

T.C.
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI
(İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI)
ANABİLİM DALI

CONVERGENCE OF CLASSICISM AND REALISM IN BEN JONSON'S
COMEDIES: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR AND THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

BEN JONSON'IN KOMEDİLERİNDE KLASİSİZM VE REALİZMİN
BULUŞMASI: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR AND THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Seçil KARANA

Ankara-2013

T.C.
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI
(İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI)
ANABİLİM DALI

CONVERGENCE OF CLASSICISM AND REALISM IN BEN JONSON'S
COMEDIES: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR AND THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

BEN JONSON'IN KOMEDİLERİNDE KLASİSİZM VE REALİZMİN
BULUŞMASI: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR VE THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Seçil KARANA

Tez Danışmanı

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sıla ŞENLEN GÜVENÇ

Ankara-2013

T.C.
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATLARI
(İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI)
ANABİLİM DALI

CONVERGENCE OF CLASSICISM AND REALISM IN BEN JONSON'S
COMEDIES: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR AND THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

BEN JONSON'IN KOMEDİLERİNDE KLASİSİZM VE REALİZMİN
BULUŞMASI: *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR, POETASTER,*
BARTHOLOMEW FAIR AND THE DEVIL IS AN ASS

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sıla ŞENLEN GÜVENÇ

Tez Jürisi Üyeleri

Adı Soyadı

Doç. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hasan İNAL

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sıla ŞENLEN GÜVENÇ

İmzası

.....
Hasanina I
.....

Tez Savunma Tarihi 20/11/2013

**TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ
ANKARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE**

Bu belge ile, bu tezdeki bütün bilgilerin akademik kurallara ve etik davranış ilkelerine uygun olarak toplanıp sunulduğunu beyan ederim. Bu kural ve ilkelerin gereği olarak, çalışmada bana ait olmayan tüm veri, düşünce ve sonuçları andığımı ve kaynağını gösterdiğimi ayrıca beyan ederim.(11/11/2013)

Tezi Hazırlayan Öğrencinin
Adı ve Soyadı

Seçil KARANA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
PART I: A BRIEF HISTORICAL SURVEY OF ENGLAND FROM 1509 TO 1660.....	5
PART II: BEN JONSON AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF CLASSICISM.....	35
Chapter I: Classical Elements in <i>Every Man out of His Humour</i>	47
Chapter II: Classical Elements in <i>Poetaster or His Arraignment</i>	64
PART III: REALISM IN BEN JONSON'S COMEDIES.....	83
Chapter I: From a Realist Perspective <i>Bartholomew Fair</i>	97
Chapter II: From a Realist Perspective <i>The Devil is an Ass</i>	115
CONCLUSION.....	130
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	136
ÖZET.....	146
ABSTRACT.....	151

INTRODUCTION

Ben Jonson (1572-1632) –as a composer of plays, masques and poetry– is considered one of the most prolific and mischievous writers of the Renaissance Period. Dryden, as well as many other critics, have regarded Jonson as “the most learned and judicious writer that a theatre ever had” (Dryden, 1996:249). He is a pioneer in composing ‘comedy of humors’, a type of comedy focusing on the predominant traits or ‘humors’¹ shaping the personality, desires and conduct. Moreover, his plays revealing a deep knowledge of and indebtedness to Greek and Roman classics has made him the most ‘classicist’ of Renaissance playwright. As such, Jonson’s plays modeled upon the classics by conforming to the ‘rules’ of classic literary genres.

Jonson acquires the “principles of conduct and thought” mostly from Greek and Roman classics such as Aristotle (384 BC – 322 BC), Quintilian² (35A.D.– 96A.D.), Martial³ (40A.D.–between 102 and 104 A.D.) (Mulryan, 2000:163). He believes that “words borrowed of antiquity do lend a kind of majesty” and in this respect, frequently includes quotations from the works of Horace (65 B.C.–8 B.C.), Virgil (70 B.C. – 19 B.C.) and Cicero (106B.C. – 46 B.C.) etc., in his works (Jonson, 1641: 61). His influence by the classics, however, does not lead him to become indifferent to the events of his time. On the contrary, he satirizes the covetousness,

¹ Ben Jonson acquired the term ‘humor’ from Medieval Philosophy which had introduced four chief liquids that existed in the human body. In his Induction to “Every Man out of His Humor” he explained “humour” with these statements: “[...] so in every human body/ The choler, melancholy blood/ By reason that they flow continually/ In some one part and are not continent/ Receive the name of humors” (lines 96-100.) According to Medieval Philosophy the predominance of one of the liquids to the other three determined the disposition of a character. Jonson used these humors in the person’s, phlegm and Therefore, an excess of choler made a person choleric or an excess of phlegm made a person phlegmatic in the plays of Jonson. Paster, K., Gail. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. USA: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

² Marcus Fabius Quintilianus known also as the father of the Rhetoric.

³ Marcus Valerius Martialis, Spanish poet famous with his Epigrams.

eagerness, vice, folly, immorality of Renaissance English society. In this respect, Jonson is not only a classicist, but also a realist and moralist; his 'classicism' and 'moralism' roots in his "education and preference" while his 'realism', depicted as 'satire' apparently originates from his "nature" (McEven, 1945: 91). Within this context, this dissertation strives to examine four plays by Jonson, namely *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599) and *Poetaster* (1601) in terms of classicism while *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) and *The Devil is an Ass* (1616) in terms of realism.

The study consists of three main parts: "Part I: A Brief Historical Survey of England From 1509 to 1660", "Part II: Ben Jonson as a Representative of Classicism" and "Part III: Realism in Ben Jonson's Comedies". The first part will provide background information giving the key historical events of the age which is very significant in terms of having a better understanding of Jonson's comedies. In this regard, mainly the Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline Age will be discussed since, in his plays, Jonson alludes to the social, political and religious problems he witnessed in these periods which occurred due to the change of throne.

In the second part, Jonson will be examined as a distinguished 'classicist playwright' of the Renaissance Period. This will be illustrated in two of his comical satires: *Every Man out of his Humour* and *Poetaster or His Arraignment*. On the other hand, the third part will concentrate on Jonson as a 'social realist'. In this sense, his two city comedies, namely *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Devil is an Ass* will be examined with regard to 'realism'. Part II, Chapter 1 'Classical Elements in *Every Man out of his Humour*', will focus on Jonson's imitations of the classical ideas, borrowings and conformity to the classical principles in detailed way. Particularly, since Jonson imitates classics such as Aristophanes' Old comedy and Theophrastus

in the play, the similarities between the play and these classics will be handled. The play will be also examined as an experimental comedy of Jonson which reveals him as an innovative playwright rather than a slavish imitator of classics. Chapter 2 “Classical Elements in *Poetaster or His Arraignment*” will be devoted to the analysis of *Poetaster or His Arraignment* in terms of classical principles and allusions employed. In this respect, Jonson’s use of classical setting and characters will be handled in order to reveal that the play is quite remarkable in terms of depicting ‘full-blooded classicist’ Jonson. Apart from this, the moral that Jonson aims to give with the play will be handled. Thus, in Part II, also Jonson’s ‘moralism’ and ‘didacticism’ will be displayed through certain examples from the plays.

On the other hand, Part III, Chapter 1 “From a Realist Perspective *Bartholomew Fair*” will focus on Jonson’s realism by dealing with realistic elements such as realistic setting and life-like language the play employs and contemporary matters Jonson criticizes. Thus, it will be revealed that Jonson is a ‘social realist’ who satirizes not only vice and follies but also corrupted morals and social institutions of his time such as marriage, law and religion of the time. Especially, the hypocrisy of Puritans through which Jonson reveals his most biting satire will be handled within the scope of ‘social realism’. In Chapter 2 “From a Realist Perspective *The Devil is an Ass*” will dwell upon morality tradition and the ‘devil plot’ which is used by Jonson to social realism criticize corrupted morals of the time. Furthermore, it will be revealed that through depicting a world worse than the hell and people eviler than the devil who makes him ‘an ass’ Jonson proves that he is an accomplished ‘social realist’. Apart from social criticism, political satire will be handled through his criticism on monopoly system, patent system and drainage of the

drowned lands in order to display that Jonson aims to raise awareness about the corrupted economic policy.

PART I

A BRIEF HISTORICAL SURVEY OF ENGLAND FROM 1509 TO 1660

Ben Jonson witnessed three different periods –Elizabethan Period (1558-1603), Jacobean Period (1603-1625) and Caroline Period (1625-1649)– thus, he was deeply affected by the social and religious changes that occurred in the Renaissance Period. In this regard, it will be necessary to provide information about the key historical events of the age before analyzing the plays. To this end, it would be best to provide a historical survey of England with connection to the religious revolution in order to better understand Jonson’s plays dealing with such topics. The focus of this survey will be on the religious reformation in England that began with Henry VIII’s decision to break off with the Roman Catholic Church and the ‘Act of Supremacy’ passed by the parliament up to the “Commonwealth Period”. Specifically, the deadlock of England between Catholicism and Protestantism – especially in the reigns of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth– and its effect on political and financial policy of the country will be discussed in detail as it will shed light to later events which Jonson handles in his works. Furthermore, since Jonson frequently alludes to and satirizes in his plays, the religious groups as Puritans which originated as a consequence of the religious conflict and discriminations; and the favorites of the kings and queens such as the Duke of Somerset, the Duke of Buckingham etc. and their influence on the politics will be held.

England went through a radical change during the reign of King Henry VIII (1509-47). He broke with the Roman Church and established the Anglican Church, which led to religious, social and political changes. The impacts of such developments would, in fact, continue for decades. At this point, one might wonder

how a king granted the title of “Defender of the Faith”⁴ by the Pope declared himself the head of the new-established church. Yet, as most critics agree, the “Religious Reformation” was an outcome of the political strife rather than religious conflict⁵. In other words, as a religious king, Henry declared his loyalty to the Pope and submitted to papal authority in every matter except for politics. Thus, the first implications of the “Religious Reformation” came out with the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536) which turned into a political matter rather than a religious one.

Henry and Catherine –widow of Henry’s deceased brother Arthur- married in 1509, two months after he succeeded the throne. Since Henry and Catherine were “in laws” and thus, their marriage was against the laws of church, it was actualized under the special permission of Pope Julius II (1503-13) (Newcombe, 1995: 24). Yet, Pope Clement VII (1523-34) did not grant him permission when Henry wished to divorce Catherine on the ground that she could not provide him with an heir. Catherine had six pregnancies, all of which ended up with miscarriages or stillbirths with the exception of Mary (later Queen Mary). Henry attributed this misfortune to their ‘sinful’ marriage and thought that God was punishing him for marrying his brother’s widow. Furthermore, he fell in love with Anne Boleyn (1507-36) and wished to marry her in order to have a legitimate heir to succeed the throne.

⁴ Victor Stater states in *The Political History of Tudor and Stuart England* that “When the Lutheran heresy broke out in Europe Henry hastened to defend the orthodox position on the sacraments in his (ghost-written) book *In Defence of the Seven Sacraments*. A grateful pope bestowed the title “Defender of the Faith” upon the king who bore it proudly even after his broke with Rome” (2002: 96).

⁵ Contrary to most critics statements, in *Henry VIII and The English Reformation* D. G. Newcombe asserts that as politics and religion were wedded indissolubly in that period, to see Henrician Reformation only as a political affair would be a mistake (1995: 62). Yet, one can claim that Newcombe overlooks an important point that the basic reason that lied behind the Henrician Reformation was political in the beginning rather than religious. Basically, because of Catherine’s inability to give Henry a legitimate heir that would provide continuity of the Tudor dynasty the Reformation was actualized.

King Henry's demand for a divorce, namely "the king's great matter", had serious repercussions in Rome (Block, 2004: 34). Pope Clementine VII rejected to acknowledge the divorce and opposed his new marriage to Anne Boleyn. In *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor and Stuart England*, Doreen M. Rosman states that if the Pope had declared that the marriage was unlawful, English Reformation would not have taken place in the way it did, if at all (1996: 24). One can agree with Rosman's assumption, however, it is not certain whether such an ambitious king as Henry would find another reason to carry out the English Reformation or not. Moreover she asserts that it was impossible for Pope Clement VII to grant Henry a divorce due to Rome being plundered by Katherine's powerful nephew Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor:

In any case Clement dared not alienate Queen Katherine's powerful nephew, Charles, ruler of the dominant Habsburg empire, whose troops had recently sacked Rome. The pope's lack of responsiveness to the king's "great matter" meant that step by step Henry took the law into his own hands (Rosman, 1996:24).

The fact that Pope Clement VII could not decide in favor of Henry under the suppression of Charles V led to a two-year endeavor on Henry's part to find a way out. Firstly, Henry wanted the annulment of his marriage by claiming that it was unlawful due to their affinity. In order to prove the unlawful nature of their marriage he pointed out the child-bearing problem of Catherine, because prohibitions stated that "those who broke the laws would be childless" (Newcombe, 1995: 29). Secondly, Henry questioned the papal authority that if he had the right to eliminate the hindrance of affinity in his marriage to Catherine. In this way, he wanted to prove

that their marriage was invalid as the Pope had no power to annihilate their affinity. After these two attempts failed, Henry turned to Cardinal Wolsey who was both the Lord Chancellor and the Pope's personal representative in England. However, the inefficacy of Wolsey in the divorce matter increased Henry's fury and decisiveness⁶ and he proceeded by removing Wolsey in 1529 and immediately convening the parliament.

Henry considered the parliament as a significant weapon which increased royal power. He stated later that "[we] at no time stand so highly in our estate royal as the time of Parliament" as it passed a series of statutes that enabled Henry to have the power over church (Lee, 2007: 4). Thus, with the power supplied by the so-called "Reformation Parliament" (1529-36)⁷, Henry aimed to oppress Papacy by attacking the monetary issues of Rome. Therefore with the first 'Act of Annates' (1532) Henry prohibited a small proportion of the "payment all bishops made to Rome before they were confirmed in their seats" (Newcombe, 1995: 47). Actually, it was a conspicuous warning to Pope that if he did not consent to the divorce, Rome would lose one of its most important sources of revenues. Moreover, in the event that Pope retaliated by refraining from the permission of creating new bishops, England got the authority to induct them (Block, 2004: 36). Another attack on papal authority took place with the

⁶ Henry showed his determination in divorcing Catherine with his uncompromising attitude towards Pope's offers including a bigamous marriage to Anne Boleyn. Because his primary aim was to provide the continuance of the Tudor dynasty through a legitimate heir and this could actualize only through a lawful marriage. See Block S., Joseph. "The Rise of the Tudor State". *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Ed. Robert Titler, Norman Jones. USA: The Blackwell Publishing, 2004. 35.

⁷ In her book *The Origins of Western Legal Tradition from Thales to the Tudors*, Goodman indicates that the term was not known before 1859 and it became commonly used after 20th century. However she claims that its usage was not strictly accurate since Henry assembled a succession of parliaments between 1529 and 1536 and each of them was assembled individually having different aims. For instance, while the assembling reason of the parliament on November 3 was 'to associate it with the condemnation of Walsey, the second session of the parliament in January 1531 was aimed at Henry's continuing matrimonial problems. See Goodman, Ellen. *The Origins of Western Legal Tradition from Thales to the Tudors*. Sydney: Federation Press, 1995. 287.

'Act of Submission of Clergy' (1534) which assented that every new canon law required the royal consent while the former laws would be revised. Furthermore, laws which were contradictory to royal policy would be omitted. Although Henry was building the "Henrician Reformation" gradually by disregarding the papal authority, Pope was determined not to acknowledge his divorce (Dickens, 1964: 106). So, Henry's elopement with Anne Boleyn was actualized under the pledge of secrecy while he was still married to Catherine. However, Anne was pregnant and Henry had to marry her immediately in order to have a legitimate heir. In other words, if Anne had not been pregnant Henry could have waited for the annulment of his marriage with Catherine in order to remarry.

In 1533 the 'Act of Restraint of Appeals' granting that "all spiritual were to be judged in England" paved the way for a legal marriage (Block, 2004: 37). This gave Cranmer, the newly consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, the opportunity to declare the annulment of the marriage. Yet, it was the 'Act of Succession' that put Henry and Anne's marriage into statutory form. According to this Act, if Anne and Henry did not have a male heir, Princess Elizabeth would succeed to the throne as the only legitimate heir. Therefore, for fear of being accused of high treason or capital punishment, the public were made to take an oath that they would abide to this act (Bryant, 1984: 25). Although every act increased Henry's power over the church and foreshadowed the break with Rome, it was realized with the 'Act of Supremacy' (1534) which predicated that "the King our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors kings of his realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England called Anglicana Ecclesia" (Lee, 2007: 4).

With the proclamation of Henry as the only supreme head of the church, the process of breaking with Rome was completed.

In *Tudor Drama and Religious Controversy*, James J. Bryant asserts that the 'Act of Supremacy' also "gave license to all future verbal abuse of the Pope" alleging one of its terms: "No manner of speaking...against the said Bishop of Rome or his pretended power...nor...against any laws called spiritual laws made by his authority and repugnant to the English laws or the King's prerogative shall be deemed...heresy" (1984: 25). Bryant's statement actually points out that while Henry let the public protest or dispraise the authority of the Pope, he did not want to share the same fate. Hence, he prevented the expression of public reactions through the 'Act of Treason' (1534), according to which anyone who spoke or wrote against the king or his policies would be imprisoned or sentenced to death. Still, there were Catholic oppositions to royal supremacy from important political figures such as the Bishop of Rochester Robert Fisher, and the former Lord Chancellor Thomas More, who were executed for high treason. As a result, both of them were executed and subsequently accepted as martyrs.

The oppositions⁸ grew with the dissolution of churches (Act of Dissolutions 1536-39) through which Henry both annihilated the threat against his authority and

⁸ As an example of these oppositions, in his article "The Rise of the Tudor State", Block mentions Pilgrimage of Grace which was not only a well-known upheaval against the break with Rome and Henry but also regarded as a serious threat to Henrician rule though it ends up with death of thousands of people in the struggle. He indicates that this upheaval revealed the futility of the idea of rebellion as the only solution to the problems. See Block S., Joseph. "The Rise of the Tudor State". *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Ed. Robert Titler, Norman Jones. USA: The Blackwell Publishing. 2004. 38. C.S.L. Davies states that the Pilgrimage was a merging of various local risings. Thus it was usual that various causes stemmed from a variety of grievances "in a revolt which the commons of some seven counties covering a third of the area of England". See Davies, C., S., L., (1968), "The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered". *Past & Present*, 41, 54-76. In "The English Reformation and the Parish Clergy" Margaret Bowker also echoes Davies' ideas and asserts that the causes of Pilgrimage could neither only be regarded in terms of "religious protest" nor it could be "geographically confined". See, Bowker, M.

supremacy and benefited from the wealth of churches by selling them to the laity. Nevertheless, these oppositions led to the death of many people and remained inconclusive. Henry, who was once “The Defender the Faith”, eliminated the last traces of Papacy and Roman Catholicism with the dissolution of monasteries. Many critics agreed that even though the country gradually converted to Protestantism, Henry, as a feverish Catholic, preserved his faith. In fact, according to Bernard “Henry’s Catholicism was Catholicism without the Pope, without monasteries and without pilgrim-ages” (2011: 409). This also shows that Henry never intended to break with Rome and reform the church but his desperate need for a legitimate heir and the Pope’s refusal to grant him a divorce led to the Henrician Reformation. This disagreement led to a conflict of religious factions that lasted for decades.

After an eventful reign that lasted 38 years, Henry VIII died on January 28, 1547. With the right given by the parliament, Henry pronounced Edward as the heir to the throne and declared Mary⁹ and Elizabeth to be illegitimate¹⁰ in his will. Yet, as a nine-year-old king, Edward had to rule the country under the control of certain politicians –namely ‘regency council’– until he reached eighteen. The members of regency council were regarded as the most corrupted and immoral politicians in England. In *King Edward VI: An Appreciation* Clements Robert Markham states that “Young Edward's worst inheritance was the body of unprincipled second-rate

(2000), “The English Reformation and the Parish Clergy”. *The English Reformation Revised*. Ed. Christopher Haigh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.75.

⁹ Although Henry declared Mary illegitimate, in “Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I” David Loades indicates that actually Mary was the only legitimate heir of Henry “in the eyes of Catholic Europe”. Loades, D., (2006), “Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I”, *The Church of Mary Tudor*, Ed. Eammon Duffy, David Loades. England: Ashgate, 1-29.

¹⁰ In “Edward VI and Mary Tudor: Protestant King and Catholic Sister” Judith Richard asserts that Edward VI was also accepted as illegitimate in the Catholic milieu “since Henry had married Jane Seymour without papal approval”, but Mary neglected this argument and acknowledged his brother right to succeed to the throne. Richard, J., (2007), “Edward VI and Mary Tudor: Protestant King and Catholic Sister”. *History Review*. 59, 18-22.

politicians, named in the Will as Henry's sixteen executors and twelve assistants to the executors" (1908: 40). The regency council was supposed to govern by a large majority and to ensure this "[...] Henry had carefully chosen from among men of different shades of religious opinion, in order to prevent any one section from becoming supreme"¹¹ (Powers, 1897: 73). Yet, upon receiving support of certain council members, Edward's uncle Edward Seymour (Earl of Hertford) who was later called as the 'Duke of Somerset' became Lord Protector and thus the supreme authority¹² of England.

Somerset ruled the country for two years (1547-49) and even though he was supposed to consult the regency council in making political decisions, he refused to do so and acted independently as the "Protector". Although he tried to justify himself by stating that he alone was responsible for his nephew ("No man shall answer the king for these things but I") (Alford, 2002:71), his attitude abuse of power led to his downfall. As the head of the Protestant Party, Protector Somerset undertook a mission to 'develop' the Reformation through an act of parliament (1547) which repealed Henrician religion doctrines or laws such as Act of treason,

¹¹ In *Church and the State under the Tudors* Gilbert W. Child echoes G. W. Powers asserting that there were two dominant parties namely the 'the old blood' and 'the new blood' in the council which Henry strived to balance their member numbers. According to Child, while 'the old blood' was composed of Catholics and headed by nobles such as the Duke of Norfolk, Bishop of Winchester Gardiner together with the Chancellor Lord Wriothesley, 'the new blood' the Seymours, Lord Parr, Lord Lisle, Lord Eussell including Archbishop Cranmer as a powerful ally to them in the new order since "[...] the Protestants were the only section of the nation upon whom they could certainly count as supporters" (1890: 106). Thus, Child asserts that with this way Henry intended to make the two parties check each other yet he could not achieve his aim. See, Child W., G., (1890), *Church and the State under the Tudors*, London: Longman, 105-106.

¹² In *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* Stephen Alford asserts that Edward Seymour had the full power of a king and states that: "When William Paget wrote in that Edward Seymour was a king in all but name, able to exercise the absolute power of the monarch, the truth was that Seymour had (in theory) inherited the complete package of practical kingship". See Alford, S., (2002), *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 70.

Act of Proclamation, Act of Six Articles and “all restrictions on printing, reading, teaching or expounding the Scriptures” (Dickens, 1964: 203).

Demolishing Henry and Cromwell’s Reformation might seem incompatible to Somerset’s mission because he demolished Henry and Cromwell’s yet, one must consider the differences between Somerset’s idea of Reformation and the Henrician Reformation. For Somerset, Reformation was to establish England as the centre of Protestantism while for Henry, it meant being the supreme head of England under Catholicism without the Pope. Thus, it is apparent that Somerset reduced the absolute power of the king in order to actualize ‘his’ reformation.

In 1547 Somerset proceeded with ‘Act of Chantries’ which was an extended version of Henrician dissolutions of monasteries. With this act, the chantries were either dissolved or confiscated due to the government’s urgent need for money. Besides, chantries were also the home of Catholic doctrines and rituals such as pilgrimages¹³, gilds, obits, etc., which were objected by Protestants on grounds that they were superstitious.¹⁴ This objection was rooted in the belief that “the prayer should be made directly to God [...] not through saintly intermediaries and through manmade representations of those intermediaries” (Rosman, 1996: 30). For this reason, they removed all man-made images such as wall paintings, sculptures, candles, holy waters etc., from churches, as well as, religious holidays, shrines of saints that were considered as the creation of human beings. Moreover, Latin Mass

¹³ Henry VIII had annihilated the shrine of St Thomas Becket at Canterbury in 1538 as it was the centre of pilgrimage like others. See Guy, J., (1995), *The Tudors: A very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 45.

¹⁴ For more examples of the prohibited ceremonies and customs see, Hutton, R., (2000), “The Local Impact of the Tudor Reformations”, *The English Reformation Revised*, Ed. Christopher Haigh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.120-125.

was replaced by Holy Communion which resulted in severe reaction of Mary and many Catholics.

The public must have been informed about the correct way of praying as there were different doctrines and books such as the *Bishop's Book*, *King's Book* etc. Thus, in order to ensure the unity in religious service 'Act of Uniformity' was passed by the parliament in 1549 and it became compulsory to use *The First Book of Common Prayer*¹⁵ in religious in the Church of England. The *Book of Common Prayer* had great significance in the Reformation process because it changed the language of worship from Latin into English. In *Church and the State under the Tudors* Child W. Gilbert states that language change was an explicit signifier of the establishment of new system namely 'Protestantism' instead of 'old religion Catholicism' that was marked by Latin (1890: 114-155). Yet, it could satisfy neither Catholics nor Protestants owing to its modifications as the conservatives disliked its innovations while reformers found its innovations inadequate (Sydnor, 1978: 12). Thus, upon the failure of the first book, the parliament enacted the Second Book of Common Prayer in 1552. *The First Book of Common Prayer* was the last step of reformation before Somerset's fall, as a result, the second book was published after John Dudley (the duke of Northumberland) became Lord Protector in succession to Somerset. And Dudley carried out the Reformation according to the acts passed by the parliament such as the Acts for relief of the poor, fasts, holidays and acts against the abusive bishops.

As *The First Book of Common Prayer* was not totally Protestant, the Parliament decided that it must have been revised thus, Archbishop Cranmer –also

¹⁵ The original title of the book was "THE BOOK OF THE COMMON PRAYER AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACREMENTES, AND OTHER RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCHE AFTER THE USE OF THE CHURCHE OF ENGLAND".

the author of the first book— was charged with revision. Since Cranmer “desired that all Protestant communities should agree” on the book, he invited some ‘learned divines’ to England (Markham, 1908: 127). To explain his purpose of this invitation Cranmer wrote a letter to the leader of the Bremen Church stating that he wanted ‘true doctrine of God’ to be implemented in the churches of England and continued with these words:

[...]Neither have we any wish to be shifting and unstable, or to deal in ambiguities: but, laying aside all carnal considerations, to transmit to posterity a true and explicit form of doctrine agreeable to the rule of the scriptures; so that there may be set forth among nations a testimony respecting our doctrine, delivered by the grave authority of learned and pious men; and that all posterity may have a pattern which they may imitate. For the purpose of carrying this important design into effect we have thought it necessary to have the assistance of learned men, who having compared their opinions together with us, may do away with doctrinal controversies, and establish an entire system of the doctrine (Guy, 2010: 25).

The above-mentioned ‘learned divines’ consisted of some important figures such as Martin Brucer and Peter Martry who later became Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and Oxford Universities¹⁶. With their help together with some countryman, Cranmer completed *The Second Book of Common Prayer* which led England to the Protestantism with alterations in Catholic ‘order of communion’ and ‘rites of consecration’.¹⁷

¹⁶ Under the influence of such important Protestant figures, universities played crucial role in the Edwardian Reformation. In *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* Stephen Alford explains this reform-minded function of universities with these words: “The universities were, ideally, flagships of Reformation, and both inside the scholarly communities of Cambridge and Oxford, and outside them, the Edwardian regime tried its hardest to blur the boundaries between learning, kingly authority, and godly religion”(2002:125)

¹⁷ In *The History of England: From the Accession of England to the Death of Elizabeth(1547-1603)*, A. F. Pollard explains the changes that occurred in the Protestant direction with the publication of the

While England was forging ahead through Protestantism with new amendments, sudden death of King Edward VI in 1553 ended both Northumberland's authority and the reforms. Even though Edward VI did not change the fate of country—since the country was manipulated by certain politicians during his reign—he was of importance as the first Protestant king of England. Yet, his death dragged England into a deadlock about who the next successor would be. Mary's (1553-59) succession to the crown in 1553 was expected to end this turmoil, but quite contrary to expectations, it brought disorder to the country due to religious amendments enforced by Mary in order to 're-Catholicize' England.

Mary's accession to the throne took place with a nine day delay during this which Jane Grey ruled the country.¹⁸ And as the first Queen Regnant of England, who was also an ardent Catholic, Mary led England back to the process of Catholicism. In order to declare herself as the legitimate queen of England, she repealed the act that proclaimed her illegitimacy. Then continued by taking steps to restore Catholicism and released the bishops—namely Gardiner, Edward Courtenay and Duke of Norfolk—who were jailed at the very beginning of the Edwardian Reformation¹⁹. In *The English Reformation*, A.G. Dickens mentions the names of important Catholic figures of Mary's council: "[...] Mary added *politiques* like Paget, Arundel, Pembroke and Petre, thus constructing a council of great numbers

second Book of Prayer with these words: "The altar was turned into a communion-table which was to be placed in the body of the church or in the chancel; ordinary instead of unleavened bread was to be used; the rubric enjoining the use of the alb and cope was omitted; and the sequence of the service was materially modified (1929: 69-70).

¹⁸ As Mary's accession to the throne would conflict with Northumberland's interests, he convinced Edward on his death bed to accept Jane Grey—the grand-daughter of the younger sister of Henry VII—as the next successor to the throne. This was both for the benefit of Northumberland, since his son married to Jane Grey, and for the reformation as Northumberland had asserted that "the reformation would be undone if Mary became queen" (Powers, 1897:79). Yet, this scheme did not prevent Mary's accession thus what Northumberland had foreseen actualized as soon as Mary became queen.

¹⁹ Moreover, Mary imprisoned the Protestants such as Northumberland, Lady Jane Grey and her husband who were later condemn to death.

and notorious disunity” (1964:259). With the help of this council —though mostly consisted of infamous figures—, Mary made progress on the course to re-Catholicize England.

During her five-year reign, Mary had five parliaments which made amendments to carry out Marian “Counter-reformation”²⁰. To begin with, the first parliament abolished the two *Books of Common Prayer* and repealed Edwardian legislations with the “First Statue of Repeal” in 1553. The Latin Mass, which had been replaced by Holy Communion with the Edwardian Reformation, was revived. As Mary wished to bring back “the ceremonies and the physical beauty of the old faith”²¹, not only psalms, but also scriptural texts, fasts and religious holidays, altars, colorful glittering images and lights were restored. Moreover, Mary opposed the royal supremacy in preference of papal authority while the parliament rejected the abolishment of the ‘Act of Supremacy’. According to A. G. Dickens the parliament’s opposition stemmed from the notion that they “would accept a return to the last years of Henry VIII, but not a return to the Middle Ages” (1964: 250). Besides, both the parliament and the public —even though it consisted of mostly Catholics— were against papal authority with a vehement nationalism. Thus, the reconciliation with Rome was not actualized until the establishment of the third parliament of Mary.

²⁰ In *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter Reformation* Michael Mullett asserts that the term “Counter Reformation” was first used by German modern history writer Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) as *Gegen-Reformation*, “Counter-Reformation,” and explains that it “assembled all the various individual areas of Catholic transformation into an overarching hy-pothesis that saw them as being essentially triggered into a hostile and defensive reaction by the Protestant Reformation. Although the term was applied to the efforts of the Roman Church to revise Catholicism in the early modern Europe, most critics agreed that Marian Reformation was a “Counter- Reformation” as well. See, Mullett, M., (2012), *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation*, Toronto: The Scarecrow Press Inc., p.119.

²¹ To get more detailed information about the Marian amendments see, Loach, J., (1991), “*Mary Tudor and the re-Catholicization of England*”. *History Today*, 12 (3).

The Second Parliament of Mary's reign convened in April 1554 and dealt mostly with Mary's marital matters, particularly her marriage to Philip of Spain. Her reasons for accepting the Spanish match is explained by Pollard in *The History of England: From the Accession of England to the Death of Elizabeth*: "She [Mary] cared only for the spiritual welfare of her people, and she believed that it was safest under the tutelage of Spain and of papacy" (1929: 105). Furthermore, Mary aimed to have an heir who would prevent Elizabeth and Mary Stuart from succeeding to the throne and thus, provide the continuation of the Catholic reign. However, contrary to Mary's aim, her marriage to Philip of Spain provided accession opportunity to Elizabeth and ended up with the removal of Catholicism upon the death of Mary without an heir. The House of Commons of the first parliament as well as the public objected²² to this match on the grounds that it created a dependency and insisted that she marry an English- man. Thus, when the second parliament accepted this marriage Mary lost most of the Catholics' favor and consequently Protestants gained power. While the tremendous impact of the Queen's Spanish marriage continued to effect the public with the return of Cardinal Reginald Pole to England the people encountered another radical change which was the restoration of the papal jurisdiction.

²² Sir Thomas Wyatt (father of Jane Grey) rebelled against Mary and her Spanish marriage in 1554. Most critics such as W. M. P. Kennedy and A. G. Dickens agree that it was not a religious but a political rebellion. In *Studies in Tudor History* Kennedy indicates that "Wyatt, it is true, gathered to his forces Protestants who were displeased at the restoration of Catholic warship, and who had originally supported the Queen; but he relied on the political issue as his principle battle-call [...]" (1916, 127-128). Yet, in *The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth* A. F. Pollard asserts that the main incentive for the rebellion was religious as "the restoration of God's word was their real concern" and to be able to gather more supporter they brought forward a political reason rather than religious one. See, Pollard, A., F., (1929), *History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth*. London: Longmans, Green and co. pp. 108-109.

Pope Julius III (1550-1555) charged Cardinal Pole with the restoration of the papal jurisdiction in England and he succeeded, that is to say, in January 1555 the third parliament acknowledged the papal jurisdiction and repealed the antipapal statutes that had been passed since 1529. Moreover, the laws against Lollard which gave way to their persecution were revived. According to G. W. Powers, the revival of the papal supremacy was an indication of outbreak of persecution since "reformed opinions were to be trampled out by force" (1987:86). Likewise, the reenactment of the medieval heresy laws, in a way, verifies Powers' allegation as it resulted in persecution of approximately 300 Protestants. The main incentive for these persecutions was Mary's desire to turn England into a pure Catholic country through either banishing Protestants from the country or burning the ones who did not consent to Catholicism. Thus, immediately after the revival of the heresy laws the first burning owing to heresy took place. This included the burning of John Rogers (1555), Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Latimer, Ridley and many others till death of Mary in 1558. When Mary died, her 'bloody' reformation faded away and she was remembered as "Bloody Mary" because of the persecutions.²³ And all her struggle for counter-reformation failed with the accession of Elizabeth (1558-1603) to the throne.

Unlike the feverish nature of Queen Mary –which can be regarded as the primary reason of her failure– Elizabeth was a demure and meticulous person who adopted the principle of pondering over steps she would take. This principle, which

²³ In "*Mary Tudor and the re-Catholicization of England*" Jennifer Loach mentions John Foxe's *Act and Monuments* (also known as *The Book of Martyrs*) which is of importance as a document that depicts the persecutions of Protestants. Yet, Loach claims that Foxe provided his source from John Rogers who wrote his account in Newgate prison where he heard Oxford Burnings from George Shipside therefore Foxe's sources were biased.

she presumably adopted after eleven-year struggle to survive,²⁴ paved the way for the establishment of the most successful monarch of English history. Accordingly, when she succeeded to the throne in 1559 as the Protestant Queen regnant of England, Elizabeth waited for the public to be poised for radical religious changes. She was aware of the fact that to make a move to undo the Marian counter-reformation might have serious repercussions on the public since religion turned out to be a very delicate situation owing to royal religious enforcements. Above all, unlike Edward VI and Mary who assigned some councilors to make decision about the country Elizabeth made decisions about not only religious but also internal and external political matters herself.

The accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne pleased everyone including certain Catholics, even though they approached her cautiously. Her right of succession to the throne was based on the ground of the 'Act of Succession' and the Will of Henry VIII. As soon as Elizabeth was enthroned, she removed some ardent Catholics from the council and replaced them with trusted friends including Robert Cecil, who served for Elizabeth till his death. Following that, the first parliament consisting of Protestant members met in 1559 and inevitable religious changes began with the removal of papal supremacy.

²⁴ Elizabeth had a harsh life; when Henry VIII died she was fourteen year old girl who had to live with her step mother, Catherine Parr, and her new husband Thomas Seymour –brother of Lord Protector of Edward VI – and had to endure Seymour' s abuses. Furthermore, when Mary succeeded to the throne and enforced Catholicism, as a Protestant princess Elizabeth was vulnerable to be accused of treason and condemn to death. Therefore, in "Elizabeth I, Gender, Power & Politics" Susan Doran mentions the belief of Elizabeth about God's preservation of her from all danger and placing her on the throne and she remarks that "[...] during Coronation procession of January 1559 she [Elizabeth] not only allowed herself to be identified with Deborah, the instrument of Divine Providence, but also compared herself to Daniel, who had been saved from the lion's den" (2003:31).

When the papal supremacy had been revived by Mary and Pole certain Protestants and Catholics were against it due to the rapidly emerging nationalism. Therefore, while certain Catholics and Protestants were ready to accept the 'Act of Supremacy', other Catholics preferred Marian amendments. Moreover, according to the bishops and certain parliament members Elizabeth's gender was an obstacle to her being titled as "the Supreme Head of Church of England". In *Elizabeth I the Voice of Monarch*, Ilona Bell states that the reason why Elizabeth could not be "the Supreme Head" was actually explained by Archbishop Heat. For Heat the reason was "the traditional patriarchal analogy" according to which "Christ ruled over the church as the monarch ruled over his people and as the husband ruled over his wife" in other words, man was superior to woman so a woman could not be "the head but feet"²⁵ (2010: 46). However, the 'Act of Supremacy' was accepted in April 1559 with a title change. Therefore, instead of "Supreme Head" Elizabeth became the "Supreme Governor" of the church.

Although the title change were to reduce the royal supremacy, "still it gave her [Elizabeth] complete control over her church and the clergy" (Powers, 1897:90). Moreover, the enactment of 'Act of Supremacy' brought along 'Act of Uniformity' which revived Edwardian Book of Common Prayer of 1552, changing the religion of England from Catholicism to Protestantism. It is mostly agreed that although Elizabeth was pleased with *The First Book of Common Prayer* (1549) which was more tolerant to Catholicism, she could not revive it due to the reaction of her Protestant supporters. In fact, her contentment with the first book stemmed from her

²⁵To get more information about "the biblical metaphor of the head and feet" (a synecdoche for the entire patriarchal system of Government) see, Know, J., (1855), "The First Blast of The Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment of Women", *Works of John Knox*. Ed. David Laing, Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club, pp. 349-423.

predisposition to some Catholic liturgy despite its contradiction with Protestantism. In this regard, in "From Elizabeth I to Charles II" Bryan Spinks indicates that "In her [Elizabeth's] chapel, despite protests and acts of clerical sabotage, she insisted on retaining a cross and candles on the communion table" (2006: 46). Besides, Elizabeth also persuaded the parliament to change certain parts of the Prayer Book of 1552 as she did not want to abandon such rituals. For instance, Elizabeth ordered that the stone altars should remain as they are, even if a wooden table replaced it in ceremonies. Furthermore, the Mass vestments, which had been removed by The Second Book of Prayer (1552), were reinstated in Elizabethan Common Prayer Book regardless of the protestation of certain fervent Protestants (who were later called 'Puritans') who claimed that vestments were "unnecessary remnants of Catholic past" (Wagner& Schmid, 2012: 1143).

In *Queen Elizabeth*, Craighton alleged that the English welcomed the religious settlement and these amendments since they hated the Pope (1920:54). Thus, when the 'Oath of Supremacy' was enforced to the Clergy, only 192²⁶ out of 9400 clergymen refused it and the penalty of those repugnant was deposal. With urgent need for new clergy to fill up these existing vacancies, the former Marian exiles, who had been banished and upon the death of Mary returned to England, were assigned. In time the number of these advanced Protestants increased and they were named "Puritans" from 1560s becoming an influential power in England. According to John Guy, the term "Puritan" was pejorative and "meant a 'church rebel' or 'hotter

²⁶ However, in *Church and the State under the Tudors* Gilbert W. Childe gives the number of those who refused the Oath of Supremacy as less than 180 and he asserts that "of these, more than half were dignitaries" (1890:186).

sort' of Protestant [...]" (2001: 71).²⁷ In this respect, their "hotter sort" of Protestantism stemmed from the influence of Calvinism in addition to other 'Continental forms of Protestantism' which they had met while they had been in exile at places such as Zurich, Geneva or Frankfurt. And as their name overtly indicated, they wanted to "purify" the church from all sort of superstitions including the cross in the baptism, wearing Mass vestments, kneeling at the communion²⁸ etc. This paved the way for a longstanding conflict between Puritans and the Queen since they found the Elizabethan religious settlement unsatisfactory and demanded for more radical reforms in the Church of England.

Apart from Puritans, Queen Elizabeth had to deal with enemies that attempted to intervene in the domestic affairs of England such as the Pope, Spain, Jesuits and "Catholic plots"²⁹ during her reign. And among these problems it was the Pope who proved to be the most problematic, as the main conspirator against both the Queen and Protestantism. Seeing that, England was the "chief centre of the 'venom'" in the

²⁷ Yet, in *From Catholic to Protestant* Doreen Rosman claims that Puritans preferred to be described as "godly" or "professors of the faith" though these descriptions insinuated that the others were unreligious (1996: 63).

²⁸ According to Puritan belief if the Church of England could not purify itself from these Catholic practices it would bring God's wrath on people who were aware of the true religion but would rather "misleading ceremonies and mindless rituals" (Doreen, 1996: 62).

²⁹ The plots aimed to revive Catholicism in England by enthroning Mary Queen of Scots (instead of Elizabeth) who was the daughter of Mary Guise (Marie de Guise) and King James V of Scotland. As James V was the son of Margaret Tudor - the sister of Henry VIII- Mary had right to claim the English Throne. Moreover, as Mary's second husband Henry Lord Darnley was the grandchild of Henry VII this marital bond also strengthened her right to claim the English throne. In *King James* Pauline Croft states that for Catholics Mary Queen of Scots was not only the next heir to the English throne but also the rightful monarch since Elizabeth was regarded as illegitimate, thus, she "usurped Mary's place" (Croft, 2003: 10). Above all, Mary was Catholic and this entailed a risk for the sovereignty of Protestant Elizabeth since the English Catholics desired Mary to succeed Elizabeth in order to re-catholicize England. Thus, when she fled to England after being defeated by Scottish nobles who rebelled against her because of the suspicions of her personal complicity in the murder of her second husband Henry Steward (Lord Darnley), Elizabeth had chance to bring Mary under her control and prevent the Catholic scheme from being actualized. Mary was incarcerated for 19 years but her involvement in the Babington plot, which intended to kill Elizabeth, resulted in her execution in 1587. See, Mullett, M., (2010), *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation*. Toronto: The Scarecrow Press Inc, pp. 321-322.

spread of Protestantism throughout Europe, Pope Pius V not only provoked the northern rebellion in England but also issued the bull *Regnans in Excelsis* in 1570, which excommunicated and deposed Queen Elizabeth. The bull brought about some Catholic conspiracies such as the Ridolfi Plot (1571)³⁰, the Romanist attack³¹, the Throckmorton's Plot (1583)³² and Babington's Plot (1586)³³, all of which aimed to assassinate Queen Elizabeth and replace her with Mary Queen of Scots. Yet, these conspiracies paved the way for stricter measures to be taken by the parliament to protect the queen and this turned the period of tolerance into a bloody struggle through persecution laws.

Although at first the parliament passed anti-papal legislations such as the one that forbade anyone to "obtain, publish and put in use papal bulls and other instruments within the realm, or to absolve subjects from their allegiance and reconcile them to the usurped authority of the Roman see" with severe penalties, the active role of such groups as Jesuit missionaries and Seminarists in the conspiracies against the Queen, ended up with more restrictive laws including the treason laws (Powers, 1897: 106). For instance, in 1585 the entrance of Jesuits to England was forbidden and those who broke the ban were executed for treason. The Seminarists who returned to England on command but rejected to acknowledge the Act of Supremacy and Uniformity would be accused of high treason. Furthermore, in 1587 fines were reinforced to non-conformists through an act of parliament particularly for

³⁰ It was the first conspiracy plot against the queen organized in 1571 by a Florentine Banker Roberto di Ridolfi and intended to murder the queen and enthrone Mary Queen of Scots with the help of Spanish troops.

³¹ It consisted of three attacks took place namely in Ireland, Scotland and England (through Jesuits) all of which were either planned or stirred up by the Pope but failed.

³² It was an attempt to assassinate the Queen which was planned by Catholic Francis Throckmorton in 1583 but failed.

³³ It was planned by Catholic Anthony Babington but this conspiracy was different from others since Mary Queen of Scots was said to involve in it personally thus, condemned to death.

Puritans who refused to attend Protestant services in 1593. Upon the conspiracies ended and Elizabeth secured her position as the Queen regnant of England with the defeat of Spanish Armada, the persecutions of Catholics decreased. However, "Before the reign closed 124 priest and 63 men and women of the laity were executed in the most revolting manner" (Kennedy, 1916: 192). Yet, these persecutions did not overshadow Elizabethan reign as they did Mary's and her 44 years reign was named as "The Golden Age" in the history of England.

Queen Elizabeth died in 1603 without an heir and King James VI of Scotland (1566-1625) as the son of Mary Queen of Scots and relative of Henry VIII, was the nearest relative of the Queen inherited English Throne. Apart from this, since he had been ruling over Scotland successfully for 37 years, nobody rejected his proclamation as King James I of England in 1603. James aimed to continue this peaceful atmosphere by uniting Scotland and England. In *King James*, Pauline Croft states that as a strong believer of the divine rights of king "James was convinced that his accession created a literally God-given opportunity, and for himself a divine obligation, to bring the two realms together in perpetuity" (2003: 56). To this end, he brought them together under the title of Britain in 1604 and proclaimed himself 'King of Great Britain'³⁴, which was rejected by English Parliament. Although his desire to unite two kingdoms "under one crown" failed, James managed to prevent Scotland from falling under the hegemony of England, most probably, with the help of Scotsmen he placed on the Privy Council (Wormald, 2002: 31).

³⁴ In "James VI & I" Jenny Wormald asserts that the parliament denied the title because the members of parliament feared that "the ancient and glorious name of England would be forgotten and foreigners would not know who they were" (2002: 31). Moreover, they wanted to dominate over Scotland thus, England would not be equal to Scotland but be a sovereign power over Scotland. See, Wormald, J., (2002), "James VI & I", *History Today*: 52 (6), 27-33.

In regard to religious conflicts in England, James kept his peaceful, compromising attitude towards religious differences, which he initially demonstrated when he was presented with a petition to him at the very beginning of his reign by Puritans, whom he disliked. Through the 'Millenary Petition' prepared by a thousand Puritans discontent with Elizabethan restrictions or obligations, and wanted to take advantage of the new reign. According to the petition 'popish' remnants such as "the giving of the ring in marriage, the sign of the cross in baptism" etc. had to be removed from the Church (Croft, 2003: 156), and a new translation of the Bible had to be prepared. Although James was against the reformation in Church matters, he would rather convene a conference to discuss the Puritan demands than disregard the petition.

The conference was held at Hampton Court on 14 January 1604 with the participation of nine bishops and five Puritan representatives (Croft, 2003: 157). The most vehement discussion was observed when one of the Puritans claimed that "lower clergy should have the right of meeting in conference and the Bishops should consult the Synod of his diocese" to which the king responded with these words: "If you aim at a Scottish Presbytery, it agreeth as well with a monarchy, as God and the Devil" and finished his speech underlining that "No bishop, no king" (Trevelyan, 1912: 78-79). After three days of discussion, it was decided that 'popish remnants' would not be removed from the Church, yet, the suggestions about a new translation of Bible and certain changes including private baptism, church courts, the disciplinary role of the bishops in the Book of Common Prayer were accepted.

However, acceptance of “a new version of Bible”³⁵ by James was remarkable since he had stated that he was against religious reformation. In his article “James I and the Puritans”, John Spiller remarks that Puritans anticipated a ‘Puritan-style’ Bible, which would exclude such words as ‘bishop’ and ‘church’ but James only intended to change “marginal notes” in the Geneva Bible which he disliked and considered as “undermining of monarchy in places” (2008: 9). James was aware of the fact that these changes did not content Puritans, and they would continue to pose a threat for him. Thus, in his fourth parliament (1624) he revealed his dislike for radical Puritans: “I think it all one to lay down my crown to the Pope as to popular party of Puritans” (Spiller, 2008: 12).

As for the Catholics, the only thing James expected from them was loyalty and to accept him as supreme governor of the church. In *History of the English Revolution*, F. E. Dahlmann asserts “almost the only objection he [James] had to the Roman Catholics was that they raised the Pope to the place which belonged exclusively to the Sovereign” (1844: 128). Likewise, James had depicted his thoughts about Roman Church frankly in his speech in the first parliament in 1603 with the following words:

³⁵ In “James VI and I and the King James Version” W.B. Patterson mentions the process of new translation of the Bible. Patterson states that James and his advisers initiated the project by choosing translators among “a large diverse and scholarly group” including certain Puritans and in August 1604 James gave instructions to the translators indicating that the Bishops’ Bible must have been the basis for the new translation. Patterson asserts that “The new Bible was aimed at showing that scholars and writers of goodwill, working individually and collaboratively, could, despite their ecclesiological differences, produce a text that English-speaking Christians could all accept” (2003: 522). Eventually, the new version of Bible which was called as “King James Version” or “Authorized Version” was finished after seven years of study and published in 1611. It has remained at the center of religious life till present day. See, Patterson, W.B., (2004), “James VI and I and the King James Version”, *Rev. of God’s Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible* by Adam Nicholas, *The Sewanee Review*, Summer 112(3), 417-427.

I acknowledge the Roman Church to be our Mother Church, although defiled with some infirmities and corruptions, as the Jews were when they crucified Christ: And as I am non enimie to the life of a sicke man, because I would have his bodie purged of ill humours; no more am I enimie to their Church, because I would haue them reforme their errors, not wishing the downethrowing of the Temple, but that it might be purged and cleansed from corruption[...] (McIlwain, 1918: 274)

As mentioned previously, James was against the corruption in the Roman Church, he was not an enemy of Catholicism. And, ever since the church was freed from 'infirmities', he was not an enemy of the Roman Church as well. To demonstrate this, James removed certain recusancy laws including fines in the early years of his reign, as he had promised Catholics prior to his accession (Gardiner, 1895: 22). Yet, the removal of penal laws led to an increase of recusants which created certain rumors about the occurrence of plots and resulted in the banishment of priest from England.³⁶ Therefore, in order to avoid the further increase of recusants and certain possible plots King James restored penal laws against recusants in 1605. On the surface, this seemed as the reason of the conspiracy against James and parliament members; yet, for Catholic plotters (namely Robert Catesby, the mastermind of the plot, and Guy Fawkes, John Wright, Thomas Percy etc.) the main incentive was mainly their hatred for Protestant regime and "the desire to revenge thirty years of religious persecution of being consigned to the political margins" (Nicholls, 2007: 797). Furthermore, in "Gunpowder, Treason and Scots" Jenny Wormald remarks

³⁶ In *History of the English Revolution* F.E. Dahlmann asserts that James revived the fine that was imposed on Roman Catholic recusants in order to preserve due balance between Puritans and Catholics. Since he deprived Puritan clergy, who did not acknowledge oath, of their benefices he had to revive certain penal laws for recusants. Dahlmann, F.,E.,(1884), *History of the English Revolution*, London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, p. 129

that: "Their [the conspirators] hope was for a Catholic England not an England containing tolerated Catholics [...]" (1985, 153). To this end, they attempted to blow up the House of Lords with gunpowder on 5 November 1605, thus, the conspiracy was named as "Gunpowder Plot"³⁷.

Initially, the plotters³⁸ who "were gentlemen of name and blood" hired the adjoining cellar of the House of Lords and 36 barrels of gunpowder was concealed there under the pledge of secrecy (Trevelyan, 1912: 93). Notwithstanding the strict secrecy, the conspiracy was revealed by an anonymous³⁹ letter written to one of the Lords. As a result, certain conspirators including Guy Fawkes being arrested and condemn to death as traitors. As in "James VI & I" Jenny Wormald states certain Catholics "erroneously" alleged that the letter was sent by Robert Cecil "in order to force James into taking a tougher line with the Catholics" (2002: 32). Notwithstanding the mystery about the writer of the letter was not 'uncovered' wholly, for Catholics the anonymous letter cost certain consequences. For instance, together with other penal laws, the Oath of Allegiance was enforced to Catholics which "sought to establish the grounds of civil obedience for those who acknowledge the spiritual authority of the papacy" in 1606 (Patterson, 1997: 76). Catholics who

³⁷ In "Strategy and Motivation in Gunpowder Plot" Mark Nicholls asserts that Gunpowder Plot evoked the Bye Plot of 1603 which had also actualized by a group of discontented Catholics with the aim of "demanding religious tolerances and the removal of unpopular ministers". Yet, whereas Gunpowder Plot intended to kill the King and the parliament members to revive Catholicism, the Bye Plot only planned to kidnap the King to provide more rights for Catholics. See, Nicholls, M., (2007), "Strategy and Motivation in Gunpowder Plot", *The Historical Journal*, 50 (4), 787-807.

³⁸ Ben Jonson was also arrested with the suspicion of involvement in the conspiracy yet he was released (Cave: 1991: 5-6)

³⁹ Likewise, in "Remember, Remember" Neil Jones claims that "recent commentators have questioned if the letter was in fact a forgery, written perhaps by Robert Cecil, the king's most important minister, to set up the conspirators for a spectacular government propaganda coup when their plot was dramatically 'uncovered'" (2003: 47).

refused to take the oath were banished from England.⁴⁰ Moreover, James augmented the anti-catholic laws through enforcing financial penalties after Henry IV's assassination by Catholic fanatics in 1610. In short, Gunpowder Plot increased the tension between Catholics and Protestants which James had been trying to defuse since his accession. All in all, James was the first Stuart king of England and in his early reign he strived for building both religious and a national union called "Britain". Yet, from 1611 on, he mostly dealt with his son's Spanish match and financial problems that left by Elizabethan government.

King James I's death ended twenty two-year Jacobean Period in 1625 and the Caroline Period began with his son Charles I's succession to the throne at the age of twenty five. Contrary to his father's pacifism, Charles adopted "an aggressive foreign policy" which led to financial crisis in consequence of the wars with both Spain⁴¹ (1625) and France⁴² (1627) (Stroud, 1999: 48). Since to be in war with both countries at the same time required great amount of money, Charles, who was in desperate need of revenue, embarked upon using prerogative taxation such as ship money, forest fines or tonnage and poundage money without parliament consent. This constituted a ground for the conflict between the parliament and the King which lasted throughout Charles's reign and ended up with Civil War.

⁴⁰ James preferred to banishment rather than persecution since he regarded the religious persecutions as barbarism.

⁴¹In *The Early Stuart Kings, 1603-1642* Graham E. Steel and David L. Smith claim that the trouble with Spain was rooted in Jacobean Period since James desired a marriage between Charles and Spanish Infanta with the aim of restoring Palatinate. However, when Charles and Duke of Buckingham traveled to Spain in order to meet the Infanta the Spanish did not allow Charles to introduce himself to the Infanta personally which led Charles and Buckingham fury, thus, resulted in war with Spain.. Seel, G., Smith, D., (2001), *The Early Stuart Kings, 1603-1642*, London and New York:Routledge.

⁴²In *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction* John Morrill notes that the reason of the war with France was "to make Louis XIII honour the terms of the marriage treaty uniting his sister Henrietta Maria to Charles I" (2005: 33). All in All, both war with Spain and France stemmed from Charles's and his major advisor Buckingham's warlike policy.

In *History of King Charles the First of England*, Jacob Abbot explains the process that led to the Civil War as follows: “

[...] four years spent in getting into the quarrel between the king and Parliament, ten years in an attempt by the king to govern alone and, finally ten years of war, more or less open, the king on one side, and the Parliament on the other (1900: 66).

Furthermore, Abbot asserts that first four years conflict was Buckingham's⁴³ work since he exerted a strong influence on Charles (1900:66). Parallel to Abbot's contentions, the parliament agreed with the general view that Buckingham was the focal figure both in foreign policy and the financial policy. The parliament members were aware of Buckingham's supremacy at court and he was the only person who responsible for monopoly of the distribution of patronage. Especially upon failure of such expensive expeditions to Cadiz (1625) and the La Roach (1627) the parliament wanted Buckingham to be impeached. Charles immediately dissolved the parliament to save his favorite from impeachment but he could not prevent Buckingham being murdered by John Felton in 1628.

Arminianism, which is also known as “anti-Calvinism” and have rituals and ceremonies very similar to Catholicism, was another significant issue that paved the way for the tension between the parliament and the king.⁴⁴ The parliament, which consisted predominantly of Protestants, attacked Arminianism in anticipation of Catholic revival as a result of the increase of Arminian number (Seel and Smith,

⁴³ King James I who was bored with his previous favorite Robert Carr (Earl of Somerset) created George Villiers the Duke of Buckingham in 1623. Thus Villiers became “the first duke for nearly a century to have no trace of royal blood in veins” (Seel and Smith, 2001: 39).

⁴⁴Undoubtedly, the conflict between Charles and the parliament proceeded not only from the predisposition of Arminianism towards Catholicism but also the accusations against Buckingham that he was responsible for the spread of Arminianism in England.

2001: 57). Besides, the protestations increased when Charles appointed two leading Armanias William Laud who became the bishop of London while Richard Montague became royal chaplain. The protestations reached its peak with “religious innovation sand ceremonies⁴⁵ Laud begot. Growing weary of suppression by the House of Common who not only regarded an Arminian as “the spawn of the Papist” (Gregg, 1981: 186) but also levying of tonnage and poundage as illegal, Charles resolved to dissolve⁴⁶ the parliament in 1629 and he ruled the country without parliament till 1640.⁴⁷

The first seven years of personal rule was peaceful since Charles ended the wars with France and Spain due to the difficulty of providing revenue in the absence of parliament. Furthermore, as mentioned before, certain taxations imposed on people especially “tonnage and poundage”⁴⁸ and “ship money”⁴⁹ was the chief matter that ruined the peacetime. In other words, in 1637 notably John Hampden and a few refused to pay the tax “without a trial” on the ground that taxation was illegal without

⁴⁵ In *Religion in Early Stuart Britain, 1603-1642* Tom Webster asserts that according to Laudian programme the ministers were supposed to “wear the full clerical regalia, to bow at the name of Jesus, to use the cross on the child’s forehead in baptism and to employ the Book of Common Prayer with no omissions or additions” (2003: 260). Thus, anticipated stability in English liturgy was destroyed again with the revival of ceremonies which not only augmented the fearful Protestant apprehension about Popish plot but also exacerbated the Puritan fury. For further liturgical innovations see, Webster, Tom. “Religion in Early Stuart Britain”, *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Ed. Barry Coward, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. 253-270.

⁴⁶ Yet, in his speech to House of Lords, Charles announced that “[...] it was merely the undutiful and seditious Carriage in the Lower House that hath made the Dissolution of this parliament” and he did not accuse all the members but believed that there were certain “vipers” that were waiting for their punishment (Abbott, 1900: 94).

⁴⁷ These eleven years period creates controversy among historians as some critics named the period as “The Personal Rule” while others called it as “Eleven Years Tyranny” (Seel and Smith, 2001:55; Stroud, 1999: 67).

⁴⁸ It was an ancient tax levied upon weight; ton and pound that was brought by trading vessels (Abbott, 1900: 97)

⁴⁹ This was an ancient tax that had been collected by the seaport owns. Yet, Charles I expanded it to a tax “assessed on all the towns, each one being required to furnish money enough for a certain number of ships” (Abbott, 1900:98).

the consent of parliament (Abbott, 1900: 99). Notwithstanding the tremendous impact it created on public, Hampden was made to pay the tax.

Apart from the prerogative taxation problem, “the problem of religious unity”⁵⁰ which stemmed from Charles’s desire to create a religious unity among England, Ireland and Scotland ended up with certain rebellions. Within this context, upon Laud’s imposition of Common Prayer Book on Scotland, Scots rebelled against Charles I. In desperate need for money to suppress the revolt Charles I urgently convened the parliament⁵¹ on April 13th 1640 which he dissolved a few weeks later upon its inadequacy in providing supplies Charles had demanded for a campaign against Scots. However, Charles I insisted on a second campaign against Scots, but, it was a great failure which compelled him to convene the “Long Parliament” in order to pay £850 per a day as requested by Scots to leave England and return to their country (Smith, 2003: 249).

The Long Parliament, which was divided as the royalists (Cavaliers) and the parliamentary reformers (Roundheads), enforced certain acts on Charles I to abolish priorities⁵² proceeded from eleven-years of Personal Rule. For instance, “Triennial Act of 1641” compelled him to “summon parliament at least every three years” or further act that “denied him the power to dissolve the Long Parliament except its

⁵⁰ In “Why did Charles I fought the Civil War” Conrad Russell states that: “The belief that it was the duty of a ruler to enforce uniformity in the true religion was one which cause difficulties for other authorities as well as Charles I” yet, contrary to them Charles contended with this problem (Russell, 1984: 34) .See, Russell, Conrad. “Why did Charles I Fight the Civil War”. *History Today*. June 1984. 34,6: 31-34.

⁵¹ This is the first parliament that Charles I convened after eleven years and as it was dissolved on May 5 it is known as “Short Parliament”.

⁵² In *History of King Charles the First of England* Jacob Abbott remarks that while Charles believed that his power was “hereditary and sovereign” and “the parliament was his council; and that they had no powers or privileges except what he himself or his ancestors had granted and allowed them” Wentworth acclaimed to the parliament that like the king they also inherited privileges and “were entirely independent of royal grant or permission” (1900: 133). Although Abbott regarded it as the “beginning of the difficulties between the king and the Commons” it can be rather regarded as the main conflict between the king and the parliament that comprised a basis for the Civil War.

own consent” (Smith, 2003: 250). Yet, it was the proclamation of the parliament to have control over armed forces that created tension between the parliament and the King⁵³. Furthermore, the king’s failed attempt to arrest certain parliament members and accuse them of high treason eventuated in his departure from the capital declaring war against the parliament.

As a result of these constituents Civil War broke out in 1642 dividing England into separate groups as supporters of the king (royalists, Episcopalians, the gentry, the nobility) and supporters of the parliament (Presbyterians, artisans, merchants, common people). However, it was not important whether one supported the king or the parliament since during seven-year fight many people perished and suffered in the bloody hands of the war on both side. Nevertheless, at the end of the war Charles I was tried for high treason in 1659 and became the first King of England that condemn to death. After execution of Charles I, England entered entirely new period; the House of Lords dissolved and the Commonwealth⁵⁴ was established under the rule of the protectorate, namely Oliver Cromwell, instead of the king. However, as in “The Cromwellian Protectorate” Graham Goodlad remarks that rather than the commonwealth the period was mostly regarded as dictatorship due to “the regime’s undeniable dependence on the support of the army together with Oliver Cromwell’s inability to work with his parliament [...]” (2007: 2). This so-called “dictatorship” proceeded till 1660 years and during this period England went through not only social but also cultural changes including the closure of the theatres for 18 years.

⁵³ The conflict between the parliament and the king about the control of the army reemerged with the Catholic Rebellion in Ireland in 1641.

⁵⁴ The period is also named as the “Puritan Interregnum” because of the success of the parliament in Civil War and the Puritan dominance over the government.

PART I

BEN JONSON AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF CLASSICISM

No one is such follower of the ancients as you
Because you, restorer of the old, follow those you
approve.

Follow still what you pursue; and may your books
Be adorned with old age from their first hour:
For assuredly youth is to be denied to literary works,
And it is necessary that these books are born aged
things,

By which let your power be given immortality.

John Donne, 'Amicissimo, & meritissimo BEN: IONSON'

In terms of classicism Ben Jonson is considered one of the most distinguished playwrights in the Renaissance Period due to both his knowledge in classical theory and its execution throughout his works. John Donne, who is not only a renowned contemporary poet but also one of Jonson's best friends, praises Jonson's classicism in his above-quoted Latin poem 'Amicissimo, & meritissimo BEN: IONSON' ('To the most friendly and deserving Ben Jonson'). He describes Jonson's classicism by stating that he "restores" in other words 'improves' the classics and follows those who serve to his purpose. Within this context, it can be asserted that although his plays are contemporary, his works reach the same quality of the classics through imitation and can be regarded as 'ancient'.

Generally speaking, Jonson conforms to classical principles, adopts classical form, style and ideas upon true poesy in his plays. Moreover, his works are abundant in borrowings and direct quotations from the classics since "only words from the ancient tongue" can give eloquence to 'uneloquent' English (Rowse, 1972: 40). Within this context, John Dryden indicates that "no man has borrow'd so much from the Ancients as he [Jonson] has done" yet his borrowings 'beautify' the language

(1671:276). In short, Jonson is a prominent representative of classicism in England, notably through his frequent conformation to classical principles and imitation of the classics. For this reason, it is necessary to begin with an outline of characteristics of 'Classicism' first together with its historical development in Renaissance England.

Classicism, the dominant movement of the Renaissance Period (1400-1600), can be defined as "a body of doctrine which is thought to be derived from or to reflect the qualities of ancient Greek and Roman culture, literature, philosophy, art, or criticism" (Flint & Addison, 1960: 88-89). Although the origin of the word 'classic', dates back to ancient Rome in which first rank citizens were called '*classici*') in gained its modern meaning, that is "a model to be followed", when "Aulus Gellius (19.8.15) contrasted a '*scriptor classicus*' (*high class*) with a '*scriptor proletarius*' (*low class*), the description carried an implication of quality" (Greenhalght, 1978: 10). Although the French used *classique* in this modern meaning in the sixteenth century, England and France did not use the term "the classics" to mean "masterpieces of Greek and Latin Literature" until the eighteenth century. Since classical education was accepted as "the only correct training for civilized life" at the time, the French and English contribution to the meaning of the word 'classic' is quite natural. Eventually, classicism become "an approach to the medium founded on the imitation of Antiquity, and on the assumption of a set of values attributed to the ancients" in the history of literature (Greenhalght, 1978: 10).

European scholars, namely 'humanists', found an opportunity to read the works of Greek and Roman writers, became acquainted with classical doctrines including, *imitation, simplicity, unity, decorum*, etc. especially after the invention of the printing press around 1450. In *The Classical tradition: Greek and Roman*

Influences on Western Literature, Gilbert Highet asserts that classical principles⁵⁵ such as “the proportions of plays”, “symmetrical division into five acts”, “the idea of having intricate plot” etc. came to be known with the classical revival ancient texts in the Renaissance Period (1976: 130-31). As a result, playwrights adopted and imitated the classical form, style and restructured the Renaissance drama on the basis of classical rules which paved the way for spreading classicism throughout Europe.

In “Jonson’s Classicism” John Mulryan states that classicism was imported to England by humanists of Oxford University such as William Grocyn (ca.1446-1519) and Thomas Linacre (1460-1524) who visited Italy and got acquainted with other humanist scholars such as John Colet (1466-1519) (2000: 163). Yet, it was popularized by Queen Elizabeth’s tutor Roger Ascham (ca.1515-68) especially through his work “The Schoolmaster” (1570) in which Ascham praises “classical models of imitation” against the translations of “undidactic Italian literature” (Ord, 2003: 203) . Eventually, with the contribution of Oxford Reformers such as John Colet and William Lyly (ca. 1468-1523), “classical education was set up in England from grammar school to universities” (Mulryan, 2000: 164). This is of vital importance, because Westminster School -where Ben Jonson received a classical education- was among these newly established Grammar Schools of the period. Although his mother had married a poor bricklayer after the death of Jonson’s father, he was enrolled to this school renowned for Latin and Greek studies, with the help of a benefactor. In *Ben Jonson: A Literary Life*, David Kay asserts that: “the

⁵⁵“The conception of drama as a fine art”, “the realization of drama as a type of literature” and “the principles of dramatic production and the structure of drama” were other elements that Renaissance drama was indebted to Greece via Rome. To learn other contributions of classical tradition to Renaissance drama see, Highet, Gilbert. *The Classical tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976, 113-131.

curriculum⁵⁶ at Westminster was designed according to the humanist principles” under the headship of Edward Grant and William Camden and “its aims were to develop piety and morality and to encourage the speaking and writing Latin and Greek through imitation of best authors” (1995: 3).

In this respect, it is apparent that Jonson’s translations, from Greek or Latin into English such as Horace’s *Ars Poetica* and Martial’s *Epigrams* 77, *Book VIII*, *Epigram* 47, *Book X*, and plays are in accordance with the goals of the School. Likewise, presumably with the moral notion he gained in Westminster School Jonson pays more attention to ‘characterization’ than ‘action’ since Aristotle asserts that “the character is that which reveals moral purpose: it shows what kind of things, in cases of doubt, a man chooses or avoids”, (1895: 27). In this regard, in *Cynthia’s Revels*’ “Prologue”, Jonson emphasizes that “Words above action, matter above words” (1981:7). The moralist notion Jonson adopts from the ancients also brings along a quality of didacticism to his works. As Quintilian and Horace, who regarded poets as “the first instructors of mankind”, Jonson believed that a poem should both instruct and please (Horace, 1911: 144).⁵⁷ As an outcome of this education and his beloved tutor William Camden, to whom he refers to as the “most reverend head to

⁵⁶ According to Rosalind Miles the curriculum at Westminster was as follows:

“1st form: *Disticha* – Dionysus Cato, *Exercitatae Linguae Latinae* – Vives, *Dialogues* and *Confabulationes*, *Pueriles* – Corderius;

2nd form: Terence, *Aesop’s Fables* in Latin, *Dialogue Sacri*, *Colloquies* – Erasmus;

3rd form: Terence, Sallust, *Selections from Cicero’s letters* – Sturmius, Aesop in Latin;

4th form: *Tristia* – Ovid, *De Officiis* – Cicero, *Epigrams* – Martial, Catullus, Terence, Sallust, Greek: Grammar, *Dialogues* – Lucian;

5th form: Justin, *De Amicitia* – Cicero, *Metamorphoses* – Ovid, Horace, Greek: Isocrates, Plutarch;

6th & 7th form: Caesar, Livy, Virgil, Greek: Demosthenes, Homer, Hebrew.

See, Miles, Rosalind. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990. 286.

⁵⁷ In his dedicatory epistle to *Volpone*, Jonson emphasizes a poet’s moral function. He stresses that a poet can fulfill the moral function of a poet that is to “inform young men to all good disciplines”, “inflame grown men to all great virtues” or be “a teacher of things divine no less than humor” and so on if he is a good man (Jonson, 1987: 76).

whom I owe / All that I am in arts, all that I know"⁵⁸, Jonson became a 'full blooded' classicist and moralist (Jonson, 1903: 227).

Jonson was a great admirer of Classical writers –mainly Aristotle, Quintilian, Horace and Martial– which he reflects through the composition his plays, imitation of and frequent reference to their works. The main classics that Jonson owed all his knowledge on poesy was especially Aristotle and Horace.⁵⁹ Therefore, it would be best to give brief information about the classical rules Jonson conformed to quite substantially, that is "imitation", "simplicity", "unity", "decorum" that were mentioned especially by Aristotle in *The Poetics* (330 B.C.) and Horace in *The Art of Poetry* (18 B.C.).

If we were to begin with "imitation", in *Discoveries or Timber*⁶⁰ Jonson asserts that "to read best authors, observe the best speakers and much exercise his own style" were three requirements needed to be observed to write well (1892: 54). Furthermore, he defines "imitation" as the ability "to convert the substance or riches of another poet to his own" and for him it is the third requisite for a poet (1892: 77),

⁵⁸ The following lines of "Epigram XIV" Jonson praising Camden also depict Jonson's admiration Jonson:

(How nothing's that?) to whom my country owes
The great renown and name wherewith she goes!
Than thee the age sees not that thing more grave,
More high, more holy, that she more would crave,
What name, what skill, what faith hast thou in things!
What sight in searching the most antique springs!
What weight, and what authority in thy speech!
Men scarce can make that doubt, but thou canst teach.
Pardon free truth, and let thy modesty,
Which conquers all, be once o'ercome by thee.
Many of thine, this better could than I
But for their powers, accept my piety (Jonson, 1903: 227).

⁵⁹ In *Timber or Discoveries*, Jonson refers to Horace and Aristotle as classics that ought to be exalted and praises Aristotle as "the first accurate critic and truest judge" and "the greater philosopher the world ever had" who thought one how to make a right judgment and what one should imitate (1892: 78).

⁶⁰ The full title is *Timber or Discoveries Made upon Man and Matters, As They Have Flowed Out of His Daily Readings; or Had Their Reflux to His Peculiar Notions of the Times*.

which again underlines that imitation is an indispensable element of writing. As observed in his works, Jonson is both a theorizer and a practitioner of this idea. Likewise, John Dryden states that Jonson “was not only a professed imitator of Horace, but a learned plagiary of all the others; you track him everywhere in their snow” (1881: 25). However, in “Jonson’s Criticism”, Stanley Steward remarks, “Jonson makes Horace’s *Ars Poetica* “so much his own” that he “becomes very he” so imbued by the substance of Horace’s thought that he is able to compound and improve upon it” (2000:183-184). In other words, although Jonson uses the ideas of Horace and other classics as a basis for his poesy, he develops and converts them to his own ideas.

Although, Jonson exercises the idea that “imitation of best authors” is a requirement of writing well, his adherence to classics and free ‘borrowings’ led to certain accusations of plagiarism⁶¹. However, Dryden states that Jonson “fears not to be taxed by any law”, on the contrary, he “invades authors like a monarch what would be theft in other poets is only victory in him” (Dryden, 1881:70). Dryden’s statement can be regarded as a defense of Jonson who considered the imitation of ancients as an honor. In this regard, Jonson frequently emphasizes that in order to ‘imitate’ the style of writers such as Homer, Virgil and Horace certain rules must be met:

⁶¹As Jonson based his play *The Case is Altered* Plautus’ two comedies *The Captivi* and *The Aulularia* Charles Fitzgeffrey blames him for plagiarism:

Jonson I call thee, come thou forth to justice
I’m here you to drag thee to the bar of Phoebus
Guilty of stealing and of wicked thieving[...]
These plays, I say then –plays so wondrous clever,
Thou stolest basely while the gods were busy,
And now proceedest as thine own to vend them:
Jonson, to justice come thou forth I call thee! (Fitzgeffrey, 1990: 67)

Not to imitate servilely⁶², as Horace⁶³ saith, and catch at vices for virtue, but *to draw forth out of the best and choicest flowers, with bee, and turn all into honey*, work it into one relish and savor: make our imitation sweet: observe how the best writers have imitated and follow them: how Virgil and Statius have imitated Homer; how Horace, Archilochus: how Alcaeus, and the other lyrics; and so of the rest (Mine italics) (1892: 77)

Like the above-mentioned “bee” that chooses the best flowers to make honey, he chooses best authors to imitate and borrow (technique, style, ideas) from in order to compose his poetry. He boasts of his borrowings since “words borrowed of antiquity do lend a kind of majesty to style, and are not without their delight sometimes; for they have the authority of years, and out of their intermission do win themselves a kind of grace like newness” (1892: 61). However, similar to gathering flowers to make a garland, some words are required for “ornament and color” that are “better when they grow to our style as in meadow, where, though the mere grass and greenness delights, yet the variety of flowers doth heighten and beautify” (1892: 61-62).

With respect to “simplicity”, like Horace⁶⁴, Jonson believes that language should be “pure and neat” that is, “plain and customary” – because when it loses its clarity “it converts into a riddle:

[...] the obscurity is marked, but not the value. That perisheth, and is passed by, like the pearl in the fable.

⁶² Jonson indicates that they have “opened the gates” not as commanders but guides (1892: 7).

⁶³ Here Jonson alludes to Horace’s comment on ‘theme’ in *The Art of Poetry* which Horace states that a poet should choose a well known theme instead of ‘inventing’ his own theme since it can be developed and became a better poem than original one. (1911: 137).

⁶⁴ In *The Art of Poetry* Horace suggests that:

Let all your precepts be succinct and clear,
That reedy wits may comprehend them soon,
And faithful memories retain them long;
For superfluities are soon forgot. (1911: 143).

Our style should be like a skein of silk, to be carried and found by the right thread, not raveled and perplexed: then all is a knot, a heap (1892: 63).

However, similar to Horace who states that “a comic subject loves an humble verse” or Aristotle who attributes a low style to comedy, it appears that Jonson thinks that the nature of a low character requires a simple language and ought to be “natural and smooth” (Horace, 1911: 136) in order to convey meaning.⁶⁵

“Three Unities” –namely unity of action, time and place– rooted in Aristotle’s “the law of probability”⁶⁶, were put forward by Italian critics of 16th century, such as Giraldi Cintio (1543), Francesco Robortello (1548), Bernardo Segni (1549), Maggi (1550), Lodovico Castelvetro (1570) as an inseparable element of ‘Renaissance classicism’ (Fyfe, 1940:21). In this respect, Aristotle only mentions “unity of action” in *Poetics*:

[...]the imitation is one, when the object imitated is one, so the plot, being an imitation of an action, must imitate one action and that a whole, the structural union of the parts being such that, if any one of them is displaced or removed, the whole will be disjoined and disturbed (1895:33).

In addition to this explanation, he states the “plot” should be of length that “may be easily embraced by the memory” which Italian scholars, in particular Giraldi Cintio mentioned as “unity of time” (1895:31). Furthermore, in *A Greek View of Poetry and Drama*, W. Hamilton Fyfe indicated that “the unity of time demands that the period of the time imagined to elapse in the play should exactly correspond with the time

⁶⁵ The simplicity of language can be also regarded as a result of Jonson’s arrogance since he thinks that the audience is so fool that they cannot understand the joke if he does not use clear and simple language. In any case, Jonson is known as even more sardonic than Shaw that despises the audience.

⁶⁶ In *The Poetics* Aristotle remarks that everything that happens on the stage must be probable and have an explanation thus “the poet should prefer probable impossibilities to improbable possibilities” (1895:91).

taken in production” (1940:21). Thus, the events have to take place within duration of 12 to 24 hours or a day. However, as stated earlier, Aristotle does not specifically deal with “unity of place” clearly; yet, it is expressed and named by Castelvetro in his translation and commentary of Aristotle’s *Poetics* in 1570.

In his plays, Jonson adapted Aristotle’s ideas in *Poetics* about the unity of time and action. In *Timber or Discoveries* Jonson indicates that fable (plot) is the imitation of one perfect action, and concerning its length he states that “the action in tragedy or comedy to be let grow till the necessity ask a conclusion [...] it exceed not the compass of one day [...]” (1892: 85). Yet, when it comes to applying this formula, he states that one ought not to adhere to these rules strictly. In this regard, Jonson utilizes classic rules to take his poesy a step further and conforms to three unities as long as they serve his purpose. For instance, while he observes the unity of action, time and place in *The Alchemist* by centering the play on a group of characters and the action in or out of a home, he disregards unity of place or action in *Every Man in his Humor* and *Volpone* (Butler, 1910: 38).

Lastly, “decorum” is of great importance in Jonson’s plays. In a general sense, the classical term decorum “designates the view that there should be propriety or fitness in the way that a literary genre, its subject matter, its character and actions, and the style of its narration and dialogue are matched to one another” (Abrahams, 1998:61). Similarly, in *Poetics*, Aristotle asserts that “a person of a given character should speak or act in a given way, by the rule either of necessity or of probability” (1895: 51). However, it was Horace who regarded decorum as major principle in his art of poesy. Especially, in *The Art of Poetry* he gives wide coverage to “decorum” stating that a poet should “match their subject to their strength” (1911:136). In other

terms he identifies 'proper measure' as composing the play in five acts, including a maximum of three characters speaking at one time and characters acting according to their proper rank. In short, according to the principle of decorum, not only character and language but also the length and style should be suitable to the contemporary society.

Like other classical elements, Jonson pays great attention to "decorum" in his plays and within the frame of decorum he introduces "the humors"- the dominance of a trait in a character- to English drama with a didactic purpose. In *English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy*, Charles Read Baskervill indicates this didacticism and some tendencies of classical literature lead to abstractions and the use of allegory in medieval literature. Jonson, however, turns these abstractions into flesh and blood characters or types with his use of humors (1911:26). In this respect, they do neither change nor develop throughout the play. For instance, in *Epicone: The Silent Woman*, Morose represents a man who hates noise, or in *Volpone* Volpone ('Fox' in Italian) represents a man who is cunning like a fox. Through this way Jonson not only achieves his moralist purpose —to instruct the audience through ridiculing character's dominant traits and follies— but also meets the demands of "decorum".

In the light of given information, it is apparent that Jonson pays great importance to classic rules, yet Jonson's being a classicist and moralist cause certain problems. To begin with, his borrowings from classics and frequent quotations in Greek and Latin makes him appear pedantic at times. Moreover, since uneducated audiences could not understand Greek and Latin, this might be the main reason of the "unpopularity" of his plays (Craig, 1990: 24). Yet, Jonson was aware of this fact and in address "To the Reader" in *Sejanus*, he confesses that though "none but the

learned would take the pains to confer them [Latin quotations]" it was a requirement of the Roman setting and the quotations show his integrity in the story (1981: 234). Secondly, because of his borrowings from classics and humorous character types, Jonson was accused of 'lack of imagination'. In *The Broken Compass*, Edward B. Partridge points out Jonson's 'lack of poetic imagination' and remarks that certain critics "think of him more a translator than as a genuinely creative artist" (1958: 213). Similar to those critics, Partridge accuses Jonson for his over consistency in his images and not surprising his audience with "a new emotional state" instead using the same sort of imagery: "Gold is always sexualized. Women are almost always compared to animals. Everything is eaten" (1958: 221). Last but not least, he did not appreciate his contemporaries; on the contrary, he uncovered their mistakes insultingly and criticized them severely. For instance, In *Conversation with William Drummond*, Drummond states that Jonson blames Sidney for not keeping decorum, "making everyone speak as well as himself" (1906:11). Further, Drummond asserts that Jonson pleased neither with Spenser's stanzas nor his matter in Allegory he had delivered in papers to Sir Walter Raleigh and he counts Sharpman, Day and Dekker as rogues (1906: 14). In *Every Man in his Humor*, Jonson, again, criticizes the contemporary writers explicitly through Bobadil's words: "They'll prate and swagger and keep a stir of art and devices when (as I am gentlemen) read' em, they are the most shallow, pitiful, barren fellows, that live upon the face of the earth, again" (1981: 198). Furthermore, as Jonson loads poets with the responsibility of moral instruction, he attacks contemporary writers who neglect to do so:

[...] not only their manners, but their natures, are inverted, and nothing remaining with them of the dignity of a poet but the abused name, which every

usurps; that now, especially in dramatic or, as they term it, stage poetry, nothing but ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy, all licence of offence to God and man is practiced (1987: 76).

Jonson's sharp tongue in his criticisms and arrogance, however, resulted in certain writer's nurturing enmity towards him. Upon the reflection of this enmity on the stage, it turned into a battle among playwrights including, Jonson, Marston and Dekker which was later called "War of the Theatres"⁶⁷. Jonson's play *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599) is known to be one of the first plays that initiate this so-called war. On the other hand, *Poetaster* (1601) might be regarded as the play that finishes the war on the Jonsonian part as he abandons writing comedy for a while on account of being tired of this war. However, Jonson's classicism is his one of the most significant weapon for ridiculing and criticizing his rivals or enemies in this war. Within this context, in *Ben Jonson: A Literary Life*, David Kay asserts that "Jonson's impulse to outdo his fellow poets by imitating classical forms more authentically is first manifested in his works of 1599 and 1600" (1995:38). Thus, in the following section, Jonson's two plays namely *Every Man out of his Humour* and *Poetaster* will be handled within the frame of classicism.

⁶⁷ "War of the Theatres" is also known as "Poet's War" since Dekker refers it as "Poetomachia" in *Satiriomastix* (1601).

CHAPTER I

CLASSICAL ELEMENTS IN *EVERY MAN OUT OF HIS HUMOUR*

Every Man out of His Humour (1599), the first play of Ben Jonson's "trilogy of comical satires"⁶⁸, is one of his earliest plays that display his 'classicism'. Although he does not conform to the 'classical principles' strictly in the play, he shows great adherence to the classics on the basis of characterization by displaying a distinct "humour" in every character. Furthermore, the use of 'Theophrastus'⁶⁹ character descriptions', 'a long induction', 'play within the play' and 'chorus' (Jonson calls it as "Grege" in the play) which evaluates and comments on the events are the main elements that render the play being regarded as an example displaying Jonson's classicism. Likewise, in the "Induction", Cordatus (a friend of the playwright) likens the play to Aristophanes' *Vetus Comoedia* which demonstrates the play is based on Greek Old Comedy⁷⁰. In this sense, in *Shakespeare & the Poet's War*, James Bednarz asserts that Jonson regards himself as "reviving not the latter but the spirit of Old Comedy" in an evolving tradition which Aristophanic comedy is "only a constituent part" (2001: 70). In other words, Jonson represents his own style and innovations in *Every Man out of His Humour* which converts the play from a mere copy of the 'Old Comedy' to an experimental play. Thus, in order to differentiate the play from others he quotes another classic Horace's motto "Non aliena meo pressi pede" (I had not placed my foot in others' footsteps) on the title

⁶⁸ The other two plays that Jonson calls as "comical satires" are *Cynthia's Revels* (1600) and *Poetaster* (1601).

⁶⁹ Theophrastus (371 BC- 281 BC) is Greek philosopher and writer who becomes the head of Lyceum after Aristotle's death (322BC). He is known for his scientific works on botanic and his book *The Characters* reflecting human nature.

⁷⁰ Old comedy is the first period of Greek comedy that begins in 5th BC and comprised of only the first nine comedies of Aristophanes. Yet, after the defeat of Athens a new type of comedy appears which is "less political and much less poetic" and chorus turn into an interlude which have "little or no connection with the action" (Harsh, 1944:257).

page of the play (Moul, 2010: 98-9). The motto underlines that Jonson follows a different path from his contemporary playwrights. Cordatus also underlines the play's peculiarity, defining the play as "strange, and of a particular kind by itself" (Induction, 228-29). Yet, through coming up with an "innovative" play Jonson runs the risk of being disgraced by the audience as Cordatus points out that although the work "hath bounteously pleased" him; he do not know "how it will answer the general expectation" (228-30).

In accord with the didactic purpose adopted from classics, Jonson severely satirizes vice and folly of the Elizabethan society. He reveals this purpose through Asper's lines at the very beginning of the play:

Well I will scourge those apes;
And to these courteous eyes oppose a mirror,
As large as is the stage whereon we act:
Where they shall see the time's deformity
Anatomized in every nerve and sinew,
With constant courage and contempt of fear.
(Induction, 117-122)

He intends to exhibit the corruptions in the society through punishing the characters and making them aware of their wicked nature. Apart from this, the play accepted as the first play of the "War of the Theatres", in which Jonson attacks certain contemporary playwrights such as Dekker and Marston (especially though the characters "Clove" and "Orange").⁷¹ Thus, the play can be regarded as one of the best examples that fuse the playwright's 'classicism' and 'realism'.

⁷¹ In "The Peace of the Poetomachia" John Enyck asserts that "the high point of parody" comes out in III.iv. when Clove pretends like a scholar uttering "Marston's certain "pompous and gibberish" words and using the title of his last play *Histriomastix* (1962:179). Furthermore, in "The Elizabethan Dramatists as Literary Critics", James P. Bednarz indicates that *Every Man out of his Humour* is the first play that Jonson criticizes Shakespeare together with Marston and Dekker in response to which Shakespeare criticizes Jonson in such plays as *As You Like It*, *Twelfth Night*, *Troilus and Cressida* and *Hamlet* (2004: 240).

To sum and substance of it, the play is appropriate for being analyzed from both a classic and a realist perspective. When the commentaries and criticism on the play is analyzed, it is evident that the play has been examined mostly with a 'realist' perspective due to its sarcastic, satiric tone and certain allusions to contemporary playwrights. However, as this chapter strives to exhibit Jonson's classicism, the play will be handled in terms of its 'classical' elements. To this end, it would be best to begin with a summary of the play which is quite troublesome as Jonson disregards 'unity of action' adapting the classical motto "Words above action, matter above words" (*Poetaster* and *Cythia's Revels*), and thus, paying more attention to matters than actions.

Every Man out of His Humour begins with an 'Induction' in which Cordatus, Mitis and Asper's speak upon the corruption in society. Asper aims at displaying the corruption with a play driving its characters out of their wicked 'humours'. To this end, Asper who also represents another character namely Macilente (a sufficient scholar) in the mentioned play, comes off the stage in order to turn into an actor, leaving Cordatus and Mitis on the stage as commentators. Meanwhile, Asper's play starts with the appearance of Prologue who wants Cordatus speak the prologue in the place of himself. However, the act begins after Carlo Buffone (a profane jester) introduces the play named *Every Man out of His Humour* to the audience.

In Act I, Macilente, an envious scholar, overhears Carlo Buffone's (an imposter) giving Sogliardo (a fool obsessed with nobility) instructions on being a 'gentleman' when he is discovered. Angered by what he hears, Macilente attempts to deter Sogliardo from Buffone's counsel but they leave him to visit the knight Puntarvolo. Subsequently, Sordido (Sogliardo's brother), a superstitious farmer who

prognosticates his harvest according to weather forecasts, appears on the stage. While, he calculates his circumstances in this respect (as Macilente observes covertly) his servant Hind brings an official paper ordering him to sell his grains. Sordido plans to bury his harvest under the earth, but give the impression that it has burnt. Then he will buy all the grains in the market in order to control the trade.

In Act II, Fastidius Brisk (a fop), Cinedo (Brisk's servant), Carlo Buffone and Sogliardo await Puntarvolo's arrival in his country house in order to observe his humour. They witness Puntarvolo 'tedious' courtly love scene played with his wife that occurs following his every return from hawking or hunting. Meanwhile, Sordido and his son Fungoso join them. Fascinated with Brisk's clothes, Fungoso asks his uncle Sogliardo for money to buy law books with the intention of buying fashionable clothes. At merchant Delirio's house in the city Macilente tries to convince Delirio to stop flattering his discontented wife Fallace. Fungoso, having spent his uncle's money on clothes, appears in a new suit but is disappointed to see Fastidious Brisk in another new suit. Thus, he begs his sister for cash to buy yet another new suit while Fallace expressed his admiration for the fashionable Brisk.

In Act III, Shift (a jester), Puntarvolo, Carlo, Fastidius, Deliro, Macilente, Sogliardo, encounter each other at the middle aisle of St. Paul. Fastidius promises Macilente to introduce him to "the most acute lady in court" if Delirio "furnishes" him with new clothes (III.iii. 20-1). On the other hand, while Sogliardo claims that he has become a 'gentleman' by buying a coat of 'arms', Fungoso, who wants an exact duplicate of Brisk's suit made, appears with his tailor. Meanwhile, in the rustics, Sordido attempts to hang himself as "his prognostication has not kept touch with him" (Grege, 9-10). Countrymen save him, but walk away in disgust when they

realize his identity. This leads to Sordido realizing his mistake and thus being “dishumoured”. The act ends in the court, in which Fastidious Brisk keeps his promise and introduces Macilente to the lady, but he does not like her at all.

In Act VI, Delirio enters with musicians to please his wife, which seems to annoy Fallace. Upon Macilente exposing Brisk as a “zany” at court, Delirio decides to withdraw his financial aid and have Brisk arrested for the debts. Fallace sends Fungoso with a sum of money to warn Brisk but he spends it on a suit. Delirio and Macilente arrive at Puntilovato’s lodgings to look for Brisk. Macilente fails to convince Delirio that his wife is not the honest person he believes her to be. The act ends with Fungoso who almost faints after seeing Brisk in another new suit.

In Act V, Puntarvolo, Fastidius Brisk and Fungoso come to the palace. Macilente poisons Puntarvolo’s dog but he accuses Shift of stealing it. Thus, in turn, obliges to confess that he makes up adventures to get a privileged place in society. Macilente, removes Saviolina’s humour by showing that Sogliardo is actually not a gentleman but a rogue. Puntorvolo seals Carlo Buffone’s lips for mocking his dead dog. Fungoso is kept in the Mitre tavern to pay the bill for all the drinks. Informed by Macilente about Fungoso’s trouble, Delirio heads for the tavern. Convinced by Macilente, Fallace, visits Brisk in prison to aid him, but, is discovered kissing him by her husband. Thus, Delirio, who realizes that his wife is not virtuous, gives up doting on her and Brisk gives up his passion for fashion. Consequently, all the characters abandon their humours and become better people.

Jonson, who regards “imitation” as the first requirement of being a good poet, takes the Greek playwright Aristophanes, a representative of Old Comedy, as a model to imitate in *Every Man out of his Humour*. Similar to Aristophanes, whose

criticism is rooted in contemporary matters and personal attacks on such playwrights as Sophocles and Euripides, Jonson satirizes folly of the time and attacks contemporary poets such as Dekker, Marston and Shakespeare. He, further, imitates the form of Aristophanes' Old Comedy he includes chorus, play within the play⁷² and the episodic structure.

In Old Comedy there are mainly five parts, beginning with *Prologus* (exposition) in which a happy idea is suggested, then the idea is objected severely in *Parados* (choral entrance), discussed in *Agon* (argument), and the chorus comes forward to directly address the audience in *Parabasis* (choral address to the audience). This is followed by *Episodes*, mostly unconnected parts, in which the idea is practiced. Finally the play ends with feasting in *Exodos* (final). Although adopts this form in *Every Man out of his Humour* Jonson alters the order of the parts in order to fit to the conventions of Elizabethan Drama. For instance, Jonson begins the play with Aristophanic chorus placing the *parabasis* (from the middle) to the beginning of the play. Thus, like Old Comedy's *parabasis* in which the playwright addresses the audience directly through chorus and comments on contemporary matters, the play starts with a long 'induction' where Cordatus, Mitis and Asper function as a chorus.

In this part, Jonson/Asper reveals his aim as follows: "With and armed and resolved hand/ I'll strip the ragged follies of time/ Naked, as at their birth——" (Induction, 15-17). Besides, the chorus intervenes and interrupts throughout the play to comment on events in order to prevent any misunderstandings in and the play. Thus, Jonson "provide[s] a model for the audience to follow" by employing the

⁷² In *The Play-within play: The Performance of Meta-theatre and Self Reflection* Gerhard Fisher and Bernhard Grainer remark that "topical features of comedy" such as "falling out the character", "improvisations" or "comic intrigues" are based on the principle of the play within the play (2007:8).

chorus as a judgment mechanism (Loxley, 2002: 51). In "Ben Jonson's Comical Satires and Vetus Comedia" William David Armes points out the function of chorus is to defend the author as in Aristophanes' plays and asserts that "Cordatus continually defends Jonson and his techniques and praises him in Act IV, scene viii" (1974: 165). That is to say, in response to Mitis criticism on the character's following their humours till Act V, Cordatus defends and praises the playwright "therein his art appears most full of lustre, and approacheth nearest the life: especially, when in the flame and height of their humours they are laid flat" (IV.viii.147-49).

Moreover, like *Episodes* in Old Comedy, Jonson utilizes the episodic structure in the play by bringing forth a different action with every humour displayed. For instance, while Puntarvolo attempts to embark on a journey to Constantinople, Delirio tries to please his wife and Sogliardo endeavors to be marked as a gentlemen. All these actions are presented as loosely attached episodes similar to Aristophanes' plays and they reach a solution with characters' being dishumoured. Yet, rather than Aristophanic festivity, Jonson ends the play underlining the moral lesson that the play give. In this regard, the play ends with Cordatus Mitis and Macilente/Asper's indication that the audience will profit from the play by observing the dishumoured characters and being driven out of their humours. In other words, the playwright achieves his purpose of raising awareness about follies and deformities of the time and, in this way, corrects people's manners.

Every Man out of his Humour is Jonson's first published play which renders it possible for Jonson to introduce each character's humour before the play begins. The Character descriptions provided for the first time in a play suggests that Jonson may have been influenced by Greek writer Theophrastus (Baskervill, 1911:69;

Hackett, 2013: 116; Kay, 1995: 51). Apart from writing quite in the Theophrastic manner, Jonson displays Theophrastic aim which is “both to amuse and to instruct” by “exposing to ridicule certain faults which he [Theophrastus] elevates into the striking tangibility of concrete character” (Bennet, Hammond, 1902: 34). In this regard, like Theophrastus⁷³ who wrote his renowned work *The Characters* displaying thirty different characters such as “The Flatterer”, “The Vicious Man” or “The Braggart” etc., Jonson describes such characters as “envious man” (Macilente), “braggart man” (Puntarvolo) or “pretentious man” (Fastidious Brisk) in the play. This way, both Jonson and Theophrastus exhibit human nature with a realistic view of the characters belonging to their period. However, as human nature does not change with passing time, there are similarities in the characters they describe. For instance, Theophrastus describes “vicious man” as follows:

It's the vicious man's way to constitute himself the patron of all worthless scamps and to support them before the court in desperate cases; and, when he passes judgment, he puts the worst construction on the arguments of the opposing counsel (1902: 85).

Similarly, Jonson delineates Macilente as:

A man well parted, a sufficient scholar, and travelled: who (wanting that place in the world account which he thinks his merit capable of) falls into such an envious apoplexy, with which his judgment is so dazzled and distasted, that he grows violently impatient of any opposite happiness in another (6-10).

Although there are differences in the Theophrastus' and Jonson's descriptions, the described characters have the same humours. In that, Macilente pretends to help or

⁷³ In “Ben Jonson and the Character- Writers” Edward K. Graham states that Theophrastus' influence on Jonson is just an “inference”, yet, he adds that as Theophrastus “was reprinted in English in 1598” it is certain that Jonson was aware of him (1906:299). In other words, short character descriptions in *Every Man out of his Humours* which is written a year after the reprint of Theophrastus in English renders his influence on Jonson quite probable.

support the others, namely Fastidius Brisk, Puntarvolo or Fallace, but actually scourges them like Theophrastian ‘vicious man’. In “Ben Jonson’s Indebtedness to the Greek Character-Sketch”, Edward Chauncey Baldwin indicates that in his two plays namely *Every Man out of his Humour* and *The New Inn* (1629) Jonson adds “short characters of the persons” to the list of *dramatis personae* because each “person is the embodiment of some ‘humour’” exactly like those of Theophrastus except their “brevity” (1901: 193). In brief, Theophrastic character descriptions provide Jonson with the opportunity to unveil the ‘characters’ humours before the play starts, thus, makes the moral lesson more effective when he dishumours the characters in the end.

Jonson adopts humour⁷⁴ theory from ancient Medical Philosophy which originated in Galen’s (a Greek physician) theory that blood is composed of equally “four mingled liquids (‘humours’) with different characteristics” (blood proper-hot and moist; melancholy-cold and dry; phlegm- cold and moist; choler-hot and dry). And as heart is the distributor of the blood, these four liquids have also “emotional effects” such as “the dry heat of choler appears as anger, the chill of melancholy as sadness etc. (Womack, 2006: 76). Thus, any imbalance occurs among these liquids results in a dominance of one of these traits or characteristics which Jonson utilizes in characterization in his plays. Furthermore, “humour” was quite prevalent in 1590s came to be known through George Chapman’s *An Humorous Day’s Mirth* (1597) and generally employed in the meaning of “fancy” or “mere affection”

⁷⁴ In the extended “Introduction” that she writes for *Every Man out of his Humour*, Helen Ostovich associates the term “humour” with Aristophanes’ “hybris”. She asserts that although “hybris” refers to “the aggressive spirit of display in certain animals” it occurs as excessive “self-absorption”, “excessive spirit of aggression fostering excessive indulgence” and this continues triggering another spirit (2001:14). Furthermore, Ostovich remarks that hybris also may be seen as excessive eating, drinking or sexual activity as observed in Carlo Buffone or characters such as Puntarvolo and Brisk who spend their energy “ludicrously” (2001:14).

(Ostovich:2001:13). Yet, Jonson uses the term in the medieval sense, thus bringing back its classical meaning, that is, an obsession or trait occurring due to the predominance of a certain flexure in the body. Likewise, Asper/Jonson complains about the “abuse of humour” in daily life explaining its meaning in detail:

[...] whatsoe'er hath flexure and humidity,
As wanting power to contain itself,
Is humour. So in every human body
The choler, melancholy, phlegm, and blood,
By reason that they flow continually
In some one part, and are not continent,
Receive the name of humours.
[...] As when some one peculiar quality
Doth so possess a man that it doth draw
All his affects, his spirits, and his powers,
In their confluents, all to run one way;
This may truly said to be a humour (*Greex*, 95-109).

In the above lines, Jonson first gives the literal meaning of the ‘humour’ as used in medieval philosophy, and then moves to metaphorical meaning, stating that it may be used for “general disposition” that dominates a character. Within this context, not only choleric or melancholic but also envious, vainglorious or superstitious Jonsonian characters appear on the stage through which Jonson ridicules vice and follies of the time. In “Jonson in the Elizabethan Period”, Mathew Steggle asserts that Jonson adapts the idea of “comedy as a curative for human folly” by associating comedy with “the pseudo-medical terminology of humours” (2010:16). Likewise, in *Every Man out of his Humour* Jonson remedies every character through dishumouring them with different punishments. For instance, Puntarvolo’s dog is poisoned, Brisk is imprisoned owing to his debts, Delirio finds out his wife’s unfaithfulness and Buffone’s mouth is sealed. In other words, like a child that is deprived of his toy, all the characters are deprived of their obsessions and turn into

more decent people. Thereby, as put forward obviously in the Induction, Jonson achieves his aim to make people “fit for fair societies” with this play (Induction, 176).

As the correlation between ‘decorum’ and ‘humour’, which has been already mentioned in the Classicism part, points out that the most significant place for decorum is ‘characterization’. Within this context, utilizing theory of humour in his characterizations Jonson also conforms to the classic principle ‘decorum’. Especially in *Every Man out of His Humour* Jonson pays attention to all characters’ acting and speaking true to their humours more than his other plays. In that, he makes them speak about their humours in every opportunity and even prolongs the scene superfluously to exhibit their humours as Mitis criticizes “Me thinkes, Cordatus, he dwelt somewhat too long on this scene; it hung i’ the hand”(II. iii. 257-58). In response to Mitis’ criticism Cordatus defends the playwright stating that “I see not where he could have insisted less, and to have made the humours perspicuous enough” (II. iii.259-60).

In “Beyond Psychology: The Moral Basis of Jonson's Theory of Humour Characterization”, James D. Redwine explains the classical principle ‘decorum’ and ‘humour’ on the common ground ‘morality’ referring to Cicero’s motto “What is proper is morally right and what is morally right is proper” (1961:326). Likewise, Jonson shows ‘what is proper’ with character’s humours especially through their decorous actions and speeches, and then reveals ‘what is morally right’ through dishumouring them. Thus, in order to serve another classical principle namely ‘morality’ and ‘didacticism’ Jonson ‘dishumours’ all of the characters when their humours reach the zenith:

Mitis: [...] yet I made it a question in mine own private discourse how he should properly call it 'Every Man out of his Humour', when I saw all his actors so strongly pursue and continue their humours?

Cordatus: Why, therein his art appears most full of luster, and approacheth nearest the life: especially, when in the flame and height of their humours they are laid flat, it fills the eye better and with more contentment (IV.viii.143-59).

As *Mitis* has stated, the characters "strongly pursue and continue their humours" though the play is about to end. This reveals that though Jonson seems to disregard the principle of 'decorum' by 'dishumouring' every character, he actually pays attention not to show the characters that he has dishumoured on the stage again. For instance, when *Sordido* is driven out of his humours saying that "Out on my wretched humour; it is that/ Makes me thus monstrous in true human eyes" (III.vii.34-5), he does not appear on the stage again. In the same vein, Jonson dishumours other characters in the final act, thus, -except their remorseful words on their wicked humours- one does not see their indecorous behaviors on the stage. In the light of given information, it is apparent that Jonson follows these steps in the process of forming "humours"; firstly, he gives the definition of 'humour' in order to prevent the abuse of the term, secondly renders every character's humour distinguishable in order to point out their wickedness and finally dishumours them in order to show the ideal manner to the audience.

While Jonson displays such conformity to the classical principle 'decorum', he does not so much depend on other classical rules, which he justifies through *Grex*'s comments on the issue. In this regard, *Mitis* asks whether the play observes the classical laws of comedy such as "the equal division of it into acts and scenes, according to the Terentian manner; his true number of actors; the furnishing of the

scene with Grex or Chorus, and that the whole argument falls within compass of a day's business" (*Grex*, 233-35). However, Cordatus, who does not feel the necessity to make such observation upon the play, delivers a long speech upon the development of classical comedy in order to underline that every literary figure brought innovation to comedy throughout the development process:

[...] *comoedia* was at first nothing but a simple and continued song, sung by one only person, till Susario invented a second, after him Epicharmus a third; Phormus and Chionides devised to have four actors, with a prologue and chorus; to which Cratinus (long after) added a fifth, and sixth; Eupolis more; Aristophanes more than they: every man in the dignity of his spirit and judgement supplied something. And (though that in him this kind of poem appeared absolute, and fully perfected) yet how is the face of it changed since, in Menander, Philemon, Cecilius, Plautus, and the rest; who have utterly excluded the chorus, altered the property of the persons, their names, and natures, and augmented it with all liberty according to the elegancy and disposition of those times wherein they wrote? (*Grex*, 245-57)

According to Cordatus' statement, there is no obligation to conform strictly to the same rules as these classics; on the contrary, he names the above-mentioned classics as models since they used their ingenuity to bring a new perspective to 'comedy'. He further asserts that contemporary English playwrights ought to follow their example:

I see not then but we should enjoy the same licence or free power, to illustrate and heighten our invention as they did; and not be tied to those strict and regular forms, which the niceness of a few (who are nothing but form) would trust upon us (*Grex*, 257-61).

As seen above, Jonson demurs at sticking to classical rules and classics 'slavishly' and indicates that one ought to make innovative contribution to the contemporary literature through reflecting 'self-style' in his works. Accordingly, rather than

observing the classical rules strictly in *Every Man Out of his Humour*, Jonson utilizes the laws as long as they serve his aim. In this respect, he ventures to disregard a classical rule, 'unity of action and time' which he mostly observes in his plays, for the sake of accomplishing his didactic aim.

To begin with 'action', it is apparent that the play does not conform to "unity of action" as it predicates upon character's 'humours' rather than their actions. In this regard, it exhibits an episodic structure in which every 'humour' creates different action that inhibits the development of 'a centre' that will connect the events together. In *The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy* Helena Watts Baum remarks that there is not a "definite focus of events" in *Every Man in His Humour* and asserts that "All of the characters attempt to move, but Jonson gives them so little room, that the plot dies of inanition" (1947: 155). In other words, the play includes so many characters with different humours that in order to disentangle them from their humours and make them "Naked, as at their birth—", Jonson deprives the play of a certain focus of events (Induction, 17-8).

Furthermore, the playwright also neglects 'unity of time' exceeding "the time limit" which is revealed through characters' conversations (Kallich, 1942: 445). For instance, Fungoso frequently refers to the time using such adverbs of time as 'a day before' (II.v.32-3) or "a while since" (IV.i.20) which means that the events take place within more than 24 hours and thus exceeds the time limit. Briefly stated, it is obvious that in *Every Man out of his Humour* 'unity of plot' and 'unity of time' are not as significant as 'unity of place' and characterization since Jonson only conforms to 'unity of place' in the play. Yet, he criticizes other contemporary playwrights,

namely Shakespeare who disregards “unity of place” through the use of oversea voyages and various settings in his plays:

Mitis: He cannot lightly alter the scene, without crossing the scene?

Cordatus: He needs not, having a whole island to run through, I think.

Mitis: [...] How comes it then that in some one play, we see so many seas, countries, and kingdoms passed over with such admirable dexterity?

Cordatus: Oh, that but shows how well the authors can travail in their vocation, and outrun the apprehension of their auditory. But leaving this, I would they would begin once: this protraction is able to sour the best-settled patience in the theatre (*Grex*, 266-72).

Here, *Mitis* and *Cordatus* talk about the play’s setting *insula fortuna* or ‘fortunate island’ which quite limited place for *Mitis* while *Cordatus* finds it adequate to alter the scene without crossing the sea within the whole island. In “The Comical Scene: Perspective and Civility on the Renaissance Stage”, Peter Womack claims that with the above-mentioned author Jonson alludes to Shakespeare’s *Henry V* (1598) in which “the action switches from England to France” with the delineations and comments of chorus (2008: 48). Within this context, the point Jonson criticizes here is playwrights’ attempt to change scene overseas even though the scene does not call for it only to display that their ability to “outrun the apprehension of their auditory” as is the case in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*.

However, Jonson also marks his criticism on Shakespeare and Elizabethan romantic comedy when *Mitis* comments on the nature of comedy:

Mitis: That the argument of his comedy might have been of some other nature, as of a duke to be in love with a countess, and that countess to be in love with the dukes’ son, and the son to love the ladies waiting maid; some such cross wooing, with a clown to their serving-man, better than to be thus near and familiarly allied to the time.

For Jonson, comedy should deal with serious matters and instruct the audience as well as amuse. In this regard, Asper conveys his (Jonson's) didactic purpose "I would give them pills to purge, / And make 'em fit for fair societies" (Induction, 175-176). Nevertheless, he also remarks that he will amuse the audience with "new conceits" and "richest words", in this way, fulfill the duty of both instructing and pleasing (Induction, 203-8). Within this context, with the speech above, Jonson ridicules Elizabethan romanticism which is quite prevalent in Shakespeare's plays. Here, Jonson probably alludes to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1596) in which cross-wooing is quite conspicuously revealed with relations such as Demetrius is loved by Helana but loves Hermia who loves Lysender. Furthermore, Jonson clarifies his perception of "comedy" in the play with Cotdatus' response to Mitis' criticism:

Cordatus: You say well, but I would fain hear one of these Autumn—judgements define once, *quid sit comædia*? if he cannot, let him content himself with Ciceros definition (till he have strength to propose to himself a better) who would have a comedy to be *imitatio vitæ, speculum consuetudinis, imago veritatis*, a thing throughout pleasant and ridiculous, and accommodated to the correction of manners: if the maker have fail'd in any particle of this, they may worthily tax him, but if not, why; be you (that are for them) silent, as I will be for him; and give way to the actors (III.vi.169-83).

Though, Jonson adopts Cicero's definition of comedy according to whom comedy should be "an imitation of life", "a mirror of manners", and "an image of truth", Bednarz asserts that Jonson copies the definition of comedy from Antonio Sebastiano Minturno's *De Poeta* (1559) (2001:68). By means of this definition Jonson emphasizes the function of comedy which is to "please" and "to correct the

manners". Apart from this, he asserts that the playwright deserves to be criticized when he does not fulfill the requirements of Cicero's comedy; otherwise, everyone should stop speaking and observe the actors in order to profit from their mistakes and "correct their own manners".

In brief, in *Every Man out of his Humour* is Jonson's first 'comical satire' in which he not only satirizes follies and manners of the time but also imitates such classics as Theophrastus and Aristophanes. He adopts the form of Old Comedy yet modifies it with his innovations which render the play a sort of peculiarity. Especially, chorus or Grex plays a significant role by explaining and clarifying the playwright's aim in the long Induction through comments and criticisms throughout the play. In addition to the chorus, the medieval humour theory penetrates in the play particularly through characterization. Moreover it serves the playwright's didactic purpose of correcting the characters manners through dishumouring them in order to make them "fit for the fair society". Although Jonson does not conform strictly to certain "classical principles", he displays the strict moral and didactic purpose rooted in his classical learning. On the other hand, in his last comical satire, *Poetaster*, Jonson displays his deep classical knowledge reflected explicitly in his strict conformity to the principles and imitations. In a way, *Every Man out of his Humour* can be regarded as the first phase of Jonson's classicism while in *Poetaster* he turns into a 'full-blooded classicist'. Within this context, in the following section, *Poetaster* will be handled as an important representation of Jonson's classicism.

CHAPTER II

CLASSICAL ELEMENTS IN *POETASTER OR HIS ARRAIGNMENT*

Poetaster or his Arraignment (1601) is another one of Jonson's early plays which is also known as the last play that Jonson named as 'comical satire'. This Elizabethan play is set in Augustan Rome and the characters are mainly composed of classical poets including Ovid, Virgil, Horace and poetasters such as Crispinus and Demetrius. Augustan Rome has been chosen because it was the period in which poesy and moral principles reached its peak. This choice is justified in the "Apologetical Dialogue", which was added later on as a response to Dekker's *Satirio-mastix*⁷⁵ (1601):

[...] I would try if shame could win upon 'em .
And therefore chose Augustus Ceaser's times,
When wit and arts were at their height in Rome,
To show that Virgil, Horace and the rest
Of those master-spirits did not want
Detractors, then, or practicers against them:
And by this line (although no parallel)
I hoped at last they would sit down, and blush.
(1981: 224)

As stated above, Roman setting and characters serve to satirize contemporary poets (such as Dekker and Marston to whom abovementioned "em" refers) and poesy through depicting ideal poesy of poets as Virgil and Horace. Furthermore, it gives an opportunity to respond to the false accusations made by Thomas Dekker (1572-1632) and John Marston (1576-1634) in the "Wars of Theatres". Especially, John Marston

⁷⁵ *Satiromastix* (1601) is a play written by Thomas Dekker in order to ridicule Jonson's *Poetaster* (1601) as a part of "War of the Theatres". Actually *Hisromastix* (1597), *Poetaster* (1601) and *Satiromastix* (1601) are successive plays written in order to ridicule the previous play. Within this context, Jonson satirizes "Marston for his egocentric mannerism and abuse of language and Dekker for his doggedly pathetic conventionalism" (Cave, 1991: 78). Likewise, in *Satiromastix* Dekker satirizes Jonson for his arrogance and ridicules Horace/Jonson in respond to which Jonson writes "Apologetical Dialogue".

can be regarded as the main incentive in the composition of the play. Within this context, in *Conversation with William Drummond*, Drummond states that Jonson “had many quarrels with Marston, beat him, and wrote his ‘Poetaster’ on him; the beginning of them was that Marston represented him on the stage as in his youth given to venery” (1906: 33). Aforementioned Marston’s play is *Histrion-mastix* (1599) in which Jonson was represented on stage with the character Chrisogonus and thus takes offence⁷⁶. Likewise, in *Poetaster* Jonson represents Marston and Dekker with the characters Crispinus and Demetrius on the stage, in order to ridicule them. In brief, Jonson’s use of ‘classical’ principles and characters in order to criticize ‘contemporary’ poesy and public figures makes *Poetaster* is one of the best examples that combine Jonson’s realist nature and his classicist education. However, this chapter on classicism will provide an analysis of *Poetaster or his Arraignment* in terms of classical elements.

Poetaster begins with the appearance of Envy and Prologue as allegorical characters on stage. Envy calls out to gather a crowd to damn the author and to disparage and slander every line, word or accent in the play. Prologue, contrary to Envy’s invitation, defends and complements the author. Prologue states that a writer needs an “armed” Prologue in order to defend the scenes with “fortyfold proof” against traducers and “illiterate apes”.

In Act I Luscus, Ovid’s servant, comes to warn Ovid Junior that his farther (Ovid Senior) is about to arrive who is studying poetry against his father’s wishes, that his father (Ovid Senior) is about to arrive. Yet, Junior is adamant about studying

⁷⁶ In *The Stage-Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters*, Roscoe Addison Small asserts that Marston did not represent Jonson on the stage with the intention of satirizing him but Jonson “resented the name Chrysogonus” since although it was a noble name, it was the name of villain “denounced” by Cicero at the same time (1899: 89-90).

poetry as he desires that his name shall live forever. Ovid Senior arrives with Pantilius Tucce (the captain) and Lupus (the tribune) in an attempt to persuade him to give up poetry for law, which will provide him with money and competency. The first act ends with Tibullus' paying a visit to Junior who is forcing himself to study law with whom he has a short conversation on poetry. Then Junior departs to meet with his beloved Julia at merchant Albius' house.

In Act II the jeweller Albius making preparations to host courtiers in his house. He instructs his wife Chloe on how to speak and act. Crispinus (Poetaster) overhearing their conversation also advises her to appear kind and courteous even if she detests them at heart. The courtiers including Gallus, Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, Hermogenes, Julia and Plautus who arrive at Albius' house lead the way to the banquet after a while except Crispinus.

In Act III Horace and Crispinus who come across in the Via Sacra⁷⁷ talk about poetry especially Crispinus' poetry. Getting tired of Crispinus' idle talk, Horace looks a way to get rid of him but he only achieves it when Lictors arrest Crispinus for his debts to apothecary Minos. Crispinus is rescued when captain Tucce becomes a voucher for his debts. While Tucce mentions his plan to arrange a supper to a passer-by player Histrio, Demetrius, a dresser of plays that is hired to abuse Horace appears. After Demetrius, Crispinus and Tucce's gossip about Horace the act ends with Trebatius' (a lawyer in Horace's company) counsel to Horace about whether to suspend writing or not.

In Act IV Gallus (one of the players) and Tiberus comes Albius' house to invite Chloe and Cytheris to the "heavenly banquet" in which courtiers would

⁷⁷ Via Sacra is an artery in Ancient Rome.

pretend to be Gods to honor them. Horace who arrives at Albius' house to inform them that Propertius (a man whose wife died) locked himself in Cythia's tomb runs away immediately after seeing Crispinus' arrival with others. On the other hand, at Lupus' house, Histrio informs Lupus about the heavenly banquet. Lupus, however, regards it as infidelity and treason, and departs for the palace to report it to Caesar. In unexpected visit, Caesar seeing that the revelers are dressed as Gods, after banishes Ovid from court and shuts Julia up in her room. The fourth act ends with Julia and Ovid's farewell scene.

In the last Act, Caesar celebrates poetry and as the ideal poet Virgil is requested to read certain parts from his *Aeneid*. Lupus interrupts the poem recital with Tucca and Lictors in order to accuse Horace of libeling Caesar with a picture. After confessing that Aesop is insinuating that the picture libels Caesar, Lupus is punished as he accuses Horace with 'hearsay evidences'. In addition to Lupus and Aesop, Crispinus and Demetrius charged with maligning Horace for accusing him of plagiarism and translation, are tried in court where Horace is the plaintiff and Virgil the praetor. At the end of the court scene, Tucca is condemned to wear vizard that makes him seem "bi-fronted" when he speaks. Demetrius is forgiven since his envy is his punishment and Crispinus is swallowed a pill that makes him vomit the bombastic words he used in his works. The play ends with Martial's words "Whatever is bursting with envy let him burst".

Poetaster comprises of a crowded dramatis persona that serve to ridicule certain people and satirize certain concepts. The play includes many allusions to Marston and Dekker, for instance, Marston is called "Rufus Laberius Crispinus" meaning "the red, curly haired, maker of mimesis" (Gair, 2004: 8). Moreover, he

delineates Crispinus as a character of “noble birth” in debt who attempts to show off his status. Crispinus introduces himself to Chloe in the following manner “my name is Crispinus, or Cri-spinas indeed; which is well expressed in my arms, a face crying in chief; and beneath it a bloody toe, between three thorns pungent” (I.ii. 80-84). Here, Marston’s/Crispinus’ physical appearance namely his short legs and arms are mocked to which Marston also alludes in his works (Gair, 2004: 9). On the other hand, in III.iv. Histrio depicts Demetrius (Dekker) as follows: “Oh, sir [Tucca] his doublet’s a little decayed: he is otherwise a very simple honest fellow, sir, one Demetrius, a dresser of plays about the town, here: we have hired him to abuse Horace, and bring him in, in a play” (1981: 168). Likewise, in *The Stage-Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-Called Poetasters*, Roscoe Addison Small asserts that Dekker was hired to satirize Jonson by Chamberlain’s Company (1899: 57). The description of the characters shows that Jonson explicitly depicts Marston and Dekker’s distinctive characteristics in order to ridicule them.

Apart from Crispinus and Demetrius, almost all of the Roman characters in the play are actually an allusion to actual persons of Elizabethan Period. For instance, Jonson represents himself as Horace while Histrio is claimed to be Henslowe and Albius is Monday etc. However, as in “Ben Jonson and the Character Writers” Edward K. Graham asserts that satire is vulnerable to two dangers: being “vague” or “personal and temporary” (1906: 302). Within this context, Jonson’s satire on certain literary figures such as Marston, Dekker and members of various professions namely players, captains, lawyers, etc., rendered the play quite personal and this paved the way for certain attacks on the playwright. Therefore, Jonson defends himself in “Apologetical Dialogue”:

I used no name. My books have still been taught
To spare the persons, and to speak the vices.
These are mere slanders, and enforced by such
As have no safer ways to men's disgraces
But their own lies and loss of honesty (1981:224).

The playwright, moreover, states that he never wrote a play "more innocent, or empty of offence" as the play inholds no fault that would provoke his enemies except its being 'his' play (1981: 224-25). However, this defense in the "Apologetical Dialogue" could not be sufficient to prevent the attacks upon the play and playwright. That is to say, Jonson's equating himself to Horace whom represents the playwright himself on the stage result in certain condemnations upon his 'arrogance'.

On closer look, it is seen that Jonson complies with 'the classical principles' in *Poetaster*. To begin with, the play observes the five-act structure, the proper measure according to Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Moreover, the play conforms to Aristotelian principle of 'three unities'; the events take place at Rome within the circle of Ovid's house, Albius' house and the palace, and revolve around a group of people namely courtiers, poets and poetasters and the action is completed within a day. The play also has the characteristics of 'morality plays'⁷⁸, namely the characterization of the morals on the stage which used to be quite prevalent during the Elizabethan Period. As a matter of fact, the use of allegorical character 'Envy' at the very beginning of the play and the attribution all the events to envy at the end of

⁷⁸ In *The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy*, Helena Watts Baum states that morality plays actually belong to Medieval Drama yet Renaissance dramatists change its form and realize that both tragedy and comedy have the same aim which is to praise virtuous actions and blame vicious actions (1947: 10). Likewise, in *Poetaster*, Jonson aims to blame envious poets which is one of the main incentives for him to write the play. Thus, the play begins with Envy's words, as a flesh and blood character, and ends with Martial's words upon envy.

the play explicitly points out Jonson's 'moral intention' which he acquires from classics as well.

The play conforms to 'decorum' especially through the portrayal of characters with 'humours' such as covetous merchant Albius, his pretentious wife Chloe and boastful "new turned poet" Crispinus delivering their speeches befitting their personalities. For instance, Albius as a merchant handles courtiers tactfully and flatters them. He even flatters his own wife by praising her to Crispinus with such lines as "she speaks the best of any woman in Italy" (II.i.29) or "she has the most best, true, feminine wit in Rome!" (II.i.69) so that she will entertain gallants and fine ladies in her home. On the other hand, Chloe, who boasts about being 'gently born', disdains her husband for being a merchant:

I was a gentlewoman born, I; I lost all my friends to be
citizen's wife; because I heard indeed, they kept their
wives as fine ladies; and that we might rule our
husbands, like ladies; and do what we listed: do you
think I would have married you else? (II.i.25-29).

Chloe is known as "politic and witty and wise woman" and her choice of husband "not for the eye" but for his polite manners towards ladies, displays her intelligence (II.ii.11). Creating a female character with such boastful humour, Jonson conforms to another classic rule which is "Virtuous women ought not to appear in comedy [...] because comedy deals with characters who are wanton and dishonest" (Hills, 1995: 172). Within this context, both Chloe and Julia are not virtuous since in VI. iii, Chloe flirts with Captain Tucca in front of his husband while Chloe has Ovid as a lover with whom she meets secretly.

Apart from Chloe, the boastful humour reveals itself in Crispinus who prides himself on his nobility at every opportunity. Particularly his remarks upon his cousin Cytheris explicitly shows his 'braggart' nature:

Chloe: She [Cytheris] is a gentlewoman

Crispinus: Or else she should not be my cousin, I assure you.

Chloe: Are you a gentleman born?

Crispinus: That I am lady; you shall see mine arms, if't please you.

Chloe: No, your legs do sufficiently show you are a gentlemen born, sir: for a man born upon little legs is always a gentlemen born (II.i.80-87).

Thus, Crispinus and Chloe are so much obsessed with being 'gently born' that they judge one's nobility with his appearance. Furthermore, Chloe welcomes Crispinus 'wholeheartedly' just because he is 'a gentleman' and her 'noble birth'⁷⁹ requires her to do so. It is also worth mentioning that Crispinus' nobility is not the only thing he prides on, in that, his boastful humour is also revealed through his comments on poesy; this is exemplified best in III.i, when Crispinus and Horace meet at the Via Sacra:

Crispinus: I protest thee, Horace (do but taste me once) if I do know myself and mine own virtues truly, thou wilt not make that esteem of Varius, or Virgil, or Tibullus, or any of 'em indeed, as now in thy ignorance thou dost: which I am content to forgive: I would fain see which of these could pen more verses in a day, or with more facility than I; or that could his mistress, kiss her hand, make better sport wither fan, or her dog—

Horace: I cannot bail you yet, sir.

⁷⁹In the play, there is not any proof about Chloe's nobility except her own words. Thus, it is not known whether she is really 'a gently born' or just tries to be one. However, as Crispinus is John Marston's parody and Marston is known as being a high descent, it would be not wrong to say that Crispinus is a real 'gentleman born'.

Crispinus: Or that could move his body more gracefully, or dance better: you should see me, were it not i' the street—

Horace: Nor yet.

Crispinus: Why, I have been a reveller, and at my cloth of silver suit, and my long stocking, in my time, and will be again—

Horace: If you may be trusted sir.

Crispinus: And then for my singing, Hermogenes himself envies me; that is your only master of music you have in Rome (III.i.146-161).

Although Crispinus is a new turned poet, he dares to compare himself to Virgil whom Horace praises words in Act V. He even considers himself superior to Varius and Virgil, in that, he puts himself in an absurd competition for writing more and better verses in a day. Furthermore, he praises his 'dancing', 'cloth of silver suit' and 'long stocking' which refers to his pride on nobility despite his everlasting debts. Even when Minus appears to arrest him due to his debts, he says "[...] I am a gentleman and a reveler, I'll make a piece of poetry and absolve all, within five days" (III.ii.55).

In the light of given information and examples, it is apparent that Jonson observes the principle of 'decorum' in the exact way that Horace has defined in *Ars Poetica*. That is to say, he gives the play 'proper length', 'proper subject' and 'proper characters' as mentioned before. Jonson, furthermore, shows regard to another principle⁸⁰ that is 'proper characters should act according to their rank' especially with the characters Caesar and Virgil. Jonson reveals the 'high rank' of Caesar and

⁸⁰In *Ars Poetica*, Horace explains this principle with these words:

Words from your pen will naturally flow;
He only gives the proper characters,
Who knows the duty of all ranks of men,
And what we owe to country, parents, friends,
How judges, and how senators should act,
And what becomes a general to do;
Those are the likest copies, which are drawn
By original of human life (1911:142).

Virgil both through their acts and speeches. For instance, as Caesar is the Emperor of Rome, he acts as a law-giver and maintains order while Virgil who is the highest poet in Rome acts as a praetor and delivers speeches on morality and virtue in the final act. Jonson also gives importance to the characters speeches fit to their social class making high ranks such as Caesar, Virgil speak in 'high style' while other socially lower characters such as Chloe, Albius, Crispinus, Demetrius or Tuca speak in low style. Besides, Ovid –a better poet than poetasters but not as good as Virgil and Horace– and Princess Julia occasionally speak in verse dependant to their milieu. Especially, the lovers Ovid and Julia speak in high style throughout the farewell scene in VI.ix. Apart from Jonson's concern for observing 'decorum', the use of the high style in certain acts (i.e. Act IV) might stem from the 'imitation' of certain classics in verse.

As mentioned in the "Classicism" part of this chapter, for Jonson 'imitation' is an indispensable element of classicism. Accordingly, he imitates primarily Horace in *Poetaster*. This is especially revealed through the representation of Jonson as the character Horace on the stage. Jonson displays his admiration for Horace in *Discoveries or Timber* praising him as "an author of much civility, if anyone among the heaten can be, the best master both of virtue and wisdom; an excellent and true judge upon cause and reason" (1892: 80). In brief, with his principles upon true poesy, Horace becomes a key figure for 'imitating'. Jonson takes this a step further in *Poetaster* by proclaiming himself "English Horace". However, his portrayal of himself as Horace in *Poetaster* is not coincidental. In "Introduction: reading Jonson's Horace" Victoria Moul asserts that among other Roman poets Jonson chooses Horace in order to display "his own self-conscious poetic authority", to point out his

courtly praised laureate role, to show his insistence in artistic freedom in spite of patronage system and monetary dependence in which he was involved obligatorily (2010: 3). In other words, Jonson uses Horace as a means of showing his distinction from other poetasters because he himself considers Horace above other Roman poets. Furthermore, in *Ben Jonson: A Life*, David Riggs points out the resemblance between Jonson and Horace's lives. That is to say, both of them come from a low family as Jonson's father was a bricklayer while Horace's was a freed slave; both were sent away for their education and this education, which "set them apart from other members of social class"; both Horace and Jonson's poetry gave them the opportunity to meet with important members of the society, etc. (1989:77). Within this context, the similarities in their lives provided Jonson an opportunity to use and adjust certain parts of Horace's *Satires* in *Poetaster*.

Jonson uses Horace's *Satires* as a base for *Poetaster* through excerpting and translating certain parts of *Satires* and he converts "the substance or richness of another poet to his own" (1892:77). For instances, the first three scene acquire its plot from Horace's Satire I. ix and also the dialogues are translated⁸¹ from it (Moul, 2006: 24). In order to defend himself against false accusations upon his satires made by his enemies, in the fifth scene of the same act Jonson translates Horace's conversation with Trebatius in Satire II.i. upon whether he should give up writing satire or not as follows:

There are to whom I seem excessive sour;
And Past a satire's law, to extend my power:
Others that think whatever I have writ

⁸¹ In "Introduction: Literary Sources" Herbert S. Mallory defends Jonson stating that these scenes are not "mere translation" since Horace's Satire consists of 78 lines however Jonson writes 325 lines in these three scenes. Furthermore, he indicates that Jonson never gives "useless verbiage" in his works, thus here "he must have produced something more than a mere translation" (1905: 31).

Wants pith, and matter to eternize it;
And that they could, in one day's light, disclose
A thousand verses, such as I compose.
What shall I do, Trebatius? Say (III.v.1-8).

In accord with Horace's Satire II.i., Jonson's Horace defends 'satire' in *Poetaster* and even though Trebatius suggests that he should quit writing, Horace is determined to write satire till his death. In a way, Jonson's translation also lets his enemies know that he will continue writing satires even though it will disturb certain people.⁸² Moreover, alluding to Marston and Dekker's attacks, Jonson justifies himself with Horace's words "[...] no living man shall touch / If first I be not forced by base approach" (III.v.65-66). In other words 'nothing comes of nothing' and what Jonson does is just to defend himself against those "malicious thieves" that try to rob his "good name, the treasure of his life" (III.v.69).

For Jonson, the 'imitation' is not limited to translations. The names of certain Roman characters in *Poetaster* are also derived from Horace's *Satires*. For instance, Augustus Ceaser⁸³, Maecenas⁸⁴, Publius Ovid⁸⁵, Cornellus Gallus⁸⁶, Propertius⁸⁷, Julia⁸⁸, etc., are historical figures in Rome, while Crispinus, Demetrius Fannius, Hermogenes Tigellius, Trebatius, etc., are figures that Horace mentioned in his

⁸² However, contrary to Horace, after *The Poetaster* Jonson quitted writing comedy saying that "[...] since the Comic Muse / Hath proved so ominous to me, I will try / If Tragedy have a more kind aspect" (1981: 228). Yet, he even did not write any play for three years.

⁸³ Augustus Ceaser (63 BC – 14 AD) is the Roman Emperor (from 27 BC till 14AD). His original name is Gaius Octavius, yet, after being Emperor Gaius Octavius adopted the name Gaius Julius Ceaser Octavianus.

⁸⁴ Gaius Maecenas (70 BC—8 BC), also known as Gaius Cilnius Maecenas is the counselor of Augustus Ceaser and also a wealthy patron of poets such as Virgil and Horace.

⁸⁵ Publius Ovidius Naso (43 BC – 17 AD) is a Roman Poet especially known with his works *Ars amatoria* and *Metamorphoses*

⁸⁶ Gaius Cornelius Gallus (70BC – 26BC) is a Roman poet and soldier who is accepted as one of the great Roman elegists.

⁸⁷ Sextus Propertius (45BC- 15 BC) is one of the greatest elegiac poets Rome.

⁸⁸ Julia (39 BC- 14AD) is the daughter of Roman Emperor Julius Caesar. She is sent exile by her father because of her inappropriate behaviors.

Satires. In other words, Crispinus is mentioned a few times in *Satires* as a wordy poet whom Horace ridicules saying that “nor will I add one word more, lest you should suspect that I have plundered the escrutoire of the blear-eyed Crispinus” (*Satire* I.i.). Furthermore, Horace labels Crispinus as “absurd” in *Satire* I. iii as he would follow Caesar even to his bath. Likewise, Jonson depicts Crispinus as a poetaster who uses bombastic words in his works, thus, punished with pills that make him vomit those bombastic words in Act V. On the other hand, Demetrius is depicted as a person who “carps at Horace behind his back” and a “hanger on” to Hermogenes Tigellius to hurt Horace (*Satire* I. x.). Horace labels Hermogenes as a good singer but a “smooth faced” maligner of his works (*Satire* I. iv and x). Additionally, Trebetius is depicted as a successful advisor to whom Horace also consults in *Satire* II. i. Briefly stated, the characters in *Poetaster* comprise of both historical figures and fictional figures that are depicted in Horace *Satires*. Hence, as Ovid and Horace are historical figures that are represented as fictional characters in *Poetaster*, the frequent use of translations and imitations of them in the play is quite normal.

It is apparent that Jonson chooses best authors to borrow their techniques and ideas to compose *Poetaster*. Because of Jonson’s translations and imitations of such classics as Ovid, Virgil and Horace etc., certain critics namely Herbert S. Mallory (1905: 5) and Victor Moul (2006: 25) labeled the play as “a patchwork” of borrowings. In *Ben Jonson’s Poetaster: Classical Tradition and the Location of Cultural Authority*, Victoria Moul reveals the scenes that Jonson borrows from other classics as follows:

Herford and Simpson also note that Crispinus’ song at II. 2.153-62 is loosely based upon Martial’s Epigram I.57. Ovid’s burlesque farewell scene draws upon

Ovid's own *Tristia* as well as echoing *Romeo and Juliet*. Many of the details of the divine banquet of VI.5 are drawn from no less a source than the first book of the *Illiad*. The Ovidian passage is, moreover, something akin to the "filching" of the 'translation'; it varies only slightly from Marlowe's version of these lines in edition of the *Elegies* –one form of 'translation' nested within another. (Moul, 2006: 24).

As Moul asserted, most of the character Ovid's tirades are translations. For instance, Ovid's lines in Act I.i. are translated from Ovid's Elegy XV in *Ars Amatoria*. In the "Apologetical Dialogue" Jonson overtly indicates his adaptation of the scene:

Indeed, I brought in Ovid,
Chid by his angry father, for neglecting
The study of their laws, for poetry:
And I am warranted by his own words.
Saepe pater dixit, srudium quid inutile tempas?
*Maenonides nullas ipse reliquit opes.*⁸⁹
And in far harsher terms elsewhere, non me
Non me verbosas leges ediscere, non me
*Ingarato voces prostituisse foro*⁹⁰ (1981: 225).

Although Jonson aims to defend himself against accusations of 'taxing the law' with these words, the play comprises of many other borrowings such as the farewell scene in VI.ix. resembling 'the balcony scene' in *Romeo and Juliet*. The first striking similarity is between Romeo's initial visit to Juliet under the balcony of her chambers, while Ovid comes under Julia's chamber window where she is confined before going to exile. While Julia mentions that the difference in their social statue renders their love impossible she draws parallelism between their ranks and their position "I high thou low? Oh, this our plight of place / Doubtly presents the two lets

⁸⁹ "Renounce this thriftless trade, my father cried: / Maeonides himself –a beggar died." (Gifford)

⁹⁰ "To learn the wrangling law was ne'er my choice, / Nor, at the hateful bar, to sell my voice." (Gifford)

of our love, / Local, and ceremonial height, and lowness; / Both ways, I am too high, and thou too low" (IV.ix.5-8). Julia's words allude to tragic figures like lovers who have to break up because of social statues, yet, the scene turns into a burlesque of tragedy. That is to say, while in tragedies such as *Romeo and Juliet* lovers prefer to die rather than separate, in *Poetaster* Julia and Ovid prefer to separate. Lastly, like certain translations of Ovid's works, in V.ii. Jonson translates Virgil's *Aeneid* yet it is revealed explicitly as Caesar asks Virgil to read an excerpt from his *Aeneid*:

Read, read thyself, dear Virgil, let not me
 Profane one accent, with an unturned tongue:
 'Best matter, badly shown, shows wore than bad.'
 See than this chair, of purpose set for thee
 To read thy poem in: refuse it not.
 'Virtue, without presumption, place may take
 Above best kings, whom only she should make' (1981: 202).

As seen above Caesar celebrates moral dimension of poetry attributing the responsibility 'to make virtue' to the poetry.

Actually, "morality" lies at the heart of Jonson's plays since he believes that poetry should not only entertain but also instruct. He underlines this didactic notion of poetry in *Poetaster* as well. Especially, the dialogue between Tucca and Histrio in III.iv. can be regarded as one of the most distinct example that depicts the moral function of poetry:

Tucca: And what new matters have you now afoot, sirrah? Ha? I would fain come with my cockatrice one day, and see a play; if I knew when there were a good bawdy one: but they say, you ha' nothing but humours, revels, and satires that gird and fart at the time, you slave.

Histrio: No, I assure you, captain, not we. They are on the other side of Tiber: we have as much ribaldry in our plays, as can be, as you would wish captain: all the

sinner i' the suburbs come and applaud our action
daily (III.iv.163-171).

In these lines, Jonson satirizes contemporary theatres which regard 'entertainment' as the only notion and thus turn into a place of 'vulgarity' and 'indecenty'. Although 'the corruption' exists in theatres from top to bottom, Jonson gets to the bottom of the corruption through mocking the players and poetasters.

However, in Act IV Jonson changes his perspective from 'corruption' to 'virtue' in order to underline moral responsibility of a poet. That is to say, Jonson points out that being eager in writing poetry does not make one a good poet, one must be virtuous first and demonstrate this virtue in his works. Within this context, Ovid is not a poetaster in terms of the quality of his poesy, but acts as one which leads to his banishment. In "The Function of Propertius in Jonson's Poetaster", Karl F. Zender asserts that "His [Ovid's] limitation lies rather in his failure to see the need for relationship between art and higher moral order. He is a maker of fictions, and he treats moral values only as imaginative and emotional conveniences" (1975:309). In this regard, his banishment stems from his keeping company with poetasters, not from his works and writings. To underline this, Jonson depicts Ovid as an ardent defender of poetry in Act I:

O sacred poesy, thou spirit of arts,
The soul of science, and the queen of souls,
What profane violence, almost sacrilege,
Hath here been offered thy divinities!
That thine own guiltless poverty should arm
Prodigious ignorance to wound thee thus!
(I.ii.201-214)

As seen above, although Ovid values poetry above all other sciences and regards it as a divine entity at the very beginning of the play, he missed the classical principle which points out that “the poet is a teacher of virtue, and the teacher must know virtue from having practice it” (Waith, 1951: 15). This principle is also revealed through Caesar’s these words “I will prefer knowledge none but such / As rule their lives by it, and can becalm” (IV.vi.73-75). Yet, involving in the scheme of ‘heavenly banquet’ scene and tried to sooth himself with “declined affections” of Julia, Ovid prefers “live in worship of vice” not “with knowledge” (IV.iv.66). Thus, Ovid is the only poet that is punished by Caesar who considers ‘virtue’ as the fundamental characteristic of a man stating that “Whosoever can, / And will not cherish virtue, is no man” (V.i.65-66). In addition to Ovid, Julia is punished because of her ‘virtueless’ behaviors while other revelers who are also in disguise as gods and goddesses lead their way to their home immediately.

On the other hand, in the final act immorality and vice get what they deserve and all the poetasters, in particular, ‘envious maligners’ such as Crispinus and Demetrius are punished. However, as Demetrius confesses that he maligns Jonson with ‘plagiarism and translation’ since “he kept better company” “better men loved him [Horace]” and “his [Horace’s] writings thrived better [...] better liked and graces” than his, he does not get an exact punishment (V.iii.406-408). Yet, Crispinus gets a severe punishment which is to vomit the bombastic words he uses. Moreover, Virgil, who represents the ideal poet in the play, teaches the principle of being a true poet to Crispinus as follows:

[...] Look, you take
Each morning, of old Cato’s principles
A good draught, next your heart; that walk upon,

Till it be well digested: then come home,
And taste a piece of Terence, suck his phrase
Instead of liquorice; and, at any hand,
Shun Plautus, and old Ennius, they are meats
Too harsh for a weak stomach. Use to read
(But not without a tutor) the best Greeks:
As Orpheus, Musaeus, Pindarus,
Hesiod, Callimachus and Theocrite,
High Homer, but beware of Lycophron:
He is too dark and dangerous a dish (V.iii.486-497).

In fact, while Jonson reveals his deep classical education, here he also mocks Marston who is not well educated. Moreover, like most Roman classics such as Horace or Quintilian stated, it is underlined that in order to be a true poet one must read the classics. In this regard, Marston/Crispinus can only get rid of “the malady of ignorance” and “learn to bear himself more humbly” through read these classics (V.iii.511). After Crispinus’ punishment, the play ends with a song alluding to poetasters: “Detraction is but baseness’ varlet; / And apes are apes, though clothed in scarlet” and Martial’s words on envy “Rumpatur, quisquis rumpitur invidia”⁹¹ (V.iii. 574).

In *Poetaster*, Jonson not only reveals his classical education by conforming to classical principles such as the three unities, decorum and imitation but also replies to his enemies in the “War of the Theatres”. For this reason, Jonson chooses a Roman setting and Roman characters which also paves the way for his depiction of ‘ideal poets’. Thus, Jonson teaches his rivals how to be a true poet by showing the difference between ‘poetasters’ such as Crispinus and Dekker and ‘ideal poets’ such as Virgil and Horace. As for Jonson, to be a ‘true poet’ means conforming to classical principles and imitating the classics. So, the play mainly includes

⁹¹ Whoever is bursting with envy let him burst.

translations and references to classics. Moreover, he also underlines the moral responsibility of the poet throughout the play and in order to serve his didactic purpose, gives a moral lesson upon 'envy' at the end of the play. In the play, Jonson considers that a poet is responsible to display virtue and wisdom in his work, thus, he reveals his morality, virtue and wisdom through ideal poets such as Virgil and Horace and Caesar's wise words in the play. Furthermore, Jonson rewards ideal poets by describing them more respectful both with their manners and words, while he punishes poetasters through humiliating them with comical punishments. Finally, it can be deduced that with *Poetaster* Jonson accomplishes his purpose which is to show moral and ideal, yet, as he gets frustrated with the everlasting attacks and criticisms he suspends writing comedy for a while.

PART III

REALISM IN BEN JONSON'S COMEDIES

The Mighty Prince of Poets, learned BEN,
Who alone div'd into the Minds of Men:
Saw all their wanderings, all their follies knew,
And all their vain fantastick passions drew.
In images so lively and so true;
That there each Humourist himself might.
Yet onely lash'd the Errors of the Times,
And n'er expos'd the Persons, but the Crimes:
And nevery car'd for private frowns, when he
Did but chastise publick iniquitie.

Thomas Shadwell *The Humourist*

As Shadwell's praiseworthy lines indicate, Ben Jonson is not only a learned classicist but also a 'realist' with his satires on contemporary matters, social problems and the follies of the time. Certain critics such as C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson remark that among his contemporaries, Jonson was singular in belonging and representing his [Elizabethan] age. He had "grown up in the very heart of Elizabethan England", knew every corner of "picturesque London" and had "more numerous and intimate relations" in Court (1925: 121). Thus, Jonson's own life provided him with the opportunity to familiarize himself with various milieus in the country, court and the city, which has reflected on his plays and made quite 'realistic'.

Jonson's realistic perspective is derived from his adaptation of Cicero's definition of comedy which is evidently revealed through Cordatus' speech in *Every Man Out of his Humour*:

[...] let him [the poet who cannot define comedy] content himself with Cicero's definition (till he have strength to propose to himself a better) who would have a comedy to be *imitatio vitæ, speculum consuetudinis*,

imago veritatis,⁹² a thing throughout pleasant and ridiculous, and accommodated to the correction of manners[...] (III.vi.169-83).

As seen above, Jonson attributes a serious task to comedy which is to reflect the reality and thus be “an imitation of life”, “a mirror of manners” and “an image of truth”. Furthermore, he frequently alludes to the fact that comedy should reflect not the truth itself but become an ‘imitation’ of it as he underlines in the Second Prologue to *Epicoene, The Silent Woman* (1609): “[...] Poet never credit gain’d / By writing truths, but things (like truths) well fain’d” (1981: 9-10). Notwithstanding, in order to create a life-like “well fain’d” play, a playwright should be a good observer before anything else. In this regard, as a realist playwright, Jonson ‘observes’ society, deploys his biting ‘satire’ and ‘humour’ in order to criticize and correct the ‘deformities’ he observes in society while paying attention to the use of ‘realistic settings’ and ‘natural language’ in his plays. Before dwelling further into Jonson’s realism, however, it would be best to begin by providing brief information about “realism” and its historical development.

Although “realism”⁹³ as a term appeared in the 19th century, the origin of the term, as pointed out by Willis H. Truitt in “Realism”, dates back to Plato and Aristotle’s discussion on imitation (*mimesis*) and art because of the close relationship between “realism” and “imitation” (1978:142). In *Republic* (around 380 BC) *Book X*. Plato mentions that although the poet imitates and depicts things as they are, he cannot actualize the *idea* or “being” itself. Within this context, a poet cannot give the

⁹² In his edition of *The Complete Plays of Ben Jonson*, G.A. Wilkes, translates Cicero’s definition as “an imitation of life”, “the glass of custom” and “the image of truth”(1981:350).

⁹³ In *English Theatre in Transition, 1881-1914*, James Woodfield defines “realism” as “the mimetic representation of life in art” and asserts that it came out as a reaction to Romanticism which “loses touch with everyday reality in its release of the imagination and pursuit of the ideal” (1984:21-22).

'truth' since his works are "third from what is" and made up of things that look 'like' a being but not being (1991: 281). Thus, he does not regard poetry as sufficient enough to convey the truth and concludes that "imitation is surely far from the truth; and, as it seems, it is due to this that it produces everything—because it lays hold of a certain small part of each thing, and that part is itself only a phantom" (1991: 281). Similar to Plato, Aristotle considers that all arts are rooted in imitation (*mimesis*), yet, unlike Plato who regards imitation as deceptive "mirror of something else", Aristotle describes "imitation" as a natural event in *Poetics* (Potolosky, 2006: 34). Handling poetry 'in itself', Aristotle mentions "poetic truth" and "higher reality" thus finds a middle way in the discussion of "reality" which is called 'verisimilitude' (1896:99).

In "Realism, Naturalism and their Alternatives", Raymond Williams indicates that realism did not originally point out to "conventions and technical methods in art, literature and drama" but "to changed attitudes towards 'reality' itself, towards man and society and towards the character of all relationships" (1978: 2). However, this change of attitude actually stems from various scientific developments such as the invention of photography and incandescent light bulb. In this regard, the invention of photography (dauguerreotype) by the French theatre designer Louis Dagguere (1787-1851) in 1840, which was improved in the modern sense by English physicist William Fox Talbot, resulted in the desire "to mirror the world" and to "show the people as they really are" (Downs, Wrigth, Romsey, 2013: 378). Furthermore, the invention of incandescent light bulb by Thomas Edison in 1879 paved the way for realistic light effect such as sunny day or dark night. As a result of the invention of these technical devices, the term "realism" came to be used in the theatre in 19th

century. In time, it became widespread by means of new ideas that developed with the publications of books such as Charles Darwin's (1809-1882) *On the Origins of Species* (1859) and Karl Marx's *Das Capital* (1867).

The publication of Darwin's *On the Origins of Species*, claiming that they come from same ancestry, reduced the 'high' position of people to mere animals. Thus, playwrights began to attach importance to "heredity" and "environment" in order to depict realistic characters (Downs, Wrieth, Romsey, 2013: 379). This, in turn, inspired Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) to analyze the mind or unconscious of animals and human which led to the development of characters with psychological depth in the theatre. Finally, Karl Marx's (1818-1883) two significant works *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Das Capital* (1867), in which he conveys the social conflict stemming from upper social class (bourgeoisie) abusing the working class (the proletariat) for profit, influenced the playwrights. Within this context, Raymond Williams states that realism is closely linked to "new social forces and new versions of social relationships" thus, new bourgeois drama brings three important innovations, namely "contemporary action", "secular actions and resolutions" and "social inclusiveness" (1978: 3). As a result, playwrights acquire a social mission to reveal the oppression and middle class' problems in their plays. Thus, the theatre progresses to a "social realism" which aims to depict and 'correct' the corruption and deformity in society.

In *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theatre*, Jonathon Haynes asserts that any art which is "thick with social references and so clearly social in its intentions deserves the name of social realism" (1992:10). However, in "Staging the Contemporary: Politics and Practice in Post-War Social Realist Theatres", Stephen

Lacy gives a more detailed definition of “social realism”: “To call a play social realist recognizes that it has political or moral intentions, an engagement with the darker and more controversial aspects of contemporary society and deals with recognizable social issues” (2011: 57). In this regard, certain playwrights such as “father of realism” Henrik Ibsen (1828 - 1906) and great socialist George Bernard Shaw (1856 –1950) aim to reform society through their social criticism and satires present in their ‘problem plays’⁹⁴. Thus, they regard theatre as a means of raising awareness of public about contemporary matters and problems.

Henrik Ibsen, Norwegian playwright, wrote many “social problem plays” that touched upon issues such as marriage, male-female relations and particularly the dehumanization of women. In “Satire in Modern and Contemporary Theater”, Christopher J. Herr argues that “his contemporaries saw Ibsen as a pessimistic muckraker, a photographer of social problems grimly airing the culture’s dirty linen” (2007: 462-63). George Bernard Shaw, who is a great admirer of Henrik Ibsen and praises him for his effort to reveal social problems in his works, uses witty and comic plots rather than Ibsen’s tragic plots, in order to illustrate the deficiencies in society. According to Shaw, the primary function of playwrights is to depict “the social and moral evils of time” (Downs, Wright, Romsey, 2013: 385). Thus, his didactic “thesis plays”⁹⁵, provide solutions in addition to revealing social problems (Brooker, 2005:708). However, while Ibsen and Shaw used the stage as a tool to convey certain

⁹⁴ Problem play is a type of 19th century drama which deals with controversial social issues of the day and reaches its maturity by means of such writers as Norwegian Henrik Ibsen and English Bernard Shaw.

⁹⁵ In *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, J. A. Cuddon defines “thesis play” as “a drama which deals with a specific problem and, very probably, offers a solution” (2013: 722). In this regard, thesis play is also known as “problem or propaganda play”. Henrik Ibsen is the major playwright that influences the genre especially with his play *A Doll’s House* while in England Bernard Shaw and John Galsworthy are accepted as the “notable contributors” (2013: 722). From 1960 on the playwrights begin to deal with political issues along with social issues such as class system, sexism and poverty etc.

ideas, expose social problems and even to reform the society in 19th century, Ben Jonson's writing already embodies all these qualities two centuries before them.

Ben Jonson lived in such an age in which drama was split into two prominent movements, namely Romanticism and Realism⁹⁶. While it is possible to say that Romanticism was practiced mainly by such playwrights as Shakespeare, Beaumont in the sense that they use extreme imagination, which brings about a kind of artificiality in their plays, and neglect Aristotelian three unities etc., Jonson, being such a strict moralist, adopts Realism which he believed to better serve his moral purpose. Within this context, Jonson criticizes contemporary drama in Prologue to *Every Man in his Humour* indicating that the audience will watch a different play form contemporary plays:

Where neither Chorus wafts you o'er the seas;
Nor creaking throne comes down, the boys to please;
Nor nimble squib is seen, to make afeared
The gentlewomen; nor rolled bullet heard
To say it thunders; nor tempestuous drum
Rumbles, to tell you when the storm doth come;
But deeds, and language, such as men do use:
And persons, such as Comedy would choose,
When she would show an image of the times,
And sport with human follies, not with crimes.
Except, we make 'em such by loving still
Our popular errors, when we know they're ill.
(Prologue, 15-26)

Thus, the playwright criticizes Romantic imagination and displays his realistic perspective stating that unlike contemporary [romantic] plays he will show "image of times" and deal with everyday deeds with colloquial language and sport with "human

⁹⁶ In *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theater*, Jonathan Haynes points out that Elizabethan realism is not related to the "development of set design" but to the morality plays since it adopts its techniques from morality play. He further asserts that with this reason critics such as Raymond William "start the history of stage realism with the Restoration (1992: 10).

follies” since comedy should both amuse and instruct. In the view of this, Jonson, who with his comedy of humours aims to endeavor to “establish more correct standards in the London theatres”, becomes one of the most significant playwrights of the period who “encourages” Realism (Nicoll, 1945: 120). However, the realism of the period is “a realism of subject matter, a social realism” which is directed by the “social dynamic” in the theater (Hayness, 1992: 6). Within this context, Jonson was inclined to depict contemporary London and its people from a ‘realistic’ perspective rather than ‘romantic’, since Romanticism was regarded as ‘aimless entertainment’ which lacked of any social notion by Jonson. Similar to Ibsen and Shaw, he regards comedy as a way to convey serious matters, thus, believes that comedy should deal with controversial social issues taking on a social task which is to demonstrate the deformity of time as he indicates in *Every Man out of his Humour*:

And to these courteous eyes oppose a mirror.
As large as is the stage, where on we act:
Where they shall see the times deformitie
Anatomized in every nerve, and sinnew.
With constant courage, and contempt of fear.
(Induction, 117-22)

In the above lines, through likening the stage to a huge mirror which reflects the ‘folly’ and ‘deformity’ of the time, Jonson alludes to “a mirror of manners”, one of the constituents of Cicero’s definition of comedy, and once again emphasizes his aim of making the audience profit from what they watch on the stage. Within this context, Jonson realizes this aim, mainly through satirizing and ridiculing the social defects of his period.

Jonson's skill in his being a good observer and a masterful satirist of contemporary matters, however, resulted in certain attack on the playwright. In *Poetaster* he points to one of these attacks, which is directed to him due to conveying his observations in his works, Dekker, the so-called Demetrius words describes Jonson as follows: "Alas, sir, Horace [Jonson]! He is a mere sponge; nothing but humorous, and observation; he goes up and down sucking from every society, and when he comes home, squeezes himself dry again. I know him, I (IV.iii. 95-8)". Indeed, this is the criticism that most Romantics use against Realists since they believe that Realists do not use their imagination and only copy contemporary events, thus, it is not art. However, what Jonson does is not to portray his observations aimlessly but to make his audience aware of the problems of the time through utilizing certain techniques such as 'satire' and 'humour'.

Indeed, like other social realists such as Ibsen and Shaw, Jonson's most effective weapon is "satire" in his social criticism. Yet, his satires, which are mainly social but sometimes also political, caused him a lot of problems. That is to say, he was imprisoned because of his political satires both for the *Isle of the Dogs* (1597) which he collaborated with Thomas Nash and for *Eastward Hoo* (1605) which he collaborated with Chapman and Marston. In *Ben Jonson A life*, David Riggs remarks that *Poetaster* (1601) was also banned due to an anonymous complain to Chief Justice Popham, "Jonson again faced the prospect of corporal punishment in the earlier part of 1600" (1989: 80). Moreover, he was accused of popery and treason for the material in his tragedy *Sejanus* (1603) and his satire on the "duke of the drowned land" *The Devil is an Ass* (1616) was prohibited from being performed on the stage.

Thus, even though Jonson barely escaped death in prison a few times, he continued writing satirical plays till his death.

One of the most significant features that separates Jonson from other satirists is his use of the “humour” theory through which he not only picturizes the Londoners but also satirizes and ridicules them in order to criticize human folly and avarice. Thus, by means of humour theory Jonson actualize his didactic purpose which is to give a moral by satirizing a dominant trait or folly of the character. In *The Broken Compass*, Edward B. Pattridge remarks that humour theory enables Jonson to utilize exaggerated characterization by depicting character’s dominant trait, yet, this prevents a total realistic atmosphere:

Jonson thought himself as a realist who would present ‘men’, not ‘monsters’, but, as a master of caricature, he created monsters. Instead of representing men as he had observed them, he exaggerated their dominant traits or focused on only one or two traits, catching a man in an oblique light and casting him into an energetic life merely by making him talk. By means of real details and allusive language and characters that are little more than counters he created a special kind of experience which is in part like the life men live, but which distorted into an experience subtly different from anything but a life we can imagine (1958:231).

As Pattridge asserts, even if Jonson caricaturizes his characters by focusing on one of their dominant trait and distorts his realism, he also creates a sort of reality and lifelikeness by utilizing “real details and allusive language”.

The point is that Jonson’s realism is rather social, thus, for him social criticism is more important than creating real characters on the stage. In other words, his realism stems mainly from his being a moralist aiming to give a moral. Within this context, it can be deduced that Jonson’s social realism originates from ‘morality plays’ which, similarly, criticizes social immoralities and misbehaviors but through

use of allegory. In *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theater*, Jonathan Haynes argues that "Jonson's great legacy from the morality" is his adaptation of "a structure of examination" and "judgment of social behaviors" (1992: 24). Jonson, however, relieves drama of religious doctrines and allegories using characters with 'humours', thus, from an abstract world of moralities, he turns to the world people live in.

Another realistic element of Jonsonian comedy is the use "realistic setting" displayed especially in his 'London city comedies' such as *Bartholomew Fair*, *Epicoene*, and *The Devil is an Ass*. In "London and Urban Space", Adam Zucker claims that when Jonson wrote *The Alchemist* he was living in the "Blackfriars precinct" where the events of the play mostly take place (2010: 102). Thus, his use "Blackfriars precinct" as setting in *The Alchemist* is not incidental; he chooses a place he knows well in order to depict more life-like characters and events. Jonson explains the why he chooses London as a setting in the prologue to *The Alchemist*:

Our Scene is LONDON, 'cause we would make
knowne.
No Countries mirth is better then our owne.
No Clime breedes better matter, for your Whore,
Baud, Squire, Impostor, many Persons more,
Whose manners, now call'd Humours, feede the Stage:
And which have still Subject, to the rage
Or spleene of Comick writers (*Prologue*, 5-11).

As above lines point out, London provides Jonson with the opportunity to depict his observations and create characters such as 'squire', 'impostor' and 'whore' which are abundant in the capital city at that time. Furthermore, the familiarity with the city and its inhabitants renders it possible for Jonson to give specific place names such as Kentish Town⁹⁷ (*A Tale of Tub*), Old Jewry⁹⁸ (*Every Man in his Humour*) The

⁹⁷ An area in North-west London.

Middle Aisle of St. Paul⁹⁹ (*Every Man out of his Humour*) and Hoxton¹⁰⁰, Petticoat Lane¹⁰¹, Shoreditch¹⁰², etc. (*The Devil is an Ass*). Apart from this, popular taverns such as the Mitre, Mermaid and Windmill, which Jonson himself frequently visited, and had chance to observe various people from every part of English society, are prevalent settings of his comedies. Thus, in a way using popular places which are crowded with people from different social ranks enables Jonson to create a 'microcosm' of the city on the stage.

London is not, however, the only setting of his comedies since Jonson utilizes places that best fits his subject matter. For instance, in *Volpone* the events take place in Venice the center of the commerce a quite popular setting in Renaissance plays as helps Jonson to present the 'money making scheme' of the play in addition to his moral aim of satirizing greedy, avaricious characters throughout the play. On the other hand, in *Poetaster* the events take place in Rome during the Augustan Age a period of high morals and elevated poesy that provides a perfect setting to criticize his contemporary poets. Therefore, he achieves to render their settings realistic by giving specific names and make the audience familiar through drawing certain parallelism¹⁰³ between such places and London.

⁹⁸ A historical financial centre of London.

⁹⁹ St. Paul Cathedral was actually a medieval cathedral in London. However, the middle aisle of St. Paul was used by Londoners as "an informal market place, labour exchange and promenade for ostentatious display" (McEvoy, 2008: 27). Because of this, it took the pejorative name "Paul's Walk" and was frequently referred by Renaissance playwrights in their plays.

¹⁰⁰ A district in the North part of London.

¹⁰¹ North of the financial district of the London

¹⁰² A district that is known as the historical centre of nuns.

¹⁰³ In "Introduction" to *Volpone*, Brian Parker mentions the parallelism driven between Venice and London stating that both were maritime trading cities which have their own 'liberty'. And then he gives English travelers Sir Politic Would-be and his wife in the play as an example to show how Jonson creates parallelism between two country asserting that they (The Would-bees) "act as a link between the exotic plot and setting on one hand and the English audience on the other" (1999: 20).

It is also worth noting that Jonson changes the setting of *Every Man in His Humour* from Venice to London in the first folio of his works. Most critics such as Swinburne, Herford and Simpson this change of setting to Jonson's growing realism. In *A Study of Ben Jonson*, Swinburne asserts that:

Transplanted from the imaginary or fantastic Italy in which at first they lived and moved and had their being to the actual and immediate atmosphere of contemporary London, the characters gain even more in lifelike and interesting veracity or verisimilitude than in familiar attraction and homely association. Not only do we feel that we know them better, but we perceive that they are actually more real and cognizable creatures than they were under their former conditions of dramatic existence (1889: 13).

Thus, London provides the Londoners or spectators with a setting and characters that they are familiar with and can relate to in comparison with "imaginary" and unknown Venice, which not even Jonson has not visited himself (Barker, 1999: 19). The English setting also provides a more "vivid and concrete use of language and figures of speech" (Haynes, 1992: 34), which contributes to the realism by creating a realistic setting and lifelike characters.

Jonson's preoccupation with displaying 'natural dialogues' is another significant element of realist drama as observed in the plays of Chekhov. In *Timber or Discoveries*, he states that:

Language most shows a man: Speak, that I may see thee. It springs out of the most retired and inmost parts of us, and is the image of the parent of it, the mind. No glass renders a man's form or likeness so true as his speech (1892: 64).

Since speech reflects the inner self, Jonson's characters are depicted through their utterance rather than their actions. In this regard, their language should be natural

enough to make them see 'real'. For Jonson the 'real' and natural language signifies on that is suitable for their social status and characteristic traits. This stems from Jonson's strict adherence to the classical principle "decorum" that has been elaborately handled in the "Part I" of this study. Within this context, in *British Drama*, Allardyce Nicoll remarks that with the development of "satire", the language of the plays was required to be more "natural" and "lifelike" and "this tendency toward greater realism in language" turned out to be a prominent feature in most early seventeenth century plays (1945: 117). Thus, as one of the best practitioners of the 'satire', Jonson displays characters employing natural language. This has also been underlined by Jonas Barish in *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* as follows:

Jonson, strenuously seeking to copy "nature", displays an increasing preoccupation with lifelike speech, a growing suspicion of "literary" sounding language, except where this becomes an object of satire, and a closer and closer attachment to the kind of familiar subject matter for everyday language is appropriate. (1960: 274).

Thus, Jonson utilizes everyday language because he writes about "familiar subject matter". Yet, in *Timber or Discoveries*, he states that sometimes men can depart from "natural ways of speaking" because of necessity, when they "thinke it fitter to speake that in obscure words, or by circumstance, which utter'd plainely would offend the hearers" or in order "to avoid obsceneness and sometimes for pleasure, and variety" (1982:64). However, apart from necessity, Jonson, as a 'full-blooded classicist' uses natural language as a requirement of classical principle "decorum".

In view of the given information, it is obvious that Jonson is one of the most significant representatives of 'realism' in the social topics he takes up in his

comedies and the employment of realistic setting. Furthermore, his moralist nature originating from his 'classicism' gives his plays the quality of social criticism since he satirizes the contemporary matters and deformities of the time with a deductive purpose. Within this context, Jonson can be called a "social realist" with a mission to educate society and resolve social problems similar to Realists such as Ibsen and Shaw. His city comedies, which portray London life and depict various characters, are specially rich in terms of realistic elements. The variety of characters that also have various humours pave the way for diverse matters to satirize for Jonson. In this regard, the following section aims to analyze two Jonsonian city comedies namely *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) and *The Devil is an Ass* (1616), which explicitly embody political and social satire represented through realistic perspective.

CHAPTER I

REALISM IN *BARTHOLOMEW FAIR*

Bartholomew Fair is the most remarkable city comedy of Jonson with its realistic setting and harsh social criticism on the contemporary London life. In this respect, Jonson fits the London society into the stage by means of the fair setting which serves him to depict a stage crowded with people from various parts of the society. This not only paves the way for creating a kind of reality but also enables Jonson to uncover his criticism on certain matters. Within this context, in “*Bartholomew Fair* and Jonsonian Tolerance”, G.M. Pinciss asserts that at the time that Jonson wrote *Bartholomew Fair*, the theaters were banned “by statute from dealing directly with issues that involve religion or government” the playwrights searched for ways of “indirection or allusion” to satirize these issues (1995:345). In this regard, Jonson reveals his criticism indirectly through such characters as Bartholomew Coke and Puritan Zeal-of-the-land Busy bringing them together at a common place which is ‘the fair’. Thus, even if censorship restricted most playwrights at the time, it could not restrain Jonson from displaying his ‘social realism’ in the play.

Jonson’s last successful city comedy *Bartholomew Fair* (1614; pub. 1631), acquires its name from the historical Bartholomew Fair, which “had been held each August¹⁰⁴ near the church of St Bartholomew in Smithfield” since “at least” 1123 (Zucker, 2010: 103). In *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*, Arthur F. Kinney dwells on the sacred and secular importance of the fair; according to Kinney Smithfield, the location of the fair, has been “identified

¹⁰⁴ The Feast of St Bartholomew (August 24) is of importance since it alludes to religious massacres that occurred in the Church of St Bartholomew.

with harsh justice” as many nonconformist and friars were martyred there (2005: 702). As for secular importance, he states that similar to other country fairs, it “probably had its origin as a gathering for worship in sacred place” and provided an opportunity for the sale of staples and livestock, for the crops of farmers, and the hiring of workers” (2005: 702). In brief, even though Bartholomew Fair originated from a religious purpose, later it turned into a ‘trade fair’.

In the play, however, Jonson creates a fair that is completely contrast to the historical fair. His ‘Bartholomew Fair’ is displayed as a place of pleasure, a ‘vanity fair’ consisted of mainly bawds, prostitutes and alcohol rather than trade. This strong contrast functions to display the moral corruption of the time. In this regard, as a ‘social realist’, Jonson not only achieves to create a kind of “realism” by means of creating vivid characters, employing colloquial language and using a realistic setting, but also displays ‘social criticism’ by representing society on the stage. Therefore, the play is quite convenient for an analysis from a ‘realistic point of view’ especially with its harsh criticism upon contemporary society.

Apart from Jonson’s prevalent ‘realism’, in the play, his ‘full-blooded classicism’¹⁰⁵ is also revealed through strict conformity to classical principles. For instance, *Bartholomew Fair* adheres to the ‘three unities’ rule more strictly than his other comedies. In that sense, the action in the play is completed in a day, beginning in the morning in Lovewit’s house and ending in Justice Overdo’s house where everyone gathers for supper. Thus, it is seen that characters are mainly confined to a specific area, namely the Fair, which displays an exact conformity to ‘unity of place’. Furthermore, the plot revolves around a group of people who visit the fair, and those

¹⁰⁵ See, Part I: “Ben Jonson as a Representative of Classicism”, pp. 33-44.

who work there. Moreover, similar to other comedies, Jonson gives importance to 'decorum' –which will be handled in detail while the language of the play is analyzed– that is seen explicitly in his characterization and his language. And, he alludes to certain classics by using Latin quotations. Thus, although the play can also be handled from a "classicist perspective", this chapter aims to analyze the play in terms of a "realist viewpoint".

The play *Bartholomew Fair* begins in John Littlewit's (a proctor) house where he arranges the marriage license of Bartholomew Cokes (an esquire of Harrow) and Grace Wellborn. Winwife, a gentleman who aspires to marry Win's widow-mother Dame Purecraft, arrive to find out she is wooed by Zeal-of-the-land Busy (a strict Puritan who is actually a hypocrite). While Winwife is discussing how to save Purecraft from Busy with Quarlous (a gamester), Cokes' servant Humphrey Wasp interrupts them in order to get the marriage license. Cokes, his sister Mistress Overdo, and Grace also arrive to find Wasp. Cokes, who shows Grace around London chooses Bartholomew Fair as their last spot. Thus, Mistress Overdo joins them to visit the fair while Quarlous and Winwife decide to follow them just for sport. Littlewit who wants to go to the fair to perform his puppet show, convinces, Purecraft and Busy saying that his pregnant wife Win desires to eat fair's pig.

Adam Overdo, (a justice of peace) arrives disguised as a mad man in order to uncover the illegal conducts in the fair. After observing the fair, Overdo comes to the conclusion that "pig-woman" Ursula's¹⁰⁶ booth is "the very womb and bed of enormity" (II.ii.124). However, there Mooncalf (Ursula's assistant) mistakes him for mad Arthur of Bradley. Furthermore, Overdo mistakenly assumes that Zekeil

¹⁰⁶ In certain anthologies such as *The Wordsworth Companion to Literature in English* the name "Ursula" is also spelled as "Ursula".

Edgworth (the cutpurse of the fair), is a good young man awaiting to be rescued from Mooncalf and Ursula. Newly arrived at Ursula's booth, Quarlous and Winwife quarrel with Dam Knockem since Quarlous insults Ursula. Thus, she tries to send away by threatening to throw hot oil on them but, she falls and burns her own leg. While Cokes, Wasp, Mistress Overdo and Grace wander around the fair, Edgworth steals Cokes' purse but learns that he has two purses. Yet, Wasp beats Justice Overdo, who accuses him with stealing the purse.

Busy, Purecraft and the Littlewits arrive at Ursula's place and eat pig roast. Cokes buys gingerbreads and some toys in order to utilize in his marriage masque. While Cokes and others listen to Nightingale's Ballad, Edgworth steals Cokes' other purse. This time, however, Quarlous and Winwife see him. As a usual suspect, "Bradley" (Overdo in disguise) is charged with the crime and taken by the officers. Knowing the actual identity of the thief, Quarlous demands of Edgworth to steal Cokes' wedding license from Wasp by threatening to reveal him. Being full with pig, Busy starts to grumble about the enormity, profanity and debauchery of the fair and destroys Letterhead and Trash's products by accusing them of "idolatry" and they are taken by the officials.

Trouble-All, a madman obsessed with Justice Overdo, tries to convince officers Bristle and Haggis not to put "Bradley" in the stocks without Justice Overdo's "warrant". Edgworth and Nightingale again cheat Cokes and take his cloak and sword. On the other hand, Grace relinquishes the marriage idea, thus, Winwife and Quarlous have a fight for her hand in marriage. Grace prefers a passerby, Trouble-All, to give the final decision by marking one of the two words that stand for Winwife and Quarlous. Grace is determined to keep the word Trouble-All chose as a

secret till they arrive at their home. Wasp plays "game of vapors" with a group of people and Edgworth steals the marriage license from him. Likewise, Knockem and Whit steal Coke's cloak and swords. Yet, Wasp is arrested as he engages in an argument with the Royal watchmen.

All the characters come together in the stock. Wasp finds a way out while the others escape through the stocks left open due to Trouble-All's fight with the officers. Purecraft suddenly feels affection towards Trouble-All. Justice Overdo appears in disguise of a porter in the puppet show in which Mistress Overdo and Win appear in masks. Quarlous arrives in the show disguised as Trouble-All in order to learn which word Trouble-All marked in Grace's book. Yet, Purecraft desires to marry him assuming that he is the actual Trouble-All. Since he knows that Trouble-All chose Winwife to be Grace's husband, he marries Purecraft using the marriage license. The puppet show is interrupted by Busy on the grounds that it is profanation. Finally, Justice Overdo and all the disguised characters' real identities are revealed. While planning to punish all the schemers, Quarlous convinces Justice Overdo to forgive all of them. Thus, Overdo invites all the characters to his house for supper.

In *Barholomew Fair*, realistic characters and the depictions of the Fair are rooted in Jonson's 'first hand observations'. In *Ben Jonson*, Herford and Simpson state that "first-hand knowledge of London and the Fair is reflected at every turn of the play" (1950:167). In this sense, Jonson draws a vivid picture of the fair and a variety of characters which render the play quite realistic and paves the way for the play being called as "transcript of life". However, in "Topographical Comedy in the Seventeenth Century", Richard H. Perkinson asserts that "Comedy is not, unfortunately, just matter of transcribing real life; the transcript must contain a

certain amount of untruthfulness or unfairness or art which will heighten the normally drab material (1936: 275). In other words, a comedy should include artificial elements that will show that it is not reality itself; otherwise, it would not be 'comic'.

In accordance with this view, Jonson prevents the representation of 'pure' realism pointing out that the play is an illusion or an imitation of life at the very beginning of the play. Thus, in the 'Induction' Jonson introduces stage-keeper, who criticizes *Bartholomew Fair* for not having real fair views such as "sword-and-bucker man" and a "juggler" etc., and the book-holder and scrivener who appear with "certain articles drawn out in haste" between the author and the audience. Furthermore, Jonson also gives certain information about the play before it is staged:

Articles of agreement, indented, between the spectators or hearers, at the Hope on the Bankside, in the country of Surrey on the one party, and the author of Bartholomew Fair in the said place and the country on the other party: the one-and-thirtieth day of October, 1614, and in the twelfth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord, James, by the grace of God King of the Faith. And of Scotland the seven-and-fortieth (75-84).

These lines explicitly name, the theatre house that the play is staged, its location and the exact date of the play. Jonson even gives notice about the duration of the play which is "two hours and an half, and somewhat more" and commenting that the aim of the play is "to delight all and to defend none" (Induction, 92-96). Through such means, Jonson creates an alienation effect, making the audience realize that they are watching 'a play'.

Similar to the "Induction", the Prologue addressed to King James I¹⁰⁷, underlines that Jonson's intention is to "delight", thus, does not include any "personal attack[s]":

Your Majesty is welcome to a fair;
You must expect: with these, the zealous noise
Of your land's faction, scandalized at toys
[...] These for your sport, without particular wrong,
Or just complaint of any private man,
Who of himself or shall think well or can,
The maker doth present: and hopes tonight
To give you for a fairing, true delight (1-12).

Although Jonson states that he writes this play just for King James I's sport without "complaint of any particular man", certain critics such as Ian Donaldson and David Kay indicate that Jonson's characters might be alluding to certain historical figures. For instance, in *Jonson's Magic Houses*, Ian Donaldson claims that "Inigo Lantherne", is a "satirical portrait of Inigo Jones", Wasp stands for Jonson, and Cokes represents Sir Walter Raleigh's son (1977: 130). Despite Jonson's claim of 'entertaining' the King as his only purpose, he also uses the stage to satirize society. Thus, his intention to "entertain" is just the tip of the iceberg as in the deeper part he reveals his 'social realism' through depicting a dark picture of corrupted world in which people just eat, drink, smoke, steal and fight. The point is that, none of his plays is written for the sole purpose of entertainment. In this respect, *Bartholomew Fair* has also been written to show the shortcomings and defects of society, corrupted morals and institutions such as marriage and law at the time.

¹⁰⁷ Both the Induction and the Prologue are directed to King James I, the reason of which may be that throughout the play Jonson satirizes the matters which King James himself criticizes. Within this context, in the "Introductory Note" he writes for *The Bartholomew Fair*, Martin Butler asserts that in *Bartholomew Fair*, Jonson handles with "aversions of the king such as James's notorious hostility to tobacco, his dislike of Puritans and swine's flesh, and his learned obligations and efficiency of his magistracy" (1989: 149).

In this respect, Jonson chooses 'Bartholomew Fair' as the setting because it is not only quite rich in terms of characters from different social classes and events but also has a historical significance which enables him to satirize society as a whole and comment on certain contemporary matters. This, in turn, attributes a kind of reality to the plot. In this sense, the play mainly consists of two groups 'the visitors of the fair' and 'the fair workers'. Moreover, the visitors are divided into three groups namely Puritan Family (the Littlewits, Purecraft and Busy), Bartholomew Cokes' group (Wasp, Grace and Mistress Overdo), and the two gentlemen (Quarlous and Winwife).¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, through displaying the fair workers mainly consisting of bawds (Whit), ballad singer (Nightingale), theft (Edgworth) and prostitutes etc., Jonson also shows that the fair deviates from its commercial aim. Consequently, he reveals his two fold criticism on certain 'social institutions' such as religion, law, marriage with the visitors group while satirizes the 'moral corruption' in the society through bawds, prostitutions, thieves etc.

Furthermore, in *Ben Jonson*, Peter Womack asserts that another incentive for Jonson to choose the fair as a setting is to evade "his own neo-classical dissatisfaction with the unnaturalness of the theatre" (1986:153). That is to say, as a 'limited' space, a fair is far more easily created on the stage than others and thus creates a feeling of reality (Womack, 1986: 153). Likewise, the convenience of the fair setting for the reproduction on the stage increases the credibility of the events and characters. As a result, the fair contributes to Jonson's realism as well as to his

¹⁰⁸ Justice Overdo is not included in any of the groups since he is in the fair as a part of his profession, thus, constantly walks around the fair within different disguises and tries to observe the environment. In accordance with this, he does not participate in any group, yet, involves in every group through a sequence of events.

classicism through generating a kind of credibility within the frame of Aristotelian principles.

Apart from realistic setting, it is apparent that Jonson executes a lifelike language by employing prose and colloquial language, which makes it easier to know and identify the characters. Furthermore, due to his strict adherence to classical principle "decorum", he pays great attention to the propriety of characters' discourses to their personalities, humours, and professions in *Bartholomew Fair*. To this end, the use of repetitions reveals the propriety between character and his profession. For instance, Overdo as a man of law always repeats the words "in Justice name', and the King's, and for the commonwealth" (III. iv. 45-48), while, Leatherhead as a seller repetitively asks "What do you lack, gentlemen? What is't buy? Fine rattles? Drums? Babies? Little dogs? And birds for ladies? What do you lack? (III.iv.4-7). Likewise, as part of her profession, Trash frequently asks "Will your worship buy any gingerbread, very good bread, comfortable bread?" (III.iv.110-11). Through such daily dialogues, Jonson also depicts the monotony of the fair life and thus creates a kind of reality.

On the other hand, Jonson also uses frequent 'repetitions' to underline certain qualifications of the characters. For instance, in order to underline that Little-wit lacks wit (as his name suggests) regards everyone in the fair as 'honest' he is drawn as character who uses repetitive words in his speech. For instance, while trying to find a way to convince Puritans Purecraft and Busy to go the Fair, Littlewit constantly repeats certain words:

Tut, we'll have a device, a dainty one (now, Wit, help at a pinch, good Wit, come, come, good Wit, an't be thy will). I have it Win, I have it i'faith, and 'tis a fine

one. Win, long to eat of a pig, sweet Win i' the Fair so
you see? (I.v.169-173)

Here, with the repetitions, Jonson not only displays Littlewit's excitement but also reveals his naïve and childish character. Likewise, ex-lawyer Trouble-All, who loses his sanity after being dismissed from his job because of Justice Overdo, repeats the same sentences "Have you a warrant?"(IV.ii.123), "It's Justice Overdo that I looking for" (IV,ii.128-29) and same words such as "quit ye", "multiply ye" (I.iv.20; IV.ii.130). The use of repetitive words explicitly displays Trouble-All's obsession with Justice Overdo's warrant. It further enables Quarlous to appear to be like mad Trouble-All and to trick everyone easily, including Purecraft who marries him supposing that he is Trouble-All, due to his repetition of sentences. Thus, 'disguise' and 'pretense' used by characters in *Bartholomew Fair* are used as devices to create comic plots in the play. For instance, in disguise of an ordinary man of the fair, Overdo, a man of law, is mistaken for a mad man Arthur Bradley, accused of theft, and beaten and finally put in stockings. Likewise, both Justice's wife Mistress Overdo and Littlewit's wife Win, proctor's wife and the daughter of a Puritan, are masked as leading to comical events.

In addition to comical effects, 'disguise' and 'pretense' are also used as weapons to satirize certain contemporary matters. In this regard, Jonson satirizes contemporary law through Overdo, marriage through Quarlous and Puritanism through Busy. Thus, becomes a commentary on society. Through his satire of the law system revealed mainly when Justice Overdo becomes a laughing stock that ends up in the stocks adds to the social realism. Instead of being displaying as a 'law man' having comprehensive knowledge of human nature and a good observer, Jonson

depicts Justice Overdo as a simple minded man who “misunderstands most of what he overhears and invariably fails to see what precisely is happening around him” (Cave, 1991: 109). In other words, Jonson ridicules the contemporary justice by depicting Justice Overdo quite contrary to the ideal.

On the other hand, the corruption in the institution of marriage is mainly revealed through the couple Dame Purecraft and Quarlous. In the Jacobean Period, marriage was regarded as a means of ‘social climbing’ and ‘money making’. Likewise, Quarlous, disguised as Trouble-All, accepts to marry Dame Purecraft for her dowry:

Why should not I marry this six thousand pound, not I think on't? and a good trade to that she beside, ha? The t'other wench Winwife is sure of; there's no expectation for me there! Here I may make myself some saver yet, if she continue mad, there's the question. It is money that I want; why should I not marry the money, when 'tis offered me? (V.ii.88-95).

In accordance with this, Quarlous decides to marry Purecraft after she claims that she “worth[s] six thousand pound” (V.ii.58). For him, marriage is a “good trade”. Jonson explicitly criticizes contemporary attitude towards marriage in pursuit of rank and wealth.

Similar to Quarlous, Purecraft desires to marry Trouble-All with the aim of “enjoying his madness”. After the astrologers, prognosticate that “she shall never happy hour, unless she marry within this sennight” to a ‘mad man’ (I.ii.55-56), she becomes obsessed with marrying a mad man. Her obsession is also revealed at the very beginning of the play by Littlewit who advises Winwife “to be a little madder than” Quarlous in order to marry Purecraft (I.ii.69-70). On the other hand, knowing

that Quarlous (in disguise of Trouble-All) will not marry her unless she reveals her true face, Purecraft tells him the truth about herself:

I'll tell you, and the truth, since you hate the hypocrisy of the parti-coloured brotherhood. These seven years, I have been a wilful holy widow only to draw feasts and gifts from my entangled suitors: I am also, by office, an assisting sister of deacons, and a devourer, instead of a distributor, of the alms. I am a special maker of marriages for our decayed brethren with our rich widows, for a third part of their wealth, when they are married, for the relief of the poor elect: as also our poor handsome young virgins with wealthy bachelors or widowers, to make them steal from their husbands, when I have confirmed them in the faith, and got all put into their custodies (V.ii.59-72).

These lines reveal that Purecraft is actually a hypocrite, covetous and self-seeking widow who benefits from her suitors wealth. Here, Jonson again generates an exact contrast between the real and ideal. By depicting Puritans as hypocrites and avaricious men making money by manipulating “young virgins” marry “wealthy bachelors or widowers” and stealing from them, Jonson points out to the moral corruption of the Puritans at the time. In order to understand Jonson’s satire on Puritanism, one must understand his attitudes toward them.

As mentioned earlier in the “Introduction”¹⁰⁹ of this study Puritanism becomes quite prevalent and dominant in the Jacobean Period. Puritans attack many social activities including art and literature as they regard them as “profanity”. This not only disturbs certain literary men but also superstitious King James I who writes a book on ‘witchcraft’ entitled ‘*Demonology*’ (1597). In this regard, both as a social realist who observes social matters closely and as a “(unofficial) poet-laureate” entertaining the King especially with his masques, Jonson becomes a strong

¹⁰⁹ See, “Introduction” pp-23-25.

opponent of Puritans. In *The Broken Compass*, Edward B. Partridge asserts that Jonson hates Puritans not only because they call “his beloved classics” “heathen”¹¹⁰, but also because of they are “hypocrites” since they are “exact reverse of what they affected” (1958: 232). In this sense, certain plays like *The Alchemist* include a harsh criticism on Puritans and *Bartholomew Fair* is one of these plays.

Bartholomew Fair can be regarded as a direct attack on Puritans, especially through the Puritan characters Zeal-of-the-land Busy and Dame Purecraft. Such characters always employ a religious discourse and regard the fair as a place where ‘idolatry’ pervades in every part of it:

The place is Smithfield, or the fields of smiths, the grove of hobby-horses and trinkets. The wares are the wares of the devils and the whole Fair is the shop of Satan! They are hooks and baits, very baits, that are hung out on every side, to catch you, and to hold you, as it were, by the gills, and by the nostrils, as the fisher doth: therefore you must not look, nor turn toward them (III.ii.45-53).

Busy considers the fair as a great threat which debauches the Littlewits with “trinkets” and “shops of evils”. Thus, he warns them not to observe the environment in the fair since the wares may beguile them into committing sin. Yet, it is Busy who commits the greatest sins, thus, revealing his hypocrisy. For instance, when Zeal-of-the-land Busy arrives at the Ursula’s booth, he enumerates the things that should be avoided for Knockem:

Only pig was not comprehended in my admonition, the rest were. For long hair, it is an ensign of pride, a

¹¹⁰ In this regard, in *Bartholomew Fair* Puritan Zeal-of-the-land Busy gets angry when Justice Overdo alludes to classics such as Horace and Persius accusing them of “popery” and says that “Friend, I will leave to communicate my spirit with you, if I hear any more of these superstitious relics, those lists of Latin, the very rags of Rome and patches of popery” (IV.vi.115-18).

banner, and the world is full of those banners, very full of banners. And bottle-ale is a drink of Satan's, a diet-drink of Satan's devised to puff us up, and make us swell in this latter age of vanity, as the smoke of tobacco, to keep us in mist and error. But the fleshly woman, which you call Ursula, is above all to be avoided, having the marks upon her of the three enemies of man: the world, as being in the Fair; the devil, as being in the fire; and the flesh, as being herself (III.vi.32-43).

Although, long hair, bottle ale and Ursula, who is regarded as the representative of the "three enemies of man" namely "the world, the devil and the flesh", are depicted as indicatives of the certain evils by Busy, this does not prevent him in indulging in one of the seven deadly sins, gluttony; excessive eating, drinking ale or even worse 'stealing'. That is to say, even though he indicates that pig should be eaten with "a reformed mouth" with "sobriety and humbleness; not gorged in with gluttony or greediness" (I.vi.86-8), he eats "two and a half" of his share and drinks "a pailful" at pig woman Ursula's booth (III.vi.58). Thus, Knockem underlines Busy's gluttony saying that: "A very good vapour! I'll in, and joy Ursula, with telling how her pig works; He eats with his eyes, as well as his teeth" (III. vi.58-9).

However, rather than other vices such as avariciousness and gluttony Jonson primarily satirizes hypocrisy of the Puritans as it is the basis of all his vices. In this regards, different characters including Dame Purecraft and Knockem reveal Busy's 'hypocrisy' throughout the play. For instance, Knockem describes him as "an excellent right hypocrite!" who "falls a-railing and kicking, the jade" when his belly is full (III.iv.54-5). Moreover, Purecraft discloses his hypocrisy with the following words: "I know him to be the capital knave of the land, making himself rich by being made feoffee in trust to deceased brethren, and cozening their heirs by swearing the

absolute gifts of their Inheritance” (V.ii.76-81). Yet, Quarlous gives a more detailed description of his hypocrisy through the following lines:

A notable hypocritical vermin it is; I know him. One that stands upon his face, more than his faith, at all times; ever in seditious motion, and reproving for vain-glory: of a most lunatic conscience and spleen, and affects the violence of singularity in all he does (he has undone a grocer here, in Newgate market, that broke with him, trusted him with currants, as errant a zeal as he, that’s by the way). By his profession, he will ever be i’ the state of innocence, though, and childhood; derides all antiquity; defies any other learning than inspiration; and what discretion soever years should afford him, it is all prevented in his original ignorance; ha’not to do with him: for he is a fellow of most arrogant, and invincible dullness, I assure you (I.iv.153-167).

Through Quarlous’ long description, Jonson actually reveals the general stance on Puritans in the period. In this sense, Puritans are not only regarded as “hypocrite” but also as “boastful”, “arrogant” and “dull”. However, Jonson also shows their “narrow-mindedness” through Zeal-of-the-land Busy’s religious discourse that he calls every ware in the fare as a devil’s work and idolatry.

However, as a so-called ‘zealous Puritan’, Busy reveals his utmost reaction to the Puppet Show by means of which Jonson brings all the characters together on the stage. While Lantherhead performs the puppet show which is actually parody of Christopher Marlowe’s poem “Hero and Leander” (1598), Busy interrupts the performance claiming the puppets to be “heathenish idol[s]” (V.v.5). Busy, then, cross swords with puppet Dionysius:

Busy: I say it is profane, as being the page of Pride, and the waiting-woman of Vanity.

Dionysius: Yea? What say you to your tire-woman, then? [...] Or feather-makers i’ the Friars that are o’ your faction of faith? Are not they, with their perukes, and their puffs, their puffs, their fans, and their huffs, as

much pages of Pride and waits upon Vanity? What say you? What say you? What say you?

Busy: I will not answer for them.

Dionysius: Because you cannot, because you cannot. Is a bugle-maker a lawful calling? Or confect-maker's? Such you have there. Or your French fashioner? *You'd have all the sin within yourselves, would you not?* Would you not? (V.v.92-108) (*Italics Mine*)

Busy's speaking to a puppet as if it is a living being generates the comedy, yet it also depicts Jonson's harsh criticism upon Puritans. Especially, Dionysius' last sentence summarizes the whole satire on Puritans by pointing out their hypocrisy once more. That is to say, Busy has "all the sins within himself" like other Puritans, yet, he still seeks the sins everywhere except himself. In this respect, Busy asserts that puppet play serves to "pride" and "vanity" but the Puritans, who belong to the faction which is called "Blackfriars Puritans" like Busy, are so keen on their clothes that they have "feather makers", "French fashioner" and "bugle-maker" etc. that produce "perukes", "puffs" and "fans" for them. Indeed, these facts uncover Busy's true nature namely his 'profaneness' although it is him who intends to uncover the true nature of the puppet play proving its 'profanity'.

Apart from satirizing the Puritans the puppet scene also serves for the festive ending bringing all characters together which is quite remarkable. Jonson mostly utilizes punishment scene of wrongdoers or court scene as a final scene yet in *Bartholomew Fair* he prefers "festive ending". In *Ben Jonson*, Peter Womack attributes 'the festive ending' to its being an adaptation of 'court masque' asserting that he adapts "the strategies of court entertainment for the popular stage" (1986: 158-59). If this is true, the use of festive ending is quite reasonable since the court masques are played as royal entertainments and thus it ought to be festive and

pleasurable. Even if Jonson intends to give pleasure with the festive ending, he does not show the feasting on the stage as he is aware of the fact that the social unity cannot actualize unless society is reformed.

To sum up, Jonson reveals his 'realist perspective' in many respects in *Bartholomew Fair*. To this end, he employs 'realistic setting' depicting a historical fair on the stage and uses colloquial language to increase the credibility of the characters within the scope of classical principle 'decorum'. Utilizing the 'fair setting' as a huge platform, Jonson attacks contemporary morals and social institutions through a diversity of characters from different parts of society. In this sense, as a 'social realist', he lampoons the social institutions of the period such law and marriage, and moral corruption by means of bawds, whores, cutpurses and other characters that constantly smoke drink and fight. Yet, he exhibits his most severe criticism upon Puritanism mirroring Zeal-of-the-land Busy as degenerated, avaricious, and 'hypocrite'. Jonson, furthermore, reveals his moral corruptions through both his actions and his discourse. However, through his protestation against the puppet play in the final act Jonson parodies the Puritan opposition against the theatres at the time. Puritans, further, intend to close the theaters due to the representation of male and female characters together on the stage to which Jonson alludes with the puppet scene. Moreover, through the puppet scene he generates comedy together with other comical elements such as disguise and pretense and gathers all the character on the stage which also paves the way for festive ending. As a result, Jonson reveals his awareness of social problems once more through *Bartholomew Fair* and even if he seems to paint a promising picture at the end, he

knows that he depicts just the ideal which cannot become reality due to the corruption in contemporary world.

CHAPTER II

FROM A REALIST PERSPECTIVE *THE DEVIL IS AN ASS*

The Devil is an Ass is the last comedy Jonson composes before leaving the stage for a duration of ten years (1616-26). In 1616, he not only starts getting royal pension but also publishes his first folio of works. The play is also of importance because it mirrors wickedness and moral deterioration of contemporary society and represents social matters through 'the devil plot' which also provides Jonson with essential frame to exhibit his elaborative observations upon corrupted London and the political world more explicitly than his other comedies. In this regard, *The Devil is an Ass* displays 'realist Jonson' particularly through his social and political satire, realistic depiction of London life and use of "pure and neat language", even though it has been written in verse.

On the other hand, similar to *Bartholomew Fair*, *The Devil is an Ass* also displays adherence to classical rules namely plain language, three unities and decorum etc. Within this context, the events take place in a day as Satan sends Pug to the world on the condition that he will return till midnight. Moreover, the setting is London and the action predominantly takes place in Fitzdottrel's house, and Lady Tailbush house (From Act III.vi. till Act V.ii.) and around Pug, Fitzdottrel, his wife and Wittipol. As for 'decorum' the characters' discourses mostly reveal their traits, such as the flirtatious Wittipol who is a romantic character. Even if the play displays certain classical rules, the 'realist principles' are more dominant in this comedy.

The abundance of social criticism in the play mainly stems from the variety of controversial topics of the time. There are many debates at the time, which provide "sufficient reasons for the part played by social themes in drama" (Knights, 1957:

174). 1616 is the year the play was composed, was full of political scandals linked to the Jacobean regime such as Sir Robert Carr, a 'favorite' of King James I, being arrested for the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury and the strong oppositions to Prince Charles' Spanish match. Within this context, *The Devil is an Ass* alludes to certain political figures in addition to contemporary problems as monopoly, witchcraft, demonology, duello as well as the vices and follies of English society through the devil scheme. In *English Dramatists: Ben Jonson*, Richard A. Cave asserts that: "What Jonson done is to take the popular devil play and while observing it overall scheme, transform it into an apology for his own style of comedy as the more exact and rigorous in its depiction of process" (1991: 128). However, this apology could not prevent the prohibition the play on King James I's demand, making the play controversial.

According to one claim, James was disturbed by Jonson's severe criticism on 'witchcraft and demonology' of which James was a strict believer and the royal policy through economic implementations such as 'monopolies and the drainage of the drowned land'. On the other hand, certain critics like G.L. Kittredge claim that James wanted to save Jonson since he annoyed certain important public figures with his lampoons. According to David Riggs, this important public figure can be Sir Robert Carr as he was one of the favorites of James and also pivotal personage in politic matters. He claims that James "awarded the right to reclaim the fens to Sir Robert Carr" which Jonson attacked with the character Fitzdotterel trying to be "Duke of Drowned Land" and consequently "the King desired him to conceal it" (1989: 244). Although critics have various assertions about the public figures that Jonson satirized in the play –Sir Paul Either Side representing Sir Edward Coke,

Wittipol representing Jonson or Frances Fitzdotterel representing Lady Elizabeth Hatton etc.— these are only assumptions. The historical figures Jonson satirizes in *The Devil is an Ass* is less important for this study, however, than the significant and debated issues that are reflected through his realism. However, to be able to figure out the link between the historical events and the play, it would be convenient to start with a summary of the play.

The play begins in Hell with Pug, an inferior devil, begging Satan to send him to the world to tempt people to do evil. However, Satan thinks that Pug is not experienced enough to cope with human devilishness (intertwined vice and virtue). Nevertheless, Satan compels him to take a cutpurse's body that was hanged that morning and serve a man called Fitzdotterel who is obsessed with demons. On his visit to Fitzdotterel's home, his host accepts to take him to his service because he likes the name "devil". On the other hand a young gallant, Wittipol, in love with Fitzdotterel's wife, makes a deal with him to attempt to seduce his wife. According to the deal, Fitzdotterel will consent to the verbal seduction attempt for a duration of fifteen minutes (without touching her and in his presence) in return for an expensive cloak.

Meanwhile Merecraft, one of the projectors, seeking Fitzdotterel's money, plans a scheme supposedly make Fitzdotterel rich with harvesting dog's skin, making wine from raisin or making him "the Duke of Drowned Land". Thus, Merecraft convinces ostentatious Fitzdotterel to make his wife take upper class manner lesson in return for a diamond ring from a Spanish lady who turns out to be Wittipol later. Pug also tries to seduce Mistress Fitzdotterel but it ends up being beaten by Fitzdotterel. For revenge, Pug arranges a meeting between Wittipol and Mistress

Fitzdotterel (without her knowledge). Her husband is informed of the situation and becomes overprotective. Thus, Wittipol and Manly decide to rescue Mistress Fitzdotterel from this situation and within the disguise of a Spanish Lady Wittipol manages to persuade Fitzdottrel to leave all his money to his wife. However, Merecraft again convinces Fitzdotterel to accuse his wife of witchcraft and acts as if he was bewitched by her. At this point, as an ass Pug cannot handle schemes plotted by human beings as Satan had initially anticipated and ends up in Newgate Prison, being accused for stealing clothes. Finally, Satan calls Pug back to Hell leaving the dead cutpurse's body behind. When the jailors see the dead body belongs to cutpurse that was hanged that morning and realize that he is actually the devil. Fitzdotterel also learns that Pug is an actual devil so gives up acting like a bewitched person and confesses everything.

Generally speaking, the title of the play is of importance since it suggests that the fashionable devil plays of the period influenced Jonson. Especially, anonymous *Merry Devil of Edmonton* (1602) and *If This Be Not A Good Play, The Devil Is In It* (1611) written by Thomas Dekker¹¹¹ with whom Jonson involved in so-called "War of the Theatres" are said to be incentive for Jonson to write the play. In this regard, Jonson makes an explicit allusion to these plays in the prologue of *The Devil is an Ass*:

If you'll come to see new plays, pray you afford us
room,
And show this but the same face you have done
Your delight, "The Devil of Edmonton".
Or if, for want of room, it must miscarry,
'T will be but justice that your censure tarry

¹¹¹ In the "Introduction" he wrote to *The Devil is an Ass*, Peter Harpe asserts that Jonson had no animosity for Thomas Dekker while he was writing this play, on the contrary, he was in debt to Dekker in many ways and frequently alluded to Dekker's plays throughout *The Devil is an Ass* (1994:30).

Till you give some. And when six times you ha' seen't,
If this play do not like, the devil is in't.

(Prologue, 19-26)

So, Jonson decides to write this play after seeing the success of the 'devil plays' and wishes to accomplish the same delightful impression as *The Devil of Edmonton*. In fact, both the fashionable 'devil plays' Jonson used as model and *The Devil is an Ass* are rooted in medieval 'morality plays'. Thus, many similarities exist between *The Devil is an Ass* and medieval morality plays, especially in their representation of wickedness of their times.

Similar to moralities, *The Devil as Ass* begins with Satan's roars¹¹² in Hell: "Ho, ho, ho, ho, ho, ho, ho, etc. / To earth? And why to earth, thou foolish spirit?" (I.i.1-1) and ends with the devil being fooled by the wickedness of the contemporary world. Thus, the first Act is abundant in allegorical characters such as Satan, Iniquity and Pug which enable Jonson to reveal his most fierce criticism on the society which is explicitly disclosed through Satan's long tirade at the very beginning of the play:

You [Pug] are not for the manners, nor the times:
They have their vices there most like Virtues;
You cannot know them apart by any difference
They wear the same clothes, eat the same meat,
Sleep i' the selfsame beds, ride i' those coaches,
Or very like, four horses in a coach,
As the best men and women. Tissue gowns,
Garters and roses, fourscore pound a pair,
Embroidered stockings, cut-work smocks, and shirts,
More certain marks of lechery now, and pride,
Than e'er they were of true nobility (I.i. 121-22).

¹¹² Jonson adopts the beginning of the morality plays, however, 'roaring' is more common in the interludes of 1550-1557 (Harpe, 1994: 57). Thus, Jonson also adopts certain characteristics of medieval interludes in *The Devil is an Ass*.

In the above lines, Satan tries to decide whether to send Pug to earth with Iniquity so that he can do evil in the world or not. However, seeing that Iniquity¹¹³ is old and obsolete compared to the changing society values and vices, Satan resolves to send Pug alone. Thus, through executing devil scheme within the frame of morality plays, Jonson not only displays a general depravity and deterioration in society, but also he specifically refers to seven deadly sins with the words “lechery” and “pride” which are mainly committed contemporary world as in morality plays.

However, the play departs from ‘morality tradition’ to some extent when Pug comes to world. It further becomes more concrete and realistic with Jonson’s portrayals of the contemporary London especially the places where corruption is mainly observed through devil’s eye. Within this context, Satan’s being a supernatural entity that knows all the sink of corruption and ability to travel whole London, enables Jonson to give specific place names from every part of London in the play. Thus, in the first act, through Satan’s comments on corrupted London, Jonson points out the prostitution in Kentish Town (village in North London), Hoxton (I.i.16-7), and in bawdy houses such as Petticoat Lane, Shoreditch and Whitechapel (I.i.61), misjudged witch trials in Lancashire (I.i.31) and Middlesex Jury which hanged three people accusing them of witchcraft (I.i.21). As a result, it is seen that the depicted picture of London is worse than Hell and people more evil than devil himself.

Apart from the various corrupted London districts, Jonson also depicts the depravity of Londoners through a diverse set of ‘humorous’ characters such as a

¹¹³ Iniquity is the old name of ‘Vice’ used frequently in the moralities and interludes. Here, Jonson prefers ‘Iniquity’ rather than ‘vice’ probably because he aims to show its old-fashionedness compared to wickedness of the contemporary world. If the obsolete language of Iniquity is taken into consideration, it can be also possible to assert that, Jonson may intend to evoke old Iniquity of the morality plays.

trickster projector, Meerecraft, an envious husband Fitzzdoterel, and a young gallant Wittipol who tries to tempt another man's wife as he falls in love with her. Although, greed and wickedness are the common grounds for all the characters (except Mrs. Fitzzdottrel), Jonson reveals his severe criticism on greedy and avaricious society most explicitly through Fitzzdottrel and Merecraft in the play. Within this context, Merecraft is an opportunist who profits from others' covetousness as his profession to project "ways to enrich men, or make 'em great / By suits, by marriages, by undertakings" (I.vii.11-2) while, Fitzzdottrel is a money-grabber whose greed so much that even his admiration for the devil and wish to see him stems from the desire to find his "hidden treasure". Furthermore, his greed overwhelms even his excessive envy that for the sake of being fashionable with a cloak which costs fifty pound, Fitzzdottrel allows Wittipol to court his wife. He tries to convince his wife to accept to see Wittipol as follows:

Here is a clock cost fifty pound, wife,
Which I can sell for thirty, when I ha'seen
All London in't, and London has seen me.
Today I go to the Blackfriars Playhouse,
Sit I' the view, salute all my acquaintance
Rise up between the acts, let fall my cloak
Publish a handsome man, and a rich suit,
As that's a special end why we go thither,
All that pretend to stand for't o'the stage
(I.vi.28-36).

Blackfriars is the playhouse where *The Devil is an Ass* is staged, thus, Fitzdottrel, who is obsessed with devil, frequently expresses his wish to see the play. However, in the above lines, it is apparent that Fitzdottrel's wish to see the play more or less stems from his being ostentatious rather than his devil obsession. According to Jonathan Hayness, fashion is "the constant of satire" as fashionable people are

“unmasked” (1992:63). Furthermore he asserts that fashion “the true sign of aristocracy as well as of vice and folly; in the Devil is an Ass, the fashion-seeking Fitzdottrel is an ass” (Hayness, 1992:53). In this regard, Jonson not only satirizes the theatres’ being used as a place to flaunt with fashionable clothes but he also criticizes using the fashion as a tool to get a higher statue in society.

Apart from London setting and humourous characters, natural language is another significant item that reveals Jonson’s realism. In this regard, even though verse form, which Jonson uses in the play, seems to distort realistic atmosphere of *The Devil is an Ass* as Jonson believes that characters language should fit to their traits and status it is not of so much importance whether he utilizes verse form or prose form. Although the exact reason of the playwright’s use of verse is not known, Peter Harpe attributes Jonson’s verse form to his regarding a play as a poem “albeit a comic poem” (1992: 9). However, it is more probable that Jonson prefers verse form since he is mostly influenced by medieval morality plays which are written in verse as well. In either case, it can be asserted that Jonson achieves a kind of reality through characters’ speech reflecting their personality both in verse and prose. For instance, Merecraft always has a self-assertive language due to his profession as is the case with Fitzdottrel:

Keep you the land, sir,
The greatness of the estate shall throw’t upon you.
If you like better turning it to money,
What may not you, sir, purchase with that wealth?
Say you should part with two of your millions,
To be the thing you would, who would not do’t?
As protest I will, out of my dividend,
Lay for some pretty principality
In Italy, from the church: now you, perhaps,
Fancy the smoke of England rather? But—
Have you no private room, sir to draw to,
To enlarge ourselves more upon? (II.i.117-27)

In the above lines, Merecraft tries to persuade Fitzdotterel for one of his project namely to be “the duke of the drowned land”. Knowing Fitzdottrel’s sensitive points, Merecraft tries to convince him with various promises to make him rich. Likewise, Merecraft tries to convince Lady Tailbush to take the patent for “toothpicks” with some generalization and exaggerations (as he frequently asserts that his project will include the whole kingdom) claiming that the subject matter is abused as “diseases and putrefactions in the gums are bred / by those are made’ of adulterate and false wood” (IV.ii.42-4).

On the other hand, Fitzdottrel has a more simple language which shows his country background and mostly talks about money, fashion or daemon. Yet, when he acts as if he is possessed by the devil, he utilizes certain jargons such as “yellow” which is supposed to be the color of devil and Spanish words such as “*Quembremous el ojo de burlas*” (V.viii.116) or “*Oui monsieur, un pauvre diable! Diabletin!*” (V.viii.119-20). He further uses repetitions such as and speaks nonsense “Yes, wis, knight, shite, Poule, jowl, owl, foul, troule, bowl” (V.viii.109-08). Likewise, when Wittipol disguised as a Spanish lady and describes the ingredients of ‘complexion focus) to Lady Tailbush he also uses certain jargon:

Your alum scagliola, or pol di pedra:
And zuccarino; turpentine of Abezzo
Washed in nine waters; soda di levanter,
Or your fern ashes; Benjamin di gotta;
Grasso di serpe; porcellento marino;
Oils of lentisco; zucche mugia — make
The admirable varnish face [...] (IV.iv.30-6)

The use of jargon and some Spanish words may fit the Spanish lady character and create a realistic atmosphere for the audience since they do not understand them. Yet, Jonson utilizes them in order to allude to significant debated matters of the day

namely Spanish match of Prince Charles and 'witchcraft'. Furthermore, 'witchcraft' is not only quite fashionable topic of the period but also has a political connection due to King James I's interest in witchcraft. Within this context, it would be convenient to provide information about position of witchcraft in society and demonical possession.

Taking his obsession with witches into consideration, it is obvious that King James I played quite a significant role in this matter. As he attributed all sorts of magic and witchcraft to Devil he enacted very strict laws to prevent it (Tyson, 2011: 5). That is to say, someone who was involved in magic or demonical possession would end up with being hanged. Although there were only fifty executions at that time, many people especially women were charged with witchcraft who were often humiliated with such treatments as "having their bodies shaved of all hair and search made of their private parts for the witch mark" (Tyson, 2011: 10). Furthermore, like King James I, the ignorant part of London society was quite superstitious, so, they attributed all the things that they could not explain to the 'witchcraft'. This paved the way for unfair accusations and false condemnation of people.

As an intellectual who follows discussed issues of the day, Jonson does not remain indifferent to the false accusations and abuse of the matter. Thus, throughout *The Devil is an Ass* he alludes to some specific cases to underline his criticism on this issue conspicuously. Accordingly, the play begins with a severe criticism of contemporary witch trials which are revealed through Satan's tirade to Pug:

You have some plot now
Upon a tunning of ale, to stale the yeast,
Or keep the churn so that the butter come not,
Spite o' the housewives cord, or her hot spit?
Or some good ribibe about Kentish Town,
Or Hogsden, you would hang now for a witch,

Because she will not let you play round Robin;
And you'll go sour the citizens' cream 'gainst Sunday,
That she may be accus'd for't, and condemn'd
By a Middlesex jury, to the satisfaction
Of their offended friends, the Londoners' wives,
Whose teeth were set on edge with it? (I.i.12-23)

The abovementioned Middlesex jury convicted three people namely Elizabeth Rutter, Joan Hunt, and Agnes Berry of witchcraft and hanged them in 1615. Agnes Berry was indicted for “languish and waste away” of Grace Halsey while Elizabeth Rutter and Joan Hunt were accused of murder by witchcraft (Kittredge, 1911: 1). Therefore, here Jonson satirizes the folly and “credulity” of the Middlesex Jury which convicted people of such absurd charges as “souring the citizen’s cream ’gainst Sunday” and gave them capital punishment.

Even though there are references to the conjurers, magic and it’s being banned, the most explicit satire on witchcraft is observed in the fifth act when Merecraft convinces Fitzdotterel to pretend he is bewitched by his wife. For the sake of taking his money back Merecraft gives clues to Fitzdotterel about acting like a bewitched person and says that: “teach you some tricks to make your belly swell / And your eyes turn, to foam, to stare, to gnash/ Your teeth together and to beat yourself/ Laugh loud, and feign six voices”(V.v.25-8) Furthermore, for Merecraft pretending like possessed by the demon is child’s play thus he tries to reassure him: “Sir be confident, / ’Tis no hard thing t’outdo the Devil in: / A boy o’thirteen year old made him an ass/ But t’other day” (V.v. 48-51). Actually, with these words not only does Jonson criticize how easily the society was deceived by a person claiming to be a witch but he also refers to the well-known Leicestershire case explicitly.

That is to say, in July 1616 fifteen women were accused of bewitching a thirteen- year-old boy John Smith and all of them were sentenced with capital punishment nine of whom were carried out instantly. However, as King James was attended some trials personally and followed many witch trials closely, he wanted to examine Smith himself and found out that Smith was just an imposter. Therefore, Sir Edward Coke who was in charge of the trial was dismissed and the remaining six women were released. Within this context, Jonson represents Sir Paul Etheirsides like Coke as one of biased and fool judges of the period who is deceived by the typical ploy of demonic possession and attributes every action of Fitzdottrel to demon without listening Wittipol's defense. Jonson uncovers his criticism via Wittipol's reaction against Sir Paul Ethersides: "If I had/ All innocence of man to be endangered, / And he could save, or ruin it, I'd not brathe/ A syllable in request to such a fool/ He makes himself" (V.viii.83-7). To sum up, Jonson combines his criticism on witchcraft to the criticism on covetousness since Fitzdottrel's accusation of bewitchment against his wife stems from his love for money. At this point, Jonson switches his criticism on covetousness in society to the covetousness in government policy, thus, criticizes the economic policy of the government.

The political criticism penetrates into the main plot of the play that Jonson explicitly satirizes the contemporary political issues through certain characters such as Merecraft, Fitzdottrel and Lady Tailbush etc. Within this context, in *Drama & Society in the Age of Jonson*, L.C. Knights claims that: "In all of Jonson's plays we are conscious that he is observing a contemporary world, but never before had he handled a major political issue so effectively" (1957: 212). Thus, if a closer look is taken at *The Devil is an Ass* it is seen that Jonson mainly dwells upon such political

matters as: monopoly system, patent system and project of drain etc. To begin with, it would be best to give brief information about “monopoly system” which is regarded as the seeds of capitalism and quite prevalent at the time.

The monopoly system to which Jonson frequently alludes throughout the play, started under the rule of Queen Elizabeth as granting some privileges to favored men “as a means of revenue to the crown or as a reward for services rendered” (Miller, 1907: 2). As it provided the crown with revenue growth and enlivened the economy, the number of monopolies reached its peak. Yet, monopolies did not bring prosperity to public quite the contrary, it led to “raising prices, debasing quality and attributing unemployment” (Kent, 2007: 217). The abusive use of monopoly system increased under the reign of King James I when he granted monopolies with arbitrary patents in order to increase the number of monopolies.

Jonson satirizes the monopoly system through the character Merecraft who acts as a projector in the play. That is to say, every schemes of Merecraft is an attack of Jonson on monopoly system the first of which is making Fitzdottrel “the duke of drowned land”:

I'll drive his patent for him.
We'll take in citizens, commoners, and aldermen,
To bear the charge and blow 'em off again
Like so many dead flies, when 'tis carried.
The thing is for recovery of drowned land,
Whereof the Crown's to have his moiety
If it be owner; else the Crown and owners
To share that moiety, and the recoverers
To 'enjoy the tother moiety for their charge
(II.i.41-48).

Making Fitzdotterel the duke of the drowned land is just one of the schemes that Merecraft projects through which Jonson also draws attention to another important

point 'the project of drain'. The 'project of drain' occurred with the flood of 1613 which stemmed from the fact that drainage system became insufficient as it was used since medieval times. To make use of these lands, King James provided his favorite men with patent to drain the drowned land and fens. This also gave him the chance to assume the title of 'duke' upon his men. Moreover, the conversation between Merecraft and Fitzdottrel points out this fact overtly when Merecraft says: "To be Duke of those lands you shall recover: take / Your title thence, sir, Duke of the Drowned-lands, / Or Drowned-land" (II.v. 18-21). Here, in addition to abusive use of patent system and the royal profit Jonson also criticizes arbitrariness and convenience of being entitled as a "duke".

Merecraft has also other schemes to make Fitzdotterel rich which are impossible to practice such as 'making glove out of dog skins' or 'making wine of raisins'. However, through his another project namely "master of dependancies" Jonson also intends to criticize increasing number of duels. In the edited version of *The Devil is an Ass*, Peter Happe explains dependencies as: "a quarrel or affair of honour awaiting settlement" and continues to give details about the procedure: "Such affairs were often taken over by bullies and thugs, who were called Masters. Merecraft's scheme is a project to set up a state monopoly for settling such affairs as "turning the Masters into an official appointment" (Happe, 1994: 139). Within this context, a state dependence serves as a kind of court which decides whether a duel takes place or not. Although Jonson's criticism upon duello may be considered as a self-criticism with regards to his killing Gabriel Spenser in a duel, his actual satire is again on the state monopolies.

To sum up, with *The Devil is an Ass*, Jonson displays how closely he observes the contemporary matters with a realistic perspective. His realism is mostly revealed through London setting which he knows by heart and his deep analysis of the London society which composes of depraved, corrupted and wicked people. At this point, Jonson adopts a two dimensional criticism in the play. On the surface he depicts how vice and folly of Jacobean society make fool of the devil. However, on the deeper level he satirizes the contemporary matters through public figures and specific cases which are the matters not only this study strives to examine but also make the play convenient to exemplify Jonson's realist perspective. That is to say, as a pretty good observer Jonson is cognizant of the corruption in the society. While through his satire on the abuse of witchcraft he criticizes ignorant people who believe every unfounded allegations of witchcraft thus are deceived easily and even sentenced to death with unreasonable and false accusations, through his satire on the abuse of monopoly system he attacks the covetousness of the people and the corrupted economic policy of government. So to speak, when Jonson's observations merge with his satires they turn into a weapon to attack the contemporary social affairs. In this way, Jonson resists Jacobean society who tries to make him turn into an ass; on the contrary, he manages to make an ass of Jacobean society through his satires.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study has been to present 'classicism' and 'realism' in Ben Jonson's selected comedies: *Every Man out of his Humour*, *Poetaster*, *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Devil is an Ass*. Within the scope of this study, it has been observed that Jonson's classicism, which originates from his classical education and great admiration for classics, does not preclude his realism, which is rather 'social' than 'real'. On the contrary, classicism and realism converges in his works. Within this context, Jonson composes his plays in accordance with classical principles, yet, as result of his 'realism' he chooses contemporary matters to handle in his works. In other words, his 'classicism' constitutes the 'form' of his plays while his 'realism' represents the 'content'. However, the first part includes background information giving the key historical events of the age which is very significant in terms of having a better understanding of Jonson's comedies. On the other hand, the second part of this study focuses on Jonson within the frame of 'classicism' while the third part handles him as a 'realist' playwright.

The first part mainly has dealt with the Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline Age since Jonson witnesses the social, political and religious problems resulting from changes on the throne and alludes to them in his plays. Specifically, the survey presented in Part I has focused on religious reformation which took place following Henry VIII's decision to break off with the Roman Catholic Church. Thus religion plays a crucial role in Renaissance England having effect on financial, political policy and social life. Furthermore the deadlock of England between Catholicism and Protestantism mainly in the reigns of Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth has been handled in this part. And finally political and financial policy, in the reigns of James

I and Charles I have been discussed in detail since they shed light to the events that Jonson deals in his works.

In Part II, Jonson has been examined as one of the distinguished classicist playwrights of Renaissance Period. It has been revealed that certain contemporary literary men such as John Donne and John Dryden praised him due to the fact that he brought high standard to the English Drama through imitating and borrowing classics notably Horace and Aristotle. Thus, “imitation” is the primary principle which not only underlies Jonson’s classicism but also paves the way for forming his own style. In this respect, he displays a didactic purpose, five-structure plot and conformity to such classical principles as the three unities, and decorum.

However, it has been also observed that Jonson does not imitate classics slavishly but reveals his own style in his works. In this regard, although Jonson conforms to Aristotelian principles “unity of time”, “unity of place” and “unity of action”, he sometimes disregards them due to his didactic purpose in the play. On the other hand, he shows an unexceptional adherence to classical principle “decorum” in his works. Within this context, it has been seen that his adaptation of ‘humour’ theory is derived from his effort to conform to decorum. Similar to allegorical characters in morality plays who represents a moral or sin, Jonson depicts flesh and blood characters that represent a dominant trait in comedy of humours. In this way, he displays a consistency both in characterization and their discourse.

Chapter I has been devoted to examination of his ‘comical satire’ *Every Man out of his Humour* in terms of classical principles. It has been revealed that in the play Jonson displays the fundamental elements of his classicism as long as they serve his aim, which is to criticize certain immoralities through ‘humorous

characters'. Within this context, he neglects 'unity of action' as he attaches particular importance to characterization. Furthermore, it has been observed that he imitates Greek writer Theophrastus in characterization and Aristophanes' *Vetus Comedia* in form through use of long induction, chorus and Old Comedies' parts namely *prologus*, *parados*, *agon*, *parabasis* and *exodos*. Yet, Jonson exhibits his difference shifting the parts and bringing certain innovations which render the play quite experimental. However experimental the play is, as a classicist playwright Jonson adheres to classical principles such as unity of place and decorum. Thus, it has been observed that even if the play does not depict 'full-blooded classicist Jonson', it is of importance in terms of revealing the fact that Jonson is not a slave of classics or mocking bird; on the contrary, he always reflects his style even if he imitates classic adapting classical ideas and principles and borrowing from them.

In *Poetaster* the second classicist play of Jonson examined in Part II, it has been observed that Jonson displays his deep classical knowledge by presenting leading classical poets of Augustan Age such as Horace, Ovid or Virgil on the stage. It also enables Jonson to satirize his contemporary colleagues by showing them the difference between poetasters such as Crispinus, Demetrius and poets such as Virgil and Horace. Thus, the play is the best example among Jonson's comedies that converges 'classicism', which is displayed through use of certain borrowings from classics and conformity to classical principles, and 'realism', which is revealed through strict satire on contemporary poesy, in itself. Apart from these, morality also plays a crucial role in *Poetaster* since Jonson intends to instruct the society as well as amuse them. In the light of this, Jonson ends the play with giving a moral to the poets that they should be virtuous and ethic first in order to mention morality.

Part III has been devoted to study of Jonson as a representative of realism which is mostly displayed with his realistic perspective and certain attacks on contemporary matters in his plays. Actually, his classicism makes Jonson 'realist' since he obtains from Horace the idea that "poetry should both instruct and please" while from Cicero's definition of comedy he adopts that comedy should be "an imitation of life", "a mirror of manners" and "an image of truth". In other words, Jonson gains a 'didactic purpose' from Horace, in order to satirize vice and follies of the time, and a 'realist perspective' from Cicero, which leads him to handling with contemporary matters, manners and problems. As a result of dealing with contemporary follies and matter, Jonson becomes a 'social realist' who regards the stage as a huge mirror reflecting time's deformities similar to the Henrik Ibsen and Bernard Shaw.

It has been also observed that the primary requirement of social realism is to be a 'good observer' which Jonson quite conforms to. Within this context, Jonson observes different milieus and satirizes the corrupted values by using certain realistic elements such as 'realistic setting', which is mainly displayed in his London city comedies, and 'natural language', which is derived from Jonson's adaptation of classical principle "decorum", (as for him 'natural language' signifies the harmony between character's traits and their discourses). However, his most effective weapons are 'humour' and 'satire' which he mainly utilizes in his social criticism. In regard to 'humour', it is apparent that Jonson uses the theory as a part of his didactic purpose and the aim of giving moral similar to morality plays. Yet, from an abstract world of moralities Jonson turns to the world people live in, thus, relieves drama of religious doctrines and allegories by means of 'humourous' characters.

Part III, Chapter I has focused on *Bartholomew Fair* a city comedy quite distinctive with its social satire. Within this context, the fair setting which serves Jonson's social criticism in many terms is actually originated from historical *Bartholomew Fair*. Although the historical fair has both sacred and secular significance, Jonson depicts the fair as the sink of sin consisting of mainly bawds, prostitutes and booths that serve drinks. In accordance with his didactic purpose, which is to criticize contemporary law, religion and marriage and moral deformation, Jonson displays the fair as a meeting point of people from different social ranks. The social ranks of characters are revealed through the use of life like language and the repetitive words. Thus, in the play through depicting a dark picture of corrupted world in which even religion is corrupted and most people just eat, drink, smoke, steal and fight Jonson not only reveals the moral corruption in the society but also displays his strong criticism on hypocrite Puritans.

In *The Devil is an Ass*, the second realist play of Jonson examined in Part III, the playwright displays a more degenerated world than of *Bartholomew Fair* in which even the devil is fooled in the face of vice and evilness of the society. As a social critic, Jonson reflects his awareness of the contemporary political world by dwelling upon major political issues such as monopoly system, patent system and project of drain etc. so effectively that the play turns into a remarkable indicative of Jonson's political criticism. Except from political satire, the play also includes a harsh criticism on the vice of the time through 'devil plot' and follies of the society through ridiculing such superstitious beliefs as witchcraft. In this way, Jonson displays his social realism by depicting a world which is worse than hell and people who are evil than the Satan.

In conclusion, the plays discussed in this study have helped to reveal the fact that Jonson is representative of both classicism and realism in his comedies. Although he does not conform to the principles of neither classicism nor realism slavishly, he adopts the classical principles in accordance with his didactic purpose while utilizing realistic principles in order to satirize contemporary social matters. Within this context, it is the “matter” that determines his way of writing since he utilizes both classical and realist elements in accordance with his matter that he handles in his plays. Thus, he sometimes disregards certain classical or realist items in order to underline his didactic intension. Last but not least, it would be best to end this study with the words he mostly quotes which also summarizes both his classicist and realist aspect: “Words above action, matters above words”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Jonson, B., (1981), "Poetaster or His Arraignment". *The Complete Plays of Ben Jonson*, Ed. G. A. Wilkes. Oxford: Clarendon Press,
- (1981), "Every Man out of His Humour". *The Complete Plays of Ben Jonson*, Ed. G. A. Wilkes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.,
- (1994). *The Devil is an Ass*. Ed. Peter Happe. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- (1989), "Bartholomew Fair". *The Selected Plays of Ben Jonson*, Ed. Martin Butler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Secondary Sources

- Abbott, J., (1900), *History of King Charles the First of England*, Philadelphia: Henry Altemus Com.
- Abrams, H. M., (1998), *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Alford, S., (2002), *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aristotle, (1895), *The Poetics of Aristotle*. trans. Butcher S.H, London: Macmillan.
- Baldwin, C. E. (1901), "Ben Jonson's Indebtedness to the Greek Character-Sketch". *Modern Language Notes*, 16 (7), 193-198.
- Baskervill, R., C., (1911), *English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy*, Texas: Texas University Press.
- Baum, W., H., (1947), *The Satiric and the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy*, Chapel

- Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Bednarz, J.(2001), *Shakespeare & the Poet's War*, New York: Colombia University Press.
- (2004),“The Elizabethan Dramatists as Literary Critics”, *Bloom's Period Studies: Elizabethan Drama*, Ed. Harold Bloom. USA: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Bell, I., (2010), *Elizabeth I the Voice of Monarch*, United States: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bennet, E., C., Hammond, A., W.,(1902), “Introduction”, *The Characters of Theophrastus*, London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Block S., J.(2004),“The Rise of the Tudor State”, *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, Ed. Robert Titler, Norman Jones. USA: The Blackwell Publishing,
- Bowker, M. (2000) “The English Reformation and the Parish Clergy”,*The English Reformation Revised*, Ed. Christopher Haigh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryant J., J., (1984), *Tudor Drama and Religious Controversy*, United States of America: Mercer Universtiy Press.
- Cave, A., R., (1991), *English Dramatists: Ben Jonson*, Ed. Bruce King. London: Macmillan.
- (1991), *Ben Jonson*. United States: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Child W., G., (1890), *Church and the State under the Tudors*. London: Longman.
- Creighton, M., (1920), *Queen Elizabeth*, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Croft, P., (2003), *King James*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Cuddon, A., J., (2013), *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*., 5th ed.
Revised by M. A. R. Habib. USA: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Davies, C., S., L., (1968), "The Pilgrimage of Grace Reconsidered". *Past & Present*,
41, 54-76.
- Dahlmann, F., E.,(1884), *History of the English Revolution*, London: Longman,
Brown, Green and Longmans.
- Dickens, A., G., (1964), *The English Reformation*, London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Donaldson, I., (1977), *Jonson's Magic Houses*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Doran, S., (2003), "Elizabeth I, Gender, Power & Politics", *History Today*. 53 (5).
- Downs, W., M., Wright, A., L., Romsey, E., (2013), *The Art of Theatre Then and
Now*, Third Edition, USA: Wadsworth.
- Dryden, J., (1881), *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, Ed. Arnold Thomas, Oxford:
Clarendon Press.
- Craig, D., H., Ed. (1990), "Charles Fitzgeffrey on Jonson 1601", *The Critical
Heritage: Ben Jonson*. London: Routledge.
- "John Dryden explains his view of Jonson (1671)" *The Critical
Heritage: Ben Jonson*. London: Routledge.
- Flint, W., Hibbard, A., (1960), *A Handbook to Literature*. (Revised and enlarged by
C. Hugh Holman). NewYork: The Odyssey Press.
- Gair, W., R.,(2004), "John Marston's Contemporary Reputation", *Antonio and
Mellida*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gardiner, R., S., (1895), *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution 1603-
1660*, New York: Charles Scribner's Son.
- Greenhalgh, M., (1978), *What is Classicism?*, London: Academy Editions.

- Goodlad, G.,(2007), "The Cromwellian Protectorate". *History Review*.
- Goodman, E., (1995), *The Origins of Western Legal Tradition from Thales to the Tudors*, Sydney: Federation Press.
- Graham E., David L., S., (2001), *The Early Stuart Kings, 1603-1642*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Graham, K., E., (1906), "Ben Jonson and the Character Writers", *The Sewanee Review*, 14 (3), 299-305.
- Gregg, P., (1981), *King Charles I*, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Guy, J., (2010), *The Tudors: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hackett, H. (2013), *A Short History of English Renaissance Drama*, London and New York: I.B. Tauris,.
- Hayness, J., (1992), *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theater*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herford, C., H., Simpson. P.,Simpson, E., eds.(1950), *Ben Jonson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hight, G., (1976), *The Classical tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutton, R., (2000), "The Local Impact of the Tudor Reformations", *The English Reformation Revised*, Ed. Christopher Haigh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jonson, B., (1903), "Epigrams". *The Works of Ben Jonson with Critical and Explanatory Notes and a Memoir by William Gifford*, Ed. Francis Cunningham. London: Chatto & Windus.

- (1906), *Conversation of Ben Jonson with William Drummond*. Ed. Philip Sidney. London: Gay and Bird.
- (1989), "The Alchemist", *The Selected Plays of Ben Jonson*. Ed. Martin Butler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
- (1892), *Timber of Discoveries Made Upon Men and Matter*. Ed. Felix E. Schelling. Boston: Ginn&Company.
- (1987), "The Epistle". *Literary Theory and Criticism from the Greeks to the Present*. Vol.III. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Kallich, M., (1942), "Unity of Time in *Every Man in his Humour* and *Cynthia's Revels*". *Modern Language Notes*, 57(6), 445-49.
- Kay, D., (1995), *Ben Jonson: A Literary Life*, New York: St. Martin's Press,.
- Kennedy, W., M., P., (1916), *Studies in Tudor History*, London: Constable and Company Ltd.
- Kent, L., M., (2007), *The British Enlightenment and the Spirit of the Industrial Revolution: The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (1754-1815)*. United States: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Kittredge, G., L., (1911) "King James I and "The Devil is an Ass" . *Modern Philology*, 9(2). 195-209.
- Knights, L., C.,(1957), *Drama & Society in the Age of Jonson*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Know, J., (1855), "The First Blast of The Trumpet Against the Monstrous regiment

- of Women”, *Works of John Knox*, Ed. David Laing, Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club,. 349-423.
- Lacy, S., (2011), “Staging the Contemporary: Politics and Practice in Post-War Social Realist Theatre”, *British Social Realism in Arts since 1940*, Ed. David Tucker, 57-80.
- Lee, J., S.,(2007),*The Mid Tudors: Edward VI and Mary, 1547-1558*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Loach, J., (1991), “*Mary Tudor and the re-Catholicization of England*”, *History Today*, 12(3).
- Loades, D., (2006), “Introduction: The Personal Religion of Mary I”,*The Church of Mary Tudor*, Ed. Eammon Duffy, David Loaches, England: Ashgate.
- Loxley, J., (2002), *The Complete Critical Guide to Ben Jonson*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Mallory, S., H., (1905), “Introduction: Literary Sources”, Ben Jonson, *Poetaster*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Markham, R., C., (1908), *King Edward VI: An Appreciation*, New York: E.P.Dutton Company & London: Smith Elder Co.
- McEven, A., K., (1945), “Jonson and Juvenal”, *The Review of English Studies*, 21(82).
- McIlwain, H., C., (1918), *The Political Works of James I*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Miles, R., (1990), *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Miller, T., S., (1907), “The Case of the Monopolies: Some of Its Results and Suggestions”,*Michigan Law Review*, 6(1), 1-24.

- Morril, J., (2005), *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moul, V., (2006), "Ben Jonson's Poetaster: Classical Tradition and the Location of Cultural Authority", *Translation and Literature*, 15 (1), 21-46.
- (2010), "Introduction: Imitation, allusion, translation: reading Jonson's Horace", *Jonson, Horace and the Classical Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullett, M., (2010), *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation*, Toronto: The Scarecrow Press Inc.
- Mulryan, J., (2000), "Jonson's Classicism", *Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, Ed. Richard –Harp, Stanley Steward. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newcombe, D., G., (1995), *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*, London and NewYork: Routledge.
- Neil, J., (2003), "Remember, Remember", *Britain*, 80 (6), 47-50.
- Nicoll, A., (1945), *British Drama: An Historical Survey from the Beginnings to the Present Time*, London: George G. Harrap & Company LTD.
- Nicholls, M., (2007), "Strategy and Motivation in Gunpowder Plot", *The Historical Journal*. 50(4), 787-807.
- Ord, M., (2002), "Classical and contemporary Italy in Roger Ascham's The Scholemaster (1570)", *Renaissance Studies*, 16 (2), 202–216.
- Ostovich, H., (2001), "Introduction". *Every Man out of his Humour*. By Ben Jonson. USA: Manchester University Press.
- Parker, B., (1999), "Introduction", *Volpone*, By Ben Jonson. USA: Manchester

University Press.

Paster, K., G., (2004), *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearian Stage*,

USA: University of Chicago Press.

Patterson, W., B., (2004), "James VI and I and the King James Version". Rev. of

God's Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible by Adam Nicholas,

The Sewanee Review, 112(3), 417-427.

Patridge, B., E., (1958), *The Broken Compass: A Study of the Major Comedies of*

Ben Jonson, London: Chatto & Windus.

Pinciss G., M., (1995), "Bartholomew Fair and Jonsonian Tolerance", *Studies in*

English Literature, 1500-1900, Tudor and Stuart Drama. 35 (2), 345-359.

Pollard, A., F., (1929), *The History of England: From the Accession of England to*

the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603), London and New York: Longmans,

Green and Co.

Rowse, A., L., (1972), *The Elizabethan Renaissance the Cultural Achievement*,

London: Macmillan.

Potolsky, M., (2006), *Mimesis*, New York and London: Routledge.

Powers, G., W., (1897), *England and the Reformation (A.D. 1485-1603)*, New York:

Blackie & Son.

Redwine, D., J., (1961), "Beyond Psychology: The Moral Basis of Jonson's –

Theory of Humour Characterization". *ELH*, 28 (4), 316-334.

Richard, J., (2007), "Edward VI and Mary Tudor: Protestant King and Catholic

Sister". *History Review*. 59, 18-22.

Riggs, D., (1989), *Ben Jonson: A Life*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rosman, D., (1996), *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor*

- and Stuart England*. London: UCL Press.
- Russell, C., (1984), "Why did Charles I Fight the Civil War". *History Today*, 34 (6), 31-34.
- Seel, G., Smith, D., (2001), *The Early Stuart Kings, 1603-1642*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Small, R., A., (1899), *The Stage-Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters*, Breslau: Verlag von M.& H. Marcus.
- Spiller, J., (2008), "James I and the Puritans", *History Review*, 61.
- Spinks, B., (2006), "From Elizabeth I to Charles II", *The Oxford Guide to The Book of Common Prayer : A Worldwide Survey: A Worthwide Survey*, Eds. Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stater, V., (2002), *The Political History of Tudor and Stuart England*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Steggle, M.(2010), "Jonson in the Elizabethan Period", *Ben Jonson in Context*, Ed. Julie Sanders, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steward, S., (2000), "Jonson's Criticism", *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*. Eds. Richard Harp and Stanley Stewart, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stroud, A., (1999), *Stuart England*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Trevelyan, M., G., (1912), *England Under Stuarts*, London: Methuen& Co. Ltd.
- Tyson, D., (2011), *The Demonology of King James I: Includes the Original Text of Demonologie and News from Scotland*, United States of America: Llewellyn Publication.

Wagner, J., A., Schmid, S., W., (Eds), (2012), *Encyclopedia of Tudor England*, USA:

ABC-CLIO.

Webster, T., (2003), "Religion in Early Stuart Britain", *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, Ed.

Barry Coward, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Womack, P., (1986), *Ben Jonson*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

—— (2006), *English Renaissance Drama*, USA: Blackwell Publishing.

—— (2008), "The Comical Scene: Perspective and Civility on the Renaissance Stage". *Representations*. University of California Press.

Wormald, J., (2002), "James VI & I", *History Today*.: 52 (6), 27-33

ÖZET

‘Yeniden doğuş’ anlamına gelen ‘Rönesans’da, edebiyat ve sanatta Ortaçağın skolastik düşüncesine karşı çıkarak Yunan ve Roma klasiklerine yeniden dönme eğilimi gösteren Hümanizm ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, İngiliz Rönesans tiyatrosu, ağırlıklı olarak dini öğeler ve konular barındıran Ortaçağ tiyatrosu anlayışından uzaklaşarak, daha seküler konulara yönelmiş ve ürünlerini Shakespeare, Marlowe ve Fletcher gibi birçok önemli oyun yazarının eserlerinde göstermiştir.

Rönesans döneminin en önemli ve etkili oyun yazarlarından biri olan Ben Jonson (1572-1637) da hem yazdığı şehir komediyalarıyla İngiliz edebiyatına kazandırdığı “tipler komedyası”yla (comedy of humors) çığır açmış, hem de Yunan ve Roma klasikleriyle ilgili derin bilgisine dayanan ve bu doğrultuda klasik yazınsal kurallara uyan oyunlarıyla klasik bir Rönesans dönemi oyun yazarı olduğunu kanıtlamıştır. Ancak, Jonson İngiliz edebiyatına kattığı yeniliklere ve etkilediği yazarlara rağmen, hak ettiği değeri görememiştir. Türkiye’de de ne yazık ki üzerine yeterince akademik çalışma yapılmamıştır. Bu yüzden bu çalışma Jonson’ın klasik biçim yanlısı ve realist yönünü oyunlarıyla örneklendirerek ortaya koymasının yanı sıra, yazar üstüne yapılmış nadir akademik çalışmalardan biridir.

Ben Jonson’un eserlerine bakıldığında, sadece Rönesans geleneğinin bir parçası olarak ‘Klasik biçim yanlısı’ olmadığı, aynı zamanda modern anlamda, çağından çok öte, bir ‘Realist’ olduğu görülmektedir. Jonson bir ‘Klasik biçim yanlısı’ olarak söz konusu dönemde birçok klasik eserin yeniden yazılması veya İngilizceye çevrilmesi, eserlerin konularını klasiklerden alması veya klasik kurallar çerçevesinde yazılmasından birçok oyun yazarı gibi etkilenmiştir. Bu yönüyle, Jonson, Rönesans’ın önde gelen klasik biçim yanlısı yazarlarından biri olarak

addedilmiştir. Öte yandan, Elizabeth, Kral I. James (Jacobean Period) ve Kral I. Charles (Caroline Period) olmak üzere üç ayrı döneme şahit olan Jonson, taht değişiklikleri sonucunda ortaya çıkan sorunları ve toplumsal değişiklikleri yakından gözlemleyip, giderek artan toplumsal yozlaşmayı ve siyasi değişimleri oyunlarında hicvederek aynı zamanda bir 'realist' olduğunu da göstermiştir. Jonson'ın klasisizm etkisiyle yazması ve oyunlarının 'klasik' olarak nitelendirilmesi arzusu, dönemin olaylarını göz ardı etmesine ve var olan çarpıklıklara kayıtsız kalmasına yol açmamıştır. Tam aksine, yazar oyunlarında Rönesans İngiltere'sindeki toplumun ikiyüzlülüğünü, açgözlülüğünü, ahlâksızlığını, erdemsizliğini ve benzeri çarpıklıkları hicvetmiştir. Bu yüzden, Jonson sadece klasik biçim yanlısı değil aynı zamanda tam bir 'realist' ve ahlâk kuramcısıdır. Dolayısıyla, oyunlarını klasisizm ve realizm bağlamında incelemek, eserlerini ve eserlerinin altında yatan unsurları daha iyi anlamak açısından oldukça önemlidir. Ancak, Jonson eserlerinde dönemin toplumsal ve siyasal olaylarına sıklıkla göndermede bulunduğu için dönemin önemli tarihsel bilgilerini vermek Jonson'ın komedilerini anlamak açısından oldukça önemlidir.

Bu çalışma üç ana bölümden oluşmaktadır; ilk bölümde tarihsel bilgi verilirken ikinci ve üçüncü bölümlerde Jonson'ın dört komedisi ele alınmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, komedi biçiminde yazılmış iki hiciv (comical satire) olan *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599), *Poetaster* (1601), 'klasisizm' bağlamında ve iki şehir komedyası (city comedy) *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) ve *The Devil is an Ass* (1616) 'realizm' bağlamında incelenmiştir. Bu bakımdan, oyunlarda klasik yazarlara yapılan göndermelerin anlatılmasının yanı sıra, Jonson'ın dönemin toplumsal olaylarını takip edip oyunlarda sıkça hicvettiği veya ele aldığı, toplumsal yozlaşma, Püritenler ve dönemin ekonomik yapısı gibi olaylar incelenmiştir. Ayrıca Jonson'ın tam bir ahlâk

kuramcısı olmasından dolayı oyunlarına öğretici bir amaç yüklemesi ele alınmış, sadece dönemin önemli olaylarını değil, dönemin insanlarında görülen açgözlülük, erdemsizlik, ikiyüzlülük gibi özellikleri de eleştirmesi üzerinde durulmuştur.

İlk bölüm, Jonson'ın komedilerine temel oluşturan Elizabeth, Jacobean ve Caroline dönemlerinin toplumsal, siyasi ve dini olaylarına ayrılmıştır. Bu bölümde esas olarak, Henry VIII'in Katolik Roma Kilise'sinden ayrılma kararıyla dinin, toplumsal, ekonomik ve siyasi olaylar üzerinde söz sahibi olması ve toplumsal yaşamı etkileyen en önemli unsur haline gelmesinden ötürü, 'dini reformasyon' üzerinde durulmuştur. Ayrıca, özellikle Kraliçe Mary ve Kraliçe Elizabeth dönemindeki İngiltere'nin Katoliklik ve Protestanlık arasındaki çıkmazı detaylı bir şekilde ele alınmıştır. Son olarak, Jonson'ın eserlerinde ele aldığı konulara ışık tutacağı için James I ve Charles I dönemlerinin siyasi ve ekonomik olayları bu bölümde tartışılmıştır.

İkinci bölümde 'klasik biçim yanlısı' bir yazar olarak Jonson'ın oyunlarında üç birlik kuralı, 'decorum' ve beşli perde yapısı gibi klasik öğelere yer verdiği görülmüştür. Bunun yanı sıra birçok klasik yazarı okuma fırsatı olan ve aldığı klasik eğitimle diğer Rönesans yazarlarından farkını ortaya koyan Jonson, oyunlarını Aristotile, Horace, Cicero ve Aristophanes gibi klasiklerin ışığı altında yazdığını, yaptığı göndermelerle sıklıkla gözler önüne serer. Bu bağlamda, Jonson'ın oyunlarının 'klassisizm' açısından incelendiği ilk bölüm iki alt başlıktan oluşmaktadır. İlk olarak *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599) adlı oyundaki klasik öğeler incelenmekte, Jonson'ın bir klasik biçim yanlısı olmasına ve belirli klasik öğeleri uygulamasına rağmen klasiklere sorgulamadan bağlı kalmadığı ve her zaman kendi tarzını ortaya koyduğu gösterilmektedir. Ele alınan ikinci oyun olan

Poetaster'de ise Jonson'un klasik öğelere daha sıkı sıkıya bağlı kaldığı görülmekle birlikte Jonson'un ahlâkçı yönü de gözler önüne serilmektedir.

Jonson 'realist' bir oyun yazarı olarak ele alındığı üçüncü bölümde oyunlarındaki gerçekçi 'mekân' ve 'anlatım' gibi bazı realist öğelerin yanı sıra toplumsal olayları hicvetmesi incelenmekte olup, Jonson'un realizminin daha çok 'sosyal realizm' olduğu ortaya koyulmaktadır. Öyle ki, klasisizmin de verdiği bir ahlâkçılıkla, Jonson, oyunlarında eğitici bir amaç güttüğü için tipleri (humours) toplumsal yergide bir araç olarak kullanarak insanları bilinçlendirmeyi amaçlar. Dolayısıyla, onun için önemli olan olay örgüsü değil 'mesele'lerdir (matters) bu sebeple 'meseleler' de toplumsal ve siyasi olaylar üzerine kurulur. Bu bilgiler ışığında ikinci bölümde ele alınan ilk oyun *Bartholomew Fair*'dir. Bu oyunda, Jonson'un realist öğeler kullanırken, bunların sosyal bir mesaj vermek için kullandığı görülür. Öyle ki, mekân olarak toplumun her kesiminden insanların bir araya geldiği 'fuar'ı kullanarak Jonson, evlilik ve din gibi birçok sosyal kurumu eleştirmenin yanı sıra karakterleri içkici ve kavgacı kişiler olarak yansıtarak toplumsal bozulmayı da gözler önüne sermiştir. Çalışmanın son incelenen oyunu olan *The Devil is an Ass*'de ise daha çok dönemin politik ve ekonomik olaylarını hicvederek Jonson farkındalığını ortaya koymuş, toplumu da yaşanan olaylar konusunda bilinçlendirmeyi amaçlamıştır. Diğer taraftan, 'moralite oyunları'nı andıran olay örgüsüyle de toplumdaki yozlaşmayı ve toplumsal değerlerin yitirilmesini bir kez daha eleştirmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, Jonson'un hem klasik biçim yanlısı hem de realist bir oyun yazarı olduğu, oyunlarında klasisizmden daha çok biçim bakımından faydalandığı ve içerik açısından ele aldığı konuların ise realizme örnek oluşturduğu ortaya

konmuştur. Öyle ki, beşli perde yapısı ve üç birlik kuralı gibi klasik öğelerle oyunlarının çerçevesini oluşturan Jonson'ın, çerçevenin içini dönemin toplumsal ve siyasi olayları ve kendi döneminde yaşayan insanların ahlâksızlığı ve erdemsizliğiyle doldurduğu görülmüştür. Buna ek olarak, Jonson'ın klasik yazarlardan edindiği 'eğitici' (didactic) bir amaçla oyunlarını yazmasından ötürü tam bir ahlak kuramcısı olduğu görülür; ahlak dersi verme çabası da kendisini dönemin olaylarını eleştirmeye yönelttiği, dolayısıyla, onun 'realist' bir yazar olmasına vesile olduğu görülmüştür. Diğer bir değişle, Jonson'ın klasisizmi onu aynı zamanda 'realist' bir yazar olmasıyla sonuçlanmıştır. Diğer taraftan, Jonson'ın iki akıma da sorgusuz sualsiz bağlı kalmadığı, aksine her iki akımdan da amacı doğrultusunda yararlandığı bu nedenle de oyunlarında her zaman kendi tarzını ortaya koyduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

ABSTRACT

The Renaissance Period, a the turning point in literary world due to secularization and the revival of ancient Greek and Roman texts, led to production of a great number of plays by various playwrights such as William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson. Ben Jonson, known especially for his 'comedy of humours' and his distinctive contributions to English drama, was very much a representative of Classical learning in the Renaissance. With the influence of 'Humanism' and the translation and revival of ancient texts, which led to 'classicism', Jonson became a 'full blooded' classicist who displayed an adherence to classical principles and writers. This strong inclination, however, did not make him indifferent to the social, political, religious problems around him. In this respect, the 'realism' in Jonson's plays is revealed through the employments of realistic elements and the criticism on contemporary matters. Thus, this study aims to reveal the convergence of 'classicism' and 'realism' in Jonson's comedies namely *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599), *Poetaster* (1601), *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) and *The Devil is an Ass* (1616).

This study is composed of three parts: Part I: A Brief Historical Survey of England from 1509 to 1660", which provides background information to Jonson's comedies that handled in this study and Part II: "Ben Jonson as a Representative of Classicism", which is illustrated with his adherence to classical principles and forms in comical satires and Part III "Realism in Ben Jonson's Comedies", which is exemplified through Jonson's two city comedies. In this regard, the first part focuses on mainly Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline Periods, the political, financial and religious problems of which Jonson witnessed personally. Furthermore, since

religion plays a crucial role on contemporary social and political matters, 'religious reformation' which took place with Henry VIII's decision to break up with Roman Catholic Church and exacerbated in the reigns of Queen Mary and Elizabeth is handled in this part. Finally the political and financial events of the Jacobean and Caroline Periods are examined since they shed light to the events which Jonson satirizes in his works.

The second part examines Jonson as a classicist playwright of Renaissance Period. In this regard, the first chapter "Classical Elements in *Every Man Out Of His Humour*" of "Part II" focuses on the indications of classicism in Jonson's *Every Man Out Of His Humour*. In this comical satire, he exhibits his classical idea through imitating the form of Aristophanes' Old Comedy and the use of Theophrastian characters and conformity to the unity of place. However, Jonson displays his innovative style rather than imitating classics servilely in the play. In Chapter 2 "Classical Elements in *Poetaster or His Arraignment*", Jonson's 'classicism' is illustrated not only through his strict adherence to classical principles such as the three unities and decorum but also certain classical allusions which is revealed by the revival of such classics as Horace, Virgil and Ovid on the stage. In this regard, the events take place in Augustan Period, the poesy and moral principles reached its peak, serves also Jonson's didactic purpose which is to differentiate the poets from poetasters by evaluating their morality. Thus the second part not only examines Jonson as a classicist playwright, it also focuses on his 'moralism' and 'didacticism' which are indispensable constituents of 'classicism'.

The third part of this study "Realism in Ben Jonson's Comedies" discusses Jonson as a realist playwright who employs realistic elements such as realistic

setting, life-like language and humourous characters in his plays. This part deals with two city comedies by Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Devil is an Ass* to illustrate that Jonson realism is displayed not only through the use of realistic elements but also through the contemporary matters he handled in his plays. In this regard, Chapter 1 “From a Realist Perspective *Bartholomew Fair*” focuses on the realistic elements employed in order to criticize contemporary social matters. In the play Jonson satirizes certain controversial social issues of the time such as Puritans, marriage system and corrupted morals through a variety of characters from different social ranks. Thus, Jonson is mainly depicted as a ‘social realist’ who utilizes such significant weapons as ‘satire’ in order to attack degenerated society in the first chapter. Chapter 2 entitled “From a Realist Perspective *The Devil is an Ass*” dwells mainly upon Jonson’s social and political satire in *The Devil is an Ass*, which are the explicit signifiers of his ‘social realism’. In this regard, Jonson not only attacks times’ vice and folly through ‘devil plot’ and ridiculing witchcraft but also employs a harsh political criticism through satirizing contemporary political and economic matters such as monopoly system, patent system and drainage of the drowned lands.

This study argues that Jonson’s classicism does not preclude his realism, but on the contrary, constitutes a form for his social realism. Thus, the convergence of classicism and realism in his comedies is depicted through his four comedies *Every Man Out Of His Humour*, *Poetaster or His Arraignment*, *Bartholomew Fair* and *The Devil is an Ass*. Jonson, however, does not adhere to classical and realist elements slavishly. Even if Jonson is regarded as both a classicist and accomplished realist, he always reveals his own unique style becoming of a didactic ‘moralist’ in his plays.