A Thesis

by

William McArthur.

Submitted for

the Degree of Ph.D.

Oct.1939.

General Subject.

An Inquiry into the Extent and Nature of Ben Jonson's familiar Knowledge of Classical Latin authors, and the Reflection and Influence of that Knowledge on his Work and Character.

Contents.

Page.

I. Chapter I : Introductory.

2. Chap.II: Jonson the Schoolboy.

7. Chap.III: The Range and Nature of his References to Latin.

I2. Chap.IV: the Minora Sidera of his Regard.

5I. Chap. V : The Majora Sidera, viz:

5I. (a) Seneca.

6I. (b) Martial.

73. (c) The Plinies.

78. (d) Plautus.

92. (e) Virgil.

99. (f) Ovid.

I08. (g) Juvenal.

II9. (h) Horace.

I33. (i) The Latin Historians.

I62. Chap.VI : Jonson the Man, Scholar, and Pedagogue.

Appendix I : Jonson's Chief Translations.

Appendix II: Bibliography.

Chap. I.

Introductory.

By showing the nature of his borrowings, by attempting to assess what apparently attracted him towards individual Latin classics, by showing his more absolute as well as relative likes and dislikes, and by estimating his total as well as specific indebtedness to his Majora Sidera, in particular, I hope to build up a picture, from one point of view, of both the man and his literary methods, and to make clear the position and the function that I believe he essayed in the literature and culture of his day.

Chap. 2.

Jonson the Schoolboy - or "Small Latin".

In Westminster School, under Camden, Jonson presumably studied an average curriculum, as times went, of Latin grammar and literature. He began, little doubt, with Lily's Grammar, "Absolutissimus de octo orationis partium constructione libellus etc.", the standard primer on the subject for more than two centuries. And it may well be that this book, in Camden's hands, profoundly influenced the rest of Jonson's career. We possess, anyhow, his suggestive tribute to Camden's personal influence; and, for certain, it will appear that grammatical interests held him paramountly all his life. His regard for this book may have extended even to its preface in which Colet insists on constant attention to the practice of chosen poets and prose writers, a favourite precept of Jonson in his maturity.

Having found his feet in Lily's Grammar, the boy Ben would next have his character and his vocabulary improved by one or more of several popular compilations of "Sententiae Pueriles". All manuals of this kind combined grammatical with moral teaching. They inculcated ethic truisms, first in two Latin words, then in three, and so on until the growing boy had a guiding precept and an apposite Latin tag against all the ethical dilemmas of life. A device this that was surely of potent influence in creating the scrap-book habit that Jonson and so many of his fellow scholars never lost in later years. And this method either

suited or swayed the youthful Jonson: either it sowed or it germinated such of his salient qualities of later years as moral fervour, padagogic dogmatism, sententiousness , and an almost religious regard for distilled wisdom in the Latin tongue. All these are clearly at work in the "Discoveries" wherein he compiles, translates, hammers out "sententiae" for himself, though never,one must concede, with anything like the arithmetical brevity of his earliest exemplars.

When Jonson had mastered a considerable number of these brief and artless apophthegms, he probably proceeded to Cato's* "Distichа Moralia", which would do nothing to lessen his tendency to admire sound sense in the Latin tongue. It must, however, be noted as curious that in the works of his maturity neither he nor his commentators have remarked on any irrefutable obligation to Cato, a rare exception among his moralising and literary benefactors. At the same time when he did come to write "Catiline" he eschewed the closet compositions of Sallust and put in Cato's mouth speeches more in keeping with his boyhood studies of the old man's style.

A little more interest, even animation, was next introduced into the training of young Elizabethans in such instructive and dramatic monologues as those of Corderius. And these, in turn, might pave the way for the"Colloquies" of Erasmus,(1) which were similar in form but more advanced in matter. One of these, the "De Alcumista", certainly was in his mind when he came to write the "Alchemist" to which it bears certain very close resemblances.(2)

(I) See numerous references to Erasmus in"E.M.Out." Act I,Sc.i. Carlo's instructions to Sogliarde on being a fine gentleman.

(2) Profs. Herford and Simpson (hereafter H.& S.) summarise these parallels in footnote to Vol.II.pp.98,99.

* Not Cato the elder or younger, but a product of much later date.

Aesop's Fables provided interconnected training in Greek, Latin and English, what time they provided, too, one hopes, some allegorical illumination to the earlier and arid "sententiae".

The "Bucolica" (I) of Battista Spanuoli, or Mantuanus - Virgil's serious local rival in the eyes of Jonson's contemporaries, though not in his - was also extremely to the taste of Elizabethan school authorities, so that our author probably made its acquaintance too.

Disputation in Latin on subjects like grammar was another common method of approach to the classics proper. It is reasonable to suppose that the youthful Jonson enjoyed the scope provided by such contests for his Latinity, rhetorical vigour, and pugnacity.

It is interesting at this point to recall Jonson's own maturer views on the most suitable Latin authors for adolescent study, a problem on which his earnest interest would not permit him to speak lightly, however much it may seem to us that his choice is beyond the capacity of youth. In "Discoveries" he commends as "openest and clearest": Livy, Sallust, Virgil, Ennius, Quintilian, Plautus, and Terence.

The last two on this curriculum remind one of another Elizabethan method of teaching Latin, namely, through the drama. Thus, the supposed boy of the "Magnetic Lady" declares, "I learned Terence in the third form at Westminster". We may safely conclude from this that Ben made the acquaintance of acted classical drama at a relatively tender age, with potential effects on his subsequent choice of a career and subsequent views on the dignity of his craft. In later life, however, he expresses

---

(I) This might be set forth as a model for imitation in the writing of Latin verses. These Camden would have his pupils draft first in English, with potential consequences on Ben's maturer style and methods. Would this method of approad not tend to produce at once the stiffness and the "body" of his verse.

disapproval[1] of school plays, Latin or English. Such facile methods, he appears to have thought, produced parrots and smatterers, and endangered the soundness of their grounding in grammar. (It may be, of course, that this animadversion was largely due to a sour recollection that in this practice of the schools originated these menaces to the adult players, the children's companies.)

On Jonson's own testimony we conclude that Cicero was a primary Latin reader, since his work had unpleasant associations for the "Readers in Ordinary" of "Catiline". And in "Discoveries" Jonson mentions also Persius and Juvenal, "whose names we now so glorify in schools, at least pretend it". Apparently he suspected that these two sinewy authors were oftener on the curricula than on the desks. But, again, as will appear, this snort may merely imply that Jonson expected of schools an impracticably high standard of Latin knowledge.

In conclusion, although Jonson nowhere expresses satisfaction with the Latin education of his day, the general standard must have been high, and the pupils, to us, in this subject precocious; at least that is so if we can accept as normal, or even as smacking of verisimilitude, the facility in translation displayed by Frank of the "New Inn" when catechised by the Host.(2) I do not think that many juveniles of to-day, describable anyhow as "pretty boy" and "a fine child", could show such ease and elegance and readiness in a Latin cross-examination.[3] From which it appears that Ben, though he left school untimely, had probably a knowledge of Latin greater both in extent and depth than most boys of to-day who present themselves for the Ordinary degree of M.A. in the subject of Latin.

---

(1) See the "Staple of News", Act III. Sc. 2: "Do we pay our money for this? We send them to learn their grammar and their Terence, and they learn their playbooks."
(2) Act I. Sc. i.
(3) Cf. Shakespeare's representation of an equally knowledgeable child under a similar catechism. 'Merry W.' IV. i. 32

Inevitably here one recalls Shakespeare and his knowledge of Latin. Clearly, though educated at the small-town school of Stratford, and though he left school even more untimely than Ben, Shakespeare must have walked with Jonson along a goodly part of this trying way of Latin knowledge.(I) At least it seems safe to conclude that, thus far, their Latin ballast was alike in nature and in weight; for anyone acquainted with schools or human nature will concede it to be unlikely that the provincial school of Stratford would evolve a markedly individual curriculum. Surely both in curriculum of study and in standard of attainment Stratford would seek to follow and to rival such famous big-city schools as Westminster. If so, at both establishments their most famous alumni received the same "small Latin", which to us appears a very great deal.

.....

(I) According to Smart the list of Latin authors studied at Saffron Walden included: Ovid's Metamorphoses, Sallust, Virgil's Eclogues and Aeneid, Cicero's Epistles, Terence, Horace, and Erasmus's Copia Rerum et Verborum, together with much Latin composition designed to give an easy familiarity with the language rather than a refined and scholarly knowledge.

Jonson, incidentally in all probability enjoyed the newly minted contributions to scholarship of Ascham and Mulcaster which Shakespeare "escaped".

Chap.3.

The Range and Nature of Jonson's References to Latin.

As a preliminary to any review of Jonson's treatment of individual Latin authorities, their influence on his work, and correlated questions, it is essential to indicate the number and names of the authorities in question. For convenience, I append in tabular form the names of all his known classic benefactors. Opposite each appears the number of occasions on which Jonson certainly makes use of the works of this particular author. To avoid erroneous deductions from this altogether too simple a catalogue one must keep constantly in mind the modifying circumstances of its compilation. Thus, the list ignores dubious and indirect debts, some as vital as basic ideas for plots; it ignores, of course, his private correspondence as that is given by Professors Herford and Simpson, his "Discoveries" too, or notebooks,(I) and all the plays of which he may be a joint author, such as "Eastward Ho!" Obviously, therefore, the list is a considerable understatement of Jonson's total indebtedness to the Latin classics, though it includes his main and most significant borrowings. But its chief value is as a rough, relative indication of the degree of importance that Jonson attached to specific Latin authors.

The list comprises what might be called illustrative quotations, Latin parallels, and such Latin phrases as might spring to his mind, unasked and "currite calamo", or might be

---

(I) For an estimate of the Latin authorities in "Discoveries" vide Gregory Smith's "Ben Jonson", p.253. For example, Quintilian, 25 references (I make it 28); Seneca the younger, 21; the elder II; Pliny, Plaut., Hor., 4 (I reckon 10: but see footnote to "Horace".)

added as an afterthought during revision where he felt his mother tongue wanted the grace and sanction of classic authority, in either case significant of the man and his methods. The list includes, too, such references as our poet adduced in proof of statements, interpretations, and translations in his "Latin" plays.(I) With these limitations and qualifications the figures given are a close rather than a rough approximation.

Name of Latin Author	Approx. No. of References in Jonson.	
Tacitus	165.	
Horace	99.	
Juvenal	74.	
Ovid	62.	
Virgil	48.	
Suetonius	42.	(plus "Catiline", passim.)
Plautus	36.	
Pliny, the elder Martial Seneca, the younger	31.	
Claudian	16.	
Lucan	15.	
Aviénus	14.	
Catullus	13.	
Persius	12.	
Cicero	11	(plus indeterminable no. "Catif
Statius	9.	
Terence	7	
Livy Varro Macrobius	6	
Petronius	5.	
Quintilian Val. Maximus Apuleius Propertius Sallust (plus "Catiline") Vitruvius	4.	
Paterculus Publius Syrus Julius Caesar	3.	
Lampridius Aul. Gellius Siculus	2.	
Arnobius Val. Flaccus Tibullus Solinus		
Sil. Italicus (2) Florus Pom. Mela Victor Festus	I.	
Honoratus Julianus Treb. Pollio Justinus Seneca, the elder Lucretius.		

(I) Vide details in Chap. on "Tacitus and Historians."
(2) Dubious detection by Whalley. Vid. "Cynth's.Revs." IV,2. Compensation may be the mot on Cunn.I.p.58. Very doubtful too.

As a piece of statistics this list calls for certain comments.

Since the least of them, for Ben's purposes, is cited more than twice as often as any that follow on the list, we may reasonably say that from Tacitus down to Seneca we have the Majora Sidera of Jonson's esteem, who therefore require most detailed treatment in this enquiry.

Note, too, that the list is particularly misleading in the case of the elder Seneca, Quintilian, and Cicero, as will appear in the proper place, because a consideration of the "Discoveries" indicates that these authors were oftener in Jonson's mind than his more imaginative works would lead us to suppose.

To anyone prejudiced by a modern valuation of the Latin classics it will appear that this list makes strange bed-fellows. To take an extreme case, Lucretius hob-nobs with such very late Latins as Victor and Honoratus. In part, of course, such surprises are due to a change of valuation between Elizabethan times and our own; but they are also in part due to our author's personal taste and requirements: and the nature of these needs and the features of that taste form the staple of the following review.

Similar problems to that of Lucretius readily suggest themselves anent others on the list. Thus, why did the charm and difficulty of Propertius - the latter quality a merit in Jonson's eyes - not raise him higher than the prosaic Vitruvius? Why does Lucan take precedence over Terence and Livy? What elevating merit did Jonson find in Avienus and Claudianus? Is the worth of Tacitus, for Jonson, fairly reflected in his apparent supremacy here? Or is Tacitus merely an historical encyclopedia, frequent but scarcely favourite reading? Such are the kinds of problems that we shall have to answer.

One final caution as to the interpretation of the above list is this: with exceptions to be noted in place, the order

of the names is fairly representative of Jonson's opinion, as that can be verified from other sources, but the actual figures must not be overstressed in that they do not discriminate between vital and less important borrowings, nor even between brief and lengthy borrowings so that a whole oration of Cicero counts for no more than a glancing allusion to a mythical personage in Pliny.

This list, then, gives a relative impression of the extent of Jonson's indebtedness to Latin literature. It remains to indicate similarly the extent of his grammatical and vocabulary borrowings from the Latin tongue.

Without using a very fine mesh, I have compiled a list of 362 glancing references to Latin phrases, Latinate English words, unallocated Latin quotations, mottoes composed by Jonson on classic models, and nondescript Latin words.

To illustrate the various usages included in this total and to show the varying degrees of remoteness from normal English practice one might instance the following categories and examples:

(a) A rare word - even in Latin -: "equi olibanum".

(b) Latinisms made notable by disregard for dramatic propriety: as "olbation" and "the venture tripartite" on the fair lips of Doll Common, coney-catcher and trull.

(c) Englished Latin: "ripe for a man".

(d) Latin words and phraseology perhaps used for judicious mystification of the rabble: "faeces of the people that sit in the obscure caves and wedges of your house" (theatre).

(e) Surely the lowest form of pun: "Dick Tator".

(f) "Popular" scientific terms: "deceptio visus".

(g) Technical terms from various mysteries, such as alchemy, cosmetry, and demonology: "magisterium", "in fumo". There are about 70 such in the "Alchemist".

(h) Legal terms: as in the interminable list of legal impediments in the closing scenes of the "Silent Woman".

(i) Terms of abuse (not that he found his mother tongue really inadequate in this): "mangonising".

(j) Terms of the schools: "redargue".

(k) Marked verbal mannerisms: "to the nail", "succubae", "merds", menstrue", and "sentences".

All these and a nondescript host beside.

In all, I repeat, there are in Jonson's dramatic and poetic works more than three-hundred-and-fifty such tributes to the Latin teaching of his time and to the presumptive knowledge of Latin among his readers and audience. For the moment we refrain from comment on the part played in his dramatic productions by all such borrowings.

In conjunction, these two lists give some idea of the extent of Jonson's acquaintance with classical Latin, some idea, too, of the readiness with which it started to his mind. We now have to consider the depth of this knowledge, its qualities and emphases and idiosyncrasies, as a means to assessing its influence on Jonson's work and the light it incidentally throws on his personal character.

.....

Chap.4.

The Minora Sidera.

I propose to treat his lesser Latin sources in ascending order of relative importance or frequency of reference, until we reach those authors whose contributions may be said to colour Jonson's work rather than to contribute to it, and who, as formative influences in their own right, deserve individual and detailed treatment.

Lucretius. Of all the authors whom Jonson cites but once the most surprising case is that of Lucretius. In so far as the infrequenc of his references to the works of the others in this first group reflects the relative lack of esteem he felt for them Jonson appears to be in general agreement with later scholars, who would hardly cavil at the neglect of such as Julian, Honoratus, and Pollio. But Lucretius is another matter. Nor is the mere solitariness of the reference all that one must note. For even in this one reference there is no sense of personal or peculiar obligation, much less inferable esteem, since it is not a direct quotation and since, in his own footnote, Jonson recognises that the idea he borrows from Lucretius (of Venus fructifying the womb) might just as well have come from many other authorities - of whom he actually cites Virgil and Homer. Further, this note of his is appended to the "Masque of Queens" which is a sort of archaeological revue, or parade of quaint and accurate pedantry, that is, a case apart from his more normal poems, a case for a "command performance" of learning divorced from the faintest emotion of even literary gratitude. Therefore the only significance of Jonson's solitary reference tp Lucretius is negative and indirect. It shows that Jonson

(a) studied Lucretius only late in life,(I) or (b) knowing the "De rerum" in good time, disliked and deliberately ignored it. Professors Herford and Simpson favour the former alternative. Personally, I incline towards the second. As will, however, appear it is but probability against probability. The late-in-life theory assumes that the extant library copy, the Amsterdam Lucretius of I620, fixes the earliest date of Ben's acquaintance with Lucretius, the more so in that it is heavily annotated in his own handwriting. The absence of references to Lucretius they therefore explain quite naturally, since by I620 the bulk of Jonson's work was done. Against this, however, I think even heavier evidence may be brought. Thus, there is a prima facie improbability in the idea that Jonson, master of so much more obscure learning, did not study Lucretius thoroughly before he was 48 years of age, remembering always that for Jonson "study" and "thoroughly" were synonymous. More important still is the fact that the "Masque of Queens" was acted and published in I609. Since the footnote in question may be a later addition, this does not invalidate , but it does weaken suggestion (a). Jonson's first copy of Lucretius, moreover, printed or manuscript, may well have perished in the Study fire of I623, taking with it his marginal gleanings, and these he may have sought to replace or recollect by annotating his fine new volume which, though published in I620, may not have come into the possession of even so eager a bibliophile till after the Fire. In any case, the very newness of the publication would naturally be a challenge to such an industrious note-taker and maker. All things considered, I lean - be it with little confidence - towards supposition (b). That accepted, his persistent neglect of Lucretius calls for explanation on grounds of will and taste, and, surprising though it seems, I believe such grounds exist.

(I) Ben's only known library copy is dated I620. Fully described by Herford and Simpson, Vol.I, pp.255-7.

All questions of poetic merit apart, the high moral fervour and didactic earnestness of the Roman were after Ben's own heart. And he did recognise the existence of these qualities in Lucretius long before he came to have the Amsterdam edition of 1620.(I) Now, as a rule what Jonson appears to have admired he freely quoted in his own work. We must, therefore, look in Lucretius for certain grave disabilities which to Jonson's mind would outweigh these sterling literary virtues. I would suggest that, for Jonson, no merit in Lucretius could compensate for his philosophic melancholy and detachment, a spirit and an attitude naturally repellant to Jonson's positive, warm, aggressive disposition. True it is, melancholy afflicted Ben often enough: generally, however, it was a melancholy from without. Indeed, the trying circumstances of a great part of his career made subjective melancholy a luxury in which he dared not indulge. His was not Antonio's nor Jacques' melancholy; it was easily diagnosable as the scholar's melancholy, the conventional melancholy of the satirist, or the aftermath of popular disapproval. Never a romantic or emotional pessimism, never a humour of melancholy. And doubt he hated too. From both he once sought refuge in the dogma and positiveness of Rome. He had, I imagine, his own, his age's, and the man of action's aversion to resignation however noble and nobly expressed, 'weaknesses' these of Lucretius not atoned for by those virtues which in another case would have aroused his ampler commendation and perhaps his "cupidity".

The other members of this group of petty creditors offer little light or guidance on our author and may be dismissed briefly. Thus, Justin is but part contributor of a solitary name to an impressive catalogue of noble dames, which suggests that herein Ben was squeezing his residual knowledge. The only reference to Trebellius Pollio appears to flatter that

(I) As appears in the phrase, "Lucretius' lofty numbers" in 'The Poetaster', Act I, Sc. i. date 1601. The wording is too conventional to affect either contention. Much later probably, viz. in Discovery CXIX, Jonson takes grave exception to the archaisms of Lucretius, describing him as "scabrous and rough in these".

Roman's importance and quality, as judged by more recent standards. For Pollio, Jonson appears to say, treats Zenobia as a noble queen should be treated by a dignified historian. Later estimates of Pollio hardly endorse Ben's phrase, "most noble description", or his conclusion, which is," with the dignity of an historian." It will be noted, however, that both phrases are ambiguous, the first markedly so, the other little less, since it may owe more to Jonson's respect for the historian's calling than to any personal appreciation for this tyro in the art.

Florus. The reference to Florus I take the liberty to question, for two reasons. First, though it is admittedly no more indirect than many which Ben himself acknowledges to Latin literature, it appears to me that only the poet's own word could validly be accepted for such an obscure working of his mind. Admit such assumptions, as Whalley did, and only weariness and the natural contraction of the span of the commentator's life could prevent the ascription to somebody else of evrything that Jonson wrote. The second objection is scarcely less cogent. In Jonson's work the supposedly borrowed fancy is less elaborated than in Florus, and such restraint is the negation of Jonson's method of dealing with importations from abroad. I therefore suggest that Ben owes nothing to Florus, a conclusion hardly upset even by granting that he adopts the idea in question.

Sil Italicus. Of passing interest is the one reference to the vast epic of Silius Italicus. It occurs in the "King's Entertainment", another mine of classic references of the antiquarian sort. Shrewdly tactful, Jonson produces this motto:

"Una Triumphis Innumeris Potior

Pax Optima Rerum -"

The sunstance and the language of the quotation show that he read aright the taste of at least one distinguished auditor; no accident this for he repeated the device frequently.

(I) "Cynth's. Revls." V,2. "He charges like a Frenchman, thick and hotly". My objection is slightly supported by the absence of Florus from his extant library list.

Even this slight degree of interest can hardly be felt for the other "solitaries" of our list. Collectively, however, they illustrate what we shall have endlessly and more effectively illustrated elsewhere, Jonson's abiding interest in grammatical studies and etymology and mythology. Thus, for the derivation of "juga" he turns to Honoratus, a German-like grammarian ofthe 4th Century, and for the names of two young satyrs he cites Julian as corroborative of Virgil, Siculus,and Synesius. With such ease did Ben flit across the centuries. Rather, one may suggest, he inclined to disregard time as a factor in his survey of Latin literature. For Ben, it was far from being a dead language, though it shared in the reverence and sanctified fixity which normally only death can confer on the repute of man or tongue...With that we may leave these grammarians, jurists and journalistic historians among whom Jonson had probably acquaintance enough to discover the text of the Sirens' song and matters of like moment, had any masque or courtly barriers required of him such curious knowledge.

Honoratus.

Julian

In the next of our somewhat arbitrary groups, Gellius, Lampridius, Siculus, Arnobius, Flaccus, and Tibullus, the last member is again surprising, though not in the same degree as Lucretius.

Minors

A modern view of Tibullus would lead one to expect that Jonson would rate Tibullus more highly than our list suggests. Yet I do not think the present grading is at all misleading. To begin with, the two references Jonson does make to Tibullus' work are purely factual, not to say pedantic and superfluous. Thus, in case even his courtly audience should assume that his line, "Phoebus when he crowned sang", was an unsanctioned , however modest, flight of mother wit, Jonson is at pains to localise the classic anecdote on which he takes his stand. The other reference is equally trifling, being no more than

Tibullus.

(I) Gunn.III.p.25. (2) do.p.72.
(3) He resented attempts to modernise or extemporise on it, scoffing at synthetic Latin as "Belgo-Gallic phrase".
(4) Gunn.III.p.73.

corroborative evidence from Tibullus that pure hands and vestments are requisite to the ritual of sacrifice.(1)

These two references, together with the known fact that Jonson's library copy of Tibullus includes a marked favourite, Catullus,(2) make it a virtual certainty that the sparsity of quotations from Tibullus is not due to any lack of familiarity. Why did he make such slight use of Tibullus, even in, say, the "Poetaster"? I believe the reason was an amalgam, in unknown proportions, of these elements. First, Tibullus is not a quotable poet in that he is not aphoristic or satiric. Secondly, he is not a mine of archaic lore, like so many of Jonson's minor sources. Finally, his elegiac charm, his delicacy of touch, his music in the monor key are qualities rarely to be found in Jonson's original work, and, though it does not necessarily follow, I do not think these qualities were essential humours of our author's spirit or taste. Jonson's taste was not, I fear, catholic enough to relish Tibullus.

In general, Jonson's use of authors in this group in no way differs from his use of those in the first category: they are but reference books of fact. It is, however, important to note once again that the facts he sought in these works are virtually all concerned with mythologico-historical beings and pagan ritual: Penthesilea,(3) Idmon,(4) Iris,(5) Paracelsus,(6) Artimesia,(7) Cinxia,(8) Chromis and Mnasil(9), together with two references to elegant gluttony from Lampridius(10) some quaint geography from Pliny's jackal, Solinus(11), and a matter of etymology from Arnobius.(12) Though the references are individually petty, the nature of their general subject matter is fully significant of Jonson's intellectual interests.

Lamprid. Solinus. Arnob.

(1) Gunn.I.p.317. "Sjan.V.4.
(2) Title is, 'Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius - Opera Omnia quae extant'. Copy is injured by damp, and possibly is salvage from the Fire; if so, a very old friend.
(3) Gunn.III.p.57 (4) do.p.166. (5) do.II.p.567.
(6) do.III.p.98 (7) do.p.57. (8) do.p.25.
(9) do.p.72. (10) do.p.371. (11) do.III.p.3. and II.p.566.
(12) do.III.p.25.

Val. Flaccus.

The sole interest that attaches to his first reference to Valerius Flaccus (I) is its extreme obliqueness. Had Jonson not pointed it out, I fear even Upton and Whalley might have passed it by. The mere acknowledgement of this debt might be taken to bear upon Jonson's literary honesty, suggesting even a pride in indebtedness, but since it appears in the footnote to a masque it must be suspect, it need not be an normal Jonsonian reflex, but is potentially an answer to a challenge tp produce classic authority for a minutia of scholarship.

Finally, as in the first group of Latin authors, practically all the references to those in the second are to be found in his own footnotes to the masques, the works which we shall find to be the privileged occasions for the display of his deepest erudition.

The facts of the next group may be forced to yield a little light on Jonson's mind and methods. It is hardly surprising that, in the normal course, Ben had little occasion to cite the original work of Julius Caesar and Paterculus, but one might reasonably expect Publius Syrus to make a braver show. After all, it is through his very quotability that Syrus has defied time and mortal custom. What we do know of his work is just what man could not forget. The fact that Ben, though familiar with these sayings from his schooldays, quotes no more than three may be explained by two - possibly ~~three~~ complementary - theories: (a) He regarded Syrus as hackneyed, childish stuff; and we shall have occasion to note his contempt for easy Latin; or (b) Jonson felt some sort of inhibition before this type of expression. Indeed, much as he admired, say, Martial, extreme condensation he himself could not regularly combine with simplicity and comparative ease in his original work. And clearly these qualities are beyond a translator who regards verbal faithfulness as paramount. Then, it may be that his favourite Horatian objection to purple patches could

Pub. Syrus.

(I) Gunn.II.p.567.Curious, Ben's only two references to Flaccus are from the First book of the "Argonautica". There seldom is found even such slight evidence that he found something beyond him.
(2)Two exceptions are:"Vol."III,6; "Alch." II,i. - both from Lamp. on sybaritic gluttony.

be extended to glittering aphorisms and commonplaces. This theoretic objection would countenance a sense of his own inability to be at the same time pungent and pleasing, forceful and facile. And this is borne out somewhat by the treatment he accords even the three passages he does quote from Syrus, which are, in turn, cynical, shrewd, and trite. The first[1] he translates literally; the second[2] he modernises; the other,[3] being introduced on an occasion of state, he leaves in the full dignity of its Latin dress. His translation, in particular, does less than justice to the original's ease. It appears to me that both the nature of these treatments and the quality of two of them bear out the suggestion that Jonson neither was, nor felt himself to be, at his best in dealing with epigrammatic condensation - and this despite his ambition to be the English Martial.

Paterc'ul. Jonson makes use of Paterculus as a text book in the construction of "Catiline". As such he is not properly included in this nor easily included in any of our arbitrary groupings. Accordingly, what has to be said of Paterculus, as of Sallust in the next division, has been postponed to the separate chapter on Tacitus and the Historians. There, too, will appear Livy and Valerius Maximus, in so far as Ben's borrowings from these can reasonably be described as factual or the matter of history.

J.Caesar. It is notable that Jonson's three references to Caesar disqualify the latter from inclusion among the historians. For two[4] of the references deal with Caesar's appreciation of points of literary criticism: and the other[5] is an anecdote of

---

(I) "Sejanus, II,4. "He threatens many that hath injured one" for, "Multis minatur qui uni facit injuriam."

(2) Volpone, I,i. (Cunn. I.p.347. "The weeping of an heir should still be laughter
Under a visor."
for, "Haeredis fletus sub persona risus est."

(3) "King's Entertainment". "Firma concensus facit".

(4) Cunn. III.p.413 and 415.

(5) do. I.p.301. "Sejan." Refer. is to the lost "Anti-Cato".

how Caesar once wielded his pen instead of a dictator of old's more normal weapons. In short, Ben refers to Caesar the litterateur, and not at all to the historian. In "Caesar", however, the character in "Catiline", full justice is done to the self-control, wiliness, and general Cassius-quality of Caesar the politician and man of affairs. The paucity of reference to Jonson's fellow warrior-scholar is hardly explicable on grounds of ignorance or dislike, and presumably must be accounted for by the Roman's deliberate restraint of diction and specious concentration on the simple "facts" of the case he chooses to present.

Apuleius

Apuleius is inevitably adduced by Jonson as an authority on witchcraft and black-magic. In part he is apparently regarded as merely corroborative of Lucan and Horace, whom Jonson took to be his major classics on the hocus pocus of witchcraft . And, of course, all three are given the slighter support of their plagiarists, the mediaeval fathers of Necromancy.

There is no evidence that Apuleius as a "novelist" or populariser of philosophy made any appeal to Jonson. Complete and probable explanations of this merely presumptive obtuseness are not hard to find. First, Ben was a student of style, from Westminster onwards, and, whatever his standard of classic Latinity, he could have been in no doubt that the style of Apuleius was as romantically fantastic as that of his matter, lacking in all classic restraint. Secondly, from Apuleius' dealings with witchcraft, both in his works and his life, he was more than suspect to his monkish readers in the Middle Ages. And no wonder; for he had Ambrose Bierce's eerie faculty of making the supernatural seem present and natural. He wrote of it with a gusto that enthralled and horrified the Middle Ages, and earned for him a part share in the ever-ready soubriquet, "Anti-Christ". Now, whatever Jonson's own views on the occult - and he investigated at least the theory of it as curiously as James himself - he is careful to note of the dark mysteries he

introduced or annotated,"All...are mere arts of Satan". Surely the windy side of the law! Thus, both in curiosity about witches and in correctness of attitude towards the mystery he was at one with the most interested member of the audience who first beheld the "Masque of Queens".(I)

Vitruvius. The relative eminence of Vitruvius on our roll may be considered rather a proof of disesteem, for the three or four(2) references detected are accounted for by Jonson's identification of Vitruvius with his contemporary counterpart, Inigo Jones, in Ben's elephantine attempts to tease his ex-coadjutor.

Propertius. Jonson's treatment of Propertius, underrated in his day anyhow,(3) tends to confirm what was suggested above about his attitude to Lucretius. For he eschews the quotation of all characteristic Propertian sentimental and amorous melancholy. True, in propria persona, Propertius appears fleetingly on the stage in "Poetaster", and there, indeed, full justice is done to him and his melancholy. In this case, however, Jonson's method is merely objective description. Propertius is lauded and lamented by the other characters as the personification of inconsolable grief, as the bereaved who d bestows on the dead loved one the immortality of obsessionist remembrance. In his own person "Propertius" limits himself to the meiosis that he is not gamesome. I believe that it was more than lack of space that prevented Jonson from bringing this lay figure to life. It is significant of the man Jonson that neither here nor elsewhere does he try to get under the skin of a character like this. For an example of this anti-romantic, anti-melancholic temper of Ben we may instance briefly his treatment of Ovid. In more than fifty citations of Ovid - some lengthy - there is but one

---

(I) Three of the four references to Apuleius are in the "Masque of Queens", viz.Cunn.III.pp.50,51,58, their contiguity suggesting a careful consultation of the reference book. The last is in Cunn.III.p.395.
(2) Cunn.II.p.476; III.p.211; do.221; do.409. The last alone is properly a reference to the works of Vitruvius.
(3) H.& S.I.p.429.

from the "Tristia" - and even that belies the title. In short, though "Poetaster" proves that Jonson knew as an objective fact that Propertius was melancholic in a love cause, I suggest that he was constitutionally debarred from feeling that Propertius was such a character, and that nothing in Jonson's own experience or make-up ever suggested to him that, as other than matter for "humorous" satire, such a romantic, poetic, melancholic sigh could walk about on two legs as a man among men.(1)

From the actual text of Propertius he borrows but one touch any way characteristic of the Roman - and that once more in the "Masque of Queens". This borrowing is a striking, though somewhat conscious or rhetorical, tribute to a woman's beauty.(2) Otherwise, Propertius offers Jonson nothing tangible save corroboration of the luxurious stage device , vain desideratum in the days of Bess, the creation of a "mist of perfumes",(3) and the even more fully documented confirmation of the existence of not one but many cupids, and of variegated colours at that.(4) Clearly Propertius is a hive that Ben did not rifle very thoroughly, taking at most a little honeycomb and rather less honey. And if frequency of quotation - factual borrowings apart - proves a kinship of the spirit, the converse is equally true: Jonson, we may conclude, had as little in common with the love-inspired, decorative melancholy of Propertius as with the more austere and philosophic melancholy of Lucretius.

Petronius. How much of the bitterness, "only a little salt", of "Volpone" was due to Jonson's personal experience of life, and

---

(1) Vide the Apologetical Dialogue to the "Poetaster" (Cunn.I.266)
(2) Cunn.III.p.57. "Lib.III.eleg.10" is Jonson's note. In the Clarendon Press text the lines appear in Bk.III.eleg.XI.
(3) "The Barriers". Apparently this matter of technique had at least a professional interest for Jonson: Mammon, too, visualises such luxury.
(4) Cunn.III.p.14, and id.p.26. A fact this that he apparently forgets elsewhere. Vide Vol.I., p.I, lin20, and id.p.337, both earlier works.

how much to his respectful recollection and faithful reproduction of the vices satirised by Petronius - and Juvenal? The greed, the duplicity, and the choking of all man's gentler and nobler qualities by "cupido haeredipetarum". No categoric answer is possible; but one might reasonably put it this way: like Juvenal, Jonson had experienced poverty, and inevitably, as a man of letters, the need to flatter the wealthy and to compete with other flatters; like Petronius, he had probably witnessed about the court and playhouse the arts defensive and offensive of patron and parasite respectively. So far Jonson and his literary creditors trod common ground. And for this reason it is fair to suppose that neither of these authors herein misled him. But they did give sauce to an appetitie already sharp.

Keeping in mind the brevity of Petronius' extant work, one is justified in concluding that Ben rated him highly.

Two of his forthright quotations from Petronius deal with the arts of simulating a moribund condition in order to secure "unsolicited" material evidence of the affection of the "beneficiaries" under one's current will.(I) Revolting satire, of course, on human cupidity, in details far-fetched may be, but first-class theatre and adapted to splendid effect.

The other references help on our accumulating evidence on the man and his ways. First, one must note that the epigram, "'Twas only fear first in the world made gods",(2) is the type of saying that Jonson borrows with surprising rarity.

Another is a philosophic sigh or stricture on the debasing nature of coitu,(3) - a recurrent idea of Ben, an arresting but, on consideration, not so very uncommon mixture of edifying condemnation of an idea and satisfaction in

(I)Gunn.I.pp.338-9.
(2) do.p.288.
(3) do.III.p.387. This epigram is probably spurious.

expressing the idea in the process of condemnation. We can hardly escape the conclusion, from this and other cases, that Ben had a considerable satisfaction in bawdry, even unphilosophic and unclassic bawdry.

His last obligation to Petronius is considerable,no less than the general design and many details of the chorus that follows Act I of "Catiline". His particular model in this is the celebrated Rhapsody of Eumolpus, and the chief objects of Jonson's and Petronius' satire are luxurious living and effeminacy with their natural sequels, greed for gold, political venality and instability, forming altogether a picture of the rottenness that normally follows the ripeness of any state.

This is the first instance we have met in Ben's works of a considerable passage of translation and worthy of notice not only on that account but because it happens to be very characteristic of his general practice and quality as a translator That means that this chorus lacks any grand virtue beyond verbal faithfulness to the original. To begin with, it is written in iambic tetrameter rhyming couplets; yet no matter less lyrical or choral could easily be imagined. The lines creak. The rhymes fall upon the ear with the smacking finality of doggerel. Stylistically speaking one is inclined to agree with the suggestion[I] that in this chorus Jonson's model was not the ancient Greeks and Romans but the ancient Elizabethans, and not the best of them either.

Such gaucherie of translation is sometimes dismissed simply with the observation that Jonson was no translator, in the modern sense at any rate, since he was generally content with a faithful verbal rendering. Why he should have been so, and why this is not a complete view I hope to make clear in the end. In passing, however, one may instance as an objection to this view the fact that it ignores the translational felicities

(I) Gifford's. Cunn.II.p.89.

of, say, "Drink to me only". A more adequate view might be this. In normal practice Jonson laid stress on matter before manner: he was a conscious stylist but only on occasion; for, as I hope to show, he was primarily a teacher of his fellows, a man with a message, earnest above art - however interested in the facts of the theories of art. He rose with his matter; he seldom rose above it, as others may at times be suspected of doing. Therefore, as his matter is in general an intellectual, satirical message that kindles him no human and inspiring passion transmittable to others, he expresses it in a manner often bleak and wintry as a Calvinistic sermon, and often to a an audience as phlegmatic too. In the chorus in point he is engrossed in his civil satire as well as in the phrasing of Petronius, for I feel little doubt that he had in mind England and her sumptuary laws as well as decadent Rome. And his moral fervour, as usual, is most sincere. But here it cannot raise the passage to even a moderate poetic height, because he has chosen a lyric measure that gives way under the weight of his moralising. On a well known occasion Burns recognises that the epistle he contemplates writing may turn out a song or a sermon; here Jonson, less wisely , essays them both at once.

Macrob. Five of Jonson's six references to Macrobius come from the "Somnium Scipionis"(I) of these, four are the usual masque notes on matters of mythological interest, and the reference to the Saturnalia(2) is even less significant.

There is, however, a little light shed on Jonson and his ways in one reference to Macrobius in the "Masque of Hymen".(3) "Such was the golden chain let down from heaven". To this line Jonson appends one of his longest footnotes, which in itself calls for comment. After mentioning that this chain of Homer's was the sun, Ben observes that he

(I) Cunn.III.p.I3; do.p.I5; do.p.22; do.p.23. The proximity of these suggests that he was not trusting entirely to memory.
(2) Cunn.III.p.I22.
(3) do.p.25.

himself has made use of the gloss of Macrobius - "to whose interpretation I am specially affected in my allusion". And this interpretation he thereafter copies out in its full length and original Latin. Now, both the nature and the length of the footnote constitute an illustration of one of Jonson's characteristic tendencies , the bolstering up of certain fancies with all the learning at his command. It is worthy of remark that the length and learning of Ben's glosses are seldom justified - as here - by any apparent merit in the idea that aroused his critical interest. He does not suit his spanner to the nut. So we are driven to one or other of these alternative conclusions in this matter: either his taste in fancies was inexplicably capricious, or else the length and adroitness of the footnote is regulated, not by his sense of the original idea's worth, but by a sort of advocate's joy in building up a case irrespective of his client's real claims on the court's time and sympathetic interest.

Varro.

If one may accept the obvious inference from a line in the "Poetaster":

"Of Varro's name what ear shall not be told?"

one must conclude that Jonson had a far higher regard for Varro than the number of his known allusions would lead one to suppose. And I consider it very probable that this line's implication should be accepted, however few Jonson's overt references. This conclusion may be arrived at along these lines. Jonson clearly, consciously, and volubly appreciated his own peculiar merits and tendencies. Therefore he was extremely likely to appreciate similar merits and tendencies, especially in a Latin removed by some centuries beyond the danger of even posthumous emulation. And with Varro his affinities are not only close but numerous. I take it that broadly the bases of resemblance and consequent appreciation were these:

(a) Both displayed an untiring energy in scholarship and

authorship that in Varro's case, only little more than Ben's, seems to rule out the possibility of any sleep even in their long lifetimes. I feel in Jonson's line above a suggestion of the respect he felt for Varro as the author of far more than three-hundred lost works, a sort of historical respect coloured by parsonal understanding of the magnitude of the achievement.

(b) Of predominant interest to both were matters of grammar and etymology. The author of the "De Lingua Latina - the only work Ben quotes (I) - was certainly of great interest to the author of the "English Grammar" and to the sort of pedagogue that Ben reveals himself to be in his "Discoveries" and elsewhere.

(c) They share an interest in the minutiae of civic and religious ceremonial. Varro, vastly the more systematic, was a sort of Sir James Frazer to his day; whereas Ben's masques were in sort an ingeniously animated Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum, or, as it were, Walt Disney cartoons seeking by the help of the various arts, music, painting, poetry, and pageantry, to give vivid and lovely life to Jonson's scholarly researches among the driest facts of mythological and ecclesiastical lore.

(d) Both are prone to didacticism.

(e) The humour of both inclines to be brutal, or at least masculine.

(f) They are prone to tediousness, not unconnected with (a) and (d). As literary parents both set store by the mere travail of authorship and scholarship. They "exposed" none of their progeny, and Ben at least was disposed to take up cudgels for his with a readiness in proportion to his neighbours' objections, most parent-like indeed. Like all undiscriminating parents, therefore these two are occasionally boring.

For all which reasons I conclude that Varro stood high in the esteem of his kindred spirit.

(I) Five references are found in Jonson's own footnotes to masques and one to the "English Gram."- as follows: Cunn.II.562, 566;do.III.pp.22,23(two),and 427.

It is clear that Jonson realised the worth of Terence as a Latin stylist, for -

"....taste a piece of Terence, suck his phrase
Instead of liquorice"[(I)] advises Virgil in prescribing a salutary regimen to soothe the stylistic crudities of Crispinus' disordered stomach. And this Ben felt was a safe specific for the purpose; whereas Plautus was "too harsh for a weak stomach". Terence he regarded as a normal literary laxative for the very young,[(2)] which perhaps doubles the insult here done to Marston. But style, qua style, was not Ben's most vital interest; and he apparently found Terence's fluid colloquies not easily imitable. Indeed, we need not expect that Jonson, the mature and powerful scholar who even valued difficulty - as will appear - should quote frequently from a school-primer, or from a stylist whom he regarded as a necessary corrective for such literary barbarism as that of Crispinus. In general, Jonson dealt with more adult difficulties in Latin, and his powerfully acid stomach predigested for his weaker contemporaries such strong foodstuffs as Plautus and "old Ennius", much as some parent sea-birds of our times, if not quite so docilely or self-sacrificingly as the pelican of Ben's own day.

(I) "Poetaster, V, i.
(2) Vide Chp.I. on Jonson's schooling.

Even if we assume that all Ben's borrowings from Terence are direct borrowings and not ultimately Greek, his debt to Terence is not heavy. One of his debts, however, is very significant for my main contention. This is a shrewd piece of advice on teaching and wonderfully modern in spirit, indicating again his intense preoccupation with the business of education and the enlightened stand he took in methods pedagogic. In effect, he says, eschew threats, appeal to a sense of honour and seek to guide by example:(1) advice which, however trite, apparently requires to be restated frequently and even rediscovered.

It is notable that only the nucleus of this idea appeared in the quarto: and this casts a dim light on the play-wright scholar's methods and workmanship. There are two reasonable explanations of the discrepancies between the two versions. These are (a) That the quarto is a cut down or acting version of the full form which is seen in the folio, and (b) that the shorter quarto form was Ben's first treatment, a treatment later expanded for final publication, and for which he naturally 'looked up' the "Adelphi" of Terence. I fancy that (b) is by far the likelier explanation because (I) it conforms to his normal practice, (2) he is not likely to be guilty of a weak parody of his own work, and (3) the final result is a closer translation (though freer than his normal practice). If, then, this is the case we are left with a very natural picture, the picture of the veteran scholar preparing the definitive edition of his works for the press, mindful of Shakespeare's fate. And in the course of this recension we see him checking

---

(I) Every Man in his H. ActI, end of Sc.2. 'There is a way...
..they'll do for shame

~~checking~~ up on this fugitive allusion or, more probably, realising ~~for~~ clearly for the first time the exact source of the idea and thereupon working out the translation in full against the challenge of posterity.

Terence provides him also with the dictum in the Prologue[1] to 'The Silent Woman',

'Truth says of old the art of making plays
Was to content the people.'

This precept 'Epicoene' faithfully observes, but on other occasions-all too often-Ben wilfully forgot it or perversely denied it, setting the authority of Terence all at naught.

In the other references to Terence[2] ~~there~~ is nothing markedly characteristic either of creditor or debtor. From this one might make exception of a footnote to 'The Masque of Beauty' where he translates 'artem musicam' as 'knowledge'. This translation has a dual significance. First, it illustrates Ben's normal method of translation, a word for a word; and, secondly, ~~because~~ it reflects, by implication and, therefore, with the truthfulness of unconscious reaction, his attitude to art. For Ben art is not mere genius, or inspiration, or any afflatus, however divine. If a word had to be found for it, then that word was 'knowledge'.

tatius

At first sight it would appear, once again, that our arithmetical hierarchy exaggerates Ben's debt to Statius, since no less than nine of his borrowings are for masques or courtly entertainments and conform to the pattern of these already pointed out. Seven[3] testify to the

---

(1) Cunn.I.p.~~338~~404.

(2) id.p.I38; id.p.456;id.III.p.I2; id.p.20.

(3) id.II.p.567; id.p.557; id.III.p.3; id.III.p.I4; id.p.26~~x~~ (two); id.p.I66.

justness of his personified representations of mythology, and one[1] to a custom for which he cites six other authorities.

The last debt he acknowledges himself. This is the famous aphorism, ' 'Twas only fear first in the world made gods'.[2] Old already in the days of Statius, like enough, even proverbial wisdom, but a golden phrase none the less which Jonson might well have embezzled in silence had he been the plagiarist some assume, or had he been inclined to set more store on 'original' thought than on his self-imposed duties as tutor, ill paid and ill appreciated, to his uncultured age and 'bringer-home' of knotty foreign authors.

Of much interest, too,(and receiving later treatment) is Ben's note to 'The Masque of Beauty'[3] - already touched on in the case of Propertius and Claudian. Here the significant phrase is 'the best and most received of the ancients besides Prop. Stat. Claud. Sido.Apoll., especially Phil in Icon Amor.' Clearly this grading according to Ben's own judgment fully justifies the 'arithmetical' eminence of Statius on our initial list. It also provokes a comparison between a modern ranking of the ancients and Jonson's ranking, and between prevailing views of Golden Latinity and Jonson's impression of the same criterion.

Cicero

It may be judged from 'Discoveries'[4] that the works of Cicero were much more frequently in his mind than would be suggested by the comparative rarity with which they provide him in his original or imaginative

---

(I) Gunn.II.p.560.

(2) Sejanus, ActII, Sc.2.

(3) Gunn.III.p.I4.

4) e.g. Discoveries: LIX, CXIX, CXXIV, CXXX (from the eulogy of the Poet in the Pro Archia).

work with matter of inspiration or guidance.

The outstanding debts to Cicero consist of an indefinable number of facts for the historical details of 'Catiline' and the very lengthy transcriptions in the same play from the "In Catilinam."(a) The former are naturally postponed for consideration among the Historians. Of the latter, largely history too, of course, it will be sufficient to say that Ben set more store by them than his audience did, that their merciless and undramatic length is significant of his self-imposed duty as an educator, and that as pieces of translation their merits are a certain not inappropriate dignity alternating with stiffness and his usual verbal accuracy and occasional infelicity.

The other references to Cicero not above dismissed or postponed may be grouped under subject matter thus:

Anecdotes from literary history...2.(b)
Literary Definitions.....2.(c)
Grammar.....I.(d)
Matters Mythological.....2.(e)

It will be clear that these references illustrate further what we elsewhere learn were matters of great interest to Jonson, namely, professional gossip of reputable vintage, the dignity of the poet's and historian's calling, grammar as the rudiments of that profession, and the curious learning of mythology in which history is coloured with the haze of romance and romance is yet given authority and sanction by the admixture of history.

But of Cicero the pleader of "causes célèbres", apart from Cicero the orator-historian of 'Catiline', there is nothing here, save the panegyric on literature from the graceful and gracious but historically less weighty "Pro Archia". And of Cicero the letter-writer nothing at all. No undress history apparently for Ben, no eavesdropping on the private

---

(I) Cat.IV,2.; (b) Cunn.I.p.269 and 301;(c)id.p.105, and Epig.XCV;(d)Cunn.III.p.427;CunnII.p.562 andIII,26;

lives of the makers of history, no humanising touches or 'debunking' of the great. Attention only to the historian's considered narrative of -

'...the intents,
The counsels, actions, orders and events of state..'(I)

The omission of 'Discoveries' from immediate consideration fallaciously associates Quintilian with Jonson's minor sources. Actually he ought to rank with such as Seneca. The very number of Ben's references in 'Discoveries' is conclusive proof that he had the highest regard for the matter and opinions of Seneca. In all there are 28 such references, the greatest number of references to any classic author to be found in his commonplace books. A consideration of their types of subject matter reveals Jonson as a diligent student of literary art, underlining and using Quintilian constantly on such matters as education,(2) types of intellect,(3) true eloquence,(4) art,(5) literary style,(6) mental exercises and the discipline of study,(7) methods of teaching,(8) human conduct and weaknesses.(9) In all these cases Quintilian supplies the text for Jonson's homily, which is frequently little more than a translation, application, or expansion of the Roman's dictum. Quintilian, in short, Jonson profoundly reverenced as a dictator on educational and literary matters*, the two supreme interests of Jonson's life. That being so, Quintilian can hardly be considered second to any other influence on Jonson's intellectual career.

With the exception of a lament for the carelessness or turpitude of parents who set an ill example to their children and even applaud their first steps in evil ways,(10) there is nothing notable among Jonson's dramatic works that need necessarily be ascribed to Quintilian. This one passage

---

(I) Epig.XCV. (2) CXIV -considerable, CXVII, CXVI. (3) Lxv, CXV. (4) XLVI, CXIX, CXVIII, CXIX, CXXI. (5) CX. (6) CXV, CXIX(three) CXX, CXXII(three), CXXVI, CXIX(two). (7) CXV, CXVII. (8) CXVI(two). (9) CXVII(two).
(10) Cunn.I.p.2I.considerable passage.
* Conversations: H.& S.I.p.I32, "He commended to my reading Quintilian who (he said) would teal me the faults of my verses as if he had lived with me.."

however, in Knowell's opening soliloquy, Act III, Sc.2. of 'Everyman in his Humour', has the air of being among Ben's favourites. It is evidently the fruit of grateful recollection and satiric meditation. Apparently, too, it is a 'literary' addition to the play and not in the Quarto. This time Ben has added strength, colour, and vivacity to the scathing but somewhat abstract, not to say stilted, original, though, for the most part, he is faithful to Quintilian's pattern and lacking only in epigrammatic quality. Juvenal and Horace contribute to it as well, mixing acerbity with humour. Consequently it is a 'meaty' passage of high sentence, wholly undramatic in the ordinary sense, but brilliant satire and true comedy in its mirroring quality: true translation, also, in its accurate and polished restatement of intellectual classic satire.

But the significance of Quintilian for Jonson cannot be found in this passage, however intrinsically interesting. The "Discoveries" hold it. And the impression they force upon us continually is of Ben the theorician, student of that earlier theorician, tirelessly making notes on the minutiae or tools of his craft, systematising, rationalising, seeking the best methods of teaching and learning, the criteria and principles of style, and showing throughout his search a very solid sense. The nature and number of these borrowings from Quintilian has done much to form the accepted picture of Jonson. They are vital to it. Yet it is easy to distort the picture they give. Thus they suggest the picture of a craftsman with an excessive interest in his tools. They suggest that he compiled a whole museum of chizels and shippons and that he frequently held forth on their historic interest, the beauty of their design and the technique of their manipulation. And his ideas of technique, we might gather, were narrowly correct. Accepting all this we visualise him as a mere artisan, no sculptor, indeed, just a monumental mason plagiarising the friezes of Greece and Rome, a base mechanical of great industry and little imagination, whose genius was incapable of large projects and wide designs, unless they had

the semi-mathematical, detective-story pattern of 'The Alchemist and 'The Silent Woman'. Such is the misconception to which Ben's regard for Quintilian not unnaturally gives colour.

There,is however, a complete answer to this. A great artist must be interested in his tools, much less in his technique;because such an interest may easily turn a cobbler and bungler into a real craftsman, it is not a converse truth that such an interest does the same to a great artist. For your great sculptor is, incidentally, a great monumental mason,too: and ignorance of fundamental technique is no merit even in the most lawless revolutionary. What is really resented in Ben is not that he had such exhaustive technical knowledge and interest but that he truculantly proclaimed his interest and his knowledge in season and out, and therefore, by the above argument he was reduced to being not merely a plodder, but a very dull plodder at that. Such was a natural, if uncritical reaction of contemporaries and even later scholars to the egotistic propaganda of classic practice in Ben's forewords, prologues, tavern talks, too, one supposes, and certainly in his interscenal 'choruses' and the glosses in his commonplace books which refer the reader to such works as Quintilian's 'Institutes" or Horace's "De Arte Poetica." Jonson, many have felt, always concentrated on details for preference, details of any science, history, mythology, antiquities, magic or medicine, it was always the same. And so with grammatical details. Surely such insistence on detail proved that, in part at least, his was a pettifogging, piffling mind. I believe - as I maintain in my conclusion - that this concentration, reiteration, propaganda and the like of Jonson's can be explained largely on other grounds than his natural inclinations. His public insistence on the minutiae of his calling, the really offensive feature of his technical interests, is, I believe, susceptible to explanation on the grounds of his historical position in the literary world , as well as the more obvious grounds of temper and personal experience.

And though his message to his fellow playwrights and auditors is almost wholly concerned with the dangers of technical ignorance, he was in practice and in theory alive to the opposite danger - though he did not escape it wholly - the danger of excessive "correctness" suggested by these lines:

"Use all the tropes
And schemes that prince Quintilian can afford you:
And much good do your rhetoric's heart."(I)

Among his vital prefaces occurs another very considerable debt to Quintilian. The "Address to the Reader" of the "Alchemist" is based on the "Institutes"(2), and was held by Jonson to be of major importance and interest as we see by its reappearance in "Discoveries".(3)

Persius.

A favourite, too, like so many satirists, was Persius. Indeed, taking into consideration the brevity of Persius' work, we may conclude that Jonson's round dozen references indicate a high degree of admiration for the qualities of Persius' work. In particular, if we keep the "Discoveries" in mind, Jonson appears to have a special liking for two quotations from Persius, if one may so conclude from the fact that he uses each of them twice. Naturally, therefore, they may be held to throw special light on his tastes and character.

These quotations are:

(a) "non te quaesseveris extra"(4)

(b) "magister artis ingenique largitor
Venter."(5)

To these, as of equal significance we may well add,

(I) Cunn.II.p.221.
(2) II.XI,XII.
(3) 63 and 65, notes 9 and 10.
(4) Cunn.II.p.194. ("Bart's.Fair" this, that ex very English comedy: speaker appropriately named Adam Overdo) and id.p.350.
(5) "To the Reader" - "Poetaster", and Cunn.III.p.122.

(c) "Tecum habita ut noris quam sit tibi curta supellex".(I)

I hold that (c) is as weighty evidence as those he quotes twice in virtue of its place on the title page of "Discoveries". Surely as the key-note for this, his book of quintessential meditations, Jonson chose a Latin text which, in addition to immediate applicability - little limitation this - seemed to Jonson, in its pith and polish, worthy of this important station, and which, because of the circumstances of its selection, is for us a significant clue to some features of the outlook and taste of the man who selected it.

Equally characteristic, I feel, is that other from Persius:

"Auriculas teneras mordaci rodere vero."(2)

And it is interesting to note how much corroboration for known traits of Jonson can be elicited from these four (or six) quotations.

Thus in the last - taken naturally with the context to which our bricklayer apparently makes it both corner-stone and key-stone, - we have the familiar Jonsonian attitude, that of the righteous satirist astonished at the unregenerate manner in which the dull ass wields its hoof when galled by bitter truth - or Jonson's version of the truth. For Ben, his own criterion was absolute and unquestionable. Like his foes, the puritans, he did not share in Pilate's doubts, for if such inner questionings destroy fanaticism they are equally inimical to satire in the grand manner.

Quotations (a) and (c) are in a measure complementary. Know your own heart, said the old satirist; look within: and such introspection will dispose the searcher to intellectual humility. Man's ill-furnished garret little justifies the pride

(I) Title-page to "Discoveries".

(2) Gunn. III. p. 418.

of ownership that he is wont to display. It is, I understand, one of the strange commonplaces of psychology that Jonson, one of the most intellectually arrogant of mankind, should have as favourite and publicly flaunted mottoes two aphorisms that inculcate intellectual humility. And yet in his thoughts and acts a maybe expiatory humility often alternated with intellectual braggadocio and self-righteousness savouring more of aggrieved Macilente than of free, magnanimous Asper. The quotations reflect a recurrent mood.

Quotation (b) is characteristic of the time and the man, the time's virile indelicacy in abuse, classical enough, and the man's favourite word, "belly". Among his very extensive repertoire of unpleasanteries why should this be a favourite? Perhaps he chose to repeat the idea often to let familiarity stifle the shame that Jonson the soldier and sworder may well have felt in the growth of his own "mountain belly". Perhaps he led the laugh against himself to damp his lampooners' powder, in bar and book. Anyhow, the genial grossness of the word, as in his phrase, "woman's great belly", is characteristic not only of his age but, in a mild way, of his personal relish for the heartiest crudity, a relish revealed in its least complicated form in the odyssey of London's "Cloaca Maxima".

In that the other references (I) illustrate matters more brightly lit by his allusions to other Latins, we may leave Persius with the reiteration of the observation that Jonson held him in high favour (2) for his kinship in satire.

(I) Discovery CXXX (trifling); Cunn.I.p.165 (sanna - appropriately courtly Latin equivalent of "cocking a snoot"; do.p.273; do.p.310, i.e."Sejanus",IV,5.(a fatuous comment on this in Giff. "Jonson seems afraid almostxx to trust himself out of the classics". The editor has the wrong sow by the ear. Jonson prided himself on hi ability to stay within the classics; do.II, p.560(on a well known Roman custom); do.III.p.103 ("open vow" for"aperto voto", a translation surely for the cognoscenti only.

(2) As final evidence of this one may cite the fact that Persius was the present he chose for his dear friend, John Roe, and the elegant Latin of the title-page dedication speaks of Persius as:

"Hunc amorem et delicias
Suas, Satiricorum doctissimum.."

Catul.

It would appear that Jonson rated Catullus as inferior to Martial. At least that seems to be the most reasonable deduction from his explosive marginal[1] comment on a comparison drawn between the two in favour of Catullus, by Muretus. Against this conclusion be it noted that the comparison of Muretus is so unbalanced as to call for protest even from one who held Catullus to be in truth the greater. Still the terms 'dure and false' applied by Jonson to that critic's view strongly suggest that Jonson was on Martial's side. As we shall show elsewhere, however, that Martial was possibly Jonson's favourite among Roman poets, even at its most strongly adverse interpretation this interesting but puzzling comment leaves the possibility that Jonson had a high regard for Catullus. And we find it is so, for, in addition to the reasonable number of direct references to the works of Catullus, we have in Jonson three considerable translations or adaptations from his work.

The first[2] is an adaptation of the famous poetic test piece, "Vivamus mea Lesbia", with which Jonson combines its sequel, now numbered VII among the works of Catullus. In this Jonson, contrary to his habit, takes liberties with the text, which for their rarity may be noted. Thus we have (a) the transposition of ideas, e.g. line I0 in Jonson is 11.2-3 in Catullus; (b) adaptation of ideas, e.g. "sports of love" and "love's fruits" replace all the Roman's arithmetical climax of kisses. In 11.21,22 we find him modernising the original in a way which, though characteristic, requires explanation and may be held significant. Thus, for the idea of the evil eye he substitutes, rationalising, the quite unsuperstitious concept of ordinary jealousy. Why? Every one of his audience would have understood "the evil eye". Why should he who normally changed his originals so little have made this alteration? (c)He has permitted additions, e.g. lines II to I4 apply to the action of the play and are not warranted by Catullus, though the facts

(1)Herford & S.I.p.253.
(2)Volp,III,Sc.6.

of his experience may have been very similar. Further, ll.I5 to I8 are Jonson's cynico-philosophic addition, suggested by - as Gifford plausibly opined - the Institutes of Sparta.(I) And the acceptability of this surmise is not lessened, really, by the obvious fact that Jonson need not have sought outwith his own experience of matrimonial estrangement for the germ of such a commonplace observation.

Undoubtedly the interpolation, lines II to I4, is an artistic shock. The idea they contain belongs to the pentameter context of the play itself, not to the lighter, lyric metre of the song proper. They are prosaic, factual, almost business-like, lacking in emotional quality, a lack that is made the more noticeable by the intensity, spirituality, and "generalised" quality attained or attempted in the rest of the translation. It seems that in this Jonson as a poet and a dramatist is guilty of a breach of taste, and guilty by his own legislative pronouncement, for no literary canon is more stressed by our author than that which insists that uniformity of texture is a prerequisite of all great art. Surely that argument he loves to bring against purple patches may here be fairly urged against his own patch of drab grey. To this blemish, speaking of details, one need only add a doubt about the equivalence of the English word "light," which in a song is either too ingenious or too limited in implication. These technicalities apart, can this be considered a good translation, as Gifford thought? I hardly think so, and chiefly for this reason that, being balanced, end-stopt, and stiff, it can convey to the English reader little of the grace, ease, and fluidity that are so marked in the original Latin.

In still another respect this song is pertinent to our present investigation. Even Gifford, after breaking a lance for Ben, refuses to follow up with close swordsmanship and confesses he agrees with the detractors who claim that the song is "ill-timed"(2) By this I assume he means that Ben's propensity for

(I) and (2) Gunn.I.p.370.

'bringing home' a classic author has misled him into putting this song in the mouth of a character that suggests any bird of prey rather than a sweet songster. Jonson himself certainly felt a little justification was necessary: so before he begins to pipe Volpone gives this by pointing out that in the past he has been a notable actor, a matinee idol even, what time a comedy was acted for 'the great Valois'. This certainly makes the introduction of the song a credibility, if not the probability that the drama demands, since the very lateness of the explanation savours of a deus ex machina. Still this is but another concealed tendency of the Fox. For years he has hidden his natural lustiness, playing a part for business reasons; when he does break into song, surprise affects the other characters as well as the audience. Indeed, judged from the auditorium instead of the leisured and more captious study I doubt whether the most hostile critic would refuse to accept , scena movente, as incompatible with the known antecedents of Volpone this sudden revelation that his lascivious heart could find choral utterance, and the choral utterance of a classic lyric to boot. Note, too, (since the publication of the play may render an appeal to an audience an invalid defence) that there is nothing inherently improbable in representing Volpone as being acquainted with the song, and for two reasons: (a) Ben considered such Latin elementary, and Volpone is represented throughout the play as speaking like a gentleman whose education had gone far beyond Catullus, and (b) Jonson might well hold that Volpone was not quoting a Latin song. Jonson had brought the song home. Volpone and any gentleman in England was free to sing it. On these grounds I fail to see how in the present instance it can fairly be asserted that Jonson's classical learning did anything to stifle his genius or mislead his judgment.

Speaking with the inevitable bias of this century one may round off one's feeling about this translation in an Irish

manner, thus: the style of the translation suggests that, as a poet, Jonson might have been an excellent prose writer. Its prose quality makes one regret that he did not seek the same lucidity, clearness, and modified balance when he came to write formal prose. It is a regret that will reappear when we come to treat of Jonson the historian-that-might-have-been.

The Marriage of Manlius was another work of Catullus[1] made use of extensively by Jonson, this time in 'The Masque of Hymen'. And naturally so, since he sought to reproduce the ceremonies and stage-props of ' a pine tree', 'flaming hair', the carrying of a bride across the threshold, and the general epithalamic hymn for blessings on bed and board, factual in nature all these borrowings, however dainty and fanciful the facts. It appears, however that his adaptation of Catullus' hymn was 'cut' in the first presentation only one stave being sung. As usual, confident in the reversal of this judgment by his readers and by posterity, Jonson printed the full text among his published works, together with an insulting pardon for the unspecified auditors or comptrollers whose ignorance had lead to the suppression.[2]

Jonson's longest translation from the works of Catullus occurs in 'The Barriers'.[3] The original, Catullus LXII ll.42-62, is the loveliest passage from Catullus' choral debate between the young men and the maidens on the cause of matrimony against the cause of virginity. Apart from the vital metre, and unreproducible, features of the metre, the beauty of the original owes much to the phrasing and to the two analogies, general and obvious enough to have the universal quality of appeal of all great poetry and raised far above the attendant danger of the commonplace by beauty of melody, nicety and fullness of the detail with which the analogies are worked out. Yet Jonson's translation reveals no

---

(1) Catullus LXI. Cunn.III.p.20, 27, 28, and 41('Hue and Cry')

(2) Her. and Simp.II.p.269.

(3) Cunn.III.p.33.

comparable inevitability, or ease of rhythm, or cadence of phrase. Indeed, as a verse translation it is incredibly bad in all but one respect, and that is fidelity to fact. So awkward are Ben's numerous inversions, so craggily Latinate such words as 'untouched', 'stroke' (i.e.'mulcet') and 'extols', so awkward is the ellipsis in 'shoot' and similar offences to the human ear, deluded by the human eye into expecting euphony, that one is driven to this conclusion, that here, as so often elsewhere, Jonson consciously and even on principle sacrificed every other merit in favour of absolute verbal fidelity. The result is, naturally, a school-boyish travesty of an immortal poem. A less apt choice for this sort of treatment could hardly be imagined.

It may be observed here, in passing, that this treatment of Catullus by Jonson is his normal or most frequent practice, but not invariable. The problem is recurrent, so we may take leave of it and Catullus with a general proposition on Jonson's literal translations (a), and two explanatory suggestions on this particular translation of the Marriage Hymn (b) and (c).

(a) Was it that for these very well known passages of Catullus Jonson felt such awe that he regarded the order of ideas and even the turns of phrase as sacrosanct? Did he think of each of his educated auditors as conferring the translation with his recollections of the original, line by line and word by word? In support of the latter view we may note that even the literal translation in his general or popular work 'Volpone' is less rigidly literal than the passages in his caviare confections, the masques.

(b) In substance and implication the whole passage supports the patriarchal or classical view of marriage by stressing as paramount feminine virtues submission , chastity, and fecundity. In its proprietorial and contemptuous attitude towards women it is a counterbiast to the 'romantic nonsense' that furnished many a plot for Jonson's rival playwrights. If this be granted, there is an obvious reason for Jonson's scrupulous adherence to the form of the original, even beyond his wont; he is sensing to the full classic

corroboration of his own views on women's proper place and function.

(c) Apart from and supplementary to (a) and (b) it may be that, as his masques were written to order, there was a now-undiscoverable reason for the very literal treatment of the "Hymen Hymenee".

In the Appendix to the "Masque of Queens" it is of interest to note that Jonson indulges himself in a little rash or misleading literary criticism of the 'A is better than B' order. "A" is Catullus; "B" Callimachus. As the "Coma Berenices of B is not extant, Jonson's sage comment cannot be more than an echo of tradition - of Ovid[1] probably - and is not, as it sounds, original.

The other discovered references to Catullus[2] are slight and of no obvious significance, though some human interest may attach to his references to the "lame god of fire"[3], in as much as his copy of Catullus was apparently one of the volumes salvaged from the famous Fire in his study.

Claudian. In our progress towards the greater lights of Jonson's inspiration we next come upon Claudianus, who, for our immediate inquiry, is very interesting. It appears that for Claudian Jonson acted in his day as publicist or champion against obscurity, as impresario almost. It was Gifford,[4] I think, who first pointed out that Jonson was the first English scholar to familiarise his countrymen with the works of Claudian, "last of the classics". And from the time of Jonson's advocacy down to 1800 his protege appears to have increased in popular favour - as these things are. In more recent years perhaps only the unusually curious scholar or historian has much regard for Ben's

---

(1) Amor.I.XV.

(2) (a) H.& S. I.p.279 suggest that the motto to a "Tale of a Tub", inficeto inficetior rure" is a reference to Inigo. Catul.XXII.
(b) Cunn.III.p.319, and again do.I.237.
(c) do.I.p.5.

(3) See (b) above.

(4) Cunn.III.p.118.

discovery or advocacy.

As to the familiarising his countrymen with Claudian it must be observed that, with one exception, all known attempts occur in courtly entertainments, none in works for the pubiic stage. One wonders why. There may be two factors at work. (a) Jonson may have recognised - surprisingly for him - that Claudian was beyond the palate of a public audience,(1) even the educated "wedges"; (b) He himself may not have made the acquaintance of Claudian before the accession of James and the great impetus that gave to masking. Of the two suppositions, however, (a) alone fully squares with the fact that in courtly entertainments references are frequent and elsewhere not to be found, even in Ben's post-Elizabethan work.

In Claudian Jonson found what most he had need of in courtly masques and barriers, a contributory source of suggestion for courtly compliment, as well as classic authority for the mythological pageantry of these recherché pantomimes.

To the mind of a scholar or pedant king, like James, would it not mightily enhance the flavour of the following compliments to learn later from the author's careful notes, that Claudian, no vulgar spring, was the source of such acceptable tributes ?

(a) On the occasion of his majesty's formal entry into London this: "Totus adest oculis, aderat qui mentibus olim".(2)

(b) "No watch or guard could be so safe to the..person of a king prince(princeps) as the love and natural affection of his subject"(3)

(c) Peregit Tranquilla Potestas
Quod Violentia nequit."(4)

All these are worked into the "King's Entertainment", suggesting very clearly that on this occasion Jonson "had the book open"(6) Taken with the further compliment from the same source and on the(5)

(1) Motto to the "Magnetic Lady" properly a learned occasion.
(2) Cunn.II.p.559 (3) do.p.558. (4) do.p.563. (5) do 563.
(6) Note the page sequence.
(5) A popular sentiment. See, too, Cunn.I.282-3.

same occasion to the worthiness (piety) of the monarch, these debts to Claudian show that Jonson had accorately gauged several of his monarch's most cherished misconceptions, such as, his clear picture of himself as a master of peaceful diplomacy, the idol of his people, and par excellence, a scholar.
And think of it! All these intoxicating draughts were from an untapped well of inspiration, poetry, and erudition.

For the rest, Jonson, rebutting by anticipation the censures of less deep or perhaps, notice, more severely classical scholars, cites Claudian twice in supposrt of his own contention that there did exist in ancient times a plurality of cupids(I) and for other matters of equal moment.

It cannot fairly be claimed that by direct quotation or by incontrovertible allusion Jonson shows any appreciative affection for the more imaginative qualities of Claudian. Unless to this we make exception of his references to the spice lands,(2) and Favonius,(3) in which he is unsuccessful in capturing the full sensuousness and delicacy respectively of the original. Happier far is his topical allusion,in Prince Henry's Barriers, to the dispersal of the Spanish fleet, where his version,for once, is briefer than the source and yet adaquate.

Fest.Avien. The frequency of Jonson's allusions to Festus Avienus is altogether adventitious. Of the total (at least I4) no less than five(4) help to provide the factual basis for the "Masque of Hymen", another clear case of the open book, not simply encyclopedic memory work. Even the few other borrowings from Festus(5) do not occur in major works. Little of significance can be squeezed from these facts beyond the tentative theory that Jonson on his own valuation of the classical hierarchy of letters reserved the "greater" authors for his own major works.

However, not to dismiss Avien too scurvily, we may take one case. Jonson's own footnote on the title "Curis", as applied to

(I) Cunn.III.pp.I4,26.See,too,Proper.p.22. Convenient faith for a
(2) do.p.II8. (3) do.p.II8. No.2 reminded (writer of masques.
poet and commentator of (3); (4) Cunn.III.pp.I4,20,26(3);(5)do.38,42

Juno, is an extreme example of his general care in explaining the erudite origins of his masques' mythological devices; for in this case[1] he meanders through a page of explanation on the fantastically frivolous occasion of an unnecessarily introduced surname in a courtly masque. Even his commentators, Upton, Whalley, Gifford, or Cunningham, have never spun a finer , or, in Jonsonese, more araneal web than this tissue from his own loins.

The real explanation of the relative frequence of 'Fest' among footnotes on Jonson is that Festus was an antiquarian, or, anyhow, a translator of an antiquarian work on etymology and Roman institutions. So these references of Jonson go to emphasise the known and notable fact that for Jonson both these subjects were of compelling importance and absorbing interest.

Lucan. Jonson expressed his admiration for Lucan as frequently and sometimes as warmly as for any ancient poet. To Jonson he was 'that excellent Lucan'[2]...'the divine Lucan'[3]. And of Lucan's works he says, 'admirable verses I can never weary to transcribe'[4]...' 'written with an admirable height'[5]. On occasion he is even compelled to quote the actual words of Lucan by a feeling of 'religion'. As against these eulogistic comments, in conversation with Drummond, slighter evidence, indeed, he recognised Lucan's shortcomings, as in making every man speak as well as himself[6] (a charge of which, with 'learnedly' for 'well', Ben himself is often guilty). Thus far Jonson's reported conversational remark is not at variance with his presumably more matured footnotes. But the conclusion of this remark, as given by Drummond, requires us to review and limit what, at first appeared to be his enthusiasm for Lucan, the more so because Drummond gives the 'contradictory' statement twice[7]. The unsettling

(1) Cunn. III. p.24.
(2) id. III. p.46.
(3) id. p.51. re 'I bit off a sinew'.
(4) id. id. Note the insistance on transcribing select passages.
(5) id. p.50. re 'spurging of the eyes'.
(6) H. & S. I. p.149.
(7) id. pp.134 and 149.

part of the remark is this:'Lucan taken in parts was Good divided, read altogidder merited not the name of a Poet', or was, more simply 'naught.' "A judicious toning down", thinks Professor Simpson,(1) of the eulogies above. A later verdict certainly and more in conformity with modern views. But is it irreconcileable with, or even necessarily, a toning down of 'divine' and 'admirable' ?. In effect,it is a corrective to the exaggerated regard suggested by the first encomiums, but not, I think, in the sense suggested by 'toning down', as a wholly or half-deliberate attempt to go back on a previous opinion.The self-contradiction is perhaps merely apparent. The final verdict - if Drummond gives it - is that Lucan lacked the architectonic gift and adhered too closely to fact, whereas the true poet makes fiction as real as fact.(2) How could Jonson apply the terms he did to an author who lacked these cardinal virtues? The answer may be that this is due to a special feature of the literary training he received, inculcated and practised, namely the distilling, memorising, and transcription of chosen passages from chosen authors.(3) Such a method is liable to exalt Lucan. He is very quotable: purple patches abound in his works. The scholar who applied himself diligently to the rare-blooms or choice-excerpts method of improving his own style could not but rank Lucan very high and deserving of warm admiration, even though, on consideration, he felt dissatisfied with Lucan's as a whole. In this way the poet who was,as an architect,'naught' might well be,as a sculptor,'admirable' or even 'divine'.

To consider first the excellencies of the excellent Lucan, these being material both to a consideration of the immediate problem and as illuminating Jonson's personal tastes and character.

Well, the most favoured and quoted verses indicate a strong - not to say morbid - taste on the part of the admiring transcriber.

---

(1) H.& S. I.p.155.
(2) Epicoene, Second Prologue.
(3) Cf. Hamlet's celebrated 'tablets'.

They anatomise the technique of witchcraft. In grisly detail they describe the habitations of witches,(1) the methods by which the witches of old, and presumably their successors, were wont to secure supplies of living blood,(2) their distinct and accepted preference for a diet of high, tough, and felon corpses,(3) and their highly professional readiness to perform a Caesarean operation in search of a really tender infant(4) for their nefarious oblations. Erichtho(5) receives an amplitude of consideration, rivalled only by Horace's Canidia. To sum up(6) the basic subject matter he borrows from Lucan runs thus: howling wolves, the noise of a corpse whipped by a snake, fiends and furies, the disembowelling and mastication of corpses, the slitting of throats and bellies, charnel-houses, churchyards, graves,

'wolves' hairs,
The mad dog's foam, the adder's ears,
The spurging of a dead man's eyes',

the snatching away of a raven's half-finished meal, with such similar details of the hocus pocus of witchcraft, irresistibly reminiscent of kindred horrors in 'Macbeth', some two years earlier.

Witchcraft apart, Jonson's greatest debt to Lucan is in 'Catiline (ActI.Sc.i.) where in a passage of ghastly power and considerable rhetorical quality he gives an adaptation of Lucan's picture of the Marian Terror. This passage differs from his other Lucan borrowings not in subject matter but in its wider sweep and quality of universality. The contexts are similar:

'When the free sword
...was familiar
With entrails, as our augurs'..(7)

and

'Slaughter bestrid the streets and stretched himself
To seem more huge'.(8)

(Jonson's additions, much preferred by Gifford, are in his usual elaborising manner, heavy in nature, catalogue-like in effect.)

(1) Cunn.III.pp.46,50. (2) id. p.51. (3) id. p.51.
(4) id. p.51. (5) id. pp.48,54.
(6) All in Cunn.III. pp. 46-54.
(8) Inevitably recalling Cassius' picture of Caesar the Colossus.
(7) Cunn.II.p.83.

If these were among the passages Jonson noted with admiration in Lucan's work what is the significance of his admiration?

Before trying to assess that, one must remember these qualifying factors in the above references to Lucan.

(a) Practically all occur in masques, chiefly 'The Masque of Queens'. That is to say, in Jonson's view these matters formed suitable entertainment for the court of an accomplished connoisseur of witchcraft. So, even had Jonson detested Lucan, he might well have used him as a reference book in such a case as this.

(b) The intention in these passages was clearly, in some measure, to hold his audience through the fascination of physical and supernatural terrors or horrors. Now it cannot have been easy to write a successful dramatic 'shocker' in competition with the 'revenge' dramas, or, still more, in competition with the real-life scenes of the hangman's disembowelling and quartering dexterity. To hear of 'a raven feeding on a quarter' would call up a very precise and even familiar picture to Jonson's audiences, but it was at best a poor second to the free shows provided by the government. It follows, therefore, that Jonson's stress on revolting physical horrors cannot have appeared as disproportionate to his first audience as to us. His attitude may well be accepted as representative, in this matter, of the mass of contemporary, insensitive masculinity. In that light, his excerpts from Lucan are more an interesting illustration of his contemporaries' obtuseness to the humane than a reflection of, and on, his own personal reactions to Lucan.

(c) Nor can one conclude that the frequency with which Jonson himself points out his borrowings indicates a high esteem for Lucan, because in 'The Masque of Queens' he was on his mettle to show Prince Henry the range and accuracy of the classical learning on which he had based the machinery of this masque.(1)

With these points in mind, one is at first inclined to suspect Jonson of irony in his expressions of approval of Lucan. That attitude is un-Jonsonian and for the following reasons impossible:

(1) H.&S.II.p.282.

(a) Only his most approved masters could be adduced for his highest audience, the court.

(b) There can be no doubt that in at least three instances Jonson's treatment of his borrowings accords with his expressed theory on Lucan's poetic merits. The first of these, the picture of Slaughter already mentioned, is a passage in which the translator evidently took as much pride as pains, a natural correlation, for it is stately, elaborate, rhetorical and of high seriousness.

This being so we revert to our former tentative conclusion that Jonson denied Lucan the power to create fiction, or character, or epic narrative worthy of the term 'poet', but he admired Lucan's powers of pungent, macabre, 'heightened'(1) poetic description.

From all this in turn we may hazard a few conclusions about Jonson the man.

(a) He had no more of tender humanity in him than his contemporaries and in his calm near-sadism compares very badly to modern minds with his gentler compeer, Shakespeare.

(b) Though policy may have suggested the subject of witchcraft, Jonson's own vigorous personality dictated the form of that study. As was always his way, for example in Tacitus, in dealing with customs or institutions, he treated witchcraft as a matter for historico-scientific research in his memory or library, for the marshalling and conferring of authorities, the balancing of probabilities against possibilities and earlier against later evidence. Hence the enormous machinery of his footnotes to this masque.

(c) Jonson felt at least one kind of romance, the romance of the horrible. His material was, it is true, authoritative. But it was fantastically ingenious, gruesome, and ghastly, showing no restraint of fancy in its own macabre genre. Even though Jonson tabulates and footnotes these nightmares as methodically as a modern psychologist cross-indexes the wildest of neurotic ravings we see his romantic leanings in his selection of facts, the thoroughness of his knowledge suggestive of loving interest and the work of his own imagination on his facts, modifying and, most significant, amplifying them. All this

(1) 'gravity and height of elocution'..To the Reader, Sejanus.

suggests ~~xxxx~~ a certain measure of attraction. In actual fact, it would be little injustice to Jonson to say that if it suited his dramatic occasions he would not boggle at accepting[1] the wildest and most romantic nonsense, ~~xx~~ just the sort of thing he regularly condemned, with this proviso, that the least restrained nightmares he adapted or devised must have the sanction of Latin authors, ancient or mediaeval. Jonson's objections to the quaint excesses of his fellow dramatists could - as here - vanish before the magic of solemn authorities for arrant nonsense

.....

(I) i.e.as an artist and dramatist. I see no evidence that he believed or disbelieved in witchcraft, or saw any need to question it. Policy would, in any case, cause the suppression of 'heretick' doubts.

Chap. 5.

The Majora Sidera.

Seneca.

There is little doubt that , in the main, Jonson accepted the prevailing I6th Century valuation of Seneca both as a dramatist and as a moral philosopher.(I) It could hardly have been otherwise, for many causes must have combined to make Jonson regard Seneca as a suitable model in drama. Seneca was , for example,'the rage' of the intellectuals during Jonson's most impressionable years, perhaps even the subject of his own school's exercitations in drama; the universities - objects ever of his veneration - acted and imitated the 'Tenne Tragedies' in Latin; the most notable early English tragedies were of Senecean pattern, such as "Gorboduc" and "Jocasta", still in Ben's productive years doubtless matters of debate, praise and dispraise, between younger and older generations of professional playwrights and scholarly imitators of the ancients. Finally, Seneca's Latin was much more familiar even to Jonson than the Greek of greater dramatists.

Probably, however, Seneca had for Jonson an attraction beyond even convention, learned association, classic sanction and professional and technical interest: I mean the attraction of "high sentence". In the case of several previous authors there has appeared clear evidence of Ben's moral fervour, ethical interests, and, in consequence, his didactic quality. Sententious moralising was ever dear to his heart; it harmonised with his ideals of the dignity of his art, and his sense of the poet's duty and civic responsibility to point towards the best and the worst in human conduct.

I see no evidence that he troubled himself with the modern feeling of Seneca's "insincerity". After all, rhetorical rhapsody and pontifical annunciation had been established as a tradition by the earliest English Senecean tragedies, and it was a quality that must have seemed most natural to the "transition"

(I) Of some 32 reference to the younger Seneca, II concern his tragedies.
(2) He was, however, with astonishing diffidence, critical of Seneca's diffuseness. (H.& S.II,p.440.)

audiences, familiar with the moral didacticism of the church's homespun drama and its secularescent developments. And much later only the rankest fustian would annoy or amuse an Elizabethan audience, and even then perhaps only the best informed sections of that audience. Elizabethan drama, late as well as early, abounds in proof that popular taste demanded high-sounding rhetoric and swelling terms, the very stuff of Seneca. If Jonson was saved from this type of contemporary excess it was largely through his pedestrian qualities of wit that check and yet sustain his rhetoric. He was certainly not saved by his critical faculties or by any sense of satiric humour that might have led him to mock, or at least question, the satisfying roundness, resonance, and moral uplift of Seneca's commonplaces.

Apart from his overt references hereafter considered and the quality of his tragic speeches, it might be thought that the best evidence of his regard for Seneca is to be found in his memorial verses to Shakespeare. In these, of course, Seneca, "him of Cordova dead", is apparently ranked in literary majesty with Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles; such is a natural deduction from the juxtaposition of the names. Against this view it must be noted that Ben is here writing fortissime and in conventional graveyard strain, not a whit short of idolatry. He is seeking all the names of the mighty dead that might do honour to his subject, cumulative honour, from each ancient his peculiar contribution, the flower of each's achievement towards the general wreath, by a sort of rhetorical paranomasia. It is not Jonson's intention herein to make a critical ranking of these ancient giants, inter se, or to compare Seneca, even by implication, with any or all of them. That the praise is of this sweeping, not to say indiscriminate, order appears in the association of Seneca with Pacuvius and Accius, not mighty ghosts these but the ghosts of ghosts, legendary reputations of which neither Jonson nore any post-classical scholar had the opportunity of judging adequately for himself.(1) The reference, therefore, must be considered

(I) Fragments and titles alone remain. Anyhow, Ben tacitly accepts Martial's stricture on their stylistic crudities in a favourite quotation. See Cunn. III, pp. 399, 425, "vomunt".

as weightily corroborative but not as a final proof of Jonson's esteem for Seneca.

In one obvious respect Jonson did not follow the practice of Seneca as did his contemporaries. Unnatural and horrific crime, massacre, macabre ghostliness and grisly gruesomeness were romantic elements in the works of Seneca that appealed strongly to an Elizabethan audience, and, consequently, both privately and professionally to those who sought their plaudits. Ben did not often yield to that. Even the box-office power of horror in the 'revenge' cycle did not induce Jonson to make unnatural domestic crime the ruling motif of a popular play. The masques are things apart: there the horrors are largely incidental, not very serious in effect and introduced for purposes already fully dealt with. He chose not to write popular plays on grim themes. Why? I incline to put it this way. He abhorred excess as inartistic, abhorred it on theoretic and critical grounds, and on temperamental grounds. The main thing is he abhorred it. Now, what is the melodrama of the revenge plays but bombast of action? The same exaggeration, caricature of tragedy, inartistic excess. And if these results do not inevitably follow the selection of such violent deeds as a theme, then it is through "much cunning" on the part of the playwright, through an alchemic imagination that Shakespeare showed in 'Hamlet' and Jonson rightly sensed he could not trust himself to show.

There is, true enough, a good deal of incidental horror in "Sejanus" and "Catiline". Note first, however, that the horror in correct Senecean technique, is narrated; note, secondly, that it is all amply warranted by history, and, indeed, could hardly be omitted. Further, the unnaturalness of the crimes of both plays has the dignity of affecting the very life and honour of the state. They are not private crimes. The distinction might be clearer if we imagine how Jonson might have treated the Hamlet theme. The stakes

at issue would not have been the soul and self-satisfaction of Hamlet, prince or ghost, the sanity of Ophelia, the purity of Gertrude. The stake would have been the commonweal, the struggle a straightforward struggle for political supremacy,(1) the issue clear-cut between Claudius, the usurper, and Hamlet, the dispossessed. And, as an example of detail, the sottishness of Claudius might have become a humour that exposed the state to foreign invasion, and Polonius might have recaptured his youthful skill in machination and rivalled Mosca. Though what of all that? If Hamlet's real humour had been introspection, it would have led "consistently" to inaction, and all the characters in Ben's version would have died in their beds according to the lease of nature - unless, of course, Claudius had a humour for poisoning. Very wisely Jonson left this sort of thing alone.

Of specific references to Seneca (the younger) the majority (I8) are to be found in Jonson's own footnotes to "Sejanus", and, therefore fall to be treated among his historical sources, as do five others.

Surely these references to Seneca collectively suggest an unusual treatment of Seneca by Ben and by an Elizabethan, for the proportions of these debts indicate a relative neglect of Seneca's rhetorical aphorisms and moral precepts, and an equally surprising preoccupation with Seneca's incidental contributions to history and mythology. We have already had frequent occasion to point out that history and mythology were two of Jonson's main objects of study. And we have also observed that he is relatively diffident about adopting moral and epigrammatic dicta. But in 'Catiline' and 'Sejanus' Jonson's debts are less tangible but far more vital than the adoption of phrase, or sentiment, or even technique. Without in any way running counter to recorded history, making indeed, as will appear, the fullest use of historical sources, Jonson has yet succeeded in giving to the personages of his two Roman plays an atmosphere and bearing markedly Senecean, obligations to these which we must in a moment return.

(I) Speeches to the people by Hamlet and Claudius.

To take first his more overt debts to Seneca, the most interesting is the Induction to "Catiline", in which the Ghost of Sylla rises in the manner of Tantalus in the "Thyestes" (and like Envy in the "Poetaster"), to authorise, bless, and specify the crimes that Catiline, up-stage, is contemplating. Knowing Catiline's past, both naturally and supernaturally, Sylla is well placed to serve as prolegomena. In the body of Sylla's speech Jonson has incorporated two direct borrowings from the speech of Tantalus, so that the question of a still further removed Greek prototype for this stage device does not arise. The general drift of the borrowed passages is "horror upon horror".

Professors Herford and Simpson condemn this technical device of Jonson as an "anachronism" having neither "meaning" nor "truth" in England, where the belief in "transmitted fate" did not hold. Then, rightly enough, they commend to Jonson's disadvantage, the simpler and more natural use of the supernatural in "Macbeth" and "Hamlet". Their final explanation of Shakespeare's superiority in this seems to be that the audience would be none the worse if they failed to perceive anything supernatural in the action of "Macbeth" and "Hamlet", since there supernatural agency's "mode of operation is..the simple soliciting of one person in the drama by another".

There is certainly nothing simple or natural about Sylla's ghost: it comes direct from hell, and says so. Indeed, the whole effect of its introduction lies in that fact. Jonson is surely not to be condemned because the apparition is what he intends it to be, namely, as unnatural or supernatural as possible. The real sting of the criticism is in the words "truth", and "meaning" and "transmitted fate". Surely all this is just too sweeping. We know that the Elizabethans set few bounds to what the powers of evil could accomplish - admittedly according to nice rules and precedents. To a people whose superstitions were of a particularly material kind surely the appearance of a demoniac ghost to foretell and acerbate the villainy of a Catiline[1] had

(I)The theme had been presented to them in earlier plays.

in fact a great deal of "truth" and "meaning". They who understood "Macbeth" understood "Catiline": if the weird sisters could disappear into thin air, Sylla is entitled to disappear into solid earth, and to be throughout the "evil spirit" of his son in the unholy ghost, Catiline.

Still, critics do not like this sort of borrowing or - shall we say? - literary resurrectionism; like no prologues, in fact, and supernatural ones least of all. So Jonson and his master, Seneca, stand condemned. That is, for to-day. And for to-day only this is an outmoded convention. Convenient, at best, we grant, as a means of revealing the past, together with some inspired and titillating information about the future, but altogether naive, like the opening of "Richard III" or "As You Like It" - forthright, literary-barnstorming stuff. Didn't Shakespeare abandon it for more subtle methods? He did; and that is largely why it is still out of fashion. But even Shakespeare cannot indefinitely prevent the reflux of fashion in such a matter. The cinema, for instance, has freely reintroduced this Senecean device. And in its previous era of favour it was clearly as acceptable as the soliloquy. Anyhow, Ben's address to the "Reader in Ordinary" does not included this among the passages that aroused popular annoyance. I suggest that they probably accepted this device for a reason he would despise, namely, the tradition of similar trap-door appearances in earlier plays that were hardly "legitimate poems". Perhaps the matter may be summed up thus: the ultimate verdict on the stage scene depends , and depended, on the combined skill of producer, actor, stage-manager, effects-man, and -probably - musician concerned. On the other hand, if, like Ben, we are prepared to have the play judged as a closet drama, there is no objection at all to the device as such, if the reader makes a small effort of imagination (I) and knows a little Roman history.

To make this poem thoroughly legitimate Jonson took

(I) H.& S.I.p.185

also from Seneca the idea of the choruses at the end of Acts I, II, III, IV, as well as the Dramatic Unities of Place, Time, and Action, not without straining the historical facts. All needless troubles, as he put aside all learned prejudice to avow in the introduction to "Sejanus".

In these choruses, of course, Jonson was tacitly appealing to ancient as against immediate Elizabethan practice. He aligns himself with Seneca and the earlier classicisers, as against the uninformed or indifferent romanticists who used "chorus" for "author and, with his superhuman insight and foresight, elucidated mysteries or overbore difficulties in the presentation of the story. A faith that moved mountains, the audience's faith, the playwright's mountains! Ben declined to employ such supernatural means to rid his drama of geographical and chronological difficulties, hampering himself by this principled refusal. So his choruses reveal, not the mind of Jonson, but the mind of the Roman public. In them we view the political crisis through the eyes of a respectable, prosaic, religious, prejudiced, and confessedly short-sighted member of the Roman bourgeoisie , smacking admittedly of Jonson, being of a moralising turn and conversant with the Roman satirists. Still, in his place and function, he accords with classic precept and precedent. This conformity is maintained by the form of the choruses: they are odes, almost certainly meant to be sung. Their stanzaic and metrical structures vary; to the eye they profess themselves songs. One must, however, regret the discrepancy between the normal line, tetrameter, and the normal matter, satire. Shakespeare achieved Jonson's aim, the sustentation of the "good cause", without the classic chorus, admittedly. His chorus is the nationalistic voice of England, and lyrically inspiring to boot. Jonson in his is merely faithful to facts: in "Catiline" the heart of Rome does not beat. Then, did Jonson's work suffer because he chose the strict classic chorus instead of the English adaptation? Not for certain. The fault of pedestrianism, woodenness, lacks of harmony between

(1) Vide Chorus to IV, contrite lament for fickleness. cf. "J. Caesar"
(2) H.& S. II. p. 115, footnote.
(3) The grex of his "E.M.Out.." is , however, notably unclassical.

matter and manner may have been begotten within Jonson himself. Unless we could show that he had a natural tendency to write lyrics of warm imaginative quality, we cannot accuse Seneca and the classics in this instance of damping his natural fire. Had Shakespeare chosen to limit his geography and even topography in accordance with Seneca, the content of his drama would have been greatly changed, but within the chosen nutshell he would still have been Shakespeare and the lord of infinite space. Jonson's method in his choruses was not bad, nor an anachronism, nor a fatal handicap, simply because Shakespeare chose a different form and wrote better plays. The fault was in Jonson's own make-up, not in Seneca; his classical learning was not an original source of weakness. At most its employment was injudicious[I] as a matter or stagecraft, and unfortunate aesthetically in that it tended to emphasise the formalism of his mind, a mind naturally prone to abstractions, generalities, and principles, and lacking - the more by comparison with his great contemporary - in the flesh and blood of imagination, and that inner spiritual warmth which the most exquisitely observed literary forms may suggest but cannot replace. In short, the choruses of "Catiline" are inferior, not because they are classic choruses, but because they are intrinsically indifferent poetry. Jonson was not wrong in seeking to re-create the classic form of chorus: he was in this performing - badly - his normal, self-imposed task of enlightening his fellows on an ancient literary method, which, after earnest thought he considered to be, not essential but, worthwhile. In his favour be it said that some form of chorus is a literary necessity. Authors as unlike as the great Greeks, Hardy, Shakespeare, and Mr.T.S.Eliot have employed it in varying forms, the last named very successfully to contemporary thinking and somewhat in the shape that Ben sought to reproduce from Seneca and his predecessors. Jonson's essay may therefore, be described as a valuable and potentially fruitful failure.

(I) Even this may be an overstatement. The revival of scholarship under James must have greatly widened the circle appreciative of such classicising, and decreased the number who were prepared to confess ignorance and boredom.

As we have said, however, the greatest influence of Seneca on this tragedy and on 'Sejanus' is the least tangible, because it is of the spirit and because it is no more than one among many contributory, coalescing and, therefore, confusing elements of personal character, education, and learning. One might indicate the part played by Seneca's influence in these tragedies by deliberately and illogically segregating it, and so, for convenience, exaggerating it by suppressing the other contributory elements. Thus: A Roman Tragedy appears to have meant, for Jonson, the sort of tragedy that Seneca could have written around Catiline and Sejanus, providing that Seneca had adhered scrupulously to the evidence of the Roman historians and permitted himself to introduce all the pertinent personages and complexities of event authorised by the historians. "Gravitas" is the keynote. The stage action is negligible. The speeches are long and undramatic, and broken occasionally by patches of almost monosyllabic dialogue, both features of Seneca's work. The characters are made mouthpieces of good or bad sentiments. All are conscious moral or immoral philosophers: they are a mixture of humour type and epic type: with a Senecean lack of realism, none is represented as suffering from self-deception in virtue or in vice. Therefore, they do not come to life, though Tacitus, Cicero, and Sallust vouch for every word they say and every thing they do. In so far as Seneca contributed to this effect, his influence was harmful to Jonson, both immediately and in the long run.

Agreed, not all this stiffness of diction and undramatic rhetoric on men and manners is ascribable to Seneca. From Seneca's apparent influence we must deduct Jonson's own preoccupation with social and political ethics, his conception of the dramatist-historian's didactic duty, his conception of Roman dignity, garnered from a field far wider than Seneca, and, finally, his avowed, if perverse, tendency to regard the body of the play as a setting for the lengthy translations that he passionately(1) held to be its supremest beauties, beauties of such a nature that their setting or

(1) Just how passionately he held by the importance of faithful translation may be seen not only in his own numerous asseverations but in his hideously impolite and impolitic snort at the quality of Cardinal Duperron's work in this kind. (H.& S.I.pp.68-9.)

foil required to be of the gravest dignity and most formal severity. Yet, even making the full of such allowances, it is but reasonable to conclude that [illegible], like the ghost of Sylla, (I) there often rose in Jonson's study the ghost of Seneca.

Examples of his literary borrowings from Seneca are as follows: Cunn.I.p.103,288(in Sejanus but unhistorical),325(pedestrian transl. of a cynical bon mot),362(another and worse translation, on a stage quite unintelligibly Latinate); Vol.II,pp.22(of subtle eroticism), 101(obscurity results from Ben's attempt at condensation),384(a conceit on Maecenas); Vol.III,pp.52(unimportant),and 52(mythological) 53(antique ceremonial),54(ditto),and 54(do.witchcraft), 271 (moral aphorism).

Jonson's total borrowings from Seneca may be divided in the following illustrative manner: Three times as many deal with mythology and witchcraft as with moral and ethical aphorisms: and the historical references are three times more numerous still than those on mythology. Relatively, therefore, he makes very sparing use of Seneca's maxims, brilliant or commonplace, which were so much to the taste of his contemporaries and earlier classicisers.

Martial.

In their monumental edition of Jonson's works Professors Herford and Simpson examine in great detail the evidence of Jonson's regard for the work of Martial and amply illustrate debts of style and form in the medley of poems that he entitled "Epigrams". Of all Jonson's latin authorities Martial's is the most easily detected influence. For, unquestionably, the aim of even the world's worst literary mimic would be clear if his butt or inspiration were Martial. In equal measure he provokes, betrays, and baffles imitation or rivalry. In this case, therefore, we may deal lightly with supererogatory evidence of Jonson's knowledge and love of Martial's work, and concentrate on the ultimate questions: To what extent was Jonson successful in his obvious attempts to imitate Martial, and with what general results on his directly imitative work and on his indirectly influenced work. Professors Herford and Simpson supply the answer to the to the first and most of the evidence for the second also. Since I cannot better their general conclusions, save in one questionable point,(I) or do more than elaborate their evidence of Ben's reagard and familiarity, it will be well to start with a brief, though fair, tabulation of their views on the relationship between the Roman and the English Martial. Thus:

(a) Jonson's technique in the ostensible epigram follows Martial's in these respects:

(I) Both employ two recognisable types of epigram, the indicative, or quasi-descriptive, and the syllogistic or deductive-conclusion type.(2)

(2) Surprise is regularly achieved, or essayed, by both.(3)

(3) Both eschew - Ben expressly - mere narration(otiosity).(4)

(I) I think Jonson was further from being the English Martial than they seem to imply. H& S. II. p.349, are admittedly vague.
(2) H.& S. II. pp. 351, 352.
(3) do. do.
(4) do. p. 351, and I. p. 133 ("Conversations")

(b) Stylistically they may be readily discriminated in that B Jonson normally lacks Martial's finesse, thrust, and point. This deficiency he seeks to compensate by energy, force, and - sometimes-violence,(I) all emphasising lack of vital restraint.

(c) Martial claimed that salacity was an essential element of the epigram. Jonson professed to avoid salacity. In the case of neither author did practice wholly conform to theory.(2)

(d) Both flattered royalty with nauseating excess, Jonson perhaps imitatively.(Their further remark, that in Jonson's case it was unnecessary, is obviously only true in a relative sense.)(3)

(e) Ben is at his worst in the shorter epigrams, where Martial characteristically excels.(4)

(f) In his epigrams Jonson's satiric matter is entirely his own, born or provoked of London, not borrowed of Martial. His cynical pictures of depraved humanity owe everything to personal observation, nothing to Martial.(5)

(g) In widening the scope (i.e. range of subject, form, and mood) of English epigram, Jonson was appealing to the practice of Martial, as against that of, say, Sir John Davies. Thus, Jonson's definition admitted to the category, odes, epistles, and epitaphs.(6)

(h) Martial's bitter brevities of portraiture may have slightly influenced the satiric and informative definitions of character that preface "Every Man Out of His Humour" and illuminate "Cynthia's Revels".(7)

(i) There is consonance in their coarseness. Naturally Martial had already coloured, in this regard, the work of Ben's English predecessors.(8) In theory as well as practice Jonson held

---

(I) H.& S.II.p.353,354.
(2) do.p.350.
(3) do.361.
(4) do.355.
(5) do. do.
(6) do.pp.346,340,347.
(7) In so far as these influenced later "character" writing, they served to introduce into English literature Martial and, more, Theophrastus.
(8) H.& S.II.p.342.

that 'salt' and virile grossness were absolute essentials in the work of Martial. e.g. he filled up the blanks of bowdlerism in one edition of Martial,[1] describing it aptly, by implication, as "castratus eviratus" and, more significantly, as "sine Martiali Martialis",[2] in contradistinction, that is, to Farnaby's edition of 1615 which secured his appreciation and advocacy by its virile completeness.[3]

(10) Like the ancient satirists (and his contemporary, Jacques) Jonson asserted that he lashed vices not the vicious, (an assertion that he had to make with suspicious frequency). The actual wording of his apologia, however, generally echoes Martial's Address to his Book. It would seem, then, that in striking this attitude Jonson felt that Martial was the nearest and dearest of his literary kin.[4]

(11) Jonson's regard for Martial probably makes for his insistence on the relative value of his own works in epigram.[5] (Manifestly his regard for Bacon is in line with this. But which regard influenced which?)

(12) In 'Every Man Out etc' and his humour types in general he adapted to the stage the satiric character-drawing of Theophrastus and Martial.[6] (Neither the total debt nor relative shares are indicated. One may reasonably suggest that his sources helped to suggest the quality of his subject matter and his analytic-satiric viewpoint, vital yet elusive contributions to the Jonsonian drama.)

---

(1) H.& S.I.p.253-4.
(2) H.& S.I.p.216.(Jonson's Latin letter in Farnaby's ed. of Mart.)
(3) do. do.
(4) e.g.in a private letter - See H.& S.I.P.195; in the Introd. to 'Volpone', Cunn.I.334; in Induct. to 'E.M. Out',Cunn.I.67, etc.
(5) He called them 'the ripest of my studies' - H.& S.II.p.343.
(6) H.& S.I.p.23.

These then are the main points of resemblance and contrast between Jonson and Martial. Now, the extent and range of such conclusions as these requires to be corroborated by extraneous evidence(to rule out coincidence), by proofs of Jonson's familiarity with Martial's works and Jonson's regard for Martial. Such evidence is widespread and amply confirms the deductions in question. We may tabulate the proofs of Jonson's familiar xx regard for his model in this way:

(I) In his creative work Jonson makes 33 indubitable references to Martial.(I)

(2) From Drummond's report of the Conversations we gather (a) that Martial was the Latin poet most frequently on his lips at Hawthornden.(2)

(b) He regarded Martial as a poet to be read "for delight";(3) he selected some of his satires as tutorial material for Nid Field,(4) and commended Martial to Drummond for his most serious study.(5)

(c) Twice he mentioned, and, indeed,"insisted in" the "vitam quae!(6)

(d) The "Verpe Poeta" ("Vin Verpum",Drummond) "he vantes to expone", recorded the Scot.(7)

(e) His contempt for acrostics he vented in Martial's terms.(8)

(I) Cunn.Vol.I.pp.- 191, 206, 221, 265, 266, 267, 270 and 2 (the same), 298, 348.
Cunn. Vol.II.pp.-560, 562(2), 563, 555.
Cunn.Vol.III.pp.- 47, 111, 230, 233, 248, 254, Motto to Underwoods, 388(the two translations), 395, 397, 399, 419, 425, the expostulation...Total 33.

To illustrate Jonson's <u>relative</u> employment of Martial, the references above may be grouped thus:
(a) One Third occur in masques and minor pieces.
(b) One Quarter occur in epigrams.
(c) Only 3 occur in histories ("Sejanus")
(d) Only 3 occur in all the other major plays.
Conclusions? For Jonson Martial was:
(a) a poet of the study and private meditations - see (d).
(b) an ancient auxiliary or prototype, a kindred spirit -see (c)
(c) in his kind, an important kind, worthy of imitation - see (b) above.
(d) like every Roman, a source of mythologic lore - see (a).

(2) See below notes (3) to (8)
(3) H.& S.I.p.136. (4) do.pp.26, 137.
(5) do.p.132. Note that this list of Jonson's most admired Latins agrees with our present division into Majora Sidera etc, except for Virgil, an omission due more likely to Drummond.
(6) do.pp.132,135. (7) do.p.149. (8) do.p.144.

(f) When he received the lenten fare of a "parasite" at Salisbury's noble table, he expressed the resentment of a freeman in an echo of Martial.(1) (The social slights to his pride were apparently numerous, the injuries keenly felt, this explosion characteristic. Did the recollection of similar ancient slights and retorts give a sort of immortality to his wrongs? Did he speak as and for his dead peers?)

(3) He possessed more than one copy of Martial and one of his latest and still extant copies is heavily annotated in his own hand, among these observations being two partial and pugnacious clouts at Martial's detractors.(2)

(4) As Professors Hereford and Simpson observe, there were similarities in the situations and fortunes of the two poets, heretics among their contemporary epigrammatists(3) similarities that were bound to be felt by an egoist, scholar, and persistent "analogist" like Jonson.)

In view of such ample and cogent evidence as this of Jonson's familiar regard for Martial, the professors are clearly justified in regarding the many resemblances, parallels, and echoes of Martial in Jonson as causal, not coincidental, as formative and influential, not merely curious and adventitious.

Before assessing the general place of Martial in our enquiry we may point out the most interesting individual borrowings from Martial.

It appears, for example, that Volpone's bizarre menage owes one amusing and unedifying circumstance(4) to Martial's picture of Quirinalis. Though he adequately represents the fact of the matter, Jonson's translation blunts the point of the play on "paterfamilias". Did he assume that its full significance would

(1) H.& S.I.p.166, and 141.
(2) do.p.253.
(3) H.& S.II.p.348.
(4) Gunn.I.p.348.

be clear to those whose censures mattered?

I would suggest, too, that Martial's picture of Tongilius feigning sickness that his friends may bring him dainties(1) helps Juvenal and Persius to eke out the details of Volpone's complex masquerade. And these two debts are substantially all that Jonson's popular plays owe to his indubitable knowledge and love of Martial.

Among his shorter and more fugitive pieces the tale is different. Thus, the dainty and apposite conceit on Salathiel Pavy,(2) owes its being and form to Martial, as does, of course, the pathetic and significant motto to "Underwoods".

Significant proof that Jonson was at home in Martial's work appears in the fact that his translation of Martial's Address to his Book(3) is in the select group of Jonson's memorable translations. Perhaps the reason for his success here is not far to seek. Firstly, as usual, Jonson adheres closely to the form and sequence of the original: secondly, as is necessarily unusual, he finds himself the translator of something that rouses his emotional not merely intellectual, admiration. He relishes the poem, no doubt because it is Martial's; but he assimilates it because it might well be his own: the situations of originator and translator are almost identical. The perfect translation is born of such a fusion of interests. Elsewhere your born translator may simulate the process and achieve his results by imaginative metempsychosis. Jonson's muddy vesture was too thick for even such a temporary escape from self. He lacked such suppleness of spirit, and either the will or the power for such subjugation of personality. (Lacked power, rather than conscious will, I think.) Therefore he depends on chance like this to overcome the disability imposed on him by his theories as a translator and by his carapace of egotism. But inevitably such identity of outlook and interest is rare to uniqueness: so, to out minds, are Jonson's great translations.

---

(1) Martial, II, XL.

(2) Epig. CXX. Mart. X, LIII. So, too, on his daughter and son. H.& S. II. p. 380.

(3) Cunn. III. p. 388. Mart. VIII, LXXVII.

By way of contrast, one may instance the "Vitam quae faciunt beatiorem." His translation of this[1] is not comparable with the other in ease or grace: and this despite his conscious and recorded affection for the original.[2] In this translation Martial attracted and eluded Jonson.

Where will an author normally turn him for a motto to his book? To a favourite work or author, surely. If, therefore, Jonson sets the name of a Latin author on even one title-page, it suggests, though it does not prove, esteem. If the same name appears several times, we are justified in concluding a high degree of familiarity and regard on Jonson's part for the author or work in question. In no less than seven cases[3] does Jonson employ the works of Martial for this purpose, and such frequence surely adds weighty corroboration to the other evidence of Martial's standing in his favour. To the extent even of enabling us to declare that he valued no Latin author higher than Martial. Indeed, on this basis of reckoning, Horace is Martial's only rival in Jonson's affection.

Of these chosen texts, all in their place significant, the most interesting is probably that which serves for motto to "Sejanus" and as text for the Prologue to "Every Man In His Humour".

"Non hic centauros, non gorgonas, harpiasque
Invenies: hominem pagina nostra sapit."

This, of course, is a reiteration of Jonson's view of his own position in English literature as the poet of form, order, and reason, in opposition to the popular romantic irrepressibles. Art for him must mirror nature in the narrowest sense. No magic mirrors of the imagination for Ben, no mirrors that distort or fancify, or call up spirits, or people their surfaces with the projections of the author's fevered and undisciplined mind. He will not pause to judge such wild beauties or assess an individual fantasy on its merits: to him they can have none, and Ariel is as Caliban since both must be "untrue to nature".

---

(1) Cunn. III. p.388. (2) H.& S. I. p.135.
(3) King's Entertainment, Underwoods, Poetaster, Sejanus, Cynth's.Rev. (folio), Prologue to E.M.In.., and a Masque.

Of all Jonson's works the printed form of "Poetaster" makes most use of Martial. No less than six times.(1) Why? Can it have been that the mood in which he wrote it, consciously or subconsciously, suggested Martial as the most appropriate book for his few hours of relaxation? Or did he deliberately tune up his "nerves" with re-readings of Martial in the intervals of composition? Did he employ Martial purposefully as a whetstone to his acrimonious but bluntish wit? That indeed is a method he recommended, to read ad hoc selections from the ancients for particular weaknesses of style. And facetiously he makes use of the same idea in the affair of Marston's eructations. Surely in the present instance we catch him making use of his own prescription. For the moment we have a glimpse into his study during the feverish fifteen weeks devoted to writing "Poetaster". He does not use his master's bitter thrusts, indeed. Rather, he reviews them: we see him conning the stoccata and passado of the classic exponent of verbal swordsmanship in hopes to better the execution of his own less finely tempered and balanced blade.

One of the references in point - twice introduced into "Poetaster", in different forms(2) - defines with emphasis the Jonsonian satiric pose. Like his classic prototypes, he professes a blameless anonymity of victim; he claims to tilt with abstractions and personifications. Now, while there is ground for claiming a measure of such generality of attack for his other satiric writings, it is manifestly naive to plead it here, in a play that owes its being to personal animosity in the narrowest sense. One may argue, too, illogically but not unfairly, that in these other less libellous satires there is also a personal occasion and provocation, if not a personal aim. We know he delighted to see his private foes in Martial's mirror; with malicious exultation he would make "Inigo" a rubric to one of Martial's shafts,(3) pushed his colleague, so to speak, into the line of an arrow fired at random long ago. Did he not also incline

(1) The Motto, Address in quarto, and Cunn. I. pp. 221, 265, 266, 267.
(2) "Ludimus innocuis verbis.." and "I used no names". See, too, H.& S. I. p. 196, note. The total argument is Shak's Jaques.
(3) H.& S. I. p. 254.

to reverse this process and proceed from the particular to the general without forgetting the particular and the vitality of personal animus? Just as he savoured his own jests too well to spare his personal friends, so he savoured his righteous indignation too well to spare his personal foes - egoist in both regards.

The other overt references to Martial illustrate features already well illustrated in the case of other authors.

A general estimate of the nature and importance of Martial's influence is involved in the answer to the question: How far was Jonson the English Martial?

To begin with, one must concede on Jonson's part a willingness to fill this role; he sedulously sought the necessary knowledge, he felt the necessary inspiration of reverence and ambition. And these qualifications are very important. They by no means ensure the success of the poet's effort, but they do ensure that the intensity of the effort will affect the nature of the disciple's work in form, and style, and approach. The ultimate limits of these influences cannot be precisely stated because points of resemblance may be due, not to any sort of imitation, but to that kinship of mentality and experience which is the basis of the provocative regard.

In the case of the Epigrams, however, the position is fairly clear. In these Ben's challenge to Martial is direct. His scope, indeed, is wider but it includes the full range of the Martialesque epigram. Note, too, that these cannot be dismissed as minor poems, by-products of the great dramatist. He himself held them among the proudest of his 'works'. We do not. Though it may be that in the present age of criticism and satire a larger measure of attention will be given to these poems from their very nature, yet it does not seem likely that a modern's reactions to a reading of them would

lead him to dissent from a verdict like this: many are powerful; few show finesse; many have touches of ingenuity, writhingly expressed; many are stiff, ponderous, and neat by turns; many are colourless, some positively dull, some just bad prose; and a few are very dainty and fanciful; a few are vicious and foul in the extreme. And, in conclusion, most modern critics would wonder why, contemporary vogue apart, the author of an "Alchemist" set such store by these hard verses and frequent infelicities. On that point definitely we part company with Jonson. But even if we concede the value and interest of the epigram as a literary form to the fullest of his conceptions, we must deny the relative degree of success that he, by profession and implication, claimed for his efforts in this kind. At best his failure to equal Martial in Martial's special domain is a narrow failure, at worst it is bathetic, and for the most part simply distinct but not disgraceful. We are, therefore, driven to conclude that Jonson is a somewhat heavy, somewhat gauche, somewhat verbose, somewhat unsalacious, unrestrained, undexterous Martial. Alas, there is no such thing; and this is to undefine Martial. For in his own limited sphere of excellence Martial is absolute, unqualifiable. To say that Jonson, here and there, approaches Martial, is to do him fair honour. To concede, however, that he falls short in the qualities and degree that make Martial "Martial" is to regard him, in his own phrase, as an English "sine Martiali Martialis".

In the case of the plays Martial's influence is less tangible, less omnipresent, and probably more important. We have already remarked on the evidence of Martial's influence on the character sketches of "Every Man Out of his Humour" and "Cynthia's Revels"[(I)]. It is at least probable that Jonson, who believed, like his favourite Virgil and his master Camden, that a poet should rough out his ideas in prose[(2)], made sketches like these for all his characters. (Such preliminary adumbration is clearly involved in his

(I) The accumulation of satiric traits in "Cynth's Revs" makes it read like the disgorging of epigrammatic notes for an unwritten play.
(2) "Conversations". H.& S. I. p. 143. "he wrott all his first in prose."

balancing of authorities in "Sejanus" and "Catiline".) True, he printed only two of these prospectuses of character. Nothing in these plays justifies the conclusion that these sketches are necessitated by any departures from his normal conception of comedy. There is no reason, therefore, to conclude that the absence of similar sketches from his printed works proves that they never existed in at least embryonic form. And if they did exist, they presumably resembled the printed examples as closely as the two favoured plays resemble the others. In the examples we have the influence of Martial is clear; we may, therefore, conclude that this influence was present in the devisal of all the humour plays - all of which is ingenious rather than conclusive.

The types of character depicted in these sketches are, of course, the characteristic humour types. For such concepts the materials and methods bequeathed by Martial are both satisfying and suggestive: the essentials of Martial and Jonson are herein identical; there is the same simplification and concentration, leading, when the stress or the selection is extreme, to caricature. In short, the humour types may be regarded with an illuminating, if incomplete, measure of truth, as being, each of them, the dramatisation of a basic epigram. They are epigrams not so much elaborated either as reiterated. They are animations (less or more) of terse prose sketches.

The consequences of this reflection of Martial are not wholly for the best. Directness of purpose, clarity of exposition, simplicity of type are admirable qualities in a popular drama: and Martial's influence is along these lines: but the obverse is quite as true and constitutes the standard charge against Jonson's innovation of humour types. Martial fostered his love of analytical dissection of the more obvious traits of his fellows. Martial's pictures are lively snapshots; but Jonson grows tedious when he tries to make cinematic films on the same technique. His pictures lack variety of detail. All is clear cut. In his clever characters there is no shade or sparkle of folly or virtue. His dupes and fops, braggarts and debauchees

are created with a consistency that God did not permit himself. They are logical in folly, consistent in their aberrations, whimsical according to pattern, predestined by Jonson's written or memorised guiding epigram on the salient feature they personify. In all this Martial has his ear, adding power and pungency to the portraiture, detracting from the imaginative realism and spirituality in interpreting the complexities and illogicalities of man's inner heart and deeper motives. If it be an overstatement to assert categorically that Martial vitally influenced the Jonsonian humour type, this at least must be conceded: the extent and nature of the relations between Jonson and Martial make it absurd to suggest that coincidence alone substantially accounts for the similarities between them in matter, outlook, and literary methods.

.....

The Plinies.

(a) The Younger.

The case of Pliny Minor is slightly puzzling. There is but one probable reference[1] to his works in all Ben's plays and poems. The obvious explanation of this scarcity, namely, that Pliny is of the second rank in intellect and imagination, cannot here be automatically maintained; for Jonson has made his regard for Pliny quite clear in other ways. Firstly, the one citation in point is elaborated in "Discoveries"[2]; secondly, two anecdotes of Pliny he "made much of" to Drummond[3]; thirdly, he speaks of Pliny in the same breath as Quintilian, Horace, Tacitus, Juvenal and Martial[4]; fourthly - most vital of all as evidence - he informed Drummond - with a view doubtless to purifying the Scot's style in Latin composition - that Pliny Secundus, together with Petronius and Tacitus "speke best Latin"[5]. (Meaning thereby, I presume, that these three collectively set the standard by which he, Jonson, judged Golden Latinity. Too much stress need not be laid on this. It may mean he thought that an amalgam of these styles was best adapted to the needs of a scholar of his own age who chose to use the learned tongue.[6] In any case, his lively sense of the continuity of Latin and Latin studies made him much less susceptible than later scholars to the urge to file and pigeon-hole Latinists in metallurgic orders of virtue and vintage.) Drummond, then, is our authority for Ben's view of Pliny. And no matter what allowance be made for his shortcomings as evidence we cannot doubt that he has given us a reasonably corret impression.

In the absence of other direct clues we may sum up the position thus: Nothing in these encomiums of Pliny Secundus conflicts with the tentative conclusion that Jonson's high regard for him was primarily, and perhaps almost wholly, due to an admiration for Pliny's prose style. The fact of the scarcity of

(1) In "Mercury Vindicated". The same idea in "Discoveries", viz. the somewhat self-contradictory commonplace that "Nature", in contra-distinction to Man, is inexhaustible.
(2) H & S. I. p. 104.
(3) do. p. 149.
(4) do. p. 132.
(5) do. p. 136.
(6) Particularly in letter-writing. See Cunn. I. p. 24. -"E. Man In."

direct quotation from the work of a favourite author permits the rider, that he felt the quality of Pliny's general matter to be less worthy of reproduction. So, if finally the younger Pliny be properly included among the Majora Sidera, we must regard him as one of those mysterious dark suns that offer no celestial guidance to the literary wayfarer.

.....

(b) The Elder Pliny.

The case of the elder Pliny is very different and very clear: one of Jonson's favourite books of reference was the Natural History.

I consider that what was observed at length of Varro applies in large measure to Pliny Major. Jonson must have felt the sympathy of kinship for (a) the very mass of Pliny's extant and reputed work;(b) for his tireless zeal in reading and the compilation of "Discoveries" too; (c) for his concern with grammar, rhetoric, and history; (d) and for his stores of mythological and archaic lore. Altogether a remarkable coincidence of habit, interests, and mentality. Further, as Pliny's extant work, the Natural History, was the "Novum Organum" of the Empire and the Middle Ages, its traditions, as well as its intrinsically curious contents, must have given it merit in Ben's eyes.

His employment of the Natural History is interesting because (a) it illustrates his general treatment of his factual sources, and (b) the nature of the treatment in this case may be shown to conflict somewhat with a common view of Ben's reliance on authority. It disposes finally, at anyrate, of the older view of Ben as a poor relation of the ancients, or even a literary pick-pocket of everything classical, whether facts or ideas.So far as a

distinction ~~a~~ can be maintained between these two aspects of thought, he borrows facts very frequently, the others, relatively rarely. And even facts he does not kidnap indiscriminately ~~to~~ against a recurrent need, as some have casually supposed.

Pliny he makes use of an indeterminable number of times (7 at least) as corroborative authority for the facts of "Sejanus", as Tacitus had done before him. A normal historian-like procedure this, to check and counter-check all available sources, indeed, according to Ben's light and the light of ~~xxxx~~ days other than his own, the only proper foundation work for an historical play.

No less than 17 times he makes use of Pliny in his masques This practice was doubtless prompted by the nature of the audience, by the precedents of his own and others' successes in adapting ancient myths to the needs of masquery, and the cumulative temptation to surpass his own efforts by increasing the complexity of this ~~xxxxxxxx~~ well-proven device. In other words, in these courtly entertainments he was both freer and more restricted than in his plays for the public stage: restricted, that is, to choosing the matter and decorations of classic archaeology and myth; freer to draw as deeply as he cared on his own stock of learning and to elaborate his borrowings to the limits of his ingenuity and erudition. These circumstances, I believe, narrowed his choice to ~~a~~ and, as a corollary, focussed his attention on the super-nicetie of the original legends, customs, and superstitions. The masques, therefore, are not the complete and true picture of the natural man, Jonson at large, unhampered by fear of playhouse censure. Rather, they reflect a specialist interest developed into a hobby or developed from a hobby. The masques must be measured against his popular plays before we have a fair reflection of the extent and nature of his interest in the classics. And in such major plays the Natural History is mentioned but five times - a small number when we consider the extent of his popular and poetic work in conjunction with the thorough familiarity he evidently had with the content of

the Natural History.

Incidentally, as will appear elsewhere also, I believe Jonson to have been remarkable not only for the number of his borrowings from the Latin classics, but for the restraint he shows in not tapping his vast stores of such learning more frequently. And it may be that his most remarkable feat lay in managing to say so much that is recognisably his own in a world where everything has already been said, and a world in which Jonson knew so many of the sayers and so well. For the weight of his classic learning is, usually, in his plays, ballast; sometimes, especially in masques, the main cargo; and but rarely overflows into the likeness of deck cargo.

Considered individually, the most interesting references to Pliny the Elder are probably these:-

In didactic vein he cites Pliny with Vitruvius in making objection to the painting or literary chimeras,(1) a recurrent criticism in Ben of Elizabethan romanticism,(2) and directed against lack of uniformity of texture and homogeneity of content and form.

Perhaps again we glimpse Jonson the patient scholar at his desk in this very detached afterthought to Candace's epitaph, "She governed in Meroe".(3) It has a distinctly "P.S." flavour that suggests he had consulted Pliny to refresh his memory.

The Roman encyclopedist's tendency towards credulity is replaced in Jonson's case by a nice or non-commital balance between deference to and mockery of his authority, a quasi-scientific suspension of judgment almost. This detachment may be noted in his own footnote to floating islands, where he concedes to a mystery of Loch Lomond precedence over "Delos and co."(4) The same credulity and contempt appear in his references to such matters as the potency of bramble-frogs in magic(5), and aconite in magical medicine,(6) the queer ways of Ethiops,(7) the

(1) Cunn.III.p.409
(2) See Chap. on Martial.
(3) Cunn.III.p.58.
(4) do. p.11.
(5) do. p.52.
(6) do.I.p.304 and III.p.54.
(7) do.III.p.6.

geography of the Niger[1], the libidinousness of the partrich[2], and the euphuistic history of unicorn's milk and panther's breath.[3] Twice he savages physicians[4], on Pliny's authority, but with a verve that suggests corroborative personal experience of their ways. His reference to that time-honoured bogey, the mandrake[5], illustrates, firstly, his curiosity in such hocus-pocus of witchcraft, and, secondly, his sense of the continuity of Latin literature, in that to the support of Pliny he marshals a regiment of mediaeval doctors of the Occult.

Significant, too, of an interest approaching preoccupation with superstitious phenomena and their interpretation is his transcription of a long passage from Pliny[6] in which the latter clearly demonstrates that not all comets presage disaster by instancing the one that appeared with no sinister consequences a little after "the mighty Julius fell."

These above apart, and apart too from the grouping of references to history and some 8 to rites, ceremonies, and the supernatural in general[7], there is no apparent system of tabulation by subject-matter that would throw much further light on the author, this creditor, and their inter-relationship.

.....

(1) Cunn.III.p.3. Does the fact that Jonson cites Solinus as a separate authority here suggest that he regarded him as an independent witness, unaware that Solinus played jackal to Pliny's lion?
(2) Cunn.I.p.382.
(3) do. p.372.
(4) He makes excellent satiric use of this in "Sejanus", Act I, Scenes I and 2.
(5) Cunn.III.p.50.
(6) do.II.p.568.
(7) e.g.Cunn.I.p.382; do.II.p.560; do.III.pp.23(several),31, 56, and 342.

Plautus.

"..at any hand
Shun Plautus.....meats
Too harsh for a weak stomach...."

Thus advised literary-physician Virgil in "Poetaster. Apparently, however, Jonson, having a large faith in his own digestive organs, indulged himself freely in this testing diet. Of course, Jonson's learning being what it was and Plautus being what he was, there existed a prima facie probability that Jonson's plays would reveal numerous obligations to Plautus: for in Plautus there was much material of comedy ready to hand, or readily convertible to Elizabethan needs, partly because the similar conditions of his own time led Plautus to anticipate the needs of an Elizabethan audience. Moreover, Plautus as a mine of ideas for drama, Latin and English, was in full production long before the time of Jonson, and was therefore grown a literary convention of the learned stage, and so of the theatre at large. It was with this probability in mind that Jonson's commentators, from Upton onwards, set about ransacking Plautus for literary parallels and dramatic promptings. These investigations have shown, in brief, that Jonson owes considerable concrete debts to the "Captivi", "Aulularia","Casina","Mostellaria"; less vital obligations to the "Cistellaria" and "Poenulus"; and an option, unclaimed, on the "Amphitryo."(1) To these I incline, as will appear, to add others still less significant.(2) Moreover, to all these works collectively that is, quite apart from localisable borrowings, the commentators agree that Jonson owed much of a less determinable nature, particularly in the concepts of comedy vaguely recognised as characteristically Plautine.(3)

(1)"He had an intention to make a play like Plautus' Amphitrio, but left it off, for that he could never find two so like others that he could persuade the spectators they were one".-Conversations Shades of "Twelfth Night"!
(2)"Menaechmi"(Cunn.I.p.441);"Trinnumus"(do.III.p.395);"Miles Gloriosus(do.I.p.285)
(3) There is no grave impropriety in regarding Plautus as Ben's final source in such apparent debts. Well as he knew Greek, Latin was both his first and his last resource.

The most obvious of Jonson's debts to Plautus is the framework of "The Case is Altered," the early play that he never chose to acknowledge. In this, two of the best known plays of Plautus, the serio-comic 'Captivi'(1) and the farcical 'Aulularia' are entangled to produce a play of great intricacy and little uniformity of texture. It may be that Horace, Quintilian and the Stagirite are responsible for the young dramatist's ingenious but vain efforts to fuse the elements that stubbornly refuse to mix.

The combination of the two plots of Plautus produces, naturally a very 'meaty' play. The nature of the linkage, hardly germane to the present inquiry, is examined in great detail by Professors Hereford and Simpson. What does concern us directly is that the resultant play is inevitably heavier than its originals. This is due not only to the compression of much matter and the reduplication of plots and connections but also to the normal Jonsonian embroidery of fancies.

(I) Jonson's use of the 'Captivi' in 'The Case is Altered' at once recalls Shakespeare's use of the same play in 'The Comedy of Errors'. Hereford and Simpson make the interesting suggestion that the duality of interest in 'The Case' which is quite uncharacteristic of Jonson at any stage of his career is due to a subservient regard for the successful recipe of high and low interests employed in Shakespeare's contemporaneous plays, 'M.S. N's. Dream' and 'The Merchant of V.' True or not, that is a pardonable deduction from such notably and unnecessarily close resemblances of form and detail as these parallels between the work of Shakespeare and Ben:-

(a) As above, they share the feature of a main plot from High Life and a sub-plot from Low Life.

(b) The language of Shylock and Jaques has more resemblances of detail than can reasinably be explained away by the coincidences of miserliness and attendant anxieties. Thus, for example, Consider:-

(i) the expression of Jaques' repeated injunctions about barring his doors (Act II, Sc.i) " - to behold my door
Beset with unthrifts, and myself abroad"

(ii) in (Act V, Sc.i.) "Thou eat'st my flesh in stealing of my gold"

(iii) do. "Thou hast made away my child, thou hast my gold:
The thief is gone, my gold's gone, Rachel's gone - "

(iv) from (V.iv.) "My gold, my gold, my wife, my soul, my heaven!"

Other similar parallels are such lines as:-

(i) (V.iv) "My lord, there is no law to confirm this action -"

(ii) do. " - I'll be glad
To suffer ten times more for such a friend."

(c) Suspense is achieved in the same way as in their common original by the prospect of punishment falling on an innocent head. Sustained

(d) Camillo dares the torture in the manner and diction of Antonio: "Welcome the worst, I suffer for a friend."

(e) Onion promises to repay his friend Juniper for helping him to steal a wife, like his nobler counterparts in 'The Merchant'.

(f) And Count Ferneze it is who says : "the sea to gape
And swallow the poor merchant's traffic up" (III,i.)

And more to the same purpose, some debts being on the other side of the Shakespeare-Jonson account.

The picture of Euclio from the "Aulularia" is elaborated but, in substance, unchanged: he remains the "humour" that Jonson found him in Plautus, and in the extremest sense of that term - a mere incarnate passion of money-hunger, more comic than pitiful for his overwhelming sense of guilty fear. Jonson's additions are tacked on in a very casual manner. Thus, he gives his Jaques a past of daring treachery, an ennobling love for the stolen child, and a strain of lyric utterance at the sight of gold. He has ascribed to Jaques, that is, a faint adumbration of the qualities later to give Volpone and Mammon an immortality of literary renown. But in the present instance these dashing qualities and this majesty of diction do not ring true. In this treatment of the basic Euclio we see Jonson's hankering for embroidery and caricature. In describing excesses of character he is prone to excesses of style. In seeking to represent intensity of any kind, even intensity of meanness and prosaic baseness, he must needs break into rhetorical poetry. The rhapsodies of Mammon and the licentious revels of Volpone's fancy are very well in the mouths of such considerable sinners: Jaques de Prie is of a baser social and intellectual order. Despite Jonson, he remains stubbornly Euclio, however much "transposed, elaborated... and overlaid".(1)

---

(1) H.& S.I.p.321.

The argument of the 'Captivi' is faithfully followed in the Count Ferneze plot and the Count himself is used as one of the ingenious links between the plots when he makes a fleeting call at Jaques' hovel as a suitor to Rachel. We find, too, that the same severity is proposed for 'Gasper' by Ferneze as for Tyndarus, his equivalent, by Hegio. There is a similar social abyss between the high life and low as between free-born and slaves in the Romanised-Greek original. On all of which matters Professors Hereford and Simpson make interesting and exhaustive comments. It remains to observe that perhaps the Plautine pert slave and the miles gloriosus coalesce in Juniper - who has affinities also with Toby Belch and Mrs.Malaprop - while the saucy realism of Aurelia and her doctrine of following the humour of the hour savour of the genial cynicism of a Pronesium.

In the 'Aululariа' Plautus makes use of the Lar as a prologue, a conveniently expeditious method of informing the audience of the source of Euclio's wealth. The locale of Ben's play ruled out this expedient. He replaced it by a speech of Jaques directed at the audience. This adaptation of his original, which called down Gifford's scorn on both playwrights, apparently still meets the occasional needs and favour of practising dramatists of to-day.

Whalley inclined to believe that Jonson improved on his original in one scene of this play by limiting a jest "to the bounds of nature!" In searching Strobilus for gold Euclio asks to see each hand in turn and then demands to see his "third" hand. Whalley opined solemnly that "no degree of avarice could lead one to suppose that a man has three hands". The comment is suspiciously owlish, though Ben apparently agreed with him. Perhaps neither visualised in the original production of Plautus some conjuring movements or similar stage 'business' by Strobilus that would lead Euclio to request grimly that he should stop his tricks and show all his places of knavish concealment at the same time.

Was this choice of plots from Plautus fortunate in its results? Though far below his best work, 'The Case is Altered' in theme and concept offers a promising variety of incidents and scenes, some genuine humour of character and situation, just opportunity for satiric exposure of a genial nature, a deal of Stephano-Trinculo hilarity and no wearisomely long patches of analysis and didactic, undramatic satire. Thomas Nashe might quite justifiably refer to it as "that witty play" and mean just what he said. Nothing in the play un-Jonsonian or unworthy of Jonson is due to Plautus. It may be that we should regard this play as one in which Jonson made a formal public appearance with two great literary sponsors, Shakespeare and Plautus. Undoubtedly the practice of these two old masters gave Jonson the little encouragement and authoritative support that even Ben may have required in his first great trial of and by public opinion. His later 'arrogance' - in part maybe inverted inferiority - does not dispose of the suggestion that he required and profited by such spritual sponsorship in his dramatic initiation. And to Plautus, at least, he did considerable credit by his adaptative obligations.

One of Plautus's broadest farces, the 'Casina'[1], apparently begat the basic idea of 'Epicoene' - remembering always that Jonson would be predisposed to favour such a plot because it led up to the doubtless convincing revelation that a boy-girl actor was actually a boy. In the original, however, even the indelicacy of 'Epicoene' is far outdone in the 'husband's' and the elderly gallant's mendacious anecdotes of bedroom experiences with Chalinus, the 'stool-pigeon' bride. It is this half of the plot that provides the play with its neat conclusion and the sustentation throughout of dramatic irony. On this occasion

(1) It is mildly interesting to note that in the 'Aulularia' (Act I) Eunomia declares that dumb women do not exist. Apparently, however, Jonson is indebted for this truism to Libanius who suggested the surly-husband-talkative-wife plot.

Jonson has treated two themes in one set of characters, eschewing the idea of twin-plots. Moreover, this time the two are inseparable. It may be, as has been suggested,(1) that there is a disparity in temper between the plot from Libanius and the plot from Plautus. The Libanius idea tempted Jonson into the development of a caricaturish humour, the Plautine idea remained pure theatre. The objection of incompatibility probably smells of the lamp - though Jonson would have considered it grave - and, in any case, such a seasoned playwright-critic as Dryden and such a seasoned playgoer as Pepys were enthusiastically oblivious to this defect in the stage presentation.

On another occasion Jonson showed his critical regard for Plautus as a master of the comic form by pleading Aloesimarchus of the 'Cistellaria' as a palliative precedent for Sordido's attempt to hang himself in full view of the audience.(2) "Is not his authority of power to give our scene approbation?" asks Cordatus: to which Mitis meekly assents. The question is really rhetorical. The apparent implication that for Jonson in such a matter classic precedent overrode all modern objections is from other sources demonstrably wrong, yet the measure of regard shown here for the Plautine concept of comedy is surely very real. Professors Herford and Simpson condemn the violences of the whole scene and dispute the accuracy of Ben's analogy.(3) Gifford apparently anticipated such an objection from our humaner times.(4) He showed cause why the death of such a profiteering corn-hoarder would be much to the tastes of an Elizabethan audience, though he was forced to agree it was a quaintly desperate means of raising laughter. If Jonson erred in this - erred from the standpoint of his day and generation - it can hardly be considered a gross error of taste when one recalls the tradition of violence then established in the theatre and the prevalence of violence in the world without. But the 'brutality' here is definitely not Plautine. The fierceness of loathing and satiric contempt expressed in the action of the scene is Jonsonian. Plautus is neither inspiration nor post facto palliation.

(1) H.& S.II.p76. (2) E.M.Out.III.ii. (3) H.& S.I.p.385. (4) Cunn.I.p.107.

The "Mostellaria" provides the slight, yet vital and comic, scheme of roguery conducted in the house of an absent owner. In Plautus the principal usurper is the son of the house and not a parallel to Subtle; but his abettor, Tranio, is a knavish slave of the same kidney as Face. In both plays the assistant rascals marshal their able wits in a comically hopeless and suspenseful attempt to prevent the re-entry of the rightful owner into his misused mansion. It strengthens the resemblance to notice that in both cases the prevarication is condoned by the wronged master.

The same play - as Gifford observes - suggests to us, and doubtless to Jonson , the lively altercation that must have drowned the hubbub of the noisiest first-night audience that ever assembled to view the "Alchemist". Grumio and Tranio are replaced by Face, Subtle, and Doll. Of course, this idea of a rapid exchange of unpleasantries is found elsewhere in Jonson, and though he had nearer sources of inspiration than the Roman, these passages of back-chat are strongly redolent of Plautus' love of comic abuse. Thus, from the "Alchemist" itself we may add the following list of expletives: "stinkards, dog-bolt, whoreson upstart, mumuring mastiff, baboons, brach, menstrue, impostors, doxy, locusts, madam suppository, scorpions, and caterpillars".(1) All Plautine in intent and technique, though bearing occasionally the polysyllabic brand of Ben.

In the "Alchemist" also the mock-Spanish scene between Surly, Face, Subtle, and Doll(2) we have an adaptation of a scene in the "Poenulus" - whatever else - where the Carthaginian tongue is similarly abused and "interpreted". Such purely verbal or lexicographical fun had a marked attraction for Jonson. Not that he was apart from his age in this: but, as usual, he tended to elaborate and underline the vogue: he was not content to suggest, as his great contemporary sometimes did in the fleeting mention of such purely literary jocosities as "the Vandians" crossing the Equinox of "Queubus".

It may be too that Jonson had Plautus in mind when Lovewit and Face, actor-manager and leading comic, perhaps,

(1) Other favourites: rogue, pimp, scab, drab, whoremaster, moth, caterpillar, horse-leech, dung-worm, mangonising-slave.
(2) Act IV, Sc. I.

respectively step forward as epilogue to the "Alchemist", and say in the English tongue, "Vos plaudite!" The same formula of request that ends "Epicoene" and Volpone"; and Macilente, rounding off "Every Man out of his Humour", specifically mentions the prototype or this practice as a matter within the knowledge of the spectators, saying, "I will not do as Plautus in his Amphitrio, for all this, summi Jovis causa, plaudite."

In the case of a scholar who, like Jonson, often points out debts that nobody else would suspect, it is probably reasonable to suggest that the induction to his least Plautine comedy, "Bartholomew's Fair", which introduces the mechanicals of the theatre in the person of the Stage-keeper, Book-holder, and Scrivener, is a faint echo of the "Curculio", in which the property-man makes a devastatingly undramatic appearance.

In the detail of some of his characters and in certain tones of many of his characters Jonson bears a striking resemblance to Plautus. In a way, the masks of Plautus' stage appear on Ben's. He added many; he elaborated most; but the "masks"(personae) his humour types remain, curiously devoid of light and shade and credible subtlety, simplifications and fixations of character, time-exposures that should be merely snapshots, attitudes, poses, affectations, whims, frowns, or grins held throughout the action of the play unaltered.

The resemblance is naturally most masked within the special Plautine sphere of excellence, the underworld. The depth of the obligation is at once apparent when one recalls Jonson's rogues' gallery of bawds and whores, swaggering braggarts, quacks, sharpers, sly, servile varlets, toadies: Fly, Face, Doll, Mosca, Ferret, Buffone, Bobadil, the quintessence of low comedy in Ben. The very proportionate number of these and their peers itself suggests affinity between Plautine precedent and Jonsonian practice. But it may be that the

obligation is most obvious in the parasite quality of his serving men and 'feast hounds', in their patient endurance of blows and expletives, their irrepressible sponginess, their complete moral worthlessness, their frequent, not unnatural, lamentations(I), their ingenuity in rascality (as contrasted with the badinage of their peers in Shakespeare), their chronic poverty and hunger(2) (never sympathetically treated in Jonson). Any one of them in these regards might stand for all in Jonson's Plautine phrase:

" at Pie corner
Taking your meal of steam in, from cooks' stalls,
Where like the father of hunger you did walk
Piteously costive."

And this personification of Parasitism follows in the 'Alchemist' hard upon the equally Plautine naivety of introduction and delight in hectoring repartee:

'Face : You most notorious whelp, you insolent slave,
Dare you do this?
Subtle : Yes, faith; yes, faith.
Face : Why, who
Am I, my mungrel? Who am I?.
Subtle : I'll tell you".

Whereupon he is as good as his word. Now, no doubt there were enough of such shifty and shiftless folk in Jonson's London, both before and after the Poor Laws, and no doubt they were disproportionately numerous and importunate in such of Ben's haunts as taverns and theatres; yet I doubt whether the English counterparts of the Greco-Roman parasites ever ousted their classic prototypes from Jonson's mind, except perhaps in 'Bartholomew's Fair'. In short, the objectivity, intellectual ingenuity, unqualified rascality, and cringing abasement of Ben's mischief-makers and underlings is distinctly a Plautine debt. As usual, such borrowed talents gained interest at his hands. Exactly the same process of adoption and elaboration is to be

(I) e.g. Pug: Woe to the several cudgels that must suffer on this back.
(2) cf. Ergasilus and Pennyboy junior's ("The Staple") brave muster of "bill-men", or parasitic tradesmen.

noted in his representation of crabbed Age and guileful Youth in their perpetual battle of wits.

And the mention of this struggle brings us to the points of resemblance between their conceptions of comic plot. In their comedies the action of the play may be regarded as a struggle between two parties which in turn may be resolved thus: Wit, Roguery, and Brains v. Innocence, Gullability, and Stupidity. The fact that in the conclusion the rogues are baffled is poor punishment and compensation for their ascendancy throughout the play: they receive a final cuff which merely suggests that the author likes them as little as he likes their dupes. Such is the long period of uneasy triumph and such the bloodless defeat experienced by Lysidamus of the 'Casina' or Labrax of the 'Rudens', or Demaenetus of the 'Asinaria', and Face of the 'Alchemist', or the finally 'peeled' Onion of 'The Case is Altered'.

To Plautus also Jonson may be in part indebted for a certain brand of satire, an exposure of human weakness in a long tirade or dramatically-unnecessary dialogue. It appears in Plautus in such passages as the revelation of the mysteries of a lady's wardrobe in the 'Epidicus', and the toilet scene of Philatium and Scapha in the 'Mostellaria', and in the perennial favourite, feminine ways of squandering male-made money. Now a similar peculiarity is seen far more frequently in Jonson, namely a tendency to ignore the true interests of his play by inserting what is virtually an essay criticising and analysing the matter in hand as, for example, Rosalind analyses the signs of love. Such are Jonson's disquisitions on the processes of alchemy in the play on that subject, or on the processes of play-writing in the 'Magnetic Lady', or on the mysteries of the cosmetic art in 'Bart's Fair'. In his case such disquisitions tend to degenerate into tedious cataloguising which suggests a reluctance to prune the sidegrowths of a learned mind. Of this tendency in Jonson the most remarkable instance among many is probably the satiric Palinode to 'Cynthia's Revels'. Similar in effect is the deliberate squeezing

of fancy to yield a climax of comic ingenuity as when Pug speculates on the catalogue of impossible tasks that may be set him, or in the 'Staple of News' (ActII,Sc.i.) where the 'Aulularia' provides Ben with a jest on the miserly hoarding of even smoke.

It would be rash to ascribe these features of Jonson's work to his knowledge and regard for Plautus. Clearly they derive from his own natural temper, which was markedly analytic, systematic, rationalising, factual, scientific in a rough manner. He loved facts and the tabulation of facts in his plays as well as in his note-books. We dare not say he owes to Plautus any of this impulse towards tabulation and exhaustive exposition. This we may, however, aver, and on his own precedent, that Plautus's practice harmonised with and was taken as justification for his natural inclination in this matter. And yet what is 'post' comes within a reasonable suspicion of being 'propter' in one so familiar with his precedents as Jonson.

How far may accidental resemblances of character be taken to qualify the many apparent debts of the one to the other? To take an additional case: would it be unsafe to assume that because Plautus's jests and Jonson's jests frequently savour of sadism Jonson is in this a borrower? Is one in this the natural product of contemporary London, the other of Rome? Certainly such a background must exist to make possible the public presentation of some of the witticisms of both playwrights. Thus it would require an audience familiar with public torture and execution to laugh with easy grace at the savage indelicacy of the Lady Frampul - Prudence dialogue in which imaginative penalties are devised for an erring tailor, punishments varying from castration with his own scissors to having

" an ell of taffeta
Drawn through his guts by way of glyster".

The Elizabethans were not tender, but surely the harsh emphasis of this is Roman.

And this in turn suggests the resemblance between the weight of Jonson's and Plautus's jests. Heavy-handed Plautus may be, but he is feather-light compared with his admirer.

Rudeness of jests and sadism apart, the plays of these two have another 'temperamental' resemblance.. I refer to the frequent tone of coarseness, vulgarity and, particularly, bawdry in Jonson's plays and poems. It is not that Jonson's gross jests and references to bawdry are markedly more numerous than, say, Shakespeare's. By no means. The real distinction between Shakespeare's and Jonson's pretice in this branch of dramatic art may be put simply thus : Shakespeare's lewd askances and double-entendres appear to increase in number with every reading of his plays; but neither footnotes nor a smuthound's scent are necessary to detect Jonson's at the first whiff. Shakespeare generally allows innocence,or ignorance,or prudery to save its blushes behind at least one innocuous interpretation. Such saving of face Jonson does not permit any more than Plautus. Their bawdry is forthright, underlined, unadulterated by any concession to decent obscurity, almost,indeed, expositionary bawdry. In fine, Jonson and Plautus in the lewd jests of their plays are at one.

Yet, however similar their veins of coarseness, one hesitates to attribute to Plautus any formative influence over Jonson in this. For one thing, Ben's relationship with Martial reveals the same feature, and might have, wholly or in part, effected the same result. For another, the infamous 'Conversations' establish a grave probability that Jonson's private talk was still more lewd than his written work. We may,therefore,with conviction assume in Jonson the existence of a bias towards bawdry and artless bawdry at that antecedent to and independent of his later intimate acquaintanceship with Plautus. Whence it

came is another matter, whether begotten while trailing a pike in his impressionable teens and nourished by the rough and tumble of the barnstorming period that followed, or, who knows, a dim heritage from the Lowland stock that helped to produce both Ben and Burns. But, however natural it may have been to him in private life, we must conclude that its presence in his plays was at least sanctioned,if not suggested,by the precedent of Plautus, confirmed, that is, and may be strengthened.

In most other playwrights this resemblance of practice between Jonson and Plautus might well be explained away as the inevitable consequence of a desire to please similar audiences, though centuries apart. This will not meet the case of Jonson. He was, in spite of a common assumption, prepared to make concessions to public taste, but he did not make the same concession systematically. Therefore, as his bawdry is consistent it may be said to come from within.

In the present instance large allowances must be made for purely coincidental resemblances of circumstances, personal, and racial temper. Even so, there remain among the noted and unnoted[1] affinities and parallels between the works of these two a substantial residue of unquestionable debts of the one to the other. In their nature, as appears, these debts are somewhat less vital than Jonson's obligations to several other Latins.

(I) The other observed citations and allusions to Plautus are fairly evenly spread throughout his plays. But they are rare in masques, and naturally frequent in 'The Case' which is here omitted.

The miscellaneous references may be tabulated thus:

(a) Sejanus, v.4 - on ceremonial. (Cunn.I.p.317.)
(b) Volpone, v.8. - a satiric jibe.(Cunn.I.p.397)
(c) The Silent Woman,II,2. - another.(Cunn.I.419.)
(d) do. IV,I. - a Latinism.(Cunn.I.437.)
(e) Cunn.III.p.283. - a worse Latinism.
(f) The Silent Woman,IV,2. - signs of distemper.(Cunn.I.p.441)
(g) Alchemist,V.I. - moral truism. (Cunn.II.p.65.)
(h) The Staple of N. II.I. satiric, comic extravaganza.(Cunn.II.297)
(i) Cunn.III.p.395 - of a fool and his folly.
(j) do. III.406.- unremarkable.
(k) do.III.p.319. - a very ancient and stale jest.
(l) The Case is Altered,II,2, The miser's parting injunctions to his daughter(from the 'Aulularia'). The same passage is treated in a later play, 'The Devil is an Ass'(Cunn.II.p.527.) with most characteristic increase in detail.
(m) The humour of polysyllabic names, such as Acolastus-Polypragmon-Asotus. From Plautus, too, comes Volturium as soubriquet for a legacy-hunter.

For few of them are of the spirit; they do not touch his imagination or penetrate through his intellect to the soul. Rather they are concerned with fact, hints on craftsmanship and dramatic technique, on plots, and types of character, sources of humour, and the tried and trusted situations and business of comedy that are apparently eternal. In brief, then, Jonson appears to have a notable admiration and respect for Plautus the dramatist - but at some distance on this side of idolatry.

.....

Vergil.

It is possible to come at Jonson's estimate of Vergil[1] with unusual directness from his representation of Vergil in the 'Poetaster' and from certain features of that representation which arise from other causes than the needs of the drama, with which, in part, they conflict.

" That which he hath writ
Is with such judgment laboured, and distilled
Through all the needful uses of our lives,
That could a man remember but his lines,
He should not touch at any serious point,
But he might breathe his spirit out of him." [2]

This encomium of Vergil - substantially Jonson's own - is pronounced by Tibullus before the Divine Poet makes his entry. On enquiring about the apparent ambiguity of the last line, Augustus Caesar is assured that this means there is to be found in Vergil's works an apposite precept or directive allusion against all the major exigencies of life.[3] Such universal richness of significant suggestion and quotability Caesar commends as 'a most worthy virtue'. In this, as will appear, is heard the voice of Jonson.

Of course, this passage together with its context constitutes the locus classicus of one of one of the tantalising mysteries of English literary history: Is Vergil Shakespeare?[4] or Chapman?[5] or another contemporary? wholly or in part? or is Vergil simply Vergil?[6] Fortunately, the exact scope of the present enquiry calls for no expression of opinion on these hypotheses. Yet in a

---

(1) Jonson uses the unpedantic form 'Virgil'.
(2) Poetaster, Act V, Sc. i.
(3) Or, keeping in mind the speakers, should this be limited to, say, "on all occasions of dignified or politic and social intercourse". This would materially affect the arguments which find difficulty in reconciling with Vergil the suggestion of "the common touch" and universality of interest.
(4) Gifford. He did not, however, make this the assertion that Herford and Simpson on one occasion claim (H.& S. I. p. 432.)
(5) Fleay.
(6) Herford and Simpson. Theirs is a masterly review of all the evidence. It hinges largely, however, on an explanation or elucidation of Jonson's phrase which, applied to Vergil one may well boggle at, viz. "rammed with life". My theory of hyperbolical idealisation on Jonson's part would at once dispose of their difficulty.

way our evidence incidentally throws an interesting, if undecisive, sidelight on the mystery. The position may be put thus. If, as is most plausible, the Virgil of the play is Jonson's single-minded essay at representing the Virgil of history, we are faced with a paradox. Jonson represents him as the half-divine oracle-seer of renaissance tradition. In this Ben is in step with his contemporaries He even implies quite clearly acceptance of some form of intellectual "sortes vergilianae", still favoured in his day, in the absence of tea leaves. Of the sincerity of his regard, thus expressed, no question can be made. Horace, Tibullus, and Gallus, collectively, representing the Good Poet, speak for Jonson himself. Moreover, their eulogies of Virgil are purple patches introduced with marked lack of dramatic propriety. It is as though they were wrung out of Jonson's not easily moved heart by some overmastering love. Beyond question, the poet Jonson is speaking through his mouthpieces with absolute directness. There is, however, a mighty "but" in the case. Note the quality of quotability and universal applicability which is particularly praised as Virgil's supreme quality. But that very master emphasis of the eulogy is emphatically not supported by the practice of Jonson in his works. For, in fact, he does not resort to the sortes vergilianae; he does not call in Virgil as a ghostly consultant[I] in "the needful occasions" of his own or of his characters' daily "conference"; he shows surprisingly little regard for the more obviously suggestive and oracular of the Roman's lines; his allusions to Virgil are mainly of a very different order.

It might appear that this relative - and it is a very relative - neglect of the accepted beauties and magic of Virgil strengthens the hypothesis that the Virgil of "Poetaster" has a topical significance, at least in part, and that Jonson's enthusiasm is roused, not by the Roman, whose works he does not resort to as often as he might, but by some beloved contemporary - unidentified.

(I) But he did apparently accept Virgil's method of composing verse i.e. first as prose, as recorded by Suetonius. H.& S.I.168.

So far as the present enquiry is concerned, this supposition is vitiated by the oft-proven fact that even from a 'favourite' poet Jonson's quotations are apt to be overwhelmingly oftener matters of fact than matters of fancy, wisdom, or even morality. Jonson quotes Vergil often enough to prove that he knew his works as intimately as we should expect, and he quotes, for him, a sufficient number of Vergil's more "poetic" lines to show that he had a very great regard for such beauties. What then? Is Virgil simply Vergil? historical? unsymbolical? I do not think so, and as I see it, there is one simple explanation that obviates the apparent paradox. At Westminster Jonson was brought up to regard Vergil as he represents him here, sacrosanct, above envy, and calumny, and even above criticism, the very apotheosis of Poetry. Now, as we know, there was one concept and ideal that could be trusted to stir the profoundest depths of Jonson's soul, and that ideal was Poetry. Vergil, he had been taught and felt, represented that ideal, as no other. Virgil is, therefore, in my view, both the historical Virgil and the symbol of True Poetry for Jonson, probably always and certainly here. It is this symbolic significance that arouses Ben's passionate rhapsody on Vergil, apart from and above his very real love of the great poet in person. There may be present in the picture some measure of reference to a contemporary, but there is no need to suppose it: in which I agree with Professors Hereford and Simpson, though on very different grounds. And this hypothesis explains away the paradoxical disparity between his theory and practice quite as well as the conflicting, and inherently improbable, hypothesis that Virgil is Shakespeare, or Chapman, or anybody else.

Our enquiry proper proceeds from the point incidentally made above that Jonson assented to the conviction and convention of his time, that, as a poet, Vergil had no superior. It is hard to imagine Jonson going with the tide of opinion. Yet we find no hint of opposition to it in this matter. Was Camden's influence too strong? Or did he find the weight of ancient and modern critical

approval too powerful to be overborne? Certain it is that tacitly and explicitly he believed that Virgil was indeed Apollo - though other members of Olympus came as readily to his mind and were oftener germane to his needs as a dramatist.

We have noted above the comparative infrequency of Jonson's philosophic, or aphoristic, or imaginative, or "directive" citations of Virgil's work - notwithstanding his eulogy of Virgil's quotability. For Ben "the needful uses of our lives" had apparently a quite peculiar meaning; his borrowings are of a distinctly specialist nature. By this I mean that out of some 43 specific references of varying length (most very brief)no less than 32 are in support of scenic or equally factual details of the masques. In other words, judged by deeds and not by the words of "Poetaster", Ben's regard for Virgil's universal utility has reference mainly to Virgil the scholarly authority on Latin folk-lore, the mythology, religious and social rites, rather than to Virgil the inspirational adviser on our "needful uses".(1)

Nor is this all: for a similar treatment of Virgil is to be noted in the quotations from his works that appear inset or as glosses in Jonson's major plays and poems. In these, of the 11 mentioned instances some 6 or 7 are merely factual references to such Roman superstitions and antiquities as "left-handed cries"(2) an obligationary precaution,(3) a universal superstition,(4) and a scholarly use of the name "Corydon".(5)

The final position is this, that in the works which are and were his stakes to the widest fame, Jonson quotes the more imaginative, thoughtful, more "Virgilian" lines of Virgil only four or five times. One of these is an extremely faithful verbal translation of Aeneid, IV, ll. 160-188,(6) the lofty description

(1) See quotation above from "Poetaster", v, i.
(2) Cunn. i. p. 428.- "The Silent Woman".
(3) do. p. 318.- "Sejanus".
(4) do. p. 138..- "E. M. Out".
(5) do. p. 15.- "E. M. In."
(6) do. pp. 251-2.- "Poetaster".

of Queen Dido's love and the personification of Rumour, selected by Jonson, the context considered, as a test-piece to vindicate Virgil's claims to immortality, and to vindicate also his own peculiar method of "hitch-hiking" to Parnassus as a translator.(1) One is the oldest of truisms on the brevity of life's good things,(2) eminently one of the quotable ideas mentioned above, but far from copyright to Virgil. Jonson "felt" this quotation, and repeated it in Epigram LXX. The third is an aphoristic illustration-cum-definition of true nobility,(3) uncharacteristically misapplied by Ben to a clown, for humour. The last is a pretty picture of "netted sunbeams" on wall or water,(4) perhaps - if the translation above be excepted - the most imaginative and poetic debt Jonson owes to Virgil.

In the masques the story is the same: facts, always facts; and again mainly about religious,(5) superstitious,(6) mythological(7) matters, or matters pertaining beyond discrimination to all three. So one is again brought up against the surprising conclusion that for Ben Jonson the everyday usefulness and pertinence of Virgil's works were confined to their incidental Roman antiquities.

This throws light on the man himself, as before remarked, and the nature of some of the references in his masques throws yet more. Thus, in that he refers to each twice, it may be concluded that he particularly admired the picture of Rumour and the meteorological portents that attended the union of Dido and Aeneas,(8) though the second is markedly lacking in outstanding poetic quality.

When these two presumably favourite passages are taken with another commended passage from Virgil we may safely conclude that the poetic qualities common to all three were qualities which Ben particularly admired in Virgil's work, and which he was presumably minded to reproduce in his own corresponding efforts.

---

(1) "And for his true use of translating men
It still hath been a work of as much pain
In clearest judgments, as to invent or make" -"Poetaster:
(2) Cunn.I.p.439; (3) do.p.444.(Did he take the book down for 3 and (4?
(4) Cunn.II.p.300.(5)e.g.Cunn.III.pp.166,22,40. (6) e.g.do.p.52.
(7) Cunn.III.pp.11,12,23,24,25,28,40,41,3,4,166; do.II.p.558.
(8) Both are in Virgil's reading above. Others in Cunn.III.pp. (26 and 61.

The third passage in question refers to Vergil's picture of "Camilla, Queen of the Volscians, celebrated by Vergil" - says Jonson himself - "than whose verses nothing can be imagined more exquisite.." She is , like Ben's own old mother, "bellatrix", and one who despises feminine servility and domesticity -

"sed proelia virgo

dura pati cursuque pedum praevertere ventos".

So swiftly and lightly does she skim through the air that she leaves the ripe corn unbent and the waves cannot wet her flying feet.

It will be readily agreed that all three passages which Jonson overtly or tacitly commends are in Vergil's grandest manner, even his vastest manner. The two long passages are the sublime of epic dignity, the perfect blend of wide vision and beauty of detail, each quality enhancing each. Language can go no further in the way of controlled hyberbole. Which suggests that if we must abstract and isolate from these passages one literary quality slightly more arresting than the others, and in consequence more likely to be their chief attraction for Jonson, that quality is Restrained Power. The exquisiteness of Vergil's detail he did doubtless admire. Sometimes, but rarely, he succeeded in imitating it. The majesty and force of such lines, however, were the qualities nearer his own compass and ambition. The consequence, his deliberate and , in tragedies, continuous effort to attain such restrained strength and orderly power does much to explain his frequent stiltedness - which is dignity, gravitas, gone wrong - and his all too frequent flatness and tediousness - which generally occur when his details refuse to mass in picture-forming groupings, occasions when the struggling artist in Jonson lays aside his brush, his selective brush, and the scholar in him produces the camera, or even the microscope. It seems altogether proper that this Power should attract such a man as Jonson; for this quality as it appears in his own work seems

the intellectual counterpart of the man's physique, the "rocky face and mountain belly", and his essentially Roman hardness of mind and character.

Which brings us to another intellectual common-multiple of Jonson and Virgil that appears in these lines too: both poets are at home among abstractions, easily "mounted upon the airy stilts.. conversant about notional and conjectural essences." Universal truths and abstract beauties warm them as more homely passions fire the blood of ordinary men. Virgil could generally warm the reader with a vicarious fervour for the ideal and the abstract; Jonson rarely. To put it another way: both poets move more freely among ideas[1] than among men, and from the coldness that ordinary minds must find in such works Jonson is not saved by the imagination, the "brooding tenderness and pathos" that humanises and universalises even the least mundane picture in the works of the Roman. It may well be that this peculiarity of unusual ~~sympath~~ sympathy for the abstract, for the ideal produced by logic or revealed by observation, the putting of the Cause above its Adherents, of Man above men, had its unhappy influence on Jonson's stormy social relationships. This may have conduced to form a deep, fertile soil for his evil, outward social qualities, aggressiveness, self-assertion, contempt for human frailties, for delicacy, illogicalities, romanticisings, and all wish-thought, make-believe pictures of personal importance and talent, all the very stuff of his scornful satire. And, conversely, this same timbre of mind accounts for Jonson's sense of grievance against those who doubted the reality of his love for his fellows, misled by his frequent contempt of individuals.

---

(1) Thus Jonson's humour characters are ideas personified, or even incarnated, not flesh and blood characters who incidentally represent a credible melange of ideas.

Ovid.

Apparently Jonson accepts the conventional Elizabethan estimate of Ovid, as he does of Vergil. The number of his allusions is, as usual, significant of high valuation; so too is the representation of Ovid in the 'Poetaster' as being, like Vergil, immune from the malice of criticasters.

At one point the personal experiences of Ovid and Jonson were similar enough to establish a prima facie probability of sympathetic prejudice on Ben's part. Both chose to follow the Arts in defiance of strong parental preference for the Useful. Ben may well have been fortified in his contumacy by recollections of the earlier rebel, may have defied the aggrieved bricklayer in phrases drawn from Ovid and so confirmed his stepfather's suspicions that Westminster had already given him more than enough of such heathen lore. We have suggested above that Vergil represented for Jonson the Ideal Poet. Certainly Ben had too deep a sense of morality and gravitas to accept Ovid as altogether such, yet it is on Ovid's lips that he puts his own famous , rhapsodic apologia for Poetry.(1) Did he feel reverence for the former, warmth for the latter? In any case, the fact that Ovid is his spokesman in this case corroborates his high regard for Ovid's popular standing and his recognition of the parallel between his own and Ovid's early lot.

Nor was this the only occasion on which Ovid helped Jonson to harden his heart against Authority and Vested Interest. When the Inns of Court protested at the scurvy aspersions implicit in 'Poetaster', he capped the offence by apologising, drawing their attention to the original passage in Ovid that they must have known and hated.

The relative positions of Ovid and Vergil in Jonson's estimation are really not determinable, for doubtless the subject

(I) Poetaster, I, i. from Amor. I, I5.

matter of Ovid is intrinsically of greater relevance to a dramatist than the subject-matter of Vergil. Consequently a slightly greater frequence of reference is not to be pressed too far.

Some traits of Jonson's character appear very clearly in what he omits from the works of Ovid as well as in what he cites. The most significant omission appears to be the "Heroides". In Jonson these tender feminine epistles struck no answering cord. The literary Jonson was deficient in tenderness on the one hand and free from sentimentality on the other, so that neither a strength nor a weakness attracted him towards this particular work. Of the spiritual aspect of sexual love he rarely shows any appreciation. In his life as in his works one gathers he regarded woman with a fine Roman mixture of formal reverence, possessiveness, superiority, or, at best, condescending tolerance, and make-believe, condescending, hyperbolic, ephemeral adoration, unless when, like Charis, she holds his heart in a way not uninfluenced by Horace, or when, like a Lady Bedford or a Lady Rutland she combines the graces of her sex with the character, culture, and erudition that he normally sought in friends of his own sex. For the rest, as goods and chattels they appear throughout Ben's plays, mere names or not-essentially-feminine humours, objects of no delicate imaginings, incapable of deep or moulding sympathies. Like the celebrated Turk, Jonson might, on reading the "Heroides" have exclaimed on the unconscionable fuss therein made over a parcel of women. Even such feminine characters as he did with overt admiration introduce into his masques, Penthesilea and the like, he clearly respected very often for their unwomanly qualities or noticed simply because great poets and historians had bequeathed him their name and unquestionable fame.

Significant, too, is the fact that the Tristia is apparently mentioned once only, though an acquaintance with it is implicit in the knowledge he shows of Ovid's career. If, on the one hand, Jonson lacked Ovid's power to understand womanliness, he lacked, on the other, all leanings towards womanishness, his mother's milk dried up completely in him, and any complaints Ben had to make against his fate were couched in the terms of an arraignment of Fate for high-treason, never in the Ovidian vein of querulousness and self-abasement. We may therefore conclude that he indicates a certain attitude towards Ovid and towards himself by not quoting the 'Tristia.'

Otherwise, his love of Ovid is almost indiscriminate. The 'Metamorphoses', the 'de Arte Amatoria and the 'Fasti' are all cited very freely. As one might expect, the first and last supply matter for the masques, while the 'Liturgy of Love', which is not quoted so freely throughout the body of his works, is worked into the 'Silent Woman' in great swatches, no less than 16 considerable passages being therein reproduced or adapted. It may be that, this done, he felt no need to educate his public further in an appreciative understanding of this unschoolboyish work of a poet whom they had studied much at school.

A consideration of the passages he chose to imitate from the 'de Arte Amatoria' shows very clearly points of contact between Ovid and Ben, though it is impossible to say how far Ben was induced to select these passages because he was writing a play of this sort, and how far the nature of the play was modified by the passages he felt impelled to translate.(1) Either alternative argues community, if not identity, of outlook between creditor and debtor.

(1) Remembering always that the germ of the play, and many incidental touches are debts to Libanius.

The ideas adopted are as follows: the technique of female dressing and deportment for specific effects;[1] the need for secrecy in the application of cosmetics;[2] an episode of feminine discomfiture[3] woman's duty "to repair the losses time and years have made";[4] the need for refinement and restraint in laughter;[5] and in walking;[6] fashion parades and degrees of feminine eligibility or gullibility;[7] the need for a diligent search after the ideal wench[8] (sadly prosified this); woman's inevitable - if tardy - capitulation before[9] a persistent suitor; the politic expedient of occasional rape;[10] the need for variety in methods of approach to different "subjects";[11] the extreme triviality of woman's objection to loss of virginity;[12] the need for contraceptives;[13] this seathing, and probably personal,[14] cynicism, "strife and tumult are the dowry that comes with a wife"; and an equally pungent and perhaps more justifiable smoke-room thrust at slanderous vaunts of boudoir conquests.[15]

We may here offer the truism that the frequency with which Ben in this play quotes the "De Arte Amatoria" and the ingenuity and assiduity with which he makes occasion to adapt and adopt large portions of it make his personal liking for it a certainty. Bu there is more in the matter than that.

In the "Silent Woman", as in others, Jonson makes vicarious appearances on the stage. He desires to moralise on the well-worn classic text, Feminine Vanity. So, as a mouthpiece, he takes Truewit, significantly so called. Truewit it is who cites most of Ovid's dicta, and in his voice we hear the "gravitas" of Ben, the not too appropriate censor of feminine levity, vanity, materialism, and general immorality. In Truewit's long - and intrinsically excellent- disquisition on this theme we hear the authoritative Jonson, for this intrusion of the poet in his own proper person is one of the penalties of being by temper a satirist and by necessity a playwright

(1),(2),(3) vide Gunn. I.p.407.
(4),(5),(6),(7) do.p.434.
(8),(9),(10),(11) do.p.435.
(12) do.p.439.
(13) do.p.440.
(14) do.p.440. For the personal note in this vide "Conversations, H.& S. I.p.139.
(15) Gunn. I.p.461.

It does not invalidate the suggestion that, in the places mentioned, Truewit is Jonson, to object that the other characters of the play quote the 'de Arte' as well as he. This simply means that Ben's personal appearances are accidental and unconscious excursions on to the boards. The facts that Daw, La Foole, Haughty, and Morose seek to make good Truewit's inconsiderable omissions from the satiric matter of Ovid's poem merely shows the strength of Jonson's satiric and didactic impulses (herein, perhaps, overcoming his sense of the drama's verisimilituse by making all his characters Latin scholars.(1)) And so by hook and by crook the "de Arte" is brought into 'The Silent Woman'. When to these ably assimilated but longish and rather undramatic passages from Ovid one adds the Latin foolery of Otter and the mock religio-legal debate in Latin on the validity of Morose's supposed marriage, one may wonder to hear that this was Jonson's most popular and longest-lived play. This can only be explained by a combination of these reasons:(I) The quotations from Ovid are perfectly worked into the context - a large claim.(2) Our ancestors knew more Latin than we do; (3) In practice the stage copy was modified.(2) Even making all these concession, we are forced to credit the play further with a very remarkable amount of innate brilliance of construction.

To a considerable extent Jonson manhandles both the facts and the fictions of Ovid. In dealing with his works at large, but especially with the "liturgy of love", as in dealing with Ovid's historical romance in 'Poetaster, Jonson eliminates

(I) A disputable point, of course, since this objection presumes that Jonson's audience recognised the source of the quotations. Unrecognised quotations were literary joint stock.

(2) And this requires us to contradict in some measure Jonson's own dedication, "There is not a line or syllable in it changed from the simplicity of the first copy". Not a fatal objection, of course to item (3).

or eschews all tenderness. In his hands and his verse the love scenes acquire an ungraciousness and stiffness partly consequent on his general attitude towards women, above noted, and curiously at variance with exquisiteness of his occasional lyrices on this theme. Prompted by Ovid and attracted by sympathy to Ovid he writes incidentally in 'Poetaster' not an Art of Love but a Science of Love, to be studied in its technical details like any other mystery or quackery such as alchemy or witchcraft. In extracting the technique of love-making from Ovid's 'de Arte' he goes off contentedly so to speak with the waxen cells and ignores the honey of eroticism, effeminacy, graciousness, plaintiveness and lyricism among which the amusingly prescribed instructions are the most factual, pedestrian, and significantly satiric feature.

The same stiffness is notable in the scenes between wanton Julia and her banished lover, the Ovid of history. Which brings us to the somewhat curious fact that Ovid of the 'Poetaster' does not square with history, even in the little that history records of him; and in Jonson's case a departure from recorded fact is unusual enough to call for explanation, or at least comment.

To Ovid Jonson gives the discredit of arranging the feast at which the Olympians are impersonated by his boon companions and Jupiter by Ovid himself. Now Jonson knew very well that this was an orgy in which Augustus himself took part. Apparently, therefore, Jonson did not boggle at modifying even well known facts of history in this case. At the same time, notice, no great injustice is done to the historical character of Ovid, since this is just the sort of escapade that Ovid might have indulged in and might have taught his emperor. Fact is wronged: the wider truth is not.

Again Jonson errs in representing, apparently, the elder Julia as the cause of Ovid's banishment. Here, however, he was in step with his contemporaries, and with many more recent scholars. Though the younger Julia was in the same case as the elder, it is improbable that Jonson, if in conflict with the traditional view of his time, would have failed to append a footnote in justification of his own interpretation of history.

Finally, the picture of Ovid given by Jonson is so incomplete as to constitute "misrepresentation". We miss the whole truth.

In these matters, however, he had sufficient dramatic justification, or, at worst, extenuation. First, nothing said or done, stiffness of manner apart, is in itself out of character with the Ovid of history. Then, secondly, what Jonson required for this play was the popular picture of Ovid as a sort of allegorical study in only two dimensions, Ovid the persistent versifier, the high priest of elegant debauchery and lover of wanton Julia, in brief, Ovid the incarnation of irresponsibility and insobriety. Within the limits of the narrow corner allotted Ovid in the action of the play, it would have been impossible to reconcile - by, say, a long and Hamletesque study - this Ovid with that other, Ovid the considerable lawyer and patron, the decorus member of - in Elizabethan eyes - a most decorous profession. In the "Poetaster" Ovid, in accordance with "humour" practice, remains a symbol of one cast of temper or closely correlated qualities, like all the others, who are equally simple and acceptable examples of culture, or discipline, or sense, or ignorance - of Jonson's cause or of the devil's. No great wrong, therefore, is done to Ovid - nothing at any rate comparable to the indignity thrust on Tibullus by associating him prominently with the debauchery of those profligates who were his friends but not invariably his associates.

A review of all Jonson's other references to Ovid reveals

(a) that on an unusually large number of occasions, for him, Ben borrows from Ovid sayings that are remarkable for either individuality of thought or felicity of expression.(1)

(b) The number of this type of allusion is, as usual, very small in proportion to his wonted debts for the facts of antiquities and myths.(2)

The total included under (a) is swollen by the persistent use of the "De Arte" above noted in the "Silent Woman", since at least 20 considerable passages in that play, which owe their being to Ovid, are satiric, pungent, and highly enough coloured by opinion and fancy to be regarded as "ideas" rather than "facts". If, however, one deducts these special cases, one arrives at the general practice of Jonson of selecting from a Latin author interminable, minute details of fact and refusing more personal obligations. Indeed, deduct the "Silent Woman" and we are left with no more than three aphorisms or golden words.

In the "New Inn" occurs the wish, "Give me a banquet of sense like that of Ovid." But from the banquet provided Jonson seldom selects the rarer, richer dishes. As is his way, he sticks here to plain fare. As always, what he borrows is common property, cyclopedic matter for the guidance of the historian, masque-maker, and scholar, rather than inspiration for the philosopher and poet - except in satisfaction of his satiric urge.

---

(1) (a) "The contraries which time till now
Nor Fate knew where to join nor how
Are Majesty and Love." (Cunn. III. p. 81.)
(b) "So that herself
Appears the least part of herself." (Cunn. II. p. 91.)
(c) "The time was once when wit drowned wealth; but now,
Your only barbarism is t'have wit and want". (Cunn. I. p. 215.)
(d) To these ideological debts to Ovid may be added another: the concept of the fountain of self-love in "Cynth's Rev's" is from the story of Narcissus - as Ben's own induction makes quite clear. Professors Herford and Simpson rightly opine that it is a luckless borrowing, since its essentially symbolic, mythic quality is out of harmony with the Jonsonian realism and satire that will not down.

The originals of the others above are:
(a) "Non bene conveniunt nec in una sede morantur
Majestas et Amor."
(b) "Pars minima est ipsa puella sui."
(c) "Ingenium quondam fuerat pretiosius auro;
At nunc barbaries grandis, habere nihil."

(2) See next page.

(Footnote (2) contd.)
These may be tabulated as follows: (Refs. are to Cunn. Vol. and page)

History-cum-Mythology.	Customs, Antiquities, Rites, Ceremonies.	Witchcraft.	Latinism, Phrases.	Ovid on Ovid.
I,149.	I,316.	III,47.	II,557.	I,211.
370.	317.	51.	III,2.This	266.
II,97.	318.	51.	is motto	
558.	II,564.	52.	to two	
560.	566.	52.	masques.	
562.	III,20.			
575.	23.			
III.3.	24.			
5.	24.			
10.	27.			
11.	31.			
12.	53.			
23.				
24.				
37.				
54.				
166.				
Totals (app.) 17.	12.	5.	3.	2.

The separation of closely connected quotations above is rather arbitrary.

To these one might add the suggestion apparently by Ovid of Ben's own impresa, "Deest quod duceret orbem" - taken presumably ((H.& S.) from the 'Metamorphoses, [redacted]
"altera pars staret, pars altera duceret orbem".

Juvenal.

Among the emulative urges felt by Jonson there is apparent a desire to rival and modernise Martial, to personate Horace, and to dramatise Juvenal. Vain yet vital essays all. He sought in vain the ultimate compendiousness of Martial, the polished finality of Juvenal's satire, and the much famed urbanity of Horace - the last being of all the most perverse piece of wish-thinking and self delusion, the approach to Juvenal the most successful.

Of course he revered and loved all three. Juvenal, together with Vergil and Tacitus, was a favourite reading at his literary suppers:(1) Juvenal, Horace and Martial he held up to Drummond as exemplars of the supremest literary virtues:(2) and - more interesting still - he remarked that Juvenal, Persius, Horace and Martial were to be read "for delight",(3) the delight of a profound scholar. Still, "delight" is the operative word. It seems that he may have felt a sense of duty in reading the others he commends, to Drummond, but the satirists - the satirists were their own reward(4) and most in tune with the timbre of his soul. Such evidence as the present enquiry can adduce tends strongly to corroborate Jonson's last remark above. Among the satirists he felt most at home, they were a refuge and a strength, and of all, I feel, he was nearest akin to Juvenal.

---

(1) H.& S.I.p.160. Conversations.
(2) do.p.132.
(3) do.p.136.
(4) From the Conversations also we gather that the story of the huge turbot was a favourite anecdote: and the other two anecdotes cited with it (H. & S.I.p.176.) are equally derisive and satiric.
Aubrey's anecdote (H. & S.I.p.184.) exists it is true in two forms. But both forms agree- and most credibly agree- that Ben failed to see what favour could be considered exorbitant in return for his conferring the boon of a true appreciation of a major Latin satirist(Horace or Juvenal).
He possessed, apparently, two editions of Juvenal, one in MS. Both are extant. Were they preserved by mere chance or his special solicitude from the recurrent perils of fire and forfeiture?

The mere number of his references to Juvenal is significant, but far from the whole proof of his regard for Juvenal. A consideration of the nature of his many specific allusions to Juvenal's works reveals a striking departure from what, so far, we have shown to be his normal practice in his borrowings. So far - notably in Ovid's case - we have found that Jonson uses his Latin authorities as a vast reference library of facts, many of them, to the modern mind, curiously unimportant facts. What he sought preeminently in them was their often incidental, archaic, mythologic, ritualistic, etymologic lore. It is with much less frequency that in his own works he borrows ideas, fancies, philosophies, the colours of other minds, and the golden phrases that form a common currency among admiring students of the ancients. With Juvenal he nearly reverses this normal practice of his. It is Juvenal's ideas, fancies, theories, criticisms and animadversions that he does borrow. These become Facts, because he acknowledges tacitly and overtly his acceptance of the Juvenalian attitude towards the world. It is an acceptance that denotes a large measure of identity between master and disciple, a community of intolerance: their birses rose at the same threats to similar social and moral ideals.

Considering these borrowings in detail, we note first that the chief factual borrowings are details of Sejanus' fate, from the Tenth of Juvenal. These number about 21, mainly noted by Jonson himself. He looked them up systematically, as was his way, collated them with his other sources, warranted the original of his statement in a footnote, or laconically cited "Juvenalis" and passed on. He used them with the punctilious care one gives to a railway time-table, yet not quite so dispassionately. For the grim horror, the edifying spectacle of guilty greatness in ruin, he represents with a relish of detail that shows the moralist and satirist in him clearly roused by the historian's facts.

His most important borrowing from the Tenth is also the least specific: it is the suggestive description "verbosa et grandis epistula"(1.71), applied by Juvenal to the letter from the misogynist of Caprae that brought down his favourite. This hint Jonson expands(1) to suit his purposes to excellent dramatic effect in the matter of suspense, and, naturally, uncramped by strict verbal faithfulness, a success that suggests he might have profitably avoided the specific translation of specific passages which is his normal practice.(2) Here, anyhow, as occasion demanded, he conceives a masterpiece of chicanery, innuendo, and purposeful vacillation.

Another factual borrowing from the Tenth of Juvenal reveals a characteristic of Jonson. Juvenal had completed his picture of the imperial minion's utter ruin by describing how his horses had their legs smashed merely for their ill associations. Jonson was not the man to omit such a piece of sadism, however unnecessary to his story proper.(3)

But these apart, his borrowings from even this satire are of the "ideal" kind above mentioned, rather than matters of historic fact. For example, he adopts the bitter felicity, satirising the fickle mob, "Sequitur fortunam, ut semper, et odit damnatos".

To "condemned" Ben characteristically adds, "guilty or not". The teacher and dramatist in him combined in this realisation of the need to underline his best satiric strokes beyond the meanest's misapprehension.

---

(1) Sejanus V.10.

(2) For example of more normal Jonsonian practice witness Cunn.I.279 Sejanus, I.i, where he must needs work in the not very remarkable or English phrase applied to Sejanus, "the second face of the whole world" - From: "Sejanus: deinde ex facie toto orbe secunda", as Ben himself points out.

His literal translation of Juv.X.1167-8 are among his most heavy-handed literal translations and lose all the contempt, scorn and dramatic vivacity of the original.

(3) With little propriety he puts this mob violence into the form of a command from the senate, so determined was he to incorporate it.

Another of Jonson's favourite satires is the Sixth, the famous indictment of the female sex, which shows good reason why a man might pause on the verge of matrimony. Upton in his "Remarks" (p.65.) has cited the passages Ben adopted in 'Epicoene' II,i.(1) Two or three features of these adaptations are notable:-

(a) The borrowed ideas enormously enrich the matter of the scene.

(b) The content is exquisitely appropriate to the needs of the scene.

(c) It corroborates the view that Jonson held a low opinion of women.

(d) It shows his delight in satire of a cynical tone.

(e) The manner in which he works in all the telling thrusts exemplifies the oft-remarked tendency of his mind to tabulate, cataloguise, and grow heavily exhaustive, to wear a specious 'scientific' air, the air of a modern 'expert'.

Of these very considerable obligations in 'Epicoene' Jonson himself makes no mention. On the other hand with scrupulous 'honesty', or pride, he points out such another debt to Juvenal as the weak and watered translation of the famous "carus erit Verri"(2) cynicism in the opening scene of 'Sejanus'. It was probably this apparent discrepancy in his editorial practice that led Jonson's early editor to assume that Jonson, while willing to acknowledge borrowed facts, sought tacitly to arrogate to himself the credit for stolen ideas. To this matter we must later return.

If the distinction may properly be made, Juvenal, like all satirists, excels in thrusts that are shrewd and penetrating rather than subtle or delicate, just the sort of thrusts in fact which the essentially coarse fibre of Jonson's intellect was most likely

(1) Cunn.I.p.413.
(2) Juvenal, III.11.49-54.

to appreciate, the plays begotten of such an intellect most likely to require, in short, "humours", as Jonson used that word. For example, again in "Sejanus", we find the humour of a parasite. But whereas Juvenal was content with the uncolourful generality,

"...aliena sumere vultum
a facie, iactare manus, laudare paratus.."

Jonson, showing (a) characteristic grossness, (b) characteristic elaboration, (c) not so characteristic concreteness, writes at great length:

"Laugh when their patron laughs; sweat when he sweats;
Be hot and cold with him...etc...etc..
ready to praise
His lordship, if he spit, or but p- fair,
Have an indifferent stool, or break wind well."(1)

Such additions on Jonson's part are peculiarly significant. For his time and immediate purpose they may have been fortunate, & yet they are not a largesse of apples for the groundlings: their grossness is not ad hoc: for this is Ben's natural voice. At once we must add that this may easily be overstressed. For example, the very same original in Juvenal begets another version in Ben(2) that shows none of these unpleasant qualities.

His other references to Juvenal reveal a good deal about Jonson's own character and fully prove our opening contention that the quality and nature of his references to Juvenal indicates an altogether exceptional warmth of sympathy and identity of outlook.

For example, there is something Roman as well as Elizabethan in his frequent deference towards old age, the Patriarchal concept. He found Juvenal in tune with his own feeling

---

(1) Cunn. I. p. 276. Juvenal, III, lines 100-106. "Natio comoeda est".
(2) Cunn. I. p. 361.

for venerability, and, as was his way, translated the sentiment of which he profoundly approved. He was even so moved as to translate it well, for his version is saved from clumsiness by a grave, earnestness of tone bespeaking sincerity and making it at once simple and sententious.(1) Again we note Jonson did not acknowledge his indebtedness.

Juvenal, in Satire XIV, lashes gluttonous parents for their debauching influence on their children. In "Every Man In His Humour" Jonson takes occasion to do likewise, though his snails, mushrooms, and perfumed sauces are modern instances.(2)

While Juvenal was a master of aphorism; Jonson, as we have seen, was a lover of aphorism who seldom made up his mind what to omit: verbosity, brevity, and obscurity are peculiarly characteristic of his attempts in this kind. Juvenal wrote:

"Et propter vitam, vivendi perdere causam - a living death one's honour lost. Setting out on the literal trail, nose and eyes to each letter footprint, Brn bogs himself in:

"And for the empty circumstance of life
Betray their cause of living."(3)

Which effectively conceals its meaning, as well as its obligation to Juvenal.

Here is another example of translational difficulty: Juvenal succintly declared:

"Nemo repente fuit turpissimus".

Jonson essayed the like brevity and succeeded, disastrously -

"No man is presently made bad with ill"(4) Here he abandons comprehensibility for literal translation's sake. Next we find him sacrificing the essential emphasis: Juvenal's,

"Nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus"

is weakly rendered:

---

(1) Juv.XIII, ll.53-63. "Every Man In."II, 3,115-12. (Cunn.I.p.21.)
(2) Cunn.I.p.22.
(3) do.p.279.
(4) do.p.183.

"That have the true nobility called virtue".(1)

More happily he derives,

"Where guilt is ~~rage~~ rage and courage both abound"(2)

from, "iram et animos a crimine sumunt". This is at least clear and at large faithful, if scarcely felicitous, or in "abound" verbally accurate, as he desiderated. This was perhaps the place for a lawless Shakespearean conversion of a tame noun into an arresting verb. Ben deliberately, as a translator, clipped his own wings in translating so 'serious' an author as Juvenal. This is not to say that he is uniformly unsuccessful here, any more than in rendering Martial. On occasion he can surpass his original in power as in,

"an emperor only in his lusts"(3)

which yields nothing to,

"aegrae solaque libidine fortes...deliciae" -

and most appropriately spirited is his elaboration (characteristic) of Juvenal's, "turpe et adulterium mediocribus etc."-reversing Doolittle's plea that the poor cannot afford a moral code, which Jonson translates:

"To do't with cloth or stuffs lust's name might merit:
With velvet plush and tissues, it is spirit."(4)

Generally, however, his translations of Juvenal are inferior to these examples. Thus, Juvenal's delator could,

"tenui jugulos aperire susurro".

Ben's equivalent, "cutting of throats with a whispering",(5) lacks the close texture of the original, forfeits the onomatopoeia, and has nothing to "tenui". To be sure, of course, such artful slitting of throats could be translated only by a wide freedom of phrase and presuming the grace on this theme of a W.H.Hudson musing on the gauchos' graceful sadism. On occasion, as we have seen, Jonson showed he had this light touch - the lightest pastry-cooks are reputedly the fattest - but on serious or sententious themes he deliberately denied himself the requisite license or freedom

(1) Cunn.I.p.183.
(2) do.p.289.
(3) do.312.
(4) Cunn.III.
(5) do.II.p.409.

in his translations. Where he was most in earnest he stuck most closely to the form of the original: and no poet seemed more earnest or worth-while than Juvenal, if we judge by the little laxity he allowed himself in translating Juvenal.

The insincerity, vanities, cunning, treachery, unscrupulousness, debauchery, and general moral worthlessness of the human race are all ideas directly echoed, if not wholly borrowed, by Jonson from Juvenal - and how much they constitute of his most characteristic work! His parasites, depraved parents, and gulls have their prototypes in Juvenal. Both authors castigate religious humbugs and philosophic-theologic frauds: one seizes on the bogus stoic, the other on the humbugging puritan. For example, I suggest that in his picture of the puritans with "Religion in their garments"(1), Jonson had in mind Juvenal's,

"Fallit enim vitium specie virtutis et umbra,
cum sit triste habitu vultuque et veste severum".

The rich, uncharitable man ignores the claims of the starving poet(2); in despite of Duncan, the face is the index of the mind(3): thrice he observes that a celebrity owes his elevation to the successful accomplishment of crimes that earned for bunglers "the hurdle or the wheel"(4) (and the references have different sources): the slanderer suffers from the whip of his own conscience which renders the flagellation of his opponents mere "feminine humour"(5) (a tenet in which Ben's practice and precept are wondrously discordant): the great ones of the earth are their victims' victims, being exposed to the betrayal of their servants' tongues(6): there is no limit to man's vanity -

"O what is it proud slime will not believe
Of his own worth...":(7)

both poets make great play of the maladies of age and, whatever Greek dramas may have lent their weight in this, Jonson had Juvenal

(1) Induction to 'Every Man Out'. Apparently Jonson's mighty and recreative memory telescoped the ages and visualised Tribulation in the garb of a false stoic, the latter in grim broadcloth.
(2) Cunn.I.p.159. (3) do.p.160.
(4) do.p.168, 275, and II.p.514. Juv.Sat.I.ll.73-76 and XIII.ll.103-5 Apparently a great favourite of both satirists, explaining in a not unpleasing way the number of the unworthy in high places.
(5) Cunn.I.p.268.
(6) do.276.
(7) do.282.

often and clearly in mind in "Volpone"[1]: parasites in both make an income out of "legs and faces"[2]: there are no better bawds than parents[4]: we know not what is good for us - to God man is dearer than to himself[5]: few act as though virtue were its own reward[6]: the vanquished may lose their silver and gold, but iron they retain, and the desperate are dangerous[7]: the widow-hunters in both are "inguinis haeres"[8]: man worships fortune, a god without divinity save in man's foolish fancy[9]: and the substance of the plot of "Volpone" may be seen in the line,

"iucundum et carum sterilis facit uxor amicum"[10] -

such is the substance of the main borrowings and parallels.

Probably there is little enough in all this catalogue - much less in the other references to Juvenal[11] - that Jonson could not have found elsewhere or within himself. But in the form in which they stand, all these observations, aphorisms, and cynicisms are, for certain, debts to Juvenal. And the persistence with which he seeks suggestions in Juvenal or corroborations of his own observations, the emphasis and faithfulness with which he renders them all, and the unwonted preponderance of "ideological" over factual borrowings , all combine to support our general conclusion that that earlier soldier and man of letters was, beyond discrimination, a powerful - probably the most powerful - literary-cum-philosophical influence on Jonson, and an exceptionally congenial commonplace of his private and semi-public reading and debating.

---

(1) "Volpone", Act I, Sc.i; II,3; III,6; IV,i.
(2) Cunn.I.p.361.
(3) do.p.369.
(4) do.II.p.22.
(5) do.100 and III.p.265.
(6) do.II.p.106.
(7) do.p.114.
(8) do.p.151.
(9) do.III.p.36.
(10) ~~do.III.~~ Juv. St. V.i.140.
(11) In brief these concern: Roman marriage customs (Cunn.III.p.20); Roman beggars' pitches (do.II.p.132.); portal decorations (do.I.p.327); Liburnian porters (do.p.323.); Domitian's council meeting on the turbot - a favourite this (do.p.323.); Domitian's retreat (do.p.312.); the blue eyes of the Gauls (do.p.298); use of the cross (do.p.285); Roman methods of voting (do.p.253); the Gemonies (do.p.310); the better men of old (do.II.p.107.); a most obscure touch noted by Ben himself (do.III.p.5); magic (do.III.p.52); injustice (do.406); it will readily noticed that these are of the usual factual order, and the many occur in "Sejanus". More considerable translation appear in their proper places. Others are: Cunn.I.pp.147,265, both "to the reader".

We must suppose that Jonson was perfectly aware of his individual debts to Juvenal, and, like other kinds of debtors, unmindful of the total score of indebtedness. But beyond such part-unconscious influences as the latter, there remains, what Jonson perfectly realised, his affinities with Juvenal in position, outlook and motives. We see the realisation of these affinities in his selection from Juvenal of a disgruntled motto for the quarto of 'Cynthia's Revels' - no haphazard, pin-point selection in the case of a man like Jonson -

"Quod non dant proceres, dabit histrio -

Haud tamen invideas vati, quem pulpita pascunt," (1)

and his transference of the second line - exquisitely appropriate - to the singular eminence of the title-page of his folio works at large. In these lines both poets record their bitterness at the lack of appreciation by the oligarchy of patronage, and this disingenuous sense of neglected desert in both cases intensifies the more universal and altruistic motives of the satirists. Juvenal's official muse is a sort of "holy indignation",

"Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum" - (2)

to which as a contributory motive force Jonson added "laughter" -

"If nature could not make a verse,

Anger or laughter would". (3)

The addition is just as true of Juvenal's work. "Laughter" begot of a singularly grim risibility in both cases -

"Like a man's laughter heard in hell,

Far down-"

the laughter of scornful impatience of human insentience, injustice, illogicality, for,

"Who is so patient of this impious world

That he can check his spirit or rein his tongue?" (4)

Who, indeed? Not Jonson. Not Juvenal either -

"Nam quis iniquae

Tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus ut teneat se?" (5)

(1) The couplet is achieved by omitting the purely local and contemporary instances that separate lines 90 and 93 in Juv. VII. The mystery of the "allusion to circumstances now unknown", that puzzled Gifford, is sufficiently solved if we assume the reference is to Ben's unsuccessful throw for royal patronage in 'Cynth's.Revs.

(2) Juv.I.1.79. (3) Cunn.III.303. (4) do.I.65. (5) Juv.I.1.30.

and in each instance the condemnatory urge finds expression in the satire that is all we have of Jovenal and the greatest single element in Jonson.

.....

Horace.

Second only to Jonson's fame as a satirist is his fame as a literary theorician. And the two richest mines of literary theory that he chose to work are Quintilian's "Institutes" and Horace's "Art of Poetry". A consideration of these two works completes and epitomises the numerous critical "asides" found throughout his plays, poems, and "Conversations". They reveal him to be an artist deeply conscious of the classical insistence on form and order, and in opposition, on ground and substance enough, to the romantic formlessness of his contemporaries.

In all Jonson refers, in his major works, only 9 times to the "Art of Poetry"; but he translated it in full;(1) he wrote a glossary on it,(2) and he added an argumentative-expositionary preface in dialogue form,(3) both notes and preface perishing in the "Great Fire". This preface he read to Drummond, and his translation had apparently not depreciated in his own valuation during ten years.(4) The preface had apparently engaged him long and deeply. It existed in some form in 1605,(5) and was recast after the writing of "Bartholomew's Fair" in 1614,(6) this being a play which might strike the rash student as in conflict with many Horatian precepts, and which Ben therefore felt to require an apologia, doubtless as usual unrepentant. His probable MS. copy of the "De Arte Poetica", still extant, is, in part consequence of this intensive study, heavily marked by his own hand.

---

(1) Gunn. III. p. 368.
(2) do. p. 321.
(3) H.& S. I. p. 134.
(4) do. do.
(5) do. p. 156.
(6) do. p. 203.

The 9 allusions to the "De Arte Poetica"[1] are, however, singularly important. First, they are given prominent positions, and, second, several appear to be favourites. By prominent position I mean that nearly all - not less than 8, arguably more - are not incidental, illustrative, or merely allusive: they are the very principles of Jonson's work, the best epitomes of ancient sanction that he can find for his dramatic practice, sacred texts that inspire, confirm, and round off his sermons. This is a point already fully made in dealing with Martial, and, on this evidence alone, Horace is Martial's only rival in Ben's esteem.

Of the references to the "De Arte" one - in two slightly varied forms - may safely be called the definitive statement of Jonson's primary concept of his duty as a comic dramatist. We find it figuring as motto to the "Staple of News" and to "Volpone". It appears also in the introduction to the "Masque of Queens". It is, of course, the immortal precept:

"Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae,
Aut simul et jucunda et idonea dicere vitae",

or, in its other form, from the same work and context,

"Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
Lectorem delectando pariterque monendo."[2]

Few in practice have been more loyal to any principle than Jonson was to this, or with more results, both good and bad. Perhaps, however, the quotation figures most significantly ~~because~~ of all in the dedication of "Volpone" because this address to "The most noble and equal sisters", is the most earnest, and complete, and compendious extant statement by Jonson of his

(1) These are to be found in Cunn.I.pp.333,334,336,332; do.II. pp.274,211,512; do.III.pp.2. To these I incline to add Cunn.II. pp.437-8. In "Discoveries there are at least 9, viz.in Nos. XXXII, LXXIII, CVII, CXVI, CXII, CXIX, CXXXI, CXXII, CXXXV.

(2) ll.333-4 and 343-4 of the "De arte Poetica.

views on the serious duties of a comic dramatist. Actually this vital piece of explanation takes the above quotation as its principal text, appeals on various occasions to Horace, and is, at large, a dissertation on the "De Arte Poetica";so that the burnt commentary and introduction, earlier work than this, in some form, were not utterly consumed.

Among other obligations to the "De Arte" there is in the dedication to "Volpone" a translation of part of Horace's rhapsodic eulogy of the poet's function as a moral guide to all mankind.(1) This is elaborated by grafting on a similar eulogy from an epistle to Augustus. The whole passage breathes the ideal fervour with which Jonson habitually regarded the high function of his own profession. And in the prologue to his last work,"The Sad Shepherd", he takes occasion to testify to his life-long faith and practice, that the heights of art cannot be scaled by happy chance or idle genius, a conclusion explicit and implicit in the "Art of Poetry".

Of necessity, the detail of his literary theory and faith -synonyms for him - went beyond Horace's manual: but it may fairly be regarded as Jonson's Decalogue and pocket-testament. From its dogma he dissents at times, yet only with the gravest circumspection, or under the coercion of inescapable and unconscious contemporary influences. His circumspection in this matter may be read into the exposition of his refusal to accept blindly all the traditional technique of drama, in the induction to "Every Man Out of His Humour". And the spirit of his age may be seen to work in him against Horace's(and the Stagirite's)prescription in the size of his casts. He transgresses also in the complexity of his plots, the occasional violence of his scene and theme,(3) and in his notorious habit of literal translation.(4) But in more profound matters he obeys the Horatian precepts with important results, as in his normal essays to achieve uniformity of texture, and in the static quality of his humour characters,(5)

(1) Cunn.i.p.333. Ars Poet. ll.390—401 (2) "A.P." ll.291-301.
(3) Cunn.i.p.185. (4) ib.133. (5) Cunn.ii.pp.125-7.This last "effect" is in notable contrast with Shakespeare's habit of allowing his principal characters to "develop".

which is a corollary to his conception of the Horatian desideratum of "self-consistency". And, finally, he produces from the "De Arte Poetica" a headline confirmation for his crusade on behalf of dramatic realism or, at least, credibility.(1)

From other works of Horace, too, he culls emblematic sub-titles for his plays, and every choice reveals the man he was. Thus, the motto of "Catiline"(2) expresses in Horace's words Ben's disdain of "publica vena", and appeals to the highborn who alone have sufficient culture to appreciate his recherché offering. The same characteristic contempt of the herd appears in the motto to "Bartholomew's Fair",(3) though the geniality of the bulk of the play itself is hardly represented by the cynical impresa. Perhaps Ben is here "scorning his own spirit" for its comparative condescension. In the motto to the "New Inn" Horace appears as a friend giving advice or comfort for the failure of the play on the public stage, and commending that higher and safer court of appeal, the study.(4) The arrogant trumpeting that heralds the printed form of "Every Man out of his Humour" - harmonising perfectly with Jonson's attitude towards his production - is a symposium of Horatian lines that outdoes the original author's not inconsiderable confidence in his achievements.(5) And this particular use of Horace, as of Martial, goes to show that Horace was one of Jonson's dearest spiritual intimates, readily turned to in triumphs and in troubles as a kindred and sympathetic spirit.

Just how nearly akin Ben must have felt Horace to be is best exemplified in the notorious picture of Horace-Jonson in "Poetaster". Of this character's qualities and aesthetic implications Professors Herford and Simpson make a most interesting and thorough examination.(6) However, their analysis

(1) Cunn.II.p.211. De Arte Poet.l.338.
(2) do.p.76.
(3) do.p.141.
(4) do.335.
(5) do.I.p.61.
(6) H.& S.I.pp.418-423 and 436-441.

and estimate touches the present enquiry only in their finding that Jonson's elaboration of "Horace" - as of "Vergil" and "Ovid" - is directly due to his strong humanist sympathies and is supererogatory, or even contradictory, to his immediate dramatic and satiric purposes. In a very just and illuminating manner they explain the psychologic stimulus that led to the creation of "Poetaster's" historical background thus: "The scholar had received his mandate from the satirist; but he was too independent and too keen to pause just when the satirist ceased to need him."(1) A very reasonable, convincing, and pleasant explanation.

To argue further, as the professors do, that 'Horace' is neither Quintus Horatius Flaccus, nor Benjamin Jonson, nor an impressive medley of both is, at bottom, merely to say that Jonson failed to achieve the impossible. The realistic and the symbolic qualities of the character, the satiric and the historical requirements, the Elizabethan and the Roman elements did not, it is true, mix; but neither did they noticeably clash, for the colours of 'Horace' in "Poetaster" are too weak and watery to be even discordant. To accuse such a character of 'inconsistency' is a vague and difficult charge to establish. Of artistic inconsistency - the gravest charge to Ben's or Horace's mind - it is not guilty; it remains throughout the same polite, deferential, long-suffering, generous, negative being. And to accuse Ben of inconsistency with history, his own or Horace's, is not aesthetic criticism at all, and little more to the point than condemning Falstaff for being a bad travesty of

(1) H. & S. I. p. 428

an actual Oldcastle.

Long ago Gregory Smith declared of Jonson that he had "a literary humour", and that in consequence he was prone to accept and to give "an illustration for an identity". That is precisely what he does in "Horace", as so often in "Discoveries" and in marginal notes on his library books.

Even so, and allowing the widest licence conventionally accorded to allegory, the fact remains that Jonson could conceive himself as walking the boards in the toga, gait, and character of Flaccus: at least he was struck by resemblances that escaped his contemporaries and puzzle us. The great unthrasser of guilt could guilt himself - paradoxical but not unusual. Judged by the studied moderation of his tone, his lack of vindictiveness, his generous and lofty scorn of detractors, his reverence for the nobility of his craft and its supreme exponents, his tolerance, long-suffering, and blandness, the Horace of "Poetaster" may reasonably be regarded as a picture of Jonson when he was, in Drummond's phrase, "at himself",(2) at peace with the world. It is extremely probable that - such is the flesh - this Jonson-in-good-humour was the poet's own conception of the natural, normal Ben, the kindly, unassertive lover of the Good. As a corollary, all departures from this norm he would explain as due to external causes, poetasters, drink, ignorant critics, disease, and the other earthly ills that stain and try the ideal character that is man's inner vision of his own real character, the great illusion. The power of his imagination and the "passion" of his nature would but serve to confirm him in this general, though not all-prevailing, misconception.

However widely we may think that Horace and Jonson did in fact differ as men, we must concede a large degree of

(1) "Ben Jonson", p.268.
(2) "Conversations" H.& S.I.p.151.

resemblance between their literary principles. As sibyl to his own times of the classic literary fiats Jonson accepts Horace as his major oracle. Thus no less than three times in "Discoveries"(1) he records with approving comment the "Ars Poetica's" principle that authors must avoid the fantastic and incoherent. And the reiteration of the caveat probably reflects the frequency with which contemporaries offended him on this score. Horace insists on artistic homogeneity - absent incidentally in the hasty 'Poetaster'. So Ben counsels his fellows to eschew their favourite, far-fetched, fairy stuff. Indeed, he slightly hardens the Horatian requirements of realism, credibility, and self-consistency into a ban on whatever is outwith normal experience. He requires fiction to conform to common observation and common sense. Even self-consistency does not justify initial extravagance of fancy. Self-consistency, however, for both is of primary importance. Let the matter be "simplex duntaxat et unum"(2), advised Horace; and Jonson echoed, "Let the work be uniform in texture or all in one key"; by which he means more than, say, the exclusion of tragedy from comedy and vice versa; for he required, like Horace, that the part should be subordinated to the whole.(3) To this latter maxim we may in part attribute the absence from Jonsonian works of quotable tags and purple patches, a conscious and deliberate omission as may be seen in the interesting excision of Lorenzo's rhapsody on poesy as between the quarto and folio versions of "Every Man In his Humour". It may be seen too in his avowed objection to "the forcing in of jests"(4) and in the rarity with which he steps aside to cull a grace. Yet he is very far from consistently observant of this Horatian principle. He does force in jests, particularly and notably jests of a very barren order, and any subject matter that appeals

(1) viz. Discoveries, CXII, CXVI, CXXXV.
(2) Ars Poet. l. 23.
(3) And this he logically extends to cover the smallest parts of parts. Within each phrase no word must obtrude or jar the critic's questing nail: for so said Quintilian and Horace (Disc. CXXII)
(4) Discovery CXVI.

to his scholarly, antiquarian, etymologic, or scientific interests is almost certain to inflate that part at the expense of the whole. In Jonson's case it remains an unrealised ambition, but a vitally important ambition, that a work of fiction should be "one and entire".

To make a detailed examination of the relations between Horatian precept and Jonsonian practice would be tedious and misleading: misleading because one cannot always state categorically when he has Horace before him, and when Horace's masters. But we may tabulate some of the more important and obvious instances of the impingement of the one author on the other. Thus, Horace decreed and Jonson remembered:

(a) Avoid bombast even in great matters - a markedly unElizabethan restraint.

(b) There is no use achieving great beauties at the risk of equally remarkable flaws.

(c) "Labor limae" and "multae liturae" are essential in works that hope for immortality of fame.

(d) Let your characters be true to history or self-consistent - both alternatives exemplified in "Catiline" and "Sejanus".

(e) Note the varying desires and natures of each stage of life - though it cannot be asserted that Ben's characters are finely discriminated by their years. The Horatian precept tends to a broad conventionalisation, as of avarice and suspicion with age, simply age, and lust and irresponsibility with youth. Jonson, no more than Shakespeare, has studies of real children.

(f) Let the matter of your play retain the common touch.

As to his preferences for Horace's poems, inter se, apart from the 'Ars Poetica', it is hard to dogmatise. His references to the Odes and Epodes, it is true, outnumber his references to the Satires and Epistles. Yet the apparent implication of that evidence is weakened by the fact that it is the latter which in his extant copy of Horace are most frequently underlined. And again in favour of the Odes it may be mentioned that he translated at full length no

(I) On the debit side of Ben's account with Horace we must acknowledge (a) Knowledge of what to 'leave out';(b) translational obscurity in seeking brevity;(c) actions are more effective in drama than speech; (d) too much learning injures plays.

fewer than three, viz.III,9; IV,1; and V,2. Another favourite was IV,9. Apparently Horace V,2, the "Beatus ille", was a test piece for translators in Jonson's time. He repeated his own version (Underwoods LXXXVIII) to Drummond and characteristically "admired it".(2) The slight ambiguity of "it" is probably immaterial.

Concerning the quality of his translations of Horace, including the "De Arte", nothing need be added to what has already been said of his other literal efforts in this genre. All his versions of Horace are governed strictly by his cramping theory that verbal faithfulness is the sine qua non; and even within the field thus circumscribed he plods straight on, or twists and curvets, galumphs sometimes, in confused, ungainly and occasionally inaccurate manner.

All his editors and commentators are naturally disappointed by his general failure as a translator, or puzzled by his occasional success. At best, they point to "Drink to me only" as condonative evidence of what he could have done but would not regularly do.

What in Jonson's circumstances or make-up can explain his deliberate defiance of Horace's own injunction that translation, if one wishes to make the material "one's own" - as Jonson's high regard for the art suggests was his intention - must not be strictly verbal?(3) Without hoping for a clear-cut, final assessment, we may distinguish the following possible factors in the situation.

(a) He might have denied the applicability of the passage cited in the "De Arte"; and he might have justified his apparent contumacy thus: "In my works you will find two kinds of

---

(1) Translations: Cunn.III.pp.387, 385, 384. IV,9 appears on p,310 and in fugitive references elsewhere, e.g.III.pp.272 and 289. This is the "Vixere fortes" ode, on Jonson's favourite theme, namely, poetry's power to confer immortality, graciously expressed in the "De Arte",too, and quoted by Jonson, Cunn.III. p.402.

(2) "Conversations", H.& S.I.p.134.

(3) "De Arte Poet." ll.131-134.

translations or versions. Horace's advice applies to the retelling of ancient stories with the object of making the final version one's own property. I have done that successfully, as my commentators say, in "Drink to me only": in it the old Greek fancies have been transmuted as well as translated. Such a process requires taste in arrangement, phrasing, omissions and decoration, beside technical dexterity. And the process, if successful, gives the translator, in happier days, a legal copyright. But the majority of my translations - note this! - are deliberately designed on a different plan and to a different end. To myself and my less educated colleagues I defined my "literal" translations in this manner: 'Real translation is that representation in another tongue which will most immediately recall the original version to one who is familiarly acquainted with the original, and which will least veil the exact form of the divine original from the ignorant laity' ".

(b) The general practice of scholars and pedants in his own day - as distinguished from clever journalistic amateurs like Cardinal Duperron.(1)

(c) Ben's innate love of difficulty, labour, and strife.

(d) His regard for severe mental discipline and, conversely. hatred of padding and all flabbiness.

(d)His religious reverence for the exact form of the original. The beloved passages he thought worthy of translation were unalterably fixed in his retentive memory, not merely in general substance, but in an order of words and sequence of ideas as sacrosanct and no more to be disturbed than , say, the formal burial service of the church, or the clichés of ancient and modern religious, demonological, hymeneal, or alchemistic ritual.(2) In this he had some form of scholar's inhibition as well as "humour".

(1) See "Conversations". H.& S.1.p.164.

(2) We have noted repeatedly how ritual fascinates him. See, in particular, Catullus, Fest.Avienus, and several of the Minora Sidera

(f) Sheer perversity would at least confirm him in a course that unpopularity would suffice to suggest. His temper gave him a large capacity for being wrong.

These points remembered, one must concede that the more insoluble problem is: Why are some of his translations free and excellent? - unless, of course, one concedes (a) above. In any case, to explain away his occasional mastery of the art of translation would be at least ungracious.

So far we have dealt with Jonson's translations of Horace and his attitude towards Horatian literary precepts. Of course, he also seeks in Horace, as in all Latin authors, whatever light is to be had on antiquities in general. Actually, he finds little of this in Horace except the arcana of witchcraft. From the latter's Canidia and Sagana he borrows details to corroborate the practices described by Ovid, Apuleius, and Lucan, not to mention many later fathers of the occult down even to his own day and king.(1) The quintessence of his heavy studies in this particular kind of nonsense and knavery is to be found in his text and notes to the "Masque of Queens".

In his more fleeting raids on Horace he fell on characteristic spoil. It was probably at Westminster that he first met the Horatian truism that money is the root of trouble and corruption.(2) His later life confirmed the truth of the apophthegm. For Jonson it appears to have had a peculiar force and interest, if one may judge from the fact that he refers to it, in one form or another, no less than four times. In the "Forest"(3) he translates one Horatian version with unusual freedom

---

(I) For his numerous other sources on this subject see Cunn.III.pp. 46, 47, and 52, or H.& S.I.pp.252-3. Apparently he thought little of James's contribution to the subject of witchcraft, for he quotes it only once and elementary tact required no less than that. Probably he found it amateurish and merely facile like Duperron's translated verse.

(2) Horace - Lib.II.Sat.3.11.94-6; Car.Lib.IV.9.1.55.

(3) XII.

and at least as much force as his own "honest plagiary", Milton, thus: .:.ingots

Were yet unfound and better placed in earth
Than here to give pride fame and peasants birth:(1)

In this we hear Jonson the disappointed representative of a noble but neglected and penurious profession, and also Jonson the scion of gentle stock. In his "Volpone", (2) too, as in Horace, "virtue, fame, honour, and all things" are ascribed to wealth; and the same sour sentiment is repeated in the "Staple of News" (3) and the "King's Entertainment". (4) So Ben first recorded his approval of the adage at the age of 31, and when 50 or more saw no reason to change his mind. Among the slights, and spurns, and periodic poverty that were his lot this favourite quotation must have been even more often on his protesting and contemptuous lips than on his pen.

In unison, too, they sing that "a man's a man for a' that" (5) - assuming perhaps that he has acquired the ideal of earthly felicity, the modesty competency so attractively pictured by Horace and admiringly translated by Ben. (6) The same idea of contentment with simple fare and humble lechery appears in the "Devil is an Ass"; (7) and the struggle to pile up what must at last be left behind both denounce because it can give no final security. (8)

From Horace, as we have seen, he draws confirmation of what may be considered his guiding principle as an artist, i.e. the nobility, the serious duty, and the consequent importance of his profession, the art of poetry. The concept was at once an

---

(1) Cunn. III. p. 271.
(2) do. I. p. 337.
(3) do. II. p. 291.
(4) do. II. p. 568.
(5) do. III. p. 246.
(6) do. III. p. 384. And see above, translation.
(7) do. II. p. 243.
(8) do. II. p. 235.

inspiration and "escape"; it was the result of his ego and it hardened that ego. There is dignity, arrogance, nobility, and hauteur in his echoed phrases, the poet is a "master in manners"(1), who can confer immortality.(2)

On the nature of satire, too, he agrees with Horace.(3) Like Horace and like Juvenal, Jonson acknowledges that he finds the satiric urge to be irresistible. Interesting light is shed, askance, on Jonson's outlook and quality of character in his claim that "Volpone" illustrates the Horatian precept and practice of keeping bitterness out of his satire so that "only a little salt remaineth".(4) To-day we feel that his saline content is high.

Jonson is in accord with Horace in his attitude towards the herd of humankind - particularly after the public indifference shown to his Roman plays. He derides the barren spectators who condemned "Catiline", sneers at the many-headed monster's preoccupation with brainless spectacle, and commends his play to the more discerning "equites".(5) And his one great play that might seem un-Horatian to the casual, and a mere pandering to the vulgar love of a huge cast of equally important characters, home-spun humour, bustle and literary formlessness, be after all prefaced with a quotation from Horace that compares the interest of the public in literature to the interest of a deaf ass.(6)

As to omissions from Horace, well, one might expect in the work of so confirmed a toper as Ben a number of references to Horace's bacchanalian odes and gracefully poetic wine-lists - the more so as Ben's taverns were for him no mere wine-swilling get-drunk-quick dens, but centres of pleasant social, literary, and generally cultural life as well. The expectation is vain.

---

(1) Cunn.I.p.333.
(2) do.III.pp.310, 272.
(3) do.III.pp.302-4.
(4) do.I.p.657.
(5) Motto to "Catiline".
(6) Motto to "Bart's. Fair". The same scorn of the many is bitterly expressed in the motto to the 1631 folio and the "Alchemist" it is better known in Milton's version, "fit audience find, though few". See the same idea of the poet's exclusive appeal underlined in his hand in his library copy of Horace (H.& S.I.254)

there are two neighbouring and negligible allusions in the formal "King's Entertainment", one to drinking cups as emblems of joy,(1) and the other to the brite "Nunc est bibendum";(2) and one to Canary wine.(3) No more. And yet this omission is but the corroborative converse of what we find he does take from Horace. Inshort, he regards Horace as essentially a "serious" poet, fit counterpart and vicar for himself on the stage. Perhaps, too, he dimly sensed that a frequent reference to poculatory verses was not becoming in a man who sang of the poet as "a master in manners", or in keeping with one who in private life and on the stage visualised himself as peer and kindred of that older "master".

The majority of his other allusions(4) to Horace are of the usual factual order. Among them we may briefly instance, as confirming Jonson's literary humour, such a pedantic borrowing as "a man of clear nostril",(5) and his dual reference to a "slippery face",(6) all of which must have led to queer misapprehensions among the less lettered members of original audiences. Equally characteristic of the same humour, and of his idea of facetiousness, is his pun on "dare verba", "Give them words" - which was surely a very Greek pun for all who had "small Latin."

.....

(1) Cunn.II.p.557.
(2) do. do.
(3) do.III.p.248.
(4) e.g.do.I.pp.285, 290; II.p.560; III.pp.3, 13, 33, 166, 242
(5) do.II.p.344.
(6) do.II.p.318; III.p.148.
(7) do.I.p.346.

References to Horace unallocated above may be found as follows: Cunn.I.pp.334, 338, 342, 343. (These group, taken with the ~~xxx~~ others in the text, indicates that Horace was very much in his mind when composing "Volpone" - a carry-over from "Poetaster" and, in less degree, from "Sejanus"?; Cunn.II.pp.224, 291, 502; Cunn.III.pp.53, 73, 166, 239, 242, 246, 298, 302-4.

The Latin Historians.

In his two Roman plays Jonson made full use of the available factual sources, just as we have seen was his unfailing practice in slighter subjects. In "Sejanus" he had recourse to Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, and Seneca - in particular the first two - supported by Dion.[1] In "Catiline" his chief authorities were Sallust, Cicero, Suetonius, Paterculus, and Valerius Maximus - in particular the first three.

He has no real occasion to employ Livy - apart from three very trifling references[2] - since the portion of Livy's History that dealt with the stories of Sejanus and Catiline was not extant. However, the difference in their temper, for certain, and in their regard for facts, probably, establishes a comfortable likelihood that Jonson would, in any case, underrate Livy. And this speculation is somewhat strengthened by the pointed omission of Livy from the lists of his favourite Latins, as these are recorded in sundry parts of the "Conversations".

In writing his historical plays it is clear that Jonson was conscious of being, once again, an innovator; and equally clear that in them he is consistently observing his earlier and later literary principles and methods. We may see him marking off his practice in historical plays from that of

---

(1) Tacitus is by far his chief authority for Acts I,II,III. Dio is the main source of Acts IV and V. In Act I Tacitus is cited more than twice as often as in Act III. But, although in all Dio is referred to much more frequently than Tacitus, the latter is Jonson's favourite, for when both are cited together Tacitus is almost invariably given precedence.

(2) "Sejanus" I,2; do. V.3; "Catiline" III,3.

his laxer contemporaries in his footnotes and in the memorable preface to the 1605 Quarto of "Sejanus". In the latter he rebuts the charge of pedantic affectation against his footnotes and then cites chapter, verse, and edition of his originals as proof of his "integrity". Further, he stresses his un-Elizabethan habit of employing none but the original Latin and Greek texts, and derides askance the only English translation available, Greneway's "Germanie" of Tacitus.(1) Bed-rock, in effect, is his claim for the foundation of this play, a claim equally true of the other. The implication is obvious: to the dramatisation of history for the English public stage Jonson claimed to bring all that scholarly apparatus, exactness,and "integrity" that made him in his private capacity the consultant of the historian Raleigh and the antiquarian Selden. Now, in thus founding a school of drama,that attracted no immediate disciples, he was simply and consistently applying to historical playwriting the methods of analytic observation seen in his humour comedies, the method of founding decorative and pantomimic fancy ~~fancy~~ on archaeologic fact that was to be in his masques, and all that in itself was but an aspect of his general belief that drama must instruct in the narrower pedagogic as well as the broader moral sense, must be true to fact or self-consistent collections of facts, as well as to nature. In these two plays, on occasion, the mass of historical incidents and instances sometimes crushes or obscures that interpretation of incident that we recognise as artistic truth, and sometimes his regard for the sanctity, the unusual personal appeal of his originals, vitiates his selection of facts: but ~~he~~ his objectives and theories - largely realised - are clear. He might have expressed them thus:

(a) "I disdain slavish obedience to recorded theories of art."(2)

---

(1)..."ignorantly done into English" - "Conversations".
(2) As in the preface to "Sejanus" above.

(b) I profess and glory in the strictest practicable observance of recorded facts.

(c) In historical plays imagination and arrangement ought to stand foursquare on knowledge. Consequently I have represented Romans acting and speaking as a careful study of extant documents makes it appear certain that they did act and speak. Where my sources failed to supply me with detail or where a dramatic build-up was necessary for any character, the workings of my mother wit are in the securest harmony with my interpretation and translation of their recorded acts and words. I have anticipated the austere, though mendacious, verisimilitude of Defoe: I have left a model of research for Gibbon and the Hollywood scenarists. The study has come to the stage. In these plays have cooperated two of man's noblest professions, the tragedians and the historian's. Here, again, are plays such as other plays should be - and many (unspecified) aren't!"

Tacitus. So much for his general ideals of historical drama and his normal fidelity to ascertainable fact. It remains to consider his deviations in practice from this rigorous conception, deviations either (a) deliberate obviously and of recognisable dramatic purpose, of (b) deviations apparently due to oversight, misconception, or confusion of some kind.

(a) Among his deliberate manipulations of his raw materials the following cases are notable and typical:

(I) Tacitus (with Dion) makes it quite clear that to his mind the intrigue of Sejanus with the wife of Drusus was

motivated by a primitive spirit of revenge for an insult, possibly even for physical assault. Ben sets his authority at naught. True, he does not abandon the incident of the assault; he merely postpones this opportunity for "action": but he makes heavily emphasises that the motive of his Sejanus is a treacherous, cold-blooded, politic, unromantic, far-sighted desire to discover the husband's state secrets through control of the giddy wife. Tacitus is satisfied with the motive of primary passion uncomplicated by intellect: Jonson eschews this reading of history probably for two complementary reasons: (a) his inability, surely sub-consciously felt, to represent convincing love-making on the stage. (His Sejanus relieves him from the embarrassment of this disability or disinclination by explaining that love "hath the smallest share" in his motives): and (b) his delight in a sinewy plot and the picture, so often repeated in varying forms, of a close-plotting mighty intellect who will in the end make a fatal slip but is not, while the play runs, at all open to the hackneyed, un-Jonsonian weakness of excessive susceptibility to women.

In short, here Jonson is replacing passion and simple romance with reason and machination.

(II) In his drama Jonson certainly does not neglect the attractively Elizabethan motive of an insult calling for condign retaliation. But characteristically he elaborates, systematises, and condenses the Tacitean materials. In so doing he enormously enhances the intellectual calibre and the purposive villainy of his chief character. Thus Ben speeds up or even coalesces the sporadic attacks of Sejanus on the party of Agrippina. And whereas Tacitus represents Sejanus as an adroit political opportunist without programme or principle, turning the unreasoning jealousy of

Tiberius to his own advantage, Jonson, on the other hand, visualises him as a grand, systematic, consistent villain. He presents Sejanus as a superlative of his kind (with many affinities in the Jonsonian album) moved immediately, no doubt, by desire of revenge, but motivated generally by innate, absolute wickedness, moderated only by diabolic cunning, to the accomplishment of a vast, complex (Jonsonian) scheme of far-sighted devilry. And so he sets the stage for an epic struggle between the old devil, retired to Capreae, and his worthy vicar, Beelzebub, left behind in Rome. In this adaptation of his materials the liberties he takes are justified by the enhancement of the dignity, tension, and oneness of his drama. And, after all, Jonson herein is merely interpreting for himself what Tacitus was, at best, in an interpretation anyhow, and of the same evidence.

(iii) The same process of telescoping and rationalising is seen also in Jonson's causal juxtaposition of the accusations of Cordus and Silius. Tacitus did not see them as political associates. Jonson did: to him they were the Good, like himself stubbornly on Virtue's side. So, with no violence to fact, and with commendable increase of clarity, he places them shoulder to shoulder - be it only against a wall for Evil to shoot at.(1)

(iv) Even in the pettiest matters he makes few alterations, and rarely misses the full force of the original. Indeed, to find an example of such an aberration we are reduced to such a pettifogging example as this: Jonson's translation,

> "Our looks are called to question, and our words,
> How innocent soever, are made crimes",(2)

by being generalised misses the concision, thrust, and power of Tacitus' emphasis on the malignant tenacity of the tyrant's memory in the word, "recondebat" -

"verba vultus in crimen detorquens recondebat".

---

(1) Act iii, Sc.i.
(2) Cunn.i.p.276.

(b) In the face of such consistent accuracy as he displays throughout his historical dramas, it is with some trepidation that one ventures to indict him for even trivial slips.(1) However, he does nod.

(i) Thus, on one occasion he errs by representing Tiberius as being at Rhodes, though later he shows that he was aware of his actually being at Capua.(2)

(ii)Jonson's picture of Arruntius is characteristic of Jonson, nobly appealing and, in its setting, quite incredible. To Arruntius Jonson ascribes a prominence and outspokenness that cannot be reconciled with his continued existence at the court of Tiberius and Sejanus. Jonson himself felt this a strain on credulity, for he sought to explain it away, without conviction, as a mere whim of the tyrant. To plead whims thus is to put reason out of office. At most we must agree that in a madman of Tiberius' kidney such a whim might exist, but in such a madman there is just nothing quite so improbable, and the picture in consequence lacks the verisimilitude essential to all fiction, and a first requirement to Jonson's conception of historical drama. The cause of this aberration is very clear, and very human. When Ben read in Tacitus of Arruntius as a man "intolerant of evil", he seized upon the laconic critique because of his own lifelong predilection for satire and moralising. In short, he once again presents a likeness for an identity: he pounces on this censorious probity of Tacitus's very shadowy Arruntius, saying, "That's me!" and thereupon Arruntius speaks with the voice, authority, and eloquence of Benjamin Jonson. But, alas, Ben would have met an untimely end in the Rome he himself depicts.

(iii) In Jonson's play Silius stabs himself in the Senate House. The unspecific language of Tacitus(3) makes this unlikely. Historically it is of little moment, but the liberty taken reveals Jonson again from temperamental causes

(1) e.g. H.& S.iv.p.473 instance six textual errors, but these are probably due to the printer.
(2) Cunn.i.p.308.
(3) "imminentem damnationem fine praevertit" - IV,c,19.

ignoring the Horatian precept on "public" violence.

(IV) Perhaps in the death of Silius and also in his treatment of the fallen Sejanus we may see his innate brutality and the shadow of his times, perhaps too we may sense in the latter instance his personal satisfaction at the long-deferred overthrow of villainy. For certain, anyhow, Tacitus gives him no authority for submitting Sejanus to violence in the Senate House nor at the hands of Macro, who was not present on that occasion.

It is, however, much more frequently and speciously urged against Jonson that he followed his authorities too slavishly rather than that he permitted himself the sort of alterations we have instanced. This school of prejudice emphasises the jig-saw nature of "Sejanus", and regards only the conjunctions and stage instructions as entirely Jonson's own work. Against this misrepresentation Professors Hereford and Simpson have rightly pointed out that in the dialogue and even the characterisation Jonson relied for far the greated part on his own imagination. And for the rest his guides often pointed the way or dropped a hint but they seldom went the whole way with him. Cumulatively, however, his guides and counsellors were numerous, as set forth by himself, and may be indicated thus:- Tacitus is his vademecum, as far as the "Annals" will take him. To this work Ben cites more than 160 references of extremely varied importance length, nature, and degree of clearness. It must not, as we have seen, be concluded that his acceptance of Tacitus, though almost complete, was uncritical. He was perfectly capable of modifying the Roman's inferences, capable too of preferring another authority, however rarely.

For instance, he ignores several sound reasons advanced by Tacitus as casting doubt on the accusation that Germanicus was poisoned by Piso; and in this Ben takes his stand with Suetonius. And even though such difference of view be very rare and Tacitus be the final authority, there is ample evidence that he examined all the other available sources too. Thus, Suetonius is cited 38 times, and of that total no less than I6 are cross-references or recognisances of facts primarily derived from Tacitus. And Suetonius, in turn, is backed up by some 20 references to Seneca, 2 to Paterculus, 7 specific and many unspecific and secondary to Pliny. Surely all this evidence of patient collation and sifting makes it clear that his final preference for Tacitus was a considered decision as well as a temperamental predilection and a literary preference suggested by his inclusion of Tacitus among those who spake best Latin.

A further proof that the nature of Tacitus' material was not the fundamental basis of Jonson's regard for his work appears in the fact that Jonson could and did find the same events and personages treated elsewhere. So he must have been attracted not only by the gist of Tacitus' story, but by the manner of its presentation, by the reflection and imprint of the Roman's mind on his work, by some measure of sympathy with his emphases, glosses, and mordant narratory-commentary. But the clearest proof of any regard is when it misleads; and Tacitus misled Jonson, misled him, says modern scholarship both in his antipathy to Tiberius and his predilection for Germanicus. (Not that this

adoption, unconscious, of the Tacitean bias had any unfortunate effects on "Sejanus". The negative, nebulous, balancing, historical attitude that seeks to split the difference between Tacitus' appraisal of Tiberius and Germanicus was not to the purpose of Jonson the dramatist or to the taste of Jonson the man.)

In short, the colour, movement, background, sympathy, and satiric viewpoint of "Sejanus" are essentially Tacitean in origin. With the changes of emphasis already noted, the steps of Sejanus' grim rise to power are from Tacitus. So too is his basic character, cunning, inhuman, ruthless, ambitious. And for the general setting and atmosphere Jonson's "ghost", Tacitus, had left the material to his hand and mind, material full of simply effective contrasts of character, pictures of noble natures engulfed in the schemes of noble villains and their parvenu sycophants, and Evil slain finally by Evil, inevitably yet astonishingly, in a climax of the grimmest intensity. Replacing the note of passive tragedy of Tacitus with the tone of active contempt and righteous indignation that is his natural voice Jonson gives a painstaking, heavy but not unjust representation of the political and social background of the "Annals". It is thronged - inspite of Horace - with a nominate chorus of corrupt senators, venal judges, ambitious political grafters, poisoners, amateur and professional, sacriligious priests, adulterers, and public informers. The commonest action is legal murder or suicide; the commonest topic, corruption; the prevailing mood, treachery. The extant examples he allows of ancient virtue, like Arruntius and Cordus, are artistically introduced by both authors like white seagulls

against a murky sky. In both the atmosphere is stifling. Never, apparently was the human race so treacherous, sordid and debased. At once we see wherein as a moralist and satirist Jonson would feel the gorgeous blackness of the picture. He seized the opportunity to fulminate against the foulness of the human race, such was his persistent urge to play the Hebrew prophet both in matter and manner. He must have found here relief as a genuinely religious man and as an unappreciated artist in delineating historic types of depravity and at least by implication damning the majority of man's yahoo race. Through the sedulously observed historic trappings we hear the Jonsonian ring in ,"filthier flatteries that corrupt the times! This furor of loathing reaches a climax in the representation of Afer (1) and Plancina, (2) and in the endless references to bloodshed and foulness. (3) So, if his picture of ancient Rome lacks the restraint, finality and stinging quality of Tacitus, it achieves in its faithful, heavier way a similar cumulative effect. If, finally it be objected that Jonson's "integrity" and researches have rendered his figures heavy, even stolid, the pleas may be offered that such was Jonson's honest reading of Roman character, in the light of his own, and not an effect of his researches into atmosphere. To the full, anyhow, he depicts the worth and weight, gravity, stodginess, earnestness, and heaviness that constitute the still prevailing English-world impression of a Roman of the Romans, O.S.

More specific sympathies and resemblances in methods and outlook between Jonson and Tacitus are to be seen in their treatment of sources and their attitude towards the unfolding of the historic drama. In the collation of authorities Tacitus showed Jonson the way, with the difference,

(1) Sej.II.Sc.3. (2) do.IV.Sc.i.
(3) Page and theme may be indicated thus: Cunn. I.p.276, delation; 279, homosexuality; foul flattery dissimulatingly spurned; 293, spying on one's host; 294, "treason" as an omnibus charge, and pharasaic grief; 307, eavesdropping; 308, domestic perfidy and physical foulness; 309, Judas kisses; 311, as 294; connivance at cuckiedom.

admittedly, that Jonson feels the greatest respect for his authorities and Tacitus the greatest diffidence about his. And then each is vitally concerned with the exposition of human character in action, Tacitus because he is professedly a moral instructor, Jonson because he is that by nature and a dramatist by necessity of birth.

Despite such affinities of mentality, Jonson's specific obligations to Tacitus are not of the spirit. For three[1] and no more may be described as characteristic of Tacitus's habit of incisive, aphoristic comment on the unfolding events of his pageant. Jonson rejects such fine literary feathers, as it is his custom, and confines his obligations to the historical groundwork of his colossal cast.

In support of Tacitus the contributions of the other Romans, Suetonius, Pliny, Seneca, are relatively inconsiderable, and that of Paterculus even trivial.

Paterc.

Apparently the time-serving bias of the last in favour of Sejanus met with neither the approval nor the immediate needs of Jonson. For the rest, he took Paterculus' eulogy of Cato, "Homo virtuti simillimus etc" and applied it with a stretch of historical propriety to his favourite, Germanicus.[2] And in another reference to Paterculus he cites chapter, verse, and edition for his soubriquets on famous Romans of the past.[3] All this might be squeezed into suggesting Jonson's shrewd and just recognition that Paterculus was a fair commentator on the past, though of questionable veracity on his own contemporaries. And in "Catiline" Paterculus

(1) And even two of these, Cunn. I.288 and 312 were not peculiar to Tacitus, Petronius and Statius retailing the former, and Juvenal employing the latter. The other is in Cunn. III.p.208.
(2) Cunn. I.p.277.
(3) do. p.278.

plays a leading part.

Sueton. Suetonius, on the other hand, is used impartially in both "histories". In "Sejanus, however, as already noted, he is not accepted by Jonson as the sole voucher for any fact of first-rate importance to the play. Throughout, he serves in general as a seconder to Tacitus, and, where the latter fails him, to Dio. The most important facts for which he is beholden to Suetonius concern the retirement to Capreae,(1) the precise sentences on Agrippina, Nero, and Drusus junior,(2) and the steps and the letter leading to Sejanus' fall.(3) That is to say, for the latter, un-Tacitean portion of his story Ben is divided between Dio and Suetonius, with a slight leaning towards Dio, if one may judge from the number of occasions on which Dio is cited before Suetonius. On his own, Suetonius provides such slighter materials as: a bitter bon-mot of Augustus,(4) corroboration of a point of pedigree,(5) the suggestions for the secret conference of Sejanus and his master (Act II, Sc.2), and some confidential thoughts or acts of the muddy-minded tyrant(6) - but all details, be it noted, in the strictest conformity with the scheme of the Tacitean picture. Tentatively, from this one might deduce that Suetonius did not stand high in Ben's esteem. And that assumption is not in conflict with another little pointer: Jonson notes that Suetonius has handed down another version of the fable "Spelunca",(7) scene of the accident. But apparently Jonson has recorded this merely as a matter of "fidelity" and scholarly interest, for he does not add to it the weight of even the slightest comment that would argue any warmth of regard for this dissenting historian.

---

(1) Act IV, Sc.5.
(2) Dunn.I.p.311.
(3) Act V, Sc.10.
(4) Dunn.I.p.301.
(5) do.p.289.
(6) do.pp.283, 288, 289, 293.
(7) do.p.306.

Pliny (the elder's) contributions are confined to "Sejanus", in which he takes his place as a respectable but very subsidiary authority. Indeed, the truest indication of Jonson's estimate of the relative importance and ad hoc value of his sources is perhaps his own footnote and the order of merit suggested therein: "De Sejano vid. Tacit...Suet...Dio...et Plin. et Senec."(I) The supernumerary nature of the last two is clearly marked by the repeated "et".

Pliny. Five localisable references to Pliny's great work suggest that Jonson, as already seen was familiar with it all: they range from Book II to Book XXVIII.

Ben's most effective borrowing from him owes its rich vitality to the borrower's satiric sense. It concerns the secret insinuating power of the Faculty of Medicine, especially with ladies,(2) and is of the same quality as much of the "Alchemist" In this instance - and to great advantage - personal experience and observation of Elizabethan quackery and charlatanry edge Pliny's (and Tacitus') satiric thrusts.

Characteristically we next find Pliny (with Horace) sending Jonson to search among the commentators for an accurate interpretation of the Roman custom of "thumbs up".(3)

Very interesting, too, is the borrowing of a touch to emphasise the tyrant's superstitious weakness, of which, like his compeer in "Julius Caesar", Jonson makes much. This concerns Pliny's (and Suetonius') observation that Tiberius pinned his faith on a laurel wreath as a lightning-conductor.(4)

Pliny next supplies a slight yet convincing touch when Tiberius, meaning generally that poison counters poison, or a Macro counters a Sejanus, yet is made to say specifically, with exquisite heightening of the historical colour, that aconite

(2) Act I, Sc.2.
(I) (3) Cunn.I.p.290.
(4) do.p.29I. See, too, omens and portents like Caesar's, but taken from Seneca, in Act V, Sc.4.

(2) taken from Seneca, in Act V, Sc.4.
(3) Cunn.I.p.290.
(4) do.p.29I. See, too, omens and portents like Caesar's, but taken from Seneca, in Act V, Sc.4.

counters "the scorpion's stroke!"(I)

Finally Pliny is adduced to back's Dio's remarkable assertion - an effectively sinister addition to Ben's eerie picture of the monster - that Tiberius could see in the dark.(2)

Cumulatively these instances emphasise that Jonson deliberately restricted his borrowings from Pliny, though he was well informed in the extent & credit available for him.

Seneca.

The general relationship between Jonson and Seneca has already been dealt with. Here it remains to point out his employment of Seneca as a witness to history. Seneca's contributions to "Sejanus", number some I8, together with an indeterminable number of details for which Seneca may be considered merely an echo of Jonson's primary sources.

Three of Seneca's specific references tell the moving story of Cremutius Cordus' noble life and death.(3) Three concern delation,(4) and three, kindred features of a tyrant's regime(5) - all matters near to Jonson's experience, commonplaces of his meditation and bitter in his heart. Characteristically, three concern the exact detail of Roman custom and ritual.(6) Two are bitter aphorisms(7) - note the relatively slight obligations of "idea". A somewhat Shakespearean omen(8), and a Marmionesque-Marlowesque-Volpone ish rhapsody of diabolic ambition(9) complete the list of more general debts. To this must be added the purely factual detail of the mutilation of Sejanus' corpse.(I0)

It will readily appear from these instances that Jonson employs Seneca, not for the historical facts incidental

---

(I) Cunn.I.p.304.
(2) do.p.3II.
(3) do.pp.276, 290, 30I - eked out by Seneca the elder ib.
(4) do.pp.275(2), 276.
(5) (a) do.p.276 - on the reading into innocent words of very treasonable implications. Shades of the prison house for Ben
(b) do.p.283 - on tyranny, how begot, how nourished, i.e. by flattery and delation.
(c) do.p.297 - the sad conclusion that virtue and worth are the worst offences to a vicious government.
(6) do.pp.3I8(2), 3I0. (7) do.pp.284,325.
(8) do.p.3I9 - a comet seen. (9) do.p.288. (I0) Act V, Sc.I0.

to the Roman's work, but for his moral lessons. Seneca the moralist[1] addresses himself to Jonson the satirist, holding up a Cordus, or a Tiberius and a Sejanus as edifying exemplars of what to be and what not to be.

Before leaving "Sejanus" we must say our little say on the classic problem of the relationship between this play and Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar", dealing only with the bearing on this problem of Jonson's Latin sources.

The parallels between the two plays are both numerous and close. That is the premises. And since "Sejanus" followed "Julius Caesar" on the stage, much less in the printed form, these parallels are naturally regarded as debts of Ben to Will, and bad debts at that. The verdicts on them have ranged from the eminently sound but somewhat non-commital imagining of Professors Herford and Simpson to the wildly exaggerated misrepresentation of such as Percy Allen. The Professors find soberly that Jonson "planned his work in conscious and even disdainful imitation" of Shakespeare's great success. On the other hand, Percy Allen's heavily documented indictment finds Jonson is indebted to his friend on every page. The first view is sound: the second, wildly exaggerated, and, in its working out, often absurd. Leaving the ballast of solid evidence that Allen's view contains, we may proceed to lessen its spread of flying sails, by taking a few examples, thus:

(a) " 'Twas only fear first in the world made gods".

This, says Allen, may well have been suggested by Caesar's,

"It seems to me most strange that men should fear - "

Strange work, indeed, since Jonson himself supplies two classic sources for this ancient proverb; and his line is a translation.

(b) "Sell to gaping suitors
the empty smoke that flies about the palace,

---

(1) Seneca's "Ad Marciam de consolatione " is pre-eminently favoured with five references.

Laugh when their patron laughs,etc,etc."

Of this most characteristic Jonsonian adaptation and elaboration of classic parasitism Allen opines - "all which needs but little distortion to make it applicable to the man who would,

"State with ordinary oaths my love

To every new protester"

Surely this requires no comment.

(c) The frequently recurring ideas of flatteryin this play, of which we have spoken above, "of tyrants' arts", also, and of men prepared for servitude ...."all attest a single origin": and that, according to Allen, is Shakespeare. We have made it clear that the details of Roman sycophancy, servility, and espionage constitute subject matter that is supplied, checked, and cross-checked by all Jonson's Latin sources. The words of Tacitus are much nearer to Ben's than are Shakespeare's; and I incline to think he felt that Will was but scurvily informed on matters of Roman social and political history compared with Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny and the rest.Finally, I fancy he knew the exact wording of the ancients more intimately than he knew his friend's ill cared for text.

(d) More daringly and ill-advisedly still Allen asserts "Cordus is Shakespeare himself"; and proceeds to quote the passage that follows his entry(p.I03). Cordus apparently resembles Shakespeare because he has written Annals ("Julius Caesar") concerning these times (the Essex Conspiracy) "queasy to be touched of Pompey and Caius Caesar". But Tacitus distinctly states that such a subject was indeed queasy, for the charge of praising Brutus and Cassius was "perniciabile reo" and Tiberius listened to it "truci

virtu"(Ann.IV,34). Surely adequate grounds for the Jonsonian representation. If these and other points coincide with the details of the Essex conspiracy, Jonson was phenomenally lucky in that,while satisfying his conscience by faithful adherence to his Latin sources, he yet appealed lucratively, if hazardously, to his audience's nose for exact topical allusions. Which is not to say he ignored such coincidences. Indeed, we have often made the point that loose parallels of events and phrases much delighted him and we know for a fact that he recognised the pretty obvious general resemblance between the outline of Sejanus career and that of Essex.(1)

(e) Arruntius and Cassius bewail the decadence of Romans. "The men are not the same; 'tis we are base",says one: "Rome thou hast lost the breed of noble bloods," ~~xxx~~ laments the other. There,concludes Allen, Jonson copied Shakespeare.This is really irresponsible. What does Tacitus say of Arruntius? He sprang into dangerous prominence when he associated himself with Asinius Gallus in bluntly asking the evasive and affectedly modest Tiberius just how much of the state he wanted handed over to him.(Ann.I.12). And even before this convincing proof of his independent mind and hatred of unconstitutional power Tiberius had noted him as an accomplished orator whose wealth made his outspokenness dangerous (Ann.I.13). Later (Ann.I.13) he appears disposed to take good old-fashioned disciplinary action against a youth who failed to show respect for the dignity of praetorian rank. Finally his suicide was prompted largely by weary disgust of the decadence of imperial Rome. In ~~xhort~~ short,Arruntius was a very conservative Roman and an outspoken laudator temporis acti. And this is the man into whose mouth Jonson puts a lament for the good old days, every word perfectly in character, apt and telling beyond all need to presuppose a Shakespearean prototype.

---

(1) Revealed by the marginal note in his library copy.

(Incidentally, when Jonson does quote Cordus-Shakespeare, he quotes him circumspectly and à parti pris - unlike his careless friend - and applies to Cassius, not to Brutus, the memorial line, "Brave Cassius was the last of all his race"(Ann.IV.34.), in this regarding as weightier the evidence of Tacitus against that of Suetonius who grants the well-worn tribute to both.)

(e) Again, Silius is made to ascribe to Germanicus, says Allen, qualities "almost wholly applicable to the character and fall of Shakespeare's Brutus":

> "He was a man most like to virtue; in all,
> And every action nearer to the Gods
> Than men in nature...
> What his funeral lacked
> In images and pomp, they had supplied
> With honourable sorrow.."

All this is very near to Shakespeare's "phraseology" concerning "the noblest Roman of them all". In the first place the resemblance in phraseology is not notable, and the sentiment must be nearly coeval with the human race. And secondly, Tacitus represents Germanicus as the idol of the Roman people, prince charming, handsome, brave, experienced, and a soldier successful in real wars. It is from Tacitus, and directly, that Ben borrows his description (and maybe misconceptions) on the appearance , character, and popularity of Germanicus. From Shakespeare he borrows phraseology, forsooth. But not always even that, agrees Allen (p.113), . "My lord, I shall but change your words," he quotes from Ben, explaining, "which was precisely what Jonson was in process of doing to Shakespeare." To this a footnote adds that Jonson's consciousness that he was doing this "very probably shaped the phrase". To such depths of misplaced ingenuity is it possible to descend if one does not keep an eye on

Jonson's Latin sources.

Naturally, in view of all this plagiarism, Allen is puzzled to explain why Shakespeare in his own playhouse permitted Jonson to bring on Shakespeare (Cordus) in person. "- to borrow from 'Julius Caesar' and to satirise its author again and again in the process. Why were these things allowed?" Well, apparently Shakespeare either knew the "Annals" or took his friend's word for it - vouchsafed often no doubt - that Tacitus and not "Julius Caesar" was his authority on Roman life and personages.

The extremest form of Allen's case would be substantiated if he could show that Jonson distorted his original Latin sources to score a topical hit over Will. I have found no example of such distortion. Every character and action in "Sejanus" has authoritative backing in Latin histories, however slight, and be it noted that the most slightly supported, which offer the greatest scope for topical reference or glancing allusion, are not those on which Allen bases his argument.

We are not concerned with purely English parallels between the two plays, not with the analogies of "Twelfth Night" and "Every Man Out of his Humour", but in the case of "Julius Caesar" and "Sejanus" plagiarism cannot be substantiated in any matters for which Jonson could find classic authority.

Sallust. The parts played in "Sejanus" by Tacitus and Dio are taken over in "Catiline by Sallust and Suetonius. For particular details or sections of the play he calls upon, as expert witnesses, Cicero, Pateroulus, Valerius Maximus, together with Dio and Plutarch.

The effects of his careful consultation of Sallust are everywhere evident in "Catiline". A curious interest attaches also to his own copy of Sallust, still extant,(1) for

(I) H.& S.I.p.254.

in it are to be seen many underlinings in his own hand, proofs of his "integrity" and props of his invention.

In addition to adopting from Sallust the general plot of his play, Jonson is beholden to him for three most interesting patches incorporated into the framework of the drama. These are: (a) Catiline's speech to his fellow conspiarators (Act I, Sc.I); (b) Caesar's; and (c) Cato's "sententiae" in the final and fatal debate on December 5th (Act V, Sc.6).

In (a) we find a characteristic Jonsonism. In Sallust, Catiline inveighs against the excesses of the "haves" to exacerbate his band of "have-nots". An opportunity to expatiate on luxurious living was not to be refused by Jonson. He could, we have noted, denounce ingenious licence and hedonism with the fervour and exactness of detail characteristic of a reformed sinner or would-be sinner. He found the idea at once attractive and repellant. We may , of course, trace this conflict of attitude in his private life - excess, debauchery, and lasciviousness alternating violently if not actually co-existing with quite genuine indignation at immorality, with self-abasement, and the gravest of satire. And the speech of Catiline in question is a good example of the operation of all these features of Jonson's character and experience. He, so to speak, in this "Mammonises" Sallust. Even so, however, in these embroiderings there is no loss of historical probability or - danger of tedium apart - of dramatic propriety.

On the other hand, Jonson's treatment of the speeches of Cato and Caesar is an exact reversal of this process, from which it may be surmised that Ben was consciously giving himself the reins in the former instance, and not just the helpless victim of the bats in his own belfry. Now, in Sallust, all the characters, Caesar and Cato included, speak with one voice. Sallust's various but unvaried approximations (I) to the original speeches remind one strongly of a B.B.C. announcer reading

(I) His introductory formula to a speech is: "Huiusmodi verba locutus est", quite journalistic caution even before the libel laws.

dulcetly such varied originals as the angry tirade of a dictator, the report of the R.S.P.C.A., and the fat-stock prices, all with little perceptible deviation of tone. For Sallust's, too, is a monotone, rhetorical, wholly undramatic. Very justifiably Jonson alters this. He who sets such store by fidelity of translation recognises Sallust's closet effusions as themselves unfaithful, and for once seeks a deeper truth. So Jonson makes Caesar and Cato speak not in the scholarly monotone of Sallust but in some measure as their own recorded words and as persistent tradition suggests was their normal style. Thus Cato is abrupt, laconic - though by no means so rough as he might have been, had Jonson's sense of "gravitas" permitted him to go the whole way. Caesar is concise, plain, direct, avoiding all the historical allusions given him (not at all incredibly) by the studious Sallust.

In his manner of adapting these three passages from Sallust there is neither inconsistency with his own principle of liberal faithfulness to the original nor indeed any remarkable genius of reconstruction. Commonsense is the keynote of them all, the negation of pedantic and pedestrian slavishness to the original.

Whereas Sallust tends to question the consensus of opinion on the matter of the blood oath exacted of his fellows by Catiline, Jonson accepts without qualification the general verdict of his other authorities. Setting aside Sallust's tentative dubiety about the veracity of contemporary report, Jonson introduces the ceremony of the bloody communion as historical fact. Perhaps two factors led him to accept it. (a) Weighing all the evidence , the proportion of doubt to acceptance among the other historians, the nature of the business in hand and the participants, the time's abuse, it is a very reasonable probability that Catiline did exact the sort of oath that Brutus abhorred. And, of course, the lack of

adequate testimony is easily explained by the swift and sudden end of the chief available witnesses of the ceremony. (b) The scene made excellent theatre in the Elizabethan Grand Guignol manner, a manner which Ben intermittently yielded to, in spite of all classic veto on stage violence, from which the drinking of human blood can hardly be exempt.

Very much happier to modern minds are Jonson's sketches of relatively minor characters based closely on Sallust, notably Fulvia, Sempronia, and Curius. The last is the discretionless, boastful, masterful bravo, and Fulvia his unreticent mistress. These are the principal agents in the revelation of the plot. Both are described and damned very briefly by Sallust.(1) Their relationship and motives are expanded in the play, and, though in general harmony with Sallust's indications, are much more real and human.

In Sallust the character of Sempronia reads like a purple patch isert, a detailed exercise in acidulous etching, worked up perhaps on some other occasion and placed rather artlessly in the narrative of events in which Sallust has no part for her to play. She was such an impressive actress that he could not bear to omit her from the cast. Jonson with a professional knowledge of the dangers and a personal objection to the illogicality of purposeless personages on the stage rationalises her position. In Sallust at best she represents a type of Catiline's adherents. But Jonson's Sempronia comes to life: she is a witty feminine orator in practice, not merely in potentiality, an active, shrewd, stimulating agent of diabolic mischief. She sees in ambassadorial spying a career appropriate to women. She is a "spot-light" case and a lively wit for whom the equally wanton, but less gifted, Fulvia very naturally feels the "professional" jealousy by which Jonson rationalises her apparently public-spirited betrayal of the plot. Indeed, it

(I) Chap.23 de conjur. Cat.

might be said that it is Jonson's glorious employment of these three characters that justifies their appearance in Sallust's history.

But less fortunately perhaps Sallust's account of the conspiracy tends to strengthen a tendency of Ben already often noted, his tendency to identify a character with a mood, or attitude, or humour, to give snapshots for moving pictures, to permit neither development nor inconsistency in his characters. Jonson's Catiline is simply the incarnation of moral foulness. From greed and a passionate love of evil for its own sake he marshals Decadence and Need against Virtue and Prosperity. He is the abnegation of principle, motiveless, "loyal only to disloyalty". He appears in the first act, like Richard III, completely armed in villainy, in his own inhuman kind perfection. Across his antecedents Jonson draws a firm line, and invokes the shade of Sulla to draw it. We are given no glimpse of the past that must have made him, step by step, the man he is. And in this misrepresentation Jonson follows Sallust. From first to last Sallust depicts Catiline as an incredible blackguard. Where he should explain, Sallust chooses to declaim. Instead of detailing Catiline's attempts to attain power by constitutional means, or making some sort of psychological examination of the thwarted ambitions, not to say just grievances, that led Catiline to faction, intrigue, insurrection and massacre, Sallust represents him as a perfect model for future moralists, a ruthless traitor motivated (if that can be) by superhuman evil, a conception that Jonson accepts as his premises on the authority of a spectral deus ex machina.

In contrast to this unrelievedly black picture of Catiline there exists the testimony of his arch foe, Cicero, who concedes that Catiline, originally at any rate, was a lad of many parts and much promise.(1) Jonson well knew this discrepant conception of Catiline and in citing it he pruned

(I) Pro Caelio I3.

it almost into conformity[1] with his own and the Sallustian view.

For the character of Cicero himself Sallust provides two pieces of evidence,(a) the incontrovertible fact that Cicero was a "new man" and (b) his own profession,not so generally accepted,that he was honest. To sub-poena Sallust for Cicero's political integrity in this matter suggests a shrewd use of Jonson's learning,for that historian's evidence is (a) strongly expressed, (b) the evidence of a reputedly hostile witness[2], and (c) the "inside" information of the man who probably married Cicero's divorced wife, Terentia. And yet modern historians doubt the validity of Sallust's and Ben's interpretation of Catiline's motives. However, no great harm is done to Jonson's scholarly repute by any such doubts which are the fruit of centuries of later and cumulative exegesis. Whether Jonson felt the lack of substance in Sallust's picture we need not say, for he put such considerations out of court by introducing Sylla's ghost. But even if he did feel the inadequacy, it is not likely that he would have sought to explain the growth and development of Catiline whose character was just the sort that sprang readily to Jonson's mind in the same completeness of idiosyncrasy or villainy. In other words, in this picture of Catiline the practice of Sallust and the preconception of Jonson coincide.

And this blackening (if such it was) of Catiline's character was brought about also by Jonson's habitual stress on the element of conflict in his drama, conflict between forces he always tried to represent as equal, in this case political evil and political good. Clearly such a view of of the Catiline conspiracy is questionable. We see Jonson

(I) Cat. IV.1.120.

(2) Sallust was a partisan of Clodius, a personal(amorous) foe as well as political rival of Milo, murderer of Clodius and client of Cicero.

suppress the manifest evils of senatorial rule. He is not unduly disturbed by the afflictions of the Allobroges, representative though they are of a vast and abject, ground-down subject populace throughout the Empire, recognised game for fortune-hunting and fortune-rehabilitating consuls and praetors. Jonson knew all this, as Cicero knew it before him. Each in his way and time is an advocate with a special plea. Jonson chose to make out a case for the oligarchy whose interests were vested as much in graft and self-interest as in their traditions of republicanism, law and order.

Finally, it may be conceded that Jonson is not always as happy in his diction as with Sempronia and Gallia, Caesar and Cato. Thus, Petreius, a simple soldier from his boyhood, speaks in a strain strongly reminiscent of the "bleeding sergeant's" turgid verbiage.

Cicero.

The most solid and extensive pieces of material that Jonson found ready to his hand for the construction of "Catiline" were Cicero's Catilinarian Orations. For Jonson the translation of these largely made the play, and for his audience they largely damned it. And the continued success of the acted version of the play late in the 17th century is no proof that the Elizabethan verdict is not the normal reaction of an audience judging a contemporary play purely as such. Later scholars and antiquarians naturally judge more highly of the merits of Ben's copious draughts from Cicero as these are matured by time and improved by the unturbid atmosphere of the study. Still the average view must be that such speeches are a dangerous experiment in drama because they are too long and too deficient in "action".

In Jonson's favour it may be observed that length, while risky, is not in itself fatal. If the speeches had the other desiderata of drama, then the length Ben allows his Cicero would not be fatal. Secondly, Jonson does cut Cicero,

and mercilessly too, though not so much by condensation as by selection and omission. The length of these speeches then is due to Jonson's scholarly regard for the original: and the length he might claim is a reasonable attempt to suggest the length of the spoken (not written) original.

But they lack "action", it is generally agreed. And yet the lives of the conspirators and maybe the fate of all Rome are bound up in these speeches, action enough "in potentia." Only words, but weighty, fatal, dignified words. The trouble is that this inherent drama is somewhat lost in the style of the speeches: action, spiritual strife, a sense of awful danger and urgency, awe, horror, fear, suspense, add all that could make drama of these speeches and is implicit in these speeches is overlaid with stately rhetoric and the artifices of verbal technique. The tension is lost. So is the attention of an average listening-watching audience. But whose fault is this? Jonson is not to blame except in so far as he was attempting two irreconcileable tasks, each separately difficult enough, (a) to entertain and instruct an English audience and (b) to re-create Rome according to the only authentic evidence available. To represent Cicero speaking without flourishes, much less briefly, must have struck Jonson as an historical absurdity - on the evidence that Cicero had left him. But that evidence filled Jonson's eye. He was prepared to select from Cicero, but he would not wrong his vision of the truth by any severe modification of the nature and quality of the passages he selected.. Alas, he may have argued, I cannot work all Cicero's evidence into a three-hour play: I cannot have any brief representation of a notoriously diffuse orator: ergo, I must insert the vitally apropos passages of the "Catilinarians", and these must be long. He rather chose to wrong his audience than to wrong the dead, or his conception of the dead. In short, he was

not so much at fault in handling his material as unlucky or injudicious in his choice of subject matter for an acted play. Catiline chosen, and Cicero extant, and Jonson having the reverence he had for history, authenticity and the sacrosanction of the Latin originals, the resultant "Catiline" followed as the night the day.

Of the actual translations, as such, nothing can be said but that they follow the original speeches closely, though permitting adaptations. They are too strong in a virile manner to represent perfectly the true atmosphere of a Ciceronian oration. They are but as near as Jonson's rugged spirit could attain to the more subtle and flexible spirit of the Roman.

From all this it will appear that in "Catiline and "Sejanus" his attitude towards his authorities and his employment of his authorities was precisely the same. Any differences in tone between the plays (as in the nearer approach to humour types in "Catiline") are perfectly explained by the different quality of the respective sources. Thus pen-portraits of merely social wastrels in Sallust permit a gleam of almost private life in "Catiline" not to be found in "Sejanus". But the gleam is transitory and the scenes of its appearance are still grim and purposeful. Purpose clear-cut, relentless, complete self-confident that was Jonson has built both plays. The identity of plan and similarity of materials chosen show that in historical play-writing Jonson neither learned not forgot.

This clarity of vision - be it a limited vision - this intelligence and wisdom to the point of inevitability in treatment of historical sources, and the relative - purely relative - failure of his two complete historical plays prompts a little doubt and questioning: Did Jonson fail to strike his proper calling?

Throughout this enquiry we have endlessly had to observe Jonson's constitutional care in the minutiae of ancient law, custom, ritual and dress. He spared no pains to acquaint himself with the multiplex curiosities of ~~ancient~~ antiquities and myths. In his histories we have noted his exhaustive compilation and cross-checking of all available evidence for the facts of his plots and characters; and we have seen his reverence for the facts and even the form of the original taking indiscreet precedence over his immediate bread-and-butter needs. We have seen him harbinger in English literature of imagination the historical method of exhaustive detection and search for local colour. All of which leads naturally to the tentative conclusion that Jonson was equipped by temper and talent to be an historian, though forced by unkind fate to ~~divert~~ divert his attention to the stage. His omnipresent interest in history was, of course, pre-eminently the interest of a moral philosopher of pedagogic, satiric, prophetic bent. It was his misfortune that, thus equipped and inclined, he was born untimely and forced to express himself in the relatively uncongenial and unsuitable form of drama. Constantly he solaced his natural leanings by reminding himself and others that the stage was a dignified profession, and that through it he did essay to improve as well as entertain his audience. He protested too often. And he denied the stage too often to be considered quite at home as a dramatist. The comparative greatness of his dramatic success does not lessen this contention, for he had the sort of mental energy and forcefulness that would have won him fame, and maybe greater fortune, on many other fields. When his subject lent itself to both moral philosophy and drama, as in his great plays on roguery, Jonson wrote memorable comedy. But when his subject did not lend itself readily to the dramatisation of satire-cum-philosophy, Jonson ceased to be a

dramatist; but he never ceased to be a moralist. And this is true of the flatter parts of his greater plays as well as of his "dotages". He would not sacrifice "uplift", satire, ~~xxxx~~ educative value and morals drawn from history of the race or the story of individuals in favour of the needs of his immediate audience or medium. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that he would have been more "at himself", to the benefit of his work and fame, in writing , like Sallust, the philosophy of history, in systematising with less bias and more care than Tacitus the motives of historical characters (an inclination implicit in the humours concept), in balancing the evidence for and against the heroes and rogues of , say, his own country's story, as on inadequate grounds he tried to do for the Rome of Cicero and Tiberius, and as he in fact perhaps did in his lost works, "Robert II", "Richard Crookback," the inchoate "Mortimer," the epic "Heroologia", and above all the prose history of HenryV. But in his time he could no more avoid the stage (and live with some comfort and fame) than an author of to-day with his name and way to make can avoid being a novelist or journalist of some sort; and so Ben's scholarly, documentary, moralising, rationalising, satirising histories remain unwritten or lost, save in the scenario form of "Sejanus" and "Catiline", and the embryonic "Mortimer".

.....

Conclusion: Jonson the Man and Scholar: the Pedagogue.

So far we have concerned ourselves with Jonson's attitude towards individual Latin authors and with the gleams of light thrown on his character by his attitude. It remains to correlate these gleams and assemble the scattered hints into a composite picture of the man at large in his relations with Latin and matters pertaining thereto.

And first, what kind of scholar was he? Well, we see that he was a scholar with marked personal idiosyncrasies of outlook and taste; by no means the universal scholar, objective, receptive, negative; but a scholar who, for example, preferred Latin to Greek, in practice if not in theory; who had violent literary likes and is suspect of dark dislikes, who exalted Lucan and tacitly decried Lucretius; a scholarly advocate of a discovery's claims to immortality or at least attention, in the case of Claudian; a scholar who included in his familiar reading all the Latin authors regarded to-day as major classics,(1) together with a number not now in such high repute;(2) a scholar who set much store by the exact text of the ancients, as in his translations and quotations; a scholar who, lacking a fixed concept of so-called Golden latinity, liked to feel the flow of Latin authorship and studies down to his own day and work, and yet had a lively contempt for "priest's Latin"(3), easy Latin(4), and dog Latin(5). And above all he was a scholar who regarded the body of Latin literature as the great encyclopedia of wisdom for all true seekers after the light whether light on history, humanity, mythology, philosophy, etymology, diablerie, medicine, or science in general. For Jonson, as we have noticed ad nauseam, the classics were the Encyclopedia Britannica and a great deal more, the inexhaustible storehouse of the minutest facts. Had there existed a real encyclopedia in his day Jonson's footnotes

(1) See list p.8. (2) e.g. "Convers."- "that Petronius, Plinius Secundus, Tacitus spoke best Latin; that Quint. 6, 7. 8 were to be altogether digested" (of Bacon), or "Prop. Stat. Sido. Apoll... ameng the best and most received.." (3) "Tale of a Tub" -"priest's lack-Latin"; "Oh, priest thy lazy Latin tongue". (4) See employmet of boy in Mag. Lady" or "Ode to Himself". (5) "Poet." V, i. "Gallo-Belgic".

to the classics would have been less than a quarter the number that they are. Nor can it be denied that his employment of the classics as books of reference so assiduously begat some of the chill and dryness, and lack of humanity and life of the spirit that encyclopedias still engender in their devotees.

For this scholar Ben the classics provided the most immediate and pleasant "escape". We can picture him immersed in his beloved Horace and Juvenal and Martial, and immured in the home of Sir Robert Townshend or the Lord of Aubigny, doubly walled in from domestic tribulation and public censure.

His knowledge of the classics were of the greatest social service to him. In his prefaces, as in his levees, we see him drawing round himself a further rampart against both ignorance and honest criticism. This was a circle of learned or, at least, cultured gentlefolk. To them he spoke and wrote; they were his "readers extraordinary". He held them both as his bodyguard and his disciples. They stood with him apart from the rabble, and their distinctive badge was a knowledge of the classics. For in those days an interest in cultural scholarship was as much the mode and proof of gentility as broad lands or short legs. And Jonson had the entree to this select caste through his learning; it alone could be the shibboleth of a novus homo like himself. And in this circle of patrician culture (and its hangers-on no doubt) Jonson won through to a literary dictatorship that must have warmed his passionately proud heart against all slights and insults from the street below. This group he delighted by the intricacy and wealth of classic allusion seen in his masques, allusion which gave Ben and his friends an exquisite sense of apartness. True, the vulgar might applaud the show. To them, however, it was tinsel rummery, mere handiwork of craftsman, cook, or Inigo. But the cognoscenti, aloof, smiled to one another as they caught the happy line from Seneca, the pretty turn to the well-known conceit of Martial. The subtle allusions, the ingenious allegories, the apt quotations, the "we-know-where" smiles were were all code words and countersigns of an unofficial

fraternity of class and culture among whom Jonson was secure and honoured. For among them his learning was a talisman, a common interest and pride, a comfortable moat entrenched about a noble house.

And when inclination or immediate occasion did not permit him to refresh his spirit with such gracious company we see the classics provide him with a still securer escape from the world, escape into his own soul. And the fruits of this withdrawal he has left, in part, in his "Discoveries". This commonplace book reveals how often he was indebted to his loving study of Latin for the beginning of a train of thought or a wholly acceptable disquisition whose hammering out or mere transcription must have detached him healthfully from the material and the mundane. He sought and found himself in these Latin studies.

For they were no passive or cowardly escape; they were the reverse of passive. Indeed, the quality of his concentration, the length of time he must have spent - and even the money - indicate that to Jonson the classics, as a relaxation, were as absorbing and as exhausting as the relaxation of "sport" has become to-day. The fantastic minuteness of care that he shows in the fruits of his studies proves that these studies must have been at least as exhausting as the efforts to earn his bread and butter on the stage, and may well have influenced the methods and rationale of the latter as they certainly influenced the approach and point of view.

From his treatment of the historians and his methods in masquery we picture him as a man who zealously sought to know historic truth in the absolute, without regard to the intrinsic importance of particular cases. The murderous methods of Tiberius or the colour of Hymen's locks, it was all one. Like Lamb's Quakers, he felt himself to be always upon oath to seek and tell Truth. And so his elaborate cross-references and pitting of authority against authority go beyond dramatic needs and even on occasion conflict with dramatic discretion. They are of the man himself, a man of surpassing intellectual honesty, and, in part consequence, a man "ill to get on with!"

His Latin studies by their fruits reveal his patience, concentration, and reverence for the learned tongue. These reveal just as clearly the stern self-discipline of the man and its common corrolary, a love of system and method. We see this in his consultation and correlation of all known sources in his histories and masque-like plays. In effect, Jonson the scholar acts with infinite care as the "ghost" of Jonson the playwright. Though the scholar was not always subservient. Playwriting - especially when unsuccessful - seemed to Ben an unpleasant by-product of scholarship; the latter was the worthwhile life. This came to mean, not that he regarded his "works" lightly, but that he tended to value them according to the amount and accuracy of the scholarship they enshrined. If others sneered at his plays as mere products of plagiarism and midnight oil, Ben was of a mind that only such oil was fit to anoint a king among authors. Such criticism or jeers merely hardened him in his application to study. And in this we may see his self-confidence, and arrogance, and independence, and argumentativeness, and combativeness, or perhaps just plain "thrawnness", part inheritance from "Annandale". Atavistic, too, may be his Scots love of order and discipline. Or Camden, more likely, may have begun the process by exhortation and example, set him in the path of patient research. Such study, at first, might seem a duty, a duty appealing to his temper, the more that it met with the disapproval of his bricklayer step-father. That duty would change insensibly into a habit and a love, a habit strengthened by Camden's moral teaching of the need to seek out the very truth. And so Ben came in time to analyse all the rough material of his learned plays with some of the elaborateness or complexity of his own Alchemist, a character begotten of his creator's love of system and analysis and accuracy in research.

This love of truth in his studies is, of course, but one facet of his general moral earnestness and fervour for virtue's

cause. His expressed appreciation of greatness in classic authors is reserved for such as sought, in his view, to elevate their fellows: Virgil the most Christian of the ancients, Juvenal the censor, Hebraic and Jonsonian in denunciation of moral turpitude, Horace the literary and moral satirist, not the songster merely, and Quintilian the professional pedagogue.

With these qualities of mind and with that background of experience Jonson was ready to give the rein to his greatest "humour", and that, I take it, was the humour of a pedagogue. Not his only humour, of course, but the others were subsidiary to it, and Jonson was, before everything, a man with a message .

When I say that Jonson had an irresistible urge to play the teacher I use the term, of course, in its widest sense, and the impulse to teach was clearer than the matter he wished to teach.

Even in the narrower sense he apparently liked to play the pedagogue. There is the famous misadventure with young Raleigh. Professors Herford and Simpson reasonably question the wisdom of entrusting such a youth to such a tutor in such a place. But this is judging by and from to-day. Raleigh knew Ben for a ripe scholar with a humour for teaching that his son must benefit from, as long as Ben was sober. And Raleigh, judging from Ben's conversation, came to the same conclusion as we must reach from Ben's "Discoveries", that juvenile education was a matter of profound concern to Jonson. He meditates on its methods and theories, objectives and content in a manner suggestive of deep interest and practical experience. Nid Field and young Raleigh were perhaps not his only two juvenile pupils. And for inspiration and guidance in this particular branch of education he constantly refers to Quintilian, and no doubt did in conversation in a manner that

led Raleigh to overlook his gentlemanly tendency to insobriety. Raleigh may well have felt he had made an excellent choice of an enthusiastic, learned, manly, and safe custodian for his wild offspring in Paris.

But this interest is merely part of his wider interest. In truth Jonson never ceased to teach, or, as a satirist, to unteach. For our purposes his chief mission was to enlighten his fellow playwrights and auditors on the classics in general and the best methods of writing dramas in particular.

The cardinal principle and virtue in a comedy,he told them and showed them , was to mix the useful with the agreeable as the ancients had long discovered. This he insists in his prologue to "Volpone" was his practice, and since he wrote plays such as others should be, this was his lesson for his brothers of the stage. He was seeking to educate to a better way both the demand, the public, and the supply, the playwrights. In a safer setting the same lesson reappears in the introduction to the "Masque of Queens": "suffer no object of delight to pass without his mixture of profit and example", his favourite idea from Horace. In consequence of an honest endeavour to live up to this principle, it is Jonson's strength that his comedies never lack body; they are full of matter. It is a correlated weakness that the didactic impulse in him would not or could not be concealed in his comedies,to the betterment of his art.

The earnestness of the man and the ennobling dignity which he accorded his profession reacted upon each other in his constant stressing of the dramatist's duty to the state. We picture him in green-room and tap-room, in season and out, expounding in his later years to the tribe of Ben, in his earlier to his equal associates, the principles of poetic and dramatic craftsmanship imbibed by himself from Horace or the Stagirite direct. And here for a moment we again cross Shakespeare's path. Thus, Professor Quiller Couch has observed of Shakespeare, "There is good reason to suppose that he had not heard of these so-called

rules of Aristotle". Now, this is very rash. It ignores Shakespeare's considerable association with Jonson and it ignores Jonson's didactic humour which appears on nearly every page he wrote. It is surely a reasonable certainty that Ben who thought and wrote so much and earnestly about just such matters must have made occasion to expound them to a friend and distinguished fellow dramatist, all the more because he was apparently indifferent(1) or hostile to such fundamental technicalities and causes of topical heart-burning. In short, if Shakespeare did not know a very great deal about the classical unities and what-not, it was because he chose to forge. For certain, he had a willing and persistent remembrancer in Jonson.

Perhaps the least disguised appearance of Jonson as a teacher in the narrower sense concerns just these "Unities". It occurs in the "Magnetic Lady". There, in dramatised interscenal explanations he lays bare to the uncomprehending vulgar and the approving cognoscenti the working of his plot by numbers. Their attention is directed to his observance of the Unity of Time, and Place, to the Catastrophe, the Epitasis, the general applicability of his incidental satire, the anonymity of his victims. He illustrates his tenets by citing: Davus, Pseudolus, Pyrgopolinices, Thraso, Euclio, and the other classic "John a Nokes" (2) - the audience is spared nothing, not even a deal of Latin in its original dress. The protests and objections of the inerudite and adverse criticasters he anticipates in the play itself (3), which is worse than taking the wind out of their sails and amounts to removing the very sails. The playwright who, with his eyes open - even in pique after dramatic failures that stung - lectured his audience in this fashion had an urge to teach or preach that was of quite religious intensity. It was his paramount humour.

(1) See Industion tothe "Mag.Lady". Jonson declares his criticism of his fellows' ignorance is given "with their" i.e.indifference?
(2) End of Act II. (3) End of Act I. "Do you look, master Damplay for conclusions in a protasis, etc.etc.."

This gust for teaching is a matter for the psychologists, so we may accept it as fundamental. But we can see what directed it towards teaching the classics, and thereafter we may examine how much and necessarily it involved him in the converse or negative preliminary to teaching, namely, satire. He was drawn to his profession of Public Informer on the Classics by the sense of Awe with which they filled him. He felt true humility before the best that was in them, and constant study merely served to show how extensive as well as sublime were the upper reaches of thought within the classics through which, "tamquam explorator", he fought and glided on new trails and strange seas, plotting out courses for his ignorant contemporaries. He thought of himself as more than an explorer, though that was his motto on every book he owned. So divine were the classics that the poet who studied them and imitated the best in them was a priest, a man apart. The poet's office he truly felt was a religious office because it deals with all that is noblest in man's aspirations and most spiritual in his capacities. He anticipated Milton, as so often, in accepting the classic dictum that it is impossible to be a good poet without being a good man; for the poet, in Horace's words must be teacher, moralist, philosopher and leader of thought. It is to this noble concept of his function that Jonson's works owe both their prevailing atmosphere of high purpose and gravitas, on the one hand, and, on the other, their frequent dullness and flatness.

And there is another aspect or consequence of his adoration of the classics and his borrowed view of the poet's calling: his very "piety" hardened his contempt for those who contemned the founts of his wisdom, despised his rites, and criticised himself, the high priest of the classic mysteries. Scoffers, romantic poetasters, and the still more ignorant laity seemed to him in his fervour all alike blasphemous. Hence the

virulence of his diatribes against those who denied his gods, or denied all literary gods and made graven images of their own "naturals", and who denied his mandate as a prophet.

It was from such that he took refuge in his study. But from his communion with the classics he could but emerge strengthened in his faith in the classics and in himself, stronger both in his sense of rightness and righteousness, common concomitants of religious enthusiasm. In his study within the holy books he found exemplars and expositions of the exacting "laws" that were the test and glory of the true poet-seer. All were, as he liked them to be, clear cut, logical in the main, not unalterable but to be modified only if earnest endeavour proved them inapplicable to modern needs. These were his literary laws and prophets enshrined in his study. But in the world outside his study and his books were the false prophets; making a merit of their ignorance; abusing their talents; misleading their degraded followers who cheered the wildest of their excesses and their grossest malfeasance in the poet's holy office. So out from his study would Ben emerge girded for another onslaught on many-headed Ignorance, either to write a play, or a prologue, or to hold forth in the tavern. And so we have another picture of the man in relation to the classics. We see him combining the erudition of Paul with the fierceness of John Baptist, and the fervour of both in his own chosen cause, namely, the advocacy by precept and example of all that he comprehended under Latin letters, culture, and humanities.

At once, however, one must correct the impression that Jonson was strangled with classic red-tape. The many rules he did did uphold are irrefragible rules of composition to this day. The really hampering and local rules of drama, such as the Unities, he was ready to deny and defy. For example, the "Silent

Woman" observes the Unities in full, and profits by the observance. So does "Every Man in his Humour". "The Magnetic Lady", Ben himself claims, is presented "in foro as a true comedy should be", which was not, thanks to ignorance, contemporary practice. And "Volpone", he asserts, observes the strictest letter of classic law. Yet nobody can point to any awkwardness in these great comedies and say it is due to the observance of any such Unities. The gain is just as clear. On the other hand, in "Catiline" and "Sejanus" he smashes the bonds of Time and Place with just less than Shakespearean freedom. True, he did it reluctantly, but he did it emphatically. His conscience troubled him, as we see in his plea that the full majesty of the classic prologue he had found impracticable, largely owing to changes in audience, he suggested. And these two extremes of his practice reveal Ben's attitude to classic laws. He was conservative but not hide-bound. Opposition, too, may have increased or apparently increased his conservatism. His respect for the accumulated wisdom of the ages made him depart from traditional literary dogma only with circumspection, and on demonstrable grounds of urgency and commonsense.

In his attempts to "bring home" the classics he met with little attention. The master's class was inattentive and so the master to get him a hearing indulged in sarcasms known as satire, to which in any case he had a natural bent, another humour. As we have seen, Juvenal, Martial, Horace of the Sermones and Tacitus of political satire formed a goodly portion of his favourite reading. The ups and downs of his career, his aggressiveness, frequent misunderstanding, and thwarted ambitions together with some nescio quid in his natural fibre enhanced the satisfaction he found in reading

and imitating the Roman masters of satire. The very intensity of his fervour for the Good, his Good, increased his satisfaction in reading satire, and added gall to his ink. Damnation of all ideas and men he detested ceased to be a means to an end, reform, and became an end in itself, his own explosive satisfaction.

We have noted again and again Ben's assurances that his satire was impersonal, as, of course true satire must be. Apparently these assurances were required of him frequently by the dubiety of his contemporaries. They misdoubted his impersonality, or frankly denied it. They sought and found Elizabethan originals for the dramatis personae of his satiric comedies. And in the belief that they could trace parallels they cannot have been wholly wrong. And yet Jonson's animated exculpations show that he honestly believed they were wrong. He vigorously and sincerely protested that the head-gear that he supplied was "ready-made" to be worn by those it happened to fit. The public were equally convinced that they knew some folk he had used as models, and were even of a mind that the caps were very good tailor-mades, indeed. How can these irreconcileable views be explained?

The public suspicion of Jonson's methods and motives in satiric portraiture is explained, if not justified, by the custom of the time, the persistent introduction of political allusions in plays, or the reading into plays of doubles entendres on matters of topical interest. It is explained too by Jonson's reputation for the extent, virulence and even violence of his personal vendettas, which established a prima facie case that he would pillory his private foes in

his public works. Ben was - and is - before all else, a "character" whose career and opinions must have been much canvassed in the relatively small world of London wits and society. And those who knew both him and his opponents so well knew exactly what to look for in his plays to satisfy their taste for "untrussing". If we judge by Ben's protests, they never failed to find it. But against this be it noted that we generally see what we expect to see, and often Ben may have been honestly chagrined to find a general picture of a human type accepted with delight as a good or bad lampoon on some local worthy. The public view was, in short, natural, often right, and often wrong.

But Jonson was in similar case. I question whether he was the sort of man who could think of mankind impersonally, and in the philosophic abstract. For he was far too passionate of heart, and close though he often closeted himself, his life was yet mainly lived in bustle and strife among men. He was no aloof spectator. Moreover his relations with his fellows were warm relations, in both senses. He beat Marston and took his pistol from him; he slew Gabriel Spencer; he was thrown into prison for loyalty to his friends, among other offences; he loved Shakespeare, and reverenced Camden and Chapman; he was spiritual father to the tribe of Ben who must have received far more than patronage from him. In brief, he was an emotionally active man who lived a full life in constant contact and conflict with his fellows, a life full of spiritual "sturt and strife". He was a personality among personalities whose art was the presentation of personalities, whose study personality, whose times demanded the introduction of personalities into plays, or made good the deficiency with their imaginations. Such a man in such a time could not avoid the passing allusion if not the

overt exposure of contemporaries. And we know that Jonson did not avoid "personalities". It culminated in "Poetaster", of course, but that was not the whole story. He lampooned Cecily Bulstrode, he sneered and jeered at Inigo Jones. And these are no isolated explosions: they are symptomatic. Perhaps the best proof of his habitual mental attitude is found in his extant books. It was his habit to note in the margin the names of contemporaries whose fate and character happened to bear a likeness to the matter of the ancient text. The Bavius and the Maevius of his friend Horace became the Marston and Dekker of his own experience. He knew the lavish English peers denounced by Juvenal, the whispering politician of Martial, Horace's bore, and so on: he knew them all because they were his personal bêtes noirs. And this I think is vital to an understanding of Jonson's relations with Latin. The hurly burly of the world followed him into the study where he sought escape. In his readings of the past he re-lived the present. He telescoped the ages, in a sense, till Tacitus became to-day's gazette of party politics, Sallust a contemporary court reporter, Horace wrote causeries on town and country life; Juvenal and Martial were the most biting of contemporary "columnists". This gave to his reading an immense reality and animation. But a man who thus dramatises and localises his reading of the past cannot utterly reverse the habit of his mind when he turns to write for the present. And it may be that often when Jonson thought he was writing in the abstract and universal there crept in persistent echoes of living contemporaries as well as of the dead that he still felt to be contemporary. Both those who saw the living in his satires may have been right, and he who claimed universality for his portraiture may have been in a way right too. He judged of the result by his intention: they by their

expectation, an expectation founded on their experience of the man. I believe that Jonson's models for his satires, his Does and Roos and John a Nokes, are less impersonal and more immediate than may be reasonably expected of the satirist. He hated too well and too many, he enjoyed reading and writing satire too well, he isolated the trait he detested too clearly and thoroughly, there was altogether too much blood in the man for him to leave his lay figures altogether unidentifiable and anonymous. He attacked the vice with at least one eye on the vicious, so that those who knew Jonson and his associates could often, I believe, "name his name", and tell each other that Mammon, and Sir Politick Would-be, and Cutbeard, and Sogliardo were respectively So-and-So, or Flute the bellows-mender.

But the very earnestness and violence of spirit that prevented the almost impossible desideratum of impersonality in his satire gave him tremendous impetus and power as an ethical reformer. And this zeal for reform, in its turn, militated against his success as a popular dramatist and was, ideed, often wholly at variance with the comic spirit, for which reason, among other reasons I have already suggested that comedy was not his metier at all. Professors Herford and Simpson have examined the ways in which his satiric urge conflicts with the comic spirit towards modifying the concept of comedy in "Volpone" and the humour types. They show, too, how in "Cynthia's Revels" he made innovations in the satiric vogue. (Just here it is apposite to note that the word "vogue" is too, too modish to be applied to Jonson. He brought such power, care, and enthusiasm to bear on any subject that he made of every vogue he adopted a crusade; and his fervour was never exhausted before his subject, whether that was the grandest satire, witchcraft or feminine toilet. Such was the overflowing, undiscriminating energy of the man and his scholarship.)

Though we must decline to profess the omniscience which alone could "explain" Jonson's satiric urge, we may before leaving it point out certain simples of which it is compounded.
(a) His natural and basic aggressiveness made him ready to attack.
(b) His care in study and meditation hardened his sense of dogmatic rightness into self-righteousness. This he did penance for in periodic masochism of despair, self-blame, religious questionings, and even religious reform - the last particularly grace-giving because materially injudicious. But, the penance over, he rose as a sinner refreshed in his sin.
(c) His frequently wounded and very sensitive vanity found relief in universal or pseudo-universal or only sub-consciously personal satire, as well as in overt lampoons.
(d) From his youth in Westminster to his paralytic bed in the same parish he had been devoted to the study of the subject-matter, the objectives, the technique, and the tone of the great Roman satirists. And if such study denotes original inclination, it, in its turn, strengthens that inclination. As a satirist he was both born and made.

Jonson's two master impulses, to teach and to satirise have appeared throughout this enquiry in his relations with numerous Latin authors. But, of course, he had contacts with Latin in many other points, and was influenced in other ways by these contacts. We must now consider the nature and effects of what we may call his less specific and his minor contacts with Latin and questions pertaining thereto.

We may first challenge the not unusual picture of Jonson as a man who nearly always said in English what he had filched brazenly from a major Latin classic or more surreptitiously from a medieval classicist. This in relation to

numerous authors and particularly in connection with his translations we have shown to be absolutely distorted and exaggerated, and in the sense of "plagiarism" quite unjust. But it all requires recapitulation. When I say that he, for example, quoted with moderation, I mean with moderation when one considers how much he knew that was quotable and how well he knew it, how much reverence must have prompted him to quote, and how fully the practice of contemporary scholars condoned quotation. Note in passing, too, that assuming an author of his time did wish, as most do, to give his work the sanction or decoration of a quotation from somebody else's, his choice as compared with the scope of to-day, was virtually limited to the ancient tongues, for plays were then unpublished and romances were not literature, speaking generally of course. And the estimate of his moderation in this is arrived at by deducting his factual quotations from the historians, for example, in "Catiline" and "Sejanus", and from everybody in masques. As said before this is to use the classics as an encyclopedia. We do not condemn or even remark on an author's partiality for the "Britannica". Such quotations and allusions are not warmed by Jonson's mind; it is but by unimportant chance that they are not to works in Hindustani or Bantu. But considering only such references to the Latin classics as seem to have moved Jonson to recall them later, such as suggested a fancy that pleased, the plot of a scene, the theme of a lyric, or the text of a sermon, we may safely say that Jonson quoted almost sparingly for a man of his time, and temper, and environment.

What then creates the undeniable impression made by a reading of Jonson that his Latin learning is both enormous and obtrusive? His vocabulary, of course. But that requires

to be qualified. For the case is not quite simple, and Jonsonese is not Johnsonese. The Latin elements in his style may be put thus: it is not Latinate, but it is peppered with Latin words. He does not exceed the average of his day when latinisms were a vogue in English writing. He uses no Latinisms of note that are not to be found in other English authors - with the, justifiable, exception of his Latin plays. In this sense, therefore, even his vocabulary, too, is restrained for the man and the time. The real humour of the scholar reveals itself in peppering his pages with words and phrases that make no pretence at all to any process of anglification, but remain naked Latin words, or at best the most Latinate of Latinisms.(I) In the "Alchemist", not reckoning proper names or mythological, there occur some 50 of which Shakespeare never makes use. The greater proportion are technical terms of the mystery of alchemy, palmistry, and general cozenage which add real colour to this play, though his practice elsewhere discounts this as his whole intention. In "Bartholomew Fair" - this being the most "unlearned" of his plays - there are still I5, mostly from the lips of Adam Overdo who acts as a safety-valve for the learned author's Latin yearnings. In the "Devil is an Ass" are I9, and a little Spanish, not inappropriate in a play that expressly recognises the devil to be an excellent linguist. "The Staple of News" has 23, the "New Inn" I9 and the "Magnetic Lady" is detailed below. These Latinisms are of such intolerable quality that even these considerable numbers seem vastly greater

(I) The following, for example, are to be found in the "Magnetic Lady": faeces, caves and wedges of the theatre, populo ut placerent, quas fecissent fabulas, a whole declension given by boy, in foro, dictamen, ergo, Hinc illae lachrymae, parerga, nemo scit, remora, tympanites, anasarca, ascites, aquosus, dominus, cimici, perstringe, amphibolies, science, epitasis, Hippocrates and other doctors, umbratil, vesica, marsupium, chiragra, secundum artem, pro captu recipientis, oppilation, obnoxious to, redargue, sine divino aliquo afflatu, let your nail run smooth, sub sigillo, quasi in communem famam, annulus his nobis sic uterque, dabit; quaere Many noticeably anent the medical art. Well may one of them say, of so many of Ben's characters, "All errant learned men, how they 'spute Latin!"

than they are, and, taken with the latinate quality of general prose style favoured by his day and a class of scholars, they serve to create the correct yet undiscriminating view that his style is rank with undigested Latinisms.

Was he,then, a "pedant"? The term can be applied to Jonson but only in a very loose manner. It denotes surely a forced, affected, or unwarranted display of learning. Jonson's learning, to be sure, is very frequently on display; but, as we have illustrated at length, it is the natural, unself-conscious language of the man himself. Its apparent forcedness or excess is due to a change of taste between the ordinary reader of to-day and the "reader extraordinary" of his own. The charge of wanton display is at once refuted by adducing a worthy motive for the display.Jonson's purpose, as we have seen, was to give his fellows a key to classic literature and the humanities. The style and a deal of the substance of his "pedantry" are corollaries and illustrations of this aim.In so far as they are purposeful they cannot be wanton; in so far as they are unconscious they cannot be called "display". But, of course, pedantry may also imply excessive care and accuracy in the minutiae of knowldge. Again Jonson's educative purpose and pedagogic methods may be pleaded, but this time perhaps it is more difficult to acquit him altogether of the many "offences" that can be laid to his charge.(I) Be it granted that a tendency to pettifogging particularities is as characteristic of Jonson as anything can be. Yet before we in consequence dub him pedant we must ask whether these scrupulous observances of accuracy in trifles and erudite clue work in pursuit of very piffling minotaurs of fact are in fact fundamental to his work or merely incidental to it,though as characteristic as the artist's signature in the corner of his picture. In the larger matters of his art we have seen that he was not

(I)He observes Latin forms in all strictness. Thus in the "Staple" we read of "great Solons, Numae Pompilii". The quarto reading was "Come let's walk in the Mediterraneum" which in the folio he carefully printed as "in Mediterraneo". And a phrase like "homo frugi" he found irresistible.Against these accuracies may be set the errors of "Sejanus" and the even less likely Jonsonian slips of the "Conversations". If the footnotes to the masques be urged against him we may plead that there he was on his mettle to produce his evidence, a command performance this.The notes to his Roman plays are equally justifiable as self-justification. It may be that the gravest charge concerns the arts and mysteries he treats of incidentally, such as cosmetics or alchemy, for it is difficult to deny that in these he seems to know a great deal more than he need have known-or shown.

hidebound by the classics ; he was no pedantic observer of the major classic dicta on art. We sought in it whatever was perennial and worthwhile. But in large matters he avoided slavish pedantry and in smaller verbal matters he was but humouring his "humour" as a scholar.

How then can one explain the prevailing conception that Jonson was a pedant? Firstly, in this charge, formulated or dimly felt as may be, there is some backwash from the popular impression of his great contemporary's "carelessness". The lightness of his pastry-cook touch adds abominably to the undoubted stratum of dough in Ben's confections. Perhaps the popular conception and Jonson's true position may be put thus: Jonson was not a pedant in the absolute sense: say, rather, that he was an expert - in the best sense of that overworked word. He was an expert in learning, particularly in all forms of Latin learning, and an expert with and urge to teach that greatly intensifies his apparent expertness. To all who do not care for his "subject" he must therefore be, loosely speaking, a pedant. But, more strictly, he should be called a "bore". The latter is the better term because it is less absolute and because it correctly implies a certain lack on the part of the observer-critic; it is two-edged. To a savage all branches of simple arithmetic that range beyond fingers and toes are doubtless pure pedantry. We may not be able to share Jonson's interest in mythology and antiquities but it is shortsighted to dismiss him as a pedant because of a limitation in our own sympathies for the subjects of his expertness. At worst he is no more of a bore than all enthusiasts must be to the indifferent and antipathetic. But what kind of bore is he? Supremely pachydermic? No. Indeed, rather a thin-skinned elephant with offensive powers far in excess of his defensive equipment, yet elephantine enough in occasional rage, and occasional wit, and limitless memory.

Second only in prevalence to the charge of pedantry is the charge against Jonson of plagiarism, of brazen and sometimes undiscriminating breaches of copyright.(I) He was charged by his earlier critics with thefts from the classics and by later critics with thefts from his contemporaries, the order of time being notable. And in that the Latin classics were of course main objects of his "plagiarism" it is necessary to examine and assess the position.

Be it noted that Jonson was apparently the first to use in English the term "plagiary". Allowance may therefore be made for the tendency of his critics to regard his weapon as a boomerang.

Furthermore the question of plagiarism keenly exercised Ben himself, if one may so conclude from the number of allusions found throughout his work. A man who inveighed so often against plagiarism could not have been himself an unconscious plagiarist. And if the limitless range of self-deception we regularly practise should make this possible, it will yet be conceded that it is gravely improbable. How then can one explain the fact that Jonson who so obviously felt himself innocent of plagiarism should yet be so often and so plausibly accused of plagiarism? The solution is to be found in his attitude towards his sources and in his idea of "originality".

With his attitude to his sources we have dealt throughout this enquiry. From what has gone before it is reasonable to conclude that a man with Jonson's regard for the classics and with Jonson's mission to "popularise" the classics in his native land could hardly reproduce too closely or too often the works and passages he took as themes and models.(2) A consciousness of his own purpose to educate his fellows by "bringing home" knotty or sublime authors must have almost completely exonerated him in his own mind from any stigma of plagiarism, must indeed, and did, make copying a merit, "plagiarism" a high and vital duty.

(I) See, for example, Percy Allen's "Shak.Jons.Wilkins as Borrowers." Or Hazlitt's dictum on "Sejanus" - "ancient mosaic of translated bits".
(2) See Appendix I, "Jonson's Translations".

As to "originality", clearly his attitude was very unlike ours. Native talent he regarded as a tender seedling that was destined to reach no fruitful maturity unless guided and fostered by cultivation according to traditional rules - allowances being made for change of climate. "Your home born projects"(I) he derided as being mere mental laziness. He denied the existence of a broad road up Parnassus. Still less would he concede that mother wits might fly to the summit borne by some divine afflatus. On the contrary he set store by difficulty. The longer the search for an idea or a fact, the more he thought of it. With rare modesty he tacitly decried what he found in his own head compared with what he found in the head of a Roman separated from him by difficulties of time, space, and language. He regarded hard work, labor limae, systematisation of knowledge as the sine qua non of what he considered genius. Though he conceded the necessity for original talent, of course, his own mental make up and his historical position forced him to stress in practice and theory the need for the preparatory toil that we are apt to regard as almost the antithesis of genius and originality. His bile overflows on all the ignorant and pretenders who exalt inspiration at the cost of scholarship. When the crassly ignorant Busy of "Bartholomew Fair" damns Latin as "the rags of Rome" there is bitter satire in Dionysius' plea, "I'll prove that I speak by inspiration; that I have as little to do with learning as he". The little place that Ben allowed in the scheme of things to originality in our sense is clear in these lines: "..he 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". Holding native talent in such low esteem, it was but natural that Jonson should make some form of plagiarism his summum bonum, "nor think it theft", as Carew(2) says, think it rather his greatest contribution to the literature of his native land.

(I) "Bart. Fair, v, i.
(2) "To Ben Jonson".

His general attitude towards his Latin sources from the point of view of plagiarism may be recapitulated thus:
(a) He observes no rigid system of "confession" or "silence" with regard to the originals of his stories, ideas, facts, or phrases.
(b) In his footnotes he acknowledges facts about historical events and personages much more frequently than he acknowledges his indebtedness for ideas.(I)

What then did he consider to be plagiarism? Briefly for Ben plagiarism seems to have been unsuccessful theft. It meant snatching at a grace or flaunting borrowed plumes out of keeping with the general tone and texture of one's own original work.(2) As a corollary, any idea to which one's own context formed a logical and artistically harmonious background became one's own property, though fifty authors had used it before. And this conclusion and view exactly squares with all that we have observed about the nature of his borrowings.

There is no evidence that he attempted to conceal his "thefts", though he did not mention them all. Some he mentioned are so obscure as to defy detection, so that silence would have been safe. Some are too obvious to require remark or hope for escape. Either way concealment was the exact reverse of Jonson's intention. He regarded "original" authorship of an idea as an historical accident, and looked on past literature as a vast communal store of ideas from which all were entitled to draw, but to draw only at need and with artistic propriety. Therefore, on his own code, the question of plagiarism becomes an artistic rather than a legal felony, and as we have seen in his own work rarely arises.

(I) We have seen that far the greater number of his borrowed ideas - sparingly borrowed these - have been noted by his editors, not himself.
(2) So in "Poet-Ape":
"Poole, as if halfe eyes will not know a fleece
From locks of wool, or shreds from the whole peece".

We are not here directly concerned with plagiarism from contemporaries, though we have has occasion to touch on Ben's debts, real and alleged, to Shakespeare. There, indeed, seems little doubt that Jonson accepted as plagiarism all thefts from the living,(I) and that such practices may, in fact, have been his conception of plagiarism when the ancients were not in question. The best proof of this is perhaps the speech of Anaides in "Cynthia's Revels"(III,2) in which he is made to pour irony on the critics of Crites, alias Jonson, and their calumnious charges of plagiarism.

It is worthy of note, in conclusion, that most of the outstanding qualities of Jonson's character as reflected in his works impinge on the subject of our inquiry. He was a man of distinctively Roman cast, mentally and spiritually. Whether he was wholly born to bear this resemblance and attracted by instinctive affinities to the literature of his brothers in the spirit, or whether long and loving study of Roman literature largely fostered, or almost wholly created, traits Roman or Romanesque cannot now be resolved. The facts remain that these resemblances existed and marked his work.

His salient Roman features may be tabulated as follows:

(I) An undissoluble compound of dignity, self-confidence, arrogance or imperiousness, high seriousness or gravitas, and a predisposition to moralise.

(2) An orderliness of mind in his studies, a habit of making a disciplined assault on his own and others' ignorance. And a not unusual corollary to this, namely, endless patience with facts, and impatience with men.

(3) A Roman-like alertness of the political and social interests and instincts, like his friend, Bacon.

(4) A certain heaviness of wit naturally enough inhabiting with the qualities in (I) above, and an abounding love of bawdry perhaps providing the necessary "escape" from these same respectable virtues.

(5) Though not unnatural in an associate of the English nobility

(I) And from the recently dead. e.g. Marlowe. Cunn.I.p.39.

his attitude towards the lower orders, trade, commerce and "flatcaps," is still distinctively patrician.

(6) His attitude towards women was a mixture of satire, mockery, and possessiveness - with notable exceptions of ladies whose wit and worth, like Portia's, raised them above their sex.

(7) He was a gourmand, a gross and hearty eater and drinker.

(8) In general his character had a hardness, ungraciousness, consistency, and lack of variety and depth that, rightly or wrongly, is now regarded as characteristically Roman.

The End.

.....

Jonson's Translations from the Latin.

Just how seriously Jonson regarded it as his duty to educate himself and his fellows can be illustrated in various ways and places: from his "Discoveries", from his exposition of dramatic theories in the form of critical "asides" to certain plays, and -best of all- from his translations.

The number of these translations, the manner of them, and his avowed regard for them prove that he considered what to-day is called "cultural and classical" education to be one of his main duties towards his age and himself.

His classic dictum on the question of translation in "Poetaster" has already been quoted; it is vital.

> "....for his true use of translating men
> It still hath been a work of as much palm
> In clearest judgments, as to invent or make." (I)

This is significant because in the passage Ben is on the defensive. That attitude ensures both earnestness of consideration and a measure of overstatement. And no doubt the passage arrogantly begs the question by making Ben himself and other "clear judgments", unnamed, the judges of the case: but such was Ben's honest view. Nor is the statement, though a defensive rebuttal, any serious exaggeration of his normal tenet and practice, for he did always maintain that his translations were the best part of his work. Just how far he was forced into this claim by his opposition to the practice of contemporary playwrights, ignorant or careless of Latin, how much by a real humility of adoration for the ancients, and how much by unprejudiced conviction cannot be known.

His considerable translations are numerous - so very numerous, indeed, that in number alone they prove that he

(I) Cunn.I.258. "Poetaster", V,i.

regarded it as one of his primary duties and privileges to introduce his listeners and readers to apposite passages of the ancients and to refresh their memories in the subject-matter of their schoolday lucubrations. Many have been noticed in passing, under the heading of the Latin author concerned. For convenience, these and others are here tabulated, with some indication of the subject matter.

Catullus: "Epithalamium" provides material in the "Masque of Hymen".
LXXII, lines 42-62 (See Catul.) - "The Barriers."
V. - "Volpone", "To Celia".

Cicero: "Catiline", IV, 2. Cicero's speech is drawn from the First Catilinarian. See "Historians".

Horace: "the Art of Poetry" translated with "observations" Burnt, see his "Execration upon Vulcan". See "Sejanus" - "To the Readers" Cunn. III. p.369 for extant portion.
"Poetaster", III, i. The setting, the Via Sacra, is a translation of Lib. I. Sat. IX.
"Poetaster", conclusion, folio only, to Act III is the Trebatius v Horace Dialogue of Lib. II, Sat. I.
Forthright translation of Lib. V, Ode II.
do. Lib. IV, Ode I.
do. Lib. III, Ode IX.

Juvenal: "Sejanus", IV, Sc. 5. several short passages.
"To the Reader" - "Poetaster" do.
"Volpone", III. Scs. 2 and 3. Lady Would-Be's colloquy.
do. IV. Sc. I. imitations.

Martial: Literal translation Cunn. III. p.388 of Epig. Lib. VIII, 77.
do. do. do. X, 47.

Ovid: See the "Silent Woman" for large sections of the "De arte Amandi" already treated under "Ovid".

Petronius: Cunn.III.p.387. Full translation of a fragment of Petronius.

Cunn.II.p.88 design and matter of Chorus to Act I of "Catiline".(adaptation)

Quintilian: "Every Man in his Humour",II,3,ll.I4-35 is a free translation of "Institutes", Lib.I,c.2.

Sallust: Several of Catiline's speeches, e.g.Act I, ScI, are taken direct.

For Cicero's and Caesar's speeches in V.6. see "Historians

Tacitus: "Sejanus" III,i. Crem. Cordus' speech

do.III,2. Sejanus' request for Livia.

Virgil: "Poetaster",V,i. Virgil is represented declaiming the "Aeneid", Lib.IV,ll.I60-I85. (Aeneas and Dido in the Cave and Fame.)

A line or two of the above are re-translated in the "Masque of Hymen",Cunn.III.p.26.

Though hardly within our subject,we may add Bonnefonius whose "Semper munditias" is the origin of "Still to be neat" See the "Silent Woman",I,i.

A careful review of each of these passages and a statistical analysis of their total effect reveal these probable conclusions - in addition to the findings and suggestions already noted under Horace (pp.I27-9):

(a) The great majority of the translations are almost word for word versions of the original Latin. Grace, pliancy, fluency, rhythm are alike sacrificed in an effort to achieve literal fidelity.

(b) In the case of "Sejanus", "Catiline", and "Poetaster" the reasoning behind this method is fairly clear. His idea is to ensure truth to nature by recording truth to facts. Virgil quotes Virgil; Cicero delivers a verbatim of copy of his own oration; Catiline quotes himself, from Sallust, his reporter and remembrancer; Horace (alias Ben) appears in a dramatised version of his own sketch of a bore and another of his dispute

with Trebatius. The device reminds one of the attempt to produce a detective story by arranging pseudo-police court exhibits and clues photographed and labelled. Whatever be the lack of selectivity and, consequently, art in this method, it is technically interesting as a recording of history and a proof of earnest desire to convince and teach, to convince the illiterate and delight the scholar.

Finally it bears on the question of plagiarism already dealt with. Ben's conscience is clear, for surely literal translation is not the method of a man who wishes to embezzle another's facts and fancies. In all the cases cited above Ben's method of translation acquits him of the charge.

.....

Appendix II.

(Works dealing in various degree with Jonson's Education, Learning etc)

Allen, Percy: Shakespeare, Jonson and Wilkins as Borrowers.

Brinsley, John: Ludus Literarius, 1612 and '27.
Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit. - Bibliography.
Castelain, Maurice: L'homme et l'oeuvre. (Contains a bibliography)

Chambers, E.K.: The Elizabethan Stage.

Conybeare, John: Latin Letters and Exercises, 1580-94.

Dryden, John: Essay of Dramatic Poesy; Preface to "An Evening's Love"

Ellis, Sir Henry: for Humphrey Gilbert's scheme for Queen' Elizabeth's Academy - Archaeologia, XXI, 506 ff.

Fleay, F.G.: Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama, Vol.I.pp.311-387, and II.pp.1-18.

Gifford, William: Memoir prefacing his edition of Jonson's Works.

Gosse, Edmund: The Jacobean Poets.

Hart, H.C.: for a study of Juniper's (the Case is Altered) sham learned vocabulary - see H.& S. Vol.I.p.325.

Hazlitt, William: The English Comic Writers.

Herford, C.F.: "Ben Jonson" in Dictionary of National Biog.XXX, (p.1802.

do. with Percy Simpson in Vols.I and II patticularly of their current edition of Jonson's Works.

Koeppel, Emil: Quellenstudien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's etc. and Ben Jonson's Wirkung auf zeitgenossische Dramatiker etc. in "Augliciatische Forschungen".

Legouis and Cazamain: A Hist. of Eng. Lit. (Containing a brief but sound statement of Jonson's position with relation to Latin Culture.)

Linklater, Eric: Ben Jonson and King James.(Slight stuff)

Mantuanus, Baptista: Eclogues (ed.W.P. Mustard, Baltimore,1911.)

Massebieu: Les Colloques Scolaires du Seizième Siècle.

Norwood, Gilbert: Our Debt to Greece and Rome.(An appendix suggests a list of English plays influenced by Plautus and Terence.)

Rayher, P.: Les Masques Anglais.

Root, R.K.: Classical Mythology in Shakespeare.

Reinsch, H.: Ben Jonson's Poetik und seine Beziehungen zu Horaz in "Munchener Beitrage,I6".

Saintsbury, George: History of Criticism,II,p.204.

Sergeaunt, J.: Annals of Westminster School.

Schelling, Felix: Elizabethan Drama; and Ben Jonson and the Classical School.

Schmidt, J.: Uber Ben Jonson's Maskenspiele in Herrig's Archive.etc.XXVII, 5I-9I.

Soergel, A.: Die englischen Maskenspiele.

Symonds, J.A.: Ben Jonson in Eng. Worthies series.

Smart: Shakespeare, Truth and Tradition.

Smith, Gregory: Ben Jonson (Eng. Men of Letters)

Swinburne, A.: A Study of Ben Jonson.

Thorndike, A.H.: Tragedy (cites lists of authorities).

Upton: his Examen of Jonson's parallels and allusions formed the nucleus of Whalley's and Gifford's notes.

Watson, Foster: The Curriculum and Text Books of Eng. Schools, I600-50.

Tudor Schoolboy Life.

The English Grammar Schools to I600.

Ward, A.W.: Hist. of Eng. Dramatic Lit.,II.pp.296-407.

.....