

COPYRIGHT

by

Esther M. Gloe

December, 1979

THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENGLISH WORK LAWS
ON THE DRAMA OF THE PERIOD
FROM 1563 TO 1642

By

ESTHER MATHILDA GLOE

Bachelor of Arts
University of Missouri
at Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri
1947

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1972

Master of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1979

Thesis
1979D
G562i
cop.2



THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENGLISH WORK LAWS
ON THE DRAMA OF THE PERIOD
FROM 1563 TO 1642

Thesis Approved:

David S. Berkeley

Thesis Adviser

William E. Hays

John Paul Bischoff

Norman N. Buchanan

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study originated from the fact that I knew that many apprentices were portrayed in plays of the Tudor and Stuart eras and at the time I was studying occupational analysis for education, I decided to investigate the role the apprentice played in those dramas. Before I had read many plays it became apparent to me that the role the apprentice played in the drama was rarely related to his job as a student of a trade, more or less the equivalent of today's technical student. However, it also became apparent that there was a good deal of influence on the plays from the world of work, and it is a study of this influence which actually forms the bulk of this paper.

It was my desire to avoid coming to the subject with a preconceived notion about what would be found in the plays, so I have read in a number of fields related to the general subject that was being studied. By combining references from education, religion, economics, law, and history, I have found evidence for a pattern of influences which has not often been seen in the entire era. Tracing the pattern through the era, to get the "Gestalt," or the big picture, has led to certain insights regarding the content of a number of the plays.

I wish to express my appreciation to my major advisor, Dr. David S. Berkeley, who encouraged me to pursue a number of different paths before settling on a specific topic. I also appreciate the tolerance of Dr. William Wray, in whose classes I pursued topics related to the main study of this paper. Dr. J. Paul Bischoff is appreciated and thanked for his assistance in suggesting books which would be helpful in eliminating gaps in my own knowledge in the fields of history and economics, and for his patience in reading the early version of the final product.

The librarians of Oklahoma State University were also of great assistance, especially in obtaining books from other libraries. Finally, gratitude is expressed to my brother and sister-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Gloe, for their understanding of my desire to pursue an education, and for their help when the dollars were scarce.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. SOCIAL INFLUENCES ON TUDOR-STUART DRAMA	1
Introduction	1
Review of the Critics	5
Problems in Economics	10
Problems in Religion	36
Education and Apprenticeship	64
Other Laws and Their Effects	83
The London Audience	95
Method of Study	103
Thesis: Drama and the Laws	107
II. THE EARLY MORALITY PLAYS	121
III. 1563-1587: LEARNING AS RELATED TO MONEY	136
IV. 1588-1604: WAR AND POVERTY	165
V. 1605-1615: WORK AND ITS REWARDS	212
VI. 1616-1630: BUSINESS AND ITS PROBLEMS	304
VII. 1631-1642: RELIGION, LAW, AND SCIENCE	327
VIII. CONCLUSION	366
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	374

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL INFLUENCES ON TUDOR-STUART DRAMA

Introduction

This study began as a study of the role of the apprentice in the drama of the Tudor and Stuart periods, 1563 to 1642. Early in the course of the study two things became apparent, first, that it was not possible to separate the role of the apprentice from the parts played by other characters in the plays without reducing the validity of the study, and second, that some larger general factor was at work than the apprentice, himself, in the society of the period, so far as his role in the drama was concerned. This era has often been studied from the point of view that it was the time when capitalism originated, and this was first considered as the possible factor at work. However, things found in the plays seldom illustrated this nineteenth century theory, though they did not negate it. Nonetheless, the plays appeared to follow a certain pattern of development. After the discovery that the play Eastward Ho appeared to be related to the repeal of the sumptuary laws in 1604, though it is better known for the fact that its criticism of James I for knighting so many Scotsmen caused

Chapman and Jonson to be jailed, the investigation turned to a study of the relationship of the plays to the laws passed during the period. Some laws do appear to have had a good deal of influence on the plays, and as the laws deal with work and education, they are an influence on the portrayal of the apprentice in the plays, as are some other factors.

Several things should be considered in discussing the treatment of apprentices as characters in the drama of this period in addition to the fact that there are other characters in the plays, such as scholars, merchants, knights, tradesmen, and the like. First, some forces influencing life were more closely unified in that society than in ours. The Church and State were not separate, education and religion were not separate, and laws regulated many facets of life, particularly religion, education, and work, in ways quite different from those in which they are regulated today. Second, the playwrights were forbidden by law to represent on stage some religious and political problems; were sometimes jailed when they spoke out on the wrong side of topics not actually covered by law; and were, as time passed, more and more criticized by the Puritans who were opposed to the theater. One would expect writers to take care when dealing with topics related to religion and law until the government position was made clear or popular feeling was running high. That they did discuss topics of current interest has already been made plain in studies of plays; for example, all authorities agree that Shakespeare's

The Tempest was influenced by a then recent shipwreck in The Bermudas. However, since the playwrights were limited by law as to what they could say, it seems most logical to relate this discussion of possible social influences which were affected by changes in the laws, or affected changes in the laws, to the times when the government acted on social problems related to religion and work by passing laws. The times the laws were passed can be documented from historical sources and these dates compared to the dates the plays were performed. A discussion of the possible influences of problems in the world of work on the plays precedes the discussion of the plays themselves in order to avoid repetition of description of the general pattern of economic problems of the times and of the laws.¹

The influences of education, economics, and religion on the English drama between 1563 and 1642 are tied together in the plays just as they are in the laws made to cope with the problems. However, it is easier to organize the discussion of such a complex topic if the three are kept separate while the issues are discussed. Therefore, the problems of economics will be treated first, then those of religion, and finally, those of education. This order is chosen because education was seen as the solution to the economic problems and was influenced by the religious changes of the times. Since the later plays especially were performed in London, the differences between London and the rest of the country are also briefly discussed.

The period of time covered is large, but a progression in the ways various themes are handled in the plays became apparent during the time they were being studied, and studying plays of only one era can lead one to miss influences from previous times which are important to the proper understanding of character portrayals in later plays.

Since World War II when many records have been made available to the public and research has been expanded, the laws of those times have been studied to see what the government thought the problems were and what it did to try to solve them. This has helped to show what the changes were because the laws were passed in sequential order and did attempt to solve problems of a particular time. This statement does not mean that one assumes that the government understood the problem in the same way a modern expert would or that the law was wise. It means that what is reflected in the actual law passed is what the people who considered themselves responsible for solving problems thought that the problems were. Writers of the time could have different ideas about what the problems were and what the solutions should be, depending on their family backgrounds, religious persuasions, the extent of their educations, and even on what audiences they wrote for. Therefore, different writers deal with topics in different ways, and so this study has made an effort to look at the work of many writers, not just those who are famous, or those who have or have not been studied before.

Review of the Critics

Several books have been particularly valuable in determining which plays should be studied and what kinds of problems a reader could expect to find the playwrights dealing with in them. The principal study of economics in relation to the drama of the period is L. C. Knights' Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson, which will be reviewed below. It concentrates on the plays of the Jacobean era. His references to particular plays are included in the discussion of those plays, as they are more pertinent there. Knights tackles the material he does in order to see if there is any obvious influence of the economic order of the times on the Jacobean drama.² He demonstrates that the drama was influenced by economic happenings of the time but also that the dramatists were often quite aware of this influence. He shows that he knows that the influence of the times on Jonson's plays was a thing that Jonson was quite aware of, and especially does this in his discussion of The Devil Is an Ass.³ Knights quotes George Unwin as saying that "a study of the leading characters in The Devil Is an Ass . . . would be by far the best introduction to the economic history of the period."⁴ It does show the popular reaction to projectors because in it Jonson criticizes the drainage of the fens, a project which was actually successfully done at a later time. Knights particularly ties his study to questions raised by Marxist critics and cautions critics that they should remember to be careful so as

not to relate literature too directly to economic factors which are understood differently now than they were at the time the literature was written.⁵ His own work attempts to avoid overly broad statements, and is a good introduction to study of the era. It will be referred to frequently.

Also of great value in helping a reader understand the earlier plays is Tudor Drama and Politics by David Bevington. He discusses various plays from the moralities to those presented just before the death of Elizabeth I. The plays are grouped according to the time at which they were written and performed, and the author demonstrates the influence of political occurrences on the content of specific plays.⁶ His chapters which deal with the plays written in the Armada years are particularly good at showing the things not often noticed. It is easy to see that such a play as Heywood's The Four Prentices of London was influenced by the war and by romantic literature. Bevington points out smaller things, such as the illegal export of corn, which are referred to in the play.⁷ The last chapter is especially valuable for its discussion of Dekker's early plays because it points out their features of social criticism, such as that found in Old Fortunatus, in which the knight chooses riches over honor.⁸ Bevington begins his discussion with a brief comment on the turns that literary criticism has taken in dealing with topical references in the plays of the Tudor era. He quotes Edith Rickert as saying: "What research is making continually clearer is that in the sixteenth century the

play and the masque did the work of the modern newspaper in guiding opinion."⁹ Bevington cautions that such criticism has led to many bizarre interpretations of individual plays, and says that the student must "avoid the common temptation to argue that Tudor politics are relevant to modern ideologies from Marxism to rightist totalitarianism."¹⁰

Charles W. Camp's The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature is another valuable study because it discusses the working people portrayed in the plays. In his chapter "Social Aspirations of the Artisan" he provides information about the role of the apprentice in the plays and also some comment on the portrayal of the citizen's wife.¹¹ However, his idea that the portrayal of the apprentice shows his increasing status cannot be demonstrated from the plays as a whole. There are as many plays in the Caroline era (1626-1642) that show a reduction of the status of the apprentice as there are which show him as a hero. His study is organized by topic, not in relation to periods of time, and thus, can be misleading at times. Nonetheless, it provides a wealth of detail regarding the names of the plays and other works in which can be found references to the working man and the apprentice. Camp does not try to relate his study to the larger field of criticism. He studies the role of the artisan in four respects: as a heroic figure, as a speculator and philanthropist, as a worker, and as a person with social aspirations. He makes plain that he does not try to tie together all phases of the craftsman's life as shown in the

drama, but merely to identify the sources and state what point of view they appear to demonstrate toward the artisan.

Brian Gibbons' Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton, is helpful for providing insight into certain specific plays by certain authors. However, the influence of the work laws which are related to the plays in the present study goes far beyond the plays which can be classified as "city comedy." The book is especially useful, however, in providing a long list of plays which he classifies as city comedy.¹² Since city comedy was satire, and often satire of earlier plays which were not city comedy, a study of city comedy alone is not valuable beyond that genre. To be properly understood the city comedies must be related to many plays which preceded them in time.

F. Mowbray Velte's The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood is also a valuable source of information about plays which deal with the working man and the apprentice in this period. It is particularly valuable for the observation that Heywood's portrayal of Jane Shore in Edward IV is the beginning of the portrayal of the errant wife and the forgiving husband.¹³ The errant wife is portrayed less sympathetically by other playwrights, but the Jane Shore story could well have provided the model for later portrayals, even though later ones were probably also affected by Jonson's satire of the citizen's wife in his Every Man Out of His Humor.

Alfred Harbage's Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions is interesting and provides a good deal of information about where various plays were performed.¹⁴ However, his insistence on the idea that all characters were consistently portrayed differently in the plays of the coterie theater than they were in those of the popular theater is an exaggeration. Between 1588 and 1642 every playwright from Shakespeare to the most lowly usually portrayed the knight as a fool, and this did not vary according to the theater in which the play was performed. The same can be said about several other characters in the plays. The discussion of the characterization of the citizen's wife, which actually is different in the plays of the coterie theater, will be detailed later when the plays which portray the citizen's wife are discussed, because a knowledge of the plots of several plays not often discussed is essential to a good understanding of factors involved, as is a sequential study of the plays.

For a basic understanding of the laws of England at that time, The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama, by Paul S. Clarkson and Clyde T. Warren, is a good place to start.¹⁵ The volume deals only with property law, not work law, but it relates the laws to the plays and provides a reader with a good basic understanding of British legal terminology and certain basic peculiarities of the laws of that time which makes more difficult books on the subject easier to comprehend.

Joan Simon's Education and Society in Tudor England is a detailed study of education at that time, and was hailed with reviews in The Historical Review and The Journal of Modern History at the time of its publication in 1967.¹⁶ Understanding of educational changes in that era had too long been distorted by the biases of A. F. Leach's English Schools at the Reformation, published in 1896.¹⁷ Mrs. Simon put all the research done after that time into one volume and made it available to the public. John Lawson and Harold Silver's A Social History of Education in England carries Mrs. Simon's study on into the Stuart era and beyond, and provides statistics which are valuable.¹⁸

All of the writers named above are referred to in these discussions below; the references are arranged by topic, not by author, as none of them use the order used here.

Problems in Economics

Studies of the dramas of this era have been greatly influenced by the works of several writers in the fields of economics and history. These writers have begun the demonstration of the influence of events of the times on the literature of the times. Their work was in turn influenced by the writers whose works they read. Consequently, it is a good idea to look at the early writers first. It is also good to remember the purpose of the writers whose works are used as references, as well as the dates when these were written. Seminal to the entire study of this era has been

Max Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, originally published before 1904, and partly intended as a comment on some ideas of Karl Marx, whose Das Capital was published between 1867 and 1883.¹⁹ Weber's book aroused a good deal of heated discussion, and it is possible that some of the disagreement is caused by the fact that its original purpose has long since been forgotten and its date of publication ignored. Misunderstandings of this book led to the publication of the later book of R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1926), which studied the same problems from a little different point of view.²⁰ Tawney's work, valuable as an explanation of many economic factors of the era from 1558 to 1662, was used by L. C. Knights in the development of his study of the influences of economic factors on the drama of the times. Knights also made use of the work of George Unwin, particularly Industrial Organization in the 16th and 17th Centuries (1904) and Gilds and Companies of London (1908).²¹ Tawney's work was published at the time of capitalism's greatest success, and reflects attitudes common at that time. Knights' book was published in 1937, in the depth of the economic depression, and reflects attitudes common at that time. Additional information about the Poor Laws of England can be found in the Webbs' 1927 study which reflects their own Fabian Socialist attitudes in its assurance that the laws finally worked properly.²² Knights' book remains the only major work which attempts to show the influence of economics on plays of that

era. However, it does not take into account different theories of economics; it simply follows Tawney's ideas.

There are several different theories which attempt to explain the changes in society which took place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and which eventually resulted in the development of the modern capitalist society. Since much modern literary criticism has been influenced by the critics' reaction to Marxism, either positive or negative, it seems logical to begin with his ideas. Others will also be described, such as those of Weber, Tawney, Unwin, Kramer, Huntington, and Miskimin. In their "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels proposed the idea that the political and intellectual history of any period of time could best be explained by the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and that a study of this showed that the history of mankind was "a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited."²³

Marx has a good deal to say about the economic changes which took place in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The changes depended on a number of factors. First was the freeing of the serf from the land; the former serf became the seller of his labor on the free labor market.²⁴ The master who employed him was a supervisor who was recompensed for his supervising skills, but because the guilds limited the number of men he could employ, the master never really became a capitalist, one who accumulated capital to reinvest.²⁵ To be invested, capital must be obtained

somewhere, and Marx said that theories earlier than his had maintained that it was obtained by those who worked hard and saved their money, especially long ago, in the dim past, and left money to their heirs. Marx maintained that this was not true, that the rich had usually obtained what they had by actual force, or at least by exploitation.²⁶ He did allow that one accidental happening influenced capitalist development in England; since large farms were leased for 99 year terms, in the period of inflation between 1560 and 1640 many fairly well-off rural gentlemen became wealthy because the rents they paid did not increase though the prices which they charged for food and wool did.²⁷ He attributed the rise of capitalist success to international trade and colonization, aided by government intervention. He says: "But they all employ the power of the state to hasten in hothouse fashion the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition."²⁸ To Marx, the accumulation of capital was not the result of hard work nor the result of taking risks but the result of acquisition by force. He saw the change as the result of conflict between capital and labor, with the triumph of the capitalist who exploited the worker.

Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1904) attempted to put a slightly different interpretation on the topic. Weber maintained that such devotion to the idea of capitalism was evident in its adherents that there had to be more at work than the simple principles of

class exploitation by which Marx explained the rise of capitalism. Weber noticed that the rise of capitalism occurred at about the same time as the rise of Protestantism, and studied the phenomena to see if there could be a link between the two. He noticed the English Puritans' fascination with the idea of "calling" where their life's work was concerned, and noticed that capitalism came earlier to England than to the continent, and so suggested that the English Protestants had come to believe that success in their "callings" on earth was evidence of their calling to faith in God. He decided that the link was that such a belief that success in the earthly calling was evidence of the presence of the heavenly calling made workers feel assured of their calling to Heaven in the Calvinist faith, which otherwise gave them no way to be sure of their salvation.²⁹ This feeling of assurance he labeled the "Protestant Work Ethic," an ethic which he said led successful businessmen to believe that their success in business was a sign from God that they were in the right business and handling the business in a way approved of by God.

A great many books and articles have been written in defense of or in criticism of Weber's thesis. The following is observed by Robert W. Green, the editor of a collection of such articles, in his introduction to the collection:

Furthermore, the valuations placed upon the Weber thesis by many of the authors seemed to reflect with unfortunate frequency the economic orientation or the religious affiliation (or lack of it)

of the writers involved. If the critic was an admirer of capitalism, he might maintain his particular religious faith had stimulated its development. If, on the other hand, the critic was hostile to capitalism, he perhaps would disavow any possibility that his religion had provided an impetus to capitalistic evolution. The Weber thesis, as a result has become in some instances, the victim of partisan contention.³⁰

The book referred to by L. C. Knights and by most students of economic features in regard to English literature between 1558 and 1642 is R. H. Tawney's book, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (1926), which was written partly to discuss Weber's thesis. Tawney rather softens Weber's thesis and comes to the conclusion that capitalism and Protestantism rose at the same time and did, perhaps, influence each other, but that neither can be called the cause of the other.

The "Capitalist Spirit" is as old as history, and was not, as has sometimes been said, the offspring of Puritanism. But it found in certain aspects of later Puritanism a tonic which braced its energies and fortified its already vigorous temper . . . It had begun by being the very soul of authoritarian regimentation. It ended by being the vehicle for an almost Utilitarian individualism.³¹

Tawney describes the conflict of the era as the clash between commercial capital and industrial capital, as had George Unwin before him, and not as a clash between the laboring class and the capitalist class as did Marx.

George Unwin, an economist, does a thorough job of describing the basic conflict of the time. He says that the business conflict was not a conflict between capital and labor but a conflict between two different kinds of capital,

that of the merchant and that of the rural wool grower.³² There were three forces at work, the capitalist farmer, the capitalist clothier, and the capitalist merchant. The corporation of clothiers in manufacturing towns was a form of industrial capital; it bought wool and put people to work at home weaving and finishing it. The companies of merchant adventurers in the large ports were a form of commercial capital; they sold the woolen products abroad.³³ People understood the operation of the merchant and the landlord, but the function of industrial capital was a thing which few people had tried to analyze. The old staple town monopolies and guild monopolies were familiar, but specific new industrial monopolies were a new feature, as were the projectors who began to appear. The projector was often a courtier who had thought up a scheme which was to bring money to the Crown and to himself. Elizabeth I had issued patents for the handling of government business as well as to the guilds for managing their crafts, but shortly before her death she had had to agree to let all monopolies be investigated, because courtier monopolies were often mishandled. James I promised to stop the use of monopolies, but he was soon issuing patents to projectors to develop new monopolies on a larger scale than Elizabeth I ever had, and people objected even more to his than they had to hers. Unwin describes several operations in detail and shows that if one projector could not succeed in a scheme, he would sell his patent to someone else; and Unwin maintains that

from such operations the great speculating capitalists grew.³⁴ He does not see this as government intervention but as a conflict between various capitalists.

Stella Kramer, who wrote twenty years after Unwin and one year after Tawney, sees the conflict as something more complicated than one between industrial and commercial capital. She says that there had always been some conflict, that the guild system never did work perfectly. It was always hard to keep the clothing trades out of one another's crafts.³⁵ From 1499 on artificers had also always tried to get into buying and selling as well as making things.³⁶ Merchants who lost everything at sea sometimes had to take up a handicraft.³⁷ She says that Unwin forgets that the commercial companies had always warred with each other as well as with the industrial capitalists:

Granting, therefore, that the struggle between the haberdashers and the feltmakers was a struggle between commercial and industrial capital, the clash between the feltmakers and the beaver-makers grew out of the rivalry between two industrial groups, each one of which seemed bent upon gaining control over the same industry.³⁸

She is of the opinion that the conflict was bound to arise in such a rigid system which tried to regulate all features of the economy.³⁹ She says that the conflict was actually one between the principles of protection and those of free trade.⁴⁰ "Free trade triumphed with the repudiation of protection and of the trades and handicrafts organized in its service."⁴¹ So, just as Marx saw the conflict of

capital and labor, and Unwin saw the conflict of commerce and industry, Kramer saw the conflict of protection and free trade.

One critic of Weber, Kurt Samuelson, mentions still another theory which has been put forward in more modern times. He says that Weber could just as easily have mentioned the weather as a force for change in the time of change to capitalism.⁴² Although the weather has been in recent times considered a force of great influence in molding events from the time of the Black Death on, such theories were largely proposed after Weber wrote. Ellsworth Huntington maintains that many of the economic changes in England (and in Ireland), were the result of changes in the weather which made the growing of crops easier or harder.⁴³ Some of his ideas have been used by Harry A. Miskimin, who dates the beginning of the change in society all over Europe from the time of the Black Death in 1349.

Miskimin says that the change in society began at that time because people began to fear early death and spend money on luxuries rather than save it or give it to the church.⁴⁴ He says that some farm land in England was abandoned at that time because of the great drop in population, but that it was soon reclaimed to be used for sheep raising.⁴⁵ He says that there was a good deal of land enclosure at later times, though this has been exaggerated.⁴⁶ He adds that the mining of bullion on the continent had started the inflation of prices in Europe long before the influx of American gold.⁴⁷

Unlike earlier authorities, he believes that the debasement of coinage had a greater influence on the economy than did American gold.⁴⁸ He mentions the effect the milder weather which prevailed all over Europe after 1460 had on the economy, and the resulting increase in population. But these factors were at work on the continent as well as England.⁴⁹ He says that England was lucky because the sea kept her separated from the continental religious wars, leaving her free to pursue economic prosperity on the seas.⁵⁰ He concludes with the idea that the stubborn English parliaments served capitalism inadvertently by refusing to grant the monarchs the excessive taxes that continental rulers demanded, thus keeping the money in the hands of investors.⁵¹ He sees not capital against labor, or commerce against industry, or protection against free trade, but a combination of factors common to other countries plus a chance on the part of England to trade on the seas with the money which parliament kept in the hands of potential traders.

Whether the force of the greedy, the clash of two kinds of capital, the conflict of competitors, or English freedom from war and accumulation of capital are responsible for the change in business methods at that time is not the purpose of this study to determine. This study is to look at the influence of the laws regarding work and poverty on the dramas of an era in which the role of the apprentice, the technical student of that time, was an important one.

Of the theorists, only Stella Kramer seems to make much

of the factor which people of the era in question mentioned when they discussed the validity of allowing certain people to make a profit beyond that which was required to sustain life. This is the element of "risk." She mentioned it in observing that merchants who lost everything at sea sometimes had to take up a handicraft. Today, everybody who reads the Sunday papers knows that the stocks are listed separately from the bonds; investment in bonds carries much less risk than investment in stocks. Just as the ordinary small investor of today knows this, the ordinary citizen of Elizabethan and Jacobean times knew that two jobs especially carried large elements of risk. The farmer ran the risk of losing a crop to bad weather and not being able to recoup his loss until a good year came. Consequently, the farmer was allowed to make a profit. In addition, the merchant who traded overseas ran the risk of losing his ships to storms or to marauders. Consequently, the merchant was allowed to make a profit. Both of these factors are mentioned in such plays as Shirley's Honoriam and Mammon, and the merchant's risk-taking is pointed out in Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice. Playwrights earlier than Shakespeare do not praise the merchant for taking risks, but after 1630 many playwrights begin to see the similarity between the problems of the merchant and those of the farmer.

Several problems arise in studying plays which have already been studied by others. Critics of the past have relied heavily on the theories of Marx, Weber, and Tawney,

and have tended to notice items which substantiate their theories. Another problem is that historians and economists have often turned to the famous writers of the past to see what evidence for trends could be found in their works. The critics and scholars read each others' works, and a circular effect is created by this method, whereby misunderstandings are reinforced by repetition. And there is a tendency to pay too much attention to the work of famous writers, particularly if it happens to present a story which can be seen to illustrate a theory. Many of the famous plays of the era are satires, and a reader should be careful to distinguish between satire and realistic portrayal. The problem which results from this is ably described by Thomas Fuller in his book The Holy State and the Profane State (1642), in the section "Of Books" where he says about satire, which was often criticized at that time:

And surely such scurrilous scandalous papers do more than conceivable mischief . . . secondly, they cast dirt on the faces of many innocent persons, which dried on by continuance of time can never after be washed off; thirdly, the pamphlets of this age may pass for records with the next, because publicity uncontrolled, and what we laugh at, our children may believe.⁵²

A reader must be careful not to accept the satire of a past era as a realistic description of it. Satire can usually be recognized by its circular plot; if nobody reforms at the end of a play, it is probably satire; otherwise, it may have a good deal of realism in it.

There are several other problems. The writers of the past did not describe economic phenomena in the terms which we use today; consequently, an effort must be made to see what they really mean by what they say. In addition, there is a tendency on the part of historical critics to call the time between 1563 and 1642 an "era of change" without making sufficient attempt to see what elements of society changed at what specific times, forgetting that when one walks a block one puts one foot in front of the other many times and does not "take one giant step" to the end of the block.

Nonetheless, L. C. Knights' Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson does still provide a good introduction for the student who wishes to become familiar with the economic problems of the times in which the great English dramas were written. Knights' study is based on the work of Weber and Tawney, as well as that of George Unwin, and on the writings of historians who had published by the time he wrote. A short review of his work will serve to point out what the major economic phenomena of the time were. Though later economists have altered some few interpretations of the times in question, the problems existed. It is just that later economists think that they may have had different causes.

Knights discusses the medieval background, the money market, the extension of foreign trade, the development of industry, the monopolies, the rise of "new men," the legalization of charging interest, and the enclosure of land. He says that the basic order of life in Jonson's time was still

the same as it had been in the Middle Ages; medieval man was conscious of status rather than class and aspired to be the best of his craft, rather than to move to another or to become a knight.⁵³ Rural life was still semi-feudal and the guilds performed similar organizing functions in the towns as the feudal organization did in the country. The main business of the country was agriculture. In the towns the guilds controlled business and industry and the larger masters controlled the guilds.⁵⁴ Knights quotes Marx as saying that capitalism actually developed in the last half of the sixteenth century, and calls that remark justified.⁵⁵ He says that the discovery of the new world was the great push to capitalistic development and that the combination of American gold and the recoinage started an inflation which ran between 1560 and 1650.⁵⁶ As mentioned earlier, Miskimin in 1977 maintains that the inflation started over 100 years earlier with the increase in mining on the continent of Europe. Exactly when the inflation started is not important to a study of the plays, what is important is that it did exist and is commented on by the playwrights from time to time, especially Jonson, most of whose plays portray the desire of people to get more money.

The international money market grew between 1511 and 1579 when Sir Thomas Gresham built his exchange.⁵⁷ Tawney said that international finance first made capital mobile, and it was mobile then. International finance prepared the way for the doctrine of economic freedom. But the ideas of

the local community and those of Gresham and the Royal Exchange were not the same and did clash. Knights goes on to say that the first quarter of the seventeenth century was a period of great economic confusion.

The great extension of foreign trade came after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, and many merchant adventurers became wealthy.⁵⁸ In addition, after 1600, joint stock companies were formed and many people invested in them, people of all classes from the Queen to the shopkeeper's widow. However, this was not the majority of the populace, and not all investors made a good deal of money.

In addition to trade, several industries expanded greatly at this time. Important was the woolen cloth industry; its organization on a nearly national level made the workers dependent on fluctuations in trade.⁵⁹ This led to depressions when trade was interrupted. Other industries which developed were salt, glass, soap, wire, iron, and the mining of tin, copper, and coal. These were organized along capitalist lines; coal mining, more than the manufacture of woolen cloth, required capitalist investment because huge sums of money were required for deep mining.

The form of capitalism which people objected to the most was monopolies. Patents for monopolies had originally been awarded to towns and then to guilds, but by the end of the reign of Elizabeth I they were used to provide services in place of a government bureaucracy.⁶⁰ In addition, they were awarded for money-making schemes, and not all the

schemes which projectors thought up were successful, so the people who invested money in them lost it. People also objected to the monopolies because they did not make goods cheaper as the monopolists had said they would. The monopolies were theoretically ended in 1624 after the impeachment of Sir Giles Mompesson for gross misuse of his monopolies for inspecting ale houses and for the manufacture of gold and silver thread.

The rise of many "new men" in the era caused much comment.⁶¹ Typical was Sir Lionel Cranfield, who rose from mercer's apprentice to Lord High Treasurer, and then was impeached in 1624. There were many others who rose to high places rapidly from obscure beginnings, and this led to a feeling of insecurity in the upper classes.

Another important factor was the enclosure of land and the buying of land by merchants.⁶² Land now began to be thought of as capital investment for a profit, not as a means of sustenance. The middle class did not rise solely on land formerly belonging to monasteries but also on that which the courtiers had to sell to keep up appearances at court. The land changed hands many times. The people's complaints about this were not about land acquisition as such but about merchant owners who were poor "housekeepers" who neglected the traditional duties of landowners, such as caring for the poor and educating the neighborhood children. These were the hospitality and education functions of the old houses in the past, and they were missed. In addition, under James I

the spending for luxury among courtiers increased greatly. Merchants did not like this; trinkets removed gold and silver from the bullion supply and interfered with the payment for goods. While the merchants were blamed for not handling land ownership properly, courtiers who sold the land were criticized for not handling gold properly.

According to Knights, several other factors also contributed to the economic confusion. The inflation and bad crop years combined with land enclosures to remove many people from farming jobs and send them looking for other work, usually in the cities. The government passed the "Poor Laws," which attempted to regulate work, relief for the poor, and restriction of begging. People felt confused by the constant changes in the laws and tended to blame all money problems on "usury."⁶³ The government tried to solve the problems; the most obvious attempt was that made to cure unemployment by passing laws which regulated work, relief of the poor, and the punishment of "sturdy beggars."

The medieval system had been one of ordered classes. Knights says that the Puritan concept of "calling" was about the same thing as the medieval concept of "degree," though others could disagree with this interpretation.⁶⁴ His explanation of the term does correspond with the idea of degree rather than calling because he says that the higher the place one held, the heavier was one's charge. Calling will be discussed in more detail in the section on religion.

People of the sixteenth century believed that private profit should be subordinated to public good. They believed that all business activity should be regulated. Consequently, parliament passed many laws in its attempt to regulate business, and Puritans were not the only people who took their work seriously.

Knights paints a picture of a society which was in a split state, part medieval and part almost modern. However, he does not particularly evaluate the relative importance of the factors at work. He discusses them separately in the order in which they are mentioned above. It is not enough to know that land was enclosed, that ten percent interest was legal after 1571, and that monopolies and projectors were unpopular with the people. The question of usury was important in the first part of the era; the question of monopolies and projectors was important in the last part. And as an actual force in the economy, the enclosures may have been more important than either usury or monopolies, though they were rarely mentioned by writers for the London stage, who wrote for the city audience, not the rural one. Knights' book brings together a great deal of information and organizes it more effectively than had been done before or has been done since. The later chapters in the book deal with individual dramatists, and the relevant material from them will be mentioned when individual plays are discussed.

Life in the country changed just as did life in the city. The landed gentry believed that more money could

be made by mass production of livestock than could be made by garden farming, and they were joined in this effort by merchants who bought land. Unwin says that the medieval era saw the rise of handicrafts in which the town replaced the village as market for the workman's products; then the Elizabethan era saw the rise of the domestic system in which the nation replaced the town as the market, largely for wool which was grown on a mass production system, and the small tradesman was replaced by the country capitalist who bought and sold wool; the modern era has seen the rise of the factory system which produces for the world market.⁶⁵ Printing was the first mass production trade of the cities, but it remained the only one for a long time while the merchant was supreme. The economic system was in a state of transition at that time.

The merchants were part of the guild system. Edward VI had effectively destroyed the guilds when he destroyed the Church guilds, but Elizabeth I revived the craft guilds by the process of incorporation in order to use them to help manage society.⁶⁶ The guilds operating in London were these new guilds, licensed by the Queen. They were related to specific products and to the control of manufacture and prices, and to the education of workers. The Queen had wished to use the guild organization to improve English products so that they would bring a good price, so the guilds tried to regulate the quality of production.

Each guild did the best it could to protect its own

members. For example, when the Chester cappers protested that London cappers were underselling them, the London cappers were forced to raise their prices.⁶⁷ The medieval idea of "just price" still lingered and a great deal of the legislation of the time was an attempt to achieve such a price. The guilds continued to influence business long after this period, but their makeup gradually changed; they effectively split into two parts. Some members became capitalists and others workers. The era was seeing the passing of the small family business, and this may be one reason the small family business is spoken of in a very sentimental way in such plays of the time as The Shoemaker's Holiday.

The laws regulating work are important especially between 1563 and 1610, but did not originate at that time. They were first tried shortly after the Black Death which in 1349 had left the country with a shortage of workers, especially workers who could get in the crops. The landowners began to compete for the services of freemen, if they did not have enough serfs to get their work done. In 1349 a statute regulating wages and the relationships between master and servant was enacted because lords had begun to raise wages so as to get such free labor as was available.⁶⁸ Additional labor problems were caused by the monopolies, and these did not originate in the reign of Elizabeth I but were of long standing. In 1353 the Statute of Staple had become law.⁶⁹ It provided for the creation of "Staple Towns" which had a monopoly on selling certain things. Then in 1406 the

first Statute of Apprentices was enacted to keep farm workers on the land by specifying that a man had to own land worth at least 20s per year in order to apprentice his children.⁷⁰ In 1495 another work law was passed, setting work hours at thirteen per day rather than twelve.⁷¹ All of these laws were passed to keep people working in the rural areas when there were not enough people to get the work done and workers were moving to get higher wages.

Between 1500 and 1550 the picture changed; however, it took a while for this to be recognized. In 1536 Thomas Cromwell still thought that he could avoid social ills by putting children to work.⁷² But by 1550 people had begun to realize that there were more workers than there were jobs. From 1550 on legacies were left in Lincoln, for example, providing money to hire the dependent poor to work at weaving, and in 1552 Christ's Hospital was founded in London in an attempt to not only care for poor orphans but to give them enough education that they could be apprenticed to useful trades. However, the government passed still another law reducing the number of holidays in order to increase the amount of time workers could spend on the job.⁷³ There had been some demand for this law as the increasing inflation made many workers want to work longer hours in order to increase the amount of wages they earned. But the increase in population made the passage of such a law a detriment to economic reform in the long run.

The Statute of Apprentices of 1563 was the great attempt

to tie all the laws regulating work and education together so as to be sure that there would be enough workers in both the rural areas and the towns and enough workers in the menial jobs, the skilled trades, and the educated professions. The act limited movement, regulated hours, provided for changes in pay and prices, and provided for technical education. It recommended apprenticeship for tradesmen's sons because it was easier for a tradesman's son to learn a trade than for him to learn farming, while a farmer's son could learn either.⁷⁴ In addition, it recommended that gentlemen's younger sons be apprenticed because if they were not, they would either become vagabonds or get their fathers to hoard money so as to be able to leave them something. It raised the income requirements for parents who wished to apprentice their sons to the better trades from 20s to £3, thus effectively removing the farmer's sons from the skilled trades. It attempted to freeze procedures as they were, though it provided for yearly adjustments in wages and prices because of the constant inflation. It was an improvement over the previous laws. Though it remained on the books until the nineteenth century, it was not always carefully enforced, and after 1618 it was judged to be superseded by the common law, and gradually lost its effectiveness.⁷⁵

The poor laws, or work laws, or vagabond laws of 1572, 1576, and 1597-1601 were an attempt to correct the problems which arose after the passage of the Statute of Apprentices in 1563. The law of 1572 said that vagabonds should be put

to work, that sturdy beggars should be separated from the genuine poor, and is the law which mentioned players, or actors, as vagabonds, stating that they needed a patron to vouch for their employed state.⁷⁶ The law of 1576 said that towns should supply themselves with flax or wool for the poor to work with, and that the poor who would not work should be sent to a workhouse which each town should build.⁷⁷ The laws of 1597 to 1601 said that poor children should be apprenticed to the humble trades so that they would not become beggars, that vagabonds who would not work were to be stripped and whipped, that people must support their own unemployed relatives, and that scholars would no longer be allowed to beg.⁷⁸ The law of 1604 said that people must not hide beggars or excuse them, and reiterated the point that poor children should be apprenticed at government expense.⁷⁹

Beatrice and Sidney Webb state that the work laws tended to be aimed at whatever group of idle people had most recently offended, and so the lowered child death rate brought on the law of 1601. Each new law tended to concentrate on a class which had just come to the attention of the authorities. The law of 1572 thus classed players as vagabonds. The law of 1572 had permitted scholars to beg if they had a license from the university; the law of 1601 changed that when it was realized that the land had more scholars than it had a use for. The presence of idle gentlemen in London apparently affected the law of 1610. Their presence was so noticeable in London in 1608 that the Lord Chancellor,

addressing the Judges and Justices of the realm in the Star Chamber, rebuked the crowd of "new and young knights who come in their braveries and stand there like an idol to be gazed upon, and do nothing."⁸⁰ Some of these young men were justices of the peace who were supposed to be enforcing the laws regarding the poor and vagabonds; and this appears to have influenced the law of 1610.

The people of that time also considered monopolies granted to courtiers to be a factor which increased unemployment by depriving men of jobs. Therefore, the feeling against monopolies went hand in hand with the feeling aroused by the unemployment of the poor. Resentment against people who would not work and people who supported themselves in ways that deprived others of work reached a peak in 1609, and the Parliament of 1609-10 wrote still another work law intended to regulate the care of the poor and the putting of people to work.⁸¹

The law of 1610 tightened up the system. It made specific provisions for putting people in workhouses, for building such workhouses, and for fining justices of the peace who did not enforce the laws. It eliminated all exemptions from the law except the one which permitted shipwrecked sailors to beg. It classified as a beggar any person who was released from jail after a disorderly conduct charge who had to find someone to pay his bills there.⁸² Thus, a gentleman could not so casually spend a night in the Counter as before and expect to be released. The passage of the work laws was

an influence which can be noted in a number of plays at different times but most particularly in those written immediately after 1610, such as The Tempest, by Shakespeare, A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, by Middleton, and Bartholomew Fair, by Jonson.

David Little describes how the problems of unemployment and monopolies were joined in the situation which came to a head after 1600.⁸³ His explanation of this is described in detail with the discussion of Shakespeare's The Tempest. However, in spite of all the contests of monopolies, patents and monopolies continued to be a major method of doing business until 1623 when the matter was, theoretically at least, resolved, after the manipulations of Sir Giles Mompesson's impeachment. Monopolists were often comic figures or actual villains in the plays of the period.

Some of these laws had unexpected results. The employment of children often condemned them to being underpaid workers. The branding of players as vagabonds led to feelings of resentment on the part of theater people. Forbidding scholars to beg made plain that there were more scholars than there were jobs for them. One would expect to find references to such things in the plays of the times, and one does. The poor scholar is a figure in plays throughout the whole era whereas the beggar figures only in plays of the earlier years, before the work and vagabond laws were carefully enforced by the Privy Council, which feared disorder.

Several of the crafts are often portrayed in the plays.

These are the shoemakers, tailors, drapers, mercers, and members of the building trades. The shoemakers and tailors were less affected by the changing conditions than some other tradesmen were.⁸⁴ The artistic element in their trades long remained, and they tried to maintain a special status for themselves. In 1600 the shoemakers and tailors refused membership to craftsmen who could not afford to pay an entrance fee of £12 and give a dinner costing £5. Unwin simply calls the shoemakers snobs.⁸⁵ They liked to boast of being the "gentle craft" because they numbered nobles among their early members. Even before 1600 they had begun to refuse to work in customers' homes. The drapers were the last of the twelve great livery companies of London, and thus were newcomers. The goldsmiths were rich, were connected with alchemy and coinage, were well educated, and lived in one neighborhood. They were sometimes pictured as being dishonest, but were not usually portrayed as usurers in the plays, though they were in actuality the people who became bankers after the Restoration. The members of the building trades could usually not work alone but had to work in teams.⁸⁶ Most tradesmen were limited by law as to how many journeymen and apprentices they could hire if they actually had them working in their shops. This does not hold true of weavers, who worked at home and sold their work to a master weaver who might not keep any workers in his shop. However, the builders had to work together to put up larger buildings. They were accustomed to group effort. This may be one

reason why Shakespeare puts Quince, the carpenter, in charge of the amateur performers in his play within the play in A Midsummer Night's Dream. Bottom, the clown of the play, is a weaver; Quince, the head man of the group, is a carpenter. Shoemakers and tailors figure in more plays than do most other trades. They were less affected by changing conditions, and thus became a sort of symbol in the plays for the good old days which seemed to be passing.

This discussion of economic problems has not attempted to cover all aspects of all questions, but only those which are important to an understanding of the plays of the period insofar as their relationship to the work laws is concerned. Much more could be said on the subject, but what has been included here should be sufficient to put the subject in perspective, to show how the study of the drama of the time is related to the study of the economic activity of the time, and to furnish information regarding the work laws of the era, which are often reflected in the dramas. Specific changes in the laws will be mentioned when the plays of each era are discussed.

Problems in Religion

The Puritans of England were people who believed that the reformation of the Church of England was not thorough enough. In general they objected to the episcopal form of church government (the use of bishops and a hierarchy), to the lack of emphasis on good preaching, to the continued use

of clerical garments, to the doctrine of transubstantiation (which said that the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist), and to the continued presence of statuary and the like in the church buildings. M. M. Knappen says that their main attack was actually against what they called "papist ceremonies."⁸⁷ What the Puritans originally wanted was more and better preaching, less emphasis on the sacraments, and a democratic system of church organization. As time passed, their emphasis changed from an attempt to reform the church organization to an attempt to influence the lives of individuals.

Puritanism itself started from strictly spiritual ideals. These ideals and new ideas were kept before the English people by the steady influx of refugees from the continent. In addition, the English people who fled to the continent during the reign of Queen Mary were exposed in particular to the teachings of Calvin. Puritanism stressed an inner life of holiness, goodness, perfectness, and not a life of otherworldliness, because it said that holiness should be demonstrated in daily life, not in a withdrawal from the world. In this respect it was typically Protestant. However, its stress on simplicity of service led to conflict with the established Church. On the accession of Elizabeth efforts were made to make the populace conform to the established Protestant Church.

The government of Elizabeth I passed a number of laws in its attempt to control the religious differences.

The laws regarding conformity to religion developed gradually as problems arose, and many are too well known to require discussion. In 1599 the second Act of Supremacy was passed, making Elizabeth I the head of the Church. In 1571 the act which required subscription to the Articles of Edward VI became law. Effort was made to limit non-standard interpretation of doctrine by forbidding the theater to discuss actual religious doctrine. For example, in 1576 morality plays were forbidden.⁸⁸ In 1577 the Puritans' "Prophecyings," an attempt to teach Puritan beliefs in informal gatherings, were also forbidden.⁸⁹

The established Church had no objection to Bible reading and many Bibles were published between 1538 and 1611. From 1543 to 1558 Bibles were not placed in the churches, but this was not because they were not to be read but because the unruly people would read them aloud during the services.⁹⁰ However, the Puritans who were not satisfied with the service or the quality of preaching began the series of Prophecyings which led to so much conflict. The earliest Prophecying session on record was the series begun in Norwich in 1564, which was started because the people were dissatisfied over the lack of well-trained speakers to serve as preachers.⁹¹ The prophecyings did not claim to be prophetic outpourings, but were rather lecture-discussion groups. In such groups people learned how to read, how to use a book, how to exchange ideas, how to confer intellectually, how to teach, and how to express themselves. When prophecyings were forbidden in

1577, they were replaced by the "Lecturings."⁹² Puritan lecturers were accepted churchmen who were skillful preachers who could hold the attention of a crowd. However, devout Puritans held to the principles of the right of free inquiry and the priesthood of all believers, and often prophesyings went on even after they were supplanted by lectures. It would be easy for the playwrights to attend lectures; the prophesyings were not accessible to strangers. In such lectures they could become familiar with Puritan speech and ideas, such as those satirized by Ben Jonson in The Alchemist and Bartholomew Fair.

The educational level of the clergy improved only gradually after the Reformation, though the uneducated clergy had been one of the principal complaints of the people. However, as the emphasis on preaching ability increased, and as Puritan speakers began to make a name for themselves as preachers, the number of other ministers who were good speakers increased also. But it was not a thing that happened quickly. The growth of completely untrained preachers from the ranks of tradesmen, such as Bunyan, largely came later. The prophesyings and lecturings are frequently referred to in the dramas of the era, but the preachers are not mentioned as a rule.

The Puritans had a different attitude toward learning than did the scholars of the Renaissance. As Knappen says, they wanted all people to learn how to read so that they could read their Bibles, but they were inclined to consider

the joys of pure learning to be a form of sinful pride.⁹³ However, after the Reformation, merchants had begun to give a new type of religious benefaction in their wills; the portions that in earlier eras had gone for prayers for the soul went for the endowment of grammar schools. Puritan merchants often endowed grammar schools in their own home towns in the hope of spreading Puritanism by employing a scholar who was inclined to Puritanism as teacher in the school.⁹⁴

Another outstanding quality of the Puritans was their devotion to work. In regard to work and business, the medieval church had merely been opposed to short measure, holiday trade, and misrepresentation. The Puritans, however, tried to use work to keep sin under control by constant labor. While all religious sects were affected by the materialistic ideas of the times, the accumulation of wealth and the idea of raising the standard of living were both unknown concepts at this time.⁹⁵ The duty of a Puritan was simply industry, thrift, and the accumulation of money for the service of God. The Puritans finally had difficulty reconciling the spiritual value of work as a tool for fighting the devil's tool, idleness, with the fact that hard work led one to make money. Weber says that the English Puritans repudiated the accumulation of money by large scale capitalist courtiers but were proud of their own superior business morality, by which they meant their own honesty as tradesmen or businessmen.⁹⁶

As time passed from 1563 to 1642, changes in attitudes and ideas were largely a matter of one thing leading to another. The medieval Church had advocated earning enough to live on and considered the making of profit to be avarice. Since the merchant aimed at making a profit, which he reinvested in his next shipload of goods, he was always more or less suspect, and his reputation was redeemed only by the obvious fact that he took a great risk in his trade because not all of his ships made it back with a cargo. In medieval times, in the morality plays the gentleman was criticized for prodigality and the citizen for avarice. The gentleman was a landowner and the citizen a merchant. At the time of the Reformation, the later morality plays criticized the old Church for avarice in its collection of lands obtained through the testaments of the dying. The reformers, themselves, were later criticized for avarice when they took over the Church lands. Avarice has always been considered a vice, and it is an easy vice for either loser to accuse the winner of having. Both sides did so whenever they could.

With the individual people the matter is more complicated. First, they became three million interpreters of the Bible who found little to agree on among themselves. However, the teachings of Calvin were of primary importance among the Puritans of England. His teachings have been searched by many people since Weber first proposed that the Protestant work ethic grew out of Puritan ideas, and that Protestantism influenced the growth of capitalism. The

Puritans did have considerable teaching about work and "calling" which appeared to spring from the teachings of Calvin. A short look at his Institutes of the Christian Religion from the point of view of specific Bible verses locates some references applicable to this question. This search of references is related to the opinions of historians and critics who maintain that the Puritans were devoted to their earthly "callings" and that they gradually lost interest in alms giving and developed a lack of faith in anyone who did not do any obvious work and finally even a lack of concern for the poor who could not find jobs.⁹⁷

A selection of Bible verses is used here to see whether or not Calvin actually said anything that could be interpreted as being the "Protestant Work Ethic," anything that could be interpreted as a statement against alms giving, anything that could be interpreted as a statement in favor of "works righteousness" (the idea that good works save), or anything that could lead to a misunderstanding of the word "calling," which can be interpreted as both the call of the gospel to the sinner and the call to a particular job on earth. The verses are those often quoted by ordinary Protestant church members in arguments, and should have been as readily available to Bible readers of that day as of the present.⁹⁸ The verses were located by using the index of Ford Lewis Battles' translation of Calvin's Institutes.⁹⁹ The first verse is one which was not found in this book; the others were found used there, but not always in the way they are used today.

For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem (Rom. 15.26).

Calvin does not appear to limit alms giving to those who have the correct faith. He does not refer to this verse which sometimes can be interpreted in that way. The other Bible verses checked were all frequently referred to in the works of Calvin.

But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and behold, all things are clean unto you (Luke 11.41).

This verse can be used to claim that proper alms may really consist of "things of the spirit," that is, preaching to the poor rather than feeding them. Calvin takes the verse in context, Christ's argument with the pharisees about washing dishes, and in Book III, Chapter, IV, Section 36, says that it means that alms are worthwhile only when the heart is pure.

And as we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith (Gal. 6.10).

Though Dryfat, the merchant in Middleton's The Family of Love (1602), makes it clear that he gives more alms to those of his own faith than to others, this is not the way that Calvin thinks the verse should be interpreted. He says that love of neighbor is not dependent upon manner of men but upon God, and in Book III, Chapter VII, Section 6, cautions people

to "look upon the image of God in them." The verse and the one below can also be used in defense of refusal to give to non-church charities.

For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always (Matt. 26.11).

Calvin does not use this passage to say that the poor should not concern people because they will always be present. It is the last half of the verse he stresses. He uses it for his argument that Christ is not now on earth, and in Book IV, Chapter III, Section 11, says that consequently Christ cannot be present in the Roman Catholic mass.

Now we command you brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us; for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you; Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an example unto you, to follow us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat (2 Thes. 3.6-10).

This group of verses is used many places. In Book III, Chapter I, Section 26, it is used to show that believers are not to be idle and disorderly. However, in Book IV, Chapter XVI, Section 29, it is used to show that one must not take the Bible too literally; infants should not be expected to work, says Calvin.

Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling (Phil. 2.12).

Calvin refers to this passage in several places besides the section on "works righteousness." In Book III, Chapter II, Sections 22 and 23, he says that only God redeems by letting his Holy Spirit help people to will aright.

Who will render to every man according to his deeds (Rom. 2.6).

Calvin discusses this verse in his chapter on works righteousness, where, in Book III, Chapter XVIII, Section 1, he says that only God redeems, and that Christians' works are evidence only that they are trying to be like Christ.

Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are differences of administration, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit. To another faith by the same Spirit; to another prophecy; to another discerning of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues (I Cor. 12.4-10).

Calvin makes no attempt to connect this with any earthly calling other than the calling to the ministry, and stresses that these things are gifts of God, not the reward of virtue, in Book IV, Chapter III, Section 11, and Book II, Chapter III, Section 9.

The Parable of the Talents, Matt. 25.14-28, is also

used by Calvin, and will not be quoted here as it is well known. Calvin relates the parable of the talents to spiritual gifts, not to worldly gifts, in Book II, Chapter III, Section 11. He says that God will give more grace to the person who has already received grace. He says that God also gives grace to the wicked, and that God gives both grace and worldly property to both the wicked and the believers, this in Book III, Chapter XXV, Section 9.

There is no evidence of any teaching related to either the Protestant Work Ethic or to a refusal to give alms. There is evidence that idleness was considered bad, just as it had been by the medieval Church. There is evidence that the work of the world was considered important. In addition, there is evidence that it was sometimes hard to tell what was meant by the term "calling," since it was used in two senses, first to mean the call by grace to redemption and second to mean the occupation that made up one's life work.

Calvin states that there will be times when the wicked will be better rewarded on earth than are the faithful.

The wicked often experience God's kindness by remarkable proofs, so as sometimes to put in the shade all the blessings of the pious, yet these lead to their greater condemnation (III, XXV, 9, p. 1004).

Book III, Chapter XVIII, Section 1, is entirely devoted to a negation of the idea of "Works Righteousness," and its title indicates this. Part 1 of this answers the question "What does 'recompense according to works mean?'" saying:

That is to say, he receives it into life by the race of good works in order to fulfill his own work in them according to the order that he has laid down, it is no wonder if they are said to be crowned according to their own works, by which they are doubtless prepared to receive the crown of immortality . . . Now that God has begun a good work in them it must be made perfect until the day of the Lord Jesus (Phil:1:6). It is, however, made perfect when resembling their Heavenly Father in righteousness and holiness, they prove themselves sons true to their nature (pp. 821-822).

In other words, the elect do good works on earth. They do them because God has given them grace. They do them in order to bring the kingdom of God to earth. And they do them in order to better their own character and thus become more like God wants them to be.

Calvin does place a good deal of value on the idea that men are called to faith in God and that they are supposed to labor in an everyday calling on earth. The confusion is probably due to the fact that the word "calling" is used to mean two different things. It is easier to understand what is meant when the word "living" is substituted as it is in modern translations when occupation is meant rather than the call to faith through grace. This will be taken up later.

Calvin extends one caution about expecting everyone to work, though he does it in connection with his discussion of infant baptism, which he defends, and where he says in Book IV, Chapter XVI, Section 29, about 2 Thess. 3.10:

If any man subtly reasons that infants ought to be denied food on the pretext that the apostle allows only those who labor to eat, does not such a man deserve to be spat upon by all? (p. 1351).

In Book II, Chapter II, Section 21, Calvin discusses the call to faith. He says about St. Paul: "He admits that men's minds are incapable of sufficient understanding to know their own calling," meaning that a man cannot know whether or not he is saved. In Book III, Chapter VI, Section 2, he is still discussing the call of the gospel when he says: "Scripture accordingly teaches that this is the goal of our calling to which we must ever look if we would answer God when he calls." In Book III, Chapter XI, Section 6, he moves on to what he describes as "The Lord's Calling as a Basis of Our Way of Life." He says of the life on earth in this modern translation by Ford Lewis Battles:

He has named these various kinds of livings callings . . . Therefore, each individual has his own kind of living assigned to him by the Lord as a sort of sentry post so that he may not heedlessly wander throughout life . . . No task will be so sordid and base, provided you obey your calling in it (p. 724).

This, indeed, does not sound much different from the medieval idea of degree, and may be what leads Knights and others to say that the two ideas are similar.

One can see that the calling to Calvin was the call to election sent from God to man by grace. The living or occupation was a thing assigned by God to a person. It did not make any difference what the occupation was so long as the believer worked in it in such a way that he was obeying the call to faith. The discussion is not related to any modern work ethic but rather to the religious philosophy which he

was attempting to reform, the Roman Catholic one in which a special blessing had been assigned to those who worked directly for the church in a regular religious order.

Calvin is merely reassuring people that work in a trade is just as satisfying to God as is work in a religious order.

His discussion of the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," also covers life in the business world. In Book II, Chapter VIII, Section 46, he says that this commandment obligates one to care for the good of others. He describes what is proper behavior in helping others and says that it is right for a man to be successful if he is

zealous to make only honest and lawful gain . . . faithfully to help all men by our counsel and aid to keep what is theirs . . . Let each man consider what, in his rank and station, he owes to his neighbors, and pay what he owes (p. 409-410).

Calvin says that men are called to faith by God. He says that they are to occupy themselves in daily work, the work of the world. They are to deal with their fellow men only in ways that are honorable and within the law. Other behavior is actually stealing. They are not to be amazed if an unbeliever is occasionally more successful than a believer. Men are not to be idle on earth. If they are idle, they cannot be obeying the calling of God who wants them to do all their work in such a way as to make the world more like the kingdom of God, and in such a way as to improve themselves for their eventual residence in Heaven.

Calvin developed his Institutes of the Christian Religion over a period of time. He wrote a short original version and expanded on it in later editions. He wrote in Latin and translated the original short version into French. Later translations were made by other people. The first Latin version was published in Basle in 1536. It was to supply rudimentary instruction to the multitude.¹⁰⁰ In 1539 the second Latin edition was published, and it was almost twice as long as the first. In 1559 the final Latin version was published and was five times as long as the original, and was intended to serve as a textbook of theology.¹⁰¹ Therefore, when one looks at old manuscripts of the Institutes they often do not say the same thing. Though several translations of an abridgement appeared in England, and a Latin abridgement was published in London in 1579, the famous translation of Calvin was that made by Thomas Norton, collaborator with Thomas Sackville on the play Gorboduc.¹⁰² Both the play and the translation appeared in 1561. This translation was carefully done, was a literal translation not a paraphrase, and was checked by theologians before it was printed. It was also the work of a master of English prose, Thomas Norton. It was reprinted nine times between 1561 and 1634. However, abridged editions were often the only ones available to people, and these did not include the discussion of "calling" which was included in later editions. Whatever else may be said of it, Norton's edition was studied by all English speaking people interested in the

teachings of the Protestant church, even Anglican divinity students.¹⁰³

The doctrine of calling is important to an understanding of several plays. It will not be quoted in full here, but the first four sentences and the last sentence will serve to show how translation could have eventually led to a change in emphasis from what had been intended in the original, and in spite of the care taken in the translation. This is Norton's version:

Last of all this is to be noted, that the Lord bid-
deth every one of us in all the doings of his life,
to have an eye to his calling. For he knoweth with
how great unquietness man's wit boileth, with how
skipping lightness it is carried hither and thither,
how greedy his ambition to hold diverse things at
once. Therefore, that all things should not be
confounded with our folly and rashness, he hath
appointed to every man his duty in several kinds of
life. And that no man rashly run beyond his bounds,
he hath named all such kinds of life vocations.
. . . Hereupon also shall grow singular comfort,
forasmuch as there shall be no worke so filthie and
vile, (if it be such a one as thou obey thy calling
in it) but it shineth and is most precious in the
sight of God.¹⁰⁴

The choice of the word "vocation" is unfortunate; this is the same word that the medieval Church used to describe the work of the clergy and religious. One cannot examine the minds of people of that time to see what they made of all this, but in Bartholomew Fair Jonson satirizes the confusion in terms by adding the additional meaning of "calling," the name that one is normally called.

Even so, none of this appears to resemble any statement

that one's success in the worldly calling will prove the presence of the heavenly one. That the confusion in emphasis did occur is indicated from time to time in literature, but is made clear only after 1642.

It took a little while for the spiritual calling of Calvin's Institutes to become the secular calling of the English Puritans; however, by 1603 it had been accomplished, though it was still later before there is any evidence that success in the calling was supposed to be an indication of assurance of salvation. In his The Rise of Puritanism: 1570-1643, William Haller traces these developments through sermons and other writings of the preachers who served as lecturers in the churches, especially in the prominent churches in London.¹⁰⁵ The discussion below is indebted to his treatment of the matter especially.

In Geneva and Scotland the Calvinists imposed their formula on the whole social structure. English Puritans were unable to reform the established Church and so they preached and experimented in religious expression and social behavior. They wanted to save the world and build Jerusalem in their own time. They converted many people of all classes, both rural and urban, to "godliness." Puritan preachers had great influence on popular taste. What they preached on was the possible answers to the question "What must I do to be saved?" The answers were stated in images of the pilgrim and the warrior. Such preachers, especially the lecturers of the famous London churches, were in competition with Marlowe

and Shakespeare of the theaters. So they described spiritual warfare, not abstract doctrine. It was the drama of Sin and Grace, the war between Christ and Satan. As the years went by they became more adept in stating the Puritan code of life. The famous preachers or lecturers were often poverty ridden scholars, part of the host of graduates from the universities who could not be placed in regular positions.¹⁰⁶

The way of life which they stressed was one of self-expression, self-confidence, and self-exertion. What fine points of doctrine they argued among themselves are not important, what counts is what they conveyed to the people who heard their lectures, what their doctrine meant and did. The big question was who is saved and who is damned. The answer was that those who believed showed their faith by constant war against their own sins. The spiritual diary became a way to keep track of one's successes and failures. People made balance sheets of their good deeds and bad deeds every day.¹⁰⁷ Then the next question was how do saints behave. In 1603 Richard Rogers tried to answer this in his book, Seven Treatises. Saints should begin the day with prayer, work hard at their jobs, and deal justly and uprightly. The believers' time must not be spent idly, carelessly, or unprofitably. The preachers tried to show the elect how to use their gifts and opportunities in this life. Those opposed had said that such a life of godliness would lead to neglect of necessary affairs and bring poverty upon the land. So Rogers answered this charge also, saying that the

man who goes to work without first attending on God:

Goeth about it preposterously, and shall find his success answerable . . . Godliness hinders not men's labours, neither decays the commonwealth. . . . The commonwealth should flourish much more, having a certaine promise of blessing.¹⁰⁸

In 1603 Gabriel Powell in his Resolved Christian goes a little farther from Calvin when he applies the parable of the talents to earthly gifts rather than spiritual gifts:

Wherein is shewed, that no man, of what state or condition soever he be, is Lord of his own riches or substance, but the steward and disposer of it, accountable unto God for all things.¹⁰⁹

The talents are given as things to be used for the service of God. Those who do not use their talents will be chided by God. Haller says that the preachers in this way gave to the general doctrine of God's calling a definite application. When the elect repented they were supposed to act.

By 1616 William Perkins had gone a step farther in this transformation of the doctrine of spiritual calling into earthly occupation. In his Works one finds:

They which are furnished with gifts for their callings, namely aptness and willingness and are thereunto called or set apart by men may rest assured they are called by God. . . . that the calling in which God (would) be served of him,¹¹⁰

and Haller observes that the preachers transformed Paul and Calvin into a code of behavior and "began to look for a new Jerusalem on earth."¹¹¹

One of the most famous religious books of the time was Arthur Dent's The Plaine Man's Pathway to Heaven (1601), which Helen C. White quotes on the subject of "calling":

God doeth allow none to live idely; but all both great and small, are to be imployed one way or another; either for the benefits of the Church or Common-wealth; or for the good government of their own households; or for the good of Townes and Parishes, and those amongst whom they do converse: or for the succor and reliefe of the poor: or for the furtherance of the Gospel, and the maintenance of the ministry: or for one good use or another.¹¹²

She also quotes a "Morning Prayer for Munday" from The Crums of Comfort:

Grant we may deal uprightly, and let the carriage of our affairs be (O Lord) so pleasing unto thee, that they may draw downe thy blessings upon us: and keep us as we pray this week following, thriving in our estates, and religious in our carriage, always meditating of good for thy glory, for the Church and Commonwealth's good, so that whatsoever we lay our hands unto, thou wilt bend our hearts to the same, so it be to thy praise and glory.¹¹³

The Puritans were opposed to idleness even more than had been the medieval Church. The medieval Church had seen it as the source of turning to sin. The Puritans saw it as neglect of the gifts which God had given to people. Everyone agreed that it was the origin of poverty and unemployment, and responded through the government by the passage of work laws and vagabond laws.

For the philosophy behind the work laws themselves it is best to turn to an Anglican. Here is Thomas Fuller, on Ruth XI:15, "Help to Work, the Best Help to Live":

Where we learn that is the best charity which so relieves people's wants as that they are still continued in their calling . . . Relieve a husbandman, yet so as that he may still continue in his husbandry; a tradesman, yet so as he may still go on in his trade; a poor scholar, yet so as he may still proceed in his studies. . . . Drones bring no honey to the hive.¹¹⁴

Apparently both Anglican and Puritan agreed that work was the best solution to the problems of humanity. But the Puritans came to stress two things, first, that everyone, even the gentleman, should work at something, and second, that since all callings were from God, any calling which did not appear to be morally proper could not rightfully be a calling, but a mere occupation, and should, therefore, not be allowed in the world. In the class of non-allowed occupations the Puritans placed both the begging friars of the Roman Catholic Church and the stage actors. Their thinking appeared to be that people should be able to see evidence of the usefulness of the work a person did, and that work which did not meet this requirement or work which appeared to conflict with Biblical teaching was not only wrong but actually profane. By 1599 Rainold's Overthrow of Stage Plays mentioned that men wore women's clothing in the performance of plays and called this morally wrong because it was in conflict with teachings of the Bible. He also said that dramatic productions cost money which might better be given to the poor.¹¹⁵ The criticism of stage plays as well as all other Puritan ideas was constantly kept before the people of London by the Puritan lecturers of the times, and was

sometimes answered by the playwrights, such as Jonson did in Bartholomew Fair.

Another major religious question dealt with in the plays of the era was the question of usury or interest on loans. Though Calvin permitted usury on loans made for business purposes, the English Puritans did not quickly accept that idea. Usury had been outlawed in the reign of Edward VI, but this was inconvenient because small farmers needed loans as well as did the capitalists of London, and the Court of Orphans of London commonly made money for its wards by lending it to reliable credit risks. R. H. Tawney's introduction to the famous tract of the era, Thomas Wilson's (1572) A Discourse Upon Usury, places the problem in perspective. The ancient church had not approved of usury but its ideas were largely based on Aristotle's dictum that "Money cannot beget money."¹¹⁶ However, in reality, most business was run on credit. In the rural areas the country corn dealers were sources of credit for farmers and in the city, merchants were money lenders.¹¹⁷ Calvin's views were that it was all right to charge interest of the rich if the terms were regulated, but not to charge it of the poor.¹¹⁸ He left the ancient teaching still adhered to by Lutherans and Anglicans for what Tawney calls "common sense."¹¹⁹ Calvin said that the rates should be regulated and interest not taken from the poor.¹²⁰ The government did attempt to regulate the rates. In 1571 the usury law was changed and ten percent interest was made legal; higher rates were prosecuted as

usury. In 1624 the rate was lowered to eight percent. Many people considered the Puritans responsible for allowing interest, but the law was changed in 1571 by Elizabeth I. Usury and other methods of extracting excessive charges from people who needed money are often pictured in the plays of the era, and the matter is related to religious questions as well as to economic problems.

Still another problem of the time is often connected to Puritanism, though the connection is more difficult to see. This is the transfer of the handling of the relief of the poor from the Church to the State. The medieval church had stressed the giving of alms. Luther had stressed good works for the good of the community, and he had denounced begging friars. From such ideas, the duty of good works for a Protestant gradually changed from good works done for individuals to good works done for the community.¹²¹ The government's administration of the Poor Laws is a reflection of this. Alms were administered by the officials, not given to individuals by individuals. The Puritans were not admirers of the charitable methods of the poor laws in particular, but thought that everyone should work, and therefore supported laws which provided workhouses for the poor. They were, however, equally opposed to the lazy gentlemen who patronized the ordinaries of London and the vagrants who begged.

In 1572 relief of the poor was transferred to the State though the organization of the Church was used to handle the actual business where necessary. The London Common Council

handled its own poor relief, but in outlying places it was the Church Wardens who took care of it. After 1597 people who refused to contribute for charity were fined, as much as £5 in some cases. Separation of the genuine poor from "sturdy beggars" who did not deserve help was the responsibility of the sheriffs and justices of the peace, just as it had been from 1576 on, though the requirement had not been enforced at all before that time and was not well enforced until after the laws of 1597-1601 were passed.

The attitude of the medieval merchant to the poor had been mixed at best. He wanted, according to Sylvia Thrupp, the prayers of the poor for his soul, so he left money for them in his will; he spared the old and needy when collecting debts; he felt that people were degraded by doing manual labor; he did not respect those asking for alms but only the industrious poor.¹²² The feelings of the Puritans on the subject do not appear to have been much different. However, one foundation of their system was that they were opposed to Catholic monasticism which encouraged men to sell everything, give the money to the Church, and become begging monks. Nonetheless, during this period all people were particularly opposed to idleness because of the problem of unemployed vagrants. The earliest criticism of actors which Puritans made included the fact that they wandered from place to place and did not do any obvious work. The Puritans also thought that a gentleman should work at something, and it was usually recommended that he study law so as to be an effective

administrator. Perkins, the famous Puritan preacher, was opposed to idleness, but cautioned that poverty could be a trial from God, while mentioning four types of idle people who should not be tolerated: rogues, beggars, vagabonds; monks, friars, papists; gentlemen; and servingmen.¹²³ In other words, the lazy and the idle rich were criticized, not the honest, out-of-work poor.

Although there are many references to the Puritans in the plays of the period, particularly in the years immediately before the Civil War, these references are usually short jokes--what today would be called "one liners"--and they are rarely characterizations. The plays do not usually deal with doctrinal questions, but satirize the habits, dress, and speech of the Puritans. Actual religious questions are seldom dealt with because the playwrights were forbidden after 1559 to deal with either matters of religious doctrine or of serious political questions. Therefore, the development of the "work ethic" is seldom referred to. Respublica, a Catholic polemic play of 1553 includes a character called "Avarice," who expects to get to heaven because of the work which he does on earth, and he is one of the main deluders of the heroine. Westward Ho, a citizen comedy of 1606, portrays a character who thinks that his portly frame and sincerity in business prove his virtue. Ben Jonson, who was always ready to take on a risky topic, satirized the Puritan idea of "calling" in Bartholomew Fair in 1614. But ordinarily the playwrights ignored such issues. This is not

surprising; there is not much one can criticize about hard work, especially in an age when one of the biggest social problems is unemployment. Generally speaking, it was not until very late in the period that anyone made very much of a connection between business and Puritanism.

The plays do occasionally mention the Anabaptists and the Family of Love. Some Anabaptists on the continent had been basically communistic in that they believed that property should be held communally. They were not a numerous sect in England at the beginning of the period. When they became more numerous, they stressed the doctrine of baptism after the age of understanding more than any particular doctrine of property ownership. Their presence is important to the drama mostly because it makes a reader aware that even the common people of that time could have known that such ideas as the communal holding of land were a social possibility that was well known. It was not necessary for an audience to have read the works of Montaigne to know that communism was a method of social organization, they could have heard about it from an itinerant preacher or read about it in the Bible. Knappen adds that while most Puritans believed in Predestination, the Anabaptists believed in Free Will, and this served to further separate them from other Puritan sects.¹²⁴

References to the Family of Love sect present a different problem. It was a communist sect, but refused to identify with either the Protestant or Catholic church, and its

members would attend either without taking part in the services.¹²⁵ It first arrived in England in 1574 and by 1598 a proclamation against it and its books was published.¹²⁶ It was accused by many of advocating community of lovers as well as of property, but it is hard to tell just what it did teach. The name of the sect and its reputation for preaching what is now called "free love" made it a handy butt for satire at the hands of the playwrights. Most references to the Family of Love sect are in no way related to any religious doctrine. Indeed, after 1600 the tendency was to use the term as a sort of standard "gag" to describe any courtesan or prostitute. For example, the courtesan in Marston's The Dutch Courtesan (1603) is referred to as a member of the family of love with no further explanation. Attempts to take such references as serious satire are misleading. It was merely slang or an "in" joke.

M. M. Knappen offers some opinions on questions of private property, alms giving, and usury insofar as they are connected with Puritanism in his study of the subject. He says that the Puritans believed in private property, that each man was to maintain his economic standing in the community. Their anti-communist attitudes were strengthened by their reaction to Anabaptism; they wanted to dissociate themselves in the public mind from the radical German Anabaptists.¹²⁷ He traces the gradual decline of the approbation of alms giving through the writings of some of the Puritan divines and says that the Reformation brought a decline in

charitable activities throughout all of England, in both Anglicans and Puritans. "The zest went out of alms giving along with the acrid odor of purgatory," is his statement.¹²⁸ This statement is not complimentary to either Puritans or Anglicans, nor even to the Catholics who are pictured as giving alms only to guarantee their own blessing in the end. Knappen says that originally Puritans and Anglicans had both denounced usury. However, he then quotes James Spottsword's The Execution of Nescheck (1616) as saying that many clergymen, both Puritan and Anglican, were charging interest on loans that they made by that time.¹²⁹ Apparently, many of the clergy of both sects had stopped opposing usury.

To find a clear picture of the person who believes in what Weber calls the "Protestant Work Ethic" one must turn to the writings of Samuel Butler (1613-1880). It is impossible to know when his Characters was written, but it had to be sometime before 1680. In this collection is found the description of "A Fanatic," which includes the following:

The Apostles in the primitive church worked miracles to confirm and propagate their doctrine; but he thinks to confirm his by working at his trade. . . . He calls his own supposed abilities "gifts," and disposes of himself like a foundation designed to pious uses, although, like others of the same kind, they are always diverted to other purposes.¹³⁰

The conflicts between the Puritans and the rest of the country were sometimes reflected in the plays, though not as often as a study of the plays of Ben Jonson alone might

lead one to believe. They were, however, heavily satirized by many writers in the last ten years before the Civil War, and most Puritan characters were portrayed as working men and women.

Education and Apprenticeship

As has been pointed out by both Joan Simon and John Lawson and Harold Silver, the proper understanding of education in England both before and immediately after the Reformation has been distorted by the bias given to the information provided in English Schools at the Reformation: 1546-1548, by Arthur F. Leach, published in 1896.¹³¹ The trend of this bias is apparent already in the title of the first chapter, "Edward VI: Spoiler of Schools."¹³² His discussion of the grammar school attended by Shakespeare is typical of the bias:

The Guild of the Holy Cross at Stratford, did keep a school; but the Guild of Stratford, at least in that form, is not a very ancient one, purporting, as it does, to have been founded by Henry VI. In fact, it was much older, as the Guild returns, under Richard II in 1389, show it then existing under the same name. Its accounts show a rent from John Schoolmaster, in 1402, for his chamber. The next step was to give him a chamber rent-free, and in 1427 a School--still part of the present School--was built for him in the yard behind the chapel and almshouses. It was not, however, until 1482 that a chaplain of the Guild endowed the School as a Free Grammar School. In 1552, the people of Stratford had to buy back from the Crown their Guild, with its School and Almshouses, and so Edward VI has the glory of having founded¹³³ Shakespeare's school at Stratford-on-Avon.

Actually, the school was founded in 1295; it became a free grammar school in 1482, being supported by a Guild of tradesmen who attended the church there and supported a chantry which prayed for the souls of departed members and taught the boys of the town; and the school was bought by the town at the time the chantries were dissolved (1552) as were most of the chantry schools.¹³⁴ In actuality, education was much more widespread in the Tudor and early Stuart periods than people of later times have realized, so much so that it makes the later periods look bad by comparison. The great push for elementary education in the United States of America is in many ways the result of the fact that the people who founded this country came here at a time when elementary education was more widespread in England than it had ever been before or was to become again until late in the 19th century. All other levels of education were also well attended at that time, about 1630.

In order to understand this it is good to look at the development of educational institutions from medieval times on. There are three periods to be considered: medieval, Renaissance, and Elizabethan-Jacobean, and five organs of education to be considered: petty schools, grammar schools, universities, law schools, and apprenticeship, as well as casual adult education, which grew rapidly after the invention of printing made the purchase of books a thing within the reach of the ordinary person.

From medieval times on education had been education for

a vocation of some sort.¹³⁵ Education at the university was training for entry into the clergy, education by a patron was training for knighthood, and education by apprenticeship was training for merchants, tradesmen, and artisans. Apothecaries, barbers, and lawyers were trained as apprentices. In England the urban middle classes had long been desirous of education and resentful of the Church's monopoly on it.¹³⁶ Already in 1393 there was a lay operated school in London, duly recorded because the Church tried to close it.¹³⁷ The Renaissance brought many changes in education, especially in England. The Renaissance educators in England, More and Colet, were aided by Erasmus, who taught there for several years. They founded (actually refounded) St. Paul's School in London in 1509, and set it up carefully so as to furnish a model for other schools. John Lyly, a married layman, was appointed master. They wrote their own textbooks and substituted Aesop's Fables and other classics, which they considered better, for the medieval books used in the past.¹³⁸ However, there had long been lay operated schools. The burgesses in Kingston-upon-Thames founded one in 1364, for example.¹³⁹ After the Black Death of 1349, there had been a shortage of trained teachers, and in 1439 Henry VI founded God's House at Cambridge especially to concentrate on the study of grammar rather than scholastic logic, so as to train schoolmasters.¹⁴⁰ The period from 1490 to 1530 was full of good harvests and overseas trade, so many schools were founded. In reality, students in lay

schools far outnumbered those in church schools long before the time of Henry VIII, and the laity in the towns was usually better educated than the rural clergy.¹⁴¹ However, it was during the time of Henry VIII that the great push to standardize education in the grammar schools came. Thus, by the time of Elizabeth I, grammar schools were already common, but many more were founded during her reign.

The population of England rose forty percent between 1500 and 1600, and thirty percent between 1600 and 1630, and this created another shortage of trained teachers.¹⁴² The universities, therefore, again concentrated on training teachers, as well as clergymen, and many men trained for the clergy spent time in the teaching profession. The universities thus trained clergymen, teachers, and frequently law students who went on to the Inns of Court. Even some merchant apprentices had received some university education, most notable being Sir Thomas Gresham, financial manager of Elizabeth I, who had attended both Oxford and Cambridge for a short time before being apprenticed to his uncle, a London mercer.¹⁴³

The literacy rate was much higher in this era than has long been believed. In 1864 in England there was only one school for every 23,750 persons.¹⁴⁴ Before the Reformation there had been one school for every 5,625 persons. By 1660 there was a grammar school for every 4,400 persons.¹⁴⁵ So the elementary and grammar school education provided at the beginning of the Victorian era was not only inferior to that

of the Elizabethan era (4,400/23,750), but actually inferior to that of medieval times (5,625/23,750). The population continued to increase after 1660, but few new schools were founded, and public education did not develop as it did in the United States. There were 300 operating grammar schools in England by 1530 and 390 by 1575.¹⁴⁶

There were five principal organs of education: the petty schools, the grammar schools, the universities, the Inns of Court, and apprenticeship with a master. A great many people, both boys and girls, attended petty school, where they learned to read English. This was especially true in the cities and towns. Richard Mulcaster, in Positions (1581), devotes an entire chapter to the proper education of girls, saying that they should be taught to read. As did Piaget, he had apparently observed his own children, and said, "Girls seem commonly to have a quicker ripening in wit than boys have."¹⁴⁷ He even advocated having women learn a trade so that they could support themselves if necessary. After 1559 all masters of grammar schools were examined by the Bishop to be certain of their orthodoxy, a system which did not effectively keep Puritans out of the schools at a later date. Women who taught petty school had to be approved by the Bishop, but were not examined. Village petty schools were attended by anyone who could pay the small fee charged. The Duke of Buckingham attended such a school.¹⁴⁸ As early as 1391 some of the gentry had tried to keep children of villeins out of the petty schools, but a law of 1406 specifically

made their attendance there legal provided the local landowner approved.¹⁴⁹ The teachers of petty schools were usually widows, spinsters, or wives of schoolmasters.¹⁵⁰ Edmund Coote's The English Schoolmaster (1596) is actually a handbook for teachers of petty schools. In 1604 it was made a rule that every parish without a grammar school had to have its curate teach petty school. After 1640, it was generally the parish clerk who did this, not the parson. Many people went to petty school and learned to read English. They did not learn to write, and this is the basis of humor in such plays as Westward Ho (1604), in which three citizens' wives are learning to write from a supposed writing master, Mr. Parenthesis, much as modern women take music lessons. Already in Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (1588), the tradesman, Simplicity, cannot believe that a pageboy he meets cannot read, and reasons that he must have not grown up in London. Schoolchildren of either petty school or grammar school are not often portrayed, but schoolmasters are, the most famous being Holofernes in Love's Labor Lost (1590).

After petty school came grammar school, and then the university. After grammar school--where he learned Latin grammar and the classics--a boy could either go to the university or into apprenticeship in one of the better trades. Both gentlemen's sons and tradesmen's sons attended the universities and went into apprenticeship. Because the younger sons of the English nobility did not inherit title and lands, the English nobility did not form a closed hereditary caste;

there had always been a movement into trade by gentlemen's younger sons and one into gentry by wealthy merchants.¹⁵¹ In addition, from the thirteenth century on, knighthood could be obtained by the acquisition of landed wealth. Wealthy merchants bought their way into the gentry by acquiring land, and the monarchs created new gentry from time to time, an especially large number being created by Henry VIII with the sale of the monastic lands. Later James I and Charles I greatly increased the number of peers. The new gentry, particularly the knights, served as members of parliament and as justices of the peace in their own home districts. They, therefore, needed education in law and administration, not training for fighting wars as had been true in previous eras. In medieval times it was not considered proper for a gentleman to attend the university, and even one Privy Counselor of Elizabeth I, the first Earl of Pembroke, could not read or write.¹⁵² However, from the time of Henry VIII on, the gentry and peers attended the university in increasing numbers, though many did not graduate, and the gentry also attended classes at the Inns of Court. Attendance at Cambridge rose from 190 new students per year in 1550 to 300 in 1570. In the 1630's Oxford got 500 new students a year, a total not equaled until the 1870's.¹⁵³

In the lower classes the custom of "Borough English" made the youngest son heir, but except in Kent, where the custom of gavel-kind, or equal inheritance, prevailed, only the eldest son of a gentleman inherited his father's title

and land, so careers had to be found for the others. The birth rate and survival rate increased greatly in this period, and the increased population meant there were second and third sons in gentle families. It had long been tradition to apprentice such a son to one of the better trades. This was not something new, though the increase in population made it seem so.¹⁵⁴ The famous Lord Mayor of London, Sir Richard Whittington, who died in 1427, came as an apprentice to London, not as the son of a ploughman, but as the son of Sir William Whittington, Knight, and as he makes plain in his will, a legitimate son, "son of his wife, Dame Jone."¹⁵⁵

The education of the nobles and gentlemen was an especially lively question because they were often not well brought up. Roger Ascham, tutor of Elizabeth I, in his The Schoolmaster (1571), observes that gentlemen's sons are often not well brought up because they are left too much in the care of servants.¹⁵⁶ Until Elizabeth I made Lord Burghley the Master of the Court of Wards, the orphans of the nobility were often badly educated because all too often wardships of heirs were sold by the monarchs and were bought by people who were interested in managing the property of their wards rather than in teaching them to manage it themselves, or were interested in marrying their own children to the heirs, a practice that not even Burghley could stop.¹⁵⁷ However, many of the young gentlemen never got any farther than grammar school either because of being wards or because their families still felt that book learning was not

needed by a gentleman. Mulcaster, in Positions (1581), advocated educating all young men together so that they could learn to understand each other and because teachers in public schools were supervised by authorities who at least tried to guarantee that their efforts were directed in the right channels.¹⁵⁸ He even added that it would be wise for the nobility to become well educated so as to not be pushed out of government jobs by those of humbler origins who used their superior education merely as a means of advancement.¹⁵⁹ Since it was rather easy for the son of a merchant to go to school not only at the grammar school but also at the university or the Inns of Court, many people who got the education needed for high positions were from the merchant class, not the gentry. The heirs of gentlemen married at a much earlier age than did most merchants' sons. While only six percent were married by the age of fifteen, twenty percent were married by the age of seventeen, and forty percent by the age of nineteen.¹⁶⁰ The apprentice, gentleman or citizen, was not allowed to marry until the age of twenty-one in most places and twenty-four in London. Merchants' sons did not have to marry to guarantee the production of an heir as most of a merchant's property was chattels, not land. The poet, Edmund Spenser, is a good example of a government administrator who was the son of a tradesman; his father was a tailor. Spenser attended Cambridge from 1569 to 1576, and after his graduation was employed by Lord Grey to help run the government in

Ireland.¹⁶¹ Though James I tightened the restrictions intended to keep dissenters out of the universities, either they were not strictly enforced or students were good at not making up their minds about religion until after graduation, because Puritans continued to attend the universities long after James I's edict of 1616. John Milton attended Cambridge from 1625 to 1632, and later took a prominent part in the government of the Puritans.¹⁶²

So a great many people, both boys and girls, attended petty school; boys who wished to prepare for the university or for apprenticeship in the better trades attended grammar school; and young men who were preparing for livings in the Church or as schoolmasters, as well as those preparing for positions in government administration, attended the universities; while lawyers studied at the Inns of Court. But the vast number of people who operated the growing commercial organization were all still trained under the apprentice system. Both gentlemen and commoners could attend the universities, and both could become apprentices. Only the nobility and the poorest farmers did not apprentice their children. Both boys and girls were apprenticed. The girls generally entered such trades as embroidering, baking, and brewing; boys entered all trades. Sylvia Thrupp provides a list of the social origins of the apprentices of the Merchant Tailors of London in 1486-87 and the Skinners of London in 1496-1500 which shows that these apprentices were: 48 sons of craftsmen, 45 sons of yeomen, 29 sons of husbandmen, 5 not

specified, and 25 sons of gentlemen.¹⁶³ She adds that already then one third to one half of the apprentices were sons of trade families who lived in smaller towns but sent their sons to London to be educated.

With this background in mind it is not surprising to find the Statute of Apprentices of 1563 recommending that young gentlemen become apprentices. It had long been the custom. It had not happened as often in the times between 1349 and 1549 as it did later when the birth rate began to rise and the infant mortality rate to drop. George Unwin observes that the Statute of Apprentices specifically recommends that younger sons of gentlemen become apprentices, because if they do not they will either become idlers or get their fathers to hoard money to leave to them.¹⁶⁴ The desire for good apprenticeships for gentlemen's sons was so great that in 1557 some members of Parliament tried to make a law limiting the access of non-gentlemen to the better trades, but the bill did not pass.¹⁶⁵ The increasing presence of gentlemen's sons in the trades is often mentioned in the plays, being praised in Eastward Ho in 1605, but being called the reason for the decline of the trades in The City Madam in 1622. After that time more young men began to attend the universities and apprenticeship became a less attractive form of education for a young gentleman.

Just as did the gentleman after the Renaissance, the merchant or tradesman expected his sons to receive an education. An elder son was likely to be sent to the university

or to the Inns of Court to be trained for government service or in the legal profession. A younger son would be apprenticed to as good a trade as his family could afford, and if his father was not a London tradesman, he would still do what he could to send his son to London for training because the variety and thoroughness of the training offered there was better than that at home.

The London apprentice figures so prominently in many of the plays of the era that a brief discussion of his place in life seems appropriate. To the people of the Middle Ages he was a student of one of the skilled trades. There were apprentice scholars, apprentice lawyers, and apprentice artisans. The apprentice artisan originally wore a blue gown made on the same pattern as the black gown of the university student. One theory further connects their training by saying that the square cap of the scholar was modeled after the mortar board of the master mason, originally the builder of cathedrals, the greatest manual laborer.¹⁶⁶ To Max Weber, who saw the Puritan era as the birth time of the work ethic, the apprentice was the symbol of labor which was free or which got paid for work, as opposed to slave labor.¹⁶⁷

In Tudor and Stuart times apprenticeship was the means of entry into the trades, training for a life work. In the early times it was used in only the most profitable trades, but later it was extended to include almost all trades. Since some trades required a good deal of training and some did not really involve manual labor, apprenticeship can in

in some ways be compared to modern technical education or business management training. Fees were required of those entering into apprenticeship. Profitable trades asked for higher fees, and the annual income required of parents who apprenticed sons was listed in the laws.¹⁶⁸ Parents apprenticing children were required to have a worth of £3 in some cases and of 40s in others. Thus the children of poor people were not apprenticed to the better trades under the law of 1563. After 1598, officials were permitted to apprentice the children of the poor as they saw fit, and did occasionally apprentice them to better trades if they exhibited talent. Leaving money in one's will to provide for the apprenticeship of poor children became a popular charity after that time. The high property restrictions for apprenticeship in the trades of merchant, mercer, draper, goldsmith, ironmonger, embroiderer, clothier, and woolen cloth weaver made those trades rather exclusive.¹⁶⁹

The training of an apprentice covered many things. An apprentice carpenter would learn many of the same things that an apprentice carpenter learns today, so his need to be able to read and compute numbers is apparent. An apprentice draper or mercer would learn such things as trade conditions, commercial law, foreign exchange, shipping, ethical principles, and the like; thus, his training was more like that of a modern management trainee in a large corporation. Most trades required that an apprentice be literate. From 1478 on that had been the requirement for goldsmiths, and in 1498

they stipulated that any insufficiency in the apprentice had to be remedied by instruction after he was accepted.¹⁷⁰

Masters were required to supervise not only the apprentice's education in the trade but his moral and ethical behavior as well. This is easy to understand when one considers that most apprenticeships began between the ages of fourteen and seventeen and did not end until the ages of twenty-one or twenty-four. The apprentice lived with his master's family and was provided with room and board in exchange for his work. The master was supervised by his guild, and an apprentice who felt unfairly treated could complain to the guild.

The government used the guild organization to supervise the training. The intent of the Statute of 1563 was to improve the quality of English goods so as to increase the market for them and thereby to improve the economy of the country. Apprentices had to pass a test to demonstrate their ability before being accepted into the trade at the completion of their training. They were supposed to wear the clothing of their own guilds, the blue gown, and the "flat cap." Failure of many to abide by this regulation brought a special proclamation from the Lord Mayor of London in 1582, further restricting the clothing worn by apprentices. Just as there was some feeling against students in the town of Oxford, there was some feeling against apprentices in London; there were, after all, a great many young men aged fourteen to twenty-four in the city.

Between the passage of the Statute of Apprentices in

1563 and the Vagabond or Work Law of 1598, many of the smaller crafts amalgamated and set up apprentice systems.¹⁷¹

After 1598 such crafts often got the apprentices placed under the provisions of the law. The tendency then grew for the status of the apprentice to be lowered. The 1563 law stated that anyone between the ages of twelve and sixty could be compelled to work at husbandry if he were not an apprentice, a university student, or a grammar school student. The laws of 1597-1601 stated that poor children were to be kept busy by apprenticing them to the lesser trades. This increased the number of people in London who were nominally apprentices. Since they were not to marry until twenty-one if women and twenty-four if men, this increased the number of young single people in London, a distinct contrast to the situation in the country where marriage at age seventeen was the norm. However, many of the country gentry were apprenticed until after the Civil War, and there were occasionally gentlewomen apprenticed to the trade of embroiderer, just as there were gentlemen drapers.¹⁷²

The beginning apprentice was actually still a child. With the child death rate as high as it was in London, oftentimes the apprentice was the only child in the household, and many masters were quite fond of their apprentices. It was not unusual for the apprentice to marry the daughter of his master and take over the business on the master's death, in Horatio Alger fashion. Apprenticeships in London were desired because there were more trades practiced there and

because the experience offered was broader than in other places. About sixty percent of apprentice carpenters and masons trained in London returned to their home towns to practice their trades after getting the type of experience they could get only in London where building was constantly going on.¹⁷³

Apprenticeship in London was different from that in other towns. London customs overrode the act of 1563 where necessary. Thus an apprentice who successfully completed his training in one trade in London was free to practice any trade in that city. When he got his "freedom of the company" or graduated, he also got the "freedom of the city," which meant that he was a citizen but also that he could practice any trade. A gentleman's son could be apprenticed to a draper or goldsmith, complete his training, and then become a merchant to handle the selling of his own family's woolen products, or the like. In the early times apprentices of gentle birth could not claim dual status, but by the time of Elizabeth I, the apprentice of gentle birth did not lose his status on apprenticeship. It was not usual to enforce clothing regulations on such apprentices when they were not working. The apprentice became a citizen of London on successful completion of his training, but after 1555 it was required of many trades that their apprentices produce a "masterpiece" to do so. This took time and money.

When finally setting up in business, the journeyman had to obtain money from somewhere. If his family was well off,

they could help him; if not, he started out by borrowing, just as did the young gentleman who came to follow the court. It is small wonder then that usury received so much criticism. In Dekker's The Fair Maid of the West, I (1603), we see Bess Bridges leaving £1,000 in her will to help young apprentices set up in trade. Many young men could marry the master's daughter and thus enter trade, if the master had a daughter of appropriate age. The merchant and tradesman did not expect an eldest son to enter the father's trade as it was obvious that this son was not always the one talented in that direction, and this is stated as early as 1523 in the play Gentleness and Nobility in which the merchant criticizes the knight's adherence to the law of primogeniture. But by the turn of the century many guilds tended to admit only relatives, and a journeyman after that time began to have an increasingly hard life. Especially in the less exclusive trades, he became more and more a hired worker, not a master; but he was free to marry and set up a household.

The apprentice was not only a worker but a rioter, a fighter, and sometimes a hero. The city of London was well aware of the tendency of the young men to erupt into violence and never forgot the "Evil May Day" of 1517 when the apprentices had rioted against the foreigners who had been brought into the suburbs of the city and had caused the haberdashers to be paying weavers and allied trades less than they had been paid previously. The officials of the city had heard rumors of the impending riot and were thus blamed by the

King for their failure to control it.¹⁷⁴ Other later incidents were not permitted to reach riot proportions. For example, when in 1592 monopolist Darcy struck an alderman, the apprentice rallying cry of "Apprentices, Apprentices, Clubs, Clubs" brought a mob to the scene, but the Lord Mayor managed to hide Darcy and disperse the mob.¹⁷⁵ The city finally tacitly allowed the apprentices their annual spring riot on Shrove Tuesday, when they were permitted to tear down the houses of prostitutes. Apparently this was considered a relatively harmless endeavor, and one which let them get the spring fever out of their systems, much as spring break allows modern college students to blow off steam. However, in 1617 the apprentices added to the destruction of the houses of prostitution the destruction of the contents of the Cockpit Theater.¹⁷⁶ The playwrights had good reason to be careful of the apprentices.

The apprentices were famous in London song and story as brave fighters, and Londoners normally conceded that the fighting ability of apprentices was what usually kept out the various invaders who came before 1588. After the 1517 May Day riot, many apprentices did distinguish themselves as fighters in the subsequent wars in France. Brave apprentices figured in ballads of the era, though such deeds as saving a master's child from drowning could be stretched into fighting lions in Turkey.¹⁷⁷ Since an increasing number of apprentices were sons of gentlemen who had been brought up to admire fighting, it is not surprising that many continued

to exhibit the traits of violence that such an upbringing would foster. Many had to learn the trait of "civility."

All London tradesmen, not just apprentices, revelled in the stories of the famous apprentices of the past. Such figures as Dick Whittington, who was actually the son of a knight and not the owner of a cat, were popular, but more popular if the story could be made that of a poor boy who made good. Whittington's actual contribution to London was the donation of his library to the Guildhall on his death. Simon Eyre, portrayed in Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday, was another popular hero, but he was a draper, not a shoemaker, and his contribution to London was the building of Leadenhall as a storage place for corn in winter and bad seasons, not the throwing of a pancake breakfast once a year. Sir Thomas Gresham was another famous apprentice, and also the son of a knight; his father had been Lord Mayor of London, and thus was knighted. Thomas Gresham continued in his business after he was knighted; many Lords Mayors did not.

In later times the many poor children apprenticed to the humbler trades changed the character of apprenticeship. Thus, we find the "Humble Petition of the Apprentices of London" in 1641 claiming that there were 30,000 apprentices in London and saying that the city tended too often to make them the scapegoats of every disturbance in the city.¹⁷⁸ They also complained of being unable to find work after completing their training. In this respect they joined the excess of scholars created by the large enrollments at the

universities. Many apprentices of the later period were devout Puritans, as were their families and masters. They bought devotional books, attended lectures, and tore down the houses of prostitution, and the theaters. The fact that the London apprentices were such a varied crew made them popular characters for the playwrights to use. Almost anything could hold true of an apprentice, who by the time the major playwrights wrote came from any trade, class, and religious persuasion, and who was young enough to make a believable hero for a love story or an adventure story.

Other Laws and Their Effects

Several types of laws are important to the dramas of the period between 1558 and 1642. These include the laws regulating work, vagabondage, and the care of the poor; the laws regulating the inheritance of property; and the sumptuary regulations of the times. In addition, the customs governing knighthood and aldermanship are important. The customs regulating knighthood and aldermanship are discussed by Sylvia Thrupp, those related to property by Paul S. Clarkson and Clyde T. Warren.¹⁷⁹ Those governing sumptuary regulation are discussed by Frances Baldwin.¹⁸⁰ But those regulating work, vagabondage, and the poor have not been studied separately as a body of law in relation to the drama. The property laws are not important here, the sumptuary laws are very important to one play, the regulation of knighthood and aldermanship is occasionally mentioned, but the effects of

the work laws already mentioned are important.

Clarkson and Warren's book is a good one to read before attempting to read the original sources because it explains the property laws in detail and gives examples of them from the plays. Its importance here is merely that it explains the difference between the problems of the gentry and the citizens. The rural gentry was handicapped by the law of primogeniture in its attempts to handle its affairs. The Conquest had imposed primogeniture on military fiefs, and it was not a popular law. The parliament of 1263 tried unsuccessfully to abolish it, but the custom spread to free lands also, except in Kent and in the boroughs which were allowed to keep their ancient customs.¹⁸¹ In 1538 when Henry VIII distributed church lands, the Statute of Uses abolished devise (division or sale) of lands, and the landed gentry objected. In 1540 the compromise of the Statute of Wills allowed the gentry to devise socage lands (free lands) and two-thirds of knight service lands as well.¹⁸² Primogeniture was of help to the king, not the landowner, because it enabled the king to always know who the heir to a piece of land was. In feudal times primogeniture guaranteed that a holder of land would be a friend of his lord. When land had become merely a means to make money, landed capital, primogeniture was a drawback to good management.

Land owned by a woman was governed by separate laws. After the conquest an unmarried woman of legal age was considered legally competent for all purposes of law. A married

woman had to have her husband's cooperation to handle land transfers, but she was in turn protected from being cheated. A woman's land could only be transferred by the method known as "Fine."¹⁸³ She and her husband had to become parties to a lawsuit. When the suit came to trial, she was examined privately by the judge to make sure that she was not being coerced into selling. Primogeniture is taken for granted in the plays, the matter of "Fine" is important in Eastward Ho, as was mentioned by Clarkson and Warren.¹⁸⁴

Under certain circumstances a gentleman's land could be forfeited. Traitors forfeited their land to the king as did murderers. This latter is important to the play Chaste Maid in Cheapside. Felons of lower rank forfeited their land to the lord of the manor.

Though land was inherited according to the rules of primogeniture, chattels were inherited according to the laws of the Church. One third went to the widow, one third to the children, and one third as stated in the will, originally "for the good of the soul." If there was no widow or no children, the division was by halves. Wills covered land while testaments covered chattels, so a person made a last will and testament. The eldest son could conceivably inherit the land and his younger brother or sister the sheep or cattle which grazed on the land.

Laws governing the land and chattels of city dwellers, citizens, were different. The chattels also followed the laws of the Church and were divided into thirds or halves as

the occasion demanded. The inheritance of land varied from place to place. In some places the youngest son inherited; in Kent all sons inherited. In London the wills indicate that land was devisable and could be left to whomever the owner desired. Not much land was owned in London, and the typical merchant left most of his wealth in the form of tradestock, equipment, money, or good debts. A London man of wealth who died while he still had young children could depend on the city to administer the property for them. The city took pride in doing a good job of this and the records of the era are not full of complaints of mismanagement by the London Court of Orphans, while there are many stories of the mismanagement of the estates of the sons of the gentry, especially before Lord Burghley was appointed by Elizabeth I to help manage them. The London Court of Orphans was, however, one of the organizations which liked to invest money at interest, and, thus, it consistently opposed laws which forbade usury. Ben Jonson is especially prone to satirize the making of money for widows and orphans, as he does in The Alchemist. After the Reformation, the one third of a man's estate no longer given to chantries for prayers for the soul was often donated for the promotion of education. One finds London merchants leaving scholarships for university students, money to found grammar schools, and money to apprentice poor children to the better trades. In the seventeenth century, many schools founded in the donors' home towns provided one of the main ways that Puritanism

was spread in the provinces.¹⁸⁵

The acquisition by a merchant of land outside the city served only to complicate things as far as his will was concerned, because he had to leave the land to his eldest son, and often the major part of his property was chattels, forcing the will to be settled under the system called "Hotch Pot," by which the eldest son had to return the value of the land to the "pot" in order to inherit part of the value of the chattels. One therefore wonders why London merchants and tradesmen tried to acquire land outside the city at all. The dramas of the era portray this as a form of social climbing, but there were many other reasons for acquiring rural property. In the first place, land was a good investment. While trade was often adversely affected by war, piracy, and depression, land produced food which usually had a market, though the price received might vary. Land was also bought in the early days to avoid leaving sizeable chattels to the Church. Land provided a place for the family to live in the country during times of plague in London. Land also was bought for political purposes and to provide a place for vacation and retirement. In addition, it was bought to disperse capital; the possession of £1,000 of stock and good debts made a London citizen liable for the job of alderman, and the job paid nothing and required much time. Consequently, many men preferred to avoid the "honor." However, many men's wives spurred their ambitions in this direction because wives of aldermen could be called "Lady" and wear the clothing of

a lady. Sylvia Thrupp mentions that there is no written record of merchants being referred to as commoners until Edward Dudley published his book, The Tree of Commonwealth, in 1510.¹⁸⁶ A law of 1414 was the first which required every person to state his estate, mystery, or craft in all legal documents, and it is one of the first indications that society was beginning to take serious notice of the new places where people fitted into the changing social order. For those who wanted a place at the top of the city's oligarchy, a large income was necessary, so people who could afford to run the risks involved boasted a lot, a form of advertising, as is indicated in the play which portrays the life of Sir Thomas Gresham, If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, in which Gresham has a pearl ground up and drinks it to demonstrate how wealthy he is.

The case was similar where knighthood was concerned. Knighthood originally carried the risk of military service and continued to carry the risk of taxation or the payment of fees to the King on special occasions. Therefore, many people did not want to become knights. Henry VIII had made it a custom to knight the mayor of London, but this was a special case. The general problem of knighthood was one of long standing. In 1392 Richard II had suspended the liberties of the citizens of London because they refused to accept knighthood. In 1491 so many fines had been imposed by the king for refusals to accept knighthood that many men gave in and became knights.¹⁸⁷ To be made a knight a man

had to have land worth £40 per year in rents. Theoretically this made him independently wealthy. To avoid becoming a knight he had to pay a fine, usually £10. Either way the king won; if the man was knighted, he had to pay a special assessment whenever the king needed it; if he was not knighted, he had to pay a quarter of a year's income in a fine. More than one levy in a year could wipe a landowner out. In 1604 James I reinstated the custom of knighting people in a group at an important public ceremony, beginning with his coronation. At that time over 300 men were knighted, and some, such as Sir Francis Bacon, were rumored to have accepted knighthood only reluctantly.¹⁸⁸ Others borrowed money to buy enough property to be worth £40 so as to be eligible for the title. At the time of the Civil War the ease with which men could be made knights was changed and they were allowed to decline without penalty.

Before the insistence on the law of primogeniture, the feeling of class consciousness had been less great. As the people began to survive in greater numbers, more and more gentle families raised a second son. There was no place for the second son to go. He could become a soldier, if there was a war; a clergyman, if he had a taste for study; or an apprentice to a merchant or tradesman. As he had no property of his own to take pride in, his hereditary gentility began to assume more importance to him. The oath, "As I am a gentleman," is a matter for humor in many of the plays of the era, but one can feel sorry for the young men, they

could only study law, enter the Church, become apprentices, or marry rich widows, and all of that in spite of the fact that in some families the younger son was likely to be superior to the elder. This problem is one which is often commented on in such plays as Fletcher's The Elder Brother.

The life of a merchant was governed by a different set of circumstances. He had to be able to communicate in order to sell things, and this also held true of his wife and children, who often worked in the shop. Consequently, the education of the merchant was well accomplished by the training of the grammar schools with their great emphasis on the study of rhetoric and literature. He then only had to learn mathematics on the job. The merchant had to have friends so he had to be agreeable; but he also had to take risks, so he had to be daring. The need for risking and coping led to a special type of education and a different type of personality from that of the country gentleman.¹⁸⁹ The good communication which was expected from the city child was what eventually came to be called "civility," and the difference in attitude between the merchant and the country landowner is often commented on in plays, from the time of Dekker's The Honest Whore, I (1603) on.

Peace was needed for international trade, so the citizens stressed the King's peace. Consequently, many things not illegal in rural areas were illegal in London; this is true of fighting and dueling. Fighting tends to turn into brawling, and brawling tends to destroy property. The

tradesmen of the city lived off their city property while the gentry only came to town to visit. This love of peace held true within their guild organizations also; the civility of the merchant was equivalent to the courtesy of the gentleman.¹⁹⁰ The peaceable attitude of the city man and his family was in direct contrast to the attitude of the gentleman who took offense at slights and fought duels to defend his honor, and this difference is often featured in the plays. It was a thing that gentleman apprentices often had to learn.

Not only were the merchants peaceable, but they were often better educated than the gentry who came to town for the court terms or to find a place at court, or just to have a good time. Thus it was not unusual for a tradesman to outwit a gentleman when mathematics was involved. Neither the grammar schools nor the universities devoted much time to the teaching of mathematics, and training for business and accounting was transferred from the universities to the Inns of Court in 1540. Thus, a gentleman who came to London was a babe in the hands of anyone who talked numbers fast enough. In 1662 Pepys, himself, recorded in his Diary that he had gotten the mate of the Royal Charles, a ship of the Navy of which Pepys was an important head, to teach him the multiplication tables.¹⁹¹ Anyone who wanted to study mathematics had to do it in London, usually with a private tutor.

The merchant and the courtier often worked together. The merchant had money and know-how while the courtier had prestige and connections, so they would combine for business.

There did, however, remain a degree of ill feeling between the merchant class who risked their fortunes on the wide seas in time of peace and the gentle class, who risked their lives in time of war. Unwin said that this was in reality a conflict between two types of capital, the gentry being farmers with land capital and the merchants being shippers with capital in ships and goods. The ordinary populace did not see it that way, but in the city of London saw it as a conflict between peaceful people and warlike people. This could be a strong emotion in a London audience where trade depended heavily on peace on the seas and where the peace of the city had long been stressed. Around 1600 Thomas Dekker praises the peaceful citizen or patient citizen in many plays, as will be demonstrated below. In later dramas the tradesmen are twitted for being too patient and the knights are twitted for being drunkards rather than fighters.

Several of the laws which regulated work, the poor, and the punishment of vagabonds have been mentioned earlier, and they will be mentioned again when the plays they are related to are discussed. Those laws did affect people's lives and the passage of new laws is often reflected in the plays.

The other law which is important to the drama is the sumptuary law which was repealed in 1604 on the accession of James I. After the time of the Black Death in 1349, sumptuary regulation became common all over Europe, being made to restrict people's attempts to spend all their money while they were alive. In 1363 the first comprehensive English

sumptuary law was passed and it allowed merchants to dress like gentlemen. A merchant worth £500 could dress like a gentleman worth £100. The poorest ploughmen and carters could only wear clothing made of blanket cloth of russet color.¹⁹² The law of 1406 regulated clothing of apprentices at the law.¹⁹³ In 1515 Wolsey produced another statute of apparel, and his attempts to enforce these laws were one of the reasons why he was so widely hated.¹⁹⁴ Laws passed during the time of Elizabeth I were generally related to economic problems and attempted to force the English people to wear English goods rather than foreign made ones, and such was the Cap Wearing Act of 1564.¹⁹⁵ In 1582 the Lord Mayor of London made a local attempt to regulate the clothing of apprentices, and it was separate from the national statute regarding clothing and how much money one could spend on it. The laws had been used by monarchs of the past to reduce the spending of people so as to guarantee that they could pay taxes and assessments. They were almost impossible to enforce, and very unpopular because they interfered with the used clothing market and with gifts from wealthy persons of old clothing to their servants. James I attempted to do both the sensible thing and the popular thing when he repealed the laws in 1604. The matter is important to an understanding of Eastward Ho (1605), and is mentioned in other plays.

The basic legal conflict of the time was that between the courts and the government administrators. The actual administration of laws was handled by justices of the peace

in the shires, where civil suits and criminal cases were handled. Enforcement of civil regulations was handled by patent. Individuals were given a monopoly to collect penalties for minor infractions of the rules. Such things as sumptuary regulation and regulation of apprenticeship were handled in this way. For example, John Martin, London haberdasher, was in 1560 granted the patent for apprenticeship violations.¹⁹⁶ Giles Mompesson was impeached in 1621 for his handling of a patent for the licensing of ale houses. The people who obtained patents had to make their money from enforcing them, so the government got only part of what was collected. The system did not work well and by the last years of the reign of Elizabeth I she had had to agree to let patents be examined by the law courts. The lawyers constantly strove to increase their control of the system. David Little points out that from 1485 on there was a movement among the lawyers to go to historical sources for legal interpretation.¹⁹⁷ The lawyers did a good deal to codify the laws and clarify them. In 1546 it had become law that all pleadable cases had to be handled by lawyers, and this strengthened their position. The common lawyers built up the Chancery Court which began the practice of handling cases by equity rather than common law. Between 1485 and 1640 the Tudors and Stuarts added many new courts, such as The Star Chamber, and new commissions, to the administrative system.¹⁹⁸ It is small wonder that comments about law and lawyers are frequent in the plays, especially towards the end of the era.

The London Audience

It was during this period that London came to be referred to as the third university of the realm. It was the home of the book publishers, and of many private teachers, as well as of the Inns of Court. It was also the home of the major part of the apprentice training that was done in the country. By 1625 London held about ten percent of the population of the country. The population of the city increased from 30,000 in 1377 to 93,000 in 1563, to 153,000 in 1593, to 223,000 in 1605, to 273,000 in 1622, and to 339,000 in 1634.¹⁹⁹ London had long been the place where learning of all kinds was spread. In 1425 Lord Mayor Richard Whittington had left his library to the London Guildhall for the use of guild members. In 1477 Caxton brought the printing press to London, where the government kept it, allowing only one press each at Oxford and Cambridge. In 1588 Dr. Thomas Hood began a series of lectures on mathematics, which continued for four years, to meet the demand raised by the visit of the Spanish Armada, which inspired an increased interest in navigation.²⁰⁰ In 1596 Gresham College was opened. In 1615 William Harvey delivered his famous lecture, at Gresham College, explaining the circulation of the blood. By 1640 the literacy rate in London was at least double that of the rest of the country, and it has been estimated to have been 60 percent.²⁰¹ The London playgoer was literate, although this was not necessarily

true of other areas. The newcomers who flocked to London made up the illiterate part of the population, unless they came there as students.

The Magna Charta had guaranteed to London all its old liberties, and though these were taken away now and then, they were always given back, usually for a price. The money from London's trade was valuable to the rulers; the maintenance of peace by the ruler was valuable to the merchants of the city, so the two cooperated. The right to burgherhood passed from father to all sons and from master to all successful apprentices. Serfs who lived for a year and a day in a borough became free men, but in London no one became a citizen who was not already free. Though in the past the city had sometimes been governed by the guilds, at this time it was divided into twenty-six wards which had one alderman apiece. Their governing functions were supplemented by the Lord Mayor and 200 Common Councilmen. The city had its own judicial system. The administration of city policies often depended on the personality of the Lord Mayor, and even Richard Whittington had in 1419 personally inspected the breweries and destroyed twelve casks of bad ale.²⁰² This was apparently not known to Ben Jonson who objected to later mayors doing similar things, and satirized their doings in Bartholomew Fair (1614).

London was the home of the principal courts, located in the suburb of Westminster. It was also the home of the Inns of Court where the law students lived. In 1574, the records

showed, there were 1400 common lawyers in the land, and in 1586 the numbers had grown to 1700. By 1586 there were 250 new students admitted to the Inns of Court every year.²⁰³

It is not surprising that many people in the city knew a good deal of law and were interested in it. At Michaelmas Term of court in the fall, many country people came to London to handle their legal business, and many London tradesmen could not have survived without their commercial business transacted at that time.

London observed many old customs instead of laws, and the customs changed from time to time. However, London was probably the only place which actually did observe the inheritance rights of widows and orphans. The laws concerning these were not changed until 1724, and then they were changed in accordance with the customs of primogeniture. Some of these laws were changed back in modern times, 1938, to again do a better job of protecting the rights of widows and orphans.²⁰⁴ To Londoners, the rights of the widows and orphans of the daring merchants who sailed "three times across the wide seas" were a thing to be protected.

Londoners were proud of their city and probably bragged about its virtues just as they bragged about their wealth if they were trying to obtain city office. It is possible that playwrights who came from other places, and even some of those who grew up in London, grew tired of hearing recitals of the virtues of the great city which was so proud of its independence, its charity, and its fairness to widows and

orphans. It might be particularly galling to some of the gentry who had to contend with the Court of Wards which ran the affairs of noblemen's orphaned children. At any rate, in the drama, particularly early in this era, the city was often portrayed as the home of vice, and in circumstances which hardly make the picture part of the standard pastoral complaint about cities. Many plays also poke fun at the idea of investing money for widows and orphans.

In the sixteenth century the city consisted of one third unemployed poor, one third workers, and one third tradesmen and merchants. The merchants were expected to care for the poor because they were the rich men of the city. The people still looked to education to solve the problems of unemployment, and still passed laws to try to solve economic problems. The general level of education in London at that time was higher than it was to be for a long time in the future, but it was fundamental education only. After the Restoration the picture changed. The population grew but few schools were built, so the educational level of the people began to drop. The enforcement of the law forbidding nonconformists to attend the two universities also removed higher education from the grasp of many of the children of London businessmen. But the London of Tudor and Stuart times was a thing quite different from that which greeted the people who opened "Sunday Schools" in the eighteenth century. The prestige of blood continued to grow because it was all the "younger brother" had to boast of; however, the wealthy

merchants could still buy this prestige or marry it or get it by royal grant. The society was in a state of flux, and this is reflected in the dramas of the era, though often the dramatists portrayed problems which had existed for a long time as if they were something new.

The players and the Puritans met in London. From the time of the building of the theaters in 1576, the playwrights wrote increasingly for the London audience, though the early drama had been more national in scope. Even Alfred Harbage concedes that after 1610 the companies rarely took plays on tour.²⁰⁵ The Puritans were very active in London which had never been famous as the seat of Christianity in England. In A.D. 616 Bede mentioned that Londoners had still refused a Christian Bishop and called them heathen.²⁰⁶ The Puritans were eager to remove any force for evil from the city, and they considered the theater to be such a force.

The early form of drama, the morality play, had been presented to the entire country, and it was really a medieval teaching device. The later dramatists claimed that they continued this educational function even after the theaters became public and professional. Such works of poetry as The Faerie Queene were written for the edification of gentlemen as were such prose works as Arcadia and Euphues. The theater was education for the masses, but it was for the comparatively well-educated masses of London. Thomas Heywood's An Apology for Actors (1612) lists what the educational functions of drama were supposed to be according to

him. The chronicle histories educated people about their country, the tragedies taught morals, the comedies made people happy, the pastorals taught rural virtues, and the moralities taught general virtue.²⁰⁷ The players had an increasingly difficult time convincing the Puritans that their plays were a force for moral good as time passed.

A number of restrictions were placed on what could be presented in the theater. The regulation of plays began with the act of 1543 which permitted plays to be presented provided that they rebuked vice and praised virtue and did not meddle in the interpretation of scripture. In 1547 Edward VI changed the law to let playwrights add interpretation. In 1551 a system of licensing was set up and only Protestant plays were licensed.²⁰⁸ The morality plays and mystery cycles continued to be presented though controversial doctrine was eliminated from them or changed. In 1553 Queen Mary proclaimed a new licensing system and the plays went on. Respublica is the only Catholic polemic play which has been preserved though there were doubtless others written. After the accession of Elizabeth I, the plays turned Protestant again, but were also political in content, and foreign ambassadors objected to them.²⁰⁹ This led to a new licensing act in 1559 which again forbade playwrights to present material which dealt directly with problems of religion and government. While the professional theater grew up in London, the old cycle plays disappeared from the rural areas. This is not too surprising because the rural churches

as well as the city churches now contained Bibles in English and the increase in education and the inspiration of the Puritan lecturers soon furnished the parishes with plenty of people who could read the Bible stories out loud. The need to present them in the form of mystery plays disappeared.

The London theaters were criticized from the time the first playhouse opened. There were complaints that they lured apprentices from their jobs. The 1572 vagabond law made it necessary for players to be patronized by a baron or obtain a license to play from the local justice of the peace if they were on tour.²¹⁰ Not until later did the Puritans object to the plays per se, and then when they discovered an Old Testament law which forbade men to wear women's clothes. Earlier and later they objected to the players as people who did no useful work. They also objected to the theaters as places which made a handy meeting place for people of ill repute of various types. Ben Jonson includes several of these items in Bartholomew Fair, which serves as his answer to the Puritans.

In addition to these things another factor caused some problems between the theaters and the government of London; not all the conflict was due to the content of the plays. William Ringler traces the course of the disagreements between the players and the Common Council of London and comes to the conclusion that the controversy was really economic; the players made too much money.²¹¹ In 1574 the Common Council agreed to license the players at the Queen's request,

after a long delay, which they excused by saying that "plays were powerful moulders of public opinion and should not be allowed to contain uncomely or seditious matter."²¹² By 1584, however, the opposition to the theaters was so great that the Council tried to have them all closed. The first theater opened in 1576; the first sermon against theaters was preached at Paul's Cross in 1577. By 1578 it became apparent that money was the real problem. Ringler points out that if all eight playing places in London played only once a week they took in £2,000 per year, and many of them played three times per week, so they took in a good deal more than that.²¹³ The religious working people of the city objected to anyone making that much money for doing no actual "work."²¹⁴ Thus, the lines in the battle of Puritan versus playwright were drawn along the topic of money at an early stage in the conflict.

The Puritans believed that the theater led to sloth and that art was not useful.²¹⁵ Their idea was that man was only the trustee of God's goods, and like the man in the parable of the talent he must account for every penny to God. Therefore, they opposed any irrational use of wealth, saying that what was expended for personal ends was withdrawn from the service of God's glory.²¹⁶ The playwrights returned the antagonistic feeling and especially in the later part of the era satirized the Puritans on many occasions. However, they tended to identify the citizens of London with the Puritans, and London tradesmen grew tired of the satiric

portrayals, and eventually stopped coming to the plays.

The government restricted what the playwrights could say about religious questions on the stage. The government also tried to restrict the dissemination of Puritan teachings. So the two groups were both restricted, but they went about solving the problem in different ways. The player dodged the issue and hoped; the Puritan lectured, wrote tracts, and finally rebelled. The playwright wrote for an audience that wanted to be amused; the Puritan spent his money endowing schools where Puritan ideas could be spread throughout the country. The Puritan created an expanding audience, the player drew a shrinking one.

Problems in education, economics, and religion did influence the content of the plays of the Tudor and Stuart periods, but it was seldom that the playwrights discussed any matter until the official government position on it had been made clear by the passage of a law. Therefore, the discussion of the influences which these things had on the dramas will be related to the dates on which the laws were actually passed, and will be related to them when specific plays are mentioned.

Method of Study

A total of 152 plays which contain as characters workmen, apprentices, merchants, or scholars have been analyzed. Though the history plays refer to people from all classes, it seems more appropriate to concentrate on the comedies,

referring to the history plays only when they contain such characters and when they are so well known that to ignore them might appear to be prejudicial to the argument. History plays are tied to historical events and are supposed to make some effort to portray an earlier era. The comedies are sometimes placed in foreign countries in an apparent effort to disguise the fact that they are dealing with local problems. However, many of the comedies are plainly placed in contemporary London, and whether they are realistic or satiric in tone, they do not purport to treat of something other than contemporary life. It is these London comedies that will be discussed in the main, though comedies placed in imaginary settings will be included when they appear to be relevant, as will history plays.

Drama in any era is a very public method of communication. Today, it is largely considered to be a method of entertainment, and one perhaps blessed with some ability to educate or reform. In the time of the Tudors and Stuarts there were fewer methods of communication than there are today, so the communication accomplished by the drama had greater influence than it does now.

Some of the questions dealt with here have been discussed in the past when accurate information was not available either about the dates when the plays were written, or about whom they were written by, or about the nature of the laws which were in effect at that time. Better information is now available regarding dates and authors, and some study

of the laws has been made.

That the treatment of various themes can be tied to changes in the laws has been shown by Celeste Turner Wright in her article which traces the treatment of the usurer in the literature of the era. She mentions that in The Staple of News Jonson specifically has the character Penny Boy state that since the rate of interest has gone down to eight percent he can no longer give two percent to the poor as he had done when the rate was ten percent, before 1626, when the play appeared.²¹⁷

All of these things are especially tied to education because the era being studied was still influenced by the Humanists' desire to improve the world by education, as well as influenced by the not so obvious idea that education was the way to advance in the world, and the later Puritan idea that education would lead people to Puritanism.

Some information about the playwrights is also important. The chief playwrights of the King's Men's Company of London were William Shakespeare (1604-1611), John Fletcher (1611-1625), Phillip Massinger (1625-1640), and James Shirley (1640-1642). These were the people who set the pace for the others; and they were also business managers of a sort; they knew what sold and how a company was run. The social origins of some of the playwrights could also be a matter of importance. John Heywood who wrote plays which praised the common people of London was a Lincolnshire gentleman and Cambridge student who did not graduate.²¹⁸

Thomas Dekker was a tradesman and perhaps even the descendent of an immigrant, but was a native and an admirer of London. He did not always praise tradesmen, but usually showed an understanding attitude towards them. Ben Jonson was London born, the son of a tradesman, and not a university graduate though his learning was admired and he was given an honorary degree late in life. His attitude towards the various classes of society has been analyzed by Judith Gardiner and Susanna Epp and shown to be favorable towards the gentry and critical of both the common man and the nobility.²¹⁹ William Shakespeare came from a family with pretensions to gentility, and his father eventually obtained a coat of arms. Shakespeare's family met with hard times when he was about the right age to enter the university; so he was apparently apprenticed to a glover. His father was a tradesman and a city official in Stratford-on-Avon. Shakespeare was not an admirer of London and lived in the suburbs. His attitudes are largely those considered typical for his times; he believed that all classes have their place and should stay in that place. M. C. Bradbrook has observed that the insistence on order and degree in Tudor England was largely theoretic; society was actually more fluid than many plays would indicate. Shakespeare and the others wrote for the London population, one in which shifting from class to class was common.²²⁰ It is well to remember that different playwrights had different attitudes, and that occasionally they changed their minds. Shakespeare was neither

like Heywood, who was fascinated by the successful businessman, nor like Jonson, who was constantly criticizing the businessman for his avarice. Shakespeare's standards were those which had been accepted in the past and were still, theoretically those of contemporary society.

The plays themselves speak of London, work, idleness, education, war, peace, and business methods as problems interrelated in such a way that it is hard to discuss any one adequately without reference to the others.

Thesis: Drama and the Laws

The plays written between 1563 and 1642 were written when there were few means of public communication, and they often show very direct effects of current events or even contain references to them, as has been noted in the past. However, no apparent effort has been made to demonstrate that a number of the plays are directly related to the passage of certain specific laws at specific times. There are a number of plays which can be shown to be influenced by the passage of the work laws, poor laws, and vagabond laws. This influence is shown in the changes in roles assigned to the apprentice, but also in changes in delineation of character of most character types used. In early plays this is hard to show because it is hard to date the time when they were written. However, as the years pass it becomes increasingly easy to demonstrate connections between plays and the passage of particular laws.

The discussion of plays written between 1500 and 1563 merely shows what kinds of characters appeared in the plays of that time, and serves to orient a reader to what was commonly presented in early English plays. The discussion of the plays written between 1563 and 1587 shows that they were influenced by the passage of the Statute of Apprentices in 1563 and the legalization of interest in 1571. This holds true of many plays about which it has not previously been said. The discussion of the plays written between 1588 and 1604 shows that these were influenced by several things. Critics have observed that they were influenced by Essex's habit of creating too many knights whenever he won a battle, and that his behavior angered the Queen and also lowered the public estimation of knighthood. However, these plays were also influenced by the Vagabond Laws and the Poor Laws passed between 1597 and 1601, laws which required the apprenticing of poor children, forbade scholars to beg, and made it a punishable offense to give alms to the undeserving poor or to refuse to give to the deserving poor. The discussion of the plays written between 1605 and 1615 shows that they were influenced by the repeal of the sumptuary laws in 1604 but more especially by the passage of still stricter work laws in 1610. The influence of these work laws and the attitudes toward work on the plays is treated here, and it constitutes the main part of the paper, because The Tempest, A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, and Bartholomew Fair are affected. The discussion of the plays written between 1616 and

1630 covers a time when the major legal change was the law abolishing monopolies, a thing which has been discussed by many critics. It is included in order to avoid loss of continuity and to point out some factors previously overlooked. The discussion of the last era shows that the plays written between 1631 and 1642 could not have been influenced by laws because none were passed during the time when there was no parliament called, but that they were influenced by the religious questions of the times, the actions taken by Archbishop Laud to deal with them, the general increase in education which becomes apparent, and the legal interpretations of the Statute of Apprentices of 1563, which served to reduce its effectiveness. Influence on the plays by the passage of the Statute of Apprentices in 1563 and the Statute of Monopolies in 1624 has been covered by several writers in relation to some of the plays discussed. It is impossible to discuss the plays without referring to their work or without referring to other phenomena of the era from time to time, but the main point to be made here is that the plays often reflect the passage of specific laws, particularly those regulating work, vagabondage, and relief of the poor. The laws are listed at note one in chronological order and with a brief statement of the item of the law which is important to this discussion.

NOTES

¹ G. W. Prothero, ed. and introd., Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934); George Burton Adams and H. Morse Stapleton, eds., Select Documents of English Constitutional History (New York: Macmillan, 1901).

The laws are: 1349, 23 Edward III, C. 7, forbids giving alms to those able to work; 1353, Edward III, creates Staple Towns; 1363, Edward III, first comprehensive sumptuary law; 1383, 7 Richard II, C. 5, justices can jail beggars; 1388, 12 Richard II, C. 7, returns beggars to home towns; 1406, Henry IV, first statute of apprentices; 1495, 11 Henry VII, C. 2, work day set at 13 hours; 1501, 19 Henry VII, C. 12, gentlemen exempted from vagabond laws; 1531, 22 Henry VIII, C. 12, justices issue licenses to beg; 1536, 27 Henry VIII, C. 25, orders towns and parishes to feed own poor; 1552, 5 & 6 Edward VI, C. 2, requires alms for the poor; 1563, 5 Eliz. C. 3, fine of £10 if not give; 1563, 5 Eliz. C. 4, statute of apprentices, covers movement, fees, wages, prices; 1572, 14 Eliz. C. 5, puts vagabonds to work, says players need patron, separates sturdy beggars from genuine poor; 1576, 18 Eliz. C. 3, puts poor to weaving flax or wool, or sends them to workhouse if refuse; 1597, 39 Eliz. C. 3, apprentice poor children; 1597, 39 Eliz. C. 4, vagabonds stripped and whipped; 1597, 39 Eliz. C. 5, erection of workhouses ordered; 1601, 43 Eliz. C. 2, apprentices poor children, people must support own relatives, begging exemption for scholars removed; 1604, 1 Jac. I, C. 7, people must not hide beggars nor barons excuse them; 1604, 1 Jac. I, C. 25, apprentices poor children; 1610, 7 & 8 Jac. I, C. 4, build workhouses by fall, exemption for gentlemen removed, exemption for shipwrecked sailors retained, justices fined for non-compliance; 1624, 21 & 22 Jac. I, C. 3, act against monopolies.

² Lionel C. Knights, Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1937), p. 1.

³ Knights, p. 2.

⁴ Knights, p. 212. On page 217 Knights points out that the fens were successfully drained only a few years later by a Dutchman. Jonson's play leads one to believe that draining of the fens is a totally ridiculous idea.

⁵ Phillip Henderson, Literature and a Changing Civilization, p. 78; quoted by Knights on page 2.

⁶ David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).

⁷ Bevington, p. 228. Footnote 10 credits Louis B. Wright's "Social Aspects of Some Belated Moralities," Anglia, 54 (1930), 142-43, 130.

⁸ Bevington, p. 292. This points out the lower opinion of knighthood which resulted from Essex's creation of many.

⁹ Edith Rickert, "Political Propaganda and Satire in A Midsummer Night's Dream." Modern Philology, 21 (1923), 136, quoted by Bevington, p. 2.

¹⁰ Bevington, p. 2.

¹¹ Charles W. Camp, The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature (1924; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1972). Chapter VI and pages 118-123 and 105-115 are relevant to this.

¹² Brian Gibbons, Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton (London: Rupert Hart Davis, 1968), p. 205 on.

¹³ F. Mowbray Velte, The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood (1924; rpt. New York: Haskell House, 1966), p. 136.

¹⁴ Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952), pp. 343-50.

¹⁵ Paul S. Clarkson and Clyde T. Warren, The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama (1942; rpt. New York: Gordian Press, 1968).

¹⁶ Joan Simon, Education and Society in Tudor England (Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1967). Reviewed by W. K. Jordan (Harvard University) in Journal of Modern History, 39 (1967), 172; and by J. E. Neale (Beaconfield) in English Historical Review, 82 (1967), 384.

¹⁷ Arthur F. Leach, English Schools at the Reformation: 1546-1548 (1896; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1968).

¹⁸ John Lawson and Harold Silver, A Social History of Education in England (London: Methuen and Co., 1973).

¹⁹ Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. Talcott Parsons, fwd. R. H. Tawney (1904; rpt. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

20 R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926).

21 George Unwin, Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Oxford: Clarendon, 1904); The Gilds and Companies of London (London: Methuen, 1908).

22 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, English Poor Law History: Part I: The Old Poor Law, Vol. VII of English Local Government (1927; rpt. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1963).

23 Karl Marx, Capital, The Communist Manifesto, and Other Writings, introd. Max Eastman (New York: The Modern Library, 1932). This is from "The Communist Manifesto," by Marx and Friedrich Engels, originally published in 1848, p. 318.

24 Marx, Capital, p. 35.

25 Marx, Capital, p. 83.

26 Marx, Capital, pp. 182-83.

27 Marx, Capital, p. 193.

28 Marx, Capital, pp. 196-97.

29 Weber, pp. 113-14.

30 Robert W. Green, ed., Problems in European Civilization: Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959), pp. vii, ix.

31 Tawney, Capitalism, p. 226.

32 Unwin, Industrial Organization, pp. 70-102.

33 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 85.

34 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 145.

35 Stella Kramer, The English Craft Gilds: Studies in Their Progress and Decline (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927), p. 104.

36 Kramer, p. 120.

37 Kramer, p. 121.

38 Kramer, p. 124.

39 Kramer, p. 124.

40 Kramer, p. 138.

- 41 Kramer, p. 138.
- 42 Kurt Samuelson, Religion and Economic Action, trans. Geoffrey French (1957; rpt. New York: Basic Books, 1961), p. 146.
- 43 Ellsworth Huntington, Mainsprings of Civilization (1945; rpt. New York: New American Library, 1959), p. 543.
- 44 Harry A. Miskimin, The Economy of Later Renaissance Europe: 1460-1600 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 56.
- 45 Miskimin, p. 77.
- 46 Miskimin, p. 78.
- 47 Miskimin, p. 32.
- 48 Miskimin, p. 43.
- 49 Miskimin, p. 77.
- 50 Miskimin, p. 178.
- 51 Miskimin, p. 179.
- 52 Thomas Fuller, The Holy State and the Profane State, in Seventeenth Century Prose and Poetry, eds. Alexander M. Witherspoon and Frank J. Warneke (1929; rpt. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1963), p. 379.
- 53 Knights, p. 18.
- 54 Knights, p. 25. His discussion is based on Unwin's.
- 55 Knights, p. 33. He refers to Marx's Capital, Everyman Edition, p. 137.
- 56 Knights, p. 35.
- 57 Knights, pp. 43-46.
- 58 Knights, pp. 51-53.
- 59 Knights, pp. 58-67.
- 60 Knights, pp. 74-83.
- 61 Knights, pp. 88-91.
- 62 Knights, pp. 98-121. See p. 120 for discussion of need for money in trade.

- 63 Knights, pp. 127-130, 131-36; p. 127 discusses usury.
- 64 Knights, pp. 147-160. This comparison of calling to degree is on page 147.
- 65 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 4.
- 66 George Laurence Gomme, The Governance of London (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), p. 373.
- 67 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 72.
- 68 Theodore Plucknett, A Concise History of the Common Law, 5th ed. (London: Butterworth and Co., 1955), p. 32.
- 69 A. K. R. Kiralfy, ed., Potter's Outline of English Legal History, 5th ed. (London: Street and Maxwell, 1958), p. 105.
- 70 Nicholas Orme, English Schools in the Middle Ages (London: Methuen and Co., 1973), p. 52.
- 71 W. G. Hoskins, "Provincial Life," in Shakespeare in His Own Age, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 17 (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1954), p. 18.
- 72 Simon, Education and Society, p. 173.
- 73 Hoskins, p. 19.
- 74 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 138.
- 75 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 139; Kramer, p. 161.
- 76 Prothero, p. 67. 14 Eliz. C. V.
- 77 Prothero, p. 72. 18 Eliz. C. III.
- 78 Prothero, pp. 96-102. 39 & 40 Eliz. C. III, IV, V.
- 79 Prothero, pp. 253. 1 Jac. I, C. VII.
- 80 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, pp. 74-75. This quoted from "Les Reportes des Cases in Camera Stellata," by John Howarde, ed. W. P. Baildon, 1894, pp. 367-68.
- 81 Prothero, pp. 271-72. 7 & 8 Jac. I, C. IV.
- 82 David Little, Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 211.
- 83 Little, pp. 196-212.

- 84 Unwin, Industrial Organization, pp. 151-52.
- 85 Unwin, Industrial Organization, pp. 62-63.
- 86 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 67.
- 87 M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism (Chicago: University Press, 1939), p. 66.
- 88 Harold C. Gardiner, S. J., Mysteries End (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946), p. 78. He also lists dates at which pageants were ended, for example, Norwich, 1564, p. 71.
- 89 Thomas Kelly, A History of Adult Education in Great Britain (Liverpool: University Press, 1962), p. 19.
- 90 Kelly, pp. 15-16. Many people were proud of the ability to read and many ministers seldom preached but merely went through the order of service. Those who wanted better preaching read the Bible, required by an earlier law to be placed in the choir loft, aloud to the others in church.
- 91 Kelly, p. 18.
- 92 Kelly, p. 19.
- 93 Knappen, p. 341.
- 94 Simon, Education and Society, p. 31.
- 95 Roy Lewis and Angus Maude, The English Middle Classes (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), p. 36.
- 96 Weber, p. 169.
- 97 Tawney, Capitalism, p. 265; Sylvia L. Thrupp, The Merchant Class of Medieval London: 1300-1500 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), pp. 179-80.
- 98 I speak as a preacher's kid who has heard countless arguments on the subject from people of all levels and types.
- 99 Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. and index, Ford Lewis Battles. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).
- The index to this edition was used to locate Calvin's use of particular Bible verses. Subsequent references to Calvin's statements are to this edition, and their location is stated directly in the text by book, chapter, and section. Any exceptions will be noted. The references are to the King James Bible, 1611, and verses from it are located by parenthetic notation in the text.

100 Benjamin B. Warfield, "Introduction and Literary History," in Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. John Allen, 7th ed. (1599; rpt. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), p. xvii.

101 Warfield, p. xviii.

102 Warfield, p. xix.

103 Warfield, p. 8.

104 Thomas Norton, trans., Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (1561, London: Middleton, 1611), microfilm (Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 11453, Case 82, Carton 490), Book III, Chapter X, Section 6.

105 William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism: 1570-1643 (1938; rpt. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).

Material in the next four paragraphs is drawn from this book and its location there is noted at the end of each paragraph.

106 Haller, pp. 15-47.

107 Haller, pp. 82-124.

108 Haller, pp. 123-24. These quotations are in mid-sentence in this book, but all are from Richard Rogers, Seven Treatises (London, 1600).

109 Haller, p. 124. These words are from Gabriel Powell, The Resolved Christian (London, 1600).

110 Haller, p. 128. These quotations are from William Perkins, Workes, n. d.

111 Haller, p. 128.

112 Helen C. White, English Devotional Literature: Prose (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1931), p. 227.

The quotation is from The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven, pp. 191-92.

113 White, p. 227.

114 Thomas Fuller, The Wise Words and Quaint Counsels of Thomas Fuller, ed. Augustus Jessopp (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892), p. 129.

115 Knappen, p. 441.

- 116 R. H. Tawney, "A Historical Introduction," in Discourse Upon Usury, by Thomas Wilson (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1963), p. 59.
- 117 Tawney, Usury, p. 89.
- 118 Tawney, Usury, p. 118.
- 119 Tawney, Usury, p. 119.
- 120 Tawney, Usury, p. 120.
- 121 Tawney, Capitalism, p. 265.
- 122 Thrupp, pp. 179-80.
- 123 Little, p. 120. He quotes from Perkins, Workes, 3 Vols., Vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1612).
- 124 Knappen, p. 371.
- 125 White, p. 42.
- 126 White, p. 44.
- 127 Knappen, p. 402.
- 128 Knappen, p. 415.
- 129 Knappen, p. 421.
- 130 Samuel Butler, "A Fanatic," from Characters, in Eighteenth Century Poetry and Prose, 3rd ed., eds. Louis L. Bredvold, Alan D. McKilloe, and Lois Whitney (New York: Ronald Press, 1973), pp. 14-15.
- 131 Simon, Education and Society, p. 166; John Lawson and Harold Silver, p. 44.
- 132 Arthur F. Leach, p. 3.
- 133 Arthur F. Leach, pp. 43-44.
- 134 Sir Edwin Sandys, "Education," Ch. 8, Shakespeare's England, Vol. I (1916; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), p. 227.
- 135 Lawson and Silver, p. 73.
- 136 Simon, Education and Society, p. 67.
- 137 Simon, Education and Society, p. 23.
- 138 Simon, Education and Society, p. 76.

- 139 Lawson and Silver, p. 46.
- 140 Lawson and Silver, p. 47.
- 141 Simon, Education and Society, pp. 32, 267. Her source is G. R. Potter, Cambridge Medieval History, VII, 1936, p. 698.
- 142 Lawson and Silver, pp. 94-95.
- 143 Raymond de Roover, Gresham on Foreign Exchange (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 19.
- 144 Craig R. Thompson, Schools in Tudor England (Washington, D. C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958), p. 4.
- 145 Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy: 1558-1641 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), p. 684.
- 146 Thompson, p. 8.
- 147 Richard Mulcaster, Positions, 1581, ed. Richard de Molen (New York: Teachers College Press, 1971), p. 135.
- 148 Lawson and Silver, p. 112.
- 149 Lawson and Silver, p. 83.
- 150 Lawson and Silver, p. 113.
- 151 Simon, Education and Society, p. 12.
- 152 Stone, p. 675.
- 153 Stone, p. 687.
- 154 Thrupp, p. 318.
- 155 Charles Mackay, "Introduction," to ballad, "Sir Rich Richard Whittington's Advancement," in Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages. The Percy Society (London: T. Richards, 1840), pp. 4-5.
- 156 Roger Ascham, The Schoolmaster, in The English Works of Roger Ascham, ed. James Bennet (London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761), p. 226.
- 157 Simon, Education and Society, pp. 157-59.
- 158 Mulcaster, p. 148.
- 159 Mulcaster, p. 174.

- 160 Stone, p. 654.
- 161 E. De Selincourt, Introd., Spenser's Poetical Works, by Edmund Spenser (Oxford: University, 1948), p. xxiii.
- 162 James Holly Hanford and James G. Taffe, A Milton Handbook, 5th ed. (New York: Appleton, 1970), p. 6.
- 163 Thrupp, pp. 389-92.
- 164 Unwin, Industrial Organization, p. 138.
- 165 Simon, Education and Society, pp. 334-35, notes 2, 3.
- 166 Helen Walters, The Story of Caps and Gowns (Chicago: E. R. Moore, 1939), p. 7.
- 167 Weber, p. 21.
- 168 Prothero, pp. 45-49.
- 169 M. H. Curtis, "Education and Apprenticeship," Ch. 4, Shakespeare in His Own Age, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 17 (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), p. 67.
- 170 Orme, p. 48.
- 171 Lawson and Silver, p. 123.
- 172 Thrupp, pp. 170-71.
- 173 M. H. Curtis, p. 67.
- 174 Charles Mackay, ed., A Collection of Songs and Ballads Relative to the London Prentices and Trades and to the Affairs of London Generally, During the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries, Vol. 1, Early English Poetry, Percy Society (London: C. Richards, 1841), pp. 11-17.
- 175 Unwin, Gilds and Companies, pp. 256-58.
- 176 Mackay, pp. 374-75.
- 177 Mackay, p. 51.
- 178 Unwin, Gilds and Companies, p. 335.
- 179 Thrupp, pp. 66, 127, 260; Clarkson and Warren, entire.
- 180 Frances Elizabeth Baldwin, Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England, Johns Hopkins University Studies, Ser. 44, No. 1 (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1926).

- 181 Plucknett, p. 528.
- 182 Plucknett, p. 587.
- 183 Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederick William Maitland. A History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I, 2 Vols., Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1898), p. 404. "Fine" is an abbreviation of finis concordia.
- 184 Clarkson and Warren, p. 149.
- 185 Simon, Education and Society, p. 397.
- 186 Thrupp, p. 290.
- 187 Thrupp, pp. 275-77.
- 188 T. W. Baldwin, Review, Eastward Ho, ed. Julia Hamlet Harris, in Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 28 (1929), 297-303.
- 189 Joan Simon, The Social Origins of English Education (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 80-82.
- 190 Simon, Social Origins, p. 83.
- 191 Lawson and Silver, p. 125. This quotes from The Diary of Samuel Pepys, ed. R. C. Latham and W. Matthews (London, 1970), pp. 131, 134, 135, 137.
- 192 Frances Baldwin, pp. 49-50.
- 193 Frances Baldwin, p. 81.
- 194 Frances Baldwin, p. 167.
- 195 Frances Baldwin, p. 210.
- 196 Margaret Gay Davies, The Enforcement of English Apprenticeship: A Study in Applied Mercantilism: 1563-1642 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 35.
- 197 Little, pp. 171-72.
- 198 E. W. Ives, "The Law and Lawyers," Shakespeare In His Own Age, Vol. 17 of Shakespeare Survey, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), pp. 73-86, p. 76.
- 199 Thrupp, p. 1; Louis B. Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (1935, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1958), p. 5.
- 200 Kelly, p. 24.

- 201 Lawson and Silver, p. 142.
- 202 Unwin, Gilds and Companies, p. 232.
- 203 E. W. Ives, p. 78.
- 204 George W. Keeton, ed., The British Commonwealth: The Development of Its Laws and Constitution, Vol. 1, The United Kingdom (London: Stevens and Sons, 1955), p. 153.
- 205 Harbage, p. 28.
- 206 Gomme, p. 109.
- 207 Thomas Heywood, An Apology for Actors, introd. and notes, Richard H. Perkinson (New York: Scholars Fascimile and Reprints, 1941), Sig. F3.
- 208 Gardiner, pp. 60-61.
- 209 Gardiner, p. 66.
- 210 Prothero, p. 68. 14 Eliz. C. V.
- 211 William Ringler, "The First Phase of the Elizabethan Attack on the Stage: 1558-1579," Huntington Library Quarterly, 5 (1942), 4:391-418.
- 212 Ringler, p. 397. He quotes E. K. Chambers, Vol. IV.
- 213 Ringler, p. 412.
- 214 Ringler, p. 414.
- 215 Weber, p. 169.
- 216 Weber, p. 108.
- 217 Celeste Turner Wright, "The Usurer's Sin in Elizabethan Literature," Studies in Philology, 35 (1938), 1:187.
- 218 Velte, p. 7.
- 219 Judith K. Gardiner and Susanna S. Epp, "Ben Jonson's Social Attitudes: A Statistical Analysis," Comparative Drama, 9 (1975), 77.
- 220 M. C. Bradbrook, "Shakespeare and the Structure of Tudor Society," Review of National Literature, 3 (1972), 2:103.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY MORALITY PLAYS

The morality plays had been in existence almost a century and a half at the time Elizabeth I came to the throne, so the writers of the later eras were influenced by what had been on the stage before. There is neither room nor time to trace influences here, but it does seem important to mention some of the early plays in order to demonstrate that certain ideas which the playwrights who became famous used over and over again did not originate with them. These ideas had been used in the drama as far back as the time of the first printing press, and perhaps farther back than that, though, of course, plays from the period before printing made their preservation easy are not often found. The plays discussed here are those which contain specific elements found in later dramas. Only the elements relevant to the discussion of later plays are touched on. The things covered are not always those considered the most important features of the plays, but they are those applicable here.

The date most commonly assigned to Mundus et Infans (The World and the Child) is 1506.¹ It was printed in 1522. At that time London was already gaining a reputation as the center of vice in the country, the wicked big city. The

protagonist of this play is Manhood, who in his youth makes the mistake of following Mundus, or worldly ways; for example, when he is still Infans he does not want to go to school. When he becomes Manhood he meets the vice character, Folly, who brags that his chief dwelling is in London.² Manhood agrees to meet Folly at London, and leaves Conscience behind in the country. After many years, when his name is Old Age, he regrets his mistake and repents. This appears to be one of the earliest non-pastoral references to the conflict between the city and the country, and is an early portrayal of London as the home of vice.

Henry Medwall's Fulgens and Lucrece is a translation from the Italian of De Vera Nobilitate by Buonaccorso, made in 1497.³ It is influenced by the ideas of the Renaissance humanists who were disillusioned by the laziness of the nobility and gentry. Lucrece picks as her husband not the noble, Publius Cornelius, but the successful commoner, Gaius Flaminius, a government official. Such ideas of marriage between classes can often be traced to the humanists. However, the ideas were not always popular even in their own time, and many critics believe that Gentleness and Nobility (1523) written by either John Heywood or his son-in-law, John Rastell, is a reaction to some of the ideas of equality stated by Renaissance humanists.

In Gentleness and Nobility (1523) there are three characters, the Knight, the Merchant, and the Ploughman. The Ploughman considers himself the most valuable person in the

realm because he is the only one who does any real work.⁴
 This theme of the need to have everyone work became a very important one later. In this play, even the Merchant tells the Knight that everyone who inherits land should have some government job assigned to him.⁵ The merchant tells about his father, a goldsmith, his grandfather, a mason, and his great grandfather, a weaver, and says to the Knight:

Mine ancestors by their wits could work and do
 As for thy ancestors I know nothing. (105-06)

In defense of his ancestors, the Knight replies:

They have been elected to be justices
 And for their wit and great discretion
 They have judged and done correction
 Upon thy ancestors--artificers
 That have made false wares and been deceivers.
 (127-31)

The Knight goes on to add:

They have been also in time of war
 Both in this land and other countries far
 Dukes and leaders of the whole army. . . .
 And thy ancestors that were there
 Were never able to bear shield nor spear.
 (134-36; 140-41)

The Merchant replies that the Knight's ancestors did not get their places of authority through wisdom but through the inheritance laws, the laws of primogeniture:

For though some were wise, yet some of them again
 Had small discretion, little wit or brain;
 But because of long continuance
 Of their great possession by inheritance--
 By the foolish manner of the world--we see
 For that cause ever they have had authority. (148-53)

He goes on to say that he feels that it is better to let the best son inherit, not the eldest. By the end of the play the Merchant and the Knight agree that they need each other and that the Ploughman does not really work hard but has to be driven to do any work at all.⁶ The Epilogue makes the point that people in positions of power who do wrong should be punished because this would encourage everyone to do better more than punishing the lowly people does. So the question of the eldest son inheriting and the problem of the need for everyone to work are introduced as themes already in 1523. Another play of Heywood's The Play of the Weather, has the laundress and the gentlewoman debate the same questions.⁷ Three questions have already arisen: the wisdom of primogeniture, the problem of what work a gentleman should do, and the doubt about whether or not the ploughman is a hard worker or someone who has to be forced to work instead of to beg. In Gentleness and Nobility the Knight and the Merchant appear to argue as equals. The one claims to be a professional fighter and the other a professional thinker. The Knight mentions his service as Justice of the Peace; the Merchant does not stress his daring as an entrepreneur, his risk taking.

Another morality interlude of Heywood raises another question, the value of education. In A Dialogue Concerning Witty and Witless (1530), John, James, and Jerome discuss what good an education does. James says that the witty man makes himself miserable, but John says that the witless one

gets cheated by everyone.⁸ John says that the student gets satisfaction from his studies, but James insists that a good worker is proud of doing a good job; a carter will be proud of a well-loaded cart, for example.⁹ Jerome finally enters with an unusual argument, saying that the witty person who lives a good life will not only have more happiness on earth but will have a better place in Heaven.¹⁰ However, the problem of the worth of education as opposed to starting to work early is stated, and the difference seems to be that the worker gets a backache while the student gets a headache.¹¹ No essential difference between the two is made clear other than that, while painful, learning may prevent one from being cheated and may perhaps even make one more sensitive so that one will lead a better life and thus get a better place in Heaven. The last speech of the play ends:

The witty wise worker to be preferred
Above the idle sort, and ye to regard
Each man himself so to apply in this
As ye may all obtain a high degree of bliss.¹²

The three can agree that idleness is bad. They cannot agree about who is happier, the man who works with his hands or the man who works with his mind.

Wit and Science, which F. P. Wilson says was written in 1530 and David Bevington says was written in 1539, takes a different attitude toward education.¹³ Its perfect allegory is sustained throughout the play, a play which can still be interesting as an early analysis of the psychology of

learning.¹⁴ Wit, the child of Nature, wants to marry Lady Science, whose father is Reason and whose mother is Experience. They accept his suit but say that he must climb Mount Parnassus to prove his worth. He begins the trip with the help of Study and Diligence, but cannot get anywhere without the help of Instruction who must be accompanied by Confidence, who is not yet Wit's companion. Wit's main enemy is Tediousness, who at first defeats him. Then Wit turns to Idleness to pass the time away, and loses all his status symbols. Wit takes off his scholar's gown and leaves it on the ground while he dances with Honest Recreation, and this taking off of the symbolic gown is important as a device in later plays. Idleness gives the gown to Ignorance, who cannot even spell because his mother would not let him go to school. Eventually Wit meets Shame, who straightens him out, and with Confidence Wit returns to Instruction, who helps him the rest of the way up Mount Parnassus. What is particularly interesting is the motivation which Wit has for wanting to marry Lady Science; he wants Favor, Riches, Fame, and Worship, four characters who appear in a sort of masque near the end of the play. Edgar T. Schell points out that this play is sometimes misunderstood because at one point Lady Science refuses Riches and the other three, but this is only because she is not in the mind of man, not yet married to Wit.¹⁵ She is valueless then, according to the allegory. She exists in the world but must be learned. Wit seeks Science as a pathway to making a living or obtaining Favor,

Riches, Worship, and Fame. The allegory would hold equally true of both book learning and apprentice training. This play is not one which praises the life of a cloistered scholar. Redford was a practicing teacher and was at St. Paul's School in 1539 when the boys of St. Paul's presented the play at Court. Once again we see that education was considered a means for the end of earning a living.

In another play, Impatient Poverty (1552) some of the interesting details have been ignored by critics who try to determine its religious orientation. David Bevington says it is Catholic, John S. Farmer says it is Protestant, and F. P. Wilson says it would be acceptable to either religion.¹⁶ Details of the arguments of the vices, Envy and Abundance, are more interesting than the main thrust of the play, which is that one should forgive, a popular idea at that time when both sides of the religious controversy were still trying to convert members of the other group. However, Envy makes the startling accusation that Peace causes Poverty.¹⁷ This was not usually said at later times because people had learned that war cut off markets. But Abundance explains some of his racketeering tactics. He does not deal in gold or silver and, therefore, avoids prosecution for usury. However, he charges more for time payments than for straight payments.¹⁸ Conscience tries to convince him that this is also usury, but gets nowhere. The honest tradesman is not being criticized. The wicked one, Colhazard, is a foreigner (a non-Londoner, continentals were called "alien"). Though he wants

to set up shop in London, he cannot because he is not free of any trade, he has not completed an apprenticeship.¹⁹

Here we see some of the tricks often thought indigenous to a later time already in operation, and see how some of the elaborate rules of the London guilds did serve to protect the public from untrained workers.

Thomas Ingelend printed and may have written the play, The Disobedient Child, which John S. Farmer dates at before 1553.²⁰ It is probably not an original play; Frederick S. Boas says that it may be based on a Dutch play, and F. P. Wilson says that it resembles Pater, Filius, Uxor, a play printed by William Rastell in 1530-34.²¹ It is a very entertaining comedy as morality plays go because, though it contains elements of the prodigal son stories, the characters are made more human than they had been in earlier moralities. They are: Rich Man, Disobedient Child, Man Cook, Woman Cook, Young Woman, Servingman, Priest, and the Devil. Disobedient Child does not want to be a soldier because he is afraid he might get killed and he does not want to go to school because schoolmasters have been known to beat students to death. His father finally agrees to give him his inheritance, and he marries at too early an age and he and his wife soon spend all of his money. The Young Woman tries to slow the process down, but to no avail. When the money is all gone, she finds work for him to do, notably carrying wood, a chore which seems to acquire symbolic value as a model of patience as one progresses through the plays written at

later times. Ironically, when Disobedient Child does not make enough money carrying wood, his wife beats him, just as he feared the schoolmaster would do. He gets his father to help him, but realizes that he will never make much money because he has learned no trade, he was too eager to marry young rather than delay his romance while he learned to make a living. The comic scenes provided by the two cooks are particularly telling on this point. Both the man and the woman cook can read, though she knows no Latin. Much of the comedy is provided by their turning Latin phrases into cookery terms, such as when Domine Labia Aperies is interpreted by her as "Dorothy lay up the keys."²² The father makes a speech about the vice of idleness too late, but he does state the theme of the play when he says:

Yet for because the scriptures declare
That he should not eat, which will not labor,
Some work to do it must be thy care.²³

Whatever the source of the play may be, it stresses the fact that all people should work, and uses the device of carrying wood to symbolize humble labor and patient endurance.

David Bevington's discussion of Respublica (1553) stresses the fact that while it is definitely a play with a Catholic orientation, it does not deal in matters of theology or ritual, the things with which people of the time were concerned.²⁴ It deals with the political maneuvers of the reign of Edward VI, but Bevington believes that it is wasted effort to try to assign the names of the vices of the play to

particular ministers of the reign of Edward VI.²⁵ Two of the lines of Avarice, the main vice, are interesting to note. Avarice meets Mercy who has come down from Heaven to help Nemesis (Queen Mary) help Respublica. He says to Mercy:

Dwell ye in Heaven and so mad to come hither?
All our hucking here is how we may get thither.²⁶

Avarice here speaks one of the earliest examples of words which can be interpreted as the so-called "Protestant Work Ethic." He expects to get to Heaven because of his hucking (huckstering) here on earth. There is no meaning for the word except that of daily work. Avarice at the end of the play is not sent to jail as are Insolence and Oppression. He must only give back what he has gotten through his dishonesty. This would probably mean that he should give back the chantry lands, which Edward VI took over. Bevington remarks that the play shows that its writer had no understanding of economic problems.²⁷ I would agree with that and add that neither did most of those who came later. Avarice continued to be a favorite character with any writer who dealt with economic problems. But it is small wonder that the playwrights did not understand if even Thomas Gresham, himself, did not.

The last play of this group is The History of Jacob and Esau, which Farmer dates at 1557-58.²⁸ This has been described by Bevington as a Protestant polemic defending the younger church as the true inheritor of the Christian

doctrine.²⁹ Since religious disagreements are not a main topic here, this leaves two interesting features in the play. It uses the Bible to criticize the hard and fast rules of primogeniture, and it mentions the doctrine of predestination, one of the favorites of the Puritans. Jacob, the younger son, inherits, as he did in the Bible story. Isaac's explanation of this, however, uses an unusual term:

Ah, Esau, Esau, thou comest too late!
Another to thy blessing was predestinate.³⁰

These are only a few of the plays which were produced or written before the reign of Elizabeth I. There are many others which are interesting, but these have been mentioned because they are the earliest cases of dramatic treatment of themes which some critics seem to think originated with the playwrights of the Jacobean era. The ideas had been in existence for a long time, and the playwrights of the later times were doubtless in many cases aware of their earlier presentation. There are even a few cases where devices or symbols from these plays are directly used by later playwrights in such a way that one must believe that the playwrights were quite familiar with the earlier plays. Here is illustrated the early origin of such themes as the importance of education to the ability to earn a living, the evils of primogeniture, the feeling of the ploughman that he was the world's only worker, the feeling of the merchant that

everyone should work, the feeling that some had to be driven to work, the tendency for the public to think that London was just a little more wicked than any other place, the argument over whether or not successful citizens should marry into the gentry, the idea that peace and war are related to prosperity and poverty, the idea that there are other ways to cheat than by taking direct usury on money, the idea that changes in religion are connected with avarice or covetousness, and the idea that man is often predestinated to a particular type of behavior. These ideas and the playwrights' comments on them and reactions to them at later times when they are uppermost in the minds of the audience will be pointed out from time to time in the plays which are discussed in the following chapters. None of these ideas originated in the reign of Elizabeth I or at a later time. They are treated in different ways at later times because the problems changed or different solutions to them were tried, and the treatment of the issues in the drama changed along with the changes in problems and proposed solutions.

NOTES

¹ Mundus et Infans, in Six Anonymous Plays: 1500-1537, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966).

² Mundus et Infans, p. 180.

³ David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 45.

⁴ John Heywood or John Rastell, Gentleness and Nobility, in Authorship and Sources of Gentleness and Nobility, ed. Kenneth Walter Cameron (Raleigh, N. C.: Thistle Press, 1941), p. 120.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations are noted parenthetically in the text by line number.

The spelling in this play and in others will be modernized in order to achieve uniformity as many of the editions used have modernized the spelling of the texts.

⁵ Heywood or Rastell, p. 117.

⁶ Heywood or Rastell, p. 123.

⁷ John Heywood, Play of the Weather, in The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), pp. 91-136.

⁸ John Heywood, A Dialogue Concerning Witty and Witless, in The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), pp. 191-217.

⁹ Heywood, Witty, p. 200.

¹⁰ Heywood, Witty, p. 217.

¹¹ Heywood, Witty, p. 210.

¹² Heywood, Witty, p. 210.

¹³ F. P. Wilson, The English Drama: 1485-1585 (Oxford: University Press, 1969), pp. 43-45.

- 14 John Redford, Wit and Science, in Chief Pre-Shakespearean Drama, ed. Joseph Quincy Adams (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), pp. 325-42.
- 15 Edgar T. Schell, "Scio Ergo Sum: The Structure of Wit and Science," Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900, 16 (1976), 187.
- 16 Bevington, p. 121; Wilson, p. 55; John S. Farmer, notes, Impatient Poverty, in Lost Tudor Plays: 1460-1566 (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 410.
- 17 Impatient Poverty, p. 314.
- 18 Impatient Poverty, p. 323.
- 19 Impatient Poverty, p. 339.
- 20 John S. Farmer, ed., The Disobedient Child, in The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), pp. 43-92, p. 120.
- 21 Frederick S. Boas, Tudor Drama (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933), Ch. III, p. 40; Wilson, pp. 43-45.
- 22 Ingelend, p. 59.
- 23 Ingelend, p. 51.
- 24 Bevington, p. 116.
- 25 Bevington, p. 119.
- 26 Respublica, in Early English Dramatists: 1460-1566 (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 260.
- 27 Bevington, p. 119.
- 28 The History of Jacob and Esau, in Six Anonymous Plays: 1528-1561, ed. John S. Farmer (1906; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 2.
- 29 Bevington, p. 120.
- 30 Jacob and Esau, p. 74.

CHAPTER III

1563-1587: LEARNING AS RELATED TO MONEY

The first five years of the reign of Elizabeth I saw passage of many laws dealing with religious questions, but from 1563 on, the laws passed dealt with economic problems. The most famous law was the Statute of Apprentices, which attempted to put everybody to work.¹ It made all work contracts effective for one year. All unmarried persons under thirty who lacked income or inheritance of 40s or goods of £10 were required to work at a trade or husbandry. Anyone between the ages of twelve and sixty, unless he was a sailor, apprentice, carrier, miner, gentleman, or student, or owned £3 worth of land, or was heir to £0 worth of land or £40 of chattels, had to work at husbandry. Single women aged twelve to forty also had to work. Wages in every shire were to be recomputed by the justices of the peace once a year and reported to Chancery by 12 July. The trades of mercer, merchant, draper, goldsmith, ironmonger, embroiderer, and clothier could only accept as apprentices the children of people who had incomes of at least 40s per year. The law made it necessary for everyone to work or to have a good excuse for not working. Masters of apprentices and teachers of students were expected to give them moral training as

well as intellectual training. This Act remained on the books until well into the nineteenth century.

In addition to regulating work, the government encouraged education. Typical is the city of Norwich, which in 1570 arranged for children too poor to go to school to be taught weaving so as to be able to earn a living.² The intent was to keep children busy and off the streets, and to educate them so they would not grow up to become beggars.

The charging of interest had been abolished in the reign of Edward IV. An Act repealing that was passed in 1571, and it became legal to charge ten percent interest.³ Business was expanding: Gresham's Royal Exchange had been founded in 1568, as had the Royal Society of Mines. Large enterprises such as those required accumulation of capital and lending and borrowing of money. Most of the populace did not see the importance of this and still considered interest to be usury for a long time afterwards.

The economic problems of the time led to widespread unemployment, and the government attempted to handle relief of the poor by law also. In 1572 the famous Act Against Vagrants was passed, and it was strengthened in 1576 when a stringent Poor Law went into effect.⁴ Each parish then had to register its genuine aged, needy, and cripples, and require the other people of the parish to pledge donations for their support. Those refusing to donate could be sent to prison. Any parish which could not take care of its own poor could give them a license to beg in the next parish. All cities,

boroughs, and corporate towns had to do the same. University scholars were forbidden to beg without a license from the university.

From about 1575 to 1587 the economic situation was more settled and there were some years of peaceful prosperity. These years included the return in 1580 of Drake's second expedition, the one made in The Golden Hind, which paid off 4,000 percent to investors and enabled Elizabeth I to pay off her debts. The country was solvent.

It is possible to see that the way certain topics are treated in the plays reflects the fact that the laws about interest, rules of work, and vagrancy have been changed. In some cases it is hard to make exact assessments of the relationships because it is not always possible to determine exactly when a play was written. However, if a play was printed before a law was passed, it had to be written before then. If it was printed after the law was passed, there is no guarantee that it was not written earlier.

In many cases the plays deal with the same topics as did earlier plays, but they treat them in different ways, giving new solutions to old problems or presenting additional problems. For example, none of the plays of this period make it seem that education is a sure road to "Riches, Favor, Fame, and Worship," as did John Redford's play, Wit and Science. The plays reveal the suspicion that education will not solve all the problems of society. They show the relationship between the growth of beggary and the decline of hospitality

or alms giving. They reveal the public's lack of willingness to accept ten percent interest. They still reveal an inclination on the part of the writers to put the merchant in a separate class from the tradesman, and to refrain from praising him for taking risks.

The plays often touch on religious questions, and are dutifully Protestant, but do not indulge in theological hairsplitting. They stress the practical Christian life and the conquest of such vices as Idleness, Avarice, and Covetousness. The plays which deal with merchants, however, mention two vices which did not appear in earlier plays and do not appear in later ones, "Hap Hazard," and "Corage." After the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, "Hap Hazard" and "Corage" were no longer popular as vices; the merchants who had provided ships for the fleet that defeated the Armada were accepted as useful members of society. That acceptance has not yet come in the plays discussed here. Of the plays, only two, Damon and Pithias, by Richard Edwards, and Campaspe, by John Lyly, were not written for the popular theater, so far as is known, though some may have been written for school performance. These two were performed by the Chapel Boys.⁵ The plays are usually studied from the point of view of religious doctrines, but they can also reveal much about the prevalent attitudes towards education, economic problems, and conflicts in social status.

Two plays are clearly related to education and training, and were probably inspired by the passage of the Statute of

Apprentices in 1563. These cannot be dated exactly so far as composition or performance is concerned, but both were licensed for printing in 1569. They are The Marriage of Wit and Science, which is related to scholarship, and The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art, which is related to apprenticeship. In his edition of the latter play, R. Mark Benbow links it to both Thomas Cromwell's urging in 1536 of parents to apprentice their children, and to the 1563 law.⁶ John S. Farmer calls attention to the fact that the former play is obviously influenced by John Redford's play Wit and Science.⁷ Both plays take a rather different direction from that taken by Redford's play.

The character "Will" is added to The Marriage of Wit and Science, and the four masque-like characters, "Riches, Favor, Worship, and Fame," are removed. The vices of the play are Idleness and Ignorance. The action concentrates more on the relationship of Wit to his mother, Nature, and his brother, Will, than on the learning process itself. Nature cannot get Science for Wit but sends Will along to help him. Will goes along to the home of Science, but finds that he does not like her mother, Experience. When Wit and Will start to school, Will argues with Instruction, and finally convinces Wit that three or four years of Study and Diligence is just too much. In this play as in the first one, Wit loses his first fight with Tediousness, but he is later the victor. However, in this battle Will changes his attitude and holds Tediousness down so that Wit can beat him up. The play is not as graceful

as Redford's but the character of Will fits neatly into the allegory. Wit, here, is not searching for money or favor; it is learning itself that he is interested in, so the play would have been appropriate for grammar school boys.

Redford's play was more appropriate for a general audience contemplating the value of education and training for life's work. This play is, however, an attractive tract which urges students to stick with their studies, and as such is clever.

More closely related to non-school training is the second play, The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art. The protagonist is Moros, and the principal vice is Idleness. The principal virtues which try to lead Moros to a good life are Discipline, Piety, and Exercitation. "Exercitation," now an obsolete word, was a word often used to describe the exercise of a trade. Exercitation says about Moros:

I will exercise him in good occupation
Whereby he shall eschew idleness.⁸

At the opening of the play Discipline, Piety, and Exercitation try to teach Moros, but he merely repeats lines after them without comprehending their meaning. The three later beat him, and he decides to try Dissimulation to fool them. They finally give up their efforts to reform him, and Discipline delivers the line which is repeated throughout the play: "The longer thou livest the more fool thou art." Idleness, Incontinence, and Wrath take over the education of Moros and get Fortune to help them in their plot. He turns to Impiety and

Cruelty, and then to the apparently "papist" vices of Philosophy, Precedence, and Antiquity. At last People is fighting Moros, and God's Judgment comes to tell him: "The longer thou livest the more fool thou art." Moros is then carried out to the Devil, on the back of still another vice, Confusion. The play lacks clarity of direction because it shifts in the middle from stressing training to stressing adherence to the Protestant faith. However, at the end, Discipline, Piety, and Exercitation again share the stage to drive home the point when Discipline explains that there are two disciplines: Scire and Sapere.⁹ Scire means to know or to be skilled in science, to be a tradesman. Sapere means to have taste or discernment, to be a scholar. The lessons of the play are to be applied to either scholars or tradesmen, and Exercitation finally adds: "There be two disciplines meet for high and low."¹⁰ The play was written to stress the lesson that everyone should learn his own job and do it well. It is intended mainly for the apprentice, who learns largely by practice, which in that day was called "exercitation."

Two somewhat later plays show a still different emphasis on education; they seem to be written for parents. These are George Gascoigne's Glass of Government (1575), and Francis Merbury's Contract of Marriage Between Wit and Wisdom (1579). These two were written after the proclamation of 1570 urged that all children start to school at the age of six or seven. Glass of Government is more nearly a prodigal son story than a morality play on education. In addition to that, the

speeches are so long that it is hard to believe that it was ever intended as anything other than an educational tract. For example, in Act I, scene 4, the first lecture of the tutor to the students is six pages long.¹¹ The story is of two fathers who each have two sons. They want their sons to be tutored before enrolling at the university, so they send them to Gnomaticus, the schoolmaster. All four boys start to school in Act I. In Act II the elder two are already complaining that they know everything the teacher is telling them, and they say that they want to go to the university. In addition, they have taken up with a harlot. In Act III the schoolmaster advises their fathers to get them away from the harlot by sending them to the university. Act IV shows them at the university, and Act V reveals that while the two younger sons are doing well in their studies, of the two elder sons one has been executed for robbery and the other whipped for fornication. It is difficult to say what the moral of the play is other than that it is in favor of education, says that students should respect their teachers, and indicates that sometimes younger sons are better than elder sons, this last being perhaps another complaint about the difficulties caused by the law of primogeniture.

A Contract of Marriage Between Wit and Wisdom changes the allegory somewhat from that of the two earlier plays about Wit and Science. It aims its message more clearly at parents, showing them what their responsibility is in educating their children. In this play Wit is the son of Severity,

his father, and Indulgence, his mother. Severity gives him good advice, but Indulgence tells him to dress neatly when calling on Wisdom and to agree with her: "Although that she do say the crow is white."¹² Idleness and Wantonness distract Wit before he even gets to Wisdom's house, and Good Nurture finds him asleep and remarks: "But yet his mother's pampering will bring his son to thrall." Honest Recreation rescues Wit but he is not satisfied with her, and says that he does not like the pursuit of Wisdom because he does not like to have "To tear myself and beat my brains, and all for Wisdom's sake!" adding that "This Honest Recreation delights me not at all."¹³ He then joins up with Idleness again, who takes him to the den of Irksomeness, who replaces Tediousness in this play; and Irksomeness does seem a more fitting name for the unpleasant features of apprentice training than Tediousness would. Irksomeness beats Wit and leaves him for dead. Wisdom comes and rescues Wit and urges him to fight again, which he does, winning the second battle. The play here digresses to let Wit be deceived by Fancy and to let Idleness demonstrate his inability to read and the fact that he must finally take up begging as his "trade." He cannot remain long in the beggars' trade because he stole the pot he uses to beg with from Mother Bee, who catches him. After this digression, Good Nurture finds Wit in the prison of Fancy and releases him on the understanding that he will travel with Good Nurture until they find Wisdom together. The meeting of Wit and Wisdom is not dramatized, but Idleness

finally learns that Wit is going to marry Wisdom and says that he will go to the wedding:

Well, my masters! I must be gone this marriage to see;
They that list not to work, let them follow me.¹⁴

At the end of the play Severity and Good Nurture come to the wedding of Wit and Wisdom but Indulgence is not there. The play is more a lesson to parents to train their children well than it is a lesson to students to pay attention to study and to use diligence. It seems logical that plays written after 1570 would take this direction because, if there had been no need to tell parents that children would be better off in school, there would not have been an additional law made to that effect. The intent of the law was to give children training in order to keep them from idleness and beggary. This is reflected in the character of Idleness in this play. He does not become a playboy as in earlier plays, but becomes a beggar.

Two plays, Like Will to Like Quoth the Devil to the Collier (1568), and All for Money (1578), demonstrate the idea that school in itself is no panacea. The first is a play which was presented at Oxford in 1578, ten years after it was licensed.¹⁵ In it there appears a foreigner, Hance, who was formerly a scholar. He proves this by speaking some Latin. But his learning did not prevent him from becoming a drunkard. He is a friend of Tom Tossopot, who brags that he lured Hance away from his studies, and then tricks him into showing how drunk he is by making him fall down. Tom

is also the friend of the main protagonist, Ralph Roister. Ralph wears fancy, expensive clothes, and drinks, expensive in itself. The main vice, Nicholas Newfangle, who claims that new fashions are one of his chief tools for corrupting young men, promises Tom and Ralph that he will reward them according to which one manages to accomplish the most interesting evils in the world. He will give them either "Beggars Manor" or "Tyburn Hill" as places to live. After Tom brags of seducing wicked wives and Flemish servants and Ralph of seducing both gentlemen and servingmen into riotousness, Nicholas Newfangle decides that they are equally bad and will have to share the reward. He gives them a bottle and a bag of food, and tells them that once they have used those up they will have their reward: the whole land will be theirs to beg in. They beat him up and go off to beg. Apparently the play was intended as an object lesson for university students who in those days were still allowed to beg if given a license by the university. Student begging was still permitted in 1568 when the play was written and in 1578 when it was presented at Oxford, but the public was apparently becoming tired of begging scholars.

The scholars' problems are presented in a still different light in All for Money (1578), a play which makes it clear that an education will not always lead to riches. The vice of the play is Sin, and the teachers are Theology, dressed as a prophet; Science, dressed as a philosopher; and Art, dressed as a tradesman and carrying tools. These three serve

to demonstrate that the three types of education were still considered of equal value at that time. The play is an ugly one in which one vice supposedly vomits up the next one. The protagonists who meet these vices are: "Neither Money or Learning," a beggar; "Learning With Money," an alms giver; "Learning Without Money," a poor scholar who cannot give alms; and "Money Without Learning," a rich man who refuses to give alms.¹⁶ The title character, "All for Money," is a magistrate who accepts bribes. In the first half of the play the four Money-Learning characters argue about the proper use of money. In the last half All for Money holds court and dismisses cases against a thief, a bigamist, and an old woman who tried to buy a young husband. The first half is too polemical about money and learning to be interesting, and the second half portrays a bribed justice who is simply too wicked to be believable. It is not a good play, but its existence suggests that the public was becoming aware that education did not always lead to making a good living. At the opening of the play Theology, Science, and Art say that people should not study in their fields just to make money. At the end of the play, Judas and Dives in Hell discuss the troubles that money got them into. It appears that after 1563 plays no longer maintained that an education guaranteed a good living but served as a reminder that education should make people understand that some of their money was supposed to be given to support the poor. The law which required alms giving was not an easy one to enforce

and more stringent measures were taken in 1597. At this point the play simply reflects the fact that there are people who do not give alms as they should; but it blames their stinginess on their lack of learning or training, not on religion, and thus reflects the fact that poor relief is becoming a part of government administration, not religion.

Several plays deal with conflicts between the trades, with what is appropriate behavior for a tradesman, and with the question of marriage, or even love, between the social classes. These plays are Grim the Collier of Croyden (1579), The Cruel Debtor (1565), New Custom (1573), and Campaspe (1583). They show that all trades were considered respectable, that some were valued for one thing and some for another, and that tradesmen were already being cautioned against trying to rise above their station.

Grim the Collier of Croyden combines two largely unrelated plots. In the main plot the Devil sends a lesser devil, Belphegor, and his servant, Robin Goodfellow, to live on earth and study women to see if they are actually as bad as the Devil has heard they are. Belphegor visits the upper class people, a group of young lovers whose parents are trying to marry them to the wrong people for money. He marries one of the young ladies and is cuckolded, as are the other new husbands. His horns are the reason why all devils from that time on have horns. The sub-plot concerns Grim, the collier, and his attempts to win the love of an honest working girl, Joan. His rival is Clack, the miller. In

earlier times the miller was an important man, but now the collier is slowly becoming important in the country as coal is becoming a major export, a fact not clearly dealt with until these plays appeared. Here, Grim, the collier, covered with black coal dust, is contrasted with Clack, the miller, who is covered with white flour. Grim asks the parson to help him woo Joan, but the parson, after first toying with the idea that he wants her himself (marriage of the clergy was not yet legal), attempts to help the miller marry Joan. Robin Goodfellow, disgusted with the maid with whom he has been romancing, and in most un-devil-like fashion, admires Joan's fidelity to her true love, Grim. Robin becomes invisible and helps Grim beat up the parson and the miller, and lets him think that he won the battle by himself. Grim, sure that he won his lady in battle, successfully claims Joan as his own, over the protestations of the miller and the parson. In Act II, scene 1, Joan makes it clear that she loves Grim for himself alone:

I'll not despise the trades ye either have
 Yet, Grim, the collier, may if he be wise,
 Live even as merry as the day is long;
 For, in my judgment, in his mean estate,
 Consists as much content as in more wealth.¹⁷

Grim is thrilled and says, "She has made my heart leap like a hobby-horse!"¹⁸ The play effectively criticizes people who force children to marry for money by contrasting Grim and Joan with the upper class lovers. It also makes the point that no trade should be the object of scorn simply because

the man who works at it gets dirty on the job. The fact that a collier is the hero of a play shows the increase in importance of mining in the country at that time.

Of the other three plays, Campaspe (1583), by John Lyly, tells the story of the prisoner of war who was loved by the ruler, Alexander.¹⁹ As a commoner she could not ever become the queen, and she prefers to be the honest wife of the artist, Appelles. The ruler, Alexander, finds out about their love and agrees that they should marry. It appears that it is better to marry well and for love within one's own class than to become mistress of a ruler. The play is not a morality but a court play on a classic story. It is interesting because it keeps the marriage within the one social class. New Custom (1573) is a Protestant morality which pictures the conflict between New Custom and Perverse Doctrine. In regard to the issues relevant here, it is interesting chiefly because New Custom specifically states:

By me then you must learn for your own behest
And for all vocations what is judged the best.²⁰

Not all things are fit for all people, and New Custom will teach what is proper. Only a fragment of The Cruel Debtor, written before 1565 by William or Lewis Wager, remains. It is interesting for showing an employee of the King who has borrowed money from the King and is unable to repay it. The King blames the subject's poverty on his spending all his money on fancy clothes, and says: "Beyond thy degree thou didst exceed in array."²¹ Here again the idea is stressed

that people have a particular place in the social structure and should stay in that place. This play was licensed in 1565 and shows that one should not dress above one's rank. In 1573, New Custom shows that the problem is wicked companions of any class, when New Custom says:

Then all wicked company you must clean forsake
And flee their society as a toad or a snake.²²

New Custom thinks he will have to teach people what the proper degrees are because Perverse Doctrine has taught them incorrectly in the past. It is hard to tell whether Campaspe was virtuous because she would not love a man who outranked her or because she would rather become a wife than a mistress. The distinction between classes seems to be becoming less related to religious principles and more to economic status.

The previous chapter showed that in Gentleness and Nobility (1523) the merchant did not seem to be given credit for his role as risk taker. In two plays of the present period he is actually criticized for taking risks, and a third places him in an even worse light, he becomes an apostate. In Appius and Virginia (1568) the vice, "Hap Hazard," is the friend of merchants and others who are willing to take chances.²³ In The Tyde Tarryeth No Man (1576) the vice, "Courage," is the one who encourages the merchant to become a money lender and lend £30 for £40 worth of property.²⁴ In The Three Ladies of London (1583) the vice, Lady Lucre, gets the merchant (Italian, so not to offend English merchants),

to turn Mohammedan while in Turkey in order to avoid paying a debt to a Jew.²⁵

In Appius and Virginia (1568) it is clear that taking a chance in any matter is considered to be evil. God controls the world, so taking chances is not proper. Hap Hazard, the vice, urges Appius, who wants to seduce Virginia, to spread the rumor that she is not really the daughter of her father, so that as ruler, Appius can claim her as his ward and move her into his house. This seems a far cry from risk taking in business but Hap Hazard appears to say they are the same:

By Jove, master merchant, by sea or by land,
 Would get but small argent, if I did not stand,
 His very good master, I may say to you,
 When he hazards in hope what hap will ensue.²⁶

Here he describes the merchant as a risk taker. Most of his lines have this rollicking beat, and its effect is not much different from that afforded by the characterizations of merchants in later plays, such as The Shoemaker's Holiday. Hap Hazard is always cheerful and ready to take a chance. When at the end of the play Virginius, the girl's father, tells him that he must hang, he goes bouncing off to the hanging, expecting the "livery" of dishonest trades to come, and claims both merchant and cutpurse as his friends:

Must I needs hang? by the gods! it doth spite me.
 To think how crabbedly this silk lace will bite me.
 Then come, cousin Cutpurse, come, run, haste, and
 follow me;
 Hap Hazard must hang; come follow the livery!²⁷

In The Tyde Tarryeth No Man (1576), by George Walpul, the vice is "Corage." Corage (Courage) encourages the foreigner, Hurtful Help, to pay higher rent though this means that he will take over the house that an English tenant has lived in for many years. Corage encourages a fourteen-year-old girl to insist on getting married merely because she is of minimum legal age. Corage encourages Courtier to borrow money on his land so that he can return to court in proper style. Corage arranges the loan from which Courtier gets only £30 from the Merchant to whom he gave £40 security. Merchant deducts his fee, the scribe who writes the legal paper deducts his fee, the merchant's man deducts his fee, and Profit and Furtherance, two vices, also get a bit of the missing money. J. Payne Collier, editor of this edition, believes that the play was written before 1576, and since Walpul was born about 1540, this is possible. However, it does appear to have been written after 1571 when ten percent interest was made legal. The Courtier's loan involves the loss of twenty-five percent of the money by various shifts, not by charging of ten percent interest. The money goes for a bribe and two fees. At the end of the play, when Courtier is unable to pay back the money, Faithful Few tries to help him. The two blame the vice, Greediness, for the predicament of Courtier, but Greediness says that courtiers are always blaming him for what is really their own prodigality and for the stinginess of the Prince. The song of the three vices, Hurtful Help, Profit, and Furtherance, sung when they

first got the money, does show that they are proud of the fact that they make money without doing any work:

We have great gain, with little pain,
And lightly spend it too:
We do not toil, nor yet we moil,
As other poor folks do.²⁸

The message is clear: charging too much interest is wrong; Profit is a vice; and Courage can lead many people to make mistakes. Faithful Few makes it clear that not all citizens indulge in such shady practices, but says that the many are being blamed for what the few unfaithful ones do. At the end of the play, Faithful Few and Authority resolve to reform the Church which does not make people behave properly.

The next of this group of plays deals with more things than just merchandising. It blames virtually all the problems in the world on the love of money. Robert Wilson, in The Three Ladies of London (1583), shows us that Lady Lucre is driving Lady Love and Lady Conscience out of business. The Prologue says that this is a city play.²⁹ Everyone wants to go to the city to work for Lady Lucre. However, her standards are not very high. Mercatore (an Italian merchant) agrees to export bell metal, which can be used to make cannon, to please her, though it is against the law and he has to bribe the searchers of ships to accomplish his task. Artifex (the tradesman or artificer) wants to work for Lady Lucre because he is being driven out of business by foreign workers who produce inferior wares and sell them cheaply. Lawyer wants to work for Lady Lucre because he has found

that pleading for Lady Conscience leads to beggary. Lawyer even brags about his talents, saying: "Tush, sir, I can make black white and white black again."³⁰ Dissimulation is the vice who has enabled Lady Lucre to win over so many formerly good people. Dissimulation finally enables Usury to destroy Hospitality, and at this point, Simplicity, the visitor from the country, exclaims:

Faith, Hospitality is killed, and hath made his will,
And hath given Dissimulation three trees upon a
high hill.³¹

Lucre finally wins over Conscience by buying the brooms that Conscience must sell to make a living. Then Lady Lucre enlists the aid of Conscience in the proposed marriage of Lady Love to Dissimulation, a marriage that will obviously destroy the value of Love. Even Simplicity is going to go to work for Lady Lucre, but he resolves that when he has to work for Lucre he will be as lazy as possible. Towards the end of Act IV Simplicity gives up and becomes a beggar. The allegory holds up well. It is true that when poverty is bad enough almost anybody will do almost any job for money. The adventure of Mercatore in Turkey, where he gives up his Christian faith to turn Moslem and have his debts cancelled, does not fit in well with the rest, but it gives the judge a chance to comment on the lack of Christianity of the people by saying: "Jews seek to excel in Christianity and Christians in Jewishness."³² This is obviously a reference to the fact that Jews were long the usurers and money lenders

of the world, and Christians were rarely permitted to charge interest in England until after 1571 when many merchants became money lenders. However, Mercatore is not charging interest, he is refusing to pay a debt which he owes the Jew. He will stop at nothing to make money. At the end of the play, an English judge puts Lucre, Conscience, and Love temporarily in jail, and says that they have a lesson to learn. He finally decides to free Lucre and Love, and lets Lucre claim Love, while leaving Conscience in jail. The play is a good allegory and an indictment of improper business dealings, and of the city of London's tendency to overvalue money. In 1588, when Wilson wrote his sequel to this, he had found a use for money, but he had not found it at this time. Here Lady Lucre is so far beyond reform that it is pointless to keep her in jail. Here money has turned Love to Lust through Dissimulation, has put Conscience in prison, and has lured Mercatore from his Christian faith. The play was written in 1583, three years after Drake's voyage which paid 4,700 percent on investments. At that time London was flooded with money, and prices had been rising accordingly. This is reflected in the play which seems to be almost obsessed with money.

All of these plays show an inability on the part of the writers to distinguish between interest, profit, and usury, even though it is taken for granted that a man must make a living. F. P. Wilson points out that the playwrights did not ask whether usury and land enclosures were economic necessi-

ties or not, but just blamed them on errors in private morality.³³ In Enough Is as Good as a Feast (1570), by William Wager, Worldly Man and Heavenly Man discuss the question, and the vice, Covetous, takes credit for the action. Worldly Man says that he merely accumulates money because he needs it for his wife and children:

If I should not take pains, ride, run, and go
 For my living, what thereof would ensue?
 A beggar should I die, masters this is true.
 Then my wife and children that I leave behind
 I fear me at your hands small relief should find.³⁴

Heavenly Man tries to convince him that he is wrong, but gets nowhere, and finally warns: "Ye poor men and commons, walk in your vocations."³⁵ Heavenly Man is warning against trying to get rich. As this play continues, Worldly Man demonstrates again the feeling that people apparently had, already shown in the play All for Money, that a man who had both money and learning would be generous to the poor and not cheat his tenants. At the end of Enough Is as Good as a Feast, when Worldly Man is about to die of the plague, he calls his friend, Ignorance, to his bedside, and asks him to write his will and testament down for him. Ignorance cannot write and so Worldly Man dies intestate, and his wife and children lose the money which he had tried to hoard for them. The moral seems to be that the man who hoards money should give it to the poor and trust to God to care for his wife and children. Worldly Man's family lose because his will cannot be written by Ignorance. In the play

The Three Ladies of London Usury actually kills Hospitality or alms giving, in The Tyde Tarryeth No Man Corage gets people to cheat others, and in Enough Is as Good as a Feast the stingy man actually loses his money at the end of the play. There is no indication in any of these plays that making money is considered good. The scholar does not necessarily make a good living, the merchant is not praised for taking risks, and the businessman is told to give to the poor rather than to leave something to his own children. The taking of risks and accumulation of profit are not considered commendable acts. Work itself is not discussed as it is in plays of later times. Here, poverty is still to be countered by alms giving.

One more play from this era should be discussed, though it is not a morality play. It is the only one extant which provides material which can be contrasted with plays of the later periods. This play is The Famous Victories of Henry V, which Joseph Quincy Adams says must be dated earlier than 1588 because Richard Tarlton is credited with making the role of Dericke famous, and Tarlton died in 1588.³⁶ The play was written not long before that date, perhaps in 1586 or 1587. In 1585 Elizabeth I had sent 6,000 soldiers to the Netherlands to help in the wars there. Though their lack of training handicapped them at first, they were eventually of much help in winning the Dutch independence. In this play the citizens are pictured as soldiers in the French wars of Henry V. The attitudes of Dericke, the carrier, and his friends, the cobbler and the costermonger, are probably not too different

from those of Londoners who were being impressed for service in 1585. Dericke is sure that they will come back all right:

Doest think we are so base-minded to die among Frenchmen? Sownes, we know not whether they will lay us in their church or no.³⁷

He is not a hero but a comic military clown. The role was written especially for Tarlton, the famous clown, but it was also written for the audience, who would have been worried about their loved ones at war in Holland. Dericke is certainly no hero, but when pressed is not actually a coward. His main interest is accumulating as much booty as he can. He avoids most of the battles by sticking a straw up his nose until he draws blood, and then showing up at the place where the wounded are cared for, to be excused from the rest of the day's battle. When he finally meets a French soldier, he does get the better of him, but he bests the French soldier by trickery, not bravery. Dericke offers to bribe the Frenchman for his life by giving him enough gold pieces to cover the length of his sword, and tells him he must lay his sword on the ground so that he can see how many gold crowns it will take to cover it. Dericke grabs the sword and chases the Frenchman, who flees. The part is genuinely funny in spots, and is not unlike the comic role of Sir John Falstaff in Shakespeare's I Henry IV. Dericke is not a hero as were the citizen soldiers who appear in plays after 1588. On the other hand, he is not a knight as Falstaff was. Later plays often showed heroic tradesmen or comic knights.

Here we get a comic tradesman who, while he is not a hero, is also not really a coward, but more a "shrewd operator."

This era of popular thinking ended in 1588. At that time England defeated the Armada and began to develop a new feeling of pride as well as an appreciation of the efforts of the merchants in that battle. The fleet that met the Armada contained 197 ships, but only 34 were ships of the Royal Navy. The other ships belonged to the merchant adventurers of London and the other port cities, and were staffed with sailors and other personnel from London and the ports. The merchants were willing to risk their ships against the Spanish fleet, and thereby risk even their fortunes. And they won. The sailors turned out to be good fighters, though they were not knights. The prizes of battle were not significant monetarily, but the pride brought home was significant. And this happened at about the same time the citizen soldiers were beginning to distinguish themselves in the wars in Holland. In the plays of the next era we can see a change in attitude towards the merchants and tradesmen of London.

In the era from 1563 to 1587 the popular drama of England included a great many morality plays which reflected the changes in popular attitudes of the day. These plays show that education was no longer expected to solve all the problems of unemployment, and that one could no longer expect to become rich simply by being either a scholar or a tradesman. They show that education was, however, valued for another thing; it was credited with making a man

generous with what money he did have. They also show that there was a realization that even a scholar could go bad, as happened with the drunken Hance. They also show parents that they should keep their children in school or at work and thus help them to learn how to earn a living, even if school or work seem to be tedious or irksome to children. They show that the presence of beggars was becoming a common phenomenon, and in one case blame this on the fact that when a simple man must work for money alone, he loses interest in his job, becomes lazy, and finally turns to beggary. Most of the plays still treat apprenticeship and university or grammar school education similarly. Notice is taken of the fact that the collier's trade makes one get dirtier than do other trades, but a worthwhile girl is not supposed to let that bother her when she is picking a husband. Work increasingly is seen not as a method for getting rich but as a method for avoiding poverty. Education of all kinds is seen as training for vocation, but also as training of the spirit for generosity to one's fellow men. The changes in laws during the period reflect the same ideas, and more often than not the plays were written shortly after a law had codified the attitude of the state towards the problem. In everything except the charging of interest the plays support the regulations of the government.

NOTES

¹ G. W. Prothero, ed., Statutes and Constitutional Documents: 1558-1625, 4th ed. (Oxford:Clarendon, 1934), pp. 45-49.

² Joan Simon, Education and Society in Tudor England (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1966), p. 370.

³ R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926), p. 180.

⁴ Prothero, pp. 67-69, 72.

⁵ Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952), pp. 343,345.

⁶ R. Mark Benbow, ed. and introd., The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art, by William Wager, in The Longer Thou Livest and Enough Is as Good as a Feast (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. xi, xiii.

⁷ John S. Farmer, ed. and notes, The Marriage of Wit and Science, in Five Anonymous Plays: 1570-1579 (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 320.

⁸ Benbow, p. 13, ll. 249-50.

⁹ Benbow, p. 76, l. 1936.

¹⁰ Benbow, p. 77, l. 1961.

¹¹ George Gascoigne, The Glass of Government, in Vol. II, The Glass of Government and Other Works, ed. John W. Cunliffe (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1910).

¹² A Contract of Marriage Between Wit and Science, in Five Anonymous Plays: 1570-1579, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 262.

¹³ Farmer, 1570-1579, p. 270, 277.

¹⁴ Farmer, 1570-1579, p. 295.

- 15 Like Will to Like Quoth the Devil to the Collier, in Early English Dramatists, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 3.
- 16 Thomas Lupton, All for Money, Microfilm, Early English Books: 1475-1640 (Madison, Wisc.: University Microfilms, STC Reel 1145).
- 17 Grim the Collier of Croyden, in Five Anonymous Plays: 1570-1579, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 127.
- 18 Farmer, 1570-1579, p. 127.
- 19 John Lyly, Campaspe, in Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas, ed. Joseph Quincy Adams (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), pp. 609-37.
- 20 New Custom, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, ed. R. Dodsley, Vol. I (London: R. Dodsley in Pall Mall, 1744), p. 78.
- 21 William or Lewis Wager, The Cruel Debtor, in Collections I, Vol. IV and V, The Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: H. Hart, 1911), p. 322.
- 22 New Custom, p. 77.
- 23 Farmer, 1570-1579, p. 101; H. C. Schweikert, Early English Plays: 900-1600 (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1928), p. 45. He dates this at 1563.
- 24 George Walpul, The Tyde Tarryeth No Man, in Early English Popular Literature, ed. J. Payne Collier (New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1966), pp. 20-72.
- 25 Robert Wilson, The Three Ladies of London, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt, introd. J. Payne Collier (London: Reeves and Turner, 1876), VI.
- 26 Appius and Virginia, in Five Anonymous Plays: 1570-1579, ed. John S. Farmer (1905; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 17.
- 27 Appius and Virginia, p. 44.
- 28 Tyde Tarryeth No Man, p. 45.
- 29 Three Ladies of London, p. 246.
- 30 Three Ladies of London, p. 283.

- 31 Three Ladies of London, p. 319.
- 32 Three Ladies of London, p. 357.
- 33 F. P. Wilson, The English Drama: 1485-1585 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 56.
- 34 William Wager, Enough Is as Good as a Feast, in The Longer Thou Livest and Enough Is as Good as a Feast, ed. R. Mark Benbow, Regents' Renaissance Drama (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), p. 89, ll. 176-80.
- 35 Wager, p. 92, l. 260.
- 36 Joseph Quincy Adams, ed., notes, The Famous Victories of Henry V, in Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), p. 667, note 1.
- 37 The Famous Victories, p. 681, ll. 1280-83.

CHAPTER IV

1588-1604: WAR AND POVERTY

The merchant ships of England had helped to defeat the Armada, and the soldiers in Holland were distinguishing themselves, but between 1588 and 1604 England was still at war. The war and other drains on the economy resulted in the passage between 1597 and 1601 of more Work Laws and Poor Laws.¹ These taxed the rich; required poor parents to apprentice their children to the less desirable trades; had rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars stripped and whipped if unwilling to work; and ordered the building of workhouses for the poor. This last part of the laws was not effective, and an additional law of 1601 enabled local authorities to raise money for relief by taxation, or to fine people who refused to contribute. Public interest in the question was steady between 1598 and 1601. Therefore, the wars influenced plays which appeared early and the work laws influenced plays which appeared late in the period between 1588 and 1604.

Too much, perhaps, has been made of the brave apprentices portrayed in the plays of this period. The brave apprentice or journeyman does appear in several plays, but his function is that of brave fighter at a time when it is

politically inexpedient to praise knights, the fighters of the past; so apprentices and journeymen become the heroes. This change in roles resulted from three things: the demands of plotting, the political situation, and the new laws. Effective plotting makes it necessary to change the roles of more than one character at a time if a play is to make sense; not everyone can be a hero. Political changes are seldom permanent and so lead to changes in character portrayal to suit the political changes. The laws regarding the poor affected not only the poor who received alms but the rich who had to give them, and solutions to problems of poverty often led to reflections on the idea that education was once supposed to solve the unemployment problem. So, many factors as well as many characters are linked in every play.

The requirements of plotting have greater influence on the structure of plays than is sometimes taken into account when they are studied as literature. When one person is the protagonist another must be the antagonist or there will be no conflict. When all characters are noblemen there is no problem, the nobleman who wins is the hero; but in plays with characters from all social classes, the playwright must choose a hero and a villain or fool for contrast. It did not immediately occur to playwrights to put a hero and an antagonist of the same lower social level in opposition to each other in one play. The plays tend to make a knight the hero and a worker, merchant, or apprentice insignificant, or to make the knight insignificant and the merchant, worker, or

apprentice a hero. The rise and fall of the reputations of different occupations as reflected in the plays tends to follow developments in public life, as will be demonstrated. The knight was unpopular and the apprentice and finally the merchant became popular in his place. This pattern holds less true in the case of the gentleman and the scholar. The gentleman was a character new to the drama and the playwrights do not seem at first to know what to do with him. The portrayal of the scholar seems to be affected by other factors. The portrayal of the woman who is less than a princess or duchess required the development of character types which did not immediately appear.

Since plays written between 1588 and 1604 can be dated with more accuracy than earlier ones, it can be seen that they reflect public events just past and the actual passage of laws. Such is the case in the sudden appearance of brave apprentices and cowardly knights. The roles taken by other characters are often merely those assigned for the sake of convenience. The alternating appearance of generous merchants and generous knights can be tied to the defeat of the Armada in 1588, which raised the merchant's reputation, and the passage of the Poor Laws, in 1598, which made people reminisce about the generous knights of old. The scholar is a figure less easy to categorize; he can be a teacher, a lawyer, or a preacher; and the different professions do not behave in the same ways. The citizen's wife is one of the most interesting of the character types. She is an unwitting

tool between 1588 and 1604, a saleswoman and a would-be lady between 1605 and 1615, and an independent person who resents being used as a sales accessory after that time. It is important to remember first that the dramas of this period are not full of Puritans, beggars, projectors, and usurers, but are full of knights, merchants, scholars, apprentices, and working men and women.

The rise and fall of the reputation of the knight in the period just before James I has been attributed by A. L. Rowse to the mistakes of Essex, who created an excessive number of knights whenever he won a battle.² This appears to me to be an accurate interpretation. However, when the Poor Laws were strengthened in 1598, the knight enjoyed a brief reprieve when a few plays portrayed knights of the past as generous alms givers. The apprentice does not appear in the earliest plays, but once the knight loses his heroic appeal he is replaced by the young apprentice, the symbol of the brave workers in the Holland wars, the sailors who fought the Armada, and the merchants who let their ships sail against that Armada. The apprentice has a brief spell of comic characterization when the knight is again briefly a hero, but is returned to heroic stature just after 1601, when Essex was executed. However, it is also in 1601 that the apprenticing of poor children to lesser trades began, and the comic child-apprentice begins to appear then. It was perhaps natural that the playwrights would think of apprentices; many of them had been apprentices when young, but few

had been merchants, and it is difficult to portray a character with which one is not familiar unless one refers to type characters such as those provided by Roman comedy.

Portrayals of the merchant and other characters must be connected to those of the knight and the apprentice. The merchant suffers a series of ups and downs, but reaches a longer period of heroic portrayal than does the apprentice, beginning with Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice (1594), which distinguishes him from the usurer, and culminating with the portrayal in Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday (1599) of Simon Eyre, one time Lord Mayor of London. The decline of the merchant is brief, and takes place at about 1602, right after the last Poor Law was passed. Then the merchant again soon becomes a hero. The scholar begins as a negative character in Doctor Faustus (1589), becomes a hero, and then is given comic roles. This change is perhaps related to the presence or absence of the Boys' Companies which were rivals for the actors' business. In only one case can it be seen as a reflection of the laws forbidding scholars to beg. The citizen's wife does not appear until almost the turn of the century. She is first a Puritan, then a mother who cannot read, and finally, Shoemaker's Holiday portrays women of several types and helps lay the foundation for some later character portrayals.

The development of these characters will be traced here individually because an understanding of their development is needed for a proper comprehension of plays written in

later times. Therefore, we will, in the main, look at the knight, the apprentice, the merchant, and the citizen's wife, and notice what happens to some other characters as well.

Though the romanticized knight still appeared in popular literature, few of that old fashioned variety appeared on the stage, and the one in A Merry Knack to Know a Knave, written in 1588 and performed in 1592, is not entirely a positive character. He is going broke because he keeps so many retainers, a thing discouraged already in 1390 when Richard II saw large bands of retainers as a possible source of rebellion.³ However, the knight is complimented by other characters for feeding the poor. He pays off the debts which several poor old farmers owe to the rich, evil one, and one of the poor men he helps remarks:

Marry, Jesus, bless you. Neighbor, how many such knights have you now-a-days.⁴

The knight agrees to lend the King £20, while the very rich farmer says he will lend him £100 only on the condition that he be permitted to ship corn overseas. The sale of corn overseas was considered one of the main causes of famine in the land at that time, so here we have an evil farmer, contrasted with a good knight.

Aside from the mayors of London who appear in the plays of Shakespeare, few decent knights are portrayed until 1599. The mayors of London in the Henry VI plays are always on the side of the King. They endeavor to keep the rebels out of the city and to drive them away from its walls.

Interestingly, it is likely that it was the lines of the mayor of London in 1 Henry VI (1591) which gave Heywood the idea for his plays in which apprentices appear as heroes. In 1 Henry VI the troops of the Duke of Gloucester and the Bishop of Winchester are fighting in the streets of London. The mayor comes to remind them that they are breaking the celebrated peace of the city.⁵ He says:

Fie, lords, that you, being supreme magistrates,
Thus, contumeliously should break the peace!
(I.iii.57-58)

He is not very successful at stopping the fighting until he hints that he will roust out the apprentices of London.

I'll call for clubs if you will not away.
This cardinal's more haughty than the devil.
(I.iii.84-85)

The warring nobles leave and the peaceable mayor, a true merchant, salesman, and patient citizen, remarks:

Good God, these nobles should such stomachs bear!
I myself fight not once in forty year. (I.iii.90-91)

The mayor fights when pushed to it, but he gets his way when he has to, as he does here. In 2 Henry VI the ultimate ironic statement about knighthood is made when Cade knights himself before fighting the Staffords. He remarks that they are merely knights and then goes on to tell Michael:

To equal him, I will make myself a knight
presently. (Kneels) Rise up Sir John Mortimer.
(Rises) Now, have at him! (IV.ii.119-21)

Shakespeare deviates from history to have Cade killed by a country man rather than by citizens of London, but he was no admirer of London. In 3 Henry VI the citizens are not particularly important, and in Richard III the mayor is deceived by Richard's pretended religious devotion as are many other people. In later plays Shakespeare contributes his share of comic knights, but he is no portrayer of brave workmen.

George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield (1593) gives a different slant on knighthood. Here the commoner, a yeoman not a citizen, not only fights well but declines to be made a knight when the king offers him the honor. The reason he gives for declining sounds noble, and thereby his actions tend to reinforce ideas in the audience that it was really exemplary behavior to avoid knighthood. However, knighthood was avoided because a knight often had to make gifts on special occasions, such as contributions to the dowry of a princess soon to be married. The exchange between George and the king appears at the play's end:

<u>King</u>	Kneel down, George.
<u>George</u>	What will your majesty do?
<u>King</u>	Dub thee a knight, George.
<u>George</u>	I beseech your Grace, grant me one thing.
<u>King</u>	What is that?
<u>George</u>	Then let me live and die a yeoman still. So was my father, so must live his son. For 'tis more credit to men of base degree To do great deeds than men of dignity. ⁶

George a Greene is merely typical. Knights, if virtuous, are to be praised for generosity, not valour.

Robert Wilson's The Cobbler's Prophecy (1594) makes fun of heraldic arms. In this play such realistic characters as the Cobbler, the Soldier, the Scholar, the Courtier, and the Country Gentleman are mixed with such mythological ones as Venus and Charon.⁷ The Soldier, Scholar, and Courtier boast of the good lives they live, and the Cobbler tells them early in the play what their faults are. Then the scene moves to Hell, where Charon complains in medieval fashion:

There's scarcely room enough for rich
So that no poor can come to Hell. (ll. 666-67)

He ends his complaint with the thought:

We now are fain to wait who grows to wealth
And come to bear some office in a town. (ll. 769-70)

A herald on the scene agrees with him and adds: "And we for money help them unto arms" (l. 771). This is a comment on the rush to obtain gentility and a coat of arms, so common then. Even Shakespeare's father, probably with his son's help, obtained a coat of arms.⁸ The scene returns to earth where the Cobbler tells the Duke that one of his advisors is about to betray him. The advisor admits his error and the Duke forgives him; but the advisor does not forgive the Cobbler, and manages to have him jailed as a horse thief. The Country Gentleman, who is supposed by tradition to be a fighter, turns out to be one of the new gentry who knows nothing of arms. He tries to hire the Soldier to go fight in his place. The Soldier refuses, but does go to fight on

his own. He is joined by an army made up of the people from the jail, and, of course, the Cobbler is one of the bravest fighters of all. It was in 1594 that the government of Elizabeth I began using the prisoners in Bridewell to fill in the ranks of the army sent to Holland, so the connection is contemporary. When the Soldier and the Cobbler come home from war, the Soldier gets the Cobbler pardoned, and the Scholar and the Soldier agree that they should stick up for each other. The play is poor drama, but it is interesting from the social point of view. Apparently the soldier, the worker, and the scholar are pitted against the new gentleman who does not know how to fight and thinks that the money which bought his "gentility" will solve any problem; and they are pitted against the courtier who spends his time in politics, not war. The professionals, soldier, scholar, and artisan, are heroes while the country gentleman and courtier are both cowards.

This state of affairs reached its culmination in 1598 with Shakespeare's creation of the comic knight, Sir John Falstaff, in 1 and 2 Henry IV. The character of Falstaff, who eats too much, drinks too much, and takes credit for killing enemies he finds dead, is too well known to require delineation here. However, it is interesting to note that soon after Falstaff made his appearance there was an upsurge of portrayals of the good side of knighthood by other playwrights, at about 1600. This may be due partly to the existence of rival companies, or due partly to the desire

to present the life of the real Sir John Oldcastle; however, this brief praise of knighthood ended when Essex again slipped into disgrace. There was a year or two when people remembered the good old days and what knighthood used to be.

Before moving on to the good knights, a look at the most foolish one of all, Sir Puntarvolo of Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humor (1599), is in order. Critics have argued over whether Sir Puntarvolo is supposed to be Sir Walter Raleigh or Anthony Munday.¹⁰ It is not really important; the important thing is that he shows what is wrong with the concept of knighthood in this late time. Sir Puntarvolo wants to make a trip to the Holy Land to fight. He takes his man and his greyhound with him wherever he goes. He woos ladies under their balconies, though he is married to a wife who refuses to accompany him to the Holy Land because she gets seasick. His dog dies, and he wants to fight a duel with the sensible man who suggests that if he is actually broken hearted over the animal's death, he should have the hide stuffed and save it to remind him of his pet. This is a poor play; its length alone, 4,510 lines, would be enough to ruin it even if it had no other faults. However, it is important as the drawing board which includes the pattern for almost every character found in what was later called "citizen comedy." Here we find the out-of-date knight, his lazy wife, the peaceable citizen, his spoiled wife, the poor scholar, the overdressed courtier, the law student, the elder brother, the younger brother, the confidence man, and the wife's

brother. Only the apprentice is missing. Jonson gathered them all together in 1599; the closing of the theaters in 1603 gave everyone a chance to study them and figure out what to do with them on stage.

In 1599 Shakespeare created two famous comic knights, Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek, in Twelfth Night. Then there was a brief revival of the reputation of the knight. In 1599 and 1600 two lesser plays presented friendlier pictures of the knight. Henry Porter's Two Angry Women of Abingdon (1599) portrays the knight of Abingdon as a friendly neighbor who helps a lost teen-age girl find her way home at night after she has tried to elope with the neighbor boy.¹¹ This knight is a gentleman. In Sir John Oldcastle (1600) the story of the real Sir John is told, and he is praised for his generosity as an alms giver.¹² At this time, just before the new Poor Law was passed, there seems to be a desire to try to retain some respect for the knight as a rich man who at least did help the poor in the good old days. However, no one can praise the knight as a fighter at a time when Essex is incurring the wrath of the Queen by making too many new knights.

Dekker's Patient Grissill (1600) includes a knight who seems to make the transition back to comic portrayal of the knight.¹³ He is not entirely a comic character, but can scarcely be called a hero, and the comic incidents of the play are related to the glorification of the knight as a friend to beggars, but not a fighter. Sir Owen ap Meridith

is Welsh, and is wooing a widow. She gives him a great deal of trouble. When he prepares a banquet for the marquess, she feeds the food to beggars, and comes dressed as a beggar herself. Sir Owen accuses her of turning the tables on him just to show that she is not going to be patient like Grissill. She replies that that is not the case; he tore her clothes the last time they had a fight, and she has no others to wear. He tells her to buy some new ones at his expense. At the end of the play, when Grissill is rewarded for her patience, Sir Owen decides that he is as patient as Grissill and that it is pointless to try to tame a widow. He reconciles himself to the idea that every family needs one patient spouse, and in his family it is going to be he, not his wife. Sir Owen is both a comic character and a knight who displays some virtues, the traditional one of generosity and a new one, patience.

After the downfall of Essex, there are few heroic knights. Chapman's Sir Giles Goosecap (1601), played by the Chapel Boys, is merely another play which includes knights who are not heroes.¹⁴ As the story goes, Shakespeare wrote The Merry Wives of Windsor at the request of the Queen, who wanted to see the comic knight, Falstaff, in love, and the details of that play are too well known to require comment here. Another jibe at knighthood found late in this period is in Middleton's Blurt, Master Constable (1602).¹⁵ In it the Spaniard, Lazarillo, functioning as tutor of a bevy of city ladies, encourages them to have their husbands knighted:

If you have daughters capable, marry them by no means to citizens . . . make your husband go to the herald for arms . . . go all the way yourselves, you can be made ladies . . . procure your husband to be dubbed! (III.iii.138-47)

After 1604 there are still fewer good knights, but there are ladies who want their husbands to be dubbed. In the years after James I's sales of knighthoods, the plays are even less complimentary to the knight and the lady than these are.

The situation with the apprentices and other workers is not so simple. There are no apprentices in the earliest plays between 1588 and 1604, and such workers as there are are not portrayed in any special way. The portrayals of the apprentice and the worker are generally similar, so they will be discussed together. Simplicity, the workman in Robert Wilson's Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (1588), is a shrewd man. He has gotten his freedom of the city of London as a tankard bearer but is now working as a ballad seller.¹⁶ He is proud of his status, proud of his education, and proud of London, as are all the characters both symbolic and realistic in this play. He remembers his apprentice days, and makes a telling comment in his conversation with the page, Will, who cannot read:

Not read, and brought up in London!
Went'st thou never to school? (p. 396)

He shows the page a picture of Tarlton, the actor, and tells him that Tarlton was once a London apprentice. Simplicity is a rather charming character, but is not really as bright

as he thinks he is, and at the end of the play the others blindfold him and tell him that he can punish Fraud by beating him, but let him beat a post instead. His efforts are well intended, but ineffectual.

The other famous early portrayals of common men are those of Shakespeare. Aside from the apprentices mentioned by the mayor in 1 Henry VI (1591), the citizens in his history plays are Jack Cade's rebels in 2 Henry VI (1592) and a few sensible citizens in Richard III (1592). Cade is more than anything a rebel. Rowse conjectures that Cade's comments about writing and schooling were probably those Shakespeare had heard the workmen of Stratford-on-Avon make when he was a child.¹⁷ Cade wants to abolish learning. He will hang the clerk for being able to write his name:

Away with him, I say! Hang him with his pen and
inkhorn about his neck. (IV.ii.109-10)

However, in the attempt to make Cade look like an enemy of learning, which was still so much admired by his audience, Shakespeare creates a great anachronism when he has Cade, who died in 1450, criticize his enemies for printing books, though printing was not introduced in England until 1477:

Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of
the realm in erecting a grammar school; and whereas,
before, our forefathers had no other books but the
score and tally, thou hast caused printing to be used,
and contrary to the King, his crown, and dignity,
thou hast built a paper mill. (IV.vii.32-37)

Cade impresses one as being a madman rather than a working

man. In Richard III, the three citizens who appear in Act II, scene 3, simply discuss the fact that any change in rule is going to produce a change in society. They fear that the new king's uncles will disagree about how to run the kingdom, and feel that this will result in trouble of some sort. The citizens say what anyone would say about such a change.

Also in 1592 comes the first famous portrayal of the worker as a hero. Though one usually thinks of the apprentice in this respect, the apprentice is no more often portrayed as a soldier than is the workman. Thomas Heywood's The Four Prentices of London, has been commented on so much that readers tend to forget about other plays of that time which have apprentices as characters or include extensive fighting on stage. The four apprentices of the play are not really ordinary apprentices at all.¹⁸ They are the sons of the deposed Duke of Boulogne, and are apprenticed by their father in London. The play appeared the year after 1 Henry VI, in which the Lord Mayor of London threatened to end the fight of the warring gentry's troops by calling for clubs; the battle cry of London apprentices was "Apprentices, Apprentices, Clubs, Clubs," and the mayor of London would have been an apprentice at one time himself. In the play, Godfrey, Guy, Charles, and Eustace are apprenticed respectively to a mercer, a goldsmith, a haberdasher, and a grocer. Eustace does not like his trade, but the others manage to say something complimentary about theirs. However, when the army recruiter comes to London, they all leave their trades

and go to war, because as true nobles they would rather fight than work. The play contains more sword fights than dialogue, which may be one reason that other playwrights of the time were so critical of it. Even the brother who was dissatisfied with his trade constantly calls attention to the idea that whatever his success in battle is, he will be sure that the trade he was apprenticed to gets credit for his success, a thing that probably made the play popular with the London audience. Eustace brags about London fighters when he hears the drums of war:

Their voice is welcome! Oh, that I had with me
 As many good lads, honest Prentices
 From Eastcheap, Canwick Street, and London Stone,
 To end this battle, as could with themselves
 Under my conduct, if they knew me here;
 The doubtful day's success we need not fear.¹⁹

After winning a battle in which they were outnumbered ten to one, the four brothers resolve to hang their trophies in the halls of their respective guilds back in London. The play has no literary value, but there are at least a dozen fights in it, and if it was done by good fencers, it could have been quite a spectacle. It is the only play of its type extant; perhaps there were others which were worse, and which contained so little dialogue that there was no point in printing them.

In 1593 George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield portrays George, the yeoman who fights, and also a group of shoemakers who fight with the king who is in disguise.²⁰ But after this the fighting workmen disappear until the

knight has risen again in people's estimation and again has to be put down as something other than a fighter, as was done in Shoemaker's Holiday in 1599, and in later plays.

From 1593 to 1598 the working man is not portrayed as a fighter until he appears in Shakespeare's Henry V. However, there are no more Cades, and the rebels of Jack Straw are put down by other citizens, and Jack Straw, himself, is killed by the mayor of London.²¹ The point made in the play, The Life and Death of Jack Straw (1595), is that it is wrong for Englishmen to fight with each other:

What means those wretched miscreants
To make a spoil of their own countrymen
Unnatural rebels what so ere. (I.iii)

At the end of the play the king punishes only the leaders of the rebellion, not the common people who were led astray. He also knights the mayor of London, Sir William Walworth. Morton reports at the end that all have been pardoned but Wat Tyler and Parson Ball, "those two unnatural Englishmen" (IV.ii). The fighting here is offstage, and the message is forgiveness and peace.

In the same year, 1595, Shakespeare provides one of the few other portrayals of workmen in Midsummer Night's Dream, in which the "mechanicals" put on their play, "Pyramus and Thisbe." His portrayal of the workers is accurate, and while they are not heroic characters, they are neither evil nor cowardly. It takes nerve to put on a play like that, and they specifically take care not to offend anyone. They make

mistakes in speaking, but in the end, they manage to get the play produced. Bottom, the weaver, is often thought of as a fool, but in reality, he comes across as a rather spunky character. A realistic touch is that of making Quince, the carpenter, the head of the crew. Carpenters had to work in teams and were accustomed to bossing other people around. There has been much speculation about who Shakespeare was intending to satirize in his portrayal of the workers, but it is not important in this context.²² The working men are portrayed in a comedy as being less bright than the principals, but they are not cowards, rebels, or confidence men, as workers are sometimes portrayed after 1604.

About the time Essex began to fight the war in Ireland, the workman and the apprentice appear as fighters once more. In Shakespeare's Henry V (1598), when Henry visits his troops the night before the battle, he finds that they are worthy soldiers, and the later comic scenes with the glove merely prove their bravery. In 1599 the worker is again a hero when Rafe goes to war in Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday. From this time on the apprentice and the workman may have comic roles, and they may lack the charitableness that the knight was once famous for, as does Hodge, the blacksmith who pushes the beggars away from his friend, Cromwell, when he becomes famous, as is shown in The Life and Death of Thomas, Lord Cromwell (1602).²³ But they are not crooked until after 1604, and they are always brave when they have to be. The apprentices and the journeymen have replaced the

knight as the symbol for the fighter. At first the apprentice simply filled the need for a hero to replace the knight. However, this lengthy period in which the working man was portrayed as a hero created a backlash later. The heroics were overdone, and were satirized after 1605.

The apprentices in Heywood's later play, Edward IV (1600), are genuine London apprentices.²⁴ In this play they are brave fighters, but it is made plain that only good working apprentices are brave, the tavern haunters are worthless. It is really this play of Heywood's, not the famous Four Prentices of London, in which the apprentices of the city are portrayed as heroes. The apprentices may go unnoticed by modern readers because they are lost in the midst of the shocking story of the king's love for Jane Shore. These lines of the apprentices are from Act I, scene 4, in which the Lord Mayor, the apprentices, and other officials of London face the rebels Spicing, Falconbridge, and others at the gates of the city. Two apprentices argue with Spicing:

<u>First Ap.</u>	Then fear not us; although our chins be bare Our hearts are good: the trial shall be seen Against these rebels on this champaign green.
<u>Sec. Ap.</u>	We have no tricks nor policies of war But by the ancient customs of our fathers, We'll soundly lay it on; take't off that will: And London prentices, be ruled by me; Die ere ye lose fair London's liberty.
<u>Spicing</u>	How now, my flat-caps; are you grown so brave? 'Tis but your words: when matters come to proof, You'll scud as 'twere a company of sheep. My counsel therefore is to keep your shops. "What lack you" better will beseem your mouths

First Ap. Than terms of war. In sooth, you are too young.
 Sirrah, go to: you shall not find it so.
 Flat-caps thou call'st us. We scorn not
 the name,
 And shortly, by the virtue of our swords,
 We'll make your cap so fit unto your crown,
 As sconce and cap and all shall kiss the
 ground. (I.iv)

Spicing has hurled two insults at them. "What lack
 you?" was the equivalent of "May I help you?" from a sales-
 man of today. The term "flat-cap" referred to the student
 cap that apprentices wore, the origin of which is explained
 by Dekker's Candido in the play Honest Whore II, and will not
 be discussed until that play is discussed. The second
 apprentice makes a lengthy speech which clearly spells out
 the conflict between the peaceable citizens and the warlike
 country gentlemen, who to the city dwellers appear to be more
 tavern brawlers than effective soldiers:

You are those desperate, idle, swaggering mates,
 That haunt the suburbs in the time of peace,
 And raise up ale-house brawls in the street;
 And when the rumor of the war begins,
 You hide your heads, and are not to be found.
 Thou term'st it better that we keep our shops.
 'Tis good indeed we should have such a care,
 But yet, for all our keeping now and then,
 Your pilfering fingers break into our locks,
 Until at Tyburn you acquit the fault.
 Go to: albeit by custom we are mild,
 As those that do profess civility,
 Yet, being moved, a nest of angry hornets
 Shall not be more offensive than we will. (I.iv)

The apprentice says that the patient citizen should not be
 underrated by the country gentleman, the citizen can fight
 when he has to. He also accuses the gentry of cheating the
 shopkeepers. He is proud of his own "civility" which is the

city virtue, equivalent to the gentleman's "courtesy."
 These apprentices, with Matthew Shore as Captain, venture beyond the walls of London to Mile End, and drive off the rebels. The grateful king wants to knight Shore along with the other leaders, but Shore, the goldsmith who has not yet been cuckolded by the king, declines the honor. As with the pinner of Wakefield, the goldsmith of London has only the most noble reasons for declining the honor of knighthood:

Pardon, my gracious lord.
 I do not stand contemptuous or despising
 Such royal favor of my sovereign,
 But to acknowledge my unworthiness.
 Far be it from the thought of Matthew Shore
 That he should be advanced with Aldermen,
 With our Lord Mayor, and our right grave Recorder.
 (II.ii)

Ironically, the king agrees to honor him in some other way, before he has met Shore's wife, whom he later seduces. The play makes the brave apprentice someone important. Others in the future show apprentices as students or young lovers, but the apprentice warrior caused too much satiric comment in later years to be taken seriously again.

Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday probably actually appeared a year before Heywood's Edward IV, in 1599, not 1600. In it the working man who is a hero is not an apprentice but a journeyman.²⁵ He is a simple, honest worker who gets drafted, goes to war, is wounded, and comes home to find that while he has no trouble getting his old job back, he cannot find his wife because she is no longer living among the shoemakers;

she has been run off by the quarrelsome wife of Simon Eyre. This play presents some difficult problems in the characterization of the working man and the working woman, as well as of the gentleman. Dekker's characters are likeable people, but there are currents in the play which make a modern reader wonder how Dekker could write it and stay out of jail. Perhaps the fact that it is simply an excellent play, and the fact that it carries a message of love and forgiveness is what prevented objections to it. It asks the audience to admire the brave journeyman who goes to war, but also asks them to accept and forgive the gentleman who does not go, Lacy. Lacy actually had travelled to Holland, squandered his money, taken up the trade of shoemaker there, and returned to London in disguise just about the time the war began. He replaces Rafe, the journeyman, in Simon Eyre's shop, and works while poor Rafe is off getting wounded. Lacy (alias Hans) is in love with Rose Oteley, daughter of the Lord Mayor of London, and neither Lacy's uncle, the Earl of Lincoln, nor the Lord Mayor approves of the cross-class match. So Lacy stays home from the war to try to sneak into the Lord Mayor's house as a shoemaker, and Rafe goes to war while his wife stays home and works as a seamstress. At the end of the play the king makes peace between all of them, and ironically enough knights young Lacy for not going to war. The king praises Lacy's love for Rose, and tells the Earl how he feels about it:

Besides, your nephew for her sake did stoop
 To bare necessity, and, as I hear,
 Forgetting honors, and all courtly pleasures,
 To gain her love became a shoemaker.
 As for the honor which he lost in France,
 Thus I redeem it: Lacy, kneel thee down! (V.v.107-12)

Lacy is knighted, and the message to him is one of love and forgiveness. But Rafe is told by his fellow shoemakers that he should be glad that it was his leg that was wounded and not his arm, because at least he can go on working as a shoemaker, with his hands. He gets his wife back in the nick of time, just as she is about to marry Hammon, the man who finally convinced her that Rafe was lost in the war. There were later playwrights who satirized this play for its "excessively democratic" ideas, among them Beaumont and Fletcher in The Knight of the Burning Pestle (1607). However, Rafe and his Jane are not even present at the banquet at the end of the play; their meeting is even marred by the offer which her gentleman suitor, Hammon, makes to Rafe to give him £20 in gold for her. Rafe is properly indignant:

Sirrah, Hammon, Hammon, dost think a shoemaker is
 so base to be a bawd to his own wife for commodity?
 Take thy gold, choke with it! Were I not lame, I
 would make thee eat thy words. (V.ii.82-85)

Rafe and Jane come across as the two finest characters created in the portrayal of the working people of London in all of the plays of Dekker; and in Rafe the common man as a warrior reaches his peak. After that, the questions of money and poverty reappear, and the plays at the end of the century

turn from war to the problems of economy which led to the passage of the new Poor Laws. There are apprentices who fight well in Edward IV (1600), and Grim, the collier, in The Lovesick King (1603), who leads 700 miners into battle for his king, but the stories do not create individual heroes who are attractive as is Rafe, the journeyman who missed the big banquet his master gave in Shoemaker's Holiday.

Three more characterizations of apprentices are important before the end of the reign of Elizabeth I. First is Club in The Family of Love (1602), second is Clem in The Fair Maid of the West, I, (1603), and third is the group of apprentices who work for the linen draper, Candido, in The Honest Whore, I (1604). Club is the first really comic apprentice. He delivers some of the wittiest lines in the play.²⁶ His first speech pokes fun at the stylish oath, "As I am a gentleman," an oath which is satirized many times in later plays:

Their first oath was by the mass; and that they have sworn quite away: then came they to their faith, as, by my faith 'tis so; that in a short time was sworn away too, for no man believes now more than 'a sees; then they swore by their honesties; and that, mistress, you know is sworn quite away: after their honesties was gone, then came their gentility, and swore as they were a gentleman: and their gentility they swore away so fast that they had almost sworn away all the ancient gentry out of the land; which, indeed, are scarce missed, for that yeomen and farmers' sons, with the help of a few Welshmen, have undertook to supply their places: that at the last they came to silver, and their oath was by the cross of this silver; and swore so fast upon that, that now they have scarce left them a cross for to swear by. (I.ii)

The speech from The Family of Love (1602) is important because the oath "As I am a gentleman" is twisted and turned in every imaginable way by later playwrights in the years when the "new men" of James I's reign were scoffed at. Club has other good lines but is less a central figure than Clem in Fair Maid of the West (1603). Clem is only fourteen years old when Bess Bridges buys out his master, a tavern keeper, and takes over Clem's apprenticeship.²⁷ He proves to be a faithful apprentice, but is really a handy device for the playwright, who has him fall out of the rigging of the ship when they travel to Turkey and unwittingly agree to be gelded when the Turkish ruler offers to make him head of the harem; young Clem does not know what a eunuch is. Some later plays also have apprentices in similar comic roles, and they are believable roles at a time when many young people were being apprenticed at early ages, after 1598. On the other hand, the group of apprentices who work in the linen shop of Candido in The Honest Whore (1604) are older, and a bunch of "nice guys."²⁸ They try to help their master but when he finally disguises himself as an apprentice, they cannot prevent his getting beaten. They could be brave, but they had no power.

Candido is a merchant; the merchant took apprentices as did the artisan. The portrayal of the merchant follows a path similar to that of the workman and the apprentice, but there are some differences. The merchant is never pictured as being rather stupid as are the artisans in Shakespeare's

Midsummer Night's Dream. The merchant is usually suspected of being too fond of making money. He starts out being portrayed as a crook, but his devotion to his country in giving his ships to fight the Armada in 1588, and his generosity with his money when the poor need it in 1598, gradually redeem him in the eyes of the playwrights and the audience. The merchant reaches his zenith as Simon Eyre in Shoemaker's Holiday and as Candido in The Honest Whore.

The first play to begin the shift in attitude towards success in business is Wilson's Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (1588), the morality play which celebrated the defeat of the Armada. The judge finally gives Lady Lucre, now reformed, to Honest Industry to be dressed for her marriage to Lord Pomp, but Lady Conscience still cannot find it in her heart to condone Usury, though the law made the charging of interest legal already in 1571. Usury tells Lady Lucre: "The law allows me, madam, in some sort" (p. 426). Finally, Policy marries Lady Conscience and convinces her that ten percent interest is all right. They agree to brand Usury with a "£," a "C" containing an "x," meaning that only 10 is allowed on 100. Policy explains this:

And know that London's pomp is not sustained by
usury,
But by well-ventured merchandise and honest
industry. (p. 482)

It took a little while for that idea to catch on.

Shakespeare gives us one of the first honorable merchants in the merchant, Antonio, in The Merchant of Venice,

in 1594. He is one of the first of the merchants who risk everything on the high seas. He is pictured as a good man, not a usurer, one who deals honorably with everyone, and one who does not charge interest for a loan. R. Mark Benbow has pointed out that Antonio not only habitually risks his fortune on the high seas for profit, but here he generously risks it for his friend, Bassanio, when he expects no profit.²⁹ It is probably this portrayal of Antonio, the merchant who should be given praise, even sympathy, for taking risks that leads such Marxist critics as Donald Morrow to say that "Shakespeare consistently sides with the commercial class."³⁰ Antonio, who cosigns his friend's note with the money lender, Shylock, is the first merchant hero who becomes a person to the audience, not a mere morality allegory for a nasty usurer or a generous alms giver. The risks the merchant takes are made believable, both those of his ships at sea, and those of cosigning notes. One remembers that Shakespeare's own father lost considerable money on notes he cosigned.

The characterization of the merchant moves from one point to another between the risk taker of Merchant of Venice (1594) to the patient citizen of The Honest Whore (1604). In Englishman for my Money (1598) we find that the merchant who is less than good is a Portuguese man who married an English woman and had three daughters.³¹ He has a fleet of thirty-two ships at sea, but feels he must be a money lender as well. Three young Englishmen, Harvey,

Ferdinand, and Ned, have mortgaged their lands to him while courting his daughters, and hope to get the girls in marriage and their lands back at the same time. This is also the hope of the girls. Helped by their good schoolmaster, Anthony, the girls have their way in the end, but not before we get a good look at the Dutch, French, and Italian merchants whom the father wants the girls to marry. The girls rate their foreign lovers, who sound as if the lands they come from had already acquired the reputations they have today. The Dutchman is the worst lover, he wants to talk business; the Frenchman is the next worst, he talks about his other girl friends; and the Italian is the best, he tells myths about loves among the gods and a few bawdy stories as well. The merchant here begins to take on a personality. If he is not very good, he is a foreigner, and his function as a salesman is not well understood by the playwright.

Next comes Simon Eyre of Shoemaker's Holiday (1599). Simon would be at home with "Babbitt" at a convention anywhere today. He wakes up everybody in the house with his early morning bellow. When his workmen insist, after meeting Lacy disguised as Hans, that they really need another hand and Eyre should hire him, he does not want to at first. Hodge, the foreman, has to stage a two speech strike to convince the boss. Hodge starts out the door, saying:

If such a man as he cannot find work,
Hodge is not for you. (I.v.55-6)

Firk, the second man echoes his sentiments: "If Roger

removes, Firk follows" (I.iv.59). Eyre gives in. Dekker's Simon Eyre is a fine piece of characterization. Eyre never says one word when two can be crammed in, but his sentences are short and staccato, and full of braggadocio about his craft and his men, and of praise for the value of work itself. When Jane asks him what she is to do while Rafe is gone, he tells her:

Let me see thy hand, Jane. This fine hand, this
white hand, these pretty fingers must spin, must
card, must work; work, you bombast cotton-candle-
queen; work for your living, with a pox to you.
(I.i.208-12)

Indeed, Simon Eyre is finally called "Mad Simon" (not too different from "Mad Man Muntz," the used car salesman of recent times) by the king himself, who tells him that he would not change a bit of him; he likes his new Lord Mayor just as he is, enthusiasm and all. Eyre was a little cautious about meeting the king, especially after his wife, Margery, warned him a little earlier: "Good my lord, have a care what you speak to his Grace" (V.iv.45). Her line brought on a two-hundred-word tirade in which Simon informed her that he knew how to "speak to a Pope, to Sultan Soliman, to Tamburlaine, an he were here, and shall I melt, shall I droop before my sovereign?" (V.iv.46-57). Simon Eyre is hardly the type of merchant who is going to become the patient citizen of most of the London comedies that follow. In the play Dekker manipulates the convention of having only the gentry speak poetry by having all the lines of

love appear in blank verse as well. In a great speech at the end of the play, Simon vacillates back and forth between the poetry of a gentleman and the prose of a workman, while he tells the king why he is giving his big breakfast for the apprentices of London. Like the lovers, when he speaks of love, either for his fellow man or his sovereign, he speaks poetry; love makes him a gentleman as it does Lacy a knight:

For, an't please your highness, in time past,
 I bare the water-tankard, and my coat
 Sits not a whit the worse upon my back;
 And then upon a morning some mad boys,
 It was Shrove Tuesday, even as 'tis now,
 Gave me my breakfast, and I swore then by the stopple
 of my tankard, if ever I came to be Lord Mayor of
 London, I would feast all the prentices. This day,
 my liege, I did it, and the slaves had an hundred
 tables five times covered; they are gone home and
 vanished.

Yet add more honor to the Gentle Trade,
 Taste of Eyre's banquet, Simon's happy made.
 (V.v.175-84)

The next step in the creation of the typical London merchant is Deliro of Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humor, also of 1599. Deliro's humor is to be too lenient with and enamoured of his wife. When he created Deliro and his Fallace, Jonson had not caught on to the fact that the well dressed, pretty wife of the shopkeeper was part of the advertising process. In Act II, scene 3, we meet Deliro, the merchant; Fallace, his wife; and Fastidious Brisk, the courtier whom Fallace dotes on. Deliro is spreading flowers and incense in his shop so that his wife will consent to enter it; she has complained about the bad odor there.

When she enters, she insists that cut flowers do not smell like growing flowers, and says that he should have left them in the garden. The scholar, Macilente, tries to tell Deliro that he is being too obsequious, but Deliro is convinced that his wife is the peak of perfection, and will not listen to advice. In Act II we learn what kind of man intrigues Fallace by what she says to Deliro:

Alas, you're simple, you: you cannot change,
 Look pale at pleasure, and then red with wonder:
 (II.iii.1667-68)

It is the courtier, Fastidious Brisk, who has caught her eye. She admires his fancy clothes and his line which can be adapted to any change of mind of a lady. In Act IV she is still pining for the courtier and her husband hires musicians to cheer her up, but she says that they play out of tune. We finally learn, when Macilente, the scholar, argues with Deliro about it, that Deliro's wife is a gentlewoman by birth who manages to hold this class difference over his head. Deliro finally takes Fastidious to court over the money he owes him, and Fastidious goes to jail. Fallace goes there to pay his bail, and her husband sees her kiss Fastidious and so is finally convinced that she at least has a crush on him. This is Jonson's portrayal of the citizen and his wife. The wife dotes on a courtier who visits the shop and the citizen is a cuckold who does not know what his wife is doing. The cuckolded merchant became a staple on the stage for a long time. The fact that merchants deliberately

stationed their beautiful, well dressed wives in their shops to lure customers inside (sex in advertising) did not become apparent to the populace at first, but was important later. Perhaps it was one of the well-kept secrets of the mystery of the trade of merchant, and no merchant's apprentices became playwrights. It is unlikely that Jonson would have refrained from mentioning it out of politeness, as he constantly criticized the merchants.

In 1600 the merchants who appear in plays are Matthew Shore in Edward IV and Villiers in The Weakest Goeth to the Wall. Shore was a difficult person to characterize; it is hard to make a hero out of the husband of the beautiful woman who becomes mistress of the king. Heywood portrays him as a man heading the force of citizens who won a war for the king, and then as one who declines the honor of knighthood. Shore tries to help his wife when he realizes that the king wants her, only to have her abducted on a day when he is absent from his shop. He retains his dignity by leaving the country, and in Act V, scene 4, he watches Jane at the waterfront as she dispenses pardons and refuses to accept money for her kindness. Jane is a good citizen; she refuses to help the courtier, Rufman, who wants to ship corn overseas, criticizing him for his lack of regard for the welfare of his country. Jane sees Shore and begs to be allowed to go with him, but he will not let her. In Edward IV, II, both Matthew and Jane die of broken hearts. It makes good drama, though it was not good history; Jane outlived her

royal lover by about thirty years. Heywood does a good job with a difficult topic, and we see part of the origin of the tale of the cuckolded merchant so common in the drama a few years later. The merchant is technically a commoner, and defenseless against a nobleman who wants his wife, if the man in question is not honorable enough to respect the marriage. The moral lesson of the two plays about Edward IV, which are really about Matthew and Jane Shore, is stated by Shore:

Oh, what have I beheld? Were I as young
As when I came to London to be 'prentice
This pageant were sufficient to instruct
And teach me ever after to be wise. (IV.i)

The apprentice in the audience is not only supposed to glory in the brave apprentices who fight for London, but is to learn the value of good morals from the play.

In The Weakest Goeth to the Wall (1600) the merchant, Villiers, helps Oriana and Diana, wife and daughter of the Duke of Boulogne, when they attempt to flee to England.³² His intentions are honorable; he wants to marry the beautiful gentlewoman. His good deeds are rewarded when the Duke is again in a position to reward good deeds, and Oriana explains that she posed as a widow only in order to be able to handle her own business affairs while her deposed husband was not there to sign papers for the lease on the property where she and her daughter lived. This good hearted merchant is rewarded for helping the homeless Oriana and Diana.

But in 1602 we find an early example of the many portrayals of merchants and their wives who are consistently

immoral in their relations with courtiers, and who have making money as the sole object of their lives. Middleton's The Family of Love (1602) is a famous play, though not a very good one. When he wrote it he had recently left Cambridge in order to help his mother fight a lawsuit against his stepfather, who appeared to be trying to cheat her out of her money.³³ The play may be in part a reflection of his own introduction to business in London rather than a satire of any religious sect. There was no particular upsurge of either the activities of the Puritans or of the Family of Love at this time. The play has often been misjudged in the past because it was thought to have been written in 1606, after the Family of Love and the Puritans had made petitions to James I in 1604. Julia G. Ebel points out that George Gifford's famous sermon against the Family of Love was first printed in 1596 and again in 1599.³⁴ But those dates seem remote from the writing of the play, especially since Middleton was not living in London for several years immediately before he wrote the play. Though the play cannot be considered seriously as satire of religious sects, it can be considered seriously as satire of London merchants. Richard Levin is more to the point when he points out that Purge, the apothecary, admits that he exploits his wife's charms to attract customers.³⁵ However, an apothecary is hardly a major merchant, and Dryfat is the merchant in this play. Dryfat is also the person who Purge thinks is carrying on an affair with Mrs. Purge, before he realizes that the gallants,

Lipsalve and Gudgeon, are attending Family of Love meetings in the hope of picking up lovers. Dryfat is satirized as the Puritan merchant who is so stingy with his alms that the Poor Law of 1601 had to be passed. Dryfat makes his position clear when he says:

First, I live in charity, and give small alms
to such as be not of the right sect: I take
under twenty on the hundred, nor no forfeiture
of bonds unless the law tell my conscience I
may do it. (III.iii)

But Purge's family is really the "family of love." It is the family that uses the lure of love to get the courtier inside the shop. We see just where this gets Purge when he ends up seducing his own wife at a meeting of the religious sect. Dryfat is not a bad sort as Puritan merchants go, and even helps the young lovers, Gerardine and Maria, who cannot get her uncle to let them marry, though his solution, the idea that they should say she is pregnant, is hardly noble. Dryfat is not really a very good person, but the apothecary, Purge, who uses his wife to lure customers into the shop and then follows her to Family of Love meetings to make sure that she is not two-timing him, is an even less attractive person.

In Edward IV Heywood has his apprentices mention the difference between the patient or peaceable merchant and the warlike or quarrelsome gentleman. Dekker, in the subplot of The Honest Whore, I (1604), develops a character who lives the role so well that anyone can see the difference.

Candido is a linen draper, a member of one of the "Twelve

Worshipful Companies" of London. Viola is his wife and Fustigo is her brother. Viola is not dishonest, but she wants her husband to think that she is because he is too patient; he never gets angry with either her or anyone else. She has her brother pretend to be her lover so that she can manage to get a jealous reaction from Candido. Candido remains patient. He is an important man in London, a member of the Common Council; he could be forgiven for standing on his rights now and then. But Candido thinks he knows what is the source of his success; he is an early believer in the motto, "The customer is always right." In Act I he states his motto in the language of his day:

Oh, he that means to thrive with patient eye
Must please the devil if he comes to buy. (I.iv.127-28)

With this motto in mind, Candido tells three courtiers who deliberately try his patience by making him sell them one inch of lawn from the middle of a bolt of cloth to come back again. Viola has Candido put into Bedlam as a madman. However, in Bedlam there is a merchant who actually is insane; he lost five ships at sea to the gunboats of the Turks and now keeps himself wrapped in fishnet as if he were a fish in the ocean. The Duke visits Bedlam and decides that Candido is not so crazy after all; the crazy man is the one who lets things get him down. However, the Duke is puzzled by the attitude of Candido, and asks him: "What comfort do you find in being so calm?" (V.ii.487). Candido makes a long speech about patience, part of which reads:

That which green wounds receive from sovereign balm.
 Patience, my Lord; why 'tis the soul of peace:
 Of all the virtues 'tis neerest kin to heaven.
 It makes men look like Gods; the best of men
 That 'ere wore earth about him was a sufferer,
 A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit,
 The first true Gentleman that ever breathed;
 The stock of Patience then cannot be poor . . .
 'Tis the perpetual prisoner's liberty:
 His walks and Orchards: 'tis the bond slave's
 freedom.
 It is the beggar's music, and thus sings,
 Although their bodies beg, their souls are kings.
 (V.ii.488-507)

The Duke compliments him on his attitude and adds:

Come therefore, you shall teach our court to shine,
 So calm a spirit is worth a golden mine,
 Wives with meek husbands that to vex them long
 In Bedlam must they dwell, else dwell they wrong.
 (V.ii.514-17)

In 1604 the merchant has triumphed. The patience of the citizen is a virtue, the journeyman is a hero, the apprentice is a man of many roles, and the knight is a thing of the past. The patient citizen appears again and again until the final closing of the theaters in 1642. His patience is sometimes praised and sometimes mocked. The knight, the apprentice, the workman, and the merchant appear in roles clearly related to the wars and the work laws in the plays written between 1588 and 1604, and the contrast between the patient citizen and the warlike countryman is made plain through them.

The merchant's wife, or citizen's wife, becomes an important character later, and so will be discussed briefly here. She develops from Florilla, the Puritan, to Viola,

the shrew. In Chapman's An Humorous Day's Mirth (1599) Florilla is the Puritan wife whose husband believes that she is dishonest.³⁶ He is actually quite wrong; she is a serious Puritan who is so busy practicing her religion that she has no time to flirt. Her husband finally learns this. Then Dekker, in Shoemaker's Holiday (1599), gives us both Margery, the shrewish wife of Simon Eyre, and Jane, the beautiful but humble and hard working wife of Rafe, the soldier. Jonson, in Every Man Out of His Humor (1599), presents Fallace, the shallow wife of the doting Deliro. In The Weakest Goeth to the Wall (1600) there is the honest wife who pretends to be a widow for business reasons. In Dekker's Patient Grissill (1600) we find the humble wife who endures all insults to convince her noble husband that she is worthy. In Edward IV (1600) there is Jane Shore, the exact opposite, who becomes mistress of the king. Patient Grissill is interesting in one respect; at the end of the play she must perform the chore which is becoming a symbol of patience and humility, that of carrying logs. Both she and her brother are carrying logs, but on seeing that the marquess is watching them, the brother, Laureo, the poor scholar, throws his logs down. Her husband makes Grissill carry off the extra logs but finally ends his trial of her character and accepts her as a worthy wife. She has proved her virtue.

After this we find most often portrayed the wife of the merchant and the problems that her role as saleswoman leads to. In Poetaster (1601) Jonson has Crispinus (Marston)

describe the city wives, but he does not seem to have caught on yet to the salesmanship function of the beautiful, well dressed ladies of the shops.³⁷ Here Crispinus talks to

Horace:

Crisp. I do make verses, when I come in such a street as this: Oh, your city ladies, you shall have them sit in every shop like the Muses--offering you the castalian dewes, and the thespian liquors, to as many as have but the sweet grace and audacity to--sip of their lips. Did you never hear of my verses:

Horace No sir (but I am in some fear, I must now.)

Crisp. I'll tell thee some (if I can recover them) I composed even now of a dressing, I saw a jeweler's wife wear, who indeed was a jewel herself: I prefer that kind of tire now, what's thy opinion, Horace?

Horace With your silver bodkin, it does well, sir.

Crisp. I cannot tell, but it stirs me more than all your court curls, or your spangles, or your tricks . . . (III.i.42-60)

Jonson has noticed what the ladies wear, and knows that Marston has too, but considers the costumes to be a method of seduction, not advertising. In The Family of Love (1602) Mrs. Purge did not really carry on a love affair with the merchant, Dryfat, or the gallants, Lipsalve and Gudgeon; the man she picked up at the Family of Love meeting was her own husband. It was his own fault for using her as he did. The advertising function of the shopkeeper's wife is mentioned in different plays in different ways and satirized by Middleton again in Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611), and Fletcher mentions it in The Fair Maid of the Inn (1625), which will be discussed later. Perhaps it was simply more conducive to convenient plotting to present the merchant's

wife as someone who prefers the relaxed, smooth talking gallant to her tired husband, than to treat her as a saleswoman. Perhaps Middleton was the only one who really understood the system. Middleton had an affinity for city life that few of the other playwrights had, and spent the last years of his career writing city pageants rather than plays. Perhaps the fact that he came from a well-off citizen family explains this. His own mother came close to being cheated by her travelling second husband, so perhaps Middleton had a bit of sympathy for the ladies.

The characterization of the scholar is a different matter. It seems to be related not to the laws of the time but to the presence or absence of active boy companies of actors in London. Nobody has been able to prove this to my satisfaction, but no one has disproved it either. There is no particular connection between the portrayal of scholars and the changes in the laws other than the appearance of the poor scholar as the brother of Grissill in the play of 1600, two years after the law of 1598 specifically ended the right of scholars to beg. Laureo, the scholar brother, will work but takes umbrage when the marquess watches him at the lowly chore of carrying logs. Attempts have been made to connect Shakespeare's scholars, such as Holofernes, to such public figures as Richard Mulcaster, headmaster of St. Paul's near the end of the century, because Mulcaster's writing tends to euphuism.³⁸ However, a great deal of writing in 1581, when his books were published, tended to be euphuistic, and since

the matter is not connected with law, it does not seem worthwhile to pursue it further. The character of the scholar seems to depend on the needs of the plot.

This seems true of the gentleman also, until the end of the period, when he begins to be seen as a threat to the happy home of the merchant. However, none of the gentleman are very admirable; they dodge going to war, flirt with the merchants' wives, and try to make the merchants angry.

The heir, the Puritan, the usurer, and the beggar do not appear often between 1588 and 1604. The heir is an heiress who is being married for her money, but who does not object so long as she gets the man she wants. The grasping heir does not appear until a later time. The Puritan is not yet a problem to the populace. The usurer has been accepted so long as he charges ten percent. The beggar is supposed to be cared for by the poor laws rather than by alms.

These plays show the rise of the merchant in the estimation of the populace, the decline of the knight in public favor, the appearance of the apprentice as a hero in war, the similar rise of the working man, the slight decline of the apprentice when the Poor Laws made it obligatory to apprentice poor children to the less desirable trades, the development of the character of the merchant's wife, and the incidental use of scholars and gentlemen as characters in the plays. The portrayal of these characters is heavily influenced by the passage between 1597 and 1601 of the Work Laws, Vagabond Laws, and Poor Laws. While it is possible

that some differences could be accounted for by the fact that different playwrights wrote for rival companies, nearly all of the plays discussed here were presented in the popular theaters.

The plays in this period are not just a group of dramas that present courageous apprentices and cowardly knights. They demonstrate the growth of the ability of the playwrights to create new character types while presenting material which is related to problems of the day. Jonson's humor characters in Every Man Out of His Humor provided later playwrights with a pattern to follow in the creation of types which could demonstrate good and bad personality traits without resorting to the allegories of the morality plays. The last plays of this period are often very good characterizations of types of people found in London at that time, and Shoemaker's Holiday and The Honest Whore I are worthwhile dramas about contemporary problems and provide portrayals of businessmen which are still believable today.

Here we have observed a series of plays which move from the influences of war to the influences of the market place. In the next period, the major passion is work, because the wars are over and the country is overrun with beggars of many varieties. The interest in work which has begun to appear between 1588 and 1604 becomes an obsession between 1605 and 1615.

NOTES

¹ G. W. Prothero, ed., Statutes and Constitutional Documents: 1558-1625, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), 39 & 40 Eliz. C. III, An act for the relief of the poor, p. 96; 39 & 40 Eliz. C. IV, An act for the punishment of rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars, p. 100; 39 & 40 Eliz. C. V, An act for erecting hospitals or abiding and working houses for the poor, p. 102; all of 1597-98; and 43 & 44 Eliz. C. II, An act for the relief of the poor, p. 103.

² A. L. Rowse, William Shakespeare: A Biography (London: Macmillan, 1963), p. 264.

³ George Burton Adams and H. Morse Stephens, eds., Select Documents of English Constitutional History (New York: Macmillan, 1901), p. 153. The reference is to 1390, a law of Richard II, "Statute of Maintenance and Liveries."

⁴ A Merry Knack to Know a Knave, in Select Collection of Old Plays, eds. J. Payne Collier and W. Carew Hazlitt (London: Reeves and Turner, 1874-76), VI, p. 549.

⁵ William Shakespeare, 1 Henry VI, in The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, et al (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

All quotations from this and other plays by Shakespeare are from this edition, and their locations will be cited and noted parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

⁶ Robert Greene (?), George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield, in Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas, ed. Joseph Quincy Adams (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), pp. 691-712, p. 712.

⁷ Robert Wilson, The Cobbler's Prophecy, in Collections, The Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: The University Press, 1914).

All quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

⁸ Rowse, p. 276.

⁹ Ben Jonson, Every Man Out of His Humor, in Materials for the Study of Old English Drama (Louvain: Uystpruyst, 1907; rpt. Vaduz Reprints, 1963).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁰ Josiah H. Penniman, ed. and introd., Jonson's Poet-aster and Dekker's Satiromastix, in The Belles Lettres Series (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1913), pp. lii, lvi.

¹¹ Henry Porter, Two Angry Women of Abingdon, in Percy Society's Kind Heart's Dream and Other Works (London: T. Richards, 1841).

¹² Robert Wilson, Anthony Munday, Michael Drayton, and Thomas Hathaway, The Life of Sir John Oldcastle, in The Malone Society Reprints, eds. Percy Simpson and W. W. Greg (Chiswick, Engl.: The Press, Charles Whittingham, 1908).

¹³ Thomas Dekker, Patient Grissill, in Thomas Dekker's Dramatic Works, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1953), I.

¹⁴ George Chapman, Sir Giles Goosecap, in The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies, ed. T. M. Parrott (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961), II.

¹⁵ Thomas Middleton, Blurt, Master Constable, in The Works of Thomas Middleton, ed. A. H. Bullen (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885), I.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁶ Robert Wilson, Three Lords and Three Ladies of London, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, 4th ed., eds. R. Dodsley and W. Carew Hazlitt, notes J. Payne Collier (London: Reeves and Turner, 1876), VI.

The locations of subsequent quotations are noted parenthetically in the text by page number as there is not an act or scene division.

¹⁷ Rowse, p. 89.

¹⁸ Thomas Heywood, Four Prentices of London, Microfilm, (London: 1615), (University Microfilm 22937, Carton 774).

¹⁹ Four Prentices, Microfilm, no pagination or division.

²⁰ Robert Greene, George a Greene, pp. 691-712.

- 21 George Peele (?), The Life and Death of Jack Straw (Ann Arbor: University Microfilm, 15592, STC 23477).
Quotations from this, which has no pagination, are noted parenthetically in the text by act and scene number.
- 22 David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 16-17.
This and other sources suggest that Shakespeare is satirizing the traveling troupes of actors, the Lord Mayor's pageants, the boy actors of London, the possible marriage of Elizabeth I to a foreigner, and the like.
- 23 Thomas, Lord Cromwell, in The Ancient British Drama (London: William Miller, 1810), I.
- 24 Thomas Heywood, Edward IV, in The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV, ed. Barron Field, esq. (London: The Shakespeare Society, 1842).
Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.
- 25 Thomas Dekker, The Shoemaker's Holiday, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (London: Cambridge University Press, 1953), I.
Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.
- 26 Thomas Middleton, The Family of Love, in The Works of Thomas Middleton, ed. A. H. Bullen (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935), III.
Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.
- 27 Thomas Heywood, The Fair Maid of the West, in Regents' Renaissance Drama, ed. Robert K. Turner, Jr. (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967).
- 28 Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton, The Honest Whore, I, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1953), II.
Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.
- 29 R. Mark Benbow, "The Merchant, Antonio, Elizabethan Hero," Colby Library Quarterly, 12 (1976), 156-70.
- 30 Donald Morrow, Where Shakespeare Stood (Milwaukee: Casanova Press, 1935), p. 28.
- 31 William Haughton, Englishman for My Money, in The Malone Society Reprints (Oxford: University Press, 1912).

32 The Weakest Goeth to the Wall, in The Malone Society Reprints, ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford: University Press, 1912).

33 P. G. Phillips, "Middleton's Early Contact With the Law," Studies in Philology, 52 (1955), 2, 186-194.

34 Julia G. Ebel, "The Family of Love: Sources of Its History in England," Huntington Library Quarterly, 30 (1966-67), 4, 331-43.

35 Richard Levin, "The Family of Lust and The Family of Love," in Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966), 2, 309-22.

36 George Chapman, An Humorous Day's Mirth, in The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies, I, ed. T. M. Parrott (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961).

37 Ben Jonson, Poetaster, in Jonson's Poetaster and Dekker's Satiromastix, The Belles Lettres Series, ed. Josiah Penniman (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1913).

It is generally agreed that Crispinus represents Marston.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text by act and scene number.

38 Richard L. DeMolen, "Richard Mulcaster: An Elizabethan Savant," Shakespeare Studies, 8 (1975), 29-82.

CHAPTER V

1605-1615: WORK AND ITS REWARDS

The period between 1605 and 1615 encompasses the first part of the reign of James I, and the time between his accession and the ending of the "addled parliament" which met briefly in 1614. During this time two laws were passed which were important to the content of the drama. First was the repeal of the sumptuary law in 1604.¹ It is of primary importance to Eastward Ho (1605), and of minor importance to a number of other plays. Second was the passage of the last of the vagabond-poor-work laws in 1609-1610.² It is of major importance to several plays, most notably Shakespeare's The Tempest (1611), Middleton's puzzling A Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611-13), and Jonson's Bartholomew Fair (1614). It is of some importance to several other plays in which working is contrasted with begging and other relevant things. Also important is the delayed understanding of the intent of the Poor Law of 1601. The law of 1598 had said that parents had to support their children; the law of 1601 amended the passage to read: "the father and grandfather, and the mother and grandmother."³ This law is an influence in the plays which show relatives of young gentlemen casting them out to live by their wits. The law of 1609-1610 tightened up the

previous regulations, setting a penalty for the failure to build a workhouse, limiting begging to that done by shipwrecked sailors, and permitting justices of the peace to search out the idle and vagrant.⁴

This period of time, 1605-1615, is also when one can tell most certainly which plays were written for the popular theater and which were written for the coterie theater. It is therefore interesting to note particular differences in the roles assigned to various characters in the plays written for the two presumably different audiences. A study of the plays reveals that there is only one remarkable difference, and that this is in the portrayal of the citizen's wife. With rare exceptions, the knight is portrayed as a negative character in both theaters. The apprentice and the workman are given a variety of roles in both theaters. The scholar is generally not pictured positively in either theater. Only in the portrayals of the citizen's wife is there a difference between the two theaters. The wife is never satirized in the popular theater. She is not often portrayed, but when she appears she is neither unfaithful nor a shrew. The satire of the social climbing wife of the citizen, the wife who flirted with courtiers, appears only in the plays of the coterie theater. Perhaps the citizen's wife rarely attended such productions. The ladies of the Court may have been jealous of the city ladies, especially after the repeal of the sumptuary laws enabled wealthy city women to wear the same fancy clothing as the Court ladies wore.

Some general statements about character portrayal on the whole in all of the plays can be made. In this period of time, 1605-1615, the apprentice is no longer a hero and not often a student. He is usually portrayed as an accepted part of the working community, and is assigned many different types of roles. He is a prince in disguise, he is a gentleman's son apprenticed in London, he is the faithful helper of his master, he is the conniving cheater of his master. The roles fit into the plays realistically, or in accordance with accepted legends in historical plays. The apprentice is no longer a stopgap used when no other character will fit into the part. In Eastward Ho (1605) Jonson, Chapman, and Marston present him as a student, but after that time he is usually a worker, though often one who is brighter than average. He can be lazy, he can be dishonest; one is falsely accused of being the bawd of his master's wife; but there is no formula with which the roles are set up. One in Eastward Ho (1605) decides to mend his bad habits and one in The City Gallant (1614) does the same. In both cases they find the blue student gown of the apprentice more attractive than the yellow uniform of the jailbird.

The merchant of the early plays of this period is still the heroic merchant of the previous period, the risk taker. Later plays begin to show him as a selfish money hoarder, though not the stock usurer. He has more realistic and inventive ways of making money than that. The portrayal of the merchant slowly travels a downhill track after a year or

two of kindly treatment at the hands of the playwrights. In 1605 we find Candido in The Honest Whore, II, still praising patience. This year also provides the life of Sir Thomas Gresham in If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, and the portrayal of Touchstone, the honest goldsmith in Eastward Ho. The merchants in Westward Ho (1604) and Northward Ho (1606) cannot be called either good or bad so far as their business lives are concerned, the plays deal with their personal lives. After these portrayals the merchant is usually shown as being no better than he has to be, though not always a cheater or projector. The years from 1607 on give us Quomodo, the money hoarder of Michaelmas Term; Lucre, who cheats his own nephew in A Trick to Catch the Old One; and Barterville, who has cheating worked out to a science and can state his philosophy of it in If This Be Not Good the Devil Is in It.

Between 1605 and 1615 the workman becomes a popular character. Of the types discussed in earlier chapters, he is the one most commonly found in these plays, though he does not always have a prominent role. Some of the portrayals of the workman seem to be heavily influenced by Shoemaker's Holiday. This influence is seen in both positive portrayals and satiric ones, such as that of the journeyman, Rafe, in The Knight of the Burning Pestle (1607).

The knight continues to be largely a person of little worth, though there are many exceptions to this. For example, The Travels of Three English Brothers, a play of 1607,

shows two of the brothers as adventurous knights who make a name for themselves and England. In The Puritan (1607) the widow finally realizes that the city knights she had been scorning would make better husbands than the phony soldier and phony scholar she and her daughter had become too friendly with. But generally the knight continues to appear as a comic or negative character. In The London Prodigal (1605) he is ruining his daughters' lives by trying to marry them to money; in Westward Ho (1604) he borrows money to purchase his knighthood; in Eastward Ho (1605) he bribes his way into the honor; in Ram Alley (1608) he is a plain coward; in It's a Mad World My Masters (1608) he is stingy to his heir and generous to his whore; in The Alchemist (1610) he is a glutton and a seeker after wealth by dishonest means; in A Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611) he is the man who "keeps" the citizen's wife; and in Wit at Several Weapons (1613) he is an old fool who wants his son to live by his wits instead of his father's money, and who intends to marry his niece off in such a way that he can keep her property rather than give her a proper dowry.

Between 1605 and 1615 the scholar is sometimes a law student and sometimes a university student. He is seldom a good student; he goes to school because his father sent him. He usually cannot get work when he completes school, and in some cases takes up cheating, begging, or making a living as a confidence man.

In these plays we also begin to find the theme of

inheritance appearing. There is the young heir who has nothing to live on until an older person dies, or the young second son who has not been apprenticed to a good trade. Most of the plays portray the older person as an uncle or aunt; they do not picture many parents or grandparents as lawbreakers. The young heirs usually outwit their elders, as in Jonson's Epicoene (1609), in Roman comedy fashion. Not until later do the heirs begin to express an overt desire for the older generation to die. The heirs are characters who turn beggar in these plays, not the scholars of earlier years or the dissolute gentry of later ones.

The portrayal of the citizen's wife in this period is a complicated matter but it is important to a proper understanding of Middleton's Chaste Maid in Cheapside and that play's relation to the work laws and the push of the people of that time to make sure that everyone worked. The problem grew out of the fact that citizens' wives often worked in their husbands' shops and apparently usually managed their own money. Alfred Harbage's statement that the ugliest feature of city comedy is the shopkeeper who is ready to prostitute his wife is too simplistic a comment on what is actually a complex portrayal, both realistic and satiric, of a character and of business practices.⁵

There are some sympathetic portrayals of the citizen's wife, such as that in The London Prodigal (1604). Here she is pictured as being misunderstood. Matthew, son of a merchant, is reduced to begging.⁶ He accepts alms from an old citizen

with a simple thank you. Then a citizen's wife offers him money. He accepts it but thinks that this means that she wants to arrange an assignation, and so offers to meet her for "secret service." She becomes very angry and takes her money back. This was not the way the citizen's wife was being portrayed in the coterie theater, however.

Already in 1602 Middleton's first play, The Family of Love, about which it is usually said that he imitated what was popular, shows Purge, the apothecary, saying that he puts his pretty wife in the shop in order to lure customers in:

I smile to myself to hear our knights and gallants say they gull us citizens, when indeed, we gull them, or rather they gull themselves. Here they come in term-time, hire chambers, and perhaps kiss our wives: well, what lose I by that?⁷

That play was presented to a coterie audience. Early in 1605, Marston, in The Dutch Courtesan, picks up the same note, also for a coterie audience. He has Mrs. Mulligrub say in the middle of a long speech about many things:

In troth a fine-faced wife, in a wainscot carved seat, is a worthy ornament to a Tradesman shop, and an attractive, I warrant, her husband shall find it in the custom of his ware, I'll assure him.⁸

The theme of the unwise woman who is overly impressed by the wrong men, begun with Jonson's Fallace in Every Man Out of His Humor (1599), appears over and over in the plays of the coterie theater. Westward Ho (1604) portrays three citizen's wives who have little work to do.⁹ They occupy

their time attending Puritan lectures and taking writing lessons. However, these three actually do go off for an evening with three gallants. They remain technically virtuous, and their husbands decide that nothing is to be gained by broadcasting their wives' shame. Besides that, all the men in the play, both gentlemen and citizens, appear in the course of the action at the house of the neighborhood pander or bawd, and so feel guilty about criticizing their wives. In this play Dekker and Webster satirize the pretensions of the middle class to a virtue superior to that of the "immoral" nobility of the time.

In the popular theater the story is different, as it was in The London Prodigal. In Heywood's portrayal of the life of Thomas Gresham, If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody (1605), John Gresham, worthless nephew of Thomas, wants to marry Lady Ramsey, widow of a former Lord Mayor, for her money. Since the play is in the popular theater, she merely gives John some money and tells him to go away.

Not all of the wives portrayed in the coterie theater are bad, but they are seldom wise. In Eastward Ho the wife helps her daughter marry a worthless knight. In Northward Ho the wife of the English merchant is honest, though her husband doubts her virtue until the London poet, Bellamont, convinces him that she is honest, but the wife of the Italian merchant intends to carry on an affair until she discovers that her lover is even older than her husband. The point made in the play is that English merchants do not waste their

time being jealous. In Michaelmas Term the wife of merchant Quomodo is a decent person; it is Quomodo who is wicked. The wife gives her husband's victim £100 to straighten out his business. She is not flirting with him, but at the end of the play they plan to marry because Quomodo pretends to be dead. In The Puritan the widow makes the mistake of falling for a supposed soldier who turns out to be a highwayman. She is led on by a dishonest scholar, Pyeboard. She is reconciled to her other suitor, a good city knight, at the end of the play. In Your Five Gallants Mrs. Newcut remains faithful to her husband, a merchant who has been lost at sea for almost seven years. In The Knight of the Burning Pestle Nell, the grocer's wife, is quite honest, but she is stupid and naive. In A Mad World My Masters the courtesan wants a wife's third of the inheritance which will finally be left by Sir Bounteous Plenty, her lover, who ought to leave it to his heir, Follywit. Ironically, Follywit marries the courtesan in order to frustrate his uncle, and so would get the money either way. In Match Me in London the king wants the wife of Cordolente, the honest tradesman. Her merchant father is willing to let him have her, but Cordolente, her husband, with the help of his apprentice, Lazarillo, succeeds in keeping his wife. In all, the plays are not kind to the citizen's wife, particularly not the one who finds her way into her husband's shop, there to meet courtiers. Some plays satirize her heavily, others make a weak attempt to be fair.

Apprentices, knights, merchants, workmen, and gentlemen appear in most of the plays. Though some plays show a bias according to whether they were played in the popular theater or in the coterie theater, the bias is not consistent except in the case of the citizen's wife. There is also no consistency to the roles assigned to the characters, again except for the portrayal of the citizen's wife.

Some critics call this the period of realistic comedy and others the period of "citizen comedy." Some tend to see the plays as realistic and others to see them as satiric. There is often an element of realism if the city characters are in the subplot. However, the element of satire or even allegory is often present too. An understanding of some of the controversies of the day makes this easier to see. The connections between the plays of this period and the general trends in commerce and business have been discussed by L. C. Knights. However, when one looks at the specific times the plays were written, considers the fact that they were often used to make comments on the passing scene, and then checks to see exactly what the problems of the time were, it is possible to make more specific connections to the exact problems discussed. Understanding these exact connections not only enables one to better see that the humor intended in Eastward Ho is a result of the repeal of the sumptuary laws as well as a jibe at the 140 knights which James I created, but it also enables one to better understand the motivations that went into the writing of

The Tempest and Chaste Maid in Cheapside, a play which has long puzzled critics, and has been called both Middleton's greatest comedy and a very immoral play. These plays are related to Jonson's Bartholomew Fair, as is shown in that play's induction. A study of the topics of the two plays shows what the connection was because it was not simple jealousy between Jonson and Shakespeare.

Criticism of Eastward Ho (1605) has rather ignored the the use of clothing as a symbol in the play, largely, perhaps, because there is so much else to comment on in it. The play included so much satire about Scotchmen that Jonson, Marston, and Chapman got in trouble over it, and Chapman and Jonson were in jail for a brief time. It also includes satire of James I's creation of a number of knights in celebration of his coronation, but many other plays include this also, and knights had long been a topic for satire. James I came from Scotland and did not sufficiently realize the effect that his creation of knights would have on a populace which was already tired of Essex's philanthropy in that direction.

The connection between the repeal of the sumptuary laws and Eastward Ho is not hard to see once it has been explained. James I repealed a set of laws which had long been both unpopular and unenforceable. However, the laws had apparently had a symbolic value to some people, and, in addition, were not really obviated in London by the repeal because many of the clothing regulations of London were those of the guilds, not those of the national government. The Puritans opposed

fancy dress, but were not the originators of the sumptuary laws. The laws had been on the books for almost three centuries and were probably less severe in England than those found on the continent.

The sumptuary laws spelled out in great detail just what clothing people could wear according to their rank or their wealth. The laws were almost impossible to enforce, but their repeal would have been just the type of thing that Marston and Jonson would have been happy to use to develop a set of symbols for a play. Edward B. Partridge has shown Jonson to be a writer who often used clothing as a symbol.¹¹ Marston was familiar with the laws because his father had been a member of the Middle Temple and the playwright, himself, had been a resident there from 1595 to 1599, though one cannot be sure how much time he devoted to the study of law, if any. He could, however, have easily supplied the details used in Eastward Ho, if they were not generally known.

Lack of familiarity with these laws can lead one to miss much of the satire in the play. There were actually two kinds of sumptuary laws. The laws for the nation were made by the King and the Parliament. The laws for the city of London were made by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. Still a third type of regulation existed, the regulation by the crafts of the clothing worn by members and apprentices.

The nature of these laws may also partly account for the play's tendency to state all problems in terms of economics,

as Anthony Caputi says it does.¹² This tendency may be as much English as it is Jonsonian. The English had long had a tendency to regulate people's lives according to their wealth. This was done to prevent squandering of money. This was often also the intent of similar laws on the continent, and Harry A. Miskimin has pointed out that the tendency to luxurious living seems to be connected to death by plague in the great Black Death.¹³ People would spend as much money as they could when they got it since they did not expect to live long. In England this was also related to the fact that knighthood was tied to wealth from earliest times, and so rich clothing was supposed to be worn by rich people. The fact that merchants were also rich led to complications. There was no logical reason to forbid a rich merchant to spend his money on clothing unless the monarch had another use for the money. Therefore, in times of war when kings wanted to borrow money sumptuary laws were likely to be enforced.

The first sumptuary laws recorded were made in 1363, shortly after the time of the Black Death in 1349. They continued to be made until the time of repeal in 1604. Other clothing regulations were made after that time, but they were related to the desire to create an English market for English goods. The basic sumptuary laws allowed wealthy merchants to wear the same clothing as gentlemen did. Those who owned property of £500 could wear the same clothing as gentlemen worth £100, and merchants worth £1,000 could

wear the same types of clothing as gentlemen worth £200.¹⁴ The merchant's artificers could dress like yeomen, and the clothing their wives and daughters could wear followed suit. It appears that the tendency of merchants of London to "ape their betters" was a phenomenon of long standing, and perhaps not so much an aping as Jonson seemed to think it was. The sumptuary laws actually had three purposes: to make class distinctions, to limit extravagance, and to encourage the use of English products.¹⁵ The basic parts of the laws had not changed greatly from their time of origin, and Frances Baldwin has effectively spelled out just what different people could wear at the time of the repeal of the laws.

Eastward Ho was written the year after the laws were repealed. However, the ordinances of the city of London and the regulations of the various crafts were not repealed. The humor of the play derives from the fact that on one hand Gertrude is behaving as if the national laws are still in effect while they are not, and on the other hand Quicksilver is behaving as if the ordinances of his craft and the city of London are not in effect while they still are. Thus, each is obeying a set of rules which does not apply. The clothing of Winifred and several other characters is used in a symbolic way and is not related to law, so far as I can determine.

The situations of the different characters display the points the playwrights wish to make about the personalities of the characters. Gertrude's desire to be able to dress like a "lady" is related to the national law. Quicksilver's

use of fancy apparel is related to the laws of the city of London and to the rules of his own trade, as well as to the general regulations for apprentices. The status of apprentices was that of technical students. The laws regulating their clothing were similar to those in effect at that time at Oxford and Cambridge universities. A still different thing is the symbolic use of clothing in the development of the character of Winifred and the prison garb finally worn by several of the characters. The prison garb was yellow and was as easily recognizable to the audience of that time as black and white stripes would be to a modern audience.

Both Gertrude and Quicksilver get clothing and lose clothing at times of changes of status in the course of the play. Golding and the tankard bearer improve their status and their clothing and Sir Petronel Flash loses his. Gertrude wants to become a lady so that she can wear the clothing of a lady.¹⁶ She marries a knight and is thereby made a lady. However, she also thereby loses all her money and has to pawn her clothing. Quicksilver wears the clothing of a gallant when he should wear the clothing of an apprentice. He later removes his apprentice robe, in a gesture similar to that of Wit in the play Wit and Science (1530), and renounces his study as an apprentice in order to become an adventurer. He finally has to wear a jail uniform home after his stay in the Counter. Golding, the good apprentice, is satisfied with his apprentice clothing, but is given the clothing of a deputy alderman because of merit. Winifred

assumes the disguise of her own clothing in order to teach her jealous husband a lesson. The tankard bearer is promoted to the status of servant to a lady, and gets a new coat.

The general point that clothes do not make the man is stated in two places in the play. The first is when the speech of the usurer, Security, about the fact that the supposed wife of Bramble is wearing the dress of his own wife, says: "Cucullus non facit monachum" (IV.i.224). The phrase means "The cowl does not make the monk." The second place where this is made clear is Golding's speech to the constable, in which he describes Quicksilver and Sir Petronel:

What! a knight and his fellow thus accoutred?
Where are their hats and feathers, their rapiers
and their cloaks? (IV.ii.253-56)

He is insinuating that he cannot tell that the one is a knight and the other a gentleman because they lack their fancy clothes. The main thrust of the play is that true virtue will find its way to recognition through hard work and humility, not through special clothing. However, even this idea is satirized to such an extent that it becomes apparent that the satire is more aimed at the repeal of the sumptuary laws or some controversy regarding it than at any citizen of London, regardless of his or her status.

In the second scene of the play Gertrude and the other women talk a great deal about clothing. She wants to become a lady so that she will no longer be restricted as to what clothing she can wear. By the old law which was repealed in

1604, she could have worn most of the things she thinks she cannot. Since Touchstone says that Gertrude is worth at least £100, according to Frances Baldwin's analysis, she could already have worn: velvet in kirtles and petticoats and satin in gowns, cloaks, and other outer garments, as well as satin in kirtles, and damask, tuffe taffeta, plain taffeta, and grograin in gowns.¹⁷ She tells her sister, Mildred, who is not as wealthy as she is, that she does not want to be limited to:

Coif with a London ticket, your stammel petticoat with two guards, the buffin gown with the tuft taffety cape, and the velvet lace. I must be a lady. . . . Your mincing niceries, taffeta pipkins, durance petticoats, and silver bodkins-- God's my life, as I shall be a lady, I cannot endure it. (I.ii.20-33)

As she is single and worth at least £100 per year, she does not have to wear the things she complains about. She could have the velvet petticoat which she does not get until she buys one for her wedding. Actually, since her father is not a poor man, he may well be worth that much himself, and it is possible that the entire family could have dressed in such a way if he had been willing to spend the money. The point is that Gertrude is living in 1605. She has met one of the £40 knights of James I's coronation and thinks that by marrying him she will be able to wear what she could wear under the old law. In addition, the old law has been repealed. Gertrude is ignorant; she has spent all her time reading romances, and is not aware that the laws have been

changed. The details of clothing mentioned so closely resemble those tabulated in Baldwin's study that one is led to think that the authors referred directly to the laws while writing the play. Both the law and the play specifically mention such items as tuff, taffety and velvet in specific garments. The law had been the law for merchant families ever since 1363.

In 1605 the whole question was pointless. Gertrude sets out to marry a "knight" because she thinks that this will enable her to wear certain clothing which in fact she can already wear. Most ironic of all is the fact that she now needs no status at all to wear whatever she desires, all she needs is the money to buy it. This scene probably had the well-informed audience at Blackfriars "rolling in the aisles." It seems fitting that Gertrude must pawn her clothing at the end of the play and have to be supported by her less ambitious sister. The entire routine is full of comic irony to one aware of what the laws had been and aware of the fact that they had just been repealed.

Such an interpretation of the play is strengthened by the fact that Gertrude's husband supposedly induces her to sell her property and then merely has her sign a paper to accomplish the transfer. Clarkson and Warren remark about the scene in which Gertrude supposedly disposes of her land simply by signing it over. They say that it is good drama but bad law, and observe that to dispose of her property after her marriage she would have had to levy a "fine" and

be examined by the judges in the court.¹⁸ This, by such a legally aware playwright as Marston seems less likely to be an oversight on the part of the writer than a deliberate attempt to characterize Gertrude as a person who lacks the common sense and the ability required to use the education which she so obviously has. The land could not have been disposed of in this way, but Gertrude is not aware of this fact and so lets herself be gulled out of the property, the same property which enabled her to wear the very clothes she married a knight so as to be able to wear. The audience would doubtless have known about the "fine" process required to separate a woman from her property. It was one of the best known legal facts in the country, and considering the care taken about a dowry at that time, it seems unlikely that most girls who had any property at all were not made aware of the process by their parents.

Gertrude has read too many romances. She expects the 140 knights of James I to be like the knights of the Round Table. She and Sindefy discuss this near the end of the play, and Gertrude ends a romantic description of the old knights with these lines, as she compares them to the new:

They would gallop on at sight of a monster; ours
run away at sight of a sergeant. They would help
poor ladies; ours make poor ladies. (V.i.52-55)

The satire is obviously of city women who spend their time reading the same kind of foolish romances as the theater audience came to see dramatized when they saw the play

Four Prentices of London. T. M. Parrott mentions some of the Spanish and other romances popular at that time as possible sources for Gertrude's ideas about knighthood.¹⁹ Sindefy agrees with her, and they move on to a discussion of what to pawn next. Gertrude lists the things she has lost and those she would be willing to give up:

Let me see: my jewels be gone, and my gowns, and
 my red velvet petticoat that I was married in, and
 my wedding silk stockings, and all the best apparel,
 poor Sin! Good faith, rather than thou should's't
 pawn a rag more, I'd lay my ladyship in lavender
 If I knew where. (V.i.67-73)

The case of Quicksilver and his apparel is more complicated. He is not financially independent as is Gertrude. However, he is an apprentice in the most exclusive trade of all, that of the goldsmiths. From 1478 on, the goldsmiths had a rule requiring that no apprentice be accepted who could not read and write. Quicksilver had probably attended a grammar school to learn some Latin in order to get into the trade. Later in the play he demonstrates that he, as well as Sir Petronel Flash, can speak French, though this could more easily have been learned in London than elsewhere. Quicksilver places more importance on his gentle blood than on his education or his opportunity to learn an exclusive trade. He wears the clothing of a gentleman, not forbidden to him by the sumptuary laws but forbidden to him by the city of London. In 1582 the Lord Mayor and the Common Council enacted a law regulating clothing of apprentices.

They could wear only clothing provided by their master, a cap and not a hat, a ruff and not ruffles, no silk or silver cloth, white or blue hose, breeches and doublet that matched, an upper coat of plain cloth or leather, an overcoat or cloth gown, no pumps or slippers, no swords, daggers, or other weapons except knives.²⁰ Quicksilver enters the first scene wearing a hat, pumps, short sword, and dagger, and hiding a tennis racquet up his cloak. Touchstone, his master, takes off the cloak, and Quicksilver objects:

Why, 'sblood, sir, my mother's a gentlewoman, and my father's a justice of Peace and Quorum! And though I am a younger brother and a prentice, yet I hope I am my father's son; (I.i.29-33)

Most apprentices were required to wear blue gowns (long coats) in the winter and blue coats to the calves in the summer.²¹ The blue coat of the apprentice was not the same shade of blue or the same style as the one worn by a servant. It was a symbol of his status as a student and similar to the gowns worn by students at Oxford and Cambridge. The students at those schools did not all dress alike because their clothing was regulated by the particular colleges to which they belonged. However, as Hargreaves-Mawdsley's study says, they generally wore black gowns, and they wore the same round cap as did the apprentices.²² Scholars (graduates) were supposed to wear the square cap. However, in 1576 great opposition to the square cap had arisen because of its supposed Romish nature, so scholars at the two universities

were permitted to wear ordinary hats when in the town, though the hats had to be black.

Apprentices were forbidden to wear hats in the presence of their masters, and only the mayor or aldermen of London could wear scarlet cloaks. By wearing a hat when Touchstone is present, Quicksilver gives the impression of deliberately insulting his boss. However, the law forbidding the wearing of hats was really economic in nature, made to encourage the wearing of English wool caps rather than French felt hats.²³ The scarlet cloak of the alderman was a status symbol equal to the scarlet academic gown of a chancellor of one of the universities.²⁴ In The Honest Whore, II, also of 1605, Candido, the merchant, gives an explanation of the origin of the flat cap worn by apprentices, citizens, and students. Parts are quoted below and should serve to show the element of pride involved in the symbol:

It is a Citizen's badge, and first was worn
 By the Romans; for when any bondman's turn
 Came to be made a freeman; thus 'twas said,
 He to the cap was called; that is, was made
 Of Rome a freeman, but was first close shorn. . . .
 Of geometric figures the most rare
 And perfect'st are the Circle and the Square,
 The City and the School much build upon
 These figures, for both love proportion.
 The city's cap is round, the scholar's square,
 To show that government and learning are
 The perfect'st limbs in the body of a State:
 For without them all's disproportionate
 It shows the whole face boldly, 'tis not made
 As if a man to look out were afraid,
 Nor like a draper's shop with broad dark shed
 For he's no citizen that hides his head.²⁵

Candido, the spokesman for the patient city merchant and

his faithful apprentice, is proud of the supposed symbolism of the square cap of the university and the round cap of the apprentice, the student in the "third university" of the land.

In Eastward Ho, Quicksilver is being presumptuous when he wears a hat in the presence of his master, but it is the fact that he wears a cloak of the type restricted to aldermen instead of wearing his apprentice's cap and cloak that really angers Touchstone. Touchstone does not appear to object to the apprentice's pumps and sword, only to his misuse of the symbols of his trade. Apparently, Touchstone feels that his apprentice has a right to wear a gentleman's clothing off the job, and the scene takes place outside the shop. It is obvious that an apprentice could not get much physical work done in the kind of padded breeches and doublet worn by courtiers of that time.

Quicksilver's changes of costume are important to the meaning of the play. The stage business between him and his mistress, Sindefy, in Act II, scene 2, is related to his status as a technical student. He comes onto the stage in his apprentice gown and lays it aside, just as Wit took off his student gown in the original play Wit and Science (1530). Sindefy tries to explain to him that he will be worse off as a courtier who seeks favor from everyone at court than he is as an apprentice trying to learn a well-paying trade from one master. She says to him:

A prentice, quoth you? 'Tis but to learn to live;
and does that disgrace a man? He that rises
hardly stands firmly; but he that rises with ease,
alas, falls as easily! (II.ii.101-05)

She fails to convince him. Like Wit, Quicksilver finds the road to riches through education too laborious and is off to make his fortune some easier way. In Act IV, scene 2, Sir Petronel Flash and Quicksilver have both lost all their fancy clothes when the ship they intended to take to the new world sank, and without their clothes as status symbols the pair cannot convince the constable that they are gentlemen. The constable is trying to draft them for service in the Army. They can find no one to swear to their identities, and without the proper clothes no one will believe that they are gentlemen. The point does not need to be belabored.

Quicksilver reaches the lowest point of his career when he has to wear the yellow garb of a prison inmate. It is symbolic of his repentance when he wears it home to the shop of Touchstone to let the neighborhood children see what can become of a young man who does not appreciate the value of his true status in life. In reality, a boy's father would have had to pay a good deal of money to a goldsmith in order to have his son accepted as an apprentice in the trade. It limited its membership drastically in order to keep prices up, and required an apprenticeship of ten years rather than the usual seven.²⁶ Early in the play Touchstone reminds Quicksilver of this and other financial facts:

Well, look to the accounts; your father's bond lies for you; seven-score pound is yet in the rear. (I.i.75-77)

In addition to his other bad habits, Quicksilver has been dipping into the petty cash drawer, and Touchstone simply charges it off against the bond which his father left for him.

But Touchstone does not seem to consider it necessary for Golding, who behaves as a good apprentice should, to complete the entire ten-year apprenticeship, and neither does the guild. Touchstone gives Golding his freedom so he can marry the other daughter, Mildred. Ordinarily apprentices could not marry until their time was up and they were twenty-four years old. When Golding is given his freedom of the company, or is graduated, the guild takes him into membership immediately. This gives him a new costume to wear, the "livery" of the company, which is equivalent to the gown and hood of a college graduate in form and meaning. In this play the guild also elects him as its representative in a minor office in the city, deputy alderman. In reality, such things were unlikely to happen to a young man just freed of his company, but the move enables the authors to make a point, and it may also be intended as satire of some of the early plays about successful London merchants who rose from the ranks rather quickly. In the position of deputy alderman Golding passes judgment on Sir Petronel Flash and Quicksilver when they are brought before him. As is proper, he is not wearing the livery of his company on the job. The

wearing of those ceremonial robes was limited to special occasions such as the annual Lord Mayor's pageant or official meetings of the company.

The blue coat of the tankard bearer who becomes footman for Gertrude's coach is a still different matter. The blue liveries of citizens' servants were largely a matter of custom, and even the gentry had servants who wore blue liveries as well as multi-colored ones. In 1 Henry VI (II.iii.46-47), Shakespeare shows the Duke of Gloucester encouraging his men to attack the Cardinal of Beaufort's men by telling them that the blue coats will win over the tawny coats. Tawny was the color worn by the liveried servants of the dignitaries of the Church.²⁷ Whether or not this was merely a practical matter is hard to say. It is obvious that blue jeans and khaki pants still provide the most popular colors for work clothes today, and this may be as much due to the fact that they are the colors least inclined to fade as it is to any long standing custom which makes them colors assigned to working men. There is no way of proving this. In any event, the footman's coat worn by the tankard bearer would not be in the same style as the apprentice's coats worn by the two young men.

Winifred's clothing is simply used as a comic device and as a symbol of the foolishness of her husband, Security, the usurer, who constantly suspects her, though he cannot recognize his own wife in her own clothing when he does not expect her to be present. It is a nice touch which fits in well.

Some editions of the play provide footnotes about the use of the clothing but none go into much detail, and none seem to mention the fact that the sumptuary laws were repealed only a few months earlier. The laws had been unpopular and hard to enforce. James I merely tried to please everyone concerned when he repealed the laws which had been accumulating for 300 years and were enforced only sporadically and then with the help of informers.

This play which makes the point that the cowl does not make the monk has been variously interpreted by different critics both as a play which praises the honest working man and as one which satirizes people of all classes. Frederick S. Boas calls it a prodigal son story and calls Touchstone a true civic worthy because of his pride in his craft and his rectitude and shrewdness; while Hazelton Spencer says that it is a bid for the favor of Jacobean Babbitts, and that it butters the shopkeepers and their code as assiduously as the courtiers are buttered in court plays.²⁸ T. M. Parrott says that it defends the morals of the city against the attacks of the "new comedy"; and Herford and the Simpsons say that "Touchstone portrays the ideal of bourgeois morality."²⁹ However, Charlotte Spivak says that although the main plot has the outline of a morality play, the moral conclusion is amusingly exaggerated with Quicksilver singing hymns of repentance in jail and Gertrude begging shelter with her sister, Mildred.³⁰ David Bevington also sees it as not praising the citizen, and says that Jonson in it is too

supercilious to both the court and the citizenry.³¹

The play certainly does not appear to butter up the shopkeepers, and if it did, not many would have known, because it was presented in the coterie theater. As to the morals, it is true that the good apprentice is rewarded in the end, but the prodigal son and daughter are also welcomed back into the family. Of course, the making up of every one at the end is a convention of comedy, and it is also in some ways reminiscent of the acceptance of Lacy by the King in Shoemaker's Holiday. But according to Jonson, comedy was supposed to reform people. The play actually criticizes the ambitious daughter more than anyone else. She does not know either the old or new laws regarding apparel, and does not even know about the safeguard of the "fine" system. In a way, her ignorance of this is as much a criticism of her father for not educating her properly as it is of her. The other character criticized is Quicksilver. He must spend a little time in prison before he realizes the value of the education which he was so eager to dispense with.

Eastward Ho was written for the upper class audience which patronized Blackfriars, but which would have included a good many of the merchant class. It is not really a comedy which is complimentary to the citizens of London; however, it does criticize other people as well as the citizens. Both the new knight and the second son who will not work are given their just deserts and then reformed. However, Golding and Mildred are too stuffy for a hero and too

priggish for a heroine. Touchstone is rather more an eccentric than a hero, but at least he is a pleasant one, and he relents at the end of the story, bringing everyone home in peace.

People who have no faults do not make good comic characters, and the play is one of the best comedies of the period. The scene in which Gertrude is boarding her coach and all the neighbors come to watch the new "lady" is very amusing and can still be appreciated by the ordinary reader. However, without a study of the sumptuary laws of the time, much of the humor in the scene in which Gertrude talks about her wardrobe is lost. In like manner, much of the pathos is lost in the scene in which Sinfy makes one last attempt to explain to Quicksilver the value of the education which he is leaving for the insecurity of court life and adventure on a ship. The people satirized here are the tradesman's daughter who wants to be a lady, the knight who bribed his way into a title, and the gentleman's second son who does not want to work as an apprentice. However, the play does make the point that not all of the citizens of London are foolish and that any can be reformed. Important also is the fact that two apprentices of equal background are contrasted with each other to show that there are good people in all classes of society. Virtue was often tied to rank in earlier plays, except for the morality plays, so this play does demonstrate this feature of the morality in a realistic comedy.

In a way the wealthy merchants were the gentry of the

towns; they owned the property and provided the work for the other people, just as the landed gentry did for the farmers. Considering this, the play seems to be as much a reaction to the changes in the laws as it is a reaction to the citizen comedy of Dekker and Middleton. Jonson had invented most of the "humor" characters found in such plays. It was not a great task for him, Marston, and Chapman to write a comedy which expressed their feelings on the subject "Clothes do not make the man," and on the repeal of the sumptuary laws. Jonson did not ordinarily write "citizen comedy" but this may be less due to the fact that he disliked citizens than that he thought that his plays should teach a lesson. For this one he had a comment to make and it was appropriate to make it with a cast of London characters.

Apparently the repeal of the sumptuary laws led to a great increase in the spending of money for clothes by everyone. There is a good deal of comment on this in other plays which came shortly after this one. For example, one of the things mentioned by the grocer's wife in The Knight of the Burning Pestle (1607) is her gown, which she says took fourteen yards of material:

Mark this, George, 'tis worth noting. Godfrey, my tailor, you know, never sings, and he had fourteen yards to make this gown; and I'll be sworn, Mistress Pennystone, the draper's wife, had one made with twelve.³²

She is actually complaining about the tailor, but a gown which used fourteen yards would have been an expensive one. Part

of the comedy of this play was probably visual. The wife, wearing a farthingale (which before the repeal of the sumptuary laws was not supposed to be worn by citizen's wives), and awkwardly attempting to sit on a stool on the stage at the opening of the play while managing her huge skirt, would probably have been funny to the audience of that day.

Another factor in the play seems direct satire of Eastward Ho. The merchant in the sub-plot to whom the good apprentice, Jasper, is apprenticed becomes angry with him and fires him when he finds that he wants to marry his daughter, Luce. Other things are satirized also, but they are not related to the laws or the plays dealt with here.

Another reference to the clothing laws is found in the play A Trick to Catch the Old One (1607), by Middleton. In it the student hero, Witgood, is attempting to keep his cheating uncle (not father or grandfather), Lucre, from totally destroying his fortune. In one scene Lucre remarks about the tavern keeper who comes from the country with a message for him:

There's more true honesty in such a country
serving man than in a hundred of our cloak
companions; I may well call 'em companions,
for since blue coats have been turned into
cloaks, we can scarce know the man from
the master. 55

The blue coat here is the country tavern keeper's. He is really helping Witgood in his endeavor to get his money back from his uncle Lucre and to get the girl he wants to marry. Lucre is making a mistake in judging him by his clothes.

In Dekker and Webster's Northward Ho there is also a sarcastic reference to clothing. When the servant brings the news to Bellamont, the poet-playwright, that there is a stranger waiting to see him, he describes the visitor by saying: "He is a gentleman, sir, by his clothes."³⁴ Many of the plays after this time feature rich young wastrels who spend virtually all of the value of their land on clothes when they first come to the city. This eventually becomes a stock device; the typical confidence man uses the sale of fancy clothes to relieve the young, naive country man of his property. Even the young citizen squanders his money on clothes in plays dating from this time on. Perhaps it was no wonder that the Puritans reacted and built a strict dress code for themselves.

Clothing was often used symbolically in the old morality plays, such as Wit and Science. Later playwrights, down to the time of the Civil War, tend to use clothing a little more directly. Whenever the audience is supposed to realize that they are looking at a wastrel, they are informed that he has just spent a good deal of money on clothing.

In addition to the satire of clothing, Eastward Ho portrays Sir Petronel Flash (flash of gunfire, roughly equivalent to flash in the pan), who is supposed to have been knighted at the coronation of James I by having bribed someone to let him into the ceremony. In Westward Ho, a few months earlier, Mrs. Tenterhook, a merchant's wife, tells her friends about one new knight, Sir Fabian Scarecrow, who

borrowed £ 200 from her husband to enable himself to become a knight. Apparently he used the money to buy land so that he could qualify for the "honor." He was later scornful to Mrs. Tenterhook, and she tells her friends in a speech that prefigures Mrs. Malaprop just what she did to him:

I cut him over the thumbs thus: why Sir Fabian Scarecrow, did I incense my husband to lend you so much money upon your bare word, and do you backbite my friends and me to our faces? I thought you had more perseverance: if you bore a knightly and a degenerous mind you would scorn it. (V.i)

On the one hand Eastward Ho is a satire of recent comedies and Heywood's history plays. On the other hand, it continues the development of methods of character portrayal used in plays which appeared after it. It is easier for a playwright to characterize a person effectively if he can give that person a set of stock phrases or gestures. For example, in Family of Love (1602), the oath "As I am a gentleman," is extensively satirized. In Eastward Ho (1605) Gertrude turns it into "As I am a lady." In Brome's play, 'Sparagus Garden (1635) it is still being satirized, and becomes "As I am almost a gentleman," in the mouth of the second son who is going to have his non-gentle blood drained and replaced by blood he will develop by eating asparagus and other special foods.³⁵

This is, of course, not the only phrase used in such a way, and the changes in stock phrases can help show the intent of the plays. In Edward IV, Heywood gave the Recorder

of London, Josselin, the habit of ending every speech with "And so forth," which made him seem a bit muddled. Simon Eyre in Shoemaker's Holiday has several stock phrases. For one thing, he is always urging "Peace." Also, he constantly calls his workers "My fine man," varying this by inserting the name of the man he is talking to. In Eastward Ho the obsession with work of the people of this particular period is shown in Touchstone, the goldsmith whose stock phrase is "Work upon that, now." He says this whenever one would expect him to tell his hearer "You had better think that over." A typical example is the opening scene in which he finds Quicksilver in front of the shop in fancy clothes:

I tell thee, I am thy master, William Touchstone,
goldsmith, and thou my prentice, Francis Quick-
silver; and I will see whither you are running.
Work upon that now! (I.i.14-17)

Touchstone's soliloquy at the end of Act I, which permits him to speak poetry, also ends with this phrase. In it he is describing his intended match between his obedient daughter, Mildred, and his honest apprentice, Golding:

This match shall on, for I intend to prove
Which thrives the best, the mean or lofty love:
Whether fit wedlock vowed, 'twixt like and like,
Or prouder hopes, which daringly o'erstrike
Their place and means. 'Tis honest time's expense
When seeming lightness bears a moral sense.
Work upon that now. (I.ii.220-26)

Touchstone may be stating Jonson's own idea of the purpose of comedy, but the lines also suit his character. In another place Quicksilver throws Touchstone's line back at him.

This is when Touchstone fires him and Quicksilver asks for a loan which Touchstone refuses to give him.

Not a penny? I have friends, and I have acquaintance; I will piss at thy shopposts, and throw rotten eggs at thy sign. Work upon that, now! (II.i.181-84)

The Puritan obsession with work was already felt in London and the rest of the country by 1605 when Eastward Ho was produced. It was to be formulated finally in the vagabond law of 1609-1610, which eliminated the exemption from prosecution previously made for gentlemen, just as the exemption made for scholars had been eliminated by the law of 1601. After the new law was passed, everybody who did not work at something was a vagabond or beggar with one exception, shipwrecked sailors. People were supposed to work. Those who could not work were supported by "Poor Relief" and the ones who would not work were sent to the "Workhouses" to be made busy in a sort of seventeenth-century W. P. A. Work was supposed to be respected. However, the working wife of the shopkeeper presented a problem that society did not yet know how to cope with. The next group of plays to be studied are those which show the influence of the problem of work and idleness and its attempted solution by law. They also show much more influence of the Puritan preoccupation with work than does Touchstone's phrase, "Work upon that."

These later plays were influenced by the law of 1609-10.

It was made to enforce all the rules listed under the laws passed previously as well as a few new rules. The question of work is related to the Puritan ideas about calling. Idleness was never praised by any Christian church; the old morality plays amply demonstrate that Idleness was considered the father of all vices. The Puritans started with that idea and the idea that work kept a person busy and thus less a prey for temptation. They moved to the idea that work had value in itself; it was a calling from God. Some of this idea originated in the teachings of Calvin, but the special emphasis developed in England, as has been shown earlier.

The questions of work and calling were on the lips of everyone in London during this time, 1605-1615. A new annotated edition of Calvin's Institutes was published in 1611, as was the King James version of the Bible. The questions raised were kept alive by the Puritan lecturers. Since the Puritans could not take over the established church and modify it to suit themselves, they devoted their energy to attempts to perfect the faith and lives of the people themselves. This was the work of the Puritan lecturers who held offices in the parish churches. This phenomenon has been studied by William Haller and Paul Seaver. Haller traces the direction taken by the material presented in the sermons and devotional books of the lecturers and Seaver makes a statistical analysis of the prevalence of lectureships. The first lectureship on London records was established in 1599 at St. Antholin's parish church.³⁶

By 1582 at least thirty of the 116 parishes of London had lecturers, half of them known to be Puritans. By 1600 there were forty-four lecturers. By 1629 there were 107. Many of the famous lecturers were Puritans, men such as Greenham, Rogers, and Perkins. The people flocked to hear them, took notes on what they said, and sometimes tried to follow their teachings.

The Puritans were in competition for audiences with the theaters as the lectures were usually given on workdays. Therefore, the lecturers tended to dramatize the things which they taught rather than to deal in abstract doctrine. Their imagery early became that of the pilgrimage and the battle, made famous by such later writers as Bunyan. This imagery was one of the things satirized in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair.

Seaver ventures an explanation of why the Puritans got such a reputation for hypocrisy. It has nothing to do with their work as businessmen.³⁷ He says that since church and state were thought to stand or fall together, Puritans who said that they agreed with this idea and then criticized the established church were said to be hypocrites. Their critics said that if they believed that the state should have an established church and that the monarch should be head of it, then they should accept what the church did and not insist on further reform.³⁸ This explanation is one which makes sense. One scarcely calls an entire group hypocrites over the actions of one member, but if the entire group subscribes to an idea which can be labeled hypocritical, that lends

itself to general criticism from others. However, the criticism in the prominent plays is aimed at another feature in the lives of the Puritans, their doctrine about "calling." The Puritans took the teachings of Calvin to mean that their work in the world, their actual job, was to be proof of the fact that they were truly converted Christians.³⁹ Consequently, a man or woman was supposed to work at an honorable trade which accomplished something useful for the world. Whenever a Puritan worked at something that could be interpreted as less than really useful, the critics were quick to point it out. Since the players were long criticized as doing work which was not useful, and were one of the first groups singled out for mention in the laws against vagabonds, they were always eager to catch the Puritans doing something which could be considered just as useless as the work which the players did. The players in turn were constantly criticized by the Puritans, who added one reason after another to their arguments as to why the stage plays should be done away with.

These ideas permeated the society of the time. Everyone who had time and any intellectual interest whatsoever went to hear the Puritan lectures. The Anglican preachers, and there were also Anglican lecturers, had to answer the Puritans. It was not always easy. At an only slightly later time than 1615, Thomas Fuller, in his The History of the Worthies of England, a series of character sketches not published until 1662, after his death, but written long

before that time, remarks about some of this in his description of Thomas Tarlton, the famous jester or actor:

Many condemn his (vocation I cannot term it, for it is a "coming" without a "calling") employment as unwarrantable. Such maintain that it is better to be a fool of God's making, born so into the world, or a fool of man's making, jeered into it by general derision, than a fool of one's own making, by his voluntary affecting thereof. Such say also that he had better continued in his trade of swine-keeping (though more painful and less profitable) his conscience changed to loss, for a jester's place in the court, who of all men, have the hardest account to make, for every idle word that they abundantly utter.⁴⁶

Fuller defends Tarlton's occupation by saying that he could make the Queen, Elizabeth I, more aware of her faults than any of her chaplains could, and that he was never guilty of profane, scurrilous, or satirical jokes.

Three plays presented after 1610 are clearly related to the controversies over work, calling, and the work laws. These questions had been around for a long time, but had not really elicited a reaction from the playwrights until the law of 1609-1610 was passed. By that time the stand of the Puritans had been made clear, and the laws were on the books. The playwrights could identify with the gentlemen criticized for not having a settled occupation because the players themselves were criticized by the Puritans for not doing any observable work. As many playwrights were scholars who could not find other work, they had also been able to identify with the scholars who were forbidden to beg.

The law was 7 and 8 Jac. Cap. IV, "An act for the due

execution of divers laws and statutes heretofore made against rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars and other lewd and idle persons."⁴¹ The law stressed that no one but genuinely shipwrecked sailors was allowed to beg and that every shire, borough, and town was to construct a workhouse where idle people could be put to such work as spinning and weaving.⁴² It set a deadline for accomplishing all this, the feast of St. Michael the Archangel in 1611. Justices of the Peace who did not get a workhouse constructed and operating by that date were to be fined £5.⁴³

When the law is combined with those which had been made earlier, as it was on the statute books, it becomes apparent that the laws had been gradually tightened over the years in an effort to make them enforceable so as to eliminate the phenomenon of beggars.⁴⁴ The law of 1601 had made it impossible for scholars to beg. The law of 1610 made it possible for gentlemen caught in disorderly conduct to be confined to the workhouse. Justices of the Peace who did not administer the law properly were to be fined. The poor who would not work could be "stripped and whipped" according to the law of 1601. The law of 1610 permits the enforcers of the law to search out the idle from their hiding places and either put them to work or punish them. The law shows the people's dislike of the mobs of idle knights in the city during the Michaelmas Term of Court, mentioned by the Webbs and in the first chapter here. It also shows that the people were aware that many scholars were hard pressed to find

work. Such scholars often became the Puritan lecturers of London as well as of other parishes in the land, as has been previously mentioned.

The three plays which especially reflect these problems are Shakespeare's The Tempest (1611), Middleton's A Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611-13), and Jonson's Bartholomew Fair (1614).⁴⁵ Jonson's play is among other things a satire of the Puritan idea of "calling" and the Puritan criticism of the theater. Middleton's play is a heavy satire which criticizes people of all classes and occupations for their tendency to exaggerate one another's faults. Shakespeare's play may be interpreted as an allegory about the problems of work in the world, the work of a ruler, and whether or not it is right to expect those of gentle birth to work at something. Jonson scoffs at the Puritans; Middleton tries to make peace between the citizen and the gentleman. Shakespeare is once again writing about what A. L. Rowse calls one of his favorite topics, the work of a ruler, and this time, using his knowledge of earlier plays to portray the differences between workers who do their jobs well and those who do not.⁴⁶ The connection between the three plays is shown in the induction to Bartholomew Fair:

Instead of a little Davy, to take toll o' the bawds,
the author doth promise a strutting Horsecourser,
with a leer Drunkard, two or three to attend him,
in as good equipage as you could wish, And then for
Kindheart, the toothdrawer, a fine oily Pig-woman
with her Tapster to bid you welcome, and a consort
of Roarers for music. A wise Justice of Peace
MEDITANT, instead of a juggler with an ape. A civil

cutpurse, SEARCHANT. A sweet singer of new Ballads ALLURANT: and as fresh a HYPOCRITE as ever was broached RAMPANT. If there be never a servant-monster in the Fair, who can help it? he says; nor a nest of antics? He is loth to make Nature afraid in his plays, like those that beget TALES, TEMPESTS, and such like drolleries, to mix his head with other men's heels. (Ind. 119-132)

The connection with The Tempest has been noted by many critics, but the connection with Chaste Maid in Cheapside seems to have escaped the critics because the character of Davy Dahumma is not so prominent in that play as is that of Caliban, the servant-monster in The Tempest; Herford and the Simpsons connect the name only to the slang use of it for a no-good fellow.⁴⁷ It seems more logical to assume that Middleton picked the name Davy for that very reason and that Jonson recognized the fact. It appears that the three plays are connected in the Induction by Jonson, himself.

Over the years scholars have successfully related The Tempest to events which had taken place shortly before the play was written. Sir Adolphus Ward was one of the first to link the speeches of Gonzalo (II.1.147-164) with Montaigne's chapter "Of the Cannibals," by showing that Gonzalo's description of an ideal commonwealth was taken from it, and that Montaigne's book was published in English for the first time in 1603.⁴⁸ Still another critic identifies Miranda with Virginia Dare, the first child born in America of English parents.⁴⁹ More recently, Raymond Urban has demonstrated that Caliban's kissing of the book, or drinking

from the bottle, of Stephano is evidence that he was following the ritual of those being inducted into the religion of drunkards invented by the vagabond clerics of medieval Europe as a parody of the Christian religion; and Urban points out that Caliban's worship of Stephano as the man in the moon is related to that parody as well as to the fact that there were three taverns in contemporary London called "The Man in the Moon."⁵⁰ Ernest Gohn has mentioned that the play is the only one of Shakespeare's which adheres to the classical unity of time, and connects this to the play's many references to "now" and "at this time."⁵¹ Thus there is evidence that the play does reflect Shakespeare's knowledge of contemporary events, and perhaps even presents some of his own reactions to those events.

Since Shakespeare did apparently draw freely on events which had just happened to build this play, it is not unlikely that he was influenced by the law of 1610 which attempted to control vagabondage. This law not only reiterated what previous laws had said, but by removing exemption clauses made it possible for persons who had sufficient living that they did not have to work to be sent to the workhouse if they were arrested for disorderly conduct.⁵² The idea of sending a rich gentleman to the workhouse simply because he was stirring up trouble on the streets of London was indeed a new thing, and could have influenced the way Shakespeare treated the topic of work and idleness and the proper work for a ruler.

In addition to the things mentioned above, a number of critics have noticed things in the play which appear to deal with the topic of work and idleness; however, none have tried to connect these features of the play with the problems of unemployment rife in England at the time the play was written, or with the laws made to deal with the problems. A review of the laws, a look at the statements made by critics regarding the relationship of the play to work, and study of the play itself will show what evidence there is to connect the play to the law enacted in 1610, just before the play was written.

There were many unemployed people in London. The presence of idle knights and gentlemen in many of the plays of this period is indicative of the fact that the city was full of idle young men who hoped to stay there long enough to get a place at Court. There were, of course, the other vagabonds as well, people still being driven off the land by enclosures and people coming to London to look for better jobs. All were subjected to some work law or another. From 1572 on the players needed a patron to escape being considered "masterless men." From 1594 on all masterless men were regularly sent to Bridewell prison to be used to fill the ranks of the troops needed by the Army.

The situation was brought to a head by several law cases in which Sir Edward Coke played an important part. By the time his influence was no longer felt, work had become in itself a thing of value and idleness was no longer merely

the breeder of evil. Even the well-known objection to monopolies grew from the feeling that the monopolies deprived workers of jobs which they could previously count on having. In 1599-1600 Coke's case, Davenant vs Hurdis, introduced the idea that all monopolies were "against the common right."⁵³ In 1603 the famous case, Darcy vs Allen, contested the twenty-one year patent on trade in playing cards. The case challenged the Crown's right to give patents at all.⁵⁴ In 1605 Allen vs Gerrard was a sequel. Allen, a London merchant, resisted Darcy's patent, saying that all men should labor because it was the law of God; and in 1605 it was firmly stated that all monopolies should be void.⁵⁵ In 1607 came Coke's famous "Charge at Norwich" in which he said that the law should encourage all voluntary labor.⁵⁶ Beggars and vagrants were a chronic plague, and the resentment felt against people who supported themselves by methods which deprived artisans of their customary work hit a high point. The reactions to the presence of idle knights in the courtroom in the court term of 1608-09 has been mentioned earlier. All these things added pressure, and the parliament of 1609-10 passed the laws which removed the exemption "though they have lawful means to live by," and permitted only shipwrecked sailors to beg.⁵⁷ Work had become an end in itself; it was the method for keeping people busy and out of trouble. Then in 1611 Shakespeare wrote The Tempest, a play obviously related to the question of attitudes toward work.

Several critics have already said that The Tempest deals with the question of idleness and sloth. Daniel C. Boughner points out that the shipwreck symbolizes the dissolution of a society which in the play separates into its three component parts: Ferdinand, Prospero, and Miranda; Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban; and Gonzalo, Antonio, Alonso, and Sebastian; and he connects this to the classic structure of the play.⁵⁸ Harry Epstein points out that Prospero lost his dukedom because he preferred occult studies to his duties as ruler and that he has to break his addiction to magic in order to fulfill his destiny as Duke; William Rockett describes the situation in a little different way when he says that while perfecting his mind Prospero neglected worldly ends and in the play is finally engaged in the labor of building a new life out of the ruins of his own past.⁵⁹ Leo Marx says that Prospero's control at the time of the action of the play is based on hard work, study, and scholarly self-discipline; and Harry Berger adds that Prospero has learned that he can rule only by rigid control, especially when confronted with such subjects as Caliban and Antonio.⁶⁰ The speeches of Gonzalo are a contrast to this concentration of Prospero on work and control. Gonzalo refers to ideas found in Montaigne's essay describing a society in which no formal economy or political system are found. To the scornful Sebastian and Antonio, Gonzalo describes the kingdom which he would operate on the island if he were able to do so:

- Gon. I' th' commonwealth I would by contraries,
Execute all things; for no kind of traffic
Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
And use of service, none; contract, succession,
Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none;
No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil;
No occupation; all men idle, all;
And women too, but innocent and pure;
No sovereignty--
- Seb. Yet he would be king on't.
Ant. The latter end of his commonwealth forgets
the beginning.
- Gon. All things in common nature should produce
Without sweat or endeavor: treason, felony,
Sword, pike, knife, gun, or need of any engine,
Would I not have; but nature should bring forth,
Of its own kind, all foison, all abundance,
To feed my innocent people.
- Seb. No marrying 'mong his subjects?
Ant. None, man, all idle--whores and knaves.
Gon. I would with such perfection govern, sir,
T' excel the golden age.
- Seb. 'Save his majesty!
Ant. Long live Gonzalo!

(II.i.148-170)

Rockett maintains that Gonzalo shows only the negative aspect of such a society, idleness, and adds that Gonzalo does not seem to see the redeeming efficacy of work.⁶¹ However, Dean Ebner says that in having Gonzalo state Montaigne's ideas Shakespeare sets up the action so as to deliver a gentle refutation of Montaigne's views in the subsequent actions of the play.⁶² It is obvious that contact with the primitive Caliban does not purge the evil characters, Stephano and Trinculo, of their wicked civilized ways, and that the hero, Ferdinand, is a man willing to work, not one devoted to idleness, as will be demonstrated below. Maxwell Luria mentions that when Sebastian calls himself "standing water" he is claiming a constitutional indolence.

Seb. Well, I am standing water.
Ant. I'll teach you how to flow.
Seb. Do so: to ebb
 Hereditary sloth instructs me.
 (II.i.221-23)

Luria uses these lines to connect the message of the play to criticism of sloth.⁶³ Irwin Smith adds the idea that the direction of the play as it is now found is distorted by the fact that after its first performance the masque was replaced by one more suitable for the play's presentation at the wedding celebration for Princess Elizabeth. The new masque is one about the goddesses of love and fertility.⁶⁴ The original masque was supposed to be a dance of the rabble. What this rabble dance was like we, of course, do not know for sure, but it could have been more closely related to the rabble who had no work to do than was the masque of the Grecian goddesses with which we are familiar (IV.i.60-138).

The characters in the play can be related to their attitudes toward work. First, one should note that the manual laborers in the play are all sailors, and they are eliminated from the action in all but the first and last scenes. They are genuine shipwrecked sailors. This is in keeping with the law. The sailors do not beg their way home, however; they are magically put to sleep. The rest of the characters are members of the upper class, or hangers-on at court, or the Duke's own servant-managers.

Of the first group of characters which Boughner has so conveniently isolated, Prospero has learned that he cannot

neglect his own work for a life of study; to be a ruler he must rule. Prospero tells Miranda:

I, thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated
To closeness and the bettering of my mind.
(I.ii.89-90)

Me, poor man, my library
Was dukedom large enough: of temporal royalties
He thinks me now incapable. (I.ii.109-10)

It is not difficult to see a resemblance between Prospero and James I, who had a great intellectual curiosity and a tendency to get directly involved in projects. As George Unwin remarked, James I did not have much ability to tell a good project from a bad one, and one of his most famous projects was his attempt to grow mulberry trees and use them for raising silkworms just as his rival, the French king, had done.⁶⁵ This was his project during 1607, about the time when the controversy about monopolies began to become a serious public issue. It would be unprofitable to draw too direct a parallel between James I and Prospero, but James I was a ruler who tended to get distracted from his work.

On the other hand, Ferdinand is a hero fit for an age in which work had replaced warfare as the road to glory, as Louis B. Wright put it in his study of that era.⁶⁶ Ferdinand knows that he must work for his true love. He will carry logs, a chore that Caliban despises, and complains about:

Here comes a spirit of his, and to torment me
For bringing wood in slowly. I'll fall flat;
Perchance he will not mind me. (II.i.15-17)

Ferdinand performs the task to prove his nobility and to prove that he is a worthy husband for the fair Miranda.

But Ferdinand does not enjoy the work:

There be some sports are painful, and their labour
Delight in them [sets] off; some kinds of baseness
Are nobly undergone; and most poor matters
Point to rich ends. This my mean task
Would be as heavy to me as odious, but
The mistress which I serve quickens what's dead,
And makes my labours pleasures. O, she is
Ten times more gentle than her father's crabbed;
And he's compos'd of harshness. I must remove
Some thousands of these logs, and pile them up,
Upon a sore injunction. My sweet mistress
Weeps when she sees me work, and says, such baseness
Had never like executor. I forget;
But these sweet thoughts do even refresh my labours,
Most [busil'est] when I do it. (III.i.1-15)

This same chore had to be performed by the young man in Disobedient Child (1552) and by the young woman in Patient Grissill (1599). This factor of the gentleman being willing to work for his true love was also a feature of the romance of Rowland Lacy and Rose Oteley in Shoemaker's Holiday (1599), where Lacy's willingness to work was rewarded by the king with knighthood. Miranda will be a good wife; her only desire is to help her husband. She offers to carry logs:

Mir. If you'll sit down,
I'll bear your logs the while. Pray give
that,
I'll carry it to the pile.

Fer. No, precious
creature,
I had rather crack my sinews, break my back,
Than you should such dishonour undergo,
While I sit lazy by. (III.i.23-28)

He declines her offer. Ruling is the proper occupation for

a princess. It is interesting to note that Shakespeare does not seem to think that it would be a virtue for a gentlewoman to work in a humble trade with her husband. Here it is the gentle Ferdinand who carries logs to prove his virtue just as it was the non-gentle Grissill who carried them in Dekker's play. Shakespeare does not show the young gentleman liking the work, but he does appear to say that a gentleman is not degraded by doing work for a good reason.

In the second group, Stephano, Trinculo, and Caliban, we see the opposite end of the spectrum of workers. Stephano is the Duke's butler and thus something more than a mere servant; the butler was originally the importer of wines. Trinculo is the court jester. Neither is eager to work at anything. Their only occupation is to make sure that they salvage some liquor from the wrecked ship so that they can continue in their usual occupation, one which today would be called "drunken and disorderly conduct," the same kind of conduct that a gentleman in London in 1611 could be sent to the workhouse for indulging in. Not only do these two fail to reform during their stay on the island, they manage to seduce into their company the local primitive, Caliban. Thus they are used to refute the idea that the easy life of the primitive would do away with the problems which seem to be created by civilization.

The third set of characters consists of the courtly gentlemen, Gonzalo, Antonio, Alonso, and Sebastian. They show attitudes toward work that are varied and ambiguous.

Alonso has been working at his proper job, that of ruling Naples, but he has made the mistake of being too friendly with the usurper of the throne of Milan, Antonio. Antonio has also worked hard; he did the job Prospero gave him to do, ruling Milan. But he became too fond of the job and arranged to get rid of Prospero so that he could rule in his own name. In a way, Antonio behaved similarly to many of the monopolists or patent holders in England during the Tudor and Stuart periods, until 1623 when monopolies were at least theoretically forbidden by law. In another way, he resembles what James I feared in his parliaments, the desire to rule for him. Monopolies had first gone to Staple Towns, then to craft guilds, and finally to courtiers. However, after 1600 most such patents and monopolies were held by courtiers, a situation which led to resentment and which led to the lawsuits in which Coke was involved. The people had developed a feeling of resentment against the placing out of both governmental jobs and merchandising jobs to courtiers. The monarch felt that his divine right to rule was being challenged. Antonio is the ultimate monopolist; he takes over the entire government. As Luria points out, Sebastian is the opposite; he frankly says that he is too lazy to work; but Antonio finally convinces him that he should exert himself enough to get rid of his brother, Alonso, so that he can, himself, take over the kingdom when they get back to Naples.⁶⁷ Ironically, neither worries about how he will manage to get back to Naples from the island.

In the third group of characters, the position of Gonzalo is very ambiguous. He has been faithful counselor to both brothers who ruled Milan, and he managed to keep Prospero from being killed. However, he shows his own disinclination to work very hard at anything when he praises the glorious idleness that would abound in the land which he would rule if he could, the land which seems to be Montaigne's land of the cannibals. The others do not take him seriously. In some ways Gonzalo refutes not only Montaigne's ideas but those of the religious sects which advocated communism and dreamed of an ideal world. Gonzalo, the idealist, should not be allowed to rule; he cannot keep Prospero in power, nor does he seem to appreciate the efforts of the hard-working sailors in the opening scene of the play.

Enter a Ship-Master and a Boatswain

Mast. Boatswain!
Boat. Here, master. What cheer?
Mast. Good, speak to the mariners; fall to't yarely, or we run ourselves aground; bestir, bestir.

Exit master. Enter Alonso, Sebastian, Antonio, Ferdinand, Gonzalo, and others.

Alon. Good boatswain, have care. Where's the master? Play the men.
Boat. I pray now, keep below.
Ant. Where is your master, boatswain?
Boat. Do you not hear him? You mar our labour; keep your cabins; you do assist the storm.
Gon. Nay, good, be patient.
Boat. When the sea is. Hence! What cares these roarers for the name of king? To cabin! Silence! Trouble us not.
Gon. Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.
Boat. None that I more love than myself. You are a counselor; if you can command these elements to silence, and work the peace

of the present, we will not hand a rope
more; use your authority. (I.i.1-26)

Even the good counselor, Gonzalo, does not realize that he is getting in the way of the working man who has a job to do. Gonzalo makes light of the matter, and does not get angry. He goes on to joke that they cannot drown because the Boatswain looks as if he is destined for the hangman. Gonzalo is a good-hearted man, but he does not see the value of work itself, and he does not understand the problems of the working man, the genuine about-to-be-shipwrecked sailor. Gonzalo is not a lawful ruler; only the lawful Duke or his heir is a proper ruler, and the Duke only after he learns to stick to his ruling and leave the magic to others.

Considering this behavior of the characters, it becomes apparent that the play is a portrayal of the kinds of workers who might be affected by the law which made it necessary for even gentlemen to do something useful. Prospero, the ruler, failed when he neglected his own duties and took up those of others. Gonzalo is a thinking counselor and a generous friend, but he cannot treat all classes fairly; he rescues Prospero but has no sympathy for the hard-working sailors. Sebastian knows that he is lazy and will only act when no real work is required. Antonio has done most of the jobs of a ruler, and finally decides that he wants the whole job and takes it for himself. Antonio is the monopolist who runs the land that everyone else is too lazy or too distracted to take an interest in. Such ideas should not be

surprising when one remembers that Shakespeare was a financially successful man. Gerald Eades Bentley has speculated that The Tempest was written especially for the new financial venture of the King's Men's Company, the Blackfriar's Theater, and that this is, in part, an explanation of its differences from Shakespeare's earlier plays.⁶⁸ William Armstrong mentions the story that Shakespeare "instructed" actors, or directed his own plays, as was reported in Sir William Davenant's Company after the Restoration, when a Mr. Betterton, who had been instructed by Sir William, said that Sir William had been instructed by a Mr. Lowen, who had been instructed by Mr. Shakespeare, himself.⁶⁹ Shakespeare directed plays and helped run the King's Men's Company, of which he was one of the principal stockholders. He knew what it took to rule the little realm where he was chief playwright, the Globe and Blackfriars, and he knew the different types of jobs that different actors did. The types of workers found in this play could easily be the types he met in the course of a day in the theater.

The characters in the first group do their jobs properly. Prospero had to learn to stick to his own job, but once he did learn he was a good ruler. Ferdinand and Miranda seem always to have known the proper attitude toward work. He does what needs to be done--for love. She offers to help the man she loves. The characters in the third group do not do anything the way that they should. They will never have the proper attitude toward work. Caliban,

Stephano, and Trinculo are beyond help. The characters in the second group have all somehow failed to do their jobs properly, though they have worked at them after a fashion. Only Ferdinand, the future ruler of Naples, and of Milan when he marries Miranda, appears to have the proper attitude toward work. He knows that he must work to prove that he is worthy of his lady, much as did Lacy in Shoemaker's Holiday. He does not pretend to like the chore; he merely does what needs to be done, and with a minimum of complaining. With such a future ruler, the kingdoms will be well cared for. With such a hero the play can end happily. With such a message the audience can feel secure, even if the next thing that it hears may be a Puritan lecture.

It would appear that Shakespeare made his statement on the value of work, particularly the work of the ruling class, in his comedy, The Tempest, and thereby addressed a problem uppermost in the minds of the people of his land at that time, a time plagued with unemployment, monopolies, and a changing system of merchandising, as well as occupied with exploration of a new world, and speculation about such methods of organizing the economy as were described not only by Montaigne but by such sects as the Anabaptists, the Family of Love, and others who wanted to return the enclosed land to the people who had been turned into vagabonds. It is apparent that learning or education is not going to solve the problems of the country in some magic fashion. Neither will they be solved by applying Utopian dreams. The play

spoke about a question timely in the era, and spoke in praise of each man doing his own job and doing it well. It ended on a note of forgiveness for mistakes of the past.

The second play which is principally a study of work is Middleton's A Chaste Maid in Cheapside (1611-13). Beginning with T. S. Eliot, critics of recent times have attempted to evaluate and re-evaluate the comedies of Thomas Middleton. Eliot says about Middleton's comedies: "He has no message; he is merely a great recorder."⁷⁰ Eliot also remarks on Middleton's ability to understand and portray women characters.⁷¹ L. C. Knights also studied the comedies of Middleton, and he says of Chaste Maid in Cheapside that it is neither one of Middleton's best nor one of his worst comedies; however, he says that one remembers from it only the details of the plot, and that it is merely a comedy of intrigue.⁷² He adds: "At times he betrays a positive animus against the citizens, but he has nothing to set against their standards, neither an aristocratic code nor a popular tradition."⁷³ Charles A. Hallett says that in the play Middleton's Allwit, the willing cuckold, is merely an anti-hero, and one of the many cynical characters which Middleton drew.⁷⁴ R. B. Parker made an extensive study of the play for his 1969 edition of it.⁷⁵ He says that it was probably presented in 1613 because it throws a sop of good character portrayals to the watermen who at that time had petitioned that a theater not be allowed on the London side of the river.⁷⁶ He does not see the play as a character study but says that "The center of the play is,

therefore, what Yeats condemned as 'the emotion of cities'," and adds that the play's most obvious perversion of sexuality is its link with competitive materialism.⁷⁷ He links this quality to the Freudian idea which equates desire for money with eroticism. He also mentions the satirical turn of the play, particularly mentioning the scene in which the Country Wench puts her illegitimate baby in a basket of meat forbidden in Lent.⁷⁸ He then points out that Middleton's work began and ended with things which had a Puritan bias.⁷⁹ He draws no conclusion from his speculation, and says: "It is useless, therefore, to expect a single moral point of view in Chaste Maid, the characters are all morally ambivalent to a greater or lesser degree."⁸⁰ Anthony Covatta analyzes the four plot structure of the play and points out that each plot is a triangle.⁸¹ He also remarks on the opinions of earlier critics of the play who have called it misanthropic, and says that it shows a very dark world indeed.⁸² However, his final opinion of the play is that it describes "life's ability to overcome all obstacles, to survive, and even grow."⁸³ Most recently, J. A. Bryant Jr. simply says that Middleton had no message, he just saw that the human community renews itself at the expense of individuals.⁸⁴

If indeed this play carries no message, Middleton spent a good deal of time constructing a play with four plots, much good dialogue, several truly good scenes, and many good lines, just in order to make a little money, and in a time when he had not written a play for several years and was

bargaining with the city of London to become official pageant writer for them. This seems highly unlikely. In addition, he was no longer an apprentice playwright but an established writer, householder, husband, and father of at least one child. The play is not a pot boiler. It is another one of the several written in reaction to the new work laws and the Puritan obsession with work. In Chaste Maid in Cheapside almost nobody can be said to work at all; the few who do are not very good at their jobs, and most of the characters make money by some method other than work or any other honorable endeavor, though all live in an aura of respectability before the public.

The play is set in London. The four plots were analyzed by Richard Levin, and his analysis is a good one.⁸⁵ Touchwood, the younger brother, wants to marry Moll Yellowhammer, daughter of a goldsmith and his wife. Their son, Tim, is an Oxford student, and is not eager to marry, but at play's end is happily married to the country mistress of Sir Walter Whorehound, the man whom Tim's parents want his sister to marry. Sir Walter keeps a city mistress also, Mrs. Allwit, whose husband would rather have her occupy herself with Sir Walter than work to support her himself, because Sir Walter is due to inherit a good deal of property from his relative, Sir Oliver Kix, who has no heir. Allwit assumes that Sir Walter will leave the money and property to his illegitimate children because he has no other heir but Davy Dahumma, a very distant relative who follows him everywhere

and tries to make sure that he remains unmarried and heirless. Sir Oliver and Lady Kix contrive to get an heir of their own by letting Touchwood, the elder brother, whose wife is living in the country at the time in order to avoid more pregnancies, give Lady Kix a "drug" (which must be administered while she is lying down) to make her pregnant. The plot is complicated, funny, and on the surface not very elevating in nature.

The play is not without a message. However, it is in no sense a realistic play. It is pure satire. It is persistent, skillful satire like Swift's "A Modest Proposal." Just as the message of Swift's essay was not anger against the Irish who had too many babies, so the message of this is not anger against the citizens of London or the gentry. Its message is not "This is what you are, gentlemen and citizens of London." Its message is "Stop calling each other this, gentlemen and citizens of London." Middleton writes for people who have a set of standards. He does not have to put them into the play any more than Swift had to put them into his "A Modest Proposal." To people who had a set of standards of work as a basis for judging society, it provided a drama of characters none of whom work. The citizens and gentlemen alike can look about them and see that London is not really like this, but that they are often guilty of criticizing each other as if it were.

Chaste Maid in Cheapside is a satirical presentation of the conflict between the gentry who are supposed to fight and

the citizens who are supposed to work. It is not an extended study of economic conditions or habits. It deals with specifics of London business and the Puritans' insistence that everyone ought to have a calling. It also takes up the question which Middleton had dealt with earlier, that of the wife of the shopkeeper who is said to be working in her husband's shop in order to lure customers in to buy, but who in the dramas of the time has often been pictured as a woman of easy virtue who is too inclined to take up with courtier customers.

Middleton really has two messages, one for the gentry and citizens of London and one for his fellow playwrights. The one for his fellow writers is similar to the one written by Thomas Fuller in 1642: "The pamphlets of this age may pass for records with the next . . . and what we laugh at, our children may believe."⁸⁶ The wives of London merchants had been so castigated by this time that the practice of having one's wife work in the shop was always treated as a scandal in plays of the coterie theater. Such treatment is equivalent to calling the "Mom and Pop Store" a house of prostitution. Many men could not operate a shop without the help of their wives. A man cannot be criticized for having a pretty wife. He cannot be criticized for having one who is "civil" and thus a good saleswoman. Middleton provides a contrast for the honest hard-working shopkeeper and his wife in this play by showing what the man who really misuses his wife's attractiveness is like. The play also

deals with the problems of gentlemen who have no heirs. In England only "heirs of the body" could inherit land, and so adoption was not a solution to the problem of childlessness. Gentlemen sometimes did not like to admit that they had no children, but they made sarcastic comments about the small number of children found in the family of the typical London tradesman. The citizen did not marry until he had completed his apprenticeship, usually at twenty-four, and the plague carried off a great many children in London. Ben Jonson, himself, lost two of his three children to the plague. The childlessness of the merchant was blamed on his working too hard, as in Westward Ho, in which the wife says that she will not ask her husband to accompany her on a trip because he will complain about being taken away from his business.⁸⁷ Middleton's play portrays a childless knight who is willing to let his wife be impregnated by another man rather than leave his property to his cousin. The gentleman here becomes dishonest in order to get an heir. Normally a citizen would leave his property to a favorite apprentice if he had no other heirs, and it was often that an apprentice married his master's daughter. The citizen was inclined to make fun of the law of primogeniture which limited what the gentleman could do with his property. The play also deals with the duels of the gentlemen around the city of London. The citizen's criticism of the gentleman as a fighter is put into the same category as the gentleman's criticism of the citizen for his patience which would tolerate even a

cheating wife. Both are exposed as being basically hypocritical in their criticism of each other.

Middleton does not take sides in the argument, and this is probably why the play has been described as amoral. He is not criticizing one side but both sides. He shows that it takes two to commit adultery. He shows that it takes two to make a quarrel. The citizen criticizes the gentleman for wanting to fight but helps create the circumstances which lead to the fight. The gentleman criticizes the merchant for having his wife work in the shop and for being forgiving if the results of this go awry. The pots and kettles have been very busy calling each other black. The citizen should not set up circumstances which lead the gentleman astray. The gentleman should not hang around town doing nothing useful while he waits for his inheritance to materialize, because his idleness leads him to disturb the peace of the city in more ways than one.

The conflict of the citizen and the gentleman is shown as almost a feud. The victims of the quarrel are the two young lovers who want to marry, Moll, the chaste maid of the title, and Touchwood, the younger brother. The plot puts them in a situation reminiscent of that of Romeo and Juliet. They both appear to be dead, she of exposure to the cold water of the Thames from which the watermen rescued her, and he of the wound which he received in the duel with Sir Walter. However, this is a comedy, and they are not really dead; they are revived in the church just before their

funeral, and the funeral becomes their wedding. Moll's parents wanted her to marry Sir Walter because they thought that it was easier to make money by marrying their daughter to a wealthy man than it was to make it in the lucrative trade of goldsmith, though they are already so wealthy that Touchwood, the younger brother, feels that marrying Moll is a good choice, not only because he loves her but because she is going to inherit £2,000.

Though the play ends in a relatively happy fashion, no one seems to have learned very much, and it seems as if the feud will go on. Middleton seems to say that he doubts that the gentry and the citizens will stop blaming each other for their troubles, and he doubts that either group will be helped by either laws or sermons which stress that everyone ought to work. There are too many people of all classes who are prone to taking the easy way out or "Idleness."

In the play everybody is very busy doing something other than an honest job. An additional piece of irony is that the Allwits have several Puritan friends who come to the christening of the latest illegitimate child but are not at all aware of what is going on. In this Cheapside a great deal of money changes hands but few there do any work at all to get it.

Allwit serves to show the difference between the merchant who has his wife work in his shop and the man who is actually selling his wife's favors. Allwit is all wit and no work, not just wittol (knowing cuckold) reversed. His

wife's ability as a saleswoman (of her charms) keeps him and her children well because they are all actually the children of Sir Walter.

Yellowhammer, the goldsmith, had worked at one time, and he is now wealthy. He is no longer interested in making more money by working at the respected trade of goldsmith. He tries to use his money to buy a title for his daughter. However, a title is not enough, the man must also have money, so he chooses Sir Walter, who is rumored to have money and is going to inherit Sir Oliver's property because the Oliver Kixes have no children. Yellowhammer and his wife both work hard at trying to marry their daughter to Sir Walter and their son to his mistress, whom they believe to be his niece. One gets the feeling that they would do less damage working hard at the goldsmith's trade and in the shop.

Sir Walter Whorehound, the knight, does not work at any knightly thing; he is not a justice of the peace, he does not manage what land he has. He lives on borrowed money which he has managed to get on the strength of his position as heir to Sir Oliver Kix. Sir Walter keeps the city busy and profitable as it trades on his supposed future wealth. And he is the ultimate in gallants who flirt with citizens' wives; he actually keeps one.

Only Sir Oliver, the impotent man, actually owns much of anything, the property that Sir Walter is to inherit some day. Sir Oliver's wife is not content with this arrangement, so he lets her be made pregnant by another man, while

pretending that he does not know what is going on. In this way he will get an heir which will satisfy her, and will satisfy him also.

Even the scholar is not doing a very good job. Tim, the student, brings his tutor home with him. The tutor has only succeeded in teaching Tim enough Latin and logic that he can manage to talk himself into such a corner that he has to accept Sir Walter's ex-mistress from the country as his wife. Tim also attempts to write a Latin verse for the funeral of his sister, but does not even succeed in that.

Touchwood, the elder brother, is not without property. However, he is so fertile that the great number of children he and his wife produce makes it impossible for him to live on the money which comes from his country land. He sends his wife to the country to live so that they will not have any children for a while. At the end of the play Sir Oliver invites him and his wife and children to join his household so that the Kixes can use the magic medicine Touchwood makes and thus have more than merely one child. With so many mouths to feed, it is debateable just how long even Sir Oliver will be able to support them.

The entire play is a statement describing the dishonesties by which all the people involved earn their livings. The result of their actions is an on-going feud between the two groups, landowners from the country and workers, or people who should be workers, from the city. The result of their actions is also that the young lovers are supposedly

sent to an early death.

Some quotations from the play can serve to point out the fact that it is pure satire. The explanation of Allwit's behavior is given in his early soliloquy:

I thank him, 'has maintained my house this ten years,
 Nor only keeps my wife, but 'a keeps me
 And all my family: I am at his table . . .
 I pay for none at all; yet fools think she's mine,
 I may sit still and play; he's jealous for me,
 Watches her steps, sets spies; I live at ease.
 (I.ii.15-17,51-53)

He wants Sir Walter to serve as godfather for the new child to help alleviate suspicion. (This is doubly ironic because the Puritans thought that parents should be the godparents at their children's christenings.) The Puritan neighbor gives the irony a triple level when she remarks at the christening party that it was all done properly:

Without idolatry or superstition
 After the pure manner of Amsterdam.
 (III.ii.4-5)

When Allwit learns of Sir Walter's desire to marry Moll, he goes to Yellowhammer with the story that Sir Walter keeps a mistress. Yellowhammer is not perturbed. He resolves not to let this keep him from his original intention.

The knight is rich, he shall be my son-in-law;
 No matter, so the whore he keeps be wholesome,
 My daughter takes no hurt then; so let them wed;
 I'll have him sweat well ere they go to bed.
 (IV.i.247-50)

Moll runs off rather than marry Sir Walter, but her parents find her and drag her home, by the hair. Since she ran off with Touchwood, the younger brother, Sir Walter now knows who is rival is.

Sir Walter and Touchwood fight a duel over Moll. It is technically proper for them to do this as both are gentlemen. Each wounds the other. The wound makes Sir Walter aware that he is mortal, but he immediately takes the tack of blaming the Allwits for his unfortunate condition. They find him wounded and offer to help him, but he will not let them:

Touch me not, villain! My wound aches at thee,
 Thou poison to my heart! . . .
 If anything be worse than slave or villain,
 Thou art the man! . . .
 Thou know'st me to be wicked, for thy baseness
 Kept thy eyes open still on all my sins;
 . . . that if I had not
 Waked now by chance, even by a stranger's pity,
 I had everlastingly slept out all hope
 Of grace and mercy. (V.i.11-30)

Sir Walter here refers to the non-gentle status of Allwit in order to insult him. Then he turns on Mrs. Allwit:

Thou loathsome strumpet! Some good pitying man
 Remove my sins out of my sight a little;
 I tremble to behold her, she keeps back
 All comfort while she stays. (V.i.33-36)

The Allwits believe that Sir Walter is out of his head because of his wound, and their only desire is to keep him alive so that they will not lose their easy source of income. Allwit tries to induce him to make his will in order to make sure that the illegitimate children will not be left out of

it. Sir Walter starts to make a will which leaves them only curses, but at that point they are interrupted by a servant who brings the erroneous news that young Touchwood is dead. Immediately the Allwits believe that Sir Walter will be accused of murder and thus lose all his inheritable property anyway. Allwit shifts to the citizen's automatic criticism of the gentry, that they fight too much and are not peaceable like citizens. He calls Sir Walter a murderer and after Sir Walter's servant suggests that it would be best for the knight to hide out for a while, he tells him that he will not harbor a murderer in his house:

Not in my house, sir,
I'll harbour no such persons as men-slayers;
Lock yourself where you will. (V.i.113-15)

Sir Walter is surprised, and even Mrs. Allwit is surprised and reminds her husband that Sir Walter might get off on a plea of self-defense. Allwit will not change his mind. While Allwit, his wife, Sir Walter, and his servant argue about what is likely to happen, a second servant comes with the news that Lady Kix is pregnant and Sir Walter's days as heir presumptive are over. Allwit tells the servants to depart and to take their "murderer" with them. He will have nothing to do with such people.

The Allwits are not repentant. When they realize that they have lost Sir Walter, they count their take, and decide that they have enough to open a house of prostitution in the Strand. They make it plain that they know that this is not

a change of occupation for them. They decide to furnish the house in an especially virtuous manner. They will put a motto in every room denouncing the vice of gambling:

And let this stand in every gallant's chamber:
 There's no gamester like a politic sinner,
 For whoe'er games, the box is sure a winner.
 (V.i.166-68)

The Yellowhammers are not much better. Tim is busy composing a Latin epitaph for the sister he believes is dead and he has barely enough learning to do that. He does not seem to mourn for her at all, but merely to wish to show off his learning. The goldsmith and his wife wonder what the neighbors will think of them and decide to skip the funeral in order to avoid the neighbors' criticisms of the way they treated their daughter. They skip the funeral to attend Tim's wedding to Sir Walter's Welsh country mistress, who he has told them is his niece and an heiress.

Sir Oliver and Lady Kix and the London gentleman, Touchwood, the elder brother, are also no better. They plan a neat little ménage à quatre, in which Touchwood, who has too many children, can support them at Sir Oliver's expense by providing Lady Kix with more of the "magic potion" which got her pregnant with the child which she is carrying.

When Yellowhammer learns that the Welsh woman whom Sir Walter encouraged his son to marry is really Sir Walter's cast mistress, he has Sir Walter put in jail, not because of that but because of the money Sir Walter owes him. Oddly

enough, Tim finds the red-headed Welsh woman attractive and is ready to marry her. His mother tells him that he told her that the logic he learned at the university could enable him to prove a whore an honest woman. He agrees:

I perceive than a woman may be honest
 According to the English print, when she is
 A whore in the Latin; so much for marriage and logic!
 I'll love her for her wit; (V.iv.108-11)

Yellowhammer decides that it is too much for a father to expect both of his children to marry well, so he is reconciled to the occasion. He sees that he can save a little money by having one dinner for both of the weddings, and so invites everyone to a wedding dinner at Goldsmith's Hall.

Only Touchwood, the younger brother, and Moll seem to be at all honorable in their dealings with each other. It is true that Touchwood is marrying Moll partly for her money, but in his duel with Sir Walter, once Sir Walter wounds him he offers him a deal, he will give him half of Moll's dowry if Touchwood will let him marry Moll. Touchwood refuses. As is usual in Middleton's comedies, the younger generation is far more honorable than the elder, and in this case they triumph in the typical style of comedy, and in a way reminiscent of Rafe and Jane in Shoemaker's Holiday.

L. C. Knights' criticism of the play, that it offers no standard for contrast with the characters presented as evil, is not really valid. Effective satire deals with a situation which would to the expected audience contrast with things

which they wholly accept as true. Just as Swift's satire in "A Modest Proposal" is based on his sure feeling that no one would be in favor of eating human babies, so Middleton's satire in this play is based on his sure feeling that no one would be in favor of selling his wife's services, letting his wife be impregnated by another man in order to get an heir, or standing in awe of a knight who keeps two mistresses and expects to marry a third girl purely for her money. Such characters are not admirable by any code of ethics. And a knight who wounds a gentleman in a duel only as a method of inducing him to sell his sweetheart in exchange for half her dowry is certainly not a man who is fighting for a good cause. The people who saw the play were supposed to contrast the behavior of the characters with the behavior of the people whom they met every day. The lesson that they were to learn was that they should stop being so critical of one another's errors. If a shopkeeper had his wife work as a saleswoman, she could be entirely innocent of flirting with gentleman shoppers. If a knight felt that his honor had been insulted, it might very well have been, and he might feel a need to fight a duel. If a gentleman had no money, and his brother had a number of children to feed, it might not be particularly disgraceful for him to marry the daughter of a wealthy merchant. If a merchant's son went to the university and learned to be a worthwhile scholar, he should not be criticized for being too ambitious. The list could go on. Particularly however, the Puritan woman who praises the

christening of the last illegitimate child of the Allwits makes plain the moral of the play: do not judge people by rumor. It also says that all classes have their proper jobs to do and their proper behavior, and that people who chose to run the world by too elaborate a set of rules are probably going to mess up the world they are trying to run.

In this play all the characters are to be considered satiric exaggerations. In real life the good citizen could easily have a pretty wife who could work in his shop, if he had a shop, which lazy Allwit does not. The good knight could possibly be rich and heirless, in which case he ought to try to make sure that his presumptive heir is leading a decent life, not try to get an heir by immoral means. The goldsmith should go on working at his trade, not try to get money by marrying his children off to wealth. The student and his teacher should apply themselves to their lessons.

Middleton has created a cast of totally immoral characters on purpose. They are not supposed to be realistic. They are supposed to serve as an object lesson to the audience. They were created to show the people of London that both the merchants of London and the gentry who visited there were rather decent people who perhaps had a few faults. He says to the gentry: "Suppose the people you did business with in London were like the Allwits!" He says to the citizens: "Suppose the gentry you knew were like Sir Walter!" The people who saw the play were supposed to say: "Thank God they are not!" It is important to remember that this was

Middleton's last comedy. After this he became official chronologer for the city of London, a writer of tragedies, and an occasional writer of city pageants.

The third important play in this group is Jonson's Bartholomew Fair (1614). As early as 1904 Carroll Storrs Alden pointed out that the puppet show in the play was not really a digression but a device to humiliate Busy, who represents Puritan prejudice against the stage.⁸⁸ In the 1930's criticism does not appear to catch the real purpose of the play at all. L. C. Knights does not even mention it in his discussion of Jonson's plays as they are related to the economic issues of the times. Una Ellis-Fermor, in a note to the discussion of Puritans in Chaste Maid in Cheapside says: "Jonson seems to have seen this with the same clearness about the same time--assuming the date of Chaste Maid to be 1611-13, which brings it to within a year of Bartholomew Fair. But Jonson's Zeal-of-the-Land Busy is angrily drawn, Middleton's Puritans with a cold, ironic disgust."⁸⁹ She does not consider Chaste Maid to be satire but realism. Herford and Simpson say of it: "Jonson commands the Puritan jargon with his usual scholarly virtuosity, but his satire does not touch the deeper strata of Puritan thought, nor could it well be guessed what school or phase of Puritanism Busy reflects."⁹⁰ In more recent times Ray L. Heffner says that the play contrasts the motives which men claim to have with those they actually have.⁹¹ And David McPherson merely ties the character of Adam Overdo in the

play to a Lord Mayor of London.⁹² Criticism does not appear to have dealt with the main thrust of the satire in the play.

The play is tied to the Puritans' obsession with work and calling, and to the work laws. There is no doubt that the puppet show in Bartholomew Fair satirizes the Puritans' ideas about the theater. However, the puppet show also satirizes the ideas of the Puritans about calling. It comes down hard on the Puritans' tendency to confuse the spiritual call from God with the callings in which they worked every day. It also makes plain that by including the actors in the work laws while not mentioning the playwrights the Puritans are being illogical. The actors would have no plays to act in if the playwrights did not write them. It also criticizes the Puritans for working in doubtful "callings" themselves. In addition, though its Biblical imagery has been noted by every editor of the play, the work imagery has been overlooked.

The scene in which Zeal-of-the-Land Busy argues with the puppet, Dionysius, and the puppet master, Leatherhead, is not a long one, and is really self-explanatory, so it will be quoted in part here, with the extraneous matter removed. But first, another look at the sentence from Calvin's Institutes on which the argument is based is in order. It is quoted below in the form Norton gave it in 1611.

Hereupon also shall grow singular comfort, forasmuch as there shall be no worke so filthie and vile, (if it be such a one as thou obey thy calling in it) but it shineth and is most precious in the sight of God.⁹³

In the argument Busy first calls the puppet an idol, then criticizes him for having no proper calling, and last says that he works at a profane trade. The argument between the Puritan, Busy, the puppet, Dionysius, and the puppet master, Leatherhead, follows:

Busy Down with Dagon, down with Dagon; 'tis I will
no longer endure your profanations.
Leat. What mean you sir?
Busy I will remove Dagon there, I say, that idol,
that heathenish idol, that remains (as I say)
a beam, a very beam . . . nor a beam of a
balance, neither a house beam, nor a weaver's
beam, but a beam in the eye of the brethren.
(V.v.1-9)

Note that the imagery used by Busy includes the mention of a beam from daily work. There is also the use of the beam in the eye from the Bible, always noted by commentators. Busy says that the puppet is not connected with useful work, but misuses the Bible verse, because its beam is in the eye of the person who cannot see his own faults.

Leat. Sir, I present nothing, but what is licensed
by authority.
Busy Thou art all license, even licentiousness it-
self, Shimei.
Leat. I have the master of the Revels' hand for it,
sir.
Busy The master of Rebels hand, thou hast; Satan's!
. . . so that I look for a bickering, ere
long, and then a battle. (V.v.17-23)

Note that the imagery here is that of fights and battles. Busy is fighting the good fight against Satan. The puppet master offers to let one of the puppets argue with Busy.

- Leat. Faith, sir, I am not well studied in these controversies between the hypocrites and us. But here's one of my motion, Puppet Dionysius, shall undertake him, and I'll venture the cause on it.
- Busy I will not fear to make my spirit and gifts known! Assist me, zeal; fill me, fill me, that is, make me full. First I say unto thee, idol, thou hast no calling.
- Dion. You lie, I am called Dionysius.
- Busy I mean no vocation, idol, no present lawful calling.
- Dion. Is yours a lawful calling?
- Busy Yes, mine is of the spirit.
- Dion. Then idol is a lawful calling.
- Leat. He says, then idol is a lawful calling! For you called him idol, and your calling is of the spirit.
- Busy Take not part with the wicked, young gallant. I call him idol again. Yet, I say, his calling his profession is profane, it is profane, idol.
- Dion. It is not profane. . .
- Leat. You cannot bear him down with your base noise, sir.
- Busy Nor he me, with his treble creaking, though he creak like chariot wheels of Satan; I am zealous for the cause.
- Leat. As a dog for a bone.
- Busy And I say it is profane, as being the page of Pride, and the waiting woman of Vanity.
- (V.v.33-76)

Busy is saying that the "calling" or trade of actor is profane. The puppet here purposefully misinterprets him to mean his name, which he says is Dionysius. The other play on words is that on the word "base." Though Norton's translation of Calvin does not use "base" to describe work, but uses the word "vile"; nonetheless, the two could be synonyms in the writer's vocabulary, and "base" is more useful here. The puppet turns the argument against Busy by now mentioning the frivolous trades that some Puritans worked in, especially those living near the Blackfriars theater.

Dion. Yea? What say you to your tire women then? Or feathermakers in Friars, that are of your faction of faith? Are they not with their perukes, and their puffs, their fans, and their huffs, as much pages of Pride and waiters upon Vanity? What say you? What say you? What say you?

Busy I will not answer for them.

Dion. Because you cannot, because you cannot. Is a bugle maker a lawful calling? Or the confect maker's (such you have there)? Or your French fashioners? You have all the sin within yourselves, would you not? Would you not?

Busy No, Dagon.

Dion. What then, Dagonet? Is a puppet worse than these? (V.v.77-90)

Busy refuses to answer for other Puritans, so the puppet calls him a fool.

Pertinent to the argument is the fact that the play being performed by the puppets was written by the Puritan, John Littlewit. Busy does not care who wrote the play. As long as someone is going to act it, he is going to stop the action. Be the play ever so good or ever so moral, it must not be presented because the stage is evil. The argument goes on and Busy finally accuses the puppet of putting males in the clothes of females, and the puppet denies that puppets have either sex and pulls his clothes up to prove it. So the argument ends in farce.

Jonson here has connected the whole argument to the work laws, or vagabond laws, criticizing the Puritans for working in trades which are not serious and godly in nature, and criticizing them for giving trouble to the actors in the plays, who in reality only present the material which is written by the playwrights. Busy is also a reflection of

of the work law of 1610 which in section V permitted justices to solicit help from the populace:

with sufficient men of the same places, to make a general privy search in one night . . . for the finding out and apprehending of the said rogues . . . and idle persons; and that such rogues etc. as they shall then find . . . shall by them be brought before the said justices . . . to be set to labor . . . ⁹⁴

Busy, as well as Justice Adam Overdo, is taking this part of the law into his own hands. Busy is more in the wrong than Overdo because he really has no official capacity. Busy is catching the rogues and vagabonds wherever he can. Busy is too busy, or working too hard, and Overdo is overdoing the job of a justice of the peace by searching for criminals.

In Bartholomew Fair Jonson does not see the problems of the ruling class or the problems of the city, he sees only the problems of the playwright and the actor in relation to the Puritan. He does also see the same thing that Middleton pointed out in his play, that the criticism of certain facets of life had reached the point of being ridiculous. This is also demonstrated in the scene in which Busy attacks the gingerbread men, calling them heathen idols (III.iv). It is also apparent in the scenes in which Mooncalf convinces Justice Overdo that Edgeworth, the cutpurse, is really a clerk.

In addition to all of this there is the "Ballad of the Cutpurse," which is sung by the ballad maker, Nightengale, in Act III, scene 5. Only the first verse is included in

most editions of the play, but the other verses sum up another one of the main points that Jonson makes, that of not overlooking the trouble in your own back yard because you are so busy criticizing the other fellow. This is the same point, in a way, that is made in Chaste Maid in Cheapside. The "Ballad of the Cutpurse" points out that the pickpocket does not operate only in the theaters. Verse three reads:

At plays and at Sermons and at the Sessions
 'Tis daily their practice such booty to make;
 Yea, under the Gallows, at Executions,
 They stick not the Stare-Abouts purses to take.
 Nay one without grace
 At a better place
 At Court and in Christmas, before the King's face.
 Alack then for pity must I bear the curse,
 That only belongs to the cunning cut-purse.
 Youth, youth, thou hadst better been starved
 by thy Nurse,
 Than live to be hanged for cutting a purse.⁹⁵

Crimes can be committed in church services, in the court sessions, at the public executions which are supposed to discourage people from crime, as well as in the theater. But only in the theater will the hard-working ballad maker give such good advice.

Jonson criticizes the Puritan who would criticize others for not working at a proper job. He also criticizes those who would try to prosecute actors as vagabonds rather than try to catch cutpurses who steal not only in theaters but in churches and in courts of law. In addition, he criticizes citizens who use their wives for advertising, and

again connects the play to Middleton's when Little-Wit wants his wife to kiss a stranger, and says: "I challenge all Cheapside to show such another" (I.ii.5-6).

Jonson's play is easier to understand than the others. It operates on a surface level. Perhaps even the people of that time had difficulty getting the point when it was made an allegory by Shakespeare or a satire by Middleton, and that is why Jonson went into so much detail in his Induction. The laws did cause a strong reaction in the playwrights and actors who were classed as non-workers. The Puritans were probably continuing their harangue about the matter. If we knew which Puritan lecturer preached which sermon on which day, we might be able to figure out who *Busy* was patterned after, and Herford and Simpson were not correct in saying that the play did not reflect a particular phase of Puritanism. It is a satire of Puritan ideas about earthly "callings." All three of the plays are good. The full implications of them have often been missed.

Several other plays of this period also deal with the same topic, that of work and leisure. Dekker's *If This Be Not Good the Devil Is in It* (1612) includes three apprentice devils who come to earth, Rufman, Shakelsoule, and Lurchall.⁹⁶ Rufman becomes a courtier, Shakelsoule a friar, and Lurchall a merchant. In Act I, scene 2, the king tells how he will spend his weeks, deciding to leave only Saturday for pleasure, and the courtiers become angry about it. In Act I, scene 3, Shakelsoule, when an apprentice cook in a

monastery, is greeted by two hungry pilgrims, whom he thinks should not be fed because they are idle. The prior agrees. Shakelsoule thinks he should be promoted to journeyman cook for that idea. Also in this play is the merchant who begins the string of very wicked merchants who come at the end of this period. Barterville speaks some lines which he presents as a merchant's philosophy. He is answered by the apprentice devil, Lurchall:

Barter. Nature sent man into the world alone
Without all company but to care for one
And that I'll do.
Lurchall True city doctrine, sir. (IV.i.80-83)

Dekker's Barterville is a far cry from his Simon Eyre of 1599. Barterville changes his religion to suit the needs of his business, and gets all he can of the savings of widows and orphans in order to cheat them. He not only cheats widows and orphans but cheats the king when he can.

Beaumont and Fletcher's Wit Without Money (1614) is also related to the same general topic. In it Isabella falls in love with a younger brother who is a scholar and has little money. He is going to have even less in the future because his elder brother, Valentine, is determined to sell his land and squander his fortune as he pleases, and so discontinues his younger brother's allowance. Isabella and her sister manage to convince Valentine that he would be better off being a proper gentleman who manages his lands. He sees that when he leaves, his tenants will have a rackrent

landlord and his brother will have to give up his studies. So the proper work of a gentleman is shown in this play and the wastrel is converted to good behavior. The play tries almost too hard to present the good side of the merchant. The merchant to whom Valentine mortgages his land is not at all anxious to get involved in the deal:

I never sought a gentleman's undoing,
Nor eat the bread of other men's vexations.⁹⁷

Since he is happy to give Valentine's land back when he can pay for it, all ends happily because the sisters marry the brothers and the girls have plenty of money.

Joseph Cooke's The City Gallant (1614) gives still a different look at the question. In it there is portrayed Sir Lionel, who has just been knighted.⁹⁸ Unlike Gresham and Whittington, he does not intend to continue working at his trade after he gets his title. He is going to turn over his business to Spendall, his assistant, and loaf in a court jacket rather than a city coat. In the end, of course, virtue triumphs, and even the apprentice, Bubble, returns to his job when he decides just as Quicksilver did in Eastward Ho that a blue apprentice's coat is superior to the yellow uniform of the jailbird.

These plays, all of which appeared between 1605 and 1615, are quite united in topic. They all deal with the reactions of the public to work and the problems of working in the everyday world. They affirm the idea that everyone has a

proper job and ought to do it. Even younger brothers or sons who must live by their wits are seldom portrayed as criminals but largely as victims of circumstances. It is not surprising that there are few apprentices in these plays. An apprentice can scarcely be criticized for not having a proper calling, only for not working in it seriously enough. Dekker's *Barterville* and Middleton's *Quomodo* are wicked merchants. However, there are as many good ones in the plays as bad ones, people like Gresham in the history play, and *Touchstone* in the comedy. In the plots, work, education, and family life all affect each other. No really persistent source of evil appears. People are actually criticized for being too critical of each other.

In the next period, 1616 to 1631, we find plays which deal with the covetous merchant. The era is that of the monopolist, and for a short time he dominates the scene and is heavily criticized and satirized. In addition to the prevalence of monopolists in the plays, the fact that James I and Charles I often tried to govern without parliament was important at this time; it meant that there were not so many laws passed for playwrights to comment on.

NOTES

¹ Frances Elizabeth Baldwin, Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England, Johns Hopkins University Studies, Ser. 44, No. 1 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1926), p. 249.

² G. W. Prothero, ed., Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents: 1558-1625, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), pp. 271-72, 7 & 8 Jac. I, C. 4, An Act for the due execution of divers laws and statutes heretofore made against rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars and other lewd and idle persons.

³ Prothero, p. 98. 1598, 39 & 40 Eliz. C. 3, An act for the relief of the poor; restated in 1601, 43 & 44 Eliz. C. 2, section 6, on page 104.

⁴ Prothero, p. 272. This is also on microfilm in "A Kalendar of tables comprehending the effect of all the statutes . . ." (Early English Books: 1475-1640, Reel 1379, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1975). This appears under the entry for the word "vagabonds."

⁵ Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952), p. 275.

⁶ The London Prodigal, in The Ancient British Drama (London: William Miller, 1810), I.

⁷ Thomas Middleton, The Family of Love, in The Works of Thomas Middleton, ed. A. H. Bullen (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935), III. Act II, scene 1, p. 31.

⁸ John Marston, The Dutch Courtesan, in The Plays of John Marston, ed. H. Harvey Wood (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1938), II. Act III, scene 2, p. 107.

⁹ Thomas Dekker and John Webster, Westward Ho, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), II.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

10 Thomas Heywood, If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, in Malone Society Reprints, ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford: The University Press, 1935).

11 Edward B. Partridge, "The Symbolism of Clothes in Jonson's Last Plays," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 56 (1957), 396-409.

12 Anthony Caputi, John Marston, Satirist (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1961), p. 222.

13 Harry A. Miskimin, The Economy of Later Renaissance Europe: 1460-1600 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 56.

14 Baldwin, p. 49.

15 Baldwin, p. 53.

16 Ben Jonson, George Chapman, and John Marston, Eastward Ho, in English Drama: 1580-1642, ed. C. F. Tucker Brooke, Nathaniel Burton Paradise (Lexington: D. C. Heath, 1933).

Subsequent references are to this edition and the location of quotations will be noted parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

17 Baldwin, p. 229.

18 Paul S. Clarkson and Clyde T. Warren, The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama, 2nd ed. (New York: Gordian Press, 1968), p. 149.

19 T. M. Parrott, introd., notes, The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies, II (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961), p. 860.

Parrott's notes are on the speech immediately above this one and mention several romances which she has read and from which she mentions characters. She would have read Palmerin of England, a translation from the Spanish, and The Mirror of Knighthood, a translation of Cavallero del Phebo, as well as stories about the Knights of the Round Table. Such romances were also satirized in The Knight of the Burning Pestle.

20 Baldwin, p. 231.

21 Charles W. Camp, The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature, Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature (1924; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1972), p. 5.

22 W. N. Hargreaves-Mawdsley, A History of Academical Dress in Europe Until the End of the Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), pp. 66, 133.

- 23 Baldwin, p. 210.
- 24 Hargreaves-Mawdsley, p. 61.
- 25 Thomas Dekker, The Honest Whore, II, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), II. Act I, scene 3, lines 22-46, 50-65.
- 26 Camp, p. 3.
- 27 Percy Macquoid, "Costume," Ch. XIX, Vol. II Shakespeare's England (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), pp. 112-13.
- 28 Frederick S. Boas, Stuart Drama (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933), p. 139; Hazelton Spencer, Elizabethan Plays (Boston: Little Brown, 1933), p. 475.
- 29 T. M. Parrott, notes, p. 839; C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds., Ben Jonson, IX (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), p. 637.
- 30 Charlotte Spivak, George Chapman (New York: Twayne, 1967), p. 99.
- 31 David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 288.
- 32 Francis Beaumont, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, ed. John Doeblor, Regents Renaissance Drama (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967). Act II, scene 1. lines 445-48.
- 33 Thomas Middleton, A Trick to Catch the Old One, in The Mermaid Series: Thomas Middleton Plays (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n. d.). Act II, scene 2.
- 34 Thomas Dekker and John Webster, Northward Ho, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955), II. Act IV, scene 1, line 15.
- 35 Richard Brome, The Sparagus Garden, in Brome's Dramatic Works (London: John Pearson, 1973), III.
- 36 Paul S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1970), p. 123.
- 37 Seaver, p. 45.
- 38 Seaver, p. 56.

39 Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vols. 20 and 21, The Library of Christian Classics, ed., John T. MacNeill; trans., index, Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), II, p. 719. Book III, Chapter X, Section 6.

40 Thomas Fuller, The Wise Words and Quaint Counsels of Thomas Fuller, ed. Augustus Jessop, D. D. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892), pp. 72-73.

41 Prothero, p. 271.

42 Prothero, p. 271.

43 Prothero, p. 272.

44 Prothero, p. 101, 39 & 40 Eliz. C. 4, 1598.

45 Ben Jonson, Bartholomew Fair, ed. E. A. Horsman, The Revels Plays (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

46 A. L. Rowse, William Shakespeare: A Biography (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 236.

Rowse discusses Shakespeare's ideas of the proper behavior of kings throughout Chapter XII, "England's Past."

47 C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds., Ben Jonson, X (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950), p. 172.

They mention Dekker's "Newes From Helle" as a source for the name, Davy.

Thomas Middleton, A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, ed. R. B. Parker, The Revels Plays (London: Methuen, 1969); William Shakespeare, The Tempest, in The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

Subsequent quotations are from these editions of Middleton and Shakespeare, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text by act, scene, and line number.

48 Tucker Brooke, John William Cunliffe, and Henry Noble MacCracken, eds., Shakespeare's Principal Plays, 3rd ed. (New York: Appleton, 1935), p. 900.

49 Tucker Brooke, et al., p. 902.

50 Raymond Urban, "Why Caliban Worships the Man in the Moon," Shakespeare Quarterly, 27 (1976), 203-05.

51 Ernest Gohn, "The Tempest: Theme and Structure," English Studies, 45 (1962), 116-125.

- 52 David Little, Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 212. He quotes from Sir Edward Coke, Institutes of the Laws of England, II (London, 1962), pp. 730-31.
- 53 Little, p. 196.
- 54 Little, p. 198.
- 55 Little, p. 200.
- 56 Little, p. 210.
- 57 Prothero, p. 101; Little, p. 212.
- 58 Daniel C. Boughner, "Jonsonian Structure in The Tempest," Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 6.
- 59 Harry Epstein, "The Divine Comedy of The Tempest," Shakespeare Studies, 8 (1972), 282, 291; William Rockett, "Labor and Virtue in The Tempest," Shakespeare Quarterly, 24 (1973), 77, 78.
- 60 Leo Marx, "Shakespeare's American Fable," The Massachusetts Review, 2 (1961), 59; Harry Berger, Jr., "Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare's The Tempest," Shakespeare Studies, 5 (1969), 269.
- 61 Rockett, p. 78.
- 62 Dean Ebner, "The Tempest: Rebellion and the Ideal State," Shakespeare Quarterly, 16 (1956), 168.
- 63 Maxwell Luria, "Standing Water and Sloth in The Tempest," English Studies, 49 (1968), 328-29.
- 64 Irwin Smith, "Ariel and the Masque in The Tempest," Shakespeare Quarterly, 21 (1970), 221.
- 65 George Unwin, Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Oxford: Clarendon, 1904), p. 179.
- 66 Louis B. Wright, Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1935), reissued 1958 by Folger Shakespeare Library, p. 10.
- 67 Luria, p. 329.
- 68 Gerald Eades Bentley, "Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theater," in Shakespeare Survey, I, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1948), pp. 38-49.

69 William Armstrong, "Actors and Theaters," in Shakespeare In His Own Age, Vol 17 of Shakespeare Survey, ed. Allardyce Nicoll (Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1964), pp. 191-204.

He quotes from David Klein, "Did Shakespeare Produce His Own Plays?" Modern Language Review, 57 (1962), 556-60. Klein maintains that Shakespeare and many other playwrights of the era directed their own works. It was called "instructing" because early plays were performed by school troupes.

70 T. S. Eliot, Elizabethan Dramatists (1927, London: Faber and Faber, 1962), pp. 83-93.

71 Eliot, p. 89.

72 L. C. Knights, Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1937), p. 260.

73 Knights, p. 260.

74 Charles A. Hallett, "Middleton's Allwit: The Urban Cynic," Modern Language Quarterly, 30 (1969), 498-507.

75 R. B. Parker, introd., notes, A Chaste Maid in Cheapside, by Thomas Middleton, The Revels Plays (London: Methuen, 1969), pp. i-lxvii.

76 Parker, p. xxxiii.

77 Parker, p. xlvi.

78 Parker, p. liv.

79 Parker, p. lvii.

80 Parker, p. lix.

81 Anthony Covatta, Thomas Middleton's City Comedies (Lewisburgh: Bucknell University Press, 1973), p. 138.

82 Covatta, p. 160.

83 Covatta, p. 162.

84 J. A. Bryant, Jr., "Middleton as a Modern Instance," Sewanee Review, 84 (1976), 572-93, 574.

85 Richard Levin, "The Four Plots of A Chaste Maid in Cheapside," Review of English Studies, 16 (1965), 14-24.

86 Thomas Fuller, The Holy State and the Profane State, in Seventeenth Century Prose and Poetry, eds., Alexander M. Witherspoon and Frank J. Warneke, 2nd ed. (New York:

Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1963), p. 379.

87 Dekker and Webster, Westward Ho, Act III, scene 3.
Line 76 reads: "You shall not hit me in the teeth that I was your hindrance." It is spoken by Mrs. Wafer to Mr. Wafer. He actually wants to go along. She and her friends are planning a trip to the suburbs with three gal-lants. The line is related to the growing legend that mer-chants are impotent because they work too hard.

88 Carroll Storrs Alden, ed., Bartholomew Fair, by Ben Jonson (New York: Henry Holt, 1904), p. xvii.

89 Una M. Ellis-Fermor, The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation (London: Methuen, 1936), pp. 135-36.

90 C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, eds., Ben Jonson, XII (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938), p. 144.

91 Ray L. Hefner, Jr., "Unifying Symbols in the Comedy of Ben Jonson," in Ben Jonson, ed. Jonas A. Barish (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1963), p. 145.

92 David McPherson, "The Origins of Overdo: A Study in Jonsonian Invention," Modern Language Quarterly, 37 (1970), 221-33. pp. 224-25.

Overdo has usually been considered to be a satire of Lord Mayor Hayes, who took office in 1614. McPherson shows that Lord Mayor Thomas Middleton of 1613 actually did the same things that Overdo does in the play. Hayes made personal investigations of crime, too, but his actions were almost simultaneous with the date the play was written, so Jonson could hardly have had him in mind. He does not mention that Richard Whittington did similar things 200 years earlier, and that others had also done them.

93 Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Thomas Norton, pub. William Norton by H. Middleton, London, 1611, microfilm (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilm, Carton 490, Early English Books Series).

94 Prothero, p. 271.

95 Alden, p. 192.

96 Thomas Dekker, If This Be Not a Good Play the Devil Is in It, in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. Fredson Bowers (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1955), III.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

97 Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Wit Without Money, in The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce (New York: Appleton, 1890), I. Act I, scene 1, p. 627.

98 Joseph Cooke, The City Gallant, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, ed. R. Dodsley (London: R. Dodsley, 1744), III.

CHAPTER VI

1616-1630: BUSINESS AND ITS PROBLEMS

Early plays treated of education, later ones of love and war, still later ones of work; such plays as The Devil Is an Ass and A New Way to Pay Old Debts speak of money. The period between 1616 and 1630 is the time when the main influence of the laws on the plays is shown in their references to monopolies and the question of just how money is to be earned. The references to monopolies have been discussed by many critics, most notably L. C. Knights and Brian Gibbons.¹ After a statement of what the legal situation was, their ideas will be discussed before other pertinent features of the plays, so as to tie the plays of this era to those of the preceding era and the following one. Several interesting features other than monopolies arise, but the monopolists have absorbed the interest of critics in the past.

L. C. Knights' study of the era explains certain features of the economic life. He points out that monopolies were granted by patent to individuals or groups to collect taxes, to relax statute laws in order to expand trade, to supervise trades, or to create industrial monopolies.² This last purpose was newest and considered objectionable. Unwin says that things came to a head in 1616 when Lady Bedford became

involved in a monopoly for manufacturing gold and silver thread, a thing which angered both silkworkers and goldsmiths.³ Sir Giles Mompesson was one of the commissioners employed to enforce these patents. He was also given the patent to enforce the licensing of ale houses. According to Robert Hamilton Ball, Mompesson not only misdirected the licensing of ale houses but also put six silk mercers in the Fleet prison. He charged ale houses exorbitant licensing fees and relicensed taverns which had been closed for permitting disorderly conduct.⁴ Four wealthy London aldermen bailed the silk mercers for £100,000 but individual tavern keepers were helpless.⁵ Parliament met in 1621 in the middle of the controversy. By 1623 it declared all monopolies illegal except a few granted to guilds and corporations, and made that a law in 1624.⁶ Mompesson was impeached but fled the country to France.⁷ His lands were confiscated and he was outlawed. Sir Francis Bacon was charged with accepting bribes, pleaded guilty, and asked for clemency. He was fined, removed from parliament, and forbidden to hold office. Lionel Cranfield, Lord Treasurer, was charged with bribery and extortion. His lands were sold to make restitution to those he had cheated. The other important law changed at this time was the usury law. The allowable rate for interest was reduced from ten percent to eight percent.

Both Knights and Gibbons say that these economic problems are reflected in the plays. Gibbons calls Jonson's The Devil Is an Ass (1616) an economic history of the time.⁸

Knights quotes economic historians to show that the plays are not always an accurate history of the time because the playwrights were conservatives and the House of Commons was commercial.⁹ The real problems, aside from actual dishonesty, were low wages, payment in kind, and unemployment; however, the dramatists did not attack these things.¹⁰ They did not understand capitalism, so they attacked what they called "usury." They attacked monopolies without understanding that trade guilds were monopolies. They saw the problem as being wicked individuals. But now these wicked individuals were not simple cheating tradesmen or money-lending merchants. The monopolists were knights, lawyers, and gentlemen. The presence on the national scene of convicted offenders gave a different direction to the plays. The wealthy merchant-prince is as common a character in the plays from 1616 to 1630 as the workman or shopkeeper was in the previous period.

The drama is so preoccupied with the monopolist and the dishonest merchant that just as the Puritans were only occasionally satirized in earlier plays, they are still only occasionally satirized here. The rising conflict between the established church and the Puritans is not yet often shown in the drama. The growth of many sects and the connections between Puritan ideas and unemployed scholars is pictured, and an awareness of the flight to the colonies is evidenced toward the end of the period.

The change in the public problems does make for changes in the characterizations of character types which have been

mentioned in earlier chapters, such as the knight, the scholar, the apprentice, and the citizen's wife, as well as the merchant. During the period between 1616 and 1630 the knight becomes a merchant, as was Sir Giles Mompesson. However, he can be either good or bad. Sir John Frugal in The City Madam (1622), by Massinger, is an honest merchant. Sir Giles Overreach in A New Way to Pay Old Debts (1625), also by Massinger, is a dishonest merchant. Sir Giles is the epitome of the covetous merchant, and he is the famous character of the times. There are other less famous merchant characters who are just as wicked or even more so.

The scholar has become a comic figure or a gull. In Fair Maid of the Inn (1625), by Fletcher, the scholar is a schoolmaster.¹¹ Like the other gulls, he wants the conjurer, Forobosco, the mountebank, to help him. He first demonstrates his lack of knowledge of mathematics with a discussion of alchemy in which he can connect the term "multiply" only with the multiplying of the human race by pregnancy. He then goes on to explain that he has a plan for saving money by dividing the weeks into nine days in order to save when paying by the month. His understanding of mathematics is not what one would hope for. He also wants to go to Amsterdam to start four new religions, but says that the Devil will have to think them up because he cannot. In The Elder Brother (1627), by Fletcher, the scholar is the elder brother who is so absorbed in his studies that he at first agrees to let his younger brother have his inheritance.¹² Then he

meets the girl his brother is going to use the money to marry, and wakes up, deciding he wants the girl himself. To prove himself worthy of her he does not have to work for her but to fight for her. Neither brother wants to fight, but they do. Fortunately, they are separated before they can hurt each other. The lazy courtier friend who watches them criticizes their behavior:

To lose a dram of blood must needs appear
As coarse as to be honest. (V.i)

Work is no longer what it takes to win a lady. The hero cannot be either a courtier or a scholar but a real gentleman who will fight for his true love. The scholar also is portrayed in The City Wit (1628), by Brome, and he is merely another one of the debtors who cause the temporary downfall of the honest merchant, rash enough to lend money to poor credit risks.¹³ This scholar finally lets himself be gulled into thinking that the prince wants to hire him as tutor, and loses a valuable jewel when trying to bribe the prince's friends to help his chances to get the job. By the end of the play he has learned better and writes a morality play to celebrate the wedding of the hero. Two of these three scholars at least demonstrate their ability to learn, though they do not show that a university education has given them much else of value.

As L. C. Knights pointed out, it was not until after the end of the reign of James I, 1625, that any great difference

between the education of various classes began to appear.¹⁴ Before then gentlemen's sons still became apprentices to merchants and goldsmiths, just as they had in the past. But in this period the apprentice is no longer an important figure, though his status is still not degraded in any way. In The Devil Is an Ass (1616) the Devil tells Pug, the young devil who wants to visit earth, that the advice of Iniquity, the vice he wants to take along, is out of date.¹⁵ Iniquity says in out-of-date alexandrines:

From thence we will put in at Custom-house key there,
And see how the factors and prentices play there.
(I.i.63-64)

The devil says that factors and apprentices are no longer famous for vice; it is now found at higher levels. In The City Madam (1622) the stingy master does not think that gentlemen's sons make good apprentices.¹⁶ Luke, who before he became master encouraged his brother's apprentices to cheat the brother, says of the apprentices when their fathers enquire about them after he is the master:

Your bonds shall lie
For your sons' truth, and they shall answer all.
They have run out. The masters never prospered
Since gentlemen's sons grew prentices. (V.ii)

Luke blames the apprentices' faults on their gentle blood. He does not know, perhaps the playwright did not, that about one fourth of London apprentices had always been gentlemen's sons. Perhaps most people did not know it. In Brome's The City Wit (1628) the apprentice is the hero, a sort of wily

servant, such as was often found in Roman comedy. He assumes the disguise of a wealthy widow in order to help his good master, the overly generous Crasy, collect from his debtors. He makes an effective and believable manipulator. In Dekker's Fair Maid of the West, II (1630) Clem, the comic apprentice, appears.¹⁷ He is ready to go to work at his old trade in a tavern if he has to. So, one can see that the apprentice is still the apprentice of before, but he is not used as a character in many plays of this period.

The workman also seldom appears. In Middleton's play The Mayor of Quinborough [sic] (1620), the tanner becomes mayor.¹⁸ He does not know how to read and write (logical, as this is A. D. 450, the time of Hengist and Horsa), but he says that he knows all the tricks of his own trade and will be a good mayor by studying those of others:

I will learn the villany of all trades,
My own I know already. (III.i)

The workman is not expected to be honest, apparently. In Shirley's The Wedding (1626) the citizen, Rawbone, is thin, a sure sign that he is not virtuous.¹⁹ He lends his friend money at eight percent, in accordance with the new law, but admits that he often charges forty. He is a coward who will not fight and who lets the other man who wants the girl he wants borrow his clothes and fight for her in disguise. Rawbone thereby loses the lady and Haver, a gentleman, gets her. These workmen are typical of the few who do appear.

They do not have positive roles, but are the typical dishonest workman and citizen who will not fight. Fighting is replacing work as the test for deciding who is worthy of the lady.

The citizen's wife also seldom figures in these plays. Satire of her was heavy in the last period; however, in the period from 1616 to 1630 this satire disappears. A look at the plays will show why; the merchant and shopkeeper have learned many new ways to advertise so as to lure people into the shop. This phenomenon of advertising will be discussed below. In these plays the wife is portrayed in several ways. In The Devil Is an Ass (1616) the other characters realize that Mrs. Fitzdottrel is a decent person and help her keep her husband from being gulled out of his money and land by making him sign it over to her. In The City Madam (1622) the social climbing ladies learn that their behavior is only going to lead them to be sacrificed to Indian tribal gods in the colony of Virginia, and they reform. In A New Wonder A Woman Never Vexed (1624) the patient citizen has a wife who is just as patient as he is.²⁰ The social climbing wife has apparently lost her fascination for audiences, and the shopkeeper's wife is no longer pictured as flirting with courtiers. The citizen's wife is simply accepted as part of the scene, as is the apprentice.

The treatment of Puritans no longer depends on their strange language as it did in the early plays of Jonson and Middleton. It is taken for granted that the sect includes

both scholars and tradesmen. They are not admirable people, but it is acknowledged that there are different sects which are not exactly alike. In The Wedding (1626) Rawbone has a servant, Camelion, who has been baptized twice, the second time when he was about to become an apprentice to an Anabaptist. The difference between Anabaptists and other sects is thereby acknowledged; Anabaptists did not believe in infant baptism while many other sects did. The scholar of The Fair Maid of the Inn (1625), who wanted to create four sects, reinforces the idea that the people of the time were beginning to differentiate between the sects and to take them seriously. However, Puritans are not frequently characters in the plays until the last ten years before the Civil War. Since Jonson satirized them so heavily from early on, readers tend to overestimate the amount of satire against them which appeared in the plays. Such satire was much more common in pamphlets than in plays.

The beggar has virtually disappeared from the drama of this period. Begging was no longer tolerated by the law, and was, according to the Webbs, actually decreasing.²¹ It is also possible that it would have been impolitic to mention beggary at any length. The only play in this period, so far as I know, which even mentions beggars is Beggars' Bush (1622) by Fletcher and Massinger.²² In that play the beggars are merely a group who accept the gentry hiding from their enemies.

The merchant is the principal protagonist in the plays written between 1616 and 1630. The plays deal with the risks

he takes, his tricks, his reputation, his frugality, his selfishness, the fact that he is a world traveller, and with his character in general, both good and bad but mostly bad. The better known plays, such as Jonson's The Devil Is an Ass and A Staple of News (1626), and Massinger's A New Way to Pay Old Debts (1625) have been analyzed many times by such critics as L. C. Knights, Brian Gibbons, and A. H. Thorndike.²³ It is agreed that the three plays are satire of the business practices of projectors and monopolists. The Devil Is an Ass portrays Fitzdottrel, the perfect gull, who is fooled by Merecraft, the projector who wants to sell toothpicks, forks, dogskin gloves, and the like, but whose biggest project is the draining of the fens for farming. Jonson clearly does not think that the fens can be drained, though a Dutchman successfully drained them about twenty years after the play was performed.²⁴ Jonson gets his minor devil to earth by having Fitzdottrel ready to accept the help of the devil in his schemes for making money. To Jonson the medieval standards are the best; a man should make enough money for a living, not a profit, and this is shown in the play's satire of avaricious people. A Staple of News is a satire of projectors, lawyers, and the love of money. As has recently been pointed out by Richard Levin, it is also a satire of the misuse of language.²⁵ Massinger's A New Way to Pay Old Debts is the famous play about a merchant. Its Sir Giles Overreach is not an avaricious Puritan, he is actually anti-Christian, as Knights notes.²⁶ His only desire is to get more and more

land and money and then to marry his daughter to a gentleman with a rank higher than his own. Overreach is not purely Mompesson, though he does deal with tavern keepers. He represents the whole new aristocracy of wealth.²⁷ In the end, he destroys his own ends and admits his lack of religion. A. H. Thorndike criticizes the ending of the play in which Sir Giles goes mad, attempts to kill his daughter, and then realizes what he has done.²⁸ Thorndike feels that when Sir Giles says his piece he is really stating Massinger's opinions, not those a real Sir Giles would have had:

I'll fall to execution. Ha! I am feeble:
Some undone widow sits upon my arm,
And takes away the use of it; and my sword
Glued to my scabbard, with wronged orphans' tears
Will not be drawn. Ha! What are these? Sure hangmen
That come to bind my hands; (V.i.361-66)

It seems correct to me to have the merchant do this. He has been making money from investments which were originally excused as providing money for widows and orphans who could not work. He realizes that he has finally been caught cheating the very people most money managers were supposed to help. He has behaved just as did Mompesson, who cheated the tavern keepers who kept good houses and let the ones who had been closed by the law enforcement agents be reopened for a fee. Massinger is linking the investment business back to the widows and orphans who were the first excuse given for permitting the charging of interest. I cannot criticize the ending. Merchants were also trained as apprentices and had

undoubtedly heard all during their youth that investments were good because they allowed people who could not work to make money from their property or money. If he had no remnant of conscience left, Overreach would not go mad. He does go mad, and his memories of his learning as a youth surface at the time madness strikes him. Though Sir Giles is a very dark villain, probably the rottenest merchant of all is Romelio in Webster's The Devil's Law Case, written in 1622, right after the monopolies became controversial. Romelio gets a nun pregnant, tries to marry his sister off for money, and stabs a man who lies sick in bed. The merchant as a character has fallen a long ways from the admirable Antonio of The Merchant of Venice or even Candido of Dekker's The Honest Whore, I.

Aside from the treatment of the merchant which is often discussed by critics, there are a number of interesting things found in the plays of 1616-1630 which relate to the progress of business and the new way of doing business, the way that we are now familiar with. These things are the reduction in interest rate, the value of risk taking, the similarity between earning money from farming and earning it from merchandising, the spread of advertising, and the movement to the new world.

Mention of the reduction of the interest rate shows that the playwrights kept up with the times. Celeste Turner Wright pointed out that the reduction of interest rate to eight percent was mentioned in A Staple of News, and pointed

out that the play was written in 1626, two years after the law was changed.³⁰ Shirley's The Wedding (1626) also has citizen Rawbone remark on the fact that only eight percent interest is legal, as was mentioned above.

The entire process of money making is discussed in various plays. Making money by taking risks in business is specifically discussed. In The Devil Is an Ass Guilthead, the goldsmith, explains the process to his son, Plutarchus, who does not want to become the gentleman his father wants him to become. Jonson's Guilthead explains the risk taking phenomenon as something almost dishonest:

We citizens never trust, but we do cozen:
 For if our debtors pay, we cozen them;
 And if they do not, then we cozen ourselves.
 But that's a hazard everyone must run,
 That hopes to make his son a gentleman. (III.i.22-26)

Plutarchus insists that he does not want to be one because in a generation or two his descendents will be cozened by the citizens of that day. Guilthead insists that courtiers are far worse than merchants because courtiers make people wait in line to see them so that they will look important. Guilthead is not proud of his risk taking, but thinks that other careers are as bad as his or even worse.

In Beggar's Bush (1622) by Fletcher and Massinger, Florez, the gentleman in disguise who is working as a merchant, tries to make Captain Hemskirk understand that making money from shipping is no different from making it by farming. The exchange quoted below has other things removed:

- Flor. You do not know what a gentleman's worth sir.
(II.iii.86)
- Capt. Nay, I'm not certain of that; of this I am,
If once it buy and sell, its gentry is gone.
(II.iii.97-98)
- Flor. No, now 'tis pity
Of your poor argument. Do not you, the lords
Of the land, (if you be any), sell the grass,
The corn, the straw, the milk, the cheese--
(II.iii.101-03)
- Capt. No, for those sordid uses we have our tenants,
Or else our bailiffs.
- Flor. Have not we, sir, chapmen
And factors then, to answer these?
(II.iii.106-08)
Do not your lawyers
Sell all their practice, as your priests their
prayers?
What is not bought and sold?
(II.iii.112-14)

This idea would have had much appeal for the gentleman entrepreneur of England, but Florez gets nowhere with the Captain. However, he is vindicated at the end of the play and returned to his rightful place in life, that of Duke of Florence. Fletcher's Florez here points out the conflict between what Unwin called different forms of capital. He also points out the fact that everyone works for pay.

In Middleton and Rowley's A New Wonder, A Woman Never Vexed (1624), which Schelling says is a history play, the life of Sir Stephen Foster, one time Lord Mayor of London, the patient citizen merchant, who eventually becomes Lord Mayor, gets an equally patient wife.³¹ Though his brother calls him "unthrifty," Sir Stephen's wife is not upset by the great amounts of money which he gives to charity. In addition, Sir Stephen explains that all business is a gamble on people

because some pay their bills and others do not. Middleton, the London city chronologer, uses the play to explain the element of risk taking, the one that people of that era thought justified making a profit. The play makes the point that making money is all right, and that giving it to charity is all right too. Apparently the problem of how to earn money, how much to earn, and what to do with it after it was earned, was a question on the lips of everyone, and Jonson shows this when he has Penny Boy Canter in A Staple of News (1626) say of Lady Pecunia, the Infanta of the Mines:

She is
The talk of the time! the adventure of the age!
All the world are suitors to her.³²

A little later, in The City Wit (1628), by Brome, Jonson's "apprentice," we find the honest merchant, Crasy, learning that he can only get the money due him from his debtors by cozening them. They are scholars and courtiers, and will not pay. His apprentice, Jeremy, disguises himself as a rich widow and helps Crasy get his money. He finally gets all that is due him:

Why! I am weary of money now. I have gotten
more in a week's cozenage than in all my days
of honesty. (V.i)

We can see that Brome does not share Jonson's total disgust for the world of business. In this play both the merchant and his apprentice are actually fine people. Jonson, on the other hand, reveals his feelings about the world of

buying and selling in The New Inn (1629), a very poor play, and a hard one to understand.³² In it, Lovell, the true gentleman-soldier-scholar, contrasts valor and risk taking:

The things true valor is exercised about
 Are poverty, restraint, captivity,
 Banishment, loss of children, long disease;
 . . . so a mind affecting
 Or undertaking dangers for ambition,
 Deserves the name of daring, not of valor.
 (IV.iv.105-19)

This appears to be Jonson's attitude toward risk taking in business as well as in war. The golden mean was his ideal, and it did not permit the amassing of capital needed to finance a capitalist society. Brome and Middleton are better able to see that the merchant often loses money because dishonesty is not confined to merchants; customers are often dishonest too. And Fletcher pointed out that everyone, merchant, farmer, lawyer, and even priest, expected to be paid.

There are also arguments about whether or not the gentry should work or even go to the university. The argument from Beggar's Bush has been quoted above. In The Elder Brother (1627) Brisac, himself a younger brother, wants to make his own younger son, the courtier Eustace, his heir because his elder son, Charles, has elected to become a scholar:

Can history cut my hay or get my corn in?
 And can geometry vend it in the market? (II.i)

He considers Eustace's experience at court superior to Charles's experience at the university. In the end he learns that both of his sons are worthy and willing to fight for the

lady they love, and to tend properly to their father's land and property. The problem is resolved when Brisac's heirless elder brother leaves his property to the son who will inherit nothing. It appears that the conflict between the patient merchant and the warlike landowner is beginning to be settled. The lazy courtier in The Elder Brother makes it clear that he thinks that soldiers are supposed to be hired professionals. The brothers both finally decide that they will be willing to fight or work as necessary, and that court life is not admirable.

In plays which take up the topic at all it becomes clear that the patient merchant is no longer patient about having courtiers flirt with his wife. To begin with, he has other forms of advertising. Merecraft, in The Devil Is an Ass, does his own advertising, and lets the lady merchant who sells makeup take care of her own business. He is good at thinking of gimmicks, and as Maurice Hussey points out, his line about how toothpicks will keep one's teeth clean and thus prevent disease does not sound very different from modern advertising.³³ In The Fair Maid of the Inn (1625), however, the question of advertising is dealt with at greater length. The Host and Hostess work in the Inn, of course. Bianca, the young daughter, enters, and the Clown remarks: "She's a pretty lure to draw custom to your ordinary" (II.ii). The host answers: "Do you think I keep her to that purpose?" (II.ii). The clown replies with a description of advertising as it is handled in England:

In English you have several adaments to draw in spurs and rapiers; one keeps silkworms in a gallery; a milliner has choice of monkeys and paraketoos; another shows bawdy East Indian pictures, worse than ever were in Aretine's; a goldsmith keeps his wife wedged into his shop like a mermaid, nothing of her to be seen (that's woman) but her upper part. (II.ii)

In the fourteen years since Middleton wrote Chaste Maid in Cheapside, the merchants have learned a lot about advertising. Now the wife is the least of their tricks. People come to admire the silkworms or the monkeys, or to look at the bawdy pictures, and linger to buy. This is the same play in which the schoolmaster wants to start four new religious sects. The society of 1625 is obviously a good deal more sophisticated than that of 1611.

The far-flung state of English shipping is also reflected in the plays. In The City Madam (1622), by Massinger, Sir John Frugal and his friends disguise themselves as Indians from Virginia, and no one seems surprised to find Indians in London. In Dekker's Fair Maid of the West, II, (1630) when Bess, the tavern keeper, needs a friend in Florence, there is an English merchant handy to give her some money for once saving his life, and thus to help her and Clem to solve their latest problem. No one would be surprised to find a friendly English merchant who had known her in Turkey conveniently in Florence because English merchants were everywhere.

In some cases the Puritans are connected to the satire of business in these plays. Middleton's jabs of 1602 to 1611

were of a lighter nature, but Jonson's were always related to the Puritans' love of money-making and their criticism of other people's habits. In this period we begin to see a few other playwrights doing similar things. The scholar in Fair Maid of the Inn wants to start four new religions just for the fun of it. The citizen, Rawbone, in The Wedding, is not virtuous, a thing related to the fact that he is too thin. He admits to charging forty percent interest when he can. He is also too cowardly to fight for the girl he wants. In Jonson's A Staple of News we learn that the "saints" in Amsterdam are active:

The saints do write, they expect a prophet shortly,
 The prophet Baal, to be sent over to them,
 To calculate a time, and half a time,
 And the whole time, according to Naometry.
 (III.ii.126-29)

But the great topic of the age is just what Jonson said it was, money. In A Staple of News the poet, Madrigal, describes Lady Pecunia in this way:

She makes good cheer, she keeps full boards,
 She holds a Fair of knights and lords,
 A mercat of all offices,
 And shops of honor, more or less.
 According to Pecunia's grace,
 The bride hath beauty, blood, or place,
 The bridegroom virtue, valour, wit,
 And wisdom as he stands for it. (IV.ii.109-16)

Money overshadows everything else. The merchant himself is not sure of collecting from his debtors. The apprentice is no longer a student who gets educated so as to earn money. The scholar still cannot earn money and so has turned to inventing religions. The wife is only one form of advertising.

People are arguing about whether or not a gentleman should work, which way of earning money is the best, and whether or not a merchant may actually be cheated by the people he tries to help by lending money to them. The world is beginning to become a thing that no longer fits the old standards. Work and money and how to manage them are the topic of the times between 1616 and 1630.

In the next era the picture changes. Everyone is the victim of unusual taxes. London is less the third university of the land because of its apprentices and more because of the information disseminated through Gresham College, where the scientists and scholars come to lecture. The apprentice is now only one of many students. The scholar is now only one of many well educated people. The city is becoming large and sophisticated. Plays in the last era, while they still resemble those of earlier times, take some new directions. Law and religion, but also science, are becoming common knowledge to the audience, and law and religion are the problems of the period, not money.

NOTES

¹ L. C. Knights, Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1937); Brian Gibbons, Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1968).

Both of these provide excellent discussions of general factors and some specific plays of the period between 1616 and 1630.

² Knights, p. 73.

³ George Unwin, The Gilds and Companies of London, The Antiquary Books (London: Methuen, 1908), p. 314.

⁴ Robert Hamilton Ball, The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach (Princeton, N. J.: The University Press, 1939), p. 7.

⁵ Unwin, Gilds and Companies, p. 317.

⁶ G. W. Prothero, ed., Statutes and Constitutional Documents: 1558-1625, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), p. 275. 21 & 22 Jac. I, C. 3, An act concerning monopolies and dispensation and penal laws, and the forfeiture thereof.

⁷ J. R. Tanner, ed., Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, A.D. 1603-1625, With Historical Commentary (Cambridge, Engl.: University Press, 1930), pp. 321-25.

Most of this discussion is taken from Tanner's description of the events.

⁸ Gibbons, p. 15. This is similar to what Tawney said.

⁹ Knights, pp. 174-76. A good deal of his discussion is based on E. Lipsom's An Economic History of England, II, III.

¹⁰ Knights, p. 175.

¹¹ John Fletcher, The Fair Maid of the Inn, in The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, II, ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce (New York: D. Appleton Co., 1854).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text by act and scene number.

¹² John Fletcher, The Elder Brother, in The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, II, ed. Rev. Alexander Dyce (New York: D. Appleton, 1854).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹³ Richard Brome, The City Wit, in Brome's Dramatic Works, I (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent-Garden, 1873).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁴ Knights, p. 141.

¹⁵ Ben Jonson, The Devil Is an Ass, ed. Maurice Hussey (London: University Tutorial Press, 1967).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁶ Phillip Massinger, The City Madam, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, VII (London: R. Dodsley in Pall Mall, 1744).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁷ Thomas Dekker, Fair Maid of the West, II, in Regents' Renaissance Drama, ed. Robert K. Turner (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1967).

¹⁸ Thomas Middleton, The Mayor of Quinborough, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, XI (London: R. Dodsley in Pall Mall, 1744).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

¹⁹ James Shirley, The Wedding, in Six Caroline Plays, ed. A. S. Knowland (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

²⁰ William Rowley (and Thomas Middleton and/or John Fletcher), A New Wonder, A Woman Never Vexed (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, STC 21432, Carton 936).

²¹ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, English Poor Law History: Part I, The Old Poor Law, Vol. 7, English Local Government (1927; rpt. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1963), p. 92.

²² John Fletcher and Phillip Massinger, Beggar's Bush, in English Drama: 1580-1642, eds. C. F. Tucker Brooke and Nathaniel Burton Paradise (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1933).

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

²³ Gibbons, pp. 192, 196, 202; Knights, pp. 188, 211; Ashley J. Thorndike, English Comedy (New York: Macmillan, 1929), pp. 231-34.

²⁴ Knights, p. 217.

²⁵ Richard Levin, "The Staple of News, The Society of Jeerers, and the Canter's College," Philological Quarterly, 44 (1965), 445-53.

Levin says that the play makes the point that news or gossip is only moderately bad, jeering is worse, and "cant" or jargon as it would be called today is the worst form of language debasement.

²⁶ Knights, p. 279.

²⁷ Knights, p. 277.

²⁸ Thorndike, p. 233.

²⁹ John Webster, The Devil's Law Case, in The Complete Works of John Webster, II, ed. F. L. Lucas (London: Chatto and Windus, 1927).

³⁰ Celeste Turner Wright, "Some Conventions Regarding the Usurer in Elizabethan Literature," Studies in Philology, 31 (1934), 176-97.

³¹ Felix E. Schelling, Elizabethan Drama: 1558-1642, II (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908), p. 262.

³² Ben Jonson, A Staple of News, in Ben Jonson, VI, eds. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938), Act I, scene 4, lines 62, 63, 65.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

³³ Maurice Hussey, ed. and introd., The Devil Is an Ass, Ben Jonson (London: University Tutorial Press, 1967), p. xi.

CHAPTER VII

1631-1642: RELIGION, LAW, AND SCIENCE

The period from 1631 to 1642 is different from the others in one way especially. Because Charles I tried to rule without parliament, between 1629 and 1640 there were no laws passed. However, in order to pay government costs Charles I did a number of things which had a great impact on the economic situation. In addition, the conflict between the Puritans and the established church reached a peak which finally led to the Civil War in 1642. The theaters were also closed in 1642. The realistic plays of this period can be related to the plays of previous periods, to the conflict between the Puritans and the established church, and to the economic problems of the time, as well as to the on-going conflict between the lawyers and the government administrators. The change in the role of the apprentice can be related to the beginning of the breakdown in the apprenticeship system which actually started after 1618 but like other things not firmed by the passage of a law did not have such an immediate effect either on society or on the drama as did those implemented by law.

Both the Webbs¹ and Tawney² say that between 1631 and 1640 the work laws, poor laws, and vagabond laws were

operating properly. The Webbs say that the workhouse actually did put people to work and pay them wages. They add that the program was financed in a variety of ways, with Cornwall financing it by fines for absence from divine worship.³ In many places the justices bound out hundreds of children as apprentices in order to put them to work, often paying the fees to get talented children into the better trades.⁴ When the work system began to break down seriously after 1640, the excess of unemployed people was partially absorbed into the armies which fought the Civil War.⁵ Tawney says that up to 1640 the Privy Council drove the justices hard in order to keep the law functioning in order to lessen the chance of public disorder.⁶

The long-effective system took care of the poor and the working class. However, without Parliament, Charles I had to get money by indirect methods in order to operate the government and to make war. According to J. R. Tanner, the methods he used to get money served to alienate all classes from him and unite them with each other.⁷ The money was collected from merchants in the form of Tonnage and Poundage on imports, from the gentry in the form of Compositions for Knighthood, from the nobles in the form of Forest Laws, from the ordinary consumer in the form of new government monopolies such as the one on soap, and eventually from the cities and towns in the form of Ship Money.⁸ All of these methods had been used by previous monarchs as special impositions, but not as steady taxes. Tonnage and Poundage had been used

for limiting specific exports and imports, Compositions were levied for such things as the dowry of Princess Elizabeth, land cleared of forest had seldom been taken by the monarch though ancient agreement provided for taking it, monopolies except for those of guilds and towns had been abolished by the law of 1624, and ship money had been collected only when the monarch needed ships for war. After 1637, when John Hampden tested the legality of ship money collection and lost the case, people began to fight back by delaying payment of the taxes of all kinds.⁹ Although the times were basically prosperous, people of all kinds felt the economic pinch of inflation and resented the added pinch of unusual taxes. This can be seen only indirectly in the plays because the playwrights were still limited by the old law which prevented them from commenting too directly on political issues. Since the issues were not settled by the passage of laws as they had been in earlier times, there is less comment on them than at previous times. What can be seen is that no economic or social class is made either the special hero or special villain of the period. The negative characters of this era are Puritans and lawyers.

The thing which is increasingly apparent in the plays is the major conflict of the period, the growing trouble between the Puritans and the established church. The handling of that problem did not require the passage of new laws; all that was required was that the old regulations against non-conformity be strictly enforced. As Henry W. Clark says,

William Laud who became Bishop of London in 1629 and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 was the man who tried to enforce the rules.¹⁰ Laud wanted a "universal" church, not a church which tolerated differences of opinion.¹¹ He attempted to silence Puritan lecturers by cutting off their sources of financial support.¹² He initiated a series of "Visitations" of the churches to make sure that they were adhering to the ritual of the established church.¹³ When Puritan preachers and church members began to emigrate to America after 1630, he passed edicts to stop the emigration because he wanted submission, not flight.¹⁴ In addition, he attempted to regulate the refugee churches in England and finally attempted to reform the Scottish ministers, in 1633 requiring them to wear the surplice and in 1637 assigning them a required liturgy.¹⁵ This last led to the Scotch invasion of England in 1639. The Scotch feudal lords had an army of 22,000 and Charles I could muster only a force of 14,000.¹⁶ So on April 13, 1640, Charles I called a new Parliament in order to get money to make war. The Parliament did not cooperate and was dissolved on August 3, 1640. The religious arguments themselves do not appear in the plays, but public reaction to the events was felt, and portrayals of Puritans as characters in the plays do increase in number.

Parliament had been more or less taken for granted by the people of England from the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth I on. During her reign it was called on an average of once every three years. Though there was no parliament

between 1614 and 1621, that period of time was not as upsetting to people as the long period between 1629 and 1640. One begins to find references to parliament in the plays of this period. Tanner points out that James I and Charles I had turned parliament into a vastly different thing than it had been in the reign of Elizabeth I. The House of Lords had been greatly increased by creations and sales of peerages.¹⁷ There had been fifty-nine peers in 1603; there were 124 by 1640. The House of Commons had not increased in size, but by 1628 a contemporary writer had remarked that the Commons was so wealthy that it could buy out the Lords three times over.¹⁸ There was actually less ancient blood in the upper house than in the lower.¹⁹ Differences between the two were minimized because the English gentry were involved in business, colonization, and speculation to such an extent that many were partners in business and such partnerships often crossed house lines.²⁰ Consequently, they were accustomed to working with each other, not against each other. This contemporary leveling of society is still reflected in the plays of the period. So there are plays which criticize Puritans, show everybody in financial trouble, and make no special criticism of anyone except the Puritans and the lawyers. It was safe to criticize the Puritans because they did not conform to the established church and it was safe to criticize the lawyers because they argued both sides of all the questions in the courts.

Most studies of the satire of Puritans have not put the

matter into a time frame. A tabulation of the plays mentioned by William P. Holden, however, shows that such a comparison can be made.²¹ His study includes all plays, tragedies and romantic comedies as well as histories and realistic comedies, and includes all references, not just character portrayals. A tabulation of his references shows 15 Puritan references between 1588 and 1604, 15 between 1605 and 1615, 17 between 1616 and 1630, and 19 between 1631 and 1642. The review made for this paper yielded 6 in the first period, 8 in the second period, 6 in the third, and 12 in the fourth. Not all references in the two studies are the same, and of the 12 found in the fourth period 5 are references not mentioned by Holden. It appears that references to Puritans in the dramas increased greatly during the time between 1631 and 1642. In addition to this general increase, all the references show a peak in certain years. Of the references in the first two time periods, seven appeared in the years 1604 and 1605, immediately after the Puritans submitted their "Millenary Petition." In the third time period, five of the seventeen were in plays produced in 1625 when feeling against monopolies and shady business practices was running high, and the tendency of the playwrights was to connect these to Puritans. In the last period, five of the references appear in 1633, immediately after the publication of William Prynne's Histrio-Mastix, which was a denunciation of the stage, and six appeared in 1640 and 1641, immediately before the beginning of the Civil War. In earlier times

Jonson and Middleton had criticized the Puritans; in later times all the playwrights criticized them.

In addition to satirical treatment of Puritans, who appeared to cause the problems of the day, and lawyers, who appeared to prevent easy solutions of the problems, the plays contain a variety of ideas. Some are merely repetitions of old formulas. Others show an increasing interest in the ideas of science, law, and the study of antiquities. Many plays portray the same character types as had appeared before, such as the apprentice, the knight, the merchant, the citizen's wife, and the scholar. Two portray an entirely new type, the antiquary. Generally the plays do not favor one class over another; however, some trends can be noted. The apprentice may be more sophisticated than before, as Charles W. Camp remarks.²² However, the apprentice is now a worker more than a student, and several plays show the reduction in his status though others still stress the earlier status. The citizen's wife is still complaining about being used for advertising, though she sometimes cooperates. The country gentleman has become an immoral person who seduces not only city women but also country girls. The workman is not merely patient, but too patient. The merchant is good or bad as the plot demands. The knight no longer boasts of his gentility or prowess. The courtier is a beggar who values his clothes more than his reputation. The soldier is reduced in status as the period progresses toward war at home.

The playwrights are not as skilled as those of the earlier periods, and only Richard Brome, as Felix Schelling observed, comes close to equalling the older dramatists, and producing better plays than even James Shirley.²³ Drama often turned to romantic comedy and tragicomedy, and those types of plays do not reflect the life of the times. Brome usually wrote city comedy, and he had learned his techniques from Jonson, whose servant he had originally been. Other writers produced only a few plays, and even some noblemen such as Suckling tried their hands at playwriting.²⁴ This yielded a mixed bag of plays. For this study only plays pertinent to the problems of education, religion, economics, and the resultant attitude toward the working man and his apprentice are discussed.

Among the working people portrayed the position of the apprentice is the most ambiguous in the plays of this time. This could be related to the fact that, as Stella Kramer says, from the time of James I on judges had ruled against the Statute of Apprentices and in favor of the Common Law, which maintained that a man had a right to work at any job.²⁵ The first such judgment was made in 1618, but unlike the actual passage of a law it was a while before its effect was felt. In addition, by 1635 many new trades, such as that of clockmakers, had appeared. Their members had never been apprenticed to clockmakers.²⁶ Such problems made the enforcement of the law difficult, especially after all trades went on the apprenticeship system after 1601. Many trades

also became freer about allowing sons to buy "membership by patrimony" in their fathers' trades, a thing that had always been permissible. For example, in 1615 John Webster bought his freedom of the Merchant Taylor's Company, and Anthony Munday was free of three companies at the time of his death.²⁷

Two plays especially show that the apprentice's position is not what it once was. In The Guardian (1631), by Massinger, Durazo, the guardian of the title, is accused of being too lenient with Caldoro, his nephew and ward.²⁸ He says of his critics:

Hide-bound money-mongers: they would have me
Train up my ward, a hopeful youth, to keep
A merchant's book; or at the plough, and clothe him
In canvass or coarse cotton; while I fell
His woods, grant leases, which he must make good
When he comes to age, (I.i)

Durazo is going to let his heir live like a gentleman until he gets his own money, and makes it clear that he thinks it would be an insult to the young man to apprentice him. In a later play, The City Match (1639), by Jasper Mayne, an Anglican clergyman, the young man who works at an apprentice's task is Frank Plotwell, the nephew of Mr. Warehouse, who is a merchant.²⁹ Frank was originally a student at the Inns of Court but neglected his studies and wasted his money. His uncle puts him to work in his own shop and tells his factor, Cypher, to train him. When Frank's old friends among the law students find him, they tease him about being an apprentice, but he denies that he is one. When his uncle and another merchant, Mr. Seathrift, leave on a voyage, Frank refuses to

study his new lessons just as he did his former ones, telling Cypher that he will not study French, Italian, Spanish, arithmetic, shorthand, and navigation, though Cypher tries to teach him. Frank eventually gets his way and marries the daughter of Mr. Seathrift, whose son marries Frank's sister. In both of these plays being a good apprentice is not treated as a thing worthy of praise.

In one other play the case is the opposite. In The Soddered Citizen (1632), by John Clavell, a reformed highwayman, Modestina, the young heroine, says to her friend, Miniona, who wants to marry a gentleman:

What is your father but a citizen?
 Will you defile your nest, what prentice is there
 That's born a gentleman, if he is bound
 Can be deprived a Scutcheon to his hearse?
 He is but under civil discipline,
 A scholar, in an honest art of life,
 There's nothing forfeits gentry but attainder,
 And nothing shows it more than courtesy.³⁰

She speaks of the apprentice as a student, learning a respectable trade in order to make a living. The apprentice does not forfeit his right to call himself a gentleman by entering a trade. Most of the other plays do not say anything either for or against apprentices, the apprentice is merely a character in the drama. In Heywood's The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (1634), the apprentice is just another character.³¹ In Tottenham Court (1633), by Thomas Nabbes, the apprentice is mentioned by the tailor's wife when she says that her husband is jealous of his Cornish apprentice.³²

In Richard Brome's The New Academy (1637), the apprentice, Cash, is more like the apprentices of earlier times. He has both good and bad qualities.³³ Charles W. Camp says that Cash shows the high state of sophistication of the apprentice because he does not "reveal by his talk or actions that he is an apprentice. Cash is, moreover, a man of the world, with a ready action by which to extricate himself when he is involved in any suspicion of scandal."³⁴ Camp's description is not very accurate. Actually, Cash has used up half of the £2,000 bond his father left for him by spending it on fancy clothes and gambling. He is in love with his master's daughter but realizes that he cannot have her when her brother supposedly dies and she becomes heiress to a large fortune. Nevertheless, he behaves gallantly, going into disguise and saving the girl and her friend from being turned into prostitutes by her wicked uncle, the elder brother of her father. Cash is sophisticated enough to fool the uncle, and in the end is forgiven for taking money from his master, the merchant. However, Cash does not get the girl; she will marry the Frenchman, the son of her father's friend, who raised her brother in France while her father raised his daughter in England. There is a double wedding planned, but Cash is not to be part of it. The days of the good apprentice who marries the master's daughter and moves on to power and riches appear to be over.

The workman fares only a little better. He is usually portrayed as being stupid enough to be cheated by the

courtier, and is teased about, not praised for, his famous patience. In The Magnetic Lady (1632), by Jonson, the tailor is the father of the heiress, Placentia's baby.³⁵ But though the money should be hers, she and the tailor will not get it unless the soldier, Ironside, who marries Placentia's guardian, Lady Loadstone, agrees to give it to her. This play is an allegory of money, Jonson's last on that topic. The tailor may produce the riches, but he cannot depend on his reward because he is not entirely honest, and the soldier will make the final decision. In The Covent-Garden Weeded (1632), by Brome, the shoemaker and the tailor fare a little better when they help the young law student, Mihill, extract some money from his uncle by disguising themselves as lawyers.³⁶ When Mihill swears to pay the shoemaker on his oath as a gentleman, the shoemaker comes up with still another satirization of that oath:

As I am a shoemaker, and that's a kind of a gentleman, you know, I'll not stir 'til I have my money; I am not an ass, Sir. (II.i)

Both the shoemaker and the tailor get their money. In The Court Beggar (1632), by Brome, the patient citizen is satirized in the person of the citizen's patient son, a young gallant.³⁷ In Act III, scene 2, we learn that his father was master of the Salter's Company. The young man's companions call his sweetheart a whore in an effort to make him angry, but he merely replies that he did not make her one. They then call his mother a whore, but he refuses to fight

over the dead, especially since one can no longer pray for them. Finally, they get him to say that he would fight if he saw a man making love to his sweetheart. In Act V, scene 1, when he finally wants to fight, he cannot make the courtier angry enough to fight with him. He tries all the standard insults and then calls the courtier a cutpurse. The courtier admits he is one, and gives him all the things he has stolen. The patient citizen now seems to be a matter for humor, as is the patient courtier. In Tottenham Court (1633), the tailor who goes with his wife and two gentlemen for a holiday in the country must pay the tab at the tapster's for everyone. In The Muse's Looking Glass (1633), by Randolph, the excess of patience is satirized in an allegory which is supposed to teach Puritans the value of play-going.³⁸ Aorgus (insensible of wrong), shows that extreme meekness is not good. To avoid losing his temper he first recites the Greek alphabet, then the Hebrew, and finally the English. He had been kicked by Orgylus (quarrelsome), and should probably have kicked back. In Robert Davenport's A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (1639), the devil is portrayed as the source of all evil, including the tailor's sin of inventing new fashions.³⁹ However, in The Parson's Wedding (1640), by Killigrew, both the tailor and the scrivener are cheated by the courtier, Jolly.⁴⁰ Two plays revert to types of earlier eras. John Ford's The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck (1634) is an old-style history play.⁴¹ It presents the story of the pretender, Perkin, a commoner who pretends to be heir

to the throne of England. Perkin is allowed to marry a noble lady who remarks on the fact that he speaks like a gentleman. However, both what he says and his behavior, he is not a good fighter, reveal him as the commoner he is. He cautions the lady: "Let's be thrifty in our hopes" (III.ii), and thrift was the virtue of commoners, not of the gentry. Thomas Rawlins' The Rebellion (1640) is another late attempt to revive an older type of play. In it the nobleman in disguise as a tailor leads the other tailors in war.⁴² However, they are not rebelling against their own ruler, they are fighting on the side of their own Duke against invaders. The only law they break is to rescue from prison the brother of the girl whom their noble tailor loves. The play is in no way related to the upcoming rebellion of the commoners in England. The Duke praises the tailors for helping him, and at the end of the play they present a play within the play which helps to solve the remaining problems of the plot.

The treatment of the merchant in the period from 1631 to 1642 is uneven, like that of the apprentice. This is shown in several plays but shown best in Shirley's two allegories. In Massinger's Believe as You List (1631) the merchants try to keep the king from doing a number of foolish things.⁴³ In The Soddered Citizen (1632) the merchants cheat the gentry. In The New Academy (1637) the merchant marries his maid so as to hold on to his property, and sends his daughter away when she does not want to marry the man of his choice, thus giving Cash, the apprentice, the chance to

rescue her. In The City Match (1639) both Warehouse and Seathrift have a hard time trying to get their respective nephew and son to work hard, but marriage to the right girls will apparently straighten the boys out. These merchants are no different from those portrayed in earlier dramas. James Shirley, however, makes the merchant an important character in two allegories, one a masque, A Contention for Honor and Riches (1632), and the other a play, Honoriam and Mammon (1639). The first is a satire of Lord Mayors' pageants, the second a play published in 1659 but believed to have been written in 1639. The two plays treat the same topic and have the same allegorical heroines, but they do not have the same ending. It seems that Shirley changed his mind sometime between 1632 and 1639, or 1659. In A Contention for Honor and Riches (1632), there are two ladies, Honoriam and Mammon.⁴⁴ Gettings, the merchant, and Clod, the landowner, both want to marry Mammon, while the Soldier, the Courtier, and the Scholar all want the lady Honoriam. In the first version of the story, Honoriam marries the scholar because he can serve as either courtier or soldier as needed, and Mammon marries the merchant, telling him that when he dies she will marry the countryman. In the second play, the allegory is more elaborately developed, and it may be influenced by the fact that the play was not published until after the Civil War was over.⁴⁵ In this second play Honoriam finally marries the scholar but not until after his virtue has been tested in many ways, and after the soldier

has agreed to the marriage. Mammon, on the other hand, is courted by the merchant, the lawyer, and the landowner. The lawyer ruins his chances with both ladies by kidnapping them and locking them up. After considerable fighting, Mammon finally marries the soldier instead of the merchant. Neither lady has much regard for the lawyer. The exact intention of the allegory is a little obscure, but seems to be more a reaction to events after some kind of fighting has taken place rather than a portrayal of things as they were before the Civil War. The merchant is not the one who gains in the end, the soldier takes all.

The citizen's wife is not as important in these later plays as she was before, and she is portrayed in a variety of ways. In Shirley's Hyde Park (1632) she is the woman who waits for her merchant husband who has been missing for seven years.⁴⁶ In Nabbes' Tottenham Court (1633) she is certainly exposed to overtures from gentlemen, but her husband, the tailor trusts her because she attends sermons three times a week, and she is technically faithful. In The 'Sparagus Garden (1635) we find the typical citizen's wife of earlier times, frustrated because she has no children.⁴⁷ In Brome's The New Academy (1637) Hannah, the merchant's wife, says that she resents being constantly exposed to the overtures of the gentry in her husband's shop, but she seems quite willing to go along with his efforts to help the evil uncle try to arrange to have the young ladies seduced by two Frenchmen. In The City Match (1639), by Jasper Mayne, the

Anglican clergyman, the city ladies are as much taken in by the new advertising methods of merchants as other people are. They go to see the display of a huge "fish taken in the Indies" just as do the others. In The Parson's Wedding (1640), the courtier, Jolly, refuses to pay the tailor unless he will send his wife to collect the bill. The tailor refuses to do this and is beaten and thrown out by Jolly's friends. The citizen's wife, like all the other characters, is no longer treated in a single stock character fashion; the portrayal changes from play to play.

The country gentleman, on the other hand, is fairly consistently treated as a fool, about as stupid as the workman. In The Guardian (1631) he is actually rather wicked, and admits that he requires as part of the lease that his tenants' daughters must sleep with him. In The Holland's Leaguer (1632) the courtier, Ardelio, has long carried on an affair with the wife of his tenant, Jeffrey, and when he finds a new mistress, he wants Jeffrey and his wife to keep her at their house.⁴⁸ In The Soddered Citizen (1632) Mountayne, the goldsmith, says that he is really helping the gentry by cheating them because this forces them to go to work as all good Christians should. Two plays do actually show the country gentlemen as a fool. In The Wits (1634), by William Davenant, two country gentlemen have seen too many plays on their visits to London, and have believed what they saw.⁴⁹ They believe the stories that city women pay their lovers, and so they come to the city to

become "kept men." Pallantine, an elder brother, and Sir Morglay Thwack, his friend, are effectively cheated by Pallantine's younger brother and the city heiress whom they are trying to cheat. In the end, the younger Pallantine marries the young lady and the elder Pallantine has learned his lesson and gives his younger brother some money. The play makes the point that it is not as easy for the country gentleman to cheat the city people as he thought it would be. Brome's The 'Sparagus Garden (1635) portrays the country gentry in an even worse light. In this rightly famous play, Tim Hoyden comes to town to finish learning how to become a gentleman. He meets Sir Hugh Money-Lacks, as evil a knight as ever lived, and Mr. Brittle-ware, a barber. They convince him that to become a gentleman he must have all the base blood drained from his body and replaced by his eating asparagus (Sir Hugh's own racket) and other expensive foods. He protests that his mother was a gentlewoman and that her blood was all right. They insist that they will not tap the "mother vein" but only the "father vein." This was probably very funny to the London audience which by this time, twenty years later, was probably quite familiar with the theory of blood circulation propounded by William Harvey at Gresham College in London in 1615. Hoyden has £400 to spend on the process, one fourth for clothes, one fourth for gambling, one fourth for learning to take care of himself, and one fourth to hold on to. The confidence men finally get all of his money, and only then does he change his oath from "As I am

almost a gentleman," to "As I am a gentleman" (IV.x). The play is both original and amusing.

Shirley's Honoriam and Mammon (1639) indicates that the country gentleman was still regularly being gulled of his money. Brome's A Jovial Crew, or the Merry Beggars (1641) does not show the country gentleman losing his money but fearing that he will lose it.⁵⁰ Oldrents is a squire instead of a knight, and he lives in fear that the prophecy that his daughters will become beggars will come true. They end his fears by joining a troupe of beggars and eventually returning home safely. In the course of the play everyone's past errors are atoned for and Oldrents welcomes into the family the illegitimate son he did not know he had.

The knight does not fare any better in this period than he did in earlier ones. However, in two plays of 1639 the characters who are knights actually seem to denounce the whole system of knighthood and the peerage system. This is not surprising considering the number of knights and peers which James I and Charles I had created. In Robert Davenport's A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (1639) Anne asks the young Lord Skales, whom her parents want her to marry, just what honor is, and he replies:

Why, ceremony,
The gift of princes, and the pride of states,
Regard in the weal public, and employment,
Respect and duty. (II.i)

She decides that she does not need those things, but tells

him that she will think it over. In The Ordinary (1639) by William Cartwright, an Anglican clergyman, Sir Thomas Bitefig is a covetous knight.⁵¹ He makes fun of his own gentle blood:

Sir, I don't regard this thing that you call blood;
'Tis a mere name, a sound. (II.v)

He wants his daughter to marry for money, and, of course, she loves a young man who has none. When near the end of the play he thinks that he is dying, Sir Thomas Bitefig gives his daughter a piece of advice:

If ever thou hast children, teach them thrift;
They'll learn religion fast enough themselves.
(V.i)

At the end of the play she marries the man she loves, Meanwhile, the son of a poor knight, Sir Robert Littleworth. Such plays seem to show that knighthood is no longer respected at all, and this may be the reason why good old Oldrents, the landlord who will not rack the rents of his tenants in A Jovial Crew, is portrayed as a squire, not a knight.

The courtier is usually scoffed at also. In Jonson's The Magnetic Lady (1632) the courtier, Silkworm, will fight, but wants to take his shirt off first so as not to get blood on it; his fancy clothes mean more to him than his honor. In A Jovial Crew (1641), by Brome, Oldrents, who fears the prophecy that his daughters are going to become beggars, fears it almost as much when he thinks that it may merely mean that they will marry courtiers, or court beggars. That

is almost as bad as "statute beggars." The girls marry local gentlemen, and have no desire to go to London, so the play ends happily.

The scholar appears in a new form in this period. In the plays of Shirley he is the person who marries Honoria, but those plays seem almost to be satires, so one cannot take that idea too seriously. In other plays he is usually pictured as an "antiquary," a student of ancient things. In The Antiquary (1637) he is a confidence man who sells such things as "Julius Caesar's hat," and "Pompey's breeches," and a book about mathematics "restored by the very Ptolemy."⁵² In The Ordinary (1639) the character is more fully developed. His name is Robert Moth, and he speaks Olde Englishe. When the others find him a widow to marry, he says: "This goeth aright; how highteth she, say you?" (II.iii). It has always been difficult in the later plays to separate scholars from lawyers as the scholars were sometimes law students. As R. J. Schoeck remarked in his article on the society of antiquaries, most antiquaries were lawyers.⁵³ As lawyers were almost as unpopular as Puritans with the playwrights, it is not surprising to find the antiquaries being satirized at this time. The society had actually been disbanded by James I in 1604, but interest in the field appears to have continued among scholars.

Though earlier eras made a point of praising soldiers, now that the war is at home, as it was in 1639 and 1641, the picture changes. In Shirley's Honoria and Mammon (1639) the

soldier marries Lady Mammon and gets the money. In Brome's A Jovial Crew (1641) the opposite point is made. The beggar playwright, named simply "Poet," writes a play in which Country, City, and Court vie for superiority and find that Divinity and Law are trying to appease them. This idea is similar to that in Shirley's play, which makes one believe that either it was produced by 1639 or that the idea was one commonly held. In Brome's play the beggar poet wants to have the soldier come and cudgell all of the other characters into submission, and says that his play will end with the idea that the beggars will at last overcome everyone. The constable comes and accuses the beggars of putting on a play and arrests them. They are soon released and get to put on a different play later. Whether soldiers will bring wealth or beggary seems to be a moot question at the time the theaters were about to be closed in 1642, as this was one of the last plays presented before the closing of the theaters. In the Elizabethan era war was considered good, a sort of "good evil," as G. R. Waggoner points out in his study of the topic.⁵⁴ The Elizabethans were thinking in terms of a "just foreign war."⁵⁵ Apparently when they are faced with a war at home, people's ideas on the subject change.

One character who can be contrasted with the apprentice in the plays between 1631 and 1642 is the heir. The apprentice is no longer a hero or even usually a student, but at least he works for a living. The heir is a rather unsavory young man. He plays around and waits for his father or uncle

to die. In addition, he says out loud that he wishes that the old man would die. Such is the heir, Brainsick, in The Soddered Citizen (1632), who contemplates sending his ill father a nasty note which will hasten his death. Such also is the heir in The Covent-Garden Weeded (1633), who admits that younger brothers never grieve over the deaths of elder brothers. Such even is the heir, Oliver, in A Jovial Crew (1641), who says that he wants old Justice Clack to die so that he can have his inheritance. These heirs do not make a pretty picture, and it looks almost as if society at this time had about given up its normal hope in the younger generation. The heir is a wastrel and the apprentice cannot solve all of the world's problems. The scholar has simply learned a good deal of useless Latin and the courtier has become as overly patient as the citizen.

The Puritan, however, comes in for the most heavy satire of all. In The Covent-Garden Weeded the Puritan is Gabriel, who became sick when he thought that his cousin was seduced. He turned to the Puritan religion as a result. However, when the cousin becomes happily married he gives up his Puritanism. Before that he objected to tavern music and talked of smiting the seducer of his cousin. His friends scoff at him and finally get him drunk. Lucie, for example, does not trust him with girls simply because he is a Puritan:

He may be good at that sport still, for there is almost none of his sect holds any other game lawful. (III.ii)

In Tottenham Court (1633) the tailor trusts his wife because she is a Puritan; apparently he is one also. In The Muse's Looking Glass (1633) the Puritans are Bird and Mrs. Flowerdew, who sell decorated feathers to the theater. They are persuaded to watch a moral play. They watch it, making many foolish comments, but in the end decide that they could learn useful things from seeing more plays. In The Wits (1634) young Lucy, who is thrown out of her home by her aunt who wants her fortune, is religious and thinks that she should learn a "calling" such as that of seamstress. Lady Ample tells her to learn how to cheat rich suitors, but Lucy does not want to lose her inheritance and so is reluctant. It is not a moral problem to Lucy but a financial one. She finally joins the other city wits in outwitting the country gentlemen who expected to cheat city women, and she finally marries young Pallantine and gets her inheritance. In The Sparagus Garden (1635), the Puritan curate who has come to perform a marriage sees Tim Hoyden, who was going to have his base blood drained by the barber, in a woman's clothes. His reaction is only to the horror of seeing a man in woman's clothes, not to the problem of who had been mistreated by whom. He says: "Oh monstrum horendum; a man in women's clothes!" (V.vi). The lawyer, Trampler, agrees with him, and adds that it is a felony by law, and wants to arrest poor, stupid Tim. In Brome's The Antipodes (1638), when the characters supposedly arrive at the other side of the world, where opposites hold true, they find that the poets all

write Puritan hymns.⁵⁶ In The City Match (1639) Frank, who does not want to be considered an apprentice, likes Tim's sister, but says that she is being ruined by her Puritan schoolmistress, and so he hesitates to marry her. She has given up her own name, Susan, and taken the new name, Dorcas. In addition, Aurelia, who hires Susan-Dorcas as a waiting lady, says that she is not very good at the job because her ideas are too Puritan:

Yesterday I went to see a lady that has a parrot,
My woman while I was in discourse converted the fowl
And now it can speak naught but Knox's works. (II.ii)

In A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (1639) the Puritans are another one of the tools of the devil. In the devil's masque the scrivener is joined by the knave, the prodigal, the beggar, the whore, the usurer, and the Puritan. This one calls himself a "Famelist," and at the end of the masque carries the strumpet off on his back (IV.i). This is the most insulting thing said yet about Puritans on the stage. Then the devil brags that he gets lawyers to delay cases and divines to invent new sects, as well as gets tailors to invent new fashions. So, all new sects are the product of the devil. In The Ordinary (1639), at the end of the play the three knaves, Shape, Slicer, and Hearsay, decide that things are too hot for them in London, and say that they are going to have to pretend to be Puritans and go to New England:

We'll claim a share, and prove that Nature gave
This boon, as to the good, so to the knave. (V.v)

In The Parson's Wedding (1640) Mrs. Pleasant and her friend, a widow, complain that life has become very dull because the new Parliament is Puritan and the Court is Platonic, and therefore, it is hard for them to find any lively gentlemen friends. In this play also, the Puritan parson is tricked into marrying a whore. Again, this is about as insulting a thing as a playwright could have had happen to a Puritan. In the last play of the era, Brome's A Jovial Crew (1641), the only sect actually referred to is the Adamites, who were running naked in the streets of London the year before. When the suitors of the two daughters of Oldrents offer to take them to London for a holiday the girls refuse to go, saying that they were there the previous year, saw all of the plays and the Adamites, and have no desire to go back. When the four young people join the beggars, they learn that the happy beggars sing anything but psalms, and that Patrico, the beggar chaplain, is married, just as if he were a Presbyterian.

The other type of character most heavily criticized is the lawyer. Jonson and some other writers had criticized lawyers long before this time, but during this era the criticism becomes common and heavy. Jonson begins it in The Magnetic Lady (1632) with the lawyer, Mr. Practice. He wears his bench robe everywhere and does not like the government administrator, Mr. Bias, because Bias scorns the Common Law.

Later, it is Practice who urges the courtier, Silkworm, to sue rather than fight a duel. However, at about the middle of Act III, Practice decides that he has fallen in love with the heiress himself and wants out of the whole complicated mess. He leaves without helping to solve the problems. In The Covent-Garden Weeded (1632) the satire is of law students who do not want to study. In Hyde Park (1632) the reference to lawyers is in a sarcastic metaphor. Mrs. Bonavent, whose merchant husband has been lost at sea says:

Suits in love should not
Like suits in law be racked from term to term. (I.ii)

In the subplot of Tottenham Court (1633) we again find two law students. The one studies and the other does not. Sam thinks that James should study harder because he will inherit a large estate and should learn how to handle it. James disagrees with this idea:

Hang state; I took no pains to get, why then should
I take any to keep it? If it will stay, so 'tis,
if not, shop-keepers that will trust, shall be paid
when they can get it. (III.i)

James learns by the end of the play that that is not the proper attitude. He ends up drunk, locked in a trunk, and hard-working Sam gets the girl. In The Muse's Looking Glass (1633) the audience of Puritans is shown two judges who exemplify the extremes of justice. Justice Nimis punishes everyone harshly. Justice Nihil wants to let off even the citizen's wife who did commit adultery with a bachelor:

A citizen's wife!
 Perchance her husband is grown impotent
 And who can blame her then? (IV.iii)

In The 'Sparagus Garden (1634) Trampler is the old lawyer who tries to help Touchwood keep the young lovers from getting married. In The Heir (1637) the lawyer gives the king an honest answer about a legal problem.⁵⁷ The king cannot believe there can be an honest lawyer:

Nay, thou art too honest, thou should'st do
 As other lawyers do, first take my money,
 And then tell me thou cans't do me no good. (IV.ii)

In The Antipodes (1638) the people discover that on the other side of the earth the lawyers will not accept fees. In The City Match (1639) his old friends among the law students involve young Frank Plotwell in just the kind of behavior his uncle was trying to get him away from when he made him work in his shop. They even tear his working clothes, and the clothes are not an apprentice's robe, off him. In A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (1639) the devil claims that he is the one who gets lawyers to delay cases. In A Jovial Crew (1641) Justice Clack punishes people first and tries them afterwards. The delay of law cases is a common complaint even today; but at that time people were often kept in jail on minor charges until the time of trial, and so they were in effect punished before they were ever tried. These plays do make it appear that the lawyer has replaced the merchant and the knight as a sort of catch-all villain for

the playwrights of the period between 1631 and 1642. The law student, on the other hand, seems often to be given the young hero role that twenty years before would have gone to the apprentice. The young hero is not well behaved, but he merely commits the sins of youth, such as wasting time and wanting to marry a girl who his father or guardian thinks is not rich enough.

In the period from 1631 to 1642 the Puritan has replaced the merchant's wife as the butt of satire and the lawyer has replaced the merchant as the source of villainy. The law student and heir serve more to contrast with the apprentice than to replace him, as he has not really disappeared from the scene. But the law student does replace the apprentice in some of the young hero roles. He is, after all, an apprentice too, and the apprentice is a student. There were about 1,000 law students in London by that time, and about 30,000 apprentices. The apprentices of these later times were often Puritans, as were their families and their employers, so it is probable that there were often more law students in the audience for which the playwrights wrote than there were apprentices.

Two plays are particularly direct in the comments made about parliaments, the Puritans, and the "new world." These are Brome's The Antipodes and Clavel's The Soddered Citizen. In the latter the protagonist, Brainsick, an heir who is eager for his father to die, has just been bailed out of jail by Mountayne, a goldsmith. Mountayne tells him that

he thinks that poor citizens should be sent to the new world. Brainsick says that he would like to go there. Undermine, a wealthy citizen, and Mountayne then discuss how many profligate citizens they have together cheated and helped send to the new world. Brainsick discusses this with Clutch, the jailer, who does not want people to reform and ruin his career. Brainsick asks a hypothetical question to which Clutch's reply is simple but not very enlightening.

Brain. What sayest thou to a lasting parliament,
Suppose the stubborn commons should become
More pliable?
Clutch That were enough to undo all the Kingdom,
For then debtors would walk at random
With a keeper in their pockets. (I.v)

Apparently people were already aware that many of the former occupants of the debtors' prisons were going to the new world. They were also apparently aware that being taxed by Parliament was cheaper than impositions laid by the King. Also, this was written in 1632, just two years after the settlement of Massachusetts Bay Colony, and just before Archbishop Laud tried to end emigration. In The Antipodes (1638) the Puritans love poetry and the players are the soberest people alive, so it is no wonder that By-Play, the head man in the supposed kingdom there makes an ironical speech to Peregrine, who is supposed to have his insanity and impotence cured by thinking that he is king, a speech which is obviously intended as comment on the stubborn parliaments of the past and the non-existent parliaments of the present.

Let not our ignorance suffer in your wrath
 Before we understand your highness laws,
 We went by Custom, and the warrant which
 We had in your late Predecessors' reigns.
 But let us know your pleasure, you shall find
 The State and Commonwealth in all obedient
 To alter custom, law, religion, all
 To be conformable to your commands. (IV.ix)

This is satire which cuts two ways. The king is insane here, but the satire of past parliaments which could never agree with the monarch is rather obvious also. All of this takes place in the other world, the opposite side of the globe. Now that the Puritans have gone to the real new world, the American continent, America is never mentioned in a complimentary way. It is no longer the home of Indians who come to London and join in tricks on people as it was in The City Madam (1622). In The Ordinary (1639), by Cartwright, the Anglican clergyman, the knaves will join the Puritans in the new world, as has been mentioned earlier.

The plays of this period rely both on old tricks and on new ideas. The influence of the fact that they were written for the London audience is clearly seen in them. Very few scenes take place in the country, and when they do, as in A Jovial Crew, they show that the problems there are the same as they are in the city. The Puritans and lawyers are heavily satirized because they did cause trouble and because it was safe to satirize them. Both were unpopular with the government. Other things can be seen in the plays, such as the influence of Gresham College in London. It was there that in 1615 William Harvey explained his theory of blood

circulation, knowledge of which is really required for proper appreciation of the blood-letting scenes in The 'Sparagus Garden. Gresham College was also where theories about magnetism would have been discussed, not the two older universities. Books had been written about the subject as is pointed out in Ronald McFarland's article on the matter.⁵⁸ However, though Jonson may have read them, other people would have learned of the matter by word of mouth, from sailors and merchants. The antiquaries also brought the results of their research to London, and therefore find themselves satirized in the plays of the time. The Devil, in A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (1639), wears eyeglasses, perhaps because such new-fangled things were still considered the trick of the devil by some enemies of the new science, and this would have been known to the audience, normally a more sophisticated group than the average populace. Jibes at science are beginning to appear and replace the jibes at alchemy. So, the job of London as the third university of the land has expanded from the training of apprentices to scientific education in general.

Brome's A Jovial Crew, or the Merry Beggars (1641), one of the last plays performed before the closing of the theaters, probably sums up the attitude of people of that time as well as anything written. There is no poverty or any real war yet, but the work laws and vagabond laws and beggar laws are beginning to collapse with the collapse of church administration, and beggars are again appearing in the land.

Squire Oldrents ignores the law which says that he should not feed beggars and lets them camp on his property. His daughters run off to join them so that he can lose his fear of his daughters becoming beggars. They are too much ladies, just as their suitors are too much gentlemen, to do a good job of begging; they beg in the fancy language of courtiers and are not very good at groveling. It is not necessary for Brome to give the beggars or the country people accents, as were given to rural people in the plays of earlier times. The superior education of the girls and their suitors is evident in their vocabularies. The four eventually return home, and Squire Oldrents learns that his young chief steward who went with them is actually his own illegitimate son, born before his marriage to the mother of the girls. Justice Clack's niece also runs off to join the beggars, and she falls in love with this son of Oldrents. Everything ends happily. But the entire tone of the play, one of joyful abandon, enables one to see that to many people of that time the Puritan emphasis on work had begun to become too much for people to listen to. They were going to at least try being beggars for a while. This comedy, part romantic comedy and part satire, more effectively pictures the period than any satire could.

The plays of this period cannot reflect the laws passed because none were passed. They do, however, reflect the beginning of the end of the apprentice system by portraying the worker who was never apprenticed in The City Match.

In addition, in their constant references to Puritans and lawyers, and their occasional references to the New World and the Parliament which never met, they show what playwrights used for material when they could not be sure of which side it was safe to support. Most of the plays are not as good as those of previous eras, though Brome's are generally far superior to those of other writers. Robert Davenport's A New Trick to Cheat the Devil and Jasper Mayne's The City Match are particularly charming. Criticism has often called the plays of this time decadent.⁵⁹ The weaknesses of the plays may be a reflection of the weakness of the rulers, which resulted in the playwrights often being unsure of just what it was safe to say, and so staying with safe subjects such as young love for the main plot and safe topics of humor, such as Puritans and lawyers, for the subplots. Effective satire requires an audience which agrees on what is right and what is wrong. Little effective satire could be written in a period immediately preceding a Civil War, particularly not at a time when for eleven years the King would not run the risk of calling a Parliament which could oppose him. The fact that there was little consensus of opinion that could be depended on may be one of the main reasons that the period produced so little satire of lasting value.

NOTES

- 1 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, English Poor Law History: Part I, The Old Poor Law, Vol. 7, English Local Government (1927; rpt. Hamden, Conn.: Anchor Books, 1963), p. 92.
- 2 R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926), p. 268.
- 3 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, pp. 85-87.
- 4 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, p. 90.
- 5 Sidney and Beatrice Webb, p. 95.
- 6 R. H. Tawney, Capitalism, p. 218.
- 7 J. R. Tanner, English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century: 1603-1689 (1928; rpt. Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1966), p. 73.
- 8 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 75.
- 9 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 78.
- 10 Henry W. Clark, History of English Nonconformity from Wycliff to the Close of the Nineteenth Century (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965), p. 278.
- 11 Clark, p. 274.
- 12 Clark, p. 279.
- 13 Clark, p. 281.
- 14 Clark, p. 283.
- 15 Clark, p. 292.
- 16 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 86.
- 17 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 90.
- 18 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 90. He quotes from a 1628 news letter not otherwise identified.

- 19 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 91.
- 20 Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts, p. 91. He lists a number of cases, especially in the "Providence Company."
- 21 William P. Holden, Anti-Puritan Satire: 1572-1642. Vol. 126 of Yale Studies in English (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954).
This material is found throughout Chapter 3, "The Puritans and the Stage," pp. 93-145.
- 22 Charles W. Camp, The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature (1924; rpt. New York: Octagon Books, 1972), p. 120.
- 23 Felix E. Schelling, Elizabethan Drama: 1558-1642, II, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908), p. 275.
- 24 John Freehafer, "Brome, Suckling, and Davenant's Theater Project of 1639," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 10 (1968-69), 3:367-83.
This article discusses the relationship of Suckling's Aglaura to Brome's The Antipodes and The Court Beggar. The article in no way affects the matter dealt with in this paper and so is not referred to in the discussion of those plays. It discusses the possibility that Suckling, himself, is satirized in the plays. It is an interesting article.
- 25 Stella Kramer, The English Craft Guilds: Studies in Their Progress and Decline (Columbia University Press, 1927), p. 161.
- 26 Kramer, p. 169.
- 27 Charles R. Forker, "Two Notes on John Webster and Anthony Munday: Unpublished Entries in the Records of the Merchant Taylors," English Language Notes 6 (1968-69), 1: 26-33.
- 28 Phillip Massinger, The Guardian, in The Mermaid Series: Phillip Massinger, ed. Arthur Symons (London: Ernest Benn, n. d.).
All quotations from this play are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.
- 29 Jasper Mayne, The City Match, in A Select Collection of Old Plays (London: R. Dodsley in Pall Mall, 1744), X.
All quotations from this play are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

30 John Clavell, The Soddered Citizen, in The Malone Society Reprints, ed. John Henry Pyle Pofford (Oxford: The University Press, 1935). Act II, scene 1, p. 28.

31 Thomas Heywood, The Wise Woman of Hogsdon, in The Mermaid Series: Thomas Heywood, ed. A. Wilson Verity, introd. J. Addington Symonds (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n. d.).

32 Thomas Nabbes, Tottenham Court, in The Works of Thomas Nabbes, ed. A. H. Bullen, Old English Plays Series (New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1968). Act III, scene 3.

Subsequent quotations from this play are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

33 Richard Brome, The New Academy or The New Exchange, in Brome's Dramatic Works, II (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

34 Camp, p. 121.

35 Ben Jonson, The Magnetic Lady, in Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1938).

36 Richard Brome, The Covent-Garden Weeded, in Brome's Dramatic Works, II (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

All quotations are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

37 Richard Brome, The Court Beggar, in Brome's Dramatic Works, I (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

38 Thomas Randolph, The Muse's Looking Glass, in Poetical and Dramatic Works of Thomas Randolph, ed. W. Carew Hazlitt (1875; rpt. New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1968).

All quotations are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

39 Robert Davenport, A New Trick to Cheat the Devil, in The Works of Robert Davenport, ed. A. H. Bullen (New York: Benjamin Bloom, 1968).

All quotations are from this edition and their locations will be noted parenthetically in the text.

40 Thomas Killigrew, The Parson's Wedding, in Six Caroline Plays, ed. A. S. Knowland (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

41 John Ford, The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck, in Typical Elizabethan Plays, ed. Felix E. Schelling (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1926).

42 Thomas Rawlins, The Rebellion, on microfilm, Old English Books: 1475-1640 (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, STC Reel 1002).

43 Phillip Massinger, Believe as You List, in The Malone Society Reprints, ed. W. W. Greg (Oxford: The University Press, 1927).

44 James Shirley, A Contention for Honor and Riches, in The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley, VI (1833; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966).

45 James Shirley, Honor and Mammon, in The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley, VI (1833; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966).

I have been unable to find any discussion of just how much the play may have been altered just before publication.

46 James Shirley, Hyde Park, in The Mermaid Series: James Shirley, ed. Edmund Gosse (London: T. Fisher Unwin, n. d.).

All quotations are from this edition and their location will be noted parenthetically in the text.

47 Richard Brome, The Sparagus Garden, in Brome's Dramatic Works, III (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

48 Shakerley Marmion, The Holland's Leaguer, on microfilm, Early English Books: 1475-1640 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, STC Reel 1073).

The title comes from Ardelio's recommending that cast mistresses should be shipped to Holland like old ships.

49 William Davenant, The Wits, in Six Caroline Plays, ed. A. S. Knowland (London: Oxford University Press, 1962).

50 Richard Brome, A Jovial Crew or The Merry Beggars, in Brome's Dramatic Works, III (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

51 William Cartwright, The Ordinary, in A Select Collection of Old Plays (London: R. Dodsley, 1744).

52 Shakerley Marmion or Thomas May, The Antiquary, in A Select Collection of Old Plays (London: R. Dodsley, 1744).

53 R. J. Schoeck, "Early Anglo Saxon and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance," Studies in the Renaissance, 5 (1958), 102-110.

54 G. R. Waggoner, "An Elizabethan Attitude Towards Peace and War," Philological Quarterly, 33 (1954) 1:20-33.

55 Waggoner, p. 22.

56 Richard Brome, The Antipodes, in Brome's Dramatic Works, III (London: John Pearson, York Street, Covent Garden, 1873).

57 Thomas May, The Heir, in A Select Collection of Old Plays, VII (London: R. Dodsley, 1744).
The date of this play is uncertain but 1637 seems likely because of its placement in Dodsley's collection.

58 Ronald E. McFarland, "Jonson's Magnetic Lady and the Reception of Gilbert's De Magnete, 1600," Studies in English Literature, 11 (1971), 283-93.

59 L. C. Knights, Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson (1937; rpt. Barnes and Noble, 1957).

Knights criticizes the Caroline playwrights for their "decadence." He places Shirley and Brome in this category, but also Fletcher, about whose plays he says: "Everything is vague, general, and unrealized" (p. 293). He says Brome merely imitates Jonson (p. 279). He says that Shirley's comedies have a literary ancestry and are not the result of direct observation (p. 298). He says that these writers' comedies bear a great resemblance to the later comedies of manners.

This is true of their romantic comedies in some cases, but Brome's plots are often quite original and Shirley's allegories are surely the result of direct observation.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

It is not very valuable to study the role of one character in a play without paying attention to the others.¹ What started as a study of the apprentice in the drama led in a number of directions. When one studies the characters in this way the question inevitably arises as to why the roles assigned to the characters change from time to time. The roles assigned appear to change in reaction to events which take place in the society which makes up the audience. In English drama between 1563 and 1642 the role of the apprentice changed from that of student to that of hero to that of manipulator during the time when the hero of the society changed from the man who fought the hardest to the man who made the most money. The first change appeared after the Spanish Armada was defeated not by the ships of the Crown but by sailors on ships which belonged to the wealthy merchants of England. The later changes are gradual, complicated, and multi-faceted.

The English drama between 1563 and 1642 does indeed reflect events in the world of the audience. This reflection is limited because the playwrights were not allowed to comment directly on matters of religious doctrine or on matters

of great political sensitivity. However, when a chronological study of the plays is made, it reveals that they reflect events much more directly than has often been realized. The playwrights appear to have felt free to comment on matters once the monarch and the Parliament had agreed on a solution to the problems and had passed a law. This holds true even though the solution is not always popular with either the people of London or the playwrights. Therefore, dividing the plays into distinct groups related to the times at which they were presented can not only help one understand the times, as has been discovered by economists long ago, but can help one understand the plays. The humor of some plays especially escapes a reader who lacks the background of the audience which attended the original presentation of the plays.

The times between 1563 and 1642 were not all of a oneness. The period from 1563 to 1588 was a time when education was still expected to solve all the problems of the realm; the Renaissance dream had not yet died. The plays of that period were influenced by the Statute of Apprentices and by the legalization of interest of ten percent. The period from 1588 to 1604 was a time of war which united the people, gave all classes confidence in themselves, and led to a firmer government policy and a faith in the nation as such. The plays of this period were influenced by the government's impressment of soldiers for war abroad and by the passage of strong laws regarding work, the poor, and vagabonds.

The period from 1605 to 1615 was a period in which the new monarch made changes, but it was also a time in which the economic problems of the country grew comprehensible to the people, and in which the Parliament made attempts to solve them by instituting the final work laws and poor laws, which for a time worked fairly well. The plays of this period are influenced especially by the passage of the final set of vagabond laws in 1610, but also by the repeal of the sumptuary laws. The period from 1616 to 1630 is the one most often studied by scholars of both economics and literature. Overemphasis on this period has led too often to the opinion that the entire era was full of dramas about criminal projectors and the like. The plays of the time are, of course, greatly influenced by the law which finally abolished monopolies in 1624, and the controversies which led to its passage. The period from 1631 to 1642 was less a period of artistic decadence in the drama than it was a time when the playwrights felt less free to comment on the scene than they previously had. Since the Parliament was not in session between 1629 and 1640, there were no actual laws passed; and there was the fear that the playhouses themselves could be closed permanently, as they finally were in 1642.

Some of the plays in particular become easier to understand in the light of a study such as this. The reactions to the repeal of the sumptuary laws are evident in Eastward Ho. The true force of the satire in A Chaste Maid in Cheapside is more easily understood when the play is looked at as

a reaction to the work laws and when all the character types are compared with characterizations commonly found in other plays of that era and those preceding it. Both of these plays are superior plays, though they do not, perhaps, carry as a direct a meaning for the ages as do the great tragedies of Shakespeare. However, even that puzzling play, The Tempest, can be better understood when one considers that it was one of several comedies written in part as a reaction to the work laws passed in 1610 and to the Puritan preoccupation with the idea that everyone should work.

The theater ceased development along the lines followed in these plays both because the theaters were closed for twenty years and because methods of communication increased in later times. Perhaps some of the better features of drama which referred to the immediate times are now being created anew in such television shows as Roots and The Holocaust, which spoke to the audience about problems of the recent past and the present.

There are doubtless other things which happened in this period of time which influenced the plays in addition to the ones mentioned here. However, the passage of certain laws did obviously have great influence on the plays and an understanding of the influence which those laws had on the plays will help a reader appreciate the plays more than might otherwise be the case.

NOTES.

¹ The plays studied are listed below, in order by date. The notation "uk" means that the author's name is unknown. In many titles an initial "the" has been omitted.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title</u>
1506	uk	<u>Mundus et Infans</u>
1523	Heywood, Rastelle	<u>Gentleness and Nobility</u>
1530	John Heywood	<u>Dialogue Concerning Witty and Witless</u>
1530	John Redford	<u>Wit and Science</u>
1551	uk	<u>Impatient Poverty</u>
1552	Thomas Ingelend	<u>Disobedient Child</u>
1553	uk	<u>Respublica</u>
1558	uk	<u>Jacob and Esau</u>
1565	Richard Edwards	<u>Damon and Pithias</u>
1566	W. or L. Wager	<u>Cruel Debtor</u>
1568	uk	<u>Appius and Virginia</u>
	Ulpian Fulwell	<u>Like Will to Like Quoth the Devil to the Collier</u>
1569	W. Wager	<u>The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art</u>
	uk	<u>Marriage of Wit and Science</u>
1570	W. Wager	<u>Enough Is as Good as a Feast</u>
1573	uk	<u>New Custom</u>
1575	George Gascoigne	<u>Glass of Government</u>
1576	uk	<u>Common Conditions</u>
	George Walpul	<u>The Tyde Tarryeth No Man</u>
1578	Thomas Lupton	<u>All for Money</u>
1579	Francis Merbury (?)	<u>Contract of Marriage Between Wit and Wisdom</u>
	uk	<u>Grim, the Collier of Croyden</u>
1583	Robert Wilson	<u>Three Ladies of London</u>
	John Lyly	<u>Campaspe</u>
1587	uk	<u>Famous Victories of Henry V</u>
1588	Robert Wilson	<u>Three Lords and Three Ladies of London</u>
	uk	<u>A Merry Knack to Know a Knave</u>
1589	Christopher Marlowe	<u>Doctor Faustus</u>
1590	Thomas Heywood	<u>Four Prentices of London</u>
	Christopher Marlowe	<u>Jew of Malta</u>

<u>Date</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title</u>
1590	William Shakespeare	<u>Love's Labor Lost</u>
	" "	<u>1 Henry VI</u>
	" "	<u>2 Henry VI</u>
	" "	<u>3 Henry VI</u>
	" "	<u>Richard III</u>
1593	Robert Greene	<u>George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield</u>
1594	William Shakespeare	<u>Merchant of Venice</u>
	uk	<u>Pedlar's Prophecy</u>
	Robert Wilson	<u>Cobbler's Prophecy</u>
1595	George Peele (?)	<u>Life and Death of Jack Straw</u>
	William Shakespeare	<u>Richard II</u>
	" "	<u>Midsummer Night's Dream</u>
1597	George Chapman	<u>An Humorous Day's Mirth</u>
1598	William Shakespeare	<u>1 Henry IV</u>
	" "	<u>2 Henry IV</u>
	Henry Porter	<u>Two Angry Women of Abingdon</u>
	George Chapman	<u>Blind Beggar of Alexandria</u>
	William Haughton	<u>Englishman for my Money</u>
	Ben Jonson	<u>Every Man in His Humor</u>
1599	William Shakespeare	<u>Henry V</u>
	" "	<u>Twelfth Night</u>
	Thomas Dekker	<u>Old Fortunatus</u>
	" "	<u>Shoemaker's Holiday</u>
	Ben Jonson	<u>Every Man Out of His Humor</u>
1600	William Shakespeare	<u>Merry Wives of Windsor</u>
	uk	<u>Love Feigned and Unfeigned</u>
	uk	<u>The Weakest Goeth to the Wall</u>
	Munday, et al	<u>Sir John Oldcastle</u>
	Chettle, Day	<u>Blind Beggar of Bednal Green</u>
	Dekker, et al	<u>Patient Grissill</u>
1601	George Chapman	<u>Sir Giles Goosecap, Knight</u>
	uk	<u>Contention Between Liberality and Prodigality</u>
1602	Thomas Middleton	<u>Family of Love</u>
	" "	<u>Blurt, Master Constable</u>
	uk	<u>Life and Death of Thomas, Lord Cromwell</u>
	Heywood, Massinger	<u>Fair Maid of the Exchange</u>
1603	Anthony Brewer	<u>Lovesick King</u>
	Thomas Heywood	<u>1 Fair Maid of the West</u>
1604	uk	<u>London Prodigal</u>
	Samuel Rowley	<u>When You See Me You Know Me</u>
	Dekker, Middleton	<u>1 Honest Whore</u>
	Dekker, Webster	<u>Westward Ho</u>
1605	Thomas Dekker	<u>2 Honest Whore</u>
	John Marston	<u>Dutch Courtesan</u>
	Thomas Heywood	<u>If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody</u>
	Chapman, Jonson, Marston	<u>Eastward Ho</u>

<u>Date</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title</u>
1606	Ben Jonson	<u>Volpone</u>
	Dekker, Webster	<u>Northward Ho</u>
1607	William Shakespeare	<u>Timon of Athens</u>
	uk	<u>The Puritan (Widow of Watling)</u>
	Thomas Middleton	<u>Michaelmas Term</u>
	" "	<u>The Phoenix</u>
	" "	<u>Your Five Gallants</u>
	" "	<u>A Trick to Catch the Old One</u>
	Beaumont, Fletcher	<u>Knight of the Burning Pestle</u>
	Day, Rowley, Wilkins	<u>Travels of Three English</u> <u>Brothers</u>
1608	William Shakespeare	<u>Coriolanus</u>
	Thomas Middleton	<u>A Mad World My Masters</u>
	Lording Barry	<u>Ram-Alley</u>
1609	Ben Jonson	<u>Epiccoene</u>
	William Rowley	<u>A Shoemaker and a Gentleman</u>
1610	Ben Jonson	<u>The Alchemist</u>
	Beaumont, Fletcher	<u>Philaster</u>
	Dekker, Middleton	<u>Roaring Girl</u>
1611	William Shakespeare	<u>The Tempest</u>
	" "	<u>Winter's Tale</u>
1612	Thomas Dekker	<u>Match Me In London</u>
	" "	<u>If This Be Not Good the Devil</u> <u>Is in It</u>
1613	William Shakespeare	<u>Henry VIII</u>
	Thomas Middleton	<u>Chaste Maid in Cheapside</u>
	Beaumont, Fletcher	<u>Wit at Several Weapons</u>
1614	Joseph Cooke	<u>City Gallant / Greene's Tu Quoque</u>
	John Fletcher	<u>Wit Without Money</u>
	Ben Jonson	<u>Bartholomew Fair</u>
1615	Beaumont, Fletcher	<u>Scornful Lady</u>
1616	Ben Jonson	<u>Devil Is an Ass</u>
1620	Thomas Middleton	<u>Mayor of Quinborough</u>
1622	John Webster	<u>Devil's Law Case</u>
	Phillip Massinger	<u>City Madam</u>
	Fletcher, Massinger	<u>Beggar's Bush</u>
1624	William Rowley	<u>New Wonder, a Woman Never Vexed</u>
1625	Phillip Massinger	<u>New Way to Pay Old Debts</u>
	John Fletcher	<u>Fair Maid of the Inn</u>
1626	James Shirley	<u>The Wedding</u>
	Ben Jonson	<u>Staple of News</u>
1627	Fletcher, Massinger	<u>The Elder Brother</u>
1628	Richard Brome	<u>City Wit</u>
1629	Ben Jonson	<u>New Inn</u>
1630	Thomas Heywood	<u>2 Fair Maid of the West</u>
1631	Phillip Massinger	<u>Believe as You List</u>
	" "	<u>The Guardian</u>

<u>Date</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Title</u>
1632	James Shirley	<u>Contention for Honor and Riches</u>
	" "	<u>Hyde Park</u>
	Richard Brome	<u>Weeding of Covent-Garden</u>
	" "	<u>Court Beggar</u>
	Ben Jonson	<u>Magnetic Lady</u>
	Shakerley Marmion	<u>Holland's Leaguer</u>
	John Clavell	<u>Soddered Citizen</u>
1633	Thomas Randolph	<u>The Muse's Looking Glass</u>
	Thomas Nabbes	<u>Tottenham Court</u>
	Shakerley Marmion	<u>Fine Companion</u>
	Thomas Heywood	<u>English Traveller</u>
1634	Thomas Heywood	<u>Wise Woman of Hogsdon</u>
	John Ford	<u>Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck</u>
	William Davenant	<u>The Wits</u>
1635	Richard Brome	<u>The Sparagus Garden</u>
1637	Richard Brome	<u>New Academy or New Exchange</u>
	Marmion or May	<u>The Antiquary</u>
	Thomas May	<u>The Heir</u>
1638	Thomas Nabbes	<u>The Bride</u>
	Richard Brome	<u>The Antipodes</u>
1639	Jasper Mayne	<u>City Match</u>
	James Shirley	<u>Honoriam and Mammon</u>
	Robert Davenport	<u>New Trick to Cheat the Devil</u>
	William Cartwright	<u>The Ordinary</u>
1640	Thomas Rawlins	<u>The Rebellion</u>
	Thomas Killigrew	<u>Parson's Wedding</u>
1641	Richard Brome	<u>A Jovial Crew</u>

The dates used are those commonly accepted by critics. In cases of disagreement, the earliest possible date has been the one used, both for consistency and because it seems to be the one most related to the influences studied. A play cannot be influenced by something that happened after it was written.

The name of the author is followed by a "?" if the attribution of the play to him is considered doubtful.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, George Burton, and H. Morse Stapleton, eds. Select Documents of English Constitutional History. New York: Macmillan, 1901.
- Adkins, Mary Grace Muse. "The Citizens in Philaster: Their Function and Significance." Studies in Philology, 43 (1946), 203-12.
- Allen, John. "Bottom and Titania." Shakespeare Quarterly, 18 (1967), 107-17.
- Ascham, Roger. The English Works of Roger Ascham. Ed. James Bennet. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761.
- Baldwin, Frances Elizabeth. Sumptuary Legislation and Personal Regulation in England. Johns Hopkins University Studies, Ser. 44, No. 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1926.
- Ball, R. C. "The Chronology of Middleton's Plays." Modern Language Review, 32 (1937), 1:33-43.
- Barish, Jonas A. "Bartholomew Fair and Its Puppets." Modern Language Quarterly, 20 (1959), 3-17.
- Bates, Katherine Lee. The English Religious Drama. New York: Macmillan, 1893.
- Benbow, R. Mark. "The Merchant, Antonio, Elizabethan Hero." Colby Library Quarterly, 12 (1976), 156-70.
- Bennet, Josephine W., Oscar Cargill, and Vernon Hall, Jr., eds. Studies in the English Renaissance Drama. New York: New York University Press, 1959.
- Berlin, Norman. "Thomas Dekker: A Partial Reappraisal." Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966), 2:263-77.
- Bevington, David. Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

- Boas, Frederick S. An Introduction to Stuart Drama. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- An Introduction to Tudor Drama. Oxford: Clarendon, 1933.
- Bowers, R. H. "A Note on Massinger's New Way to Pay Old Debts." Modern Language Review, 53 (1955), 2:186-94.
- Bradbrook, Muriel C. "Shakespeare and the Structure of Tudor Society." Review of National Literatures, 3 (1972), 2:90-105.
- "The Status Seekers: Society and the Common Player in the Reign of Elizabeth I." Huntington Library Quarterly, 34 (1960-61), 111-25.
- Bryant, J. A. Jr. "Middleton as a Modern Instance." Sewanee Review, 84 (1976), 572-93.
- Burelback, Frederick M. Jr. "War and Peace in Shoemaker's Holiday." Tennessee Studies in Literature, 13 (1968), 99-107.
- Calvin, Jean. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 7th Am. rev. ed. Trans. John Allen. Introd. Benjamin Warfield. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936.
- Institutes of the Christian Religion. The Library of Christian Classics, Vols. 21 and 22. Ed. John T. McNeill. Trans. and Index, Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Camp, Charles W. The Artisan in Elizabethan Literature. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 75. New York: Octagon Books, 1972.
- Caputi, Anthony Francis. John Marston: Satirist. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1961.
- Clark, Henry William. History of English Nonconformity from Wicliff to the Close of the Nineteenth Century. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.
- Clarkson, Paul S. and Clyde T. Warren. The Law of Property in Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Drama. 2nd ed. New York: Gordian Press, 1968.
- Champion, L. S. "The Comic Intent in Jonson's The New Inn." Western Humanities Review, 18 (1964), 66-74.

- Covatta, Anthony. Thomas Middleton's City Comedies. Lewisburgh: Bucknell University Press, 1973.
- Cunnington, Phillis. Medieval and Tudor Costume. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1968.
- and Cecil Willett Cunnington. Handbook of English Costume in the Sixteenth Century. London: Faber and Faber, 1954.
- Davies, Margaret Gay. The Enforcement of English Apprenticeship: A Study in Applied Mercantilism, 1563-1642. Harvard Economic Studies, 97. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- DeMolen, Richard. "Richard Mulcaster: An Elizabethan Savant." Shakespeare Studies, 8 (1975), 29-82.
- DeRoover, Raymond. Gresham on Foreign Exchange: An Essay on Early English Mercantilism with the Text of Sir Thomas Gresham's Memorandum for the Understanding of the Exchange. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Doebler, John. "Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle and the Prodigal Son Play." Studies in English Literature, 5 (1965), 2:333-44.
- Ebel, Julia G. "The Family of Love: Sources of Its History in England." Huntington Library Quarterly, 30 (1966-67), 331-43.
- Eliot, Thomas Stearns. Elizabethan Dramatists. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.
- Ellis-Fermor, Una M. The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation. London: Methuen, 1936.
- Fisch, Harold. "Shakespeare and the Puritan Dynamic." Shakespeare Survey, 27 (1974), 81-92.
- Forker, Charles. "Two Notes on John Webster and Anthony Munday: Unpublished Entries in the Records of the Merchant Taylors." English Language Notes, 6 (1968-69), 26-33.
- Freehafer, John. "Brome, Suckling, and Davenant's Theater Project of 1639." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 10 (1968-69), 3:367-83.
- Gardiner, Harold C. Mysteries End: An Investigation of the Last Days of the Medieval Religious Stage. Yale Stud. in Engl., 103. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1946.

- Gardiner, Judith K. and Susanna S. Epp. "Ben Jonson's Social Attitudes: A Statistical Analysis." Comparative Drama, 9 (1975), 68-89.
- Gibbons, Brian. Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton. London: Rupert Hart Davis, 1968.
- Gomme, Sir George Laurence. The Governance of London: Studies on the Place Occupied by London in English Institutions. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907.
- Green, Robert W., ed. Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1959.
- Grudin, Robert. "Prospero's Masque and the Structure of The Tempest." South Atlantic Quarterly, 71 (1972), 3:401-09.
- Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism: 1570-1643. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Hallett, Charles A. "Middleton's Allwit: The Urban Cynic." Modern Language Quarterly, 49 (1970), 498-508.
- Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952.
- Hargreaves-Mawdsley, W. N. A History of Academical Dress in Europe Until the End of the Eighteenth Century. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.
- Holden, William P. Anti-Puritan Satire: 1572-1642. Yale Studies in English, 126. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Keeton, George W., ed. The United Kingdom. Vol. XI of The British Commonwealth: The Development of Its Laws and Constitution. London: Stevens and Sons, 1955.
- Kelly, Thomas. A History of Adult Education in Great Britain. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1962.
- Kiralfy, Albert K. W., ed. Potter's Outlines of English Legal History, 5th ed. London: Street and Maxwell, 1958.
- Knafla, Louis A. "The Law Studies of an Elizabethan Student." Huntington Library Quarterly, 32 (1968-69), 3:221-40.
- Knappen, Marshall M. Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism. Chicago: University Press, 1939.

- Knight, W. Nicholas. "Equity, The Merchant of Venice, and William Lambarde." Shakespeare Survey, 27 (1974), 93-104.
- Knights, Lionel C. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1937.
- Kramer, Stella. The English Craft Gilds: Studies in Their Progress and Decline. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.
- Lawson, John. Medieval Education and the Reformation. New York: Humanities Press, 1967.
- and Harold Silver. A Social History of Education in England. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Levin, Harry. "Jonson's Metempsychosis." Philological Quarterly, 20 (1941), 3:340-44.
- Levin, Richard. "The Family of Lust and The Family of Love." Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966) 2:279-90.
- "The Four Plots of Chaste Maid in Cheapside." Review of English Studies, 16 (1965), 14-24.
- "Name Puns in The Family of Love." Notes and Queries, 210 (1965), 340-42.
- "The Staple of News, The Society of Jeerers, and the Canters' College." Philological Quarterly, 44 (1965), 445-53.
- Lewis, Roy and Angus Maude. The English Middle Classes. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.
- Little, David. Religion, Order, and Law: A Study in Pre-Revolutionary England. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Mackay, Charles, ed. A Collection of Songs and Ballads Relative to the London Prentices and Trades and to the Affairs of London Generally. Vol. I, Early English Poetry. The Percy Society. London: T. Richards, 1841.
- Mackay, Maxine. "The Merchant of Venice: A Reflection of the Early Conflicts Between Courts of Law and Courts of Equity." Shakespeare Quarterly, 15 (1964), 4:371-75.
- McFarland, Ronald. "Jonson's Magnetic Lady and the Reception of Gilbert's De Magnete." Studies in English Literature, 11 (1971), 283-93.

- McPherson, David. "The Origins of Overdo: A Study in Jonsonian Invention." Modern Language Quarterly, 37 (1970), 221-33.
- Marston, Richard. "Deception and Social Dislocation: An Aspect of James Shirley's Drama." Renaissance Drama, 9, (1966), 227-45.
- Mason, Alexander. "The Social Status of Theatrical People" Shakespeare Quarterly, 18 (1967), 429-30.
- Maxwell, Baldwin. "Middleton's Michaelmas Term." Philological Quarterly, 22 (1943), 29-35.
- "Twenty Good Nights: The Knight of the Burning Pestle and Middleton's Family of Love." Modern Language Notes, 63 (1948), 2:233-37.
- Miskimin, Harry A. The Economy of Later Renaissance Europe: 1460-1600. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Mulcaster, Richard. Positions. Abridged and introduced by Richard DeMolen. Classics in Education, 44. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.
- Nicoll, Allardyce. Shakespeare in His Own Age. Vol. 17: Shakespeare Survey. Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1964.
- Olive, W. J. "Imitation of Shakespeare in Middleton's Family of Love." Philological Quarterly, 29 (1950), 75-78.
- Orme, Nicholas. English Schools in the Middle Ages. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Palm, Franklin Charles. The Middle Class Then and Now. New York: Macmillan, 1936.
- Plucknett, Theodore F. T. A Concise History of the Common Law, 5th ed. London: Butterworth, 1956.
- Pollock, Sir Frederick, and Frederick William Maitland. A History of English Law: Before the Time of Edward I. 2nd ed., 2 Vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.
- Prothero, G. W., ed. Statutes and Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1934.
- Reynolds, George F. "Aims of a Popular Elizabethan Dramatist." Philological Quarterly, 20 (1941), 3:340-44.

- Ringler, William. "The First Phase of the Elizabethan Attack on the Stage: 1558-1579." Huntington Library Quarterly, 5 (1941-42), 391-418.
- Rowse, Alfred Leslie. William Shakespeare: A Biography. London: Macmillan, 1963.
- Schell, Edgar T. "Scio Ergo Sum: The Structure of Wit and Science." Studies in English Literature: 1500-1900, 16 (1976), 179-99.
- Schelling, Felix E. Elizabethan Drama: 1558-1642. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1908.
- Schoeck, J. R. "Early Anglo-Saxon Studies and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance." Studies in the Renaissance, 5 (1958), 102-10.
- "The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and Men of Law." Notes and Queries, 1 (1954), 417-21.
- Schweikert, Harry C. Early English Plays: 900-1600. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1928.
- Seaver, Paul S. The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent: 1560-1662. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- Simon, Joan. Education and Society in Tudor England. Cambridge, Engl.: The University Press, 1967.
- The Social Origins of English Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Smith, Hallett D., ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Tempest. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- Spencer, Hazelton. Elizabethan Plays. Boston: Little Brown, 1933.
- Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy: 1558-1641. Oxford: The University Press, 1965.
- Tanner, Joseph K., ed. Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I: A. D. 1603-1625: With an Historical Commentary. Cambridge: The University Press, 1930.
- English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century: 1603-1689. Cambridge: The University Press, 1966.

- , ed. Tudor Constitutional Documents: A. D. 1485-1603: With an Historical Commentary. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948.
- Tawney, Richard H., ed. A Discourse Upon Usury. by Thomas Wilson. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1963.
- Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1926.
- Thompson, Craig R. Schools in Tudor England. Washington, D. C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958.
- Thorndike, Ashley H. English Comedy. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Thrupp, Sylvia L. The Merchant Class of Medieval London: 1300-1500. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Unwin, George. The Gilds and Companies of London. London: Methuen, 1908.
- Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Oxford: Clarendon, 1904.
- Velte, Friedrich Mowbray. The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood. New York: Haskell House, 1966.
- Waggoner, G. R. "An Elizabethan Attitude Towards Peace and War." Philological Quarterly, 33 (1954), 1:20-33.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. English Poor Law History: Part I, The Old Poor Law. Vol. 7, English Local Government. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1963.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Trans. Talcott Parsons. Fwd. R. H. Tawney. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- White, Helen C. English Devotional Literature (Prose): 1600-1640. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 29. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1931.
- Williams, Gwyn A. Medieval London: From Commune to Capital. London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1963.
- Wright, Celeste Turner. "The Usurer's Sin in Elizabethan Literature." Studies in Philology, 35 (1938), 178-94.
- Wright, Louis B. Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1935.

VITA²

Esther Mathilda Gloe

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE INFLUENCE OF THE ENGLISH WORK LAWS ON THE
DRAMA OF THE PERIOD FROM 1563 TO 1642

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Ponca City, Oklahoma, August 8, 1926, the daughter of the Rev. Mr. Virtus Christian Frederick Gloe, and Mrs. Amelia Wilhemina Claybaker Gloe.

Education: Graduated from Central High School, Kansas City, Missouri, in June, 1943; received Bachelor of Arts degree with distinction in English from the University of Missouri at Kansas City in 1947; received the Master of Education in Counseling from the University of Oklahoma in 1972; received the Master of Arts in English from the University of Oklahoma in 1974; enrolled in the doctoral program at Oklahoma State University in 1976, and completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1979.

Professional Experience: Taught English and Spanish at Cooper, Iowa, 1947; was correspondent for Business Men's Assurance Company, 1948-49; was engineering section assistant at Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, 1950-67; was education specialist for the U. S. Army, 1967-72; was graduate teaching assistant at the University of Oklahoma, 1973-74; was writer-editor at U. S. Postal Training School, 1974-76; was graduate teaching assistant at Oklahoma State University, 1976-79.