The Ben Jonson Journal
Table of Contents
Volume 6 (1999)

ARTICLES

W. DAVID KAY

Epicoene, Lady Compton, and the Gendering of Jonsonian Satire on Extravagance / 1

> *Then, if you love your wife, or rather, dote on her, sir: o, how shee'll torture you! ... shee must have that rich goune for such a great day; a new one for the next; a richer for the third; bee serv'd in silver; have the chamber fill'd with a succession of groomes, foot-men, ushers, and other messengers; besides embroyderers, jewellers, lyre-women, sempsters, father-men, perfumers; while she feeles not how the land drops away; nor the acres melt; nor foresees the change when the mercer has your woods for her velvets; never weighes what her pride costs, sir: so shee may kisse a page, or a smooth chinne, that has the despairs of a beard.*
> (*Epicoene*, 2.2.91-92, 104-14)[1]

> *HAUGHTY. Make him give milke, and hony.*
> *MAVIS. Looke how you manage him at first, you shall have him ever after.*
> *CENTAUR. Let him allow you your coach and foure horses, your woman, your chamber-maid, your page, your gentlenman-usher, your* french *cooke, and foure groomes.*
> *HAUGHTY. And goe with us, to* Bed'lem, *to the* China *houses, and to the* Exchange.
>
> (*Ibid.*, 4.3.18-25)

Prominent among the many anti-feminist cliches that Ben Jonson reinforces in *Epicoene* is the classical stereotype of the extravagant wife whose willful pursuit of expensive pleasures and foreign fashion drains her husband's resources.[2] In the first epigraph above, an inventive expansion of Jonson's source in Juvenal's sixth satire, Truewit tries to dissuade Morose from marriage by itemizing the numerous servants and suppliers necessary to sustain the Jacobean lady's aristocratic life style and by playing up contemporary anxieties about selling land or timber to pay debts. In turn, Morose tests his prospective bride by asking her how, if she speaks so softly, she will communicate with "her counsell of taylors, linneners, lace-women, embroyderers, and sit with 'hem some- times twise a day, upon *French* intelligences," or how she will give the necessary instructions "for that bodies [i.e., bodice], these sleeves, those skirts, this cut, that stitch, this embroyderie, that lace, this wire, those knots, that ruffe, those roses, this girdle, that fanne, the tother skarfe, these gloves" (2.5.71-73, 78-81). These catalogues are further expanded in Act 4 when Epicoene meets the Ladies Collegiates, the group of courtly women who live apart from their husbands and usurp masculine prerogatives by sitting in judgment upon the male wits and "braveries" (finely-dressed gallants) circulating in the play's fashionable West London scene. [3] Their instructions on what Epicoene should request for maintenance, quoted in the second epigraph above, define the entourage thought suitable to a woman of status and highlight some of the newly

fashionable items, such as coaches and French cookery, that raised the cost of aristocratic living in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Moreover, the inclusion among the Collegiates of the socially ambitious Mistress Otter, the rich former china dealer whose wealth gives her the upper hand in her marriage to Captain Otter, further connects the play's satire to the world of London commerce, as does Haughty's invitation to Epicoene to accompany the group on their shopping and sight-seeing trips.[4]

ROBERT S. MIOLA
Creating the Author: Jonson's Latin Epigraphs / 35

Ben Jonson holds an important place in our reconstruction of early modern authorship and print culture.[1] His 1616 *Workes* employed the folio format generally reserved for philosophical and theological treatises, adopted conventions of design associated with classical authors, grandly metamorphosed plays into works, constructed in and through print a poetic career. Mesmerized by this achievement, we tend to forget that the 1616 folio was neither the first nor last Jonsonian attempt to translate drama into print, plays for spectating into works for reading. Jonson circulated in various manuscripts in the seventeenth century; twelve plays appeared in quarto: *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1600), *Every Man In His Humour* (1601), *Cynthia's Revels* (1601), *Poetaster* (1602), *Sejanus* (1605), *Eastward Ho!* (1605), *Volpone* (1607), *The Case Is Altered* (1609), *Catiline* (1611), *The Alchemist* (1612), *Epicoene* (1620), *The New Inn* (1631), this last technically an octave. There were also published masques, an abortive attempt at a second folio (HS 9: 85-86), and perhaps plans for a collection of masques.

Jonson's folio emerges more clearly when seen in historical process with these works, especially the earlier play quartos, which (in annotated form) literally and materially served as copy texts for much of Jonson's folio. The quartos themselves culminate a long process of blending vigorous native theatrical traditions with the conventions of classical drama publication. The innovative Elizabethan resolution of the 1590s featured roman type with italic special effects instead of blackletter, the movement of speech prefixes from the right to the left margin, division into acts and scenes, and the inclusion of stage directions.[2] Seen in context, Jonson's play quartos are an endpoint as well as a prelude, and they reflect the larger cultural tensions and ambivalences implicit in the transformation of playwrights into authors, playscripts into plays into print.[3]

JULIE SANDERS
Jonson, *The Sad Shepherd* and the North Midlands / 49

In 1633 and 1634 Ben Jonson wrote two specially-commissioned entertainments for William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle (c. 1593-1676): the *King's Entertainment at Welbeck* and *Love's Welcome at Bolsover* respectively. These two lavish spectaculars, written for and staged at Cavendish's residences at Welbeck Abbey in Nottinghamshire and Bolsover Castle in Derbyshire, are rightly read as occasional texts which have a highly specific sense of event and location built into their language and action.[1] Cedric Brown has stressed their "sense of place."[2] A sense of place, though, is equally significant for another Cavendish-related text authored by Jonson in

the Caroline 1630s--the unfinished play *The Sad Shepherd; or, A Tale of Robin Hood* (c. 1636). In that play, the importance of topography is stressed from the beginning: the dramatis personae describes Robin as "The chiefe Wood-man, Master of the Feast" and Marian as "the Mistris."[3] The merry men, including familiar figures such as Friar Tuck, Little John, Will Scarlet and George a Greene, constitute "Their Family." Most of the other characters are guests, shepherds and shepherdesses invited to the forest feast, including Clarion, Lionell, Aeglamour, Karolin and others. On the margins of this community, in both societal and dramatic terms, is Maudlin, "The Witch of Papplewicke," and her family. Papplewick is in fact a real village in the far southern region of Sherwood Forest, a location central to both the Robin Hood legend and Jonson's play.

Jonson's geographical specificity does much to construct Maudlin as one of the stereotypical witch-figures Diane Purkiss' work has done so much to dispel: an old woman living on the margin of the community, often alongside her animals or familiars, skilled in herbal lore and medicine (within the course of the play Maudlin carries out several curses and spells) and demonized by neighbors.[4] In this respect the playwright might be felt to be merely confirming a patriarchal stereotype or prejudice in his portrayal, but we need to note some of the specifics in more detail. For Maudlin does not live alone; she has a family, in that sense mirroring or paralleling the Robin-Marian situation, and she is from a forest community, not outside of it. She is not only from Papplewick but is clearly familiar with her fellow villagers or neighbors--for it is to them that she partly distributes the venison she steals from the forest feast (while disguised as Marian). Jonson's witch will, in the course of the play, prove to be far from stereotypical or one-dimensional: Maudlin's is a complex and ambivalent portrayal that serves as much to critique Robin's way of life as it does to critique the selfish behavior of Maudlin and her children.

LESLEY MICKEL
"A Learned and Manly Soul": Jonson and His Female Patrons / 69

The connection between Jonson and his female patrons presents itself as a topic of current academic interest and relevance, because it is inflected not only by gender relations, but also by the complex forms of patronage, and thus calls for a creative synthesis of two current, but largely separate, areas of literary enquiry. While much has been written about Jonson as a patronage poet, and, to a lesser extent, about his representation of women, limited critical space has been devoted to a consideration of how these categories over-lap in certain circumstances, affecting the stance Jonson adopts in relation to his patrons and also his wider sense of poetics.[1] However, this imbalance is being redressed with the emergence of new work re-evaluating some of the orthodox critical commonplaces associated with Jonson.[2] Katherine McLuskie's chapter on Jonson in her seminal feminist analysis, *Renaissance Dramatists*, established a feminist perspective on Jonson which has been influential for a number of years, and is perhaps due for revision; in focusing on the representation of women in Jonson's drama and poetry McLuskie characterizes his relations with female patrons as thinly disguised flattery fueled by a deep seated misogyny; while this charge seems true in many instances, it is somewhat an over simplification of Jonson's attitude to his female patrons and his depiction of women generally. In this essay I

intend to examine Jonson's rather ambivalent attitude to gender and to suggest that the attitude to women expressed throughout his work is rather more problematic than the term "misogyny" allows; this will involve consideration of masque (*The Masque of Queens* [1609]), poetry and drama (*Epicoene* [1609]). In focusing on a range of Jonson's work I hope to reveal certain continuities in his representation of female agency. My appraisal of his attitude to women does not attempt to deny that on the one hand, many of his female depictions suggest an unrestrained misogyny, particularly a skepticism about the limits of female virtue and constancy, but on the other hand a sympathetic identification with certain female characters may also be detected. This argument rests on the belief that Jonson is, at the very least, open to the possibilities of female agency, and this often includes the principle of discrimination between the noble individual and the mass of humanity. The poet recognizes certain mutual aspects of marginality with his female patrons, ensuring a shared active moral virtue. Clearly, it would be ridiculous and anachronistic to champion Jonson as a protofeminist, but there are crucial episodes in the drama, masques and poetry where gender roles and characteristics are open to question, and which do not merely reproduce the constraining ideology of the day regarding the female body and intellect.[3]

PAMELA ALLEN BROWN
Jonson Among the Fishwives / 89

Jonson was always impatient to speed up "the civilizing process"--in other people. His impatience with women was especially keen. In his plays the most uncivilized bodies are female, and the noises and effluents of the female grotesque pervade his work.[1] Vulgar women with laughing mouths crowd into his theater, piquing his rage to order. Perhaps because regulation breeds representation, Jonson describes the women in his audiences more concretely than any other playwright. In Andrew Gurr's *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, for example, Jonson is the major source on which Gurr draws for his findings about women playgoers. Gurr's index entry under "women" even sounds Jonsonian: "see apple-wives, citizen wives, fishwives, ladies, whores."[2]

Why is the lowly streetseller, so remote from literature and history, so prominent in this list? Seemingly powerless, the market-woman appears to have powerfully bothered and fascinated the poet. Proverbially exhibiting ignorance, a love of spectacle, clowning, and romance, and a large-lunged readiness to curse and jeer, she was held to be the theatergoer with the worst taste and most offensive laughter. Yet detraction was not the sum of Jonson's engagement with the huckster: she was a source of language and drama as swell as noise. In the special case of *Bartholomew Fair*, as I will argue, he even wrapped himself in a pigwife's bulk and mouthed her fierce argot, Billingsgate.

ROBERT C. EVANS
Friendship in Shakespeare's *Othello* / 109

Friendship seems an important but relatively neglected aspect of Shakespeare's *Othello*, even though the topic was much emphasized in Renaissance thought and culture.[1] Comments *have* been offered in passing

on the theme's relevance to the play, but the matter has received surprisingly little sustained analysis.[2] Critics, of course, have explored in depth the main characters' relations, but rarely as friendships *per se*. Perhaps this is true because the relation of Othello and Desdemona seems, most obviously, one between lovers or spouses, while the relation between Othello and Iago can seem primarily one between a commander and his subordinate. The same might be said of the links between Othello and Cassio, while the relation between Cassio and Iago seems mainly that of fellow officers, one of whom is technically the other's superior. Similarly, Iago and Roderigo might most profitably be seen as puppeteer and puppet (or duper and duped), and while the links between Desdemona and Emilia are certainly friendly, Emilia might seem at first more Desdemona's inferior attendant than her close friend.

Many good reasons exist, however, for viewing all these relations as friendships. The relations among the male soldiers, for instance, are frequently described in terms of *love*, not merely supervision and obedience, and in fact the play often raises the interesting question of whether (and how fully) true friendships can really exist between persons of disparate social and military ranks. Can a lieutenant and his captain truly be friends? Can a captain and an ensign, or an ensign and a lieutenant? Can a general's wife really befriend the wife of an ensign, or her husband's junior officers? And, perhaps most intriguingly, can the relation between a general and his own wife truly be a friendship? *Othello* raises these and other questions, and my chief purpose here will simply be to show that friendship is not merely ancillary to the work but is a persistent, integrative theme.[3] My focus, at this point, will not be on broad theories of friendship or on the larger historical context but on the minute details of the play itself. I thereby hope to demonstrate that friendship is, if nothing else, an aspect of the drama worth fuller study.

ROBERT L. MONTGOMERY
The Present Tense: Shakespeare's Sonnets and the Menaces of Time / 147

In Shakespeare's *Sonnets* time has structural and emotional functions that make it the dominant and most persistent of all the issues the speaker has on his mind. As such it has drawn the attention of almost every reader and critic. In as succinct a summary of the theme as one could devise, John Kerrigan remarks that "On every side, its [time's] harsh calligraphy is seen."[1] The repeated perception of its relentless and irreducible destructiveness conditions the mood of the sequence, and familiarly it is the antagonist against which the speaker mobilizes his art. The most prominent literary models Shakespeare used are also well known: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book XV, and Spenser's *Ruins of Time*. Between these sits Petrarch's *Trionfi*, presumably available to Shakespeare in Lord Morley's translation. All of them dilate on the universal and unstoppable progress of Time, and all of them are in some fashion warnings about pride, the neglect of attention to mortality, or the inevitable passing of beauty. The prophetic thrust of this commonplace hardly needs reminding, except to note that it is also a feature of some of the plays, especially *Richard II* and *Troilus and Cressida*, and in both plays, as in the Sonnets, time works to frustrate hope and humble the will. It is also a commonplace in French Petrarchism. Du Bellay refers to "temps injurieux" in Olive 34.4, and in 39 assures his interlocutor that his love will protect her against time and death.[2] Ronsard offers another precedent in poems

sometimes very close to Shakespeare's usage, as in *Le Prentier livre des sonnets pour Hélène*, 14, whose "trots ens vent ja passez que ton oeuil me tient pris" suggests Shakespeare's 104 ("Three winters cold ... three summers' pride ... three beauteous springs ... Three April perfumes in three hot Junes burned"), though Shakespeare's treatment is different.[3]

J. P. CONLAN
The Tempest and the King's Better Knowledge / 161

Of Shakespeare's plays, *The Tempest* is the most obviously dependent on the literature of the Virginia propagandists. Nonetheless, scholars appear "still-vexed" by the relevance of the "Ber-moothes." Called aggressively colonialist,[1] temperately expansionist,[2] anti-imperialist,[3] ambiguous,[4] deeply ambivalent,[5] elusively relevant,[6] and completely silent on the issue of imperialism,[7] *The Tempest* has provoked a contentious debate about its ontology as a political statement. And yet, there is no shortage of contemporaneous evidence to show *The Tempest* was received as perhaps the most important anti-imperial statement of the period.

This evidence has gone unnoticed in part because *The Tempest*'s tragic, comic and miraculous elements have encouraged the play to be understood only as a romance, a "serious but nonrealistic mode of representation."[8] Too proscriptive, this genre description borders on the anachronistic, for the premise that God revealed His will in history, rewarding the good and punishing the wicked, equally informed the history, theology, and colonial rhetoric of the Jacobean period. Thus, by Jacobean standards, the realism of *The Tempest* rested on a footing comparable to other truth-bearing discourses. With its shipwreck by magic storm understood as a plausible pseudo-historical event, the play unfolded to reveal to its royal audience a nefarious relationship between disaster interpretation and the manipulation of royal policy. Setting the play's rhetorical action within the larger context of the loss of Neapolitan sovereignty, Shakespeare revealed to King James the potential dangers to himself and the peace of his realm should he be persuaded by Virginia propaganda.

JULIA BRETT
"Grace is grace, despite of all the controversy": *Measure for Measure*, Christian Allegory, and the Sacerdotal Duke / 189

Allegory, by definition, evokes our interest in two ways: in the events and characters presented, and in the ideas or abstractions they are intended to convey. The controlling influence of the allegory constructs meanings that lie outside the narrative itself; Christian allegory, then, structures ideas so as to evoke meaning from scriptural texts and religious experience. Consequently, allegorical readings of *non-allegorical* texts present some critical problems. According to Brian Vickers in his metacritical text, *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels*, Christian allegorical readings of Shakespeare plays err precisely because the allegorical structure--and therefore the meaning--is imposed upon the text from without, not constructed from within. Like other critical schools, says Vickers, the Christian allegorists use Shakespeare's plays "to validate [their] own theories, overlooking, rejecting, and falsifying whatever does not match the template which they superimpose

on literature" (372). Vickers's primary objection here involves the allegorists' seeing characters "as mere *representatives*. They 'stand for' something else in an external allegory, to be read outside, and independent of the play, having its own narrative pattern, and a quite different conclusion" (373). In short, "The play is subordinated to the paradigm."

I find Vickers's overall critical stance refreshing and invigorating. It offers us a perspective from which we may identify, assess, and if necessary reject criticism which irresponsibly distorts the text or ignores essential elements. And, like Vickers, I find much recent criticism deserving of such rejection. However, I am a little suspicious of what appears to be Vickers's (and perhaps others') wholesale dismissal of the critical school of Christian interpretation. And I wonder if my reservations might have more to do with the manner in which these opinions are presented than with the opinions themselves. In other words, I agree that a text which is not an "allegory" in terms of its structure and intentions cannot legitimately be read as one; but it seems to me that Vickers may be using the terms "Christian allegory" and "Christian interpretation" interchangeably (perhaps even carelessly), when the distinction between the two is important. "Allegory" is far more limiting than "interpretation." The first implies specific constructions for the use of extended metaphor; the second opens up a much larger universe of discourse.

RICHARD BRUCHER
Piracy and Parody in Chettle's *Hoffman* / 209

Alleged to be "one of the worst plays ever scraped together,"[1] Henry Chettle's *The Tragedy of Hoffman* (1602-03) has nonetheless achieved a measure of historical significance. Written for Philip Henslowe, probably to capitalize on the popularity of revenge plays at the turn of the seventeenth century, *Hoffman* is assumed, on the one hand, to epitomize "the true energy and vulgar limitations of the average Elizabethan mind."[2] It is not clear if this mind belongs to Chettle, the hack writer of potboilers, or to the theater-goer, the consumer content to be entertained by "a tissue of improbabilities dependent for interest upon intrigue and violence."[3] On the other hand, *Hoffman* is said to be a breakthrough play, the first to present the Kydian revenger hero as an out-and-out villain. Chettle's play thus "indicates clearly that the Elizabethan audiences were growing increasingly chary of accepting the bloody heroes as good and admirable men."[4] Violence and moral instruction are by no means incompatible in popular entertainments or in demonstrations of state power.[5] Delight in and antipathy toward violent retribution may be an essential tension in experiencing early modern revenge plays. Moral-ethical theories of revenge tragedy posit that audience sympathies shift from approval to condemnation as the revenger turns duplicitous and bloody.[6] Political theories of revenge cite a recurrent social tension between order and disorder that gets resolved in favor of government authority. The state's inability to provide justice may prompt private vengeance, but the quest for private justice itself means anarchy, which is anathema to all but the most extreme sectarians.[7]

Hoffman is a surprisingly useful text for re-examining popular expressions of revenge precisely because seemingly unambiguous ethical and legal issues

may in fact be deeply conflicted in popular culture. This is especially true if, as Ronald Broude has argued, we recognize that in 1600 revenge meant something akin to what in the late twentieth century we would call retribution, that is, a just or deserved punishment, often without personal motives. Retribution, even if exacted privately, approximates the objectivity of state justice, which seeks to reflect (or appear to reflect) divine purpose. Revenge aimed at personal redress becomes anti-social, a crime against the commonwealth. By these criteria, Hoffman's vengeance is an extreme case of anti-social revenge because his father was legally executed for piracy, not heinously or secretly murdered. Hoffman's violations pile up; his vengeance "is dictated by family loyalty, motivated by hatred and lust for power, conducted at the expense of innocent bystanders, and devoted to the subversion of political and cosmic order."[8] With these kinds of disruptions at stake in a turn-of-the-century culture anxious about succession, it is understandable that popular entertainments and socio-political discourses like revenge plays tend to end with the restoration of legitimate governments.[9]

SURVEY
Outstanding Twentieth-Century Books in English Renaissance Scholarship / 223

Below are the results of a survey by *The Ben Jonson Journal* asking Renaissance Studies scholars for their selections of the best scholarly/critical books in the field written in the twentieth century. Thirty persons responded, and their choices are listed below, along with many of the comments of those who included them. Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* was the single work receiving the most votes (17); four books of C. S. Lewis (*The Allegony of Love*, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, *The Discarded Image*, and *A Preface to Paradise Lost*) received a combined 21 votes. The list of books follows, with the number of votes following the title . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHIC AND EDITORIAL STUDIES
HUGH CRAIG
The Weight of Numbers: Common Words and Jonson's Dramatic Style / 243

In the last few decades, stylistics has taken an increasingly statistical turn. As more text becomes available in machine-countable form, and as ways of making use of the data thus provided are better understood, scholars have turned more and more to empirical methods, especially for resolving vexing problems of attribution. A quantitative approach also has some advantages when it comes to describing an author's style. The procedures can take account of an unlimited quantity of evidence, and counting makes for an even-handed approach: all passages are treated alike, whether or not they are appealing, memorable, or well-known. Unexpected aspects and factors can emerge through the process of analyzing patterns in the numbers, and there are statistical tests which impose an impartial check on perceptions about the strength and consistency of the effects observed.

Common words--articles, prepositions, and so on--are by no means the only features that can be counted in a text, but they are among the simplest to recognize, making the process faster and more reliable. They also promise a certain independence from the subject-matter at hand, so that the student will be working with underlying patterns of style which should persist whether

the play is set in Venice or London, deals with kings or serving maids, and whether it presents scenes of war, commerce, or courtship. Lexical words, the usual focus of literary commentary, offer more immediate possibilities of interpretation, but are much more subject to the influences of local content, and are uneven in distribution, and so unsuitable for fine-grain analyses using hundreds of small text blocks. In the present case, statistical findings based on counts of very common words can be simply stated.

CLINT DARBY
Modern Books on Ben Jonson: A General Topical Index (First Supplement) / 261

Katie J. Magaw's "Modern Books on Ben Jonson: A General Topical Index" (*Ben Jonson Journal* 5 [1998]: 201-48) attempted to report the ideas and themes listed in the indexes of more than a hundred English-language monographs published since 1886. Most of the entries Magaw included were "based on the indexes first prepared for the original books themselves" and thus reflected "the topics the original authors personally considered most important" (201). However, when those authors either did not list topics (focusing instead on personal names and other proper nouns) or did not even provide indexes, Magaw listed topics mentioned in their tables of contents. The present updating attempts to include books published during the time since Magaw completed her index; a few earlier books inadvertently omitted; as well as a few in which listings from the indexes are now supplemented by additional words from the contents pages.

NOTES
MATTHEW PRINEAS
"Yet Once More": An Allusion to Hebrews 12.26-27 in Ben Jonson's "On the Famous Voyage" / 277

At first glance, the concluding poem of Jonson's *Epigrammes* seems anomalous. Its insistent filthiness violates, or appears to violate, the poet's earlier promise to eschew the sort of lewd, profane beastliness that he says Jacobean readers had falsely come to expect of the genre (2.11).[1] His own "chaste book" (49.6), by contrast, is to be ruled by a "wiser temper" (2.8). And so it impressively is. Yet this restraint, scrupulously maintained through most of the volume, appears to desert him in "On the Famous Voyage." [2] Combining mock-epic and burlesque technique with incidental satire, the poem treats a boating trip down Fleet Ditch (by this time "a shallow, silt-choked, rubbish-filled abomination, 'very stinking and noisome,' no longer navigable, little better, indeed, than a sewer") [3] as a Virgilian voyage into hell. "Famous Voyage" may be most famous now for its exuberant scatology. As they make their way up the Ditch in a rowboat, Jonson's heroes confront an apocalypse of shit--stuck to walls (136), floating in flakes (138), heaped in piles (139), mingling with the grease, hair, and offal of "measled hogs" (145). This has led some readers to suggest that Jonson, perhaps fed up with his own epigrammatic rigor, has "lost it" in Epigram 133, and divulges here his obsessive personality, his compulsion to hoard, his "anal eroticism." [4] More recently, however, and following the early lead of Wesley Trimpi, others have highlighted the poem's anomalies of form and genre. While B. R. Smith perhaps goes too far in asserting that the most "jarring" aspect of this poem is not its filthiness, but rather its "dependence on developed narrative," such approaches at least possess the virtue of taking seriously Jonson's artistic

purposes in placing "The Famous Voyage" so conspicuously at the end of his *Epigrammes*.[5]

PETER HYLAND
"Not the paths I meant": Jonson and Shakespeare / 289

The process that has constructed the Western canon with Shakespeare at its center is, in our poststructuralist age, a controversial one, but even the most dismissive of Bardicides have found it difficult to dislodge him as the yardstick against which other writers are measured. While the implied inferiority to Shakespeare of all other poets has not prevented them from being treated fairly and on their own terms by critical authority, however, the poets and, especially, dramatists who wrote within the direct context now dominated by Shakespeare have not fared so well, and nobody has suffered more than Ben Jonson for not being as good as Shakespeare. Not only is Jonson's writing harsh, arid and constipated, we are told, but Jonson himself was an unappetizing man, morose and bitter and, worst of all, envious of the fluent, magnanimous Shakespeare. As we are informed by Augustus Ralli at the beginning of his historical survey of Shakespearean criticism, "Ben Jonson's plays are thought to owe more to art than inspiration, and he is said to have envied Shakespeare his popular success. He was a scholar in the technical sense, which Shakespeare was not, and is popularly supposed to have made of his more exact knowledge a weapon to injure Shakespeare."[1]

Much recent commentary on Jonson has attempted to resolve this uncomfortable binary relationship, and to redefine Jonson's supposed envy.[2] I do not think, however, that much attention has been paid to the irony that Jonson, in his attempts, on quite proper literary grounds, to define a canon that would have him at its center, became the victim of that very process of canon-construction. It was Jonson, not Shakespeare, who wanted to exist "for all time," and at the center of a canon that was largely of his own formation.

JEFFREY KAHAN
Reforging Macklin's Forgery: Yet Another Example of Steevens "Laughing in His Sleeve" at Malone? / 295

In 1748, the Shakespearean actor Charles Macklin said he owned a Caroline pamphlet that mentioned Shakespeare in conjunction with Ford and Jonson. Macklin later said he lost the pamphlet at sea in 1760. Macklin did, however, make a transcription of the pamphlet, which later fell into the hands of Shakespeare editor George Steevens. In 1790, Steevens passed this transcript on to Malone, who examined its contents in his 1790 edition of Shakespeare. The document's contents raised many contentious issues concerning several key dramatists of the Jacobean stage. Malone exposed the document as a forgery and attributed it to Macklin.

Although Steevens supposedly held this transcript for over thirty years, and published editions on Shakespeare in 1773, 1778, and again in 1785, he never included or referred to this transcript. If the document deserved such scrutiny, why hadn't Steevens brought it to light sooner? Even more oddly, Steevens never discussed the transcription in his 1793 edition, which was a

direct rebuttal to Malone's edition. It is likely that at least part of the transcript of this fake was in itself a fake, carefully placed by Steevens to mislead and vex his rival, Edmond Malone.

ROBERT S. MIOLA
Lancastrian Shakespeare: A Conference on Region, Religion, Patronage, and Performance--Report on the International Conference at the University of Lancaster and the Hoghton Tower Shakespeare Centre, 21-23 July 1999 / 305

The Shakespeare Programme at Lancaster University, specifically Professors Richard Dutton, Richard Wilson, and Alison Findlay, and the Hoghton Tower Shakespeare Centre hosted an international conference 21-23 July 1999. At the conference scholars discussed the possibility that Shakespeare spent some of his "lost years" in Catholic households in Lancashire, particularly at Hoghton Tower. They also reassessed regional economics and politics and reconsidered the shape of Catholic culture in Early Modern England. . . .

[Editors' Note: *The Ben Jonson Journal* will publish a special issue on Catholicism in English Renaissance literature next year and invites contributions from its readers.]

THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES

HERBERT WEIL
"Be vigitant, I beseech you": A Fantasia on Dogberry and Doubling in *Much Ado About Nothing* / 307

If we attend to the structure of *Much Ado About Nothing*,[1] long recognized as unusual, then observe more carefully its details with some of their implications, we may well find reason to doubt the universality of several basic scholarly beliefs or assumptions about casting at the Globe. We may then discover plausible possibilities (though surely not conclusive evidence) for a way in which Shakespeare might have designed this play to permit alternative casting when a major actor was unavailable, either temporarily or permanently. Our discovery of these potential alternatives may well lead to a new increased sense of openness and of tentative construction in Shakespeare's process of composition.

In modern productions of Shakespeare's plays, the doubling of actors in multiple roles inevitably must include elements which are not authentic in terms of Elizabethan staging. But although the Royal Shakespeare Company's Theatregoround and the Shenandoah Shakespeare Express (both using actresses and fewer players) cannot precisely recapture all the effects of the 1590s, they can show us possible groupings of actors that few had recognized. Such experiments can help create for us a stimulating imaginary dialogue with the casting decisions for Elizabethan plays--particularly when doubling is used to evoke qualities of meaning, experience, and feeling for design rather than merely to serve economic necessity.

ESSAY REVIEW

R. V. YOUNG
Harold Bloom's *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* / 319

BOOK REVIEWS
ARTHUR F. KINNEY
Peter Beal's *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and Their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* / 327

KEVIN J. DONOVAN
Achsah Guibbony's *Ceremony and Community from Herbert to Milton: Literature, Religion and Cultural Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England* / 333

PAUL STRAUSS
Carol Everhart Quillen's *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism* / 341

EDITORS' CHOICES

RICHARD HARP: *Jonson: Four Comedies*, ed. Helen Ostovich, and Jonson's *Volpone*, eds. Brian Parker and David Bevington; Henri du Lubac's *Exegesis: Volume I: The Four Senses of Scripture*. STANLEY STEWART: Gale H. Carrithers, Jr. and James D. Hardy, Jr., *Age of Iron: English Renaissance Tropologies of Love and Power*; Ronald Corthell, *Ideology and Desire in Renaissance Poetry: The Subject of Donne*; *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*, eds. Claire McEacherm and Debora Shuger. ROBERT C. EVANS: Judy Kronenfeld, *King Lear and the Naked Truth: Rethinking the Language of Religion and Resistance*; Adriana McCrea, *Constant Minds: Political Virtue and the Lipsian Paradigm in England, 1584-1650*; Matthew Steggle, *Wars of the Theatres: The Poetics of Personation in the Age of Jonson*. / 347