Marston as a person. The parody, however, was unmistakable; the young, ambitious John Marston could hardly have helped resenting it, particularly since it came from a man he had tried to compliment. In Jack Drum's Entertainment (1600, after Every Man In His Humour) he held his annoyance in check fairly well, but he could not resist a hit or two at Jonson. Thus Brabant Senior in Jack Drum reminds us at times of Ben, and Marston shows a definite willingness to parody his critic. Meanwhile, Jonson became more and more irascible, more and more convinced of his own artistic infallibility, and more and more certain that Poetry was being debased. In Cynthia's Revels (February-March, 1601) he lets the admirable Crites deliver the critical outburst he himself had been storing up. Crites says some just, but unkind, things about the condition of poetry in Jonson's day; his remarks may well have offended several people. Certainly they further offended John Marston, who perhaps fancied he saw something of himself in the foppish courtier Hedon. I do not think Hedon was meant to suggest Marston, or anyone; but Jonson had read insults into the complimentary Chrisagonus, and Marston perhaps had as much cause to read them into the type character Hedon.
What I would call the Quarrel-proper began with Marston's next play, *What You Will*, performed in late March or April of 1601. The personal touches prior to *What You Will* were no more than light sparring compared to those that came after it. *What You Will* is in a sense the linking play. Lampatho Doria is an inept and partial caricature of Jonson, but he is the nearest thing to a full-scale representation the Quarrel produced prior to *Poetaster*. In addition to Lampatho Doria, Marston uses the bitter criticisms of Quadratus to strengthen and direct his attack.

*What You Will* angered Jonson. He knew that he was a better poet and a better playwright than Marston, and he knew that Marston and many of his associates were turning out what he considered bad plays. *What You Will*, the play in which Marston pointedly satirized him, was itself a very weak performance. Jonson's particular pique at Marston, coupled to his general disgust with bad poetry, prompted Jonson to begin *Poetaster*. Also, by the time he began the play, he had heard a rumour that Thomas Dekker had been commissioned to write a play against him. He determined to work quickly and strike what he hoped would be a silencing blow. Writing with unusual haste he finished *Poetaster* in fifteen weeks, and saw it produced in June of 1601. *Poetaster* is the first of the two major Quarrel documents. Horace, Crispinus, and Demetrius were definitely meant to represent Jonson, Marston, and Dekker;
the same characterizations, representing the same three dramatists, reappear a few months later in the second major Quarrel document, *Satiromastix* (late summer or fall, 1601). Horace, Crispinus, and Demetrius are in my opinion the only personal representations in the Quarrel-proper. They are unmistakably drawn, and are much more elaborate vehicles of satire than any of the disputed characterizations.

Dekker's part in the conflict has already been summarized once, but I should reiterate one point. His contribution, *Satiromastix*, was a piece of commissioned satire. Jonson would probably have written a *Poetaster* sooner or later whether he had quarreled with Marston or not, but if Jonson himself had been a bit better mannered Dekker would have had no reason to write *Satiromastix*. He tacked the satiric portions of that play onto an unfinished tragedy, and the satire certainly does not jibe very well with the rest of the play. He would scarcely have made so tangential an addition unless he acted out of personal animus or monetary need. In his case I think personal animus can be discounted, for he seemed to bear Jonson no ill-will. Unlike Marston and Jonson, Dekker's satire was in the nature of a job.

*Poetaster* and *Satiromastix* were the only two plays that the Quarrel really gave us. The satire in the fringe plays, and even in *What You Will*, was stuck away in non-integral scenes. Only in those two instances did it com-
prise a major portion of a play. What began as bickering, minor literary argument, became in 1601 a large-scale personal feud.

Like Small, I hold Jonson chiefly responsible for the Quarrel. Both sides may have been to some extent in the wrong, but Jonson was more so than the poetasters. It is of course possible that Marston delivered some unpardonable insult to Jonson, but if so, we know nothing about it. Apparently the poetasters acted in self-defense. Of course Jonson thought he had an excellent reason for attacking the poetasters: they were writing bad poetry. Unfortunately he attacked more than their poetry, and in doing so, behaved ungenerously. He was certainly acute enough to distinguish between an attack on a bad poem and an attack on a bad poet; indeed, in the "Apologeticall Dialogue" he claimed to have kept the distinction. His plays do not bear him out. He can be justified insofar as he legitimately defended poetic ethics and championed good poetry, but he cannot be completely excused. In fairness, however, I should say that his criticisms were always based on a passionate and sincere desire to see better poetry written and better plays performed. But he was not always fair with the productions of his rivals; and indeed, his concern for poetry had such ill-natured manifestations that his adversaries cannot be blamed for their remonstrances. Dekker, in particular, deserves applause for his equitable, even-tempered handling of a
difficult writing chore.

The poetasters were only seeking their due when they attacked Jonson. They were not always good writers, but they had a right to expect better treatment than he was inclined to give. Their riposte was much more temperate than Jonson's thrust. *Poetaster* is unmatched in Quarrel literature for its vehemence and intensity; *Satiromastix*, compared to it, is a sugar pill. It must be added, however, that *Poetaster* is also unmatched among the Quarrel plays for its literary excellence and satiric power. Neither Jonson's ability as an artist, nor his concern for and devotion to art are open to question. And in spite of the personal nature of the last plays a fairly comprehensive attempt to define the poet had been made before the War was over.

In the end the Quarrel evened itself out. Marston was probably never satisfied with his position, but I suspect he had too much of the malcontent in him to have ever been easily happy. After the events of 1601 Jonson and Dekker were obviously content to let be. All three men had too much to do to continue an essentially profitless argument. Jonson was plainly tired of the whole affair; Dekker clearly not interested in any prolonged feud. We do not know how Marston felt, but the plays he produced in the years immediately following the Quarrel suggest that he too buckled down and put his energies to better use.
There remains only the question of the Quarrel's significance. The scholars who were so quick to disagree with one another about the shadowy identifications hold equally diverse opinions about the over-all importance of the conflict. Oscar James Campbell, for example, ignores the Quarrel almost completely while concentrating on the very plays which embody it. Other scholars see the Stage War as a pivotal episode in the careers of both Marston and Jonson, an episode which the literary historian cannot afford to overlook. I hold with the latter opinion. The Quarrel gave us the major portions of two plays, Poetaster and Satiromastix, and some portions of several others: Everyman Out of His Humour, Jack Drum's Entertainment, What You Will. Thomas Dekker was not much affected by the disturbance, because his emotions were never involved. Ben Jonson, on the other hand, was very much upset by the Quarrel; it was perhaps the force which turned him from comedy to tragedy. At the same time, the War helped to prod John Marston from his early laziness, poor craftsmanship, and stylistic crudity, and in doing so it prepared the way for The Malcontent. Besides its undoubted effect on the two dramatists, the Quarrel caught and held the interest of the Elizabethan theatre world in a time of unparalleled dramatic activity. Finally, it reflected the high concern with poetry and poetic ethics which was characteristic of the period; and thus provides for the student a significant point of contact with Elizabethan literature as a whole.
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