NATIONAL LIBRARY

OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

OTTAWA

CANADA

6248

NAME OF AUTHOR ALAN R. YOUNG

TITLE OF THESIS The English Prodigal Son Plays to 1625

UNIVERSITY of ALBERTA

DEGREE Ph. D. YEAR GRANTED 1970

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) A.R. Young

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Dept. of English
Acadia University
Wolfville
Nova Scotia

DATED 14 May 1970

NL-91

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ENGLISH PRODIGAL SON PLAYS TO 1625

by

C ALAN R. YOUNG

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1970

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The English Prodigal Son Plays to 1625" submitted by Alan R. Young in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

B. N. de Luna
Supervisor

W. J. Jones

H. A. Hargreaves

John O'Neill

Rhoda Dunlap
External Examiner

Date 9 May 1970

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is concerned with English plays prior to 1625 which have plots based on the parable of the Prodigal Son. Such plays were especially popular in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In England there was also a vogue for such works, though it was less pronounced than on the Continent.

The first chapter deals with the traditional theological and iconographic interpretations of the parable which had become established prior to the period with which this study is primarily concerned. Certain social, political and economic matters of concern to men of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are also briefly referred to, since this study pays particular attention to the manner in which topical concerns of the period also influenced the various interpretations given the parable in the plays.

Chapter Two is concerned with the dual influence on the English Prodigal Son plays of the Continental Christian Terence and the native English Moralities, and the third chapter deals with plays such as The Disobedient Child, Misogonus and The Glasse of Governement, all of which use the parable to provide prudential lessons concerning education. Chapter Four is concerned with various allegorical Prodigal Son plays, two of which, Jonson's Cynthia's Revels and The Staple of News, are seen as being specifically concerned with the proper use of wealth and some discussion is given of

earlier literary allegories on the same subject.

Chapter Five deals with Prodigal Son plays in which the protagonist is a prince. Special attention is paid to the literature de regimine principum to illustrate contemporary fears concerning the possible fate of a country were it to be ruled by a prodigal prince. Chapter Six deals with certain plays presented at the public theatres early in the seventeenth century and designed to appeal to bourgeois literary tastes. By contrast, the following chapter discusses certain private theatre plays of the same period which appear to mock bourgeois tastes and ethics and to treat the traditional form of the Prodigal Son play in an ironic fashion.

The dissertation concludes with some broad generalisations concerning the universal appeal of the parable, and a number of later Prodigal Son plays are mentioned to show how later dramatists continued to be attracted by the parable. In addition there are three appendices. The first contains versions of the parable as found in the Vulgate, the Bishops' Bible and the New English Bible, to which is added the Buddhist parable of the Prodigal Son. The second discusses the identity of the playwright satirised in the figure of Posthaste in Marston's Histriomastix, and the third contains a chronological list of extant iconographic representations of the parable up to 1700.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge above all the continual help and encouragement I have received over the past two years from my Supervisor, Dr. B.N. De Luna and two of her colleagues at the University of Alberta, Dr. H.A. Hargreaves and Dr. J. Orrell, both members of my Supervisory Committee. I am also grateful for the help I have received in my correspondence with C. Wingfield Digby (Keeper, Department of Textiles at the Victoria and Albert Museum), A. Halcrow (Sub-Librarian at Trinity College, Cambridge), the Reverend George Hurst (Rector, Brooke Parish Church, Norfolk), Edward Morris (Keeper of Foreign Art at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool), and Katharine Whitehorn (Journalist on the staff of The Observer). I am also indebted to Dr. R. D'Alquen, the Reverend William J. McGinley, Christine Wilding and Margaret Young for help with translations from German, Latin, Italian and Greek respectively. For help with much of the proof-reading, I am grateful to Barbara Garlock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Abstract iii

Acknowledgements v

Introduction 1

I. The Parable and its interpretation 4

II. Dramatic Anticipations of the English Prodigal Son Plays: The Christian Terence and the Moralities 56

III. Later School Plays: The Disobedient Child, Misogonus, The Glasse of Governement 124

IV. Allegorical Treatments of the Parable of the Prodigal Son 171

V. Princely Prodigals 226

VI. Prodigal Son Plays and the London Bourgeoisie . . 305

VII. Parodies and Ironic Adaptations of the Parable . 333

VIII. Conclusion 377

Appendix A: Three Texts of the Parable of the Prodigal Son and a Buddhist Parable 382

Appendix B: The Identification of Posthaste in Histriomastix 389

Appendix C. List of Extant Pictorial and Sculptural Representations of the Prodigal Son Parable Prior to 1700 with sources of Descriptions and Reproductions 404

PAGE

References 417

Bibliography 482

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation will be to consider the various dramatic adaptations of the parable of the Prodigal Son in England during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The popularity of such works in England has often been referred to by commentators on English literature who have also recognized that this popularity was only a small part of a much larger vogue which was particularly prevalent in Germany and the Netherlands, and not without echoes in Italy, France and Spain.

In selecting what I consider to be the English Prodigal Son plays I have been faced with a number of problems. Only a few works consciously parallel almost every plot incident in the parable. A number have only some of the incidents, and others deliberately depart from the pattern of the parable in sections of plot, often in order to make some specific theological point. There are also those plays which parallel the parable only in a sub-plot, or those which offer no clue as to whether or not the author was really aware of the parallels between his work and the parable. Consequently a number of plays discussed in this study cannot be called "Prodigal Son plays" without certain qualifications being made. In all cases I have been careful to make these, and I have thought it better to employ this approach than to set up rigid criteria as to what constitutes a Prodigal Son play, a process which

would inevitably, it seems to me, lead to the exclusion of much relevant material.

It should be noted, however, that my criteria have even so not been sufficiently liberal to permit me to include detailed discussions of plays that such eminent critics as Muriel Bradbrook and Hardin Craig have categorised (erroneously, I believe) as "Prodigal Son plays." The reader will consequently find no discussion of Dekker's 2 Honest Whore (1604-ca. 1605) and The Wonder of a Kingdom (1623-31),[1] nor any consideration of the anonymous Jack Juggler (ca. 1555), Common Conditions (1576), The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune (1582), and Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes (ca. 1570-83).[2] I have also excluded, though not without some hesitation, Jacob and Esau (ca. 1550-57).[3] Other works were considered for inclusion, but it was decided to reject them on the grounds of their being insufficiently close to the pattern of the parable. Among these were the following: W. Wager's The Longer Thou Livest (ca. 1559-68) and Enough Is as Good as a Feast (ca. 1564), Nathaniel Woodes' The Conflict of Conscience (1570-81), Nashe's Summer's Last Will and Testament (1592), Dekker's Old Fortunatus (1599), Chapman's All Fools (1599-1604), Middleton's Michaelmas Term (1604-6), Heywood's The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (ca. 1604), Beaumont and Fletcher's The Scornful Lady (1613-16) and Fletcher's Wit without Women (1614-20).

The chief concern in this dissertation will be with the degree to which a playwright follows or alters the

pattern of the parable, along with the possible reasons for any alterations he may make. I shall also be concerned with interpreting what the parable seems to have meant for him. This last point is of key interest since, depending on how the playwright presents the parable, different interpretations are possible to him as are explorations of various topical concerns of the period, particularly those associated with education, the nature of kingship, the proper use of wealth, and the specific means of attaining spiritual salvation. My discussion of the plays will also include, where relevant, considerations of such matters as the degrees of allegory present in individual works, the literary sources of a play where these are independent of the parable, and the ironic treatments of the subject by certain playwrights who wrote for the private theatres.

Before beginning the study of the plays themselves, I have first devoted one chapter to a consideration of various theological and iconographic traditions which seem to have influenced the interpretation and representation of the parable up to the period in history with which I am particularly concerned in this dissertation. Certain social, political and economic matters which were of particular interest to men of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and which are reflected in the plays are also briefly mentioned in the first chapter. As for non-dramatic English works patterned on the parable, these are brought in wherever relevant in my discussion of the plays themselves.

CHAPTER I

THE PARABLE AND ITS INTERPRETATION

Part One: Textual Evidence

Luke 15:

11. He said moreouer, A certeine man had two sonnes.
12. And the yonger of them said to his father, Father, giue me the portion of the goods that falleth to me. So he deuided vnto them his substance.
13. So not long after, when the yonger sonne had gathered all together, he toke his iorney into a farre countrey, and there he wasted his goods with riotous liuing.
14. Now when he had spent all, there arose a great dearth throughout that land, and he began to be in necessitie.
15. Then he went and claue to a citizen of that countrey, and he sent him to his farme, to feede swine.
16. And he wolde faine haue filled his bellie with the huskes, that the swine ate: but no man gaue them him.
17. Then he came to him self, and said, How manie hired seruants at my fathers haue bread ynough, and I dye for hunger?
18. I wil rise and go to my father, and say vnto him, Father, I haue sinned against heauen, and before thee,
19. And am no more worthie to be called thy sonne: make me as one of thy hired seruants.
20. So he arose and came to his father, and when he was yet a great way of, his father sawe him, and had compassion, and ran & fel on his necke, and kissed him.
21. And the sonne said vnto him, Father, I haue sinned against heauen, and before thee, and am no more worthie to be called thy sonne.
22. Then the father said to his seruants, Bring forthe the best robe, and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feete,
23. And bring the fat calf, and kil him, and let vs eat, and be merie.
24. For this my sonne was dead, and is aliue againe: and he was lost, but he is founde. And they began to be merie.
25. Now the Elder brother was in the field, and when he came and drewe nere to the house, he heard melodie, and dancing,
26. And called one of his seruants, & asked what those things ment.
27. And he said vnto him, Thy brother is come, and thy father hathe killed the fatted calfe, because he hathe receiued him safe and sounde.

28. Then he was angrie, & wolde not go in: therefore came his father out and entreated him.
29. But he answered & said to his father, Lo these manie yeres haue I done thee seruice, nether brake I at anie time thy commandement, & yet thou neuer gauest me a kid that I might make merie with my friends.
30. But when this thy sonne was come, which hathe deuoured thy goods with harlots, thou hast for his sake killed the fat calfe.
31. And he said vnto him, Sonne, thou art euer with me, and all that I haue, is thine.
32. It was mete that we shulde make mery, & be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is aliue againe: and he was lost, but he is founde.[1]

This parable, quoted in the version found in the Geneva Bible (1560), is the third of a group of three related parables in Luke 15, the subjects of the other two being the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin. Like these last two the parable of the Prodigal Son is concerned with the theme of repentance. The parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin are each told by Jesus in justification for his own conduct when the Pharisees have just objected to the manner in which he has been consorting with sinners.[2] Both these parables stress God's love for the "lost," his active role in seeking them out, and the joy in Heaven over the one sinner who repents.

The parable of the Prodigal Son, with which we are especially concerned here, continues the lesson of the other two. Although Jesus may have told it on a different occasion, since Luke separates it from the previous two by making what appears to be a fresh start in verse 11 with the words "He said moreouer" (εἶπεν δὲ in the Greek text and Ait autem in the Vulgate),[3] its context is nevertheless appropriate, for it explores the human aspect of the theme of God's love. Now, instead of concentrating attention on God's active role

in seeking the "lost," Jesus gives a parable which depicts the development of repentance in the heart of the sinner. The father does not go in search of his "lost" son, but his son returns to him of his own accord.[4] Forgiveness is unqualified and rejoicing at the son's return is stressed as is the element of joy which is also to be found at the end of the two previous parables.

The final episode involving the Elder Brother obviously has relevance to the occasion on which the parable was probably told, though Jesus does not make any explicit link between this character and the Scribes and Pharisees in his audience. However, if we do take it that this section exists primarily as a result of Jesus' immediate historical situation, we can in part account for the discomfort that one can easily feel today at the treatment the Elder Brother receives in the story. Among theologians, for example, one school of thought has felt the final episode to be an appendix which does not belong to the original story.[5] Another has felt this section to be an anti-climax,[6] while yet another has felt it to be of a later date.[7] Whatever the case, the Elder Brother is a controversial figure and has, as we shall see, received varying interpretations by exegetes. As for literary adaptations of the parable, these often exclude him altogether, or, like the theological writings on the parable, offer a wide diversity of interpretation.

Whatever may be felt about its final verses, the parable as a whole, and taken in context, remains one of the

central expressions of Christ's message, and not surprisingly has been described as "a pearl among the parables,"[8] and as "the Gospel within the Gospel" ("Evangelium in Evangelio").[9] The movement from sin to redemption and reconciliation with God, which the parable suggests by analogy, can be seen as the essence of the Christian view of man's relationship with God. However, the manner in which we see the parable today is very different from the manner in which it has been interpreted in the past. Consequently it is worth considering briefly at this point the interpretations given to the parable from the earliest times in Christian history up to the period during which the plays to be discussed in this study were written.

When Jesus first employed the parable, certain features of it may have struck his Jewish audience quite differently from the manner in which we perceive them. For example, the fact that the younger son is the one who asks for his portion was quite in character with the structure of Jewish society in Christ's time.[10] According to Jewish law the first-born received at his father's death two-thirds of the inheritance if there was only one other son, the younger receiving one-third.[11] Because a younger son's prospects were consequently smaller than those of an elder brother, it would be quite natural that he should desire to leave home and seek his fortune elsewhere. Only a younger son could make such a request during the father's life-time.[12] Since a subdivision of landed property would have an adverse effect on the worth of the

remaining two-thirds, the younger son's portion would almost certainly come in cash, flocks, clothes and so on, and that the younger son in the parable turned all into cash is clear from verse 13 (see Appendix A, part c).

However, in Jewish law, if part of an inheritance was made over in the form of a gift during the father's life-time by the father to his son, the son obtained right of possession, but he did not acquire the right of disposal. If the son were given land, for example, he could sell it but the purchaser could not take possession until the death of the father. Nor did the son in such cases acquire the usufruct, for this remained in the father's possession until his death. What happens in the parable is that the younger son wants both the right of possession and the right of disposal in order to lead an independent life. This involved a special kind of legal settlement which apparently did take place at this period.[14] It meant, of course, that after the settlement, the son had no further claim on his father, not even to food and clothes. It is this fact which renders the younger son's plight so perilous after he has spent all his money.

The fact that the younger son had contact with swine and could not have observed the Sabbath would be utterly abhorrent to a Jewish listener (Leviticus 11: 7, and Matthew 8: 31-2).[15] This probably needs no comment, and certainly William Oesterley does not bother to mention it. However, the prodigal's willingness to become a "hired" servant is worth a brief discussion. Of the three grades of workmen on

a Jewish estate the "hired" man was the lowest in status. He was an outsider, paid as a casual labourer and liable to dismissal at any time. In contrast the "bondmen" and the "menservants" (the latter occupying the lower status) were much better treated and benefitted from the fact that the master of the estate had clearly-defined responsibilities towards them. In asking to be a "hired" servant, the Prodigal Son is thus offering to become something less than a slave, since the "bondmen" and "menservants" were in fact slaves,[16] and here it is worth noting, as Oesterley has pointed out, that the Prodigal's form of confession would have had special meaning to the Scribes and Pharisees in Jesus' audience since they would have been reminded of various important Rabbinical texts.[17]

One should also note that the father's unexpected behaviour in verse 20 where he runs to meet his son would have apparently been considered both undignified and unusual for an old man according to Jewish custom.[18] At the same time, however, such unusual behaviour would have served to emphasize for Christ's listeners the love and compassion that the father clearly felt for his returning son.

The kiss, as we know from II Samuel 14: 33, is a sign of forgiveness.[19] The son's request to be a wage-earner is never made, for his father interrupts his confession (verse 21) and immediately treats him as an honoured guest.[20] The father confers on his son a ring, a robe and shoes. The ring is probably a signet ring, and the father's gift of it should

consequently be interpreted as the bestowal of authority.[21] In Jewish custom, investiture with a new robe was regarded as a reward for service, while shoes were a luxury peculiar to free men who do not go bare-foot like slaves. This ceremonial bestowal of the signs of status and authority would perhaps have reminded Jesus' audience of the episode in Genesis 41 where Joseph is appointed chief vizier and Pharaoh gives him a ring, a robe of fine linen, and a gold chain (verse 42). The killing of the fatted calf, an honour reserved for special guests upon special occasions, would have been a further sign for Jesus' audience (if any more were needed) of the father's forgiveness of his son and his desire to reinstate him.

One final aspect of the Jewish background should be noted. According to Oesterley, there exists a Jewish parable on the theme of a degenerate son. It tells of a king's son who has fallen into bad ways. The king sends his tutor to the young man saying, "Come to thyself, my son." But the son replies, "With what face can I return, I am ashamed to come into thy presence." To this the father replies, "My son, should a son be ashamed to return to his father? If thou returnest, will it not be to thy father that thou comest?"[22] The intent of this parable, with its references to Jeremiah 3: 12 and 25, and 31: 9, is very close to that of the New Testament parable, and both are completely in accord with earlier Jewish teaching, a fact which would not have been lost on Jesus' audience.

In his Gospel, Luke gives us no clue as to exactly

how the early disciples of Jesus interpreted the parable of the Prodigal Son, but it is possible that, like many of the early Church Fathers, they interpreted it in the manner of an allegory in which each incident and term stood for some idea. The method of exegesis then consisted of decoding the allegory, term by term, just as Matthew interprets the parables of the Tares and the Dragnet (13: 37-43, and 47-50), and Mark interprets that of the Sower (4: 13-20), both men significantly attributing their interpretations to Jesus himself.

Opposed to this method is the view held by modern theologians and in varying degrees by many earlier exegetes that the parables possess one point of comparison only and that the details are not intended to have any independent significance, there being no one-for-one correspondence as in true allegory. With regard to the parable of the Prodigal Son, for example, modern commentators have noted the fact that God is named in a paraphrastic way in verses 18 and 21: "Father, I haue sinned against heauen [i.e. God], and before thee." This makes it difficult for the father in the parable to be an allegorical representation of God. On the other hand, as Jeremias has pointed out, some of the expressions used in the original text of the parable are meant to suggest that the father is to be taken as an image of God.[23]

The allegorical interpretations of early theologians are highly complex. Most of them agree that the figure of the father represents God or Christ, but where the two sons are concerned, there are various opinions. Some writers, for

example, see the elder and younger sons as representing the Jews and the Gentiles respectively. Ambrose, Tertullian and Rabanus share this view, the last-named saying:

> Son, the Jews, as it says in the Gospel: "The elder son was in the field"; which means that when the Gentiles were called to the faith, the Jews in their error remained beyond God's influence. . . .
> Son, the Gentiles, as it says in the Gospel: "My son was dead, and is alive again," that is to say, the Gentiles had died through lack of belief, but returned to life through faith.[24]

Other commentators, who include Augustine, see the elder and younger brothers as representative of self-righteous and sinful man respectively,[25] while Jerome and others take things one step further by seeing the elder brother as representative of the Pharisees.[26]

The figure of the landowner, who is referred to in the Bishops' Bible (1568) and the Geneva Bible as "a citizen," in the Vulgate as "uni civium," but in the New English Bible as "one of the local landowners," is seen by some of the early Fathers as a philosopher ("philosopho").[27] Ambrose, however, saw him as "the prince of this world" ("Princeps . . . istius mundi"),[28] and this interpretation was often followed throughout the Middle Ages.

The only other characters mentioned in the parable are the servants, and these have been seen as representing the Apostles.[29] In the same manner the early exegetes insisted upon supplying allegorical interpretations for even the smallest details. To Augustine, for example, the husks ("coddes" in the Bishops' Bible) are "worldly doctrines, barren and resounding with vanity" ("saeculares doctrinae,

sterili vanitate resonantes").[30] To Hugh of St. Victor, however, they were "the sordid productions of poets, and the philosophers' doctrines polluted with various errors, which are the food of filthy minds" ("sordida figmenta poetarum, et diversis erroribus polluta dogmata philosophorum, quae sunt cibus immundorum spirituum").[31] Where Augustine interpreted the robe as "Adam's lost grandeur" ("dignitas quam perdidit Adam"),[32] Ambrose explained it as "the cloak of wisdom." For this last-named exegete, and also for Bede, the ring is a symbol of faith and truth,[33] and for Ambrose the shoes were the proclamation of the Gospel,[34] while Augustine and Jerome regarded the killing of the calf as figurative of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.[35]

One final sample may suffice to show the ingenuity of early Biblical exegesis of this parable. Jerome chose to interpret the all-important reconciliation scene between the father and his younger son as follows:

> When he [the son] came to his homeland, and before he entered the house of repentance, he [the father] clung to his neck, that is, he assumed human form. Just as John reclined on Jesus' breast and was made the sharer of his secrets, so in this way he [the father] placed upon his younger son his light yoke, that is to say, that obedience to his commands is facilitated by grace rather than individual effort.[36]

In connecting the parable with John's relationship to Christ, and as with his interpretation of the fatted calf which was mentioned earlier, Jerome is typical of many Patristic exegetes who commonly applied to the New Testament what Henry Oxborn Taylor has called a special symbolic mode, whereby the parables, like the stories of the Old Testament, "become

figurative of Christ and the needy soul of man, or figurative of the Christian dispensation with its historical antecedents and its Day of Judgement at the end."[37]

This kind of Biblical exegesis is basic to the iconographic structure of the Biblia Pauperum which was widely known throughout Europe and was especially popular towards the end of the fifteenth century. In this work episodes in Christ's life are framed in a kind of triptych by "characters who are figurative of the Old Testament and pre-figurative of the New Testament" ("Figurae typicae Veteris Testamenti atque anti typicae Novi Testamenti"). These are accompanied by short explanatory texts. The Prodigal Son parable is represented by one illustration which depicts the Prodigal's return and his welcome by the father. In many versions, such as that dating from the early part of the fourteenth century and now in the State Library in Vienna, the Prodigal's mother is also present.[38] This scene is on the right-hand side of a page, the central illustration being of Christ's revelation to the Apostles after his crucifixion. We are thereby reminded of the manner in which the Apostles abandoned Jesus when he was taken into custody, just as the Prodigal Son left his father. Similarly, we are also expected to recall that, just as the father forgave the Prodigal Son, so Christ forgave the Apostles who forsook him and fled. Significantly, the left-hand picture depicts the meeting in the Old Testament between Joseph and his brother, and it is worth noting in passing that Cyril of Jerusalem in one of his Catechetical

Lectures (No. XVI) earlier made a somewhat similar connection between the Prodigal Son parable and the Old Testament by linking the Prodigal's return with the meeting (Genesis 46: 29) between Joseph and Jacob:

> We must give a good signification to the words "fell upon me." They mean "affectionately," as when Jacob having recovered Joseph "fell upon his neck," or like the affectionate father in the Gospel parable who saw his son returning from his absence abroad, and "had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck, and kissed him."[39]

Returning for a moment to the Biblia Pauperum, we find that the interpretation of the illustrations is made clear by the brief written explanations. Beneath the left-hand picture is one which in the German text, for example, says,

> Joseph signifies Christ, who appeared to his disciples who were together at Easter and were afraid of him when he said to them: "Peace be with you, I am he, fear nothing."[40]

Beneath the central picture are the words "Jesus appears and shines in the glory of his resurrection" ("Jesus apparet surgentis gloria claret"), while beneath the picture of the Prodigal Son is the following commentary:

> One reads in Luke's Gospel how the Prodigal Son, who had wickedly consumed his portion in a foreign land, returned with a sad heart to his father, who received him kindly and comforted him with a kiss of peace. This gentle father signifies Christ, who appeared before his disciples, who were sitting down in sadness, and comforted them with his presence.[41]

Throughout the Middle Ages such elaborate allegorical and typological interpretation was much practised. Indeed, one finds that Origen's type of threefold interpretation is developed into "foure maner undirstandynges" which are described in one English medieval sermon as the "sence historial"

as "whan a man understondith the story that spekith of a bodili doynge even aftur the lettre sowneth," the "sence allegorik" as "whan a man understondith bi a bodili thyng that he redith of in story an other gostli thyng that is betokened therbi," the "sence tropologik" as "whan a man redith a story that spekith moche of myghti dedis or of gode worchyng, and undirstondith that he shuld have stronge gostli dedis of holi lyvyng," and finally the "sence anagogik" as "whan a man undirstondith an hevenli thyng bi a bodili thyng seid in story."[42] Walter Hilton (died 1396), the English mystic who was a near contemporary of Langland's, gives another such explication of these levels of allegory in The Scale of Perfection:

> By the letter, that is lightest and most plain, is the bodily kind comforted; by morality of Holy Writ, the soul is informed of vices and virtues, wisely to know depart the one from the tother. By mystihood it is illumined for to see the works of God in Holy Kirk, readily for to apply the words of Holy Writ to Christ our head and Holy Kirk that is His mystical body. And the fourth, that is heavenly, longeth only to the working of love, and that is when all soothfastness in Holy Writ is applied to love; and for that is most like to heavenly feeling, therefore I call it heavenly.[43]

In our parable, the father's house might consequently be taken in a straightforward literal or historical sense simply as a certain Jewish family's house at the time of Christ. At another level, it can be taken as the Christian ideal of family life, on another level as the Church from which the prodigal (i.e. the sinner) has departed,[44] or at another level as the Heaven to which the erring sinner, if he repents, eventually returns.[45]

One of the best-known medieval examples of this type

of interpretation as applied to a parable is Langland's treatment of the Good Samaritan in Passus XX (C text) of Piers Plowman. On the literal or historical level, Langland sees the parable as demonstrative of the situation of the Samaritans in Judaea. Allegorically, the parable demonstrates the basic Christian precept of "Love thy neighbour." Tropologically, it demonstrates the necessity for Charity to accompany Faith and Hope, and anagogically, it is seen as referring to Christ's willingness to lose his own life for the redemption of sinful mankind from mortal spiritual peril.[46] Admittedly, this example shows a rare use of this strict form of fourfold interpretation by a medieval poet,[47] but it may stand here as a manifestation of the kind of interaction that was possible between Scriptural exegesis and literature. At the same time, we should do well to remember that such a method had by no means been forgotten by the end of the sixteenth century, as is abundantly clear from Sir John Harington's well-known explanation of the different levels of allegory in A Brief Apology for Poetry, which was prefixed to his translation of Orlando Furioso (1591):

> The ancient Poets haue indeed wrapped as it were in their writings diuers and sundry meanings, which they call the senses or mysteries thereof. First of all for the litterall sence (as it were the vtmost barke or ryne) they set downe in manner of an historie the acts and notable exploits of some persons worthy memorie: then in the same fiction, as a second rine and somewhat more fine, as it were nearer to the pith and marrow, they place the Morall sence profitable for the actiue life of man,approuing vertuous actions and condemning the contrarie. Manie times also vnder the selfesame words they comprehend some true vnderstanding of naturall Philosophie, or somtimes of politike gouernement, and now and then of diuinitie: and these same sences that comprehend so excellent knowledge we call the Allegorie, which Plutarch

defineth to be when one thing is told, and by that another is vnderstood.[48]

After explicating the various allegorical senses of the Perseus and Gorgon story, Harington goes on to defend the use of allegory in literature. Among other things, he says, when discussing the subject of parables,

> But to goe higher, did not our Sauiour himselfe speake in parables? as that diuine parable of the sower, that comfortable parable of the Prodigall sonne, that dreadfull parable of Diues and Lazarus, though I know of this last many of the fathers hold that it is a storie indeed and no parable. But in the rest it is manifest that he was all holinesse, all wisedome, all truth, vsed parables, and euen such as discreet Poets vse, where a good and honest and wholesome Allegorie is hidden in a pleasaunt and pretie fiction.[49]

It is clear from this that Harington, at least, would have had no objection to a multi-level interpretation of the Prodigal Son parable as an allegory.

Before considering the interpretations given to the parable by the early reformers, a few examples of medieval exegesis must be mentioned. On the whole theologians of this period do not develop new interpretations but confine themselves to compiling extracts from the works of the early Church Fathers. This must be seen in part as the result of the 19th Canon of the Trullan Synod (Quinisexta), which Justinian II summoned in 692. The Synod was convoked in order to furnish disciplinary measures for the fifth and sixth Ecumenical Councils of Constantinople II and III, and the majority of its canons were concerned with re-affirming the true faith and authority of apostolic ordinances, patristic traditions and previous canonical legislation.[50] According to J.M. Creed, the 19th Canon "expressly instructs

the clergy to confine their expositions of Scripture to the teaching of the Fathers, and to refrain from expositions of their own."[51] It is for this reason that Bede is so careful to state the authority of the Fathers of the Latin church in the letter to Acca which prefaces his commentary on St. Luke's Gospel (ca. 735), though in his interpretation of the parable he is particularly indebted to Augustine and Ambrose.[52] The Canon may also explain why St. Bernard, writing in the twelfth century, followed Ambrose in his interpretation of the citizen in the parable:

> I myself think that he [the citizen] signifies one of those evil spirits who, by sinning with an irrevocable obstinacy, are sunk in such an affection for evil and sin that they are no longer the guests and the strangers, but are like the citizens, and, if one may say so, they are like the inhabitants of sin.[53]

Similarly in the French Bible moralisée of the thirteenth century, which contains eight pairs of medallions illustrating the parable, the same tradition is adhered to, the figure of the citizen being paired with an explanatory medallion depicting the Devil.[54]

One wonders if it was a similar care at least to appear orthodox that prompted William of Nottingham, a late fourteenth century commentator, to refer to Clement, Ambrose and Jerome immediately after giving a rather startling exegesis of the phrase "Cecidit super collum eius" ("fel on his necke"). I quote the whole passage:

> He fell on his neck, holding him in the embraces of love, and this accompanied by mercy. The neck is referred to, however, because it stands midway between the body and the head, uniting them to each other. It can therefore be understood as the repentance of the sinner which stands midway between

God and man. . . .
He fell on his neck and kissed him, therefore, shows how man is perfectly reconciled to God through the action of subsequent Grace. It should be noted here that the usual word is accurrens and this is what Bede and Clement have. Ambrose, however, has occurrens. Jerome, in his letter on the Prodigal Son parable has occurrens.[55]

Mention here may also be made of another English exegesis of the same period. The preacher, after giving a very vivid and dramatic rendering of the parable itself, begins his exegesis with the traditional interpretation of the father as God and the two sons as righteous and sinful man respectively in the manner of Augustine:

Nowe goostely to my porpose. Be this fadere that hath ij sonnes I vndirstond the Fadur of heven. Be the ij sonnes I vndirstond the ryghtfull and the synnefull. The ryghtfull is all-vey redye to God, and ther-fore he is sewere and may take the blisse of heven for is good lyvynge when he will.[56]

To this he adds the following in which he sums up the essence of his interpretation:

But, for-sothe, wett thou well that itt is more ioye to the Fadur of heven oon synnefull man that is nere lost thorowe synne--when he will crie mercy and amend hym, that is more lykenge to God of suche oon than of many ryghtfull men that neuer dud synne, as Crist witteness in the gospell where he seis thus, "Maius gadium erit in celo super vno peccatore penitenciam agente quam super nonaginta nouem iustis," et cetera--"itt is more ioye in heven of on synnefull man that doth penaunce than on nyntye and nyne ryghtfull men that nedis no penaunce."
And ther-fore, thou synneful man, be thou neuer so synnefull, wete thou well that the mercy of God is myche more than ys thi synne, and ther-fore sey to God as the yonge man seid that had trespassed to ys fadur, "For my trespas," ut supra.[57]

In the English version of the Gesta Romanorum there occurs an interesting version of the parable of the Prodigal Son. This is followed by a somewhat unusual allegorical interpretation, though certain aspects of it, such as the idea

that the Prodigal represents Adam, have traditional authority. The story as it appears in the Gesta Romanorum tells of a Roman knight who had two sons, one of whom married a common prostitute against his father's will. When his father heard of what had happened, he forbade his son to visit him. Later this son had a son himself, but became sick and in need. He then sent messengers to his father asking for forgiveness. His father was filled with compassion and forgave him, and the erring son returned to him and presented him with his new grandson. However, the knight's other son was most displeased, and he objected strongly to his father's change of heart with regard to his brother. The father then said that, because the son who had remained at home refused to forgive his erring brother, he should consequently receive nothing by way of inheritance. The story is then given the following interpretation:

> The fader of the two bretherne betokeneth the fader of heuen. And this two sones betokeneth ye nature of aungelles, and nature of man. For man [Adam] was wedded vnto a comune woman of the bordelle [Eve], whan he ete of the apple agaynst the commaundement of god, wherfore he was exyled by ye fader of heuen, and putte fro the Ioyes of paradyce. The sone of the comune woman betokeneth mankynde. The knyghtes sone, that is to saye, Adam, began to be nedefull for after his synne he was putte from ioye in to this wretched valey of teares and wepynge, accordynge to this scrypture, In sudore vultus &c. In the swete of thy vysage thou shalte ete thy brede. But after, by the passyon of Cryste he was reconsyled. But the other sone [i.e. the elder brother in the parable], whiche betokeneth the deuyll, was euer vnkynde, & grutcheth dayly agaynst oure reconsylynge, sayenge, that by synne we oughte not to come vnto the herytage of heuen. Unto the whiche brynge vs our lorde Ihesus! Amen.[58]

Like William of Nottingham's exegesis, this interpretation is a startling one, especially with regard to the manner in this

instance in which the elder brother figure is explicated. Nevertheless, such commentaries on the parable were not unusual at this period of time.

It was the excesses of this type of elaborate interpretation, however, which provided much of the impetus for the Humanists and Reformers, who inspired by the newly-recovered Greek text of the New Testament, endeavoured in varying degrees to confine themselves to the literal meaning of the text in their exegeses. Erasmus, whose edition of the Greek New Testament was published in 1516, must take credit for much of the inspiration behind this movement, but even he is still a somewhat transitional figure in that he does not altogether abandon allegorical interpretation. Three short passages from Erasmus' Paraphrase of St. Luke's Gospel may be quoted here in the translation by Udall which first appeared in 1548, bound in the form of a running commentary on the text of the Great Bible which it accompanied. Edward VI in 1547 ordered the work, then nearing completion, to be placed in every church within a year,[59] and it can be assumed that this particular exegesis consequently became well-known in England, and probably furnished many a cleric with material for his sermons. Right from the beginning of his exegesis of the parable of the Prodigal Son, Erasmus shows his dependence on tradition by interpreting the two sons as representative of the Jews and the Gentiles. However, he is at pains to stress the parable's special historical context and the general application which it nonetheless possesses:

Than added he ferthermore this third parable, which albeit it generally apperteineth to all sinners, arising from their sinnes and trespaces: yet for the rate of the time in which it was spoken, it dooeth more directely touche the Gentiles, called and receiued to the grace of the gospel, and the Jewes (who semed to themselfes alreadi iust) and enuied the felicitie of the same Gentiles.[60]

Further traditional influences show in Erasmus' interpretations of the citizen and of the husks. Recounting the Prodigal Son's plight at the time of the famine, Erasmus says,

he [the prodigal] was now of force constreigned to be as a bond seruaunte to a forein and vncurteous citezen of a straunge toune. Whan men refuse to receiue the swete yoke of the Lorde, than are thei compelled to beare the most hard and heauie yoke of Satan. Wilt thou heare how miserable a kynde of bondage it is to serue the desires of the world? The citezen that was his maister, sent him to his mainour in the countrey, there to kepe and fede his hogges. From how greate a dignitee into howe greate reprochfulnesse was the miserable young man brought through his owne folye? Of a ryche enheritoure of an exceding ryche house, he was now made a bond man and a swineheard: and yet notwithstanding did not that same his cruell maister so much as geue him meate to eate.

(fol. cccxxvii^{v})

A similar influence of tradition shows itself in Erasmus' discussion of the husks:

Eueri vain & void pleasure of the world, which dooeth but for a shorte space pacifie, neither satisfiyng the solle, nor making it fatte, bee as the huskes and coddes that the swine fede of. With these are the ill spirites delited: and suche as are their sworne seruauntes, thei dooe rather lure and tol & traine with those baites, then fil them. And yet haue thei not alwaies plentie or aboundaunce of these readie at hand neither, or in case thei haue, yet is it marred and disrealised with much galle of sondrie griefes and sorowes.

(fol. cccxxviii^{r})

When one looks at the writings of men like Luther, Bucer, Zwingli and Calvin, who were all indebted to the Humanist approach, one finds a common stress on the literal, as opposed to the allegorical, interpretation of Biblical

statements, and this approach clearly followed the Humanist approach both to Scripture and to Classical literature.[61] Tyndale is the most obvious English representative of this viewpoint. In his Obedience of a Christian Man (1528) he devotes considerable space to proving that Scripture has only one sense, and not the traditional four. Consequently he is very critical of Origen and says,

> For Origen and the doctors of his time drew all the scripture unto allegories: whose ensample they that came after followed so long, till they at last forgot the order and process of the text, supposing that the scripture served but to feign allegories upon; insomuch that twenty doctors expound one text twenty ways.[62]

Applying this principle to the problem of the interpretation of parables, Tyndale elsewhere states that "a parable may not be expounded word by word; but the intent of the similitude must be sought out only, in the whole parable."[63]

The attack by Tyndale on Origen is echoed by Calvin in the Commentaries when he discusses Origen's interpretation of the controversial II Corinthians 3: 6-10. When he gets to the phrase "for the letter kills," Calvin says,

> First Origen, and then others, distorted this phrase badly, to give it a corrupted meaning; and so arose the most pernicious error that Scripture is not only useless but even harmful unless it is turned into elaborate allegories.[64]

Similar statements are to be found in Luther, and that which appears in The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520) is one of the more concise:

> I would not have a theologian devote himself to allegories until he has exhausted the legitimate and simple meaning of the Scripture; otherwise his theology will bring him into danger, as Origen discovered.[65]

Luther left no extended commentary on any of the

Gospels, but he several times refers to the parable of the Prodigal Son.[66] What the parable primarily seems to signify for him is the perpetual willingness of God to forgive the repentant sinner. As such, the parable was a manifestation of justification by faith, perhaps the most central of all Lutheran doctrines. Hence, when referring to the Prodigal Son as an example of repentance in "To the Saxon Princes" (1545), Luther stresses the act of faith involved in the Prodigal's surrender. Such blind submission, he implies, is the way to God's heart:

> Then too, there was the prodigal son in the gospel, Luke 15, who no longer wanted to be called son and yielded his inheritance completely and said, "Father, treat me as one of your hired servants," etc. By doing this he won his father's heart so that he too received him with joy, as one may read there.[67]

A similar thought lies behind two other references which Luther makes to the parable:

> (i) The prodigal's return began not with the fear of punishment, but his repentance came from this, that his father inwardly drew him and love for his father's house flowed through him, for he said: "How many hired servants are in my father's house? . . . I am not worthy to be called thy son." Such a sigh God sees and hears.
>
> (ii) The prodigal said this in words, but more important were the anguish and crushing of his heart. This came before the groaning in his throat and the upward sigh. In this music, to us the most painful and doleful, God has more joy than in any other service of worship, as Isaiah said (ch. 57: 15), "I will dwell with those who are of a broken and contrite spirit."[68]

Luther's stress on the inner consciousness of sin and the direct availability of God's Grace to the individual, should he inwardly repent, are both characteristic of the central interests of Reformist thought, for implied in each is the idea

that the role of a priest in the confessional is redundant. Furthermore, forgiveness is not something to be earned by good works, as the Catholic Church (according to Luther) would have men believe.[69]

Calvin, unlike Luther, did write a full commentary on Luke 15 in his Commentarius in Harmoniam Evangelicam (1553). Just as Luther did, he stresses in his discussion of the parable the direct communication between the repentant sinner and God. In this way, criticism of the Catholic confessional is implied. Such criticism actually becomes explicit when Calvin comes to describe the Prodigal's confession to his father as "not of the kind the Pope has invented, but of the kind with which the son reconciles the offended father to himself: for this humility is absolutely necessary for the forgiveness of sins."[70] For Calvin, the central message of the parable is that God's mercy exceeds the requirements of those who stand in need of it. Speaking of Christ's purpose in relating the parable, Calvin says,

> He [Jesus] compares God to the human father, who not only forgives the crime of his son, but runs forward to meet him on his return. To God it is just not sufficient to pardon those who seek forgiveness, but in addition he anticipates them with paternal forgiveness.[71]

Calvin's thoughts are here very obviously related to assumptions concerning the doctrine of Prevenient Grace, or what Calvin called "Irresistible Grace." The spirit of his interpretation, however, appears to be very close to that of the anonymous medieval sermon-writer quoted earlier. Most striking is the contrast between Calvin's stress on God's

anticipation of the sinner's return (the sinner, in Calvin's opinion, being powerless without Prevenient Grace) and William of Nottingham's allusion to "subsequent Grace" ("gratiam subsequentem") which, by definition, follows the Prodigal's repentance, but does not precede it. The other point which Calvin stresses concerns the Elder Brother. Calvin claims that this latter acts in an evil and perverse fashion and that his behaviour amounts to a sinful and envious attempt to set limits to God's grace:

> In this latter part of the parable, he [Christ] accuses of inhumanity those who would malignantly wish to restrict the grace of God as if they were envious of the salvation of wretched sinners.[72]

In view of what both Luther and Calvin had to say about the parable, it is perhaps not so surprising that it came to have a special place in the hearts of early Protestants. Furthermore, because of the anti-Catholic nature of the interpretations that could be placed on the parable, it could also be used as a weapon in religious controversy. Here, perhaps, we have the raison d'être for many of the dramatic adaptations of the parable by Continental Protestant authors.

In England, following the issues of The Book of Common Prayer in 1549, 1552 and 1559, and following the issue of The New Church Calendar in 1561, it was established that the parable of the Prodigal Son should be read three times every year in church on 4 March, 3 July, and 29 October, provided that those dates did not coincide with a Sunday or a Holy Day.[73] The parable was also alluded to in the official An

Homily of Repentance and of True Reconciliation unto God where it is referred to as evidence of God's merciful nature:

> For sith that God in the Scriptures will bee called our Father, doubtlesse hee doeth follow the nature and property of gentle and mercifull fathers, which seeke nothing so much, as the returning againe, and amendment of their children, as Christ doeth aboundantly teach in the parable of the prodigall sonne.[74]

The parable, as we shall see in our discussion of its iconographic treatments, was certainly well-known to Englishmen in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. How the parable was interpreted, however, varied considerably.

The Bishops' Bible merely stated that in the parable "the great mercie of God is set foorth" (fol. xlv^{v}). The marginal annotations in the Geneva Bible, however, not unexpectedly, perhaps, follow Calvin. Against verse 20, for example, the doctrine of Prevenient Grace is alluded to in the statement that "God preuenteth vs and heareth our gronings before we crye to him" (fol. 36^{v}). The Geneva Bible also takes a view of the Elder Brother which is similar to that of Calvin, for against verse 25 it is stated that "God reproueth the enuie of suche as grudge when God receiueth sinners to mercie" (fol. 36^{v}).

For a full exegesis of the parable by an English Protestant, we may turn to Samuel Gardiner, a theological writer of somewhat later date than Luther and Calvin. In his interpretation of 1599 entitled Portraiture of the Prodigal Sonne, the allegorical tendency is still very strong, and many details of the story are interpreted in a traditional manner. For example, the landowning citizen, according to

Gardiner, "was the Diuell whome he obayed: this farme of his which hee attended, was this present euill worlde, in the which the Diuell raigneth" (p. 6). The swine are the "vncleane spirits," the husks are "the light and idle vanities of this worlde" (p. 6), the robe is the "first royaltie which Adam lost, and Christ redeemed for vs" (p. 7), and the slain calf is "Christ slaine from the beginning of the worlde, for him and vs all his prodigal children" (p. 7).

On the other hand, he sees the two brothers as "two sortes of people in the Church of God," the elder being "orderlie and of good gouernment contented to abide in his fathers house & liberties of this church," while the younger, whom he later refers to as "this Acolastus and prodigall person" (p. 113), he sees as being "exorbitant, refactorie and disloyall, gadding abroad after his owne fancies" (p. 6). For Gardiner, the parable is

> . . . the Epitome of the Gospell, the abstract and compendium of the whole woorke of our redemption. For these two poynts are the summe of our doctrine, and our preaching. The doctrine of Repentance: The forgiveness of sinnes. Vnto Repentance properlie doe belong the whole bodie of sinne, and our entire conuersion from our sinnes to God. The forgiueness of our sinnes naturally compriseth the free grace of God, our iustification, and whatsoeuer else appertaineth to our Redemption (p. 10).

The continuity of this with the thought of Luther and Calvin is very clear, and this impression becomes stronger as the work progresses.

The second book of Gardiner's work is devoted to the "Regresse and happie returne home of the prodigall sonne." As in the case of Luther and Calvin, he sees the prodigal's inner

consciousness of sin and the consequent humble desire for repentance as being vital to the meaning of the parable when taken as a whole:

> This man through affliction was so humbled and punished, & so ashamed of himself as he was not himself, and the due regard thereof in a sorrowful submission altered & changed him, and brought him to himselfe. This was most necessarie for him to doe, as without which there had beene no recouerie of him. (p. 118)

The third chapter of this second book stresses the necessity for faith to accompany repentance, and, when Gardiner says that this is to be accompanied by the sinner's direct confession to God, his affinity to the Lutheran concept of justification by faith is very clear. This is especially so when he goes on to decry "running vnto monkes & sacrificing shauelings, whispering in their eares and confessing our sinnes . . . an idle ceremonie, an inuention of mans braine, founded as it is supposed by Pope Innocent the thirde" (p. 162).[75]

The third book, which deals with the reconciliation between the prodigal and his father, stresses the concept of God's grace which had been central to Calvin's interpretation. Like Calvin, Gardiner makes a special point of the fact that the father in the parable ran out to meet his son (p. 212), thereby showing God's active role in bringing the sinner home. Unlike Calvin, however, he completely ignores the final episode involving the Elder Brother. Nevertheless, it is apparent from his earlier description of the Elder Brother as being "orderlie and of good gouernment" that his attitude was

probably a favourable one and quite unlike that of Calvin. Apart from this last point, however, Gardiner can be taken as representative of Lutheran and Calvinist interpretations of the parable as reflected in English Protestant exegesis.

It should be noted, however, that not all English writings on the parable followed this pattern. Consequently, before considering the relationship of iconographic treatments of the parable to the interpretations accorded it by different theologians, one more English work should be mentioned. This work may serve to illustrate a particular tendency in Protestant religious writing which is clearly reflected in the Prodigal Son plays but which, thus far, has not been apparent in any of the theological writings on the parable we have discussed. John Carr's The Ruinous Fal of Prodigalitie (1573) shares the tendency of many sixteenth and early seventeenth century writings on the subjects of prodigality, thrift and the proper use of wealth to put forward a prudential ethic. Carr's work contains a section on the parable of the Prodigal Son, and, where in those works discussed thus far theologians tended to show an eschatological bias in their treatment of the Prodigal, Carr seems more concerned with the sufferings of the Prodigal in this world than with the state of his soul. Consequently, he is at pains to point out that "the prodigall chylde":

> spente his porcion in riotousenesse, and was neuer careful for to kepe and saue the same, to the entent that he might, obteine the pleasure of it an other daye, but riotously wasted it, what was his end? the Scriptures do ostend, he was faine to eate amonge swine.
>
> (sig. E3^{v})

Completely absent for the moment is any suggestion of an inner meaning for the parable whether allegorical or analogical. We are instead confronted by an interpretation of it as a prudential lesson on the folly of wasting money so that it cannot be enjoyed over a long period of time, and the fact that the Prodigal was reduced to the miserable state of having to eat with pigs. This lesson is enforced when Carr goes on to say,

> Thus you maye see always that prodigalitie doth consume wealth, good name, and fame, it abateth honour, it disgraceth a mans credite, it causeth hate of friendes, and reape [sic] the losse of fauour. (sig. $E4^r$)

Only then does Carr mention the idea that "more then this, it draweth the displeasure of God towardes vs" (sig. $E4^r$).

Carr's hostility towards the prodigal is what strikes us most about this exegesis. Such an attitude derives chiefly from his concern to put across a predominantly prudential moral, but at the same time it almost certainly derives in part, one assumes, from the discomfort the author feels at the apparent ease with which the sinner achieves forgiveness. A similar discomfort, combined no doubt with a desire to attack the sympathetic treatments usually accorded the Prodigal Son by the Reformist church, is to be found in Thomas Murner's Die Schelmenzunft. In this work, Murner, a Catholic theologian and a bitter opponent of the Reformation, includes the Prodigal Son in his guild of rogues, and at the end this latter acts as a representative for the whole guild when he pleads for forgiveness to the Father who is to be identified

with God. Strikingly no mention is ever made as to whether or not the Prodigal is eventually forgiven.[76] Hostility to the Prodigal Son is also implied in Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, where, after speaking at length about "those prodigious prodigals" who "eat up all at a breakfast, at a supper, or amongst bawds, parasites, and players" and "consume themselves in an instant," refers disparagingly to the manner in which many of them then "repent at leisure, and when all is gone begin to be thrifty."[77]

As will be seen, a number of the Prodigal Son plays do in fact treat the Prodigal in an equally hostile manner. Sometimes, like Carr's and Burton's, their authors' attitudes seem influenced by a desire to teach a prudential lesson. Sympathetic depictions of the Prodigal's repentance and forgiveness are consequently excluded to make way for vivid portrayals of his unpleasant fate. Other playwrights, as will be seen also, treat the Prodigal in a hostile manner in order to depict the Prodigal as having been excluded from among the Elect, the sorry end to which he is brought being confirmation of this fact. Indeed, it will be found, when we come to study the plays, that they show as much variety in their interpretations of the parable as the various theologians we have discussed thus far.

Part Two: Iconographic Evidence

Before turning our attention to the plays themselves, some account should be given of traditional iconographic presentations of the parable. Such presentations are important

since they frequently contain elements which, though also found in the plays, do not seem to derive directly from theological interpretations. Indeed, one can go further and say that they virtually form a tradition of interpretation which is independent of direct Biblical and theological influence.

That the parable was a very popular subject for iconographic treatment from the Middle Ages up to the period with which this study is primarily concerned is clear from the many extant versions of it in stained glass, mural paintings, sculptures, miniatures, tapestries, painted hangings, paintings and engravings, all dating prior to the second half of the seventeenth century, and some of them dating back to the eleventh century.[78] Some of the earliest of these are narrative cycles such as the famous windows on the parable in the cathedrals of Chartres, Bourges, Auxerre, Sens and Troyes, the thirteenth century series of miniatures in the Bible moralisée, the fourteenth century sculptured relief on the main door of Auxerre Cathedral, and Peter Drach's series of six woodcuts in his Spiegel menschlicher Behaltnis (ca. 1478). Later on, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the parable was a popular subject for tapestry and a number of works of this kind are still extant. Later still, it became a favourite subject of painters and engravers who often treated only individual scenes.

In England I have so far been able to locate two extant mural works. One of these is a fourteenth century painting on

the subject of the parable on the south wall of Brooke Parish Church, Norfolk.[79] Unfortunately this work has been painted over with lime-wash,[80] but drawings by C.J.W. Winter have been preserved and published, together with a description by M.R. James.[81] The painting measures about six to eight feet square. One part depicts a large gabled building. In front of the open door stands the father with arms partly extended, welcoming the returning prodigal who is tattered and bare-legged. To the right, the elder brother, who is by contrast well-clad, is walking away in indignation, his back turned on the reconciliation scene. In the background is to be discerned some kind of enclosure in which there are some pigs. This doubtless originally showed the prodigal's employment in the far country.

Below the central scene depicting the forgiveness of the prodigal are representations of four of the Seven Deadly Sins: Gluttony, Pride, Wrath and Avarice, each of which is shown issuing from a Hell's Mouth. This juxtaposition of the ideas of Sin and Repentance is a very dramatic one, and of special interest to us here is the artist's choice of sins. The presence of Gluttony clearly alludes to the scenes of feasting which, as will be seen in a moment, were a traditional feature of iconographic representations of the parable. The presence of Pride, which is depicted as a young man holding a comb and a mirror, alludes to the prodigal's concern with clothing, another feature which appears to have been traditional in iconographic representations. Wrath is shown

stabbing himself with his own daggers. This is one of the more fascinating features of this painting, since Despair, a Sin which is virtually interchangeable with Wrath in iconography at this time, is also traditionally associated with the Prodigal.[82] The presence of Avarice, with its traditional connections with the sin of usury, may possibly be an allusion to the means of the prodigal's downfall. Usurers play a like role in a number of plays, so that, however incongruous this Sin may appear in relation to the portrayal of a prodigal, there may well be important reasons for its presence.

More characteristic of iconographic representations of the parable, however, is a late sixteenth century painting in an upper room of a farmhouse at South Mimms, near Barnet, Hertfordshire.[83] This work was originally in five panels divided by feigned pilasters. The first panel, which probably showed the division of the inheritance and the Prodigal's departure, has unfortunately been destroyed. The second panel depicts the riotous living of the Prodigal and shows him feasting with some courtesans. It includes the figure of a hostess who appears to be reckoning up the Prodigal's bill. Above this we are shown the Prodigal being driven from the door of the tavern with a broom held by the same woman. She is aided by a servant who wields a pitch-fork. These incidents, as will be seen, play an important part in many iconographic representations of the parable, and they clearly had an influence on the plays.

The third panel of the South Mimms painting shows the

incident of the Prodigal offering himself for hire, while below he is seen eating husks. The fourth panel shows the reconciliation, with the father falling on the neck of the Prodigal, while behind stand several servants with a robe and some shoes. The final panel, which has been badly cut into by the construction of a doorway, shows the killing of the calf, and the elder brother. Doubtless, below this was originally the feast scene. That there must once have been many such works on the subject of the parable seems likely from a reference by a character in Rowley and Middleton's (?) A Match at Midnight (ca. 1622) to a text on the Prodigal over a chimney,[84] and from Richard Leigh's statement in The Transposer Rehears'd (1673) that the Prodigal Son was a common subject for domestic art.[85]

As a subject for tapestry in England, the parable seems to have been especially popular, as one can see from the many references to tapestries and sets of tapestries on the subject in the inventories of the household goods of Wolsey and Henry VIII.[86] A tapestry on "The Story of tint barne" (i.e., "lost child") is also listed in an inventory of the household tapestries of James V of Scotland in 1542.[87] That the subject may also have been a popular one for tapestry bed-curtains is suggested by Sir Bounteous' description in Middleton's A Mad World My Masters (1605-6) to "curtains . . . wrought in Venice, with the story of the prodigal child in silk and gold; only the swine are left out, . . . for spoiling the curtains."[88] The subject seems also to have been

a popular one for tapestry cushion-covers in the sixteenth century, and a number of these are still extant, including a set of six in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.[89]

Much more familiar to the average Englishman in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, however, would have been painted hangings on the subject. These were, as their name suggests, painted rather than woven. Consequently they were less costly than tapestries, though they served a similar function. Such works were common decorations in houses and taverns, besides serving a more utilitarian purpose in helping to keep out cold draughts and damp. They usually featured some kind of proverbial, allegorical or Scriptural subject and were accompanied by inscriptions, as one can deduce from the frequent allusions to painted hangings in the literary works of the period.

One of the most revealing of these is William Bullein's Dialogue both pleasaunt and pietifull [sic], wherein is a godlie regiment against the Feuer Pestilence (1564). In this work a London citizen (Civis) and his wife (Uxor) ride out from London to escape the plague. Beyond Barnet they stop at a tavern to rest the horses. Roger, the servant, then says of the inn parlour,

> This is a comely parlour, very netly and trimely apparelled, London like, the windowes are well glased, & faire clothes with many wise saiynges painted vpon them.[90]

The citizen's wife, who is not very bright, then gets her husband to explain the inscriptions on the hangings and to interpret their allegorical meanings. The next few pages

reveal a great deal about the nature of such hangings and about their subject matter. Unfortunately, the parable of the Prodigal Son is not one of those described, even though it was certainly a very popular story for such works of domestic art.[91]

In Dekker's If This Be Not Good (1611-12), however, there comes on to the stage at one point a character by the name of Scumbroth. He has been behaving in a prodigal fashion but now has lost everything and is dressed "like a beggar." He comments on his state as follows:

> What saies the prodigall child in the painted cloth? when all his mony was spent and gon, they turnd him out vnnecessary; then did hee weepe and wist not what to don, for he was in's hose and doublet.[92]

Even in this brief passing allusion, the detail of "they turnd him out vnnecessary" stands out, yet it is completely in accordance with the incident involving the courtesans in the South Mimms painting. In this reference to the parable, Dekker is surely drawing upon iconographic sources rather than the Bible. Another allusion to the Prodigal Son story as a subject for painted hangings is to be found in Thomas Randolph's The Muse's Looking-Glass (1630). At one point a character by the name of Micropsychus says,

> I have seene in mother Red-cap's Hall
> In painted cloath the story of the Prodigall.[93]

Two references to painted cloths on the subject of the parable may also be intended in Shakespeare, although in both instances it is not absolutely clear whether paintings, hangings, or even tapestries are being referred to. In 2 Henry IV, for example,

Mistress Quickly says to Falstaff [II, i, 152-4],

> By this Heauenly ground I tread on, I must be faine to pawne both my Plate, and the Tapistry of my dyning Chambers. (II, i, 736-8)[94]

To this Falstaff replies [II, i, 155-59],

> Glasses, glasses, is the onely drinking: and for thy walles a pretty slight Drollery, or the Storie of the Prodigall, or the Germane hunting in Waterworke, is worih [sic] a thousand of these Bed-hangings, and these Fly-bitten Tapistries. (II, i, 739-43)

When Mistress Quickly describes Falstaff's room in the Garter Inn in The Merry Wives of Windsor, it would seem as though Falstaff had his way with regard to mural decorations [IV, v, 7-9]:

> There's his Chamber, his House, his Castle, his standing-bed and truckle-bed: 'tis painted about with the story of the Prodigall, fresh and new. (IV, v, 2225-7)

Other iconographic treatments of the parable in England were of a variety of kinds. Leona Rostenberg in her work on English Publishers in the Graphic Arts refers to a work entitled The Prodigal Sifted or the lewd and lamentable End of Idle, profuse and extravagant persons.[95] This was sold by Robert Walton, a dealer in prints in the late 1640's. The work was advertised as "emblematically set forth" and "useful to set up in all families." Its title suggests that the work spells out a prudential moral in the manner of John Carr's work discussed earlier.

Four engravings on the parable, possibly by Martin Droeshout, were apparently inserted in the fourth edition of 1694 of J. Goodman's The Penitent Pardon'd (1679).[96] In addition, according to A.W.C. Hallen, there at one time

existed in his family an early seventeenth century coverlet of Flemish origin depicting four scenes from the parable.[97] It was also thought at one time that one of Holbein's works was based on the Prodigal Son story.[98] In 1603 an inventory of the goods of the late Christopher Smythe mentioned a "mapp of the Prodigall sonne in a fraime,"[99] and, much later in 1662, John Davies of Kidwelly in his translation of Olearius' Voyages and Travels of the Ambassadors Sent to the Great Duke of Moscovy, mentioned a "Clock, on which was represented, in painting, the Parable of the Prodigal Child."[100]

The long-standing popularity that such works enjoyed is evidenced by Charles Gildon's statement in The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton (1710) referring to a country ale-house in which were "several notable Cuts, as of the Prodigal, Robin Hood and Little John."[101] In addition, in Washington Irving's Bracebridge Hall, which was published in 1823, there is an allusion to old-fashioned furniture which included "prints of the story of the prodigal son, who was represented in a red coat and leather breeches,"[102] while Edward Peacock, writing in Notes and Queries in 1897, states that representations of scenes from the career of the Prodigal Son were once common in farmhouses and cottages.[103]

From all this it is clear that the parable was familiar both during the period with which this study is chiefly concerned and later. Possibly also its familiarity derived more from such iconographic presentations as those just mentioned than from theological works or from the thrice

annual reading of the parable in churches.[104] If this is so, then it is worth paying some attention to the manner in which the parable is presented in such iconographic treatments of it.

Such works as the Biblia Pauperum and the Bible moralisée, by their very intent, closely reflect traditional theological interpretations, but others, such as the series of woodcuts by Cornelis Anthonisz, which date from about 1540, even seem to elaborate upon the allegorical interpretations of the earlier theologians. The second cut in the series by Anthonisz, for example, depicts Filius Prodigus' dissipated feasting with two women, Caro (Flesh) and Avaritia (Avarice). Above them is a fearful seven-headed monster labelled "Spiritus Erronei, et Fanatici." At the left end of the table sits Mundus wearing an orbed crown. Before him is a backgammon board and dice, and his right foot is resting on Conscientia who is lying beneath the table. At the other end of the table is Proprium Commodium who is in the act of leaving, in order to make off with Filius Prodigus' purse. In the background are three other allegorical figures: Vanitas blowing a bubble, Heresis, and Ratio who is playing the bag-pipes and who represents trust in mere human reason.[105] Of particular note here is the fact that, as in the wall-paintings at Brooke, the Prodigal Son is associated with figures of Pride, Avarice and Gluttony (here represented as Caro).

In Anthonisz' third cut, the prodigal is shown eating the husks which are labelled "the leaven of the Pharisees." He is surrounded by the figures of Disease, Famine, War, Death,

Hell, the Devil and Conscience. The heart of this last-named is being gnawed by a snake labelled "Desperatio," and she is in the act of killing herself with a sword.[106] Of especial interest here is the presence of Despair, which was also associated with the prodigal in the Brooke painting in the figure of Wrath stabbing himself. Since Despair is an important motif in almost every Prodigal Son play, occurring either as a state of mind or as an allegorical figure who appears on stage, Anthonisz' use of the sin in his woodcut needs some comment. Possibly he was influenced by the traditional Patristic theological interpretations of the parable in which the word "perierat" ("was lost") in verse 24 was explicated as "in desperatione" ("in despair").[107] Indeed, the use of the Prodigal Son as an example of a desperate soul who nevertheless recovered from his plight was quite common in religious writings. Isidore, for example, in his discussion entitled "De desperatione peccantium" says,

> The great God rejoices in a desperate soul, and at the same time in a converted one, more than in one which has never been lost. Just as he did in the case of the Prodigal Son, who was dead, and came to life again, was lost and was found, and in whose return there was great joy for the father.[108]

Similarly, in Bernard of Clairvaux's "On the flight and bringing back of the Prodigal Son" ("De fuga et reductione filii prodigi"), the Prodigal at the low point of his fortunes is locked in the Prison of Despair where he is comforted by his servant Spes (Hope), the traditional opponent of Despair.[109] The Parson's allusion to the Prodigal Son in the discussion of Wanhope in The Canterbury Tales is in keeping

with theological thought,[110] as is the much later allusion in Burton's discussion of Despair in the Anatomy of Melancholy (Vol. III, 401). It is also notable that similar connections are implied in a number of literary works other than the Prodigal Son plays. In Canto XIII of Dante's Inferno, for example, two prodigals are seen to arrive in the pathless wood where withered trees enclose the souls of suicides,[111] while Spenser, in the Faery Queene (Bk. II, xii, 7-9) describes the "despairful drift" ["end"] of wretched prodigals on the Rock of Vile Reproach which Sir Guyon passes on his way to the Bower of Blisse. Of relevance to the appearance of this worst of sins in both Anthonisz' woodcut and in the Prodigal Son plays is the long tradition of literary presentations of allegorical encounters between mankind and despair,[112] some of the best-known being in Skelton's Magnyfycence, George Wapull's The Tyde Tarryeth No Man, Sackville's Induction to The Mirrour for Magistrates, the story of Cordila in The First Parte of the Mirrour for Magistrates (1574), the usurer in Greene's Looking Glass for London, and, of course, the Faery Queene (Bk. I, ix).

In Anthonisz' final cut, which depicts the Return, the Prodigal is greeted by the father who is labelled as "Pax." In the background is Constantia, who probably represents the Elder Brother, and who is playing on a harp while Justitia and Laeticia stand by and bend their knees. In the background is the Church and above the whole scene is the Holy Ghost.[113] This final illustration clearly refers to the

tenth verse of the eighty-fifth Psalm which from early times was considered as affording a major statement relating to God's position with regard to the disposal of sinful man: "Mercie and trueth shal mete: righteousnes and peace shal kisse one another" (Geneva Bible). In commenting on this verse, Owst has pointed out that in it

> the personification of Virtues seems to find an unmistakable place in the very pages of Holy Writ. Early allegorists and commentators of the Middle Ages must have seized upon it with delight, as a valuable stimulus for the development of their fancy along these same lines. At all events, by the twelfth century this apparently innocent outburst of Jewish poetic fervour had been expanded into an elaborate disputation between the four Sister-Virtues in the presence of God, concerning the Fall of Adam and the plan of future redemption for mankind through Christ, following an example already set by the Jewish Midrash.[114]

This is not without considerable relevance to the drama, since, as Hardin Craig has pointed out when discussing this Psalm and the Morality plays, the problem of why God should show mercy to sinful and ungrateful man was subjected to formal consideration in terms of the abstract in the Morality plays and was at the same time a central issue in these works.[115] Now, since this theme receives such a perfect exposition in the parable of the Prodigal Son, part of the relationship between the Prodigal Son plays and the Moralities will be apparent. That Anthonisz should have combined an allegory of the Virtues with the narrative of the parable is thus not so surprising as it might at first seem. Indeed, Anthonisz was not the only artist to perceive the potential connection between the debate of the Virtues and the parable. Giorgio Vasari's mid-sixteenth century painted altar-panel depicting

the Allegory of the Redemption of Man's Sin has as its centre-piece the debate between Justitia and Misericordia concerning the redemption of man. On the left is depicted the Fall of Adam and Eve with their expulsion from Eden. Balanced against this on the right is the crucifixion of Christ, the second Adam, and a scene showing the forgiveness of the repentant Prodigal Son by his father.[116]

As I suggested, the second cut of Anthonisz' series is of particular interest. In this we have the scene in which the Prodigal feasted and rioted with whores in a tavern. Such a scene seems to have been a commonplace in iconographic presentations, occurring as early as the Bible moralisée in which the Prodigal is shown at a table with two courtesans who caress him while he plays at dice. Such scenes, as I suggested, seem to have exerted a strong influence on literary adaptations of the parable, among which the earliest now extant is probably the anonymous Old French work, Courtois d'Arras, written before 1228.[117] In this work the Prodigal's dissipations take place at an inn where two courtesans swindle him out of his money after he has been drinking and gambling. He also loses his cloak, tunic and trousers, before being put out on the street.

This same tavern scene also occurs in the mural at South Mimms which I described earlier, but of a much earlier date is the stained glass window in seventeen panels in Bourges Cathedral.[118] Panels Five to Eight show the Prodigal being invited into a house by a woman who seduces him but

later turns him out minus his cloak and tunic. Panel Nine shows the Prodigal playing dice in an inn, having lost everything but his breeches, and Panel Ten shows him being beaten from the door by two women, one of whom has a stick. The window at Chartres in nineteen panels depicts a similar series of scenes in Panels Four to Eleven. In Panel Four two courtesans invite the Prodigal in.[119] Then they feast him, crown him with flowers and embrace him.[120] In Panel Eight he loses his money at chess, and this is followed by panels showing him being chased half-naked from a bed, put out on the street, and beaten with a stick by one of the courtesans.[121]

Two fifteenth century German tapestries also depict similar scenes.[122] The earlier of these dates from the first third of the century and is in the Museum at Marburg. It depicts the story in eight panels. The third panel shows the Prodigal meeting a woman before a house. She is holding his hand, and in the next panel we find the two of them in a bath being washed by another woman. Panel Five depicts the by now familiar scene of the Prodigal being driven away by the two women who both have sticks in their hands.[123] Then, in a fragment of a tapestry dating from the latter part of the same century and now in the Museum at Nuremberg, there are depicted four scenes. In one, two women are bathing the Prodigal before they sit down to eat a feast, and in the background is a house within which can be discerned a bedroom. In another scene three women, only one of whom has a stick, are driving the Prodigal away from the house. As so

often, he is virtually naked. This last detail suggests that he has been gambling, a matter which, as we have seen, is often explicitly depicted. Apparently, the painting described by Mrs. Jameson as being by Holbein also includes this detail along with the usual feasting with courtesans:

> In the foreground the Prodigal is feasting with his mistress, and gambling with a sharper, who is sweeping the money off a table; in the background are the more important scenes. He is driven out and stripped by his profligate companions; he is feeding the swine, and he returns to his father. (A small spirited picture in the Liverpool Museum.)[124]

Dekker's description of a wall-hanging of the Prodigal Son in If This Be Not Good (quoted earlier) makes it seem certain that these scenes that play so important a part in iconographic presentations of the parable were also incorporated in painted hangings on the subject and in other domestic art forms. Consequently we can assume that they would have been familiar as a tradition to playwrights of the period. Of course, some Biblical authority is to be found for these scenes in the phrase "he wasted his goods with riotous living" (verse 13) together with the Elder Brother's accusation (made without any evidence so far as one can tell) that the Prodigal devoured his portion with harlots (verse 30). One might also point out the interesting marginal gloss in the Geneva Bible against Proverbs 5: 9, which refers to the harlot's lack of pity for both Samson and the Prodigal Son. The real source, however, for the presence of these scenes in both iconographic treatments and literary treatment of the parable is not really a Biblical one, and we may suspect that there are other reasons why they are treated so fully in the works just

described.

First it should be noted that such scenes enable a very dramatic contrast to be made between the Prodigal's "sweet life" when he has wealth and the brutal rejection he suffers as soon as it is used up. Secondly, and possibly more significantly, such scenes enable a moralist to bring in representations of various sins, among them lechery, gluttony, drunkenness and gambling. Here it should be pointed out that the tavern has a key role to play. This institution conveniently combined a number of moral and social evils, and, as such, it was traditionally the target for attack by moralists. The English translator of The Book of Vices and Virtues referred to it as "the deuels scole hous,"[125] Hoccleve noted in The Regement of Princes (1411-12) that the tavern "be-for vnthrift berith the lanterne,"[126] while John Earle in his Microcosmography, much later in 1628, described the tavern as "a house of sin . . . but not a house of darkness, for the candles are never out, and it is like those countries far in the North where it is as clear at midnight as at mid-day."[127] One remembers particularly the early use of the motif in the scene in Passus VII (C Text) of Piers Plowman (lines 350-441) where Gluttony is invited into the tavern by Betty the alewife, just as the Prodigal in most of the works just described is met at the tavern door by a female (p. 88). This ends Gluttony's resolution to go to confession, for once inside the tavern he is surrounded by the riff-raff of the parish, who include harlots and gamblers.

Like the Prodigal, he gets caught up in a kind of gaming (p. 89). He also has too much to drink before he leaves. Later, however, Repentance appears on the scene, and Gluttony confesses to having taken the Lord's name in vain, to having eaten and drunk to excess when others have been hungry and might have been fed, and to having spent too much time in taverns (pp. 91-92). The parallels with the repentance of the Prodigal Son are not hard to see, and it is clear that this traditional association of the tavern with gluttony, rioting, gaming, swearing, lechery and drunkenness is carried over into iconographic representations of the parable of the Prodigal Son and thence into the Prodigal Son plays, as will be seen in later chapters.

Thirdly, of course, one cannot overlook the sheer entertainment value of such descriptions of riotous behaviour, nor can one neglect the appeal that such scenes must have had on account of their realism which served to give the parable an immediate relevance to contemporary life. That preachers were themselves quick to recognize this particular potential of the parable can be seen in a sermon by Michel Menot, an early sixteenth century French Franciscan friar who wrote a vivid and highly colloquial sermon on the Prodigal Son and presented it in contemporary terms that were designed, one can be sure, to give it the appeal of immediacy to his congregation. The following is a translation (in condensed form, since the author repeats himself in both French and Latin) of Menot's description of the Prodigal Son's plight when all his

money has gone:

> After everything had been dissipated among prostitutes, pimps, actors and hangers-on, and when his purse was empty and filled with nothing that would rub together, and when the beautiful clothes of the boastful young lord had been sold, everyone considered ill of Sir Boastful in his patched shoes and doublet. Thus in a short time my gallant turned into what looked like an apple-picker, dressed like a burner of houses, and bare as a worm. There scarcely remained to him an under-shirt, and this was no cleaner than a kitchen floor-cloth and was knotted on his shoulders to cover his poor skin. And so the very women who during his prosperity used to accompany him in his pomps, now strike his bare face.[128]

Such features all combine to explain some of the great appeal of the parable during the period with which we are concerned, and the fact that most of them (the bath scene being perhaps an exception) could easily be given vivid dramatization on the stage accounts for their frequent presence in the plays.

Yet the chief reason why the parable has been so attractive to artists of all kinds throughout the history of Christianity must surely derive from the fact that the Prodigal Son is so easily seen as symbolic of man's confrontation with the dilemma of world <u>versus</u> spirit. Perhaps it is for this reason that the basic pattern of the parable is not confined to Christian thought. One of the most famous Buddhist parables also concerns a prodigal son, and this has been included for purposes of comparison in Appendix A. Although there are obvious dissimilarities with the Christian parable, the central theme of progress from a lower state of being towards reconciliation and union on a higher plane of existence is common to both parables. It is this theme, above all else, which has united the many artists who have treated

the subject of the parable, among them being the anonymous authors of the stained glass windows described above, painters such as Bosch, Rembrandt, Van Dyck, Rubens, Murillo, Salvator Rosa and Greuze; engravers such as Dürer, Hogarth, Anthonisz, Hans-Sebald Beham and Amos Doolittle; sculptors such as Rodin and the anonymous creators of the reliefs at Auxerre and Amsterdam and the ivory casket in the Louvre; musicians such as Auber, Debussy and Benjamin Britten; choreographers and dancers such as George Ballanchine and Villella of the New York City Ballet respectively; and a great many writers beginning with the author of Courtois d'Arras and going on to Kafka, Rilke, Gide, Faulkner and Arthur Miller.[129]

Each century has, of course, interpreted the parable according to its own peculiar patterns of thought. Hence, besides drawing on theological and iconographic traditions, the English Prodigal Son plays of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries also reflected contemporary concern with the problems of education, so that in some plays, for example, the misbehaviour of the Prodigal and the good behaviour of the Elder Brother are presented as unsuccessful and successful manifestations of the educative process. Aspects of this are explored in terms of the upbringing and education given by parents, or, if the father-son relationship of the parable is altered to that of teacher-student or artisan-apprentice, such exploration may be in terms of school and university education or in terms of the education of apprentices.

Earlier I referred to the development of a prudential ethic in certain Protestant theological interpretations of the parable, and this is reflected in certain of the plays. In these, where education is concerned, there are similar signs of a shift away from an eschatological bias. Consequently, where the Middle Ages had placed prime emphasis on spiritual values in education, there is an increasing tendency to give more and more recognition to such secular advantages as financial profit and social advancement commensurate with the growth of a capitalistically-oriented society.

With the growth of the so-called "Protestant Ethic" with its equation of moral virtue with work and success, the sin of prodigality, which is seen as comprehending idleness and a refusal to benefit from education as well as the more obvious evil of unthriftiness, comes high in the hierarchy of sins. The Prodigal consequently becomes for a number of thinkers something of an enfant terrible and is liable to be treated harshly. As a result, he may well be deprived of the forgiveness accorded him in the parable. In this kind of way, educational ideals become closely bound up with concern over what constitutes the proper use of wealth and the responsibility and power that accompany it. In certain plays, such as Shakespeare's two Henry IV dramas and Dekker's If This Be Not Good, this theme is extended to cover the responsibilities of a prince so that the potential effects on a kingdom of prodigality in its ruler may be shown.

Finally, before coming to the study of the plays themselves, it should be mentioned that in a number of plays in the early seventeenth century there may be detected the growth of an ironic treatment of the various serious concerns mentioned thus far in this chapter. The authors of these works often adopt an ambivalent attitude towards the Prodigal. In some plays, condemnation of the Prodigal's exploits may be expressed, but this runs counter to the sympathy which has been generated for him on account of his lively rebelliousness and the entertaining nature of his encounters with the seamier side of life. In more extreme cases an author's sympathies may appear to rest with the Prodigal throughout, and the final conversion of the sinful young man may be no more than an ironic joke at the expense of more traditionally serious adaptations of the parable and the moral and didactic claims that these have made.

From this account of theological and iconographic interpretations of the parable, and from the brief outline of some of the various other social and economic concerns of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries which are to be found reflected in the Prodigal Son plays of this period, it may be seen that the Biblical parable, though remarkable for its directness and simplicity of structure, nevertheless provoked a considerable variety of responses in those theologians, artists and writers who sought to communicate its meaning in their own peculiar ways. This variety is reflected in the many plays patterned on the parable, and the following

study of these will not only provide a certain degree of insight into the concerns of the age during which they were written but will also reflect in some measure the individuality of each playwright according to the kind of interpretation he has placed upon the Biblical story.

CHAPTER II

DRAMATIC ANTICIPATIONS OF THE ENGLISH PRODIGAL SON PLAYS: THE CHRISTIAN TERENCE AND THE MORALITIES

The English Prodigal Son plays develop from two distinct dramatic traditions: the Christian Terence and the native Morality plays.[1] In this chapter I will briefly discuss these two traditions in order to show how the nature of each tradition made it almost inevitable that authors would eventually adapt the narrative pattern of the Prodigal Son parable for their own particular purposes. Since the earliest Prodigal Son plays to appear in English were a translation and an adaptation respectively of two European examples of the Christian Terence, I will first deal with this tradition and discuss these two plays. I shall then go on in the second part of the chapter to talk about the native Morality plays and to discuss the first two of these works to adapt the Prodigal Son parable.

Since the growth of the Christian Terence has been dealt with fairly fully elsewhere,[2] no more than the briefest of summaries seems necessary here. This is not to underestimate the importance of the tradition, however, for it will be seen that it played a very important part in the development of the early Prodigal Son plays in Europe and then later in England. In the grammar schools of the sixteenth century,

drama was used as a method for teaching Latin, the lingua franca of the Church, diplomacy and scholarship. Of the Classical dramatists only Terence seems to have been well-remembered during the Middle Ages,[3] and he was the first Classical dramatist to be printed both on the Continent (in 1470 at Strasburg) and in England (in 1495-7).[4] In addition to being valued for linguistic reasons, Terence was also highly regarded both in the Middle Ages and during the sixteenth century as a great moral teacher. Melanchthon's notes on how to teach Terence, which are appended to Erasmus' school edition (Basle: Froben, 1534) provide an excellent insight into the manner in which the Latin playwright's works were interpreted in schools as a series of moral lessons.[5] Andria, for example, is seen as a moral lesson on the modesty and filial behaviour appropriate to a young man. Eunuchus is a lesson on the dangers of bad company, especially of courtesans like Thais and braggarts like Thraso. Heautontimorumenos is concerned with the degree of strictness which a father should exercise towards his son's upbringing and excesses. As Madeleine Doran has pointed out,[6] if a moral was not immediately obvious from the text, the latter could always be distorted to make one, as Elyot does in his free translation in The Governor of a passage in Eunuchus (lines 930-3).[7]

Nevertheless the fact that the Latin plays tended to be somewhat tolerant of the misdeeds of youth at the expense of parental authority inevitably led to reactions. Responsible teachers naturally questioned this aspect of the Latin

drama and many expressed doubts as to the wisdom of exposing their pupils to the manners, morals and pagan beliefs to be found there, even though Terence might paradoxically remain a source for moral enlightenment as is evidenced, for example, by such works as Udall's Floures for Latine spekynge selected and gathered oute of Terence (1534-5).

Thomas Becon, an ardent Protestant who was one of the Marian exiles, may be taken as representative of English fears concerning pagan writers such as Terence. He says on one occasion, for example, that "to teach them [i.e. students] nothing but the doctrine of the heathen and profane writers is not to edify, but to destroy, not to correct, but to corrupt, the youth of the Christians."[8] An even clearer statement of this point of view is to be found in the first English printed edition of Schonaeus' famous collection of plays entitled Terentius Christianus (1595) in which the English editor states that:

> For the boys (as the grammarian Lily, not unknown in England, said), only pure things are suitable. In Terence there is pure language, but the subject-matter for the most part is not pure, nor is that strange. What can you expect from a poor ethnic, ignorant of the true God, the source of true purity? Therefore Schonaeus, a very learned man, did something worth while: for the benefit of Christian boys he has clothed more chaste subject-matter in the pure language of Terence, in order that along with elegance of style boys may imbibe holiness and uprightness of character.[9]

But such views were not new in the sixteenth century. Long before, as early as the tenth century, Hrotswitha had prefaced her collection of plays with a statement which expressed all the basic ideals of the later writers of the Christian Terence:

> There are many Catholics, and we cannot entirely acquit ourselves of the charge, who, attracted by the polished elegance of the style of pagan writers, prefer their works to the holy scriptures. There are others who, although they are deeply attached to the sacred writings and have no liking for most pagan productions, make an exception in favour of the works of Terence, and, fascinated by the charm of the manner, risk being corrupted by the wickedness of the matter.[10]

Hrotswitha's work remained in obscurity until Conrad Celtes discovered her plays at the Monastery of St. Emmeram at Regensburg in 1493. He published them in 1501, and they were soon imitated in the Dorothea (1507) of Chilianus.[11] Before this, however, Reuchlin had already written his Sergius and his Henno,[12] the latter being considered by Herford as of prime importance to the development of Terentian imitation even though its subject-matter is not sacred.

However, as Herford and others have pointed out,[13] the chief development of the Christian Terence occurred in Holland where three schoolmasters, Macropedius, Gnapheus and Crocus, apparently independently, arrived at similar solutions to the problem of teaching their pupils the admirable Latin style of both Terence and Plautus without at the same time morally endangering the young minds in their charge by exposing them prematurely to the bawdy and pagan world of Roman comedy. All three of these men wrote Latin comedies, and two of them, Macropedius and Gnapheus, chose as subjects for their best-known works, Asotus and Acolastus respectively, the New Testament parable of the Prodigal Son.

In the story as it appears in Luke 15 the basis for a Terentian-style intrigue already existed. This had been developed in the traditional iconographic treatments of the

parable discussed earlier in this study, for, as we have seen, these tended to elaborate on the Prodigal's dissipations, showing him as prey to the machinations of gamblers, procurers and courtesans who first divest him of his money and then drive him naked out into the street. Furthermore the plot of the parable contains the father-son conflict which so often is the basis for the plot of Latin comedy.[14] However, where in Latin comedy the young men who revolt against their fathers (usually over the possession of a girl) always get their own way in the end, in the parable this pattern is reversed, for in the end the prodigal submits to his father's will.[15] The attractiveness to schoolmasters of such a change in the normal Terentian plot-pattern is obvious, for at a stroke one of the less "desirable" aspects of Latin comedy could be eliminated and in its place could be substituted a lesson in Christian humility, repentance and forgiveness. Also the story could be made to yield a lesson in the obedience owed to parents and to people such as schoolmasters who had been given authority over youth. This last-mentioned potential was in fact soon developed further as can be seen in such works as Macropedius' Rebelles (1535) and Stymmelius' Studentes (1549) in which the prodigals lead idle and dissipated lives at school and at university respectively.

Although the plays of the Dutch humanists are of tremendous importance to the development of the Christian Terence on the Continent, and although all of them were written towards the beginning of a great vogue for plays on the parable of the

Prodigal Son which affected the whole of Europe (and Germany in particular) and which began in the late fifteenth century and continued throughout the sixteenth, our chief concern in this study must be with only one of them. I refer to Gnapheus' Acolastus which was translated into English in 1540, making it the second Prodigal Son play to appear in English, the first being an adaptation of Ravisius Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor, printed in the early 1530's.

The English adaptation of Textor's work unfortunately exists today only in fragmentary form. All that remains are two halves of a folio leaf which were originally part of the binding for an octavo volume, printed in Paris in 1542 and entitled Claudii Altissiodorensis in Epistolam ad Galatas enarratio.[16] Greg believes that the English play was probably printed by William Rastell, and thus between the years 1530 and 1534. No title exists for the work, but in the Malone Society Collections it is headed The Prodigal Son while in Greg's bibliography (see note 16 above) it is called [Pater Filius et Vxor, or The Prodigal Son].

The original by Textor is one of a number of short Latin "dialogi" which he wrote for his pupils whilst teaching at the College of Navarre in Paris during the first two decades of the sixteenth century.[17] It should be stressed that the English work is an adaptation, not a translation, as one writer on the English Prodigal Son plays has called it.[18] The same critic also claims that Textor's dialogue is "generally regarded as the forerunner of the prodigal-son play,"[19]

but I can find no evidence that the work has in fact been so regarded. Just possibly this critic is confusing this dialogue with Textor's De filio prodigo (ca. 1510) which has a quite different plot, one which its author claims was derived from the very well-known story of the Prodigal Son ("ex historia notissima de puero prodigo").[20] This latter work, like Textor's Thersites, is of great interest with regard to the development of the Christian Terence and little credit seems to have been given Textor for his achievement, since, although he did not follow the form of Latin comedy, he nevertheless seems to have anticipated most of the other elements of the Christian Terence. In De filio prodigo, for example, his use of meretrices, his concentration of his plot on the intrigues of these ladies to ruin the prodigal, and his didactic intention in writing the play for his students, show an anticipation of the aims of the Dutch writers of the Christian Terence who later utilized the parable of the Prodigal Son for their plays, though in qualification it should be added that just possibly Asotus, which was not published until 1537, may in fact have been written as early as 1510, perhaps before Textor's play.

The first record of any edition of Textor's works, however, is of that printed posthumously in Paris in 1530,[21] and the first edition known to have been printed in England was that of Henry Bynneman in 1581. That Textor's work was known in England before 1581 is apparent from the fact that at Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1543 an "actio dialogi Tex-

toris" was performed. This was probably Thersites,[22] and in fact some years earlier, in 1537 between the 12th and 24th of October, another adaptation of Textor's Thersites, perhaps by Nicholas Udall, was performed probably by the boys of Eton,[23] and a text which may be this latter work was printed by John Tysdale in about 1560.[24] The fact that the English fragment with which we are here concerned was probably printed just after the first known edition of Textor's works suggests that its author had had access to the Paris edition. In the following pages I propose to give a consideration of the English fragment and also a fuller summary of Textor's original than might normally be acceptable as an introduction to a discussion of the English fragment. The reason for this is that Textor's dialogue also provided the basis for the English Prodigal Son play, The Disobedient Child, which will be discussed in a later chapter.

Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor is entirely prudential in its ethics. It begins with the young man (Juvenis) complaining to his father about the beatings he has received at the hands of the teacher at school ("Aiunt autem mollicella corpuscula, noctes & dies flagris illic contundi, cruscula ipsa pedum tenus detunicari" fol. 34^{V}).[25] The basic situation at the beginning of the parable has in this way been applied to the situation of the student impatient with school discipline. This is typical of many of the later "School-Dramas," and the especial appeal to schoolmasters of such an application of the parable is quite understandable. Textor's young

protagonist has an even worse shock for his father a short time later. He announces that he wants to get married ("Quum sim forma adeo venusta & liberali vt nihil supra, vxorem velim ducere" fol. 36^{v}). His father's hostile reaction is perhaps a foregone conclusion ("Pape! quid audio? . . . Hei iuuenum delirum" fol. 36^{v}), and certainly this ties in with Textor's strongly anti-feminist ideas as expressed both in this work and elsewhere.[26] However, the son insists on leaving his father, regardless of the latter's protests. Again the situation as found in the parable has been altered. Instead of the son's taking his portion and going into the world, the son in Textor's work leaves home to get married, an equally foolish thing to do in Textor's opinion, as we shall see. A rather touching scene follows in which the young man and Camilla plight their troth to one another ("Hunc ego annulum in amoris perpetui pignus obfero" fol. 47^{r}). This is immediately followed by a contrasting monologue from the father in which he laments the fact that, once married, his son will have a life of misery. In quite a dramatic fashion this speech is in turn followed by a scene in which the couple quote Aristotle and other learned classical writers in support of their contention that marriage is a desirable state. But before long Camilla turns shrewish and sends her young husband out to sell firewood ("Has clitellas humeris superpone, ac lignum venale compitatim deferas, quo nostrum vtrique, victum quaerites. Perge nigot" fol. 49^{r}). Like the prodigal in the parable, Juvenis is reduced to menial labour and a

miserable existence, though his hopes before had been so bright. Like the prodigal, Textor's young man then realizes his error and thinks once again of his father ("O quam miseri sunt qui vxoribus suis nubunt, miseri inquam, quibus vxores imperant, verum nunc experior quod mihi pater praedixerat, multas in matrimonio esse miserias, miserum me, quid agam" fol. 49^{r}). As he endeavours to sell his firewood to passers-by ("Heus tu, qui propinquus hic astas, hoc me exoneres ligno" fol. 49^{r}), he reflects on what his devilish ("sathanica") wife will do to him if he does not earn any money. Eventually the beatings of his wife prove too much, and he returns to his father. Again the situation is very close to that of the parable.

Textor's treatment of the reconciliation scene, however, is very different from what occurs in the New Testament parable. The returning sinner is greeted by his father with harsh words which amount to saying "I told you so":

> Since you refused to accept my advice, you suffer whatever you suffer deservedly. For what you have suffered is nothing to what you will suffer in the future. Because if you think that this happens only to you alone, listen to the rowdy Xantippe, wife of Socrates. Hear with what insults she rails at her husband, wearing him out with her insults.[27]

From this we can conclude that the young man's fate, unlike that of his counterpart in the New Testament, is not to be a happy one.

The end of the English fragment is missing so we cannot be certain if Textor was followed in this important detail, but as will be seen later this aspect of Textor is in fact taken up and elaborated in the later Prodigal Son play, The

Disobedient Child, which is also related to this dialogue of Textor, and in which the protagonist, as in Textor's work, comes to a bad end.

What we have in Textor's play, one of the earliest of all the Continental Prodigal Son plays, is a re-working of the parable which is entirely prudential in its ethics. The writings of theologians on the parable appear to have been completely ignored for Textor makes no attempt to suggest that the son's return to his father has any allegorical connection with the Christian concept of God's Grace to the repentant sinner. All he is concerned with is showing the evils that will befall a youth in this world who, ignoring the advice of a father, gives up his studies for the love of a woman. To rub the point in, Textor alters the pattern of the parable so that the father does not forgive the repentant young man. Furthermore, it is implied that, since the young man is married, he is saddled with his fate for the rest of his life.

Here an interesting comparison can be made between Textor's De filio prodigo, a work I mentioned earlier in which the moral is similarly prudential. In the latter work, after the prodigal has been fleeced by the three meretrices who then flee from him and refuse to befriend him when he later meets them, the Interpres, who is Textor's spokesman, ends the play by saying to the audience:

> Look, spectator, this is the fate of prodigals, where they are fleeced of absolutely everything, the naked fellows are reduced to the condition of beggars. Prostitutes are in truth similar to ants, which abandon empty granaries. (fol. 146r)[28]

As I said earlier with regard to Juvenis, Pater et Vxor, we cannot tell for certain whether the English fragment followed Textor in its moral, but sufficient comparisons can be made between the two works to suggest that it probably did. The eighty-four line fragment has four characters: Pater, Filius, Vxor and Servus. The last-named is hence an addition to Textor's list. Where the fragment begins the wife lets it be known that she is considering cuckolding her husband. This is, however, not one of the threats made by Textor's character. From off-stage we hear the voice of Filius, and we are immediately reminded of Textor when he says, "Wyll ye by any faggottes?" ("Heus tu, qui propinquus hic astas, hoc me exoneres ligno" fol. 49^{r}).[29] Vxor then continues by saying that she must go and sew a napkin for Sir John Rose "To wype therwith his nose" (line 10, p. 28).[30] Before going off she sings a song in which she states that her husband is a knave and will die a cuckold. Just before she begins, we again hear the plaintive cry of "wyll ye bye any faggottes" (line 25, p. 28), and after she has gone off, the cry is heard once more before Filius comes on stage and delivers a monologue in which he complains that no one will buy his faggots. Then he says,

> Now to my home
> when that I shall come
> I shall be beten bytterly
> I wolde the erth had me swalowed
> My fathers wyll when I not folowed.
> (lines 31-5, p. 28)

Certain phrases from Textor immediately spring to mind: "Si domum nummis vacuus rediero sathanica illa muliercula diriter me iugulabit" (fol. 49^{r}), "vellem me terra absorptum" (fol.

50^{r}), "Ah pater, pater . . . Verum nunc experior quod esse praedixerat" (fol. 50^{r}). Also, just as Textor's father wanted his son to have a proper school education, the English counterpart wanted his son to be a "clarke" (line 36). And just as Textor's protagonist refused to follow his father's will and went off and got married, the same is true of the English Filius who laments his fate in words which again are very close to those of Textor:

> . . . I was a fole so starke
> That his [Pater's] mynde I iudged nowght
> But that I haue now derely bowght
> O woo is to that man all dayes of his lyfe
> That hath a shrewde queane to his wyfe
> All this trowble my father tolde me before
> But of his wordes I made no store . . .
> (lines 37-43, pp. 28-9)[31]

During this speech, the father in the English work is on-stage, apparently unobserved by Filius. Throughout the fragment the father comments on what is going on, whereas Textor's Pater in a much less dramatic way gives all his comments in one long soliloquy. The final comment of Pater in the English version is, I believe, quite significant, for it suggests that the English version will come to a conclusion similar to that of Textor's play. This final remark of Pater comes immediately after the son's monologue. Pater says, "It is to late sonne, now so to saye" (line 47). In this way, following Filius' admission that he has been in error, that his father was right, and that nothing has come of his marriage but misery, we are presented with a dramatic situation similar to the end of Textor's play except that the son in the English version has not yet approached his father directly. What is important,

however, is that in the English version the same distortion of the pattern of the Prodigal Son parable as occurred in Textor seems to have been followed. There is no forgiveness and it would appear that there will be no alleviation of Filius' plight. Again the moral would seem to be entirely prudential, designed to impress upon youthful minds the errors involved in disobeying a father, in giving up a school education and in getting married too early. Of course we cannot be absolutely sure that the English fragment did follow this pattern, but, from the evidence we have, it seems more than likely that it did.[32]

The first of the English Prodigal Son plays is consequently something of a surprise. The whole allegorical tradition underlying the customary interpretation of the parable has been ignored, as has the eschatological element usually so predominant in early Tudor plays on the subject of erring youth. Of course it might be argued that to call the play "The Prodigal Son" as did the Malone Society editors is misleading since neither Textor nor the anonymous English author refer to the parable. Furthermore, there is no sign of an elder brother, while the important reconciliation scene is not a feature of either play on account of the hostile attitude of the father. Nevertheless it is my opinion that the English fragment has not been misnamed, for it corresponds very closely in theme and plot to a number of later Prodigal Son plays, including such English versions as the Terentian The Glasse of Governement and the Morality Nice Wanton in both

of which the protagonists err in not taking advantage of education, and consequently come to a bad end. Most important of course is the basic pattern of the play whereby a son forsakes his father, gets into trouble and comes to his senses and then resolves to return to his father, although, in the case of the English fragment, we have had to infer this last-mentioned feature. Nor should the fact that a reconciliation between father and son seems unlikely deter us from accepting the work as a Prodigal Son play since, as we shall see, such a distortion of the pattern of the parable is not uncommon either where the author is concerned to communicate a purely prudential ethic (as is the case here) or where his religious outlook makes him unwilling to accept the idea that such a flagrant sinner should be forgiven with such apparent ease. The first English Prodigal Son play is thus very independent of both the traditional theological and the traditional iconographic treatments of the parable. For a play which is closely related to both we should turn to the second Prodigal Son play to appear in England: Acolastus.

It is not until 1540, when John Palsgrave, Chaplain to Henry VIII and friend of both Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, produced his translation of Gnapheus' Acolastus, that we have a fully extant Prodigal Son drama in English. Gnapheus' play had been acted by his schoolboys in 1528 at the school in the Hague where he was a teacher, and it had been printed in Antwerp in the following year. Acolastus was not, however, the first of the Continental Prodigal Son plays for it is

preceded by the anonymous Courtois d'Arras (late twelfth century), Castellano Castellani's Rappresentazione del Figliuol Prodigo (fifteenth century and published in 1527), the anonymous Florentine Festa del Vitel sagginato (ca. 1500), Antonia Pulci's Del Figliuol prodigo (ca. 1500), the anonymous L'enfant prodigue (ca. 1504), the two dialogues by Textor discussed above, a pantomime play called L'enfant prodigue which was put on at Ghent before Duke Philip the Good in 1458,[33] Burkard Waldis' Der Parabell vom verlornen Sohn (1527), and Macropedius' Asotus which was published in 1537, but written some time before. Gnapheus in his introductory epistle to Johannes Sartorius also mentions that he has heard that a physician by the name of Reynerus Snoy had written something based on the same story ("in eodem versatum argumento"), though no other trace of this work, whatever it was, appears to have survived.[34] But although Gnapheus' play was not the first to adapt the parable, it is exceptional for the phenomenal popularity it achieved and for the widespread influence it exercised. Its popularity can be measured by the number of editions and translations it received. Indeed it was one of the most frequently printed literary works of its time. Within five years of its publication it was reprinted eleven times in Antwerp alone. In Cologne it went through twelve editions between 1530 and 1577, thirteen in Antwerp during the same period, and ten in Paris up to 1584.[35] It was translated into German at Zurich in 1535, at Vienna in 1545, and at Thurgau in 1627, and into French by Antoine Tiron at Ant-

werp in 1564, while in Italy Guicciardini hailed Gnapheus as "the foremost comic writer from among the younger German writers" ("primus apud inferiores Germanos poeta comicus").[36] J. Bolte in his edition of a copy of 1529 notes forty-seven editions and reprints before 1585, and Bradner in an article on Latin plays lists thirty-one editions before 1600.[37]

Palsgrave's prime aim in providing his Ecphrasis Anglicae in Coemediam Acolasti was to present a "double" text with the English below the original Latin in order to facilitate the learning of Latin in grammar schools. In contrast to Sir Thomas Elyot's ideal that "if a child do begin therein at seven years of age, he may continually learn Greek authors three years, and in the meantime use the Latin tongue as a familiar language,"[38] is Palsgrave's more practical desire to establish a method by which English children might be taught not only idiomatic Latin (even Elyot's dream of Greek is dropped) but idiomatic English as well.[39] Accordingly, Palsgrave's Acolastus provided not only English equivalents for the Latin original, but also gave other possible translations for the Latin. This makes the English section strange reading, as each phrase is repeated several times in various possible forms. It also makes it plain that the English version could never have been acted as it stands, whereas the Latin text is admirably suited to performance, a fact which certainly did not go unnoticed by English pedagogues.

Acolastus was the first of the Continental plays to be printed in England for the purpose outlined by Palsgrave,[40]

and it certainly came at an apt time since Henry had just issued a proclamation commanding the use in English schools of Lily's grammar.[41] That Palsgrave was attempting to capitalize on his employer's current concern with Latin studies in schools is obvious from the preliminary explanation which precedes his Epistle to Henry, and from the Dedicatory Epistle itself in which he says,

> . . . where as it is clerely perceyued, by your most prudent wysedom, how great a damage it hathe heretofore bene, and yet is, vnto the tender wyttes of this your noble realme, to be hyndered and confounded with so many dyuers and sondry sortes of preceptes grammaticall: you haue for the redresse thereof, wylled one self and vniforme maner of teachynge of all those Grammaticalle ensygnements, to be vsed through out all your hyghnes domynions, and commytted the dysposyng of that matter vnto suche syngular personages, both of exact iudgement, and therto of excellent lyterature, that I for my parte do not a lyttell hereof reioyce, and ernestly do I wyshe, that I at these present dayes (whiche in that exercyse, haue dispent no small tyme of my lyfe) hadde observed but some one vaylable document to brynge to this Gazophilacium, some thynge to helpe to the furtherance of this your noble graces so goodly, and therto so godly and moche fruitefull a purpose.[42]

Palsgrave's specialized linguistic aims need not concern us unduly here. Certainly they do not seem to have excited much enthusiasm among his contemporaries. Only one edition of his work appeared (that of 1540), and there is no record of any reaction from Henry VIII. However, the fact remains that Gnapheus' original was very well-known in England, sufficiently known in fact to call for an edition of the Latin text in 1585.[43] Indeed Palsgrave's translation is but one manifestation of the popularity in England of Gnapheus' play and its key role in the development of the English Prodigal Son plays. It is for this reason that I have chosen to pay so much attention in this chapter to a work which is not of

native English origin.

Palsgrave, of course, designed his work to be used in the schoolroom, and it is worth pointing out that in one of his additions to Gnapheus' text, A declaration what the names vsed by the auctour of this Comedy, do signifye, he provides explanations of his characters which, in their heavily didactic overtones, are typical of the didactic style of the schoolmaster-authors of the Christian Terence. The explanations regarding Acolastus, Philautus and Lais may serve here as examples of this:

> Acolastus, Pelargus sonne, to whom the auctour hath giuen that name. For Acolastus signifieth in latyn prodigus mendicus, intemperatus, immodestus, lasciuus, libidinosus, incastigatus, that is to say, a stroy good, a begger, wantynge temperance in his diete, wantynge meane and measure, wantonly inclyned to bodily lustes, and one that wyll endure no correction: all whyche conditions may appere in this comedye to be in Acolastus, Pelargus prodygall chylde.
>
> Philautus, Acolastus counsaylour, which gyueth hym aduyse to dysobey his father, & to lyue after his sensual apetite, which signifieth amans seipsum. For whã one stãdeth to moch in his own conceit, or loueth him self more than al the towne doth after, than waxeth he stubburne, and wyll folowe no good and substanciall counsayle, nor be obediente to his father or parentes, but runne on the brydell at his owne pleasure.
>
> Lais was one of the moste bruted cõmon women that clerkes do write of, whom they cal also Corĩthia, for she was borne at Corinthe, and all the youthe of Grece resorted vnto her, for her great beautie, and she demanded of her wowers no more but what she listed.[44]

Such material would, of course, provide a schoolmaster with ideas on how to extract moral lessons from the play. In this way Palsgrave is in part following the tradition exemplified in the teaching notes of Melanchthon added to Erasmus' edition of Terence, which I referred to earlier. In addition to these explanations of the characters' names, Palsgrave also

added before the second scene of the first act a long (though he refers to it as "briefe") discourse on the types of metre used by Gnapheus, together with marginal notes throughout the work all intended to instruct the student as fully as possible in grammar, syntax and Latin verse metres (pp. 41-4). In such a combination of moral and linguistic aims he follows the writers of the Christian Terence, and the humanist circles with which he was so closely associated would surely have fully approved.[45]

But even though Palsgrave's work may not have become well-known in England, the fact remains that the Latin play certainly was. Indeed it is highly likely that the work was studied in the classroom and performed by schoolboys. Significantly, Nashe in The Unfortunate Traveller has Jack Wilton describe a performance by schoolboys. That the performance supposedly took place in Wittenburg need not necessarily mean that he is not writing with some English experience in mind, particularly as there is no evidence that Nashe ever visited Germany:

> The Duke laught not a little at this ridiculous oration, but that verie night as great an ironicall occasion was ministred, for he was bidden to one of the chiefe schooles to a Comedie handled by scollers. Acolastus, the prodigal child, was the name of it, which was so filthily acted, so leathernly set forth, as would haue moued laughter in Heraclitus. One, as if he had ben playning a clay floore, stampingly trode the stage so harde with his feete that I thought verily he had resolued to do the Carpenter that set it vp some vtter shame. Another flong his armes lyke cudgels at a peare tree, insomuch as it was mightily dreaded that he wold strike the candles that hung aboue their heades out of their sockettes, and leaue them all darke. Another did nothing but winke and make faces. There was a parasite, and he with clapping his handes and thripping his fingers seemed to dance an antike to and fro. The onely thing they did well was the prodigall

childs hunger, most of their schollers being hungerly kept; & surely you would haue sayd they had bin brought vp in hogs academie to learne to eate acornes, if you had seene how sedulously they fell to them. Not a ieast had they to keepe their auditors from sleeping but of swill and draffe; yes, nowe and then the seruant put his hand into the dish before his master, & almost chokt himselfe, eating slouenly and rauenously to cause sport.[46]

Nashe also has Will Summer in Summers Last Will and Testament mention an entertainment, which may or may not have been Acolastus, in which appeared the prodigal child "in his dublet and hose all greasy, his shirt hanging forth, and ne'er a penny in his purse, and talke what a fine thing it is to walke summerly, or sit whistling under a hedge and keepe hogges."[47] Herford believes that the play was probably known to John Foxe of whom it is said in the preface ("ad prium lectorem") to his Christus Triumphans (1556),

He did not allow himself in this play to flagellate any kind of vices nor the ruder faults of the vulgar sort, as was the custom of ancient comedy. However this kind of thing is to be found in excess in Asotus and the remainder of the most learned German comedies.[48]

Lyly almost certainly knew Acolastus. Not only does Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit (1578) follow the basic pattern of the parable of the Prodigal Son in its plot, with its hero leaving his native country and coming to a foreign city where he falls prey to temptation, is brought to a state of misery and then repents, but it also uses the names of two of Gnapheus' characters.[49] Eubulus, an old man who gave advice to Pelargus in Acolastus, in Lyly gives advice to Euphues, the role of the father having disappeared.[50] The other name taken from Acolastus is that of Philautus, a male counterpart for Philautia, the third nymph in Erasmus' The Praise of Folly (1510).

In Gnapheus' play he is the embodiment of self-love and it is he who leads Acolastus into trouble. In Lyly's work his role has been changed somewhat, for he is not so much a tempter as a partner of Euphues. Nevertheless it is he who provides the agency by which Euphues meets Lucilla, the cause of Euphues' downfall.[51]

Jonson too probably knew Acolastus as is evidenced by the title "Acolastus-Polypragmon-Asotus" in Cynthia's Revels.[52] John Day in The Parliament of Bees (ca. 1634-40 or 1608) calls his prodigal Plush Bee by the name "Acolastus," Samuel Gardiner, as we saw in Chapter One, refers to "this Acolastus and prodigall person" in his Portraiture of the Prodigal Sonne (p. 113), and Samuel Nicholson in Acolastus his afterwitte (1600) structures his work around a meeting between a repentant prodigal, Acolastus, and an old man, Eubulus, Acolastus' "auncient friend" (sig. $E2^{v}$), who at one point plays the role of adviser by persuading Acolastus, who is in the depths of despair, against committing suicide (sig. $E1^{v}$).[53] We know too that Gnapheus' play was performed in 1560-1 at Trinity College, Cambridge,[54] and the fact that it was reprinted in the Brylinger volume of Biblical plays, Comoediae ac Tragoediae aliquot ex Novo et Vetere Testamento Desumptae (Basle, 1541), a work almost certainly familiar to many in England,[55] makes it reasonable to assume that Acolastus was in fact well-known among educated men in England. For this reason, regardless of whether or not Palsgrave's translation was widely read, Gnapheus' play cannot be left out of

any account of the English Prodigal Son plays.

In the introductory epistle to Johannes Sartorius, Gnapheus gives some account of his purpose in writing Acolastus. He points out that his age has not produced any Menanders or Terences ("haec aetas nostra . . . Menandros et Terentios nullos habet").[56] Consequently he has decided to try out his hand at comedy, taking from the Bible a story which he thought was suited to comic treatment. In style he has tried to be as meticulous as possible, and he claims that he has dealt with the story so as to give pious teachers material that will be suitable for instruction of an edifying nature ("habeant autem litteratores pii, quod affatim doceant, et moneant bene" p. 84). In the Prologue he mentions that within the play is hidden a mystery ("mysterion"),[57] or, as Palsgrave translates it, a "couert or darke meanyng," "a secret sence or hydde intent."[58] For an explanation of this mystery we have, however, to wait until the Epilogue.

Although Gnapheus' play is important in the development of drama for its near-perfect imitation of the structure of Terentian comedy,[59] this is not a matter which need concern us much here. What is more important for our purposes are the alterations Gnapheus has made in adapting the New Testament parable and his interpretation of it as implied by these alterations. Beginning with the Actorum Nomina which precedes the Prologue we find that all the characters have been given names taken from Roman and Greek authors. As might be expected, a number are from Terence and Plautus but there

are also a surprising number derived from Aristotle. The names have been chosen carefully so as to suggest certain attributes for the characters. Acolastus' name derives from the Greek "ἀκολάστος" meaning "incontinent" or "licentious" and would appear to derive from Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics (VII, 7). This is apt, but it adds nothing new to the character of the Prodigal Son as we know him from the New Testament. More revealing is the name Philautus given to Acolastus' friend who at the beginning of the play urges Acolastus to demand his portion and leave home, who later urges him to throw away the "Book of the Law" ("bibliorum codex") given him by his father, and who urges him to have faith in himself only, to make himself his only joy and to let all his hopes be centred in himself alone. Such a philosophy is exactly matched by Philautus' name (φίλαυτος) which in Greek means"self-love" and is also found in Aristotle. When Acolastus says that Philautus has totally occupied his thoughts and has taken possession of his heart (II, ii, 6-8, p. 72), we are surely meant to grasp the allegorical significance of the situation. Philautus is both Acolastus' friend and an abstraction representing his evil genius. He also provides us with a clue to Gnapheus' interpretation of what constituted the Prodigal Son's sin when he left home to go to the far country.

Another character whom Gnapheus has added to the New Testament story is Eubulus, the elderly friend and advisor of Pelargus, Acolastus' father. Eubulus' name (εὔβουλος)

means "well-advised" or "prudent," and in this respect it is in keeping with the role he plays in the drama. Initially he suggests that, since Acolastus insists on leaving home, he should be allowed to go, so that later, when he is restored to his senses, Pelargus will be able to forgive him and bind him more tightly to him than ever before (I, i, 6-8, p. 36, 1-6, p. 37). This detail is, of course, an interesting addition to the parable, but one which does not appear to alter the intended meaning of the original. Indeed Erasmus in his paraphrase gives a somewhat similar interpretation of the father's action:

> The indulgent father divided his substance between his two sons, but not without the hope that [the younger son] would reform.[60]

In fact it is Eubulus who provides nearly all the wisdom in the play. Pelargus, whose name (πελαργος) literally means "a stork," is frequently overcome by his emotional attachment to his son, and he follows Eubulus' good advice, often in spite of his initial impulses (I, i, 2-3, p. 40).[61] This, of course, causes complications when we are looking at the play on an allegorical level, as we are invited to do by Gnapheus' use of the term "mystery." Where traditionally the father in the parable was taken to represent God, here this is often plainly impossible, as for example when Pelargus states that he shares the human weaknesses of other men ("Homo sum Eubule. Humani nihil a me est alienum" III, iii, 3, p. 110). In such cases it is Eubulus who sees things clearly and counsels wise action. Indeed Pelargus' constant anxieties

about his son and about whether or not events in the world obey a predetermined plan amount, in Eubulus' eyes, to impious behaviour ("Minue uero hanc improbam / Curam" III, iii, 5-6, p. 106) since Pelargus is in effect refusing to accept the idea that everything is controlled by the will of the gods (III, iii, 4-5, p. 107).[62] In this same speech, as if unaware of the contradition between "gods" and "God," Eubulus later goes on to warn Pelargus against showing lack of faith in God who has given us the assurance that he has taken us into his care and has numbered all the hairs of our heads (III, iii, 9, p. 108, 1-2, p. 109). Clearly in such passages Pelargus does not fit the traditional interpretation given to the father in the parable.

One writer on Acolastus has suggested that, in the conflict between Eubulus and Pelargus, Gnapheus has consciously set out to present in dramatic terms the great contemporary debate of the period between Luther and Erasmus.[63] Where Erasmus had in his De libero arbitrio (1524) attacked Luther by asserting the idea of man's freedom of will as a necessary condition for moral responsibility, Luther in what is widely considered his greatest theological work, De servo arbitrio (1525), had counterattacked with a denial of the idea of freedom of will. Gnapheus' Protestant leanings, which had already got him into trouble with the Inquisition and which eventually forced him into exile,[64] and the fact that Erasmus' work went through three editions in 1524 while Luther's went through ten editions before 1527,[65] make it reasonable to assume that

the author of Acolastus was indeed familiar with both works when he wrote his play. If, as Atkinson believes, Gnapheus favoured the Lutheran doctrine of "mera necessitas" which implies that God's foreknowledge and will are set so that man is governed by absolute necessity, and if in Acolastus he chose to have Pelargus and Eubulus represent the views on free will of Erasmus and Luther respectively, then we have in the play a very interesting adaptation of the parable for the purposes of religious polemic. The behavior of Acolastus is to be seen as a fortunate fall, demonstrating the Lutheran paradox which states that God redeems man through the action of evil, since in falling Acolastus is behaving according to "mera necessitas." Eubulus' faith that good will result and the fact that his faith proves to be justified provide a justification of Luther's doctrine, while Pelargus' waverings must be taken as a mild rebuke of Erasmus.

Towards the end of the play, however, Gnapheus seems to expect us to see Pelargus somewhat differently, for he is presented in the traditional manner as an image of God. Gnapheus prepares us for this by having the repentant Acolastus repeat the words of the Prodigal Son in the parable before returning home: "how many hired servants in my father's house have bread enough to spare, whilst I meanwhile perish with hunger" ("quot mercenarij in patris aedibus / Abundant panibus, dum ego interim hic fame / Pereo" V, iv, 4-6, p. 168). A few lines later we find Pelargus talking like the father in the parable of saving him who was lost and of bringing the dead

to life ("Salutem perdito, uitamq; mortuo / Hinc Eubule apprecer" V, v, 4-5, p. 172). Like his counterpart in the parable Acolastus decides to say to his father that because of his sins he is no more worthy to be called a son and is willing to be treated as a hired servant:

> Pater, peccaui in caelum & coram te, tuus
> Posthac indignus sum, qui dicar filius.
> Sodes Pater, uel ut unum è mercenarijs
> Tuis, me habeas.
> (V, v, 6-9, p. 173)

In the same vein the remainder of the play follows the pattern of the parable very closely: the father runs forward to embrace his son, the son begs forgiveness, and the father calls for a robe, a ring and shoes, and orders the fatted calf to be killed in preparation for a feast since his son who was dead is now alive again ("Hic filius meus iamdudum mortuus / Erat, & reuixit: perierat, & inuentus est" V, v, 10-11, p. 177). There is nothing to prevent one from interpreting this final section in the traditional allegorical fashion, and there is certainly nothing to suggest that Gnapheus intended the scene to be taken any other way, especially since in the Epilogue, which follows the departure for the feast, and in which Gnapheus unravels the "mystery" beneath the surface of his plot, we find a fairly traditional interpretation of the parable. We are told, for instance, to see the play as an image of how fallen mankind recovered his salvation (Epilogue, lines 10-12, p. 179). From it we may learn both the nature of man's arrogant rebellion against God for which he deserves to die (lines 13-14, p. 179, and line 1,

p. 180) and the contrasting depth of the compassion of the Heavenly Father who freely welcomes back his returning son without reproaching him for his sins (lines 1-6, p. 180). In addition Gnapheus tells his audience that, if one were to acknowledge one's sins, one would receive the Father's forgiveness as did the Prodigal Son (lines 6-9, p. 181). Finally Gnapheus explains that Christ's purpose in the parable was to make clear that the more we grieve at being opposed to God and to being born the sons of anger, so much the more joy is there in being restored to the Father's grace through being given the Holy Spirit (lines 10-11, p. 181, and lines 1-3, p. 182).

Pelargus' role in the play is thus an ambiguous one. On the one hand he appears to present an image of a lack of faith in God's plan to restore sinful mankind (see especially III, iii, 8-9, p. 108, 1-2, p. 109), whereas in the latter part of the play he more closely approximates to the father in the parable and in support of this we are instructed in the Epilogue to view him as an image of God's concern for fallen mankind. This contradiction is never really resolved and must be considered a weakness in the play.

With his other characters Gnapheus is more successful. Acts II to IV are largely concerned with Acolastus' dissipations, and they are peopled by characters straight out of Roman comedy. There is Sannio, a pimp in Terence's Adelphoe, Syrus, a slave in Adelphoe and Heautontimorumenos, Syra, a bawd in Terence's Hecyra, Chremes, an old miser in Andria,

Heautontimorumenos, and Phormio, and Bromia, a nurse in Plautus' Amphitryo. All of them have somewhat similar roles here, except that Bromia is Sannio's cook and Chremes is a farmer and plays the part of the man who gives the destitute prodigal a job minding pigs during the famine. Also involved in this section of the play is Pamphagus, a parasite (his name, παμφαγος, comes from Aristotle and means "all-devouring") who is chiefly responsible for Acolastus' downfall, Pantolabus (the name of a parasite in Horaces's Satires I, 8, 11, and II, 1, 22), and Lais, who, like her famous Corinthian counterpart, is a noted courtesan.

It is in this middle section of the play that Gnapheus elaborates most on the parable. Yet it should be pointed out that in his expansion of the phrases "dissipavit substantiam suam vivendo luxuriose" (verse 13) and "devoravit substantiam suam cum meretricibus" (verse 30), he is following the same tradition as that which, for example, permitted the creators of the stained glass windows in the French cathedrals to devote as much as one third of their available space to similar scenes.[66] An account of the extent of this tradition in iconographic versions of the parable has already been given in the previous chapter. Some literary treatments of the scenes had also already appeared as can be seen, for example, in Courtois d'Arras (see above, Ch. I, p. 46), in Castellano Castellani's Rappresentazione del Figliuol Prodigo (fifteenth century), and in Burkard Waldis' play Der Parabell vom verlornen Sohn (1527),[67] and such elaborations on the details

of the prodigal's life in the far country were already familiar material for sermons, as we saw in Chapter I. The only thing which need surprise us perhaps is that an author of the Christian Terence, who by definition is endeavouring to prevent his pupils from being in contact with the immoralities of Roman comedy, should devote so much space to such an entertaining picture of roguery and debauchery. But possibly Gnapheus shared Elyot's view that such things were permissable if they were "undoubtedly a picture or as it were a mirror of man's life, wherein evil is not taught but discovered; to the intent that men beholding the promptness of youth unto vice, the snares of harlots and bawds laid for young minds, the deceit of servants, the chances of fortune contrary to men's expectation, they being thereof warned may prepare themself to resist or prevent occasion."[68]

In these scenes Acolastus, arriving in the far country with the ten talents which constitute his portion, falls into the hands of Pamphagus and Pantolabus who promptly conduct him to Sannio's house. Enough provisions for ten people are ordered. Flute-players arrive along with Lais who is followed by a train of maid-servants.[69] Acolastus, enamoured of Lais, gives her a gold necklace before they both retire to bed (III, v). The next day Acolastus is cheated of the remainder of his money at dice by Pamphagus. Sannio and Lais demand payment, and Acolastus is stripped of his clothing and put out into the street to the accompaniment of a blow from Lais (IV, v). As was seen in the previous chapter, all these

elements, including the game of dice and the beating from the courtesan, are traditional, so that in one sense Gnapheus cannot be considered such an innovator with regard to his adaptation of the parable as might at first seem.[70] Nevertheless it is important to realize that in this, the most influential of all the Prodigal Son plays, almost three fifths of the action was devoted to the protagonist's life in the far country. That such scenes must have proved highly popular seems very likely from the fact that they soon form a staple ingredient of most Prodigal Son plays, particularly those written in the manner of the Christian Terence. Presumably their inclusion was thought to be morally justifiable, perhaps for the reasons mentioned by Elyot in the passage from The Governor just quoted.

Before leaving our discussion of this play a number of other features need a brief mention. First it should be pointed out that the contradictions noted above in the presentation of Pelargus are not the only ones in the play. In giving his work a classical setting in imitation of Terence, Gnapheus has been unable to avoid mixing references to pagan gods with Christian terminology. In one speech, for example, Eubulus talks of the gods ("Deos" III, iii, 6, p. 107) and at the same time of God ("deum" III, iii, 1, p. 109). Elsewhere allusions to Venus (II, ii, 13, p. 74), Mercury (IV, iv, 6, p. 138), Jupiter (IV, vi, 17, p. 146), the gods ("deorum" IV, vi, 3, p. 149) and Pan (IV, vii, 3, p. 152) are interspersed with allusions to such specifically Christian concepts as our

first parents ("patres" III, iii, 2, p. 113), God ("Deus" III, iii, 6, p. 113), "the byble boke" ("bibliorum codex" I, iv, 9, p. 57), and heaven ("caelum" V, v, 6, p. 173), not forgetting the use of actual words and phrases from the New Testament parable towards the end of the play. That Gnapheus has not been completely able to solve this aspect of the problem of adapting his Christian story to a Classical setting is clear, but, unlike the weaknesses in the presentation of Pelargus, such contradictions do not obscure the main issues which Gnapheus is trying to communicate in his interpretation of the parable: God's willingness to forgive fallen mankind if he repents, the idea that there is a heavenly plan governing the workings of God's purpose in the world, and the idea that the more mankind grieves at being in conflict with God, the more he may rejoice at being restored through God's grace. This interpretation has certain additional facets. As mentioned earlier Acolastus' sin in leaving his father is depicted as being that of arrogant self-love. At the beginning of the play it is also suggested that he is heir to a kingdom (I, i, 10, p. 27), having been chosen as such by Pelargus. Not for a moment does it appear that we are expected to take this literally. This is not to be a play where, as in Shakespeare's Henry IV, we are to be shown the dangers threatening a country in which the heir to the throne is a prodigal. Instead what Gnapheus seems to intend is that the kingdom referred to be taken allegorically to refer to the heavenly kingdom to which mankind is heir.

Throughout the work there is a great deal of play upon the words "king" and "kingdom" designed to bring out this facet of Gnapheus' interpretation of the parable. Once Acolastus has left his father and given up his heirdom, ironically one of the first things he does is to remark how the world adores him and how he considers himself to be a king (II, iii, 2, p. 86). Later Pantolabus addresses him as "thrice great king" ("Ter maxime rex" II, iii, 5, p. 87), and later still from a king Acolastus suddenly becomes a beggar and his understanding of this is very much part of his self-realization in IV, vi, when he has been beaten from Sannio's house ("Ex rege nummato ampliter, repente inops / Mendicus" IV, vi, 4-5, p. 147) and in V, ii, when he is herding swine and speaks of his former glories as a king ("Rex pridem splendidissimus" V, ii, 7, p. 160).[71] His restoration to his father thus also implies a restoration to his kingdom, that is to say, to the heavenly kingdom to which God has made man heir.

In this way Gnapheus manages to create a series of reminders throughout the play of the "mystery" hidden beneath the surface of his plot which he only explains fully in the Epilogue. One matter possibly related to this stress on Acolastus as an heir is the fact that Gnapheus has completely ignored the episode of the elder brother. Acolastus is twice referred to as a younger son ("Iuniorum" Argvmentvm Comoediae, line 3, p. 23, and "Minor ille natu" I, i, 7, p. 29), but this fact is ignored where the question of heirdom is concerned. Perhaps the elder brother is left out simply in order

that we should not question the idea of Acolastus' being heir, but more likely, I believe, is the possibility that the episode was excluded in order to allow more space to deal with Acolastus' life in the far country. Also perhaps Gnapheus felt, as some theologians have done, that verses 25-32 of the parable form a separate entity and are an unnecessary incursion into an otherwise completely satisfactory plot. Why carry over the faults of the original into one's dramatic adaptation?

This then is the work which Palsgrave translated so enthusiastically into English in 1540. Apart from the fragmentary adaptation of Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor its appearance is the first sign that the great popularity of the Prodigal Son plays, already established at that time on the Continent, was to be shared by English authors and audiences. Perhaps through Palsgrave's text, but more probably through first-hand contact with the original Latin play, Acolastus became widely-known in England. Its demonstration of the adaptability of the parable to Terentian dramatic form and all that that implied for the authors of the Christian Terence did not go unnoticed, as will be seen, for example, in our later discussion of Gascoigne's Glasse of Governement, and as a measure of its literary influence we have already remarked upon works by Lyly and Samuel Nicholson. In its exploitation of the potential of the parable for purposes of religious polemic it pointed the way for a number of English playwrights who were able to advance their own individual re-

ligious points of view according to the manner in which they treated the parable. Finally in its lively and entertaining scenes depicting the dissipated life of the prodigal in the far country it helped lay the foundation for many similar scenes which were to occur in future plays of the period, although, as we shall see in a moment, the native English Morality plays had already exploited the entertainment value of such episodes in somewhat similar scenes.

The Morality Plays

In the first chapter I mentioned that the Morality plays were related to the Prodigal Son plays in that both show a common concern with the theme of God's mercy towards sinful and ungrateful man. Indeed it is perhaps surprising that the authors of the early Moralities prior to 1500 did not make use of the parable, so close was its pattern and theme to what they were attempting to communicate in their plays. Instead, as we have seen, the parable appears to have been ignored in England as a potential source for plays until well into the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, since many of the early Prodigal Son plays owe so much to the dramatic traditions of the early Morality plays, I feel that it is worthwhile at this point to mention certain features of these earlier plays which later recur in varying degrees in the Prodigal Son plays. In this way I hope to show that, although there is a strong Continental influence on some of the early English Prodigal Son plays, there is also to be taken into account the influence of a strong native dramatic tradi-

tion which plays a part in determining how English authors chose to adapt the parable for dramatic representation.

Earlier I pointed out that the chief difference between the parable of the Prodigal Son and the two parables which immediately precede it in Luke 15 consists of a shift in emphasis from God's active role in seeking the erring soul of mankind to a consideration of the development of repentance in the heart of man himself and of his return to God. In much the same way where the Miracle plays had dramatized the spiritual history of the Judeo-Christian civilization together with Christ's life, either as depicted in the New Testament or as typified and allegedly prefigured in the Old Testament, the Morality plays focus their attention on man himself. In this they demonstrate an eschatological bias, a feature, of course, which has much in common with most of the interpretations of the Prodigal Son parable mentioned in the previous chapter.

The basic message of the Moralities as a group concerns God's mercy to erring mankind. This theme results in many of the plays having a plot pattern not unlike that of the parable of the Prodigal Son which according to most interpreters conveys this same message. The plays commonly begin by depicting mankind in a state of youthful innocence, although in Everyman (ca. 1495-1500), which in many respects is an exception, Everyman has already fallen. More typical is the manner in which Humanum Genus in The Castell of Perseverance (early fifteenth century) enters naked, saying that "this nyth

I was of moder born,"[72] or Anima in Wisdom (1450-1500) enters "as a mayde" desiring to marry Wysdom,[73] or the naked Infans in the later Mundus et Infans (ca. 1500-22), the representative of mankind at the age of seven (the age commonly associated by the Catholic Church with the attainment in the individual of moral and spiritual responsibility).[74] At this early stage mankind is frequently given good advice to aid him in his journey through life. In The Castell, for example, this is delivered by Bonus Angelus, in Wisdom by the title-character who is identified as Christ, and in Mankind by Mercy. Perhaps in these scenes of advice may be seen the source of the advice scenes which often occur in the Prodigal Son plays between the father or some other adviser and the protagonist before the last-named leaves for the far country, although in point of fact these occur in Acolastus (see especially the scene between Pelargus and Acolastus in I, iii), so that the Moralities must not be thought of as the only source for such scenes in later English Prodigal Son plays.[75]

In the Morality plays the protagonist then goes out into the world.[76] In The Castell, for example, man is symbolically taken to the World's stage by Malus Angelus where he is "clad in clothis newe."[77] It is interesting that this same symbolic use of clothes also occurs at the very opening of Mundus et Infans where the naked child (before going off to "playe") is clothed by Mundus.[78] In Mankind New Guise persuades Mankynde to sell his gown for a new-fashioned jacket, in Nature (ca. 1490-ca. 1501) the World gives Man

clothes, and in The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene (ca. 1550-66) Mary's fashionable clothes are an important indication of her fallen state.[79] Clothes are also made use of symbolically in Magnyfycence (1515-23) in which the title-character, after leading a prodigal existence, meets Adversyte who beats him and takes away all his goods and fine clothes. Reduced to beggary, Magnyfycence is at first not recognised by his former courtiers. Later, after he has begged for forgiveness, he is given some new clothes by Redress. This technique of depicting spiritual laxness by showing the sinner's desire for rich clothing and, as is clearly shown in Nature,[80] of re-enacting Adam's first act of putting on clothes after the Fall, is a commonplace of medieval literature. As one writer put it:

> I holde hym a fole that wolde be proud to weere a garnement that were but a tokne of his fadre schame and his owene. This is the right tokenynge of clothing, that was founded for no thing but for the synne of oure first fadre for to hyle his confusion, that is his vndoynge and oures.[81]

This theme is thus not peculiar to the Moralities. However, it is worth noting here, since, as has already been seen in the descriptions given above of iconographic representations of the parable of the Prodigal Son, costly garments are also a traditional feature of the prodigal's way of life in the far country prior to his dramatic loss of them at the hands of the courtesans and prior to the final all-important bestowal of the "prima stola" by his father when he returns.

Once he has gone into the world, the protagonist of the Moralities is beset by temptation just as the Prodigal

Son in many of the iconographic versions of the parable is enticed into a tavern by courtesans. The tavern also occurs as a symbolic locale for all manner of vices in a number of the Moralities, particularly the later ones where the conflict between vices and virtues is apt to be replaced by the dramatic representation of some specific temptation. In the Digby Mystery Mary Magdalene (ca. 1480-1520), which is part Mystery and part Morality play, there is a tavern scene showing Mary with Luxurya and a gallant called Curiosity who seduces her.[82] In Part One of Nature, Man repairs to a tavern at one point and we hear that he has made friends there with Lechery, Envy, Wrath, Gluttony, Covetise and Sloth and has dismissed Reason.[83] In The Four Elements (ca. 1517-ca. 1518) Sensuality takes Humanity to a tavern and there follow two scenes involving a taverner.[84] In Mankind at one point, Mankynd declares he will go to the ale-house,[85] and a little later he promises to go there on a Sunday. Here, of course, we are reminded of the section of Piers Plowman discussed in the previous chapter. In Wisdom a similar function to that of the tavern is performed by the notorious area of Holborn where man finds opportunity for all manner of sins. In such scenes there are plainly very close similarities with the corresponding scenes in Prodigal Son plays depicting the prodigal's dissipated living in the far country.

At this point in the Moralities the central motif of the Psychomachia comes into its own as the forces of good and evil debate and do battle (in The Castell an actual siege

occurs) over possession of man's soul. Mankind appears lost to the forces of evil, just as the Prodigal Son succumbs to all the vices of the tavern. At this point, however, Conscience in some form or other arrives on the scene. In Wisdom it is the title-character who enters and reminds man that "Dethe, to euery creature certen ys."[86] In Mankind it is Mercy who performs this role, in Mundus et Infans it is Consyence and Perseueraunce, in Youth (1513-29) it is Charity and Humility and in Hickscorner (ca. 1513-16) it is Contemplacyon and Perseveraunce who significantly give new garments to Frewyll and Imagynacyon, two of the vices who are converted, the protagonist having disappeared before the end of the play.[87] This episode corresponds to the prodigal's self-realization, and just as the prodigal may at this point (as he was in Acolastus) be beset by despair, the deadliest of all sins, so too in the Morality plays this sin may appear at this time. In Magnyfycence (1515-23) Dyspare enters in person claiming that the sins of Magnyfycence are too great for mercy. In Wisdom, somewhat early in the play, Lucyfer says of mankind, "So with dyspeyer I xall hym qwell."[88] Despair is also alluded to in Nature and in The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene it is represented as acute.[89] In Mankind, to give yet another example, the protagonist is beset by the thought that "The egall justyse of God wyll not permytte sych a synfull wrech / To be rewyvyed & restoryd a-geyn: yt were Impossibyll."[90] And in Mundus et Infans man is on the verge of despair, but is given a timely warning by

Perseveraunce:

> Nay, nay, Manhode, saye not so!
> Be-ware of Wanhope, . . .[91]

In the Moralities, as in representations of the parable of the Prodigal Son where the prodigal is threatened by despair, the appearance of this sin enables the dramatist to emphasize the Christian teaching that God's mercy is always in excess of a repentant sinner's faults. The way to reconciliation with God is thus always open--the very point which Marlowe's Faustus fails to perceive. We have already seen in Chapter I how one medieval sermon writer and Calvin, in their interpretations of the parable of the Prodigal Son, made this the central point of their exegeses, and for our purposes it is significant that this same point is central to the message of the Moralities. Nowhere in the Moralities does it receive a clearer statement than in The Castell where, after the death of Humanum Genus, the four heavenly virtues or Daughters of God debate the fate of his soul. Truth and Justice demand, like the elder brother in the parable, that the sinner be treated according to the letter of the law, whereas Mercy and Peace request forgiveness. But God, like the father in the parable, grants forgiveness to the sinner and bids him sit at his right hand. Here we have that basis for a link with the Prodigal Son parable that was mentioned in the previous chapter and which was exploited iconographically by Anthonisz and Vasari in their allegorical representations of the parable.

In Mankind an interesting qualification is made con-

cerning mercy when Mercy warns Mankynde of the danger of sinning whilst at the same time expecting mercy to follow: "Synne not in hope of mercy! that ys a cryme notary; / To truste ouermoche In a prince, yt ys not expedient."[92] This is in accord with Owst's conclusion that medieval moralists of all classes considered that "'presumpcion and over-hopynge in the mercy of God' is one if not actually the most potent and deadly of current popular heresies."[93] Owst quotes a number of sermons to illustrate this point including passages from Bromyard and Dr. John Waldeby. Both writers are highly critical of the tendency of many preachers to emphasize God's boundless mercy. Waldeby says,

> There is a fish in the sea, in whose mouth the bitterest water turns to sweetness. Therefore on account of the sweet water the little fishes are attracted to his mouth. But when they have got inside it, he swallows them up, rends them with his teeth, and slays them. So, spiritually speaking, the preacher who always talks of the piety and pity of God, and of the sweetness of the Lord Jesus to sinners, pleases them hugely and right gladly do they listen to him. . . . But assuredly when the preacher dwells too much on the divine mercy, and says nought of punishment, he makes the people presume too greatly on the mercy of God, and thus to lie and perish in their sins.[94]

That such a point of view should later recur in the Moralities suggests that it had a continuing currency. This could mean that in some quarters the Moralities, and by implication the traditional interpretation of the parable of the Prodigal Son, were not too popular. This is of particular interest to us in this study since a number of the Prodigal Son plays of Protestant origin deliberately distorted the parable in order to insist that mercy was not so easily come by as the parable might suggest. That there are anticipations of this

point of view prior to the Reformation is consequently an important consideration if one suggests that the changes made by Protestant writers to the basic pattern of the parable derived solely from a religious point of view peculiar to Protestant thought.

Apart from similarities of theme and plot-pattern, the Moralities also anticipate the Prodigal Son plays in certain other ways. A Morality is, of course, by definition an allegory and, as has already been shown, the parable of the Prodigal Son customarily lent itself to allegorical interpretation. As for the Prodigal Son plays these also, as we saw in the case of Acolastus, can be allegorical in varying degrees. In fact one of the great fascinations of many of the Prodigal Son plays is the problem of deciding to what degree a particular work is allegorical.

Another way in which the Prodigal Son plays are related to the Moralities concerns the central character in each. In the Moralities this is Mankind, and, as I have pointed out, he may be represented as passing through different stages of his life from infancy to old age. Certain of the Moralities, however, show mankind only in his youth. Plays such as Hickscorner, Youth and The Four Elements, by concerning themselves only with this one stage, anticipate the Prodigal Son plays where the central figure is an erring youth.

The Four Elements and certain other Moralities such as Wit and Science (1531-47) also anticipate some of the con-

cerns of the Prodigal Son plays by dealing with the theme of education. In such plays the familiar model of the assault of the vices on mankind tends to be replaced by an analogous struggle for knowledge. As A.P. Rossiter has said, the "educational" Moralities are the voice of the "new men,"[95] be they lawyers, financiers, civil servants or school-teachers, who are concerned with the importance of the New Learning both for its own sake and for its value to society. Such works are consequently apt to include Ignorance and Idleness as very important figures in the hierarchy of vices, and in this, one can see a shift away from the eschatological bias of the early Moralities as schoolmasters take up their pens to urge upon their pupils virtues which are conceived of as academic and worldly rather than spiritual. Nowhere is this change more clearly revealed than in a passage in Redford's Wit and Science where Wit, the youthful protagonist, fears he has lost out in his attempt to woo Science, the daughter of Experience and Reason:

> Alas! that lady I have now lost
> Whome all the world lovth and honoryth most!
> Alas! from Reson had I not varyd,
> Ladye Science or this I had maryd;
> And those fower gyftes which the World gave her
> I had woon, to, had I kept her favor;
> Where now, in-stede of that lady bryght
> Wyth all those gallantes seene in my syght,--
> Favor, Ryches, ye, Worshyp and Fame,--
> I have woone Hatred, Beggry and Open Shame.[96]

Wit's despair over the loss of "Favor, Ryches, . . . Worshyp and Fame" is clearly a far cry from the despair of the protagonist of Mankind who feels that God's mercy may be denied him. As I noted at the end of the previous chapter, this

tendency to place utilitarian rather than spiritual values on education and to shift away from an eschatological bias towards an increasing concern with life in this world is part of the growth of the so-called Protestant ethic. Since a number of the Prodigal Son plays were also written by schoolmasters for the enlightenment of their pupils, and since some of these plays also show a deep concern with the education of youth, together with the same shift away from an eschatological bias in their interpretation of their central theme, a further link between the Moralities and the Prodigal Son plays may be discerned.

Lusty Juventus

By common consent the earliest Prodigal Son play to be written originally in English is Wever's Lusty Juventus (1547-53).[97] It might be argued, I believe, that the work is not really a Prodigal Son play in the sense that the author is not really attempting to follow the narrative pattern of the New Testament parable. Instead he is refashioning for the purposes of religious polemic the familiar plot-pattern of Moralities like Mundus et Infans, Youth and Hickscorner. Nevertheless I feel that the work should be included in this discussion for two reasons: first because it has unhesitatingly been categorised as a Prodigal Son play by such writers as Lily Campbell and Madeleine Doran,[98] and second because its author is the first native writer to show a conscious awareness of the connection between the Morality pattern and that of the parable of the Prodigal Son. This last point is

made clear towards the end of the work where the repentant Juventus is assured of God's grace,[99] and we may therefore consider the work as a transition between the Morality type in general and the Prodigal Son type in particular.

The work, which was almost certainly written during the reign of Edward VI, is both topical and violently anti-Catholic.[100] The play opens with a Prologue by a Messenger who cites the harsh and restrictive view of youth given in Ecclesiasticus:

> An untamed horse will be hard, saith he,
> And a wanton child wilful will be.
> (p. 3)

After the Messenger has given a brief summary of the plot, Juventus enters and in ironic contrast to the stern speech of the Messenger sings of the pleasures of youth (p. 4).[101] There follows an advice scene in which Good Counsel, referring to St. Paul to the Ephesians and to Deuteronomy, urges Juventus to give up his dreams of pleasure and idleness and "walk circumspectly, redeeming the time" (p. 6). His emphasis on the letter of the Scripture and the necessity of following the Law as defined there immediately sets the Protestant tenor of the work. Good Counsel then goes on to tell him of the importance of continual prayer:

> That it might please the Lord omnipotent
> To send unto you his holy spirit and comforter,
> Which will lead you every day and hour
> Unto the knowledge of his word and verity,
> Wherein you may learn to live most christianly.
> (p. 8)

Again, with pointed lack of any reference to the role of the Church, we have a very Protestant bias. Knowledge then ar-

rives and, like Good Counsel, quotes from the Old Testament as to the importance of obeying the Law (p. 10), and he also stresses the Lutheran concept of justification being primarily through faith rather than works (pp. 10-11).

If we have the parable in our minds, what Good Counsel then adds to Juventus' instruction comes as something of a shock:

> Though your elders were blind, doubt not you therefore;
> For Saint Peter saith, vain is the conversations
> Which ye receive by your elders' traditions.
> (p. 11)

Our would-be prodigal is thus being pointedly urged not to follow anything he might have been told by his father. This, of course, is quite alien to the New Testament parable and to most of the earlier Moralities. Here, however, I think we can take it that by "elders" Wever has in mind the fact that the older generation at the time the play was written would have been brought up as Catholics, or, as Knowledge puts it, "wrapped in ignorance, / Being deceived by false preachers" (p. 11). For one of Wever's religious inclinations, it would hardly do for the young to follow in the footsteps of their fathers.

Once Juventus has been given a copy of "Christ's testament" (p. 12) (reminding one of the scene in which Acolastus is given the "bibliorum codex,") he goes off into the world (p. 14). A scene follows in which the forces of evil, in this instance the Devil and Hypocrisy, plan Juventus' downfall.[102] Hypocrisy formulates a plan by which Juventus will

be seduced first by Fellowship and then by Abominable Living, a whore whose name later turns out to be Bess, although Hypocrisy introduces her as Honesty. When Hypocrisy and Juventus meet, the former chides the latter for wanting to go to hear a sermon where in all likelihood he will hear nothing that he did not already know. He also reverses Good Counsel's earlier argument about the teachings of one's elders:

> Was there not as well-learned men before as now?
> Yea, and better too, I may say to you?
> And they taught the younger sort of people
> By the elders to take an example.
> (p. 24)

He then accuses Juventus of presumption:

> Now every boy will be a teacher,
> The father a fool, and the child a preacher;
> This is a pretty gear:
> The foul presumption of youth.
> (p. 24)

Again in contrast to most Moralities concerned with youth and certainly in contrast to many Prodigal Son plays, Wever is here implying that youth should not follow the advice of the older generation but should follow instead the promptings of its own conscience, here allegorized in the persons of Good Counsel and Knowledge.

In the face of Hypocrisy's arguments, Juventus' former good intentions soon evaporate and Hypocrisy introduces him to Fellowship. Inevitably Bess is sent for and Juventus kisses her and adds the sins of swearing and blasphemy to that of bawdry. The roisterers then go off, presumably so that youth may "fulfil his own mind, / As the course of nature doth him bind" (p. 32). Good Counsel appears and laments Ju-

ventus' downfall and the general follies of the times. When Juventus returns he is looking for a game of dice to join, thereby adding yet another of the sins traditionally associated with the Prodigal Son's dissipations. When Good Counsel rebukes him, we are again reminded of the Prodigal when Juventus replies,

> What hast thou to do, and if I lose my coat?
> I will trill the bones, while I have one groat;
> And, when there is no more ink in the pen,
> I will make a shift, as well as other men.
> (p. 34)

Good Counsel then goes on to list Juventus' sins which include whoredom, pride, swearing and religious hypocrisy ("yet ye are a great gospeller in the mouth" p. 36). In addition Juventus has engaged in the traditional concern of the Prodigal Son with fine clothes ("To avance [sic] your flesh, you cut and jag your clothes" p. 36).

At this point Juventus, like the Prodigal Son, comes to himself. However, it should be noted that, unlike his New Testament counterpart, Juventus has not been materially reduced to desperate straits. Nevertheless, Good Counsel's words have a similar effect on him, and he is reduced to despair, like many of the protagonists of the Moralities and like the Prodigal Son in certain iconographic and literary versions of the parable:

> Alas, alas! what have I wrought and done!
> Here in this place I will fall down desperate;
> To ask for mercy now, I know, it is too late.
> Alas, alas! that ever I was begat!
> I would to God I had never been born!
> (p. 36)

Good Counsel then reminds Juventus of God's promises concerning the repentant sinner, and this statement of the way in which God's mercy always exceeds man's sin reminds us of the particular interpretation Calvin chose to give to the parable of the Prodigal Son (see above, Ch. I, p.27):

> Ah, wretched creature, what doest thou surmise?
> Thinkest not that God's mercy doth exceed thy sin?
> Remember his Merciful Promises, and comfort thyself
> in him.
>
> (p. 37)

It is here that God's Promises enters and reminds the repentant Juventus that

> For me his mercy sake thou shalt obtain his grace,
> And not for thine own desertes, this must thou know;
> For my sake alone, ye shall receive solace;
> For my sake alone, he will thee mercy show.
>
> (p. 38)

Here Wever is plainly alluding to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, a doctrine he has already referred to earlier in the play. This is significant, since, as we saw in Chapter I, Luther and other Reformists interpreted the parable as evidence that salvation was to be achieved through faith, and not works. As if thinking along these very lines himself, Wever now has Good Counsel remind Juventus of the parable:

> The prodigal son, as in Luke we read:
> Which in vicious living his good doth waste,
> As soon as his living he had remembered,
> To confess his wretchedness he was not aghast;
> Wherefore his father lovingly him embrac'd,
> And was right joyful, the text saith plain,
> Because his son was returnen again.
>
> (p. 39)

Having now realised that "Broad and pleasant is the path which leadeth unto pain, / But unto eternal life full

narrow is the way" (p. 39), Juventus launches into a long speech addressed to "All Christian people which be here present" (p. 40) in which he points out to them the lesson of his encounter with the devil's temptations, telling them to put their trust in the Law, to set their delight both day and night on Christ's Testament, and not to credit all things "unto the outward show." The play then closes with the traditional call to prayer for "the prosperous estate of our noble and virtuous king, / That in his godly proceedings he may still persevere" (p. 41).

Lusty Juventus may not be quite the full-fledged Prodigal Son play that Acolastus is, but it is nevertheless a significant work for the purposes of this study since it demonstrates most clearly a transition between the established plot-pattern of the earlier Moralities already familiar to English audiences and that of the Prodigal Son plays as introduced into England by the adaptation of Textor's dialogue and the translation by Palsgrave of Gnapheus' Acolastus. Not only is the plot-pattern of Lusty Juventus on the whole very close to that of the Prodigal Son parable, but more significantly the author displays an awareness of this fact. From here it is only a small step to the incorporation of the narrative pattern of the New Testament parable, which was already popular in European school plays, into the native English forms of religious drama. Furthermore Wever's engagement in religious polemic, like that of Gnapheus, points the way for other English authors of Prodigal Son plays who chose to adapt

the parable in such a way as to propound their own religious views.

Nice Wanton

Contemporary with Lusty Juventus is another late Morality play, the anonymous Prodigal Son play Nice Wanton. The first extant edition of this work is dated 1560 but like Lusty Juventus it probably dates from the reign of Edward VI since the king (not, however, specified) is referred to several times in the play,[103] and even in the final speech where the word "queens" is used it is made to rhyme with "things," indicating that "kings" was probably the original word used (p. 114). The play was thought by Chambers to be an adaptation of the Rebelles (published 1535) of Macropedius, a contemporary fellow-countryman of Gnapheus,[104] and if this were true, one would have yet another example, though of a somewhat different kind from that furnished by Acolastus, of an established link between the Dutch Prodigal Son plays and the English versions. However, the evidence provided by a comparison of the two plays does not, I believe, support such an idea, and it is hard to see how Chambers arrived at this conclusion, unless he accepted over-readily the statement of Brandl who calls Nice Wanton "an obvious adaptation of the Rebelles of the Dutch Rector Macropedius, though with all kinds of original variations."[105]

The plot of Rebelles had concerned two boys whose indulgent mothers transferred them from one school to another with the request that they be exempted from corporal punish-

ment.[106] The boys naturally take advantage of this and are soon at their pranks, for which the schoolmaster, Aristippus, nonetheless gives them a beating. Their mothers, Philotecnium and Cacolalia, then remove them from the school and set them up in trade, but the boys soon go off to a tavern where scenes of dissipation like those in Acolastus occur. They call for meretrices, are cheated at play by two rogues and are then thrown out of the house minus both clothes and money. They then rob a sleeping farmer for which they are arrested and condemned to death. After being petitioned by the boys' mothers the schoolmaster is able by a legal technicality to deliver the boys from the magistrate as subject to his correction rather than that of the civil powers. With newly-acquired humility the two repentant boys beg their schoolmaster's forgiveness. But justice must be done, and he gives them a sound flogging before he goes off to a feast with the parents and neighbours.

The plot of Nice Wanton, on the other hand, concerns three children, Barnabas, Ismael and Dalilah. Barnabas is a virtuous youth who goes to school, works hard at his studies and never fails to give prudent advice to his badly-behaved brother and sister who throw away their school-books (just as Acolastus threw away his "bibliorum codex") and take to licentious living, stealing and playing dice with Iniquity. At no point does the schoolmaster appear, and there is, of course, only one mother, although she does play a major role in the play. At the end of the work Dalilah is "dead of the pox

taken at the stews" (p. 111) and Ismael's body is hung in chains after he has been hanged. From this summary of their plots, it can be plainly seen that the differences between the two works are too many and too major to allow one to think of Nice Wanton as an adaptation of one of the better-known plays of the Christian Terence into the form of the English Morality.

Looking more closely at Nice Wanton we see that the pattern of the original parable has been altered in a number of significant ways. Most important is the manner in which, within the scope of the play, there is no clear statement that ultimately forgiveness and reconciliation have been accorded to the sinners. The Calvinistic bias behind this point of view becomes more explicit when we learn that Barnabas, though one of "Three branches of an ill tree" (p. 94), has nevertheless been given "special grace" by means of which he may avoid sin. This becomes clear when Eulalia, a neighbour, complains to Xantippe, the mother of the three children in the play. After accusing Ismael of being "light-fingered" and hinting that Dalilah has some "nice tricks three or four," she goes on to speak of Barnabas:

> But your other son is good, and no thanks to you!
> (p. 99)

For some reason, Barnabas in spite of being spared the rod, has not fallen into evil ways, something for which his mother Xantippe deserves no credit. It is Barnabas himself who later in the play suggests the explanation for his being an exception to the apparent rule that "children, brought up in idle-

ness and play, / Unthrifty and disobedient continue alway" (p. 98). Addressing his mother he says,

> In that God preserved me, small thank to you:
> If God had not given me special grace,
> To avoid evil and do good, this is true,
> I had lived and died in as wretched case,
> As they did, for I had both suffrance and space;
> But it is an old proverb, you have heard it, I think:
> That God will have see, shall not wink.
> (p. 112)

Of relevance here is Dalilah's claim earlier in the play. After describing her physical state, which includes all the more obvious signs of tertiary syphilis,[107] she suggests that she has deserved her present wretchedness because she is devoid of grace:

> Where I was fair and amiable of face,
> Now am I foul and horrible to see;
> All this I have deserved for lack of grace;
> Justly for my sins God doth plague me.
> (pp. 104-5)

There is, of course, an implicit contradiction here. If the proverb of which the Messenger in the Prologue reminds his hearers is true (i.e. "He that spareth the rod, the child doth hate"), then logically all three children should have gone astray. W. Roy Mackenzie points out this contradiction when he remarks that "the working out of the lesson has been confused by the employment of individual persons, who may turn out good or bad irrespective of parentage or training."[108] What Mackenzie does not see, however, is that this basic contradiction derives not so much from the use of "individuals and specialized types" rather than "personified abstractions"[109] as from the imposition of a theological doctrine upon a basic narrative pattern which is fundamentally contradictory to it.

Furthermore, the author has confused two somewhat contradictory Protestant concerns. On the one hand he has shown a predeterministic bias by depicting Barnabas as apparently one of the elect while Dalilah and Ismael appear not to have been so chosen. On the other hand a major theme of the play concerns itself with the fact that, since man is prone to evil from his youth, education is vital in the struggle to turn him from his "natural wont evil." This was a concept of education which Protestants held very dear, but it is one that is not easy to reconcile with Calvinistic thought regarding Election and Predestination.

Where the pro-Lutheran Acolastus had utilised the pattern of the parable to demonstrate the concept of man's fall being part of a pattern of "mera necessitas" which eventually opened the way for a display of God's infinite mercy, and where Lusty Juventus had stressed the importance of faith as opposed to works, we now have a version of the parable which implies a concept of divine grace which appears to make divine mercy harder to come by. One is, in Nice Wanton, strongly reminded more of Calvin's remarks on Election and Predestination in the Commentaries than of his interpretation of the parable discussed in the previous chapter:

> But if the election of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was a free act of God, we must conclude that the individuals whom God singles out from the whole body are freely chosen. And so I come to the fourth step . . . For when many who are descended from Jacob according to the flesh are rejected no less than Esau, it is clear that when God elects individual men his choice is governed by his free favor and compassion. . . . It seems harsh to many to think that God chooses some and rejects others, and does not consider men's worth, that by his own free will he chooses whom he pleases and moreover rejects others.[110]

Furthermore, the author has confused two somewhat contradictory Protestant concerns. On the one hand he has shown a predeterministic bias by depicting Barnabas as apparently one of the elect while Dalilah and Ismael appear not to have been so chosen. On the other hand a major theme of the play concerns itself with the fact that, since man is prone to evil from his youth, education is vital in the struggle to turn him from his "natural wont evil." This was a concept of education which Protestants held very dear, but it is one that is not easy to reconcile with Calvinistic thought regarding Election and Predestination.

Where the pro-Lutheran Acolastus had utilised the pattern of the parable to demonstrate the concept of man's fall being part of a pattern of "mera necessitas" which eventually opened the way for a display of God's infinite mercy, and where Lusty Juventus had stressed the importance of faith as opposed to works, we now have a version of the parable which implies a concept of divine grace which appears to make divine mercy harder to come by. One is, in Nice Wanton, strongly reminded more of Calvin's remarks on Election and Predestination in the Commentaries than of his interpretation of the parable discussed in the previous chapter:

> But if the election of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was a free act of God, we must conclude that the individuals whom God singles out from the whole body are freely chosen. And so I come to the fourth step . . . For when many who are descended from Jacob according to the flesh are rejected no less than Esau, it is clear that when God elects individual men his choice is governed by his free favor and compassion. . . . It seems harsh to many to think that God chooses some and rejects others, and does not consider men's worth, that by his own free will he chooses whom he pleases and moreover rejects others.[110]

Thus where those English Catholic Moralities discussed earlier had shown the path from sin to salvation open to all mankind, and where traditional interpretations of the parable of the Prodigal Son had normally been concerned with the same theme, in Nice Wanton we have a version of the theme of erring youth in which the prodigals are displayed in a manner which implies that they are unalterably damned from the beginning. In point of fact this is not quite the case for, as Barnabas explains to Xantippe, both Ismael and Dalilah repent of their sins before dying, thereby opening the way to salvation:

> Yet in this we may all take comfort:
> They took great repentance, I heard say,
> And as for my sister, I am able to report,
> She lamented for her sins to her dying day:
> To repent and believe I exhorted her alway;
> Before her death she believed, that God of his mercy,
> For Christ's sake would save her eternally.
> (p. 113)

However, the important point, and one which distinguishes this play from a Prodigal Son play such as Acolastus, is that we are given no sign within the play itself as to whether or not Ismael and Dalilah are forgiven. They may repent, but we do not learn whether or not they were after all among those elect who "alone by God's grace are drawn away from destruction."[111] Because there is no sign of reconciliation with God (the climax of the Biblical parable as usually interpreted), the emphasis in Nice Wanton remains centred on the sin and tragic fates of Ismael and Dalilah together with the virtuous and edifying spectacle of Barnabas.

It follows that where the concentration in the plays

so far discussed (with the exception of the English adaptation of Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor) had been upon the eschatological implications of the pattern of the parable, what we have now is an emphasis on cause and effect as they affect man in this world, and in particular on the sufferings that will be experienced as the price of sin. Perhaps some justification for this emphasis on worldly suffering can be found in the original parable in the section where the Prodigal Son suffers hunger and rejection. Nevertheless there is a fundamental distinction between his suffering and that of Ismael. In the parable, as traditional interpretations make clear, the prodigal's physical hunger is symbolic of his spiritual hunger, or, as the writer of one medieval sermon put it, "for a verier beggere is ther noon bodely than is a synnefull man goostely."[112] The prodigal has only to return to his father to be fed and clothed, both literally and in the spiritual sense. In Nice Wanton, however, the physical sufferings of the sinners are not so much symbolic of a spiritual condition as the effect of it. Furthermore this physical condition is not in any way alleviated by a change in spiritual condition, as happened in the case of the Prodigal Son.

In this we can see, I believe, the effects of the Protestant reaction against the institutionalism of the medieval Catholic church, for by asserting the concept of the priesthood of all believers and the responsibility of the individual for inner regeneration, the Protestant movement

was bound to insist upon the necessity for rigorous self-discipline in worldly living. Hence there was a concern for living according to the Law and a corresponding emphasis upon the dire punishments that might befall one in this world if the Law were ignored. This was an important aspect of the search for salvation if the ritual of the Confessional was to be discarded, for no longer did the answer to a sinner's predicament lie in visiting his priest. The road to reconciliation with God was now much tougher, and there was no easy way of avoiding punishment incurred for past sins, however conscience-stricken one might be. Thus it is that for some Protestants, among them the anonymous author of Nice Wanton, the parable of the Prodigal Son was not easy to accept as it stood. Not only did it make the path to salvation appear too easy, but also it ignored the fact that God's grace is a product of his will, and, because it is not something man can earn, however great his faith, it is given to some (the Elect) and not to others (the Reprobate). It is these aspects of Protestant thought which are so insistently demonstrated in Nice Wanton with regard to the fates of Dalilah and Ismael, and it is these ideas which have caused the author to alter so radically the crucial reconciliation scene in the parable.

Certain other aspects of the parable which the author of Nice Wanton must have found hard to reconcile with his religious point of view should be mentioned at this point. The behavior of the father in the original parable would ob-

viously be difficult to incorporate into Nice Wanton, in view of the fates of Ismael and Dalilah. Some clear indication on an allegorical level would have had to be made as to whether or not the erring children were accepted after they repented. This the author clearly wants to avoid, and so he has made the role of the parent in his play quite different from that of the father in the parable. In Nice Wanton the parent figure is an indulgent mother who is depicted as largely responsible for the sinful behaviour of two of her children, Ismael and Dalilah. By depicting a mother rather than a father, the author has avoided any suggestion that a criticism of God might be intended, for it is made plain in the play that Xantippe is in fact almost as culpable as her two erring offspring in that it was her sparing of the rod which resulted in their downfall. As the Prologue points out:

> If children be noseled in idleness and ill,
> And brought up therein, it is hard to restrain,
> And draw them from natural wont evil,
> As here in this interlude ye shall see plain:
> By two children brought up wantonly in play,
> Whom the mother doth excuse, when she should chastise.
> (p. 95)

Mothers had indeed appeared in earlier versions of the parable, as we saw in Chapter I, but, apart from Rebelles, this was the first time this use had been made of the potential which is inherent in the role.[113]

The use of Xantippe to demonstrate the importance of parental responsibility in the upbringing of children is another instance of the Protestant bias of this play. Both Catholics and Protestants of the age would have agreed that

the responsibility for the nurture of youth lay primarily with the parents, or, as Hugh Rhodes says in The Booke of Nurture and Schoole of good manners for man and for Chylde,

> Set your yong people forth with spede
> good manners for to learne:
> Vnto your Elders gentle be,
> agaynst them say no harme.
> If youth doe euill, their Parents sure
> reape this reporte full soone:
> They that should teach other folkes good,
> belyke themselues haue none.
> A good Father, good children makes,
> grace being them within;
> For as they be vsed in youth,
> in age they will begin.[114]

Or as William Baldwin in A Treatise of Morall Philosophie (1547) says in his summary of a section on parents and the upbringing of children,

> Parents and Masters that haue charge ouer youth,
> Ought well to regard their office and duty
> And bring vp their children in Gods holy truth;
> By word and example, both honest and godly,
> Rebuke, chastice, and instruct them gently:
> For as they shall order themselues hereafter,
> It shall be imputed vnto their teacher.[115]

Even stronger is Thomas Becon's statement in A New Catechism, set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son. Becon, who was Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer in the reign of Edward VI and thus contemporary with the author of Nice Wanton, puts it this way:

> . . . parents are bound by the commandment of God, and as they will avoid the danger of everlasting damnation, to teach their children the law of God and the true worshipping of him, that they, in their young years drinking in the knowledge of God's most holy will, may learn to serve their Lord God.[116]

That indulgent mothers of Xantippe's type constituted a special threat to the proper nurture of children was recognized by Burton in The Anatomy of Melancholy where he says,

> Parents often err, many fond mothers especially, doat so much upon their children, like Aesop's ape, till in the end they crush them to death, Corporum nutrices animarum novercae, pampering up their bodies to the undoing of their souls: they will not let them be corrected or controlled, but still soothed up in everything they do, that in conclusion "they bring sorrow, shame, heaviness to their parents" (Eccles. 30: 8, 9), "become wanton, stubborn, wilful, and disobedient"; rude, untaught, headstrong, incorrigible and graceless.[117]

As Protestantism developed and the household came more and more to be viewed as the primary unit in the hierarchy of discipline, in which the master of the house became, as it were, priest of the family and took on a number of the spiritual duties formerly the prerogative of the parish priest, there is an increasing consciousness of the importance of the parental role in the upbringing of children.[118] As Hooker said, "To fathers within their private families Nature hath given a supreme power."[119] It is the realisation of this power and the responsibility which its execution involves that accounts for the urgency with which the subject is debated in the large amount of literature on the subject, dating from the period with which this dissertation is concerned.[120] In their concern with education, plays such as Nice Wanton should be considered as part of this body of literature. It has already been pointed out that the parable of the Prodigal Son could be adapted to bring out educational concerns if the father-son relationship were altered to that of teacher-student. Later in this study we shall see that it could equally be adapted to depict that of artisan-apprentice or king-prince. In Nice Wanton the author has presented a mother-offspring relationship in which the misbehaviour

of two of the children is to be construed as the product of poor parental upbringing, and as such we have yet another example of just how adaptable the parable could be.

Just as the author of Nice Wanton has chosen to alter the traditional role of the father, so too he has made a significant alteration in his portrayal of the figure of the virtuous brother, Barnabas. From what has already been deduced about the religious views of the author we can be fairly sure that the somewhat harsh treatment accorded to the figure of the elder brother in the parable would not be an acceptable one. After all the elder brother did keep the Law and he had stayed close to his father. Why should he be treated so scornfully when the prodigal had only to return from his dissipations, say he was sorry, and be given his father's blessing? In Nice Wanton the author is able to put the record straight on these matters. Barnabas, like the elder brother in the parable, does remain at home. He is always obedient and remains entirely virtuous. The whole pattern of the play insists that we regard him as exemplary in every respect. In addition it is he against whom we are to judge all the other characters in the play, including Xantippe, who is not only remiss in the upbringing of her children but, after they are dead, contemplates the act of suicide, an act guaranteed "for ever to exclude God's mercy" (p. 112).[121] Characteristically it is Barnabas, "by interpretation / The son of comfort" (p. 96), who prevents her from taking such a step.[122]

Yet, despite the author's intentions, it is hard not to

feel that Barnabas exhibits precisely the Pharisaical trait of adhering to the letter of the Law rather than the spirit, and we recall that it was this particular mode of behaviour which Christ seems to have condemned in the New Testament parable in his presentation of the elder brother. When he meets Dalilah just before her death from syphilis, he offers her medical attention, food and clothing almost as a duty:

> As for your body, if it be curable,
> I will cause to be healed, and during your life
> I will clothe you and feed you, as I am able.
> Come, sister, go with me, ye have need of relief.
> (p. 107)

But this token of comfort appears only after a strongly self-righteous "I-told-you-so" speech, the whole spirit of which is fundamentally opposed to that of the New Testament parable where forgiveness is promptly given, along with food and fresh garments, with no questions asked. Unlike that virtuous Samaritan in another of Christ's parables, Barnabas puts words before actions:

> Consider, Dalilah, God's fatherly goodness,
> Which for your good hath brought you in this case.
> Scourged you with his rod of pure love doubtless,
> That, once knowing yourself, ye might call for grace.
> Ye seem to repent, but I doubt whether
> For your sins or for the misery ye be in:
> Earnestly repent for your sin rather,
> For these plagues be but the reward of sin.
> But so repent that ye sin no more,
> And then believe with steadfast faith,
> That God will forgive you for evermore,
> For Christ's sake, as the scripture saith.
> (pp. 106-7)

Only after this stern speech does he offer bodily comfort to his sister. Very significantly, there is no mention by Barnabas of forgiveness. This indeed is not something that

enters into the author's scheme at all, and it is this which above all, I feel, accounts for the difference between this author's adaptation of the pattern of the parable of the Prodigal Son and that, for example, of Gnapheus. Yet, as we shall see, the author of Nice Wanton was not the only playwright to take such a view of the New Testament parable.

In this chapter we have seen in our study of the earliest English Prodigal Son plays just how adaptable the parable was to the expression of different aims and religious points of view. No two authors chose to interpret the pattern of the story in quite the same way. Gnapheus, whose influential version probably keeps closest to the Biblical original, left out the episode of the elder brother completely and used the parable to demonstrate a Lutheran bias regarding the doctrine of "mera necessitas," a fact which caused him to alter considerably the character of the father in the parable. At the same time he elaborated upon the passing references in the parable to the prodigal's dissipated living and made these scenes take up the bulk of his play. In this he was following tradition, but this bias may in part have been due to his eagerness to imitate Terence, while it probably escaped censure on moral grounds with the excuse that he was showing evil, not teaching it.

Quite different were Textor's dialogue and its free adaptation into English. In these works the moral was entirely prudential and was aimed specifically at students, who were warned against the folly of forsaking their studies to

get married. Both the English fragment and Palsgrave's translation of Acolastus represent the emergence in England of an awareness of the aims and dramatic forms implicit in the European school-dramatists' adaptations of the parable. It would not be long before Acolastus had its English imitators.

The other works discussed in this chapter show how the English Prodigal Son plays also developed quite naturally from the dramatic traditions of the native Moralities. It is debatable whether Lusty Juventus can really be called a Prodigal Son play. Nevertheless, the play is important for showing just how easy could be the transition from the traditional pattern of the Morality to a plot pattern based on the parable. Lusty Juventus shows not only the author's awareness of this fact, but in its use of plot pattern to demonstrate the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith it shows, like Acolastus, how the parable might be adapted into dramatic form for the purposes of religious polemic.

In Nice Wanton, the other work which developed from the Morality tradition, we again see how a Protestant author can react to the traditional pattern of sin and redemption as he found it in the Moralities and in the parable of the Prodigal Son. The author of this work clearly has a strong Calvinistic bent and, as a result, he is unable to reconcile his predeterministic views with the parable as it stands. Accordingly he radically alters the parent's role in the story and presents his counterpart to the elder brother as a

figure of virtue. Furthermore, the essentially comic pattern of the parable by which the prodigal returns home, is forgiven and is reconciled to his father is changed in favour of a basically tragic pattern by which the two erring youths come to a fatal end with no clear sign being given as to whether or not they will enter Heaven, even though they have both died repentant.

In these preliminary examples one is struck above all by the variety of interpretations given to the parable. As will be seen in the following chapters this is characteristic of the English Prodigal Son plays. It is a mark both of the adaptability of the parable, and as such, perhaps, an explanation for the popularity of the story since it could be utilized so easily to demonstrate so many different, and often conflicting, articles of belief.

CHAPTER III

LATER SCHOOL PLAYS: THE DISOBEDIENT CHILD, MISOGONUS, THE GLASSE OF GOVERNEMENT

In this chapter I shall discuss three plays all of which show a close relationship to those dramas which were discussed in the previous chapter in that they are all examples of the way in which the Prodigal Son parable could be adapted to serve the needs of contemporary writers concerned with education. Like the plays of the previous chapter these plays have a didactic intent which is directed towards school or university students, and it is this, more than anything else which shapes the authors' interpretations of the parable. The first play, The Disobedient Child (1559-70), is a much expanded adaptation of Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor, and the other two, Misogonus (ca. 1560-77) and The Glasse of Governement (1575), have many of the characteristics of the Christian Terence and would appear to be influenced by the example of Gnapheus' Acolastus, though both are written in English. Like Acolastus, Lusty Juventus and Nice Wanton, both The Disobedient Child and The Glasse of Governement show a Protestant bias in their respective interpretations of the parable, particularly in the manner in which their protagonists come to a sorry end.

The Disobedient Child

Thomas Ingelend's The Disobedient Child has been tentatively identified as the work entered by Thomas Colwell on the Stationers Register in 1569-70 and entitled "An enterlude for boyes to handle and to passe tyme at christinmas."[1] This tells us for whom the play was written and the colophon of the undated first edition in the British Museum tells us virtually all we know of its author. It reads:

A pretie and Mery new Enterlude: called the Disobedient Child. Compiled by Thomas Ingelend late Student in Cambridge. Imprinted at London in Fletestrete, beneath the Conduit by Thomas Colwell.[2]

The work may have been written as early as the reign of Edward VI on account of the line, "Look that ye truly serve the king" (p. 90), though such evidence is not very strong in this instance as "king" might very well simply mean "ruler."[3] Chambers and Harbage both date the composition of the work at ca. 1560, but in both cases this is obviously a very tentative dating.[4]

As has already been suggested, the plot of this play has certain features in common with Textor's Juvenis, Pater et Vxor and the fragment of an English work printed between 1530 and 1534 which is also based on Textor's dialogue. The plot concerns a rich Londoner's teenage son who, having been reared in an indulgent manner, refuses to go to school in direct opposition to his father's expressed wish. As an excuse he tells a gruesome tale of the horrors of corporal punishment inflicted on the pupils at his school (this is a much expanded version of Textor and so vivid as to make one wonder if the author does not have some childhood experience of his own in mind).

The son refuses to take up as an alternative some profession such as soldiering. Instead he shows himself determined to leave his father's house and get married, even though he is still so young. This he does, deriding his father in the process, only to discover the folly of his behaviour when, after an extravagant wedding feast at which his unthrifty ways are given full reign, he discovers that his wife is a shrew. Besides lashing him with her tongue she administers regular beatings, which are far more severe than any schoolmaster would have managed. She also forces her husband to sell wood, fetch water and wash clothes. When she goes off to visit her gossips in another town, the young man expresses his repentance for his earlier rebellion against his father, and he decides to return to his home in London. On his arrival his father takes him in and ministers to his immediate bodily needs but tells him that he cannot stay and must return to his wife.

Clearly there are some similarities with the English fragment in which a young man refused the education offered him by his father, who had wanted him to be a "clarke," and instead married "a shrewde queane" who beat him and forced him to sell faggots. However, the incident of his being cuckolded and the incident in which he is shamed by his father's servant, who is seen to have more education than he has, are both omitted by Ingelend. Since in the fragment the episode of the prodigal selling wood is far more elaborate than the corresponding scene in The Disobedient Child and since the wife's desire to cuckold

her husband and the episode involving the servant are elaborations peculiar to the fragment, it is possible to argue either that the two English versions are quite independent of each other, or that The Disobedient Child is the earlier work. Because of the sophistication of Ingelend's work I am inclined to favour the view that the texts are independent of each other.

Ingelend's work is in places virtually a translation of Textor,[5] as can be seen, for example, in Ingelend's version of the final harsh words of the father. In Ingelend the final speech from Textor (quoted above in Ch. II) is split into two sections with a certain amount of dialogue in between:

(i) For so much as by my advice and counsel
In no manner wise thou wouldest be ruled,
Therefore to thee I cannot do well,
But let thee still suffer as thou hast deserved.
(p. 86)

(ii) If that thou thinkest thyself alone
Only to lead this irksome life,
Thou may'st learn what grief, sorrow and moan,
Socrates had with Xantippe his wife.
(p. 87)

In addition Ingelend, in character with his status as "late Student in Cambridge," has retained all of Textor's allusions to such Classical figures as Demosthenes, Tully, Hipponactes, Ovid (including Textor's quotation from Ovid), Aristotle, Heracleus, Pythagoras, Socrates, Crates and Xantippe.

However, where Textor's work had consisted of some 230 odd lines shared between three characters, Ingelend's expanded adaptation is over 1500 lines long and contains as many as ten characters, though, interestingly enough, the

names, like those of the original, are all generic and include "The Rich Man's Son," "The Priest," "The Devil," and so on. Also, where Textor's work had consisted of some five scenes, Ingelend has added a number of his own which have no precedent in Textor. Among such additions is the father's soliloquy (pp. 55-6) in which he laments the contemporary tendency to pamper youth and the consequent "unthriftiness, vice, and iniquity" to which youth is prone (p. 56). There is also a scene between a Man-Cook and a Maid-Cook (pp. 56-60) in which these two characters discuss the excesses of the bridal feast ordered by the young man.[6] This last-mentioned detail, which demonstrates the young man's prodigality, is interesting for the way in which Ingelend has transformed the feast with courtesans, a traditional motif in earlier adaptations of the parable, into a bridal feast. Furthermore, we also learn in this scene that, like the Prodigal Son in many other adaptations of the parable, the young man is in debt because of his lavish expenditure on expensive clothes, and in addition it would appear that he has lost his friends:

> In very deed he comes a great way,
> With my master he may not long abide;
> It hath cost him so much on costly array,
> That money out of his purse apace doth slide.
> They say that his friends be rich and wealthy,
> And in the city of London have their dwelling,
> But yet of them all he hath no penny
> To spend and bestow here at his wedding.
> And if it be true that his servant did say,
> He hath utterly lost his friends' good-will, . . .
> (p. 58)

Later there is another additional scene in which the father speaks of a visit from a stranger who has been sent by

the keeper of the inn where his son has been staying to try and obtain payment for some of the young man's bills. By locating the scenes of the protagonist's prodigal living at an inn, Ingelend has been able to link his story even closer to the Prodigal Son parable than Textor has done, for, as we have already seen many times, the tavern was the traditional location of the prodigal's revels in both iconographic and literary versions of the parable.

Further traditional elements in the prodigal's dissipated living are added when Ingelend presents a scene in which the young man's servant, rather like Flavius in Timon of Athens, complains of his master's prodigality. Not only are the servant's legs worn out from running to fill so many pots "With all manner wine, ale, and beer," and from serving "dish after dish," but his master's calls for cards and dice have added to the confusion along with the drunkenness of the participants in the riotous revels (pp. 73-4). By adding gambling, drunkenness and general riotous behaviour to the list of the prodigal's dissipations, Ingelend confirms the fact that he is following the traditional presentation of the parable in many of its details. But while Ingelend's work contains many of the elements of traditional versions of the parable, and certainly more than Textor's dialogue contains, it is of even greater interest to us here for the manner in which it has, like the works discussed in the previous chapter, adapted the parable in order to present a specific point of view concerning the upbringing of youth.

First of all, Ingelend appears to have a somewhat utilitarian view of education. As the Prologue tells us, the father earnestly moved his son to give himself to studies in order that he might have a pleasant life, unvexed by trouble in his later years:

> In the city of London there was a rich man
> Who, loving his son most tenderly,
> Moved him earnestly now and then,
> That he would give his mind to study,
> Saying that by knowledge, science and learning,
> Is at the last gotten a pleasant life,
> But through the want and lack of this thing
> Is purchased poverty, sorrow and strife.
> (p. 45)

This equation of education with worldly comfort and prosperity is further elaborated later on in this scene. Anxious to see his son doing something, the father asks the boy at what trade he would like to make a living and whether he would like to be a soldier. The boy turns down both ideas, and so the father pictures to him the alternative:

> Somewhat to do it is meet and convenient;
> Wilt thou then give thy diligent endeavour
> To let thy youth unhonestly be spent,
> And do as poor knaves, which jaxes do scour?
> For I do not see that any good art,
> Or else any honest science or occupation,
> Thou wilt be content to have a part,
> After thy father's mind and exhortation.
> (p. 51)

Cleaning jakes plainly cannot be associated with worldly comfort, worldly prosperity, or social status. The latter element, which is only implied here, is made more specific when the father later says,

> And if thou wouldest follow the book and learning,
> And with thyself also take a wise way,
> Then thou mayst get a gentleman's living,
> And with many other bear a great sway.
> (pp. 53-4)

With such a point of view Ingelend at once demonstrates his Protestant bias, for, where the medieval concept of education was largely derived from eschatological concerns,[7] post-Reformation thinking was far more inclined to show an awareness of the secular, as opposed to the religious, implications of education and to stress its utilitarian value, particularly where financial profit and social advancement are concerned. The reasons for such a change are too numerous to enter into here, but they include such factors as the historical events of the Reformation by which secular agencies took over from the Catholic church the major responsibility for education, the increasing social mobility, a thing encouraged by the Tudors' promotion of many men to positions of power which formerly would have been out of reach for men of their social level, the increasing demand within the commercial classes for apprentices and assistants of one kind or another who were literate and could keep accounts, and the development of a Doctrine of Work, with its implied insistence on the values of thrift and diligence--what Weber once described as "the valuation of the fulfilment of duty in worldly affairs as the highest form which the moral activity of the individual could assume."[8]

Because he rejects these values, the Rich Man's Son is described as being like "one that was clean devoid of grace" (p. 45), and here we are immediately reminded of Dalilah and Ismael in Nice Wanton, though in point of fact this possible explanation for the young man's behaviour in

The Disobedient Child is never really developed as it is in the case of the two errant youngsters in Nice Wanton. The initial sin of the Rich Man's Son is simply that of his rejection of contemporary social values. But in addition, it consists of mocking and deriding the "gentle monition" of his father (p. 45), and of marrying a young woman "Whereby of lust he might have his fill" (p. 46).

In disobeying his father in such an unpleasant manner the young man is, of course, breaking the 5th Commandment--"Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy daies maie be prolonged upon the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee" (Exodus 20: 12. Geneva Bible). Prior to the Reformation the writers who discuss this Commandment usually interpreted it on a number of levels. The following passage from a medievel sermon is fairly representative:

> . . . that arte bownden to worshippe iiij faders. The firste is our Fadere that is in heven, the second is euery old man, and the iij ys he that hase cure of thi sowle, and the iiij is the fadere that gat the in-to this world. Thise faders we awght to worshippe. Also ther been moders the wiche that we shall worshipp, the wiche holychurche is the firste, and thi modere that bare the.[9]

After the Reformation the list of who is intended by "father" is usually extended, but the Commandment is not thought to pertain to a Christian's obedience to God. Thomas Becon, for example, in his Catechism states quite categorically that "This commandment pertaineth not unto the person of God,"[10] and in Edward VI's A Short Catechisme (1553) no mention is made of the Deity in the section dealing with this Commandment. Both catechisms just mentioned, however, expand the

list of "fathers." For Becon these include father, mother, magistrate, prince, spiritual minister, elders, governors, and superiors in general, the last-mentioned to include "schoolmasters, teachers, tutors, patrons, masters of occupations."[11]

This stress upon schoolmasters is interesting in that it is in harmony with the implied status they give themselves in contemporary "School Dramas," but it also shows that this was not just a self-assumed status. Becon, in the section of the Catechism entitled "Of the Office and Duty of Scholars," states that the duty of scholars "is to love, reverence and honour their school-master, even as another father," while William Baldwin says in the Treatise of Morall Philosophie that "We are no lesse bound to our Schoolemaisters that rightly teach vs, then we are to our very naturall parents."[12] Edward's catechism, in keeping with a man who founded so many schools, also includes the schoolmaster:

> Honour of father and mother containeth love, fear, and reverence, yea, and it further standeth in obeying, succouring, defending, and nourishing them, if need require. It bindeth us also most humbly, and with most natural affection, to obey the magistrate, to reverence the ministers of the church, our schoolmasters, with all our elders, and betters.[13]

Thus where the Commandment prior to the Reformation had been interpreted as a call to obey first God the Father and then one's earthly father, interpretations of it after the Reformation stress obedience to one's earthly father and to one's temporal superiors, rather than to God. Once again we have an example of a change from a predominantly spiritual concern to one which is apparently more conscious of secular concerns,

the dividing line being apparently the Reformation.

By disregarding his father's wishes and by evading the discipline of the schoolmaster, Ingelend's prodigal is thus breaking the 5th Commandment in two ways, and, as we shall see, his later misery is to be regarded as the just deserts of such impious behaviour. At the same time, however, we are expected to see that the boy's father is also partly responsible. Several times he admits as much, confessing that he has been lax in the upbringing of his son. At one point, for example, he says to the audience,

> Wherefore we parents must have a regard
> Our children in time for to subdue,
> Or else we shall have them ever untoward,
> Yea, spiteful, disdainful, naught and untrue.
> And let us them thrust alway to the school,
> Whereby at their books they may be kept under.
> (p. 55)

Later the Perorator makes the same point when at the end of the play he draws attention to the moral for the audience:

> Wherefore take heed, all ye that be parents,
> And follow a part after my counsel;
> Instruct your children and make them students,
> That unto all goodness they do not rebel;
> Remember what writeth Solomon the wise:
> Qui parcit virgae, odit filium.
> Therefore for as much as ye can devise,
> Spare not the rod, but follow wisdom.
> (p. 89)

Here the Perorator is referring to that means of enforcing filial obedience which Scripture had so generously prescribed (Proverbs 13: 24; 22: 15; Ecclesiasticus 7: 23; 30: 12; Hebrews 12: 6 and 8), and which numerous writers on the duties of parents had reiterated throughout the Middle Ages and long after.

The refusal of certain English Humanists to endorse this principle of learning and the notorious abuses of corporal punishment which are occasionally known to have occurred, as for example in the case of Udall's practices at Eton, had little influence upon the age,[14] and Ingelend's point of view as expressed in this play is a commonplace of the period and one which, as we have already seen, is reflected in the Prodigal Son plays. As the sterner forms of Protestantism with their rigorous insistence on discipline gained ground, recourse to the rod was hardly likely to abate and the wisdom of the proverb "Qui parcit virgae, odit filium" was hardly likely to have been questioned.

Ingelend's version of the Prodigal Son's leaving his father is thus closely connected with educational issues. Both father and son are violating time-honoured educational principles, though it is the son who will inevitably suffer most. But let us now see how this is worked out in the play and how it is built around Ingelend's version of the parable.

When the son leaves to get married, the father issues him a stern warning:

> Take heed hereafter, if thou be troubled,
> At me thou never seek redress.
> (p. 53)

This is a somewhat different attitude from that of the father in the New Testament, but we shall find that it is certainly in character with this particular father. When he speaks of his son's inheritance, for example, in direct contrast to what happens at the beginning of the story in the Bible, he refuses

to give the boy a penny:

> . . . of my goods thou gettest not a penny,
> Nor any succour else at my hands,
> For such a child is most unworthy
> To have any part of his father's lands.
> (p. 54)

Later he gives a further example of this attitude for, after the son has wasted what money he has (plus a great deal more that he does not have), his father refuses categorically to pay any of the debts the young man has incurred at the inn where he has been staying for a time:

> . . . I sent him no money
> To pay such debts as my son did owe,
> Because he had me forsaken utterly,
> And me for his good father would not know.
> (p. 67)

The father's attitude is thus that of "Let him stew in his own juice," or, to quote the proverb used by the father himself: "But as he had brewed, that so he should bake" (p. 68). Anticipating the possible return home of the prodigal couple, the father then goes on to say,

> My mind giveth me, that they will come dwell
> At length by their father for want of living;
> But my son doubtless, for anything that I know,
> Shall reap in such wise as he did sow.
> (p. 69)

Clearly in all this, Ingelend has the pattern of the parable in the back of his mind, but at the same time he wants to prepare us for a very different reaction on the father's part from that which occurs in the New Testament version when father and son are reunited.

After this anticipatory warning we have a scene in which the young couple bill and coo over each other, alluding,

like their counterparts in Textor, to Aristotle's Ethics, and to Heracleus, Pythagoras, Socrates and Crates in support of the married state. Then, after the servant has given the audience his description of the feasting, gambling, drunkenness and rioting in which the young couple are involved, the way is prepared for the young man's folly to be exposed. In the very next scene, the money having run out, the wife puts her husband to work, loading him up with faggots and making him fetch water and wash clothes. In between jobs she beats him (pp. 74-9).

At first the young man bewails his fate:

> O mirth, O joy, O pastime and pleasure,
> How little a space do you endure!
> (p. 75)

Then the element of despair enters his thoughts, and we are reminded once again of traditional versions of the parable where despair, as we have noted, is a common motif:

> I would to death I had been agate [on the way],
> When my mother in bearing me made lamentation.
> What shall I do? whither shall I turn?
> Most careful man now under the sky!
> In the flaming fire I had rather burn,
> Than with extreme pain live so heavily.
> (p. 78)

It is at this point that he decides to ride home to his father while his wife is away visting her gossips. His decision, however, unlike that of the prodigal in the parable, appears to be dictated by material considerations rather than any inner repentance:

> Although that I be a gentleman born,
> And come by my ancestors of a good blood,
> Yet am I like to wear a coat torn,
> And hither and thither go carry wood!

> But rather than I this life will abide,
> To-morrow morning I do intend
> Home to my father again to ride,
> If some man to me his horse will lend.
> (p. 79)

As soon as the son has set off, Satan appears claiming that he is the one responsible for the young man's fall:

> O, it was I that made him refuse
> The wholesome monition of his father dear,
> And caused him still of a wife to muse,
> As though she should be his joy and cheer!
> O, it was I that made him go hence,
> And suppose that his father was very unkind;
> It was I that did drive him to such expense.
> And made him as bare as an ape is behind.
> (pp. 80-1)

He too in speaking to the audience mentions despair:

> Take heed, take heed of my temptation,
> For commonly at the last ye have the fall,
> And also [be] brought to desperation.
> (p. 82)

In passing it should be mentioned that the appearance of Satan would seem to be the only incident in the play which is interpreted allegorically in the manner of the earlier Moralities. It is for this reason perhaps that the presence of one who claims that "The world is my son, and I am his father, /And also the flesh is a daughter of mine" (p. 83) is somewhat incongruous.

Satan's lengthy speech is followed by a long soliloquy by the young man who has just arrived in London (pp. 84-5). He confesses to having been wild and wanton and to having followed his own fancy and will rather than the advice of those who gave him good counsel. He confesses to being a "froward son" and, as for his past attitude to school, he says,

> The thing that was evil I ever loved,
> Which now I see is my confusion.
> I could not abide of the school to hear;
> Masters and teachers my heart abhorred;
> Methought the book was not fit gear
> For my tender fingers to have handled.
> (p. 84)

In addition to this regrettable attitude to education, which Ingelend is, of course, at pains to stress, the Prodigal also confesses to the traditional sins of his kind: love of costly clothes, sloth, wantonness, unthriftiness and riot. Paraphrasing the words of his counterpart in the New Testament he sums up by saying,

> That well I am worthy of God's curse,
> And of my father to have small meed [recompense].
> (p. 85)

The father now enters and the son "without craft or wile" falls on his knees, but his father maintains his former attitude in direct reversal of the parable, for there is no forgiveness or joyful welcome for the son:

> For so much as by my advice and counsel
> In no manner wise thou wouldest be ruled,
> Therefore to thee I cannot do well,
> But let thee still suffer as thou hast deserved,
> For that thou has suffered is yet nothing
> To that tribulation which is behind coming.
> (p. 86)

A little later the father says,

> I cannot, my son, thy state redress;
> Me thy father thou didst refuse;
> Wherefore now help thy own foolishness,
> And of thy wife no longer muse.
> (p. 87)

From this we can see that the young man's repentance produces little response of mercy or forgiveness, though the father does minister to the immediate bodily needs of his erring son:

> But yet come on, to my house we will be going,
> And there thou shalt see what I will give:--
> A little to help thy need living,
> Since that in such penury thou dost live;
> And that once done, thou must hence again,
> For I am not he that will thee retain.
> (p. 88)

Even in Nice Wanton the erring children had had some hope of mercy in the next world, but in The Disobedient Child punishment for sin is rigorously exacted in this world with the threat of yet worse to come in the next ("that tribulation which is behind coming").

Ingelend has thus deliberately reversed the most significant aspect of the parable. His intention in doing so appears to derive from his attempt to provide a prudential moral for emulation by his audience and players. Parents are told to "Spare not the rod, but follow wisdom" (p. 89), and are reminded of another familiar proverb which teaches that proper education in youth may be very effective, but that if left too long there will be little hope:

> For as long as the twig is gentle and pliant
> (Every man knoweth this by experience),
> With small force and strength it may be bent,
> Putting thereto but little diligence;
> But after that it waxeth somewhat bigger,
> And to cast his branches largely beginneth,
> It is scant the might of all thy power,
> That one bough thereof easily bendeth.
> (pp. 88-9)

The moral for students is a very prudential one which makes clear the dangers of not submitting to the educative process:

> God unto him [the Rich Man's Son] did suddenly then send
> Such poverty with a wife and grief together,
> That shame and sorrow was his end.
> Wherefore to conclude, I warn you all
> By your loving parents always be ruled,

> Or else be well assured of such a fall,
> As unto this young man worthily chanced.
> (p. 90)

As in Nice Wanton such insistence upon the sufferings to be endured in this world as a result of sin has a strongly Protestant ring to it. But where in Nice Wanton the tragic ending of the play was in part the result of an attempt to demonstrate the idea of Election, in Ingelend's play the stress is solely upon the prudential moral pertaining to education and the related duties of father to son and son to father. Once again the original pattern of the New Testament parable has proved its adaptability.[15]

Misogonus

As one modern critic has said, "The manuscript play Misogonus . . . perhaps more closely resembles the Acolastus and its classical prodigal-son type than any other extant Tudor drama."[16] Like Acolastus the work owes much to Latin Comedy and has at the same time a Christian moral. In the case of Misogonus this is directed specifically at youthful scholars. No source has been satisfactorily identified for the play, apart from the obvious one of the New Testament parable, though the work would appear to owe something to both Acolastus and Asotus.[17] Authorship of the play remains a puzzle, but the most likely candidate is Laurence Johnson who matriculated at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1570, received his B.A. in 1573-4 and proceeded to his M.A. in 1577, and humorously signed himself on the manuscript beneath the list of dramatis personae as "Laurentius Bariona. Ketthering, Die

20 Novembris, Anno 1577."[18] "Bariωna" would appear to be a scholarly pun on Matthew 16: 17 in which Christ says to Peter, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona."[19] In Greek "Bar-jona" ("Son of Jonah") is "βὰρ Ἰωνὰ" and since elsewhere the disciple's father is referred to as "Johannes" ("Ἰωαννης" John 1: 42 and 21: 15-17), Johnson's use of the word, with its retention of the Greek omega as a clue, is particularly appropriate.

Two other names on the manuscript, those of Antony Rudd and Thomas Rychardes, suggest alternative possibilities for author as well as the possibility of joint-authorship.[20] Johnson, Rudd and Richards were all associated with Cambridge in the 1570's,[21] but whoever the author may have been, it seems almost certain that the play was written by a Cambridge scholar (or scholars) for performance there in 1577 or shortly before.[22] Indeed telling evidence for a date of about 1577 was put forward by Hyder Rollins in 1924 in a footnote to his edition of A sorrowfull Sonet, made by M. George Mannington, at Cambridge Castle. To the tune of Labandala Shot (1576). In his note Rollins points out that one of the characters in Misogonus sings a "songe to the tune of Labondolose Hoto," beginning,

> O mighty Jove some pitty take
> one me poore wretch for christis sake
> Greif doth ne gripe, payne doth me pinch
> willfull dispite my harte doth wrinch.
> (II, v, 117-20)

The third of these lines also appears to contain an allusion to the first line of Mannington's ballad ("I Waile in wo,

I plunge in pain"), and, since Mannington's ballad was first entered on the Stationers' Register on November 7, 1576, one can reasonably infer that Misogonus was written after this date.[23]

Where The Disobedient Child, which was also by a Cambridge man, had derived its plot and form from Textor, Misogonus is much more akin to the Dutch Christian Terence, and it is perhaps not without significance that two Dutch Prodigal Son plays, Acolastus and Asotus, were performed at Trinity College, a number of years before Misogonus was written, in 1560-1 and 1565-6 respectively.[24] The play is set in ancient Italy, employs names of Greek derivation for most of its characters and is divided into acts and scenes in the Terentian manner, although the whole of Act V is missing from the manuscript. As in Latin Comedy and as in the Christian Terence, a great deal of the action is taken up with scenes of intrigue and dissipated living. The author also makes use of the standard "lost-found" motif of New Comedy, a device not found in previous Prodigal Son plays, while character types are for the most part those of Latin Comedy and the Christian Terence. As in the case of Acolastus, the play provides a fascinating study of how the parable of the Prodigal Son could be adapted to make a drama modeled on Terentian and Plautine comedy that would be suitable in didactic intent for performance at an academic institution.

Misogonus ("μισογονος" or "Parent-hater") is the heir of a wealthy widower Philogonus ("φιλογονος" or "Child-lover"),

who, as his name suggests, has been over-indulgent in the treatment of his son who has taken to riotous and prodigal living in defiance of his father's pleas. Philogonus, whose constant fear that there is no hope for his son is very reminiscent of Pelargus' anxiety in Acolastus, is advised by an elderly neighbour, Eupelas ("εὔπελας" or "Good Neighbour"), a character clearly modeled on Eubulus in Gnapheus' play. Eupelas' efforts to persuade Misogonus to leave his life of debauchery are to no avail,[25] and we see Misogonus blaspheming (line 1, p. 186); threatening to murder someone (lines 71-4, p. 189); "huntinge of too legged venicin" (line 24, p. 195) in the form of the courtesan Melissa; drinking (lines 13-14, p. 204); squandering money (lines 27-8, p. 204); dicing (lines 31-2, p. 204; and lines 147-261, pp. 209-13); and deriding his father (lines 51-2, p. 216), all of those actions in fact which were traditionally associated with the prodigal.

Most of these misdemeanors occur in a long scene (II, iv) which appears to be located in the traditional tavern. Philogonus' threat to disinherit his son is ignored when the former arrives at the tavern, and the prodigal is only brought to his senses when a "lost" elder brother appears on the scene. Although the last act is missing, it seems certain that the repentant prodigal will be forgiven.

From this very brief outline it will be seen that the play in the main follows the pattern of the parable, but in small details there are some surprising changes. As in Asotus the prodigal does not leave home, and initially there is no

mention of any "portion." However, the author makes use of the idea of the "portion" when he has Philogonus threaten to disinherit Misogonus. Even more striking is Philogonus' offer to give Misogonus his "childes part" should the latter ask for forgiveness (line 22, p. 251).[26] The matter of inheritance is also raised when Eugonus ("εὐγονος" or "Parent lover"), the virtuous elder brother, returns and is welcomed by Philogonus:

> O welcome home my sonne my sone my comfort & my ioy
> thou art the lenghtner of my life the curar of care
> here of my house possession take & all my lands ẽioy.
> (IV, i, lines 178-80, p. 250)

It is the discovery that he is not to be Philogonus' heir after all which provides the initial shock to Misogonus that sets him on the road to repentance. In this way the author has made use of an element of the Biblical parable (the question of inheritance) in a manner quite different from the way it was used originally, and has integrated it into his plot so as to replace the famine in the far country as the stimulus for the prodigal's remorse.

As has been suggested, the prodigal's riots and the location of them follow tradition, as does his desertion by his companions at the end of IV, ii. In the same way his despair, which accompanies his self-realisation, is also a recognizable traditional motif:

> O god, o divill, o heaven, o hell, my hart now rents in twaine
> a comes, a comes, a comes I shall dye in desperation
> to hange my selfe surely I thinke now I must be fayne
> I haue sinned so much that Ime quite past hope of salvation.
> (IV, ii, lines 53-6, p. 253)

The treatment of the elder brother, on the other hand, is something quite new and seems more likely to have been drawn directly from Terence or Plautus where the action (see especial-

ly Terence's Heautontimorumenos) often depends upon the discovery of a child lost since birth. In Misogonus the protagonist has an elder twin brother, unknown to all except for Codrus and Alison, two of Philogonus' tenants, and Madge Caro and Isbell Busby who were present at the birth. On the advice of "a certaine learnde manne" (line 226, p. 230) Philogonus' wife had despatched "theldest" [sic] to her brother in Apollonia shortly before she herself died. In Misogonus it is consequently the elder brother who travels and then returns home and not the prodigal younger brother as in most adaptations of the parable. At the opportune moment when Philogonus is in despair over what to do about Misogonus, he is informed of Eugonus' existence and that his elder son may be recognized by the fact that he has "two thums one [sic] one foote" (line 192, p. 229). Attempts by Misogonus, aided by Cacurgus ("κακουργος" or "mischief-maker") in the guise of a travelling doctor and astrologer, fail to silence those who can corroborate the story of Eugonus' birth, and the elder brother is welcomed home by Philogonus with all the joy that marked the welcome of the prodigal in the New Testament parable.

The warm welcome given Eugonus and his treatment as a figure of virtue is in deliberate contrast to the parable. Indeed Eugonus is a very different character from his Pharisaical counterpart in the parable, as can be seen in his words to Misogonus at one point:

> Alas brother I come for no landes I cume to see my father I & to doe my deutye vnto him as it doth me become.
> (lines 9-10, p. 251)

Although he advises his younger brother to repent (lines 13-14, p. 251), his demeanour is gentle and generous, as is seen in IV, i, when he meets Codrus and Alison on first setting foot in his homeland. It is very clear that he will not complain should Misogonus be forgiven, nor does he seem interested particularly in any right he may have to Philogonus' property. His duty to his father is something heartfelt and spontaneous (as in the quotation above) and this makes him just as much a contrast to Misogonus as to the elder brother in the parable.

Such an alteration of the original is to be explained by the fact that the author of the play is anxious to set up a balanced pair of characters, the one good and the other bad. Where in the parable both sons are criticized at different times for their attitudes to life, the author of Misogonus has developed a black-white contrast from the start and is enabled thereby to give examples to his audience of proper and improper filial behaviour.

Another manner in which the original parable has been altered concerns the portrayal of Philogonus. Like Pelargus in Acolastus he lives, as I have pointed out, in a state of constant anxiety about his son. In Acolastus this was depicted as involving a lack of faith in God's mercy and his ability to work good from evil. In Misogonus this pattern is changed somewhat, but not enough to make one dismiss the thought that the author had Acolastus in mind. Initially Philogonus' attitude to his prodigal son is one of anxiety

verging on despair:

> Well there is no remedye heil be my death I knowe
> I may suffer a while but I can not longe indure.
> (lines 53-4, p. 201)

As in Acolastus it is the father's sage neighbour (Eupelas in this instance) who points out the errors of such fears when he says, "Gods aboue all thoughe you thinke him past whoo" [i.e. "out of hearing"] (line 55, p. 201). Later he advises Philogonus in much the same way:

> The best is for yow to trust in Christ Jhesus alone
> and by faith in his mercy your selfe for to stay.
> (lines 103-4, p. 218)

At this point Philogonus sings a song in which he prays to God:

> O Christ thou art my onely ayde
> if thou helpes not Ime quite dismayde.
> (lines 121-2, p. 219)

He then admits responsibility for his son's behaviour:

> My sinnes I willingly confesse
> Hath oft of right deservd no lesse
> I was the cause of this my care
> the rodd alway sith I did spare
> If I in tyme had him correcte
> Ide never binn this sore affecte
> tis I tis I that am too blame
> My selfe my selfe deserveth shame
> I am o Lorde alone in faughte
> by sufferinge this selfewill he caughte.
> (II, v, lines 127-36, p. 219)

And he ends the song much as he had begun it, with a prayer for help:

> To the o Lorde I doe retourne
> here in this miserye as I mourne
> Desiringe if it may the please
> my paynes a little to appease
> thoughe it be farr beyonde my faith
> Yet thou canst helpe thy gospell saith
> Helpe Lorde helpe Lorde helpe yet in tyme
> and lay not to my charge this cryme

> pardon for that is past I crave
> wth hope some helpe of the to haue.
> (lines 167-76, p. 220)

From this point on the remainder of the play can be read as a working out of the answer to Philogonus' prayer. In the very next scene, when Philogonus learns of Eugonus' existence, he in fact interprets the information as a gift from God, "a miracle most wonderfull & rare" (line 281, p. 232):

> Mocke one Misogonus if thou wilt if god another sendes
> I care not I he as by righte shall haue my goodes & landes
> Ile set ye light I warrant the till thou thes fautes amends
> wch yet if thoult repent thoust finde great curtisye at my handes.
> (lines 274-7, p. 232)

When a meeting between Philogonus and Eupelas later occurs, the latter elaborates upon "gods providence /in shewinge mercye to his servauntes" (lines 1-2, p. 241), and when Eugonus and Philogonus meet, the latter bursts into a prayer of thanks to God who "canst miraculously helpe thy servaunts vnawares" (line 173, p. 249). The lesson to be drawn by the audience here, as in Acolastus, is that God's mercy works in mysterious ways and that what is required of man is faith. The actual ways in which the respective authors of the two plays have chosen to demonstrate this dictum differ somewhat, though both authors relate it to the debates between Philogonus and Eupelas, and Pelargus and Eubulus respectively.

Finally it should be pointed out that the Lutheran doctrine of "mera necessitas" so prominent in Acolastus has been toned down. Furthermore we are not asked to see it in relation to the behaviour of the prodigal so much as in

relation to Philogonus. Nevertheless the author (or authors) of Misogonus plainly show a Protestant bias in their adaptation of the parable and this is very much in keeping with a continual stream of anti-Catholic allusions which occur throughout the work and which are at their most evident in the portrayal of Sir John, a priest and haunter of taverns, who is not "of this new start vp rables" (line 64, p. 205), and consequently is made to represent all that was thought to be reprehensible in the history of English Catholicism.

As for the main theme of the play, this would seem to be concerned, as was that of The Disobedient Child, with the necessity for rigorous enforcement of discipline where young people are concerned. Early in the play Philogonus admits that after his wife's death he unwisely pampered his child, neglected to get him tutors or schoolmasters, and now fears that it is too late to get Misogonus to change his ways. Referring to the same proverb which we came across in Ingelend's play, he says,

> can you bende a bigge tree w^{ch} is sappy & sound
> he is to olde I tell yow to stubberne & to stoute.
> (lines 158-9, p. 181)

Later he says,

> O that I had provided him tuters in youth.
> O that in vertue I had him first traynde
> Education is the best thinge that can be of a truthe
> Good lorde what hartes ease therby had I gaynde.
>
> Yf it were to doe agayne I knowe what to doe
> I woulde disple him i faythe I woulde tute him a good
> he should lacke for no masters and governoures to
> he shoulde haue whippings inoughe be sure that he shoode.
> (lines 57-64, p. 201)

And this leads him to reiterate that familiar proverb that

seems to recur in so many Prodigal Son plays:

> He that spareth the rod hates the childe as Salamon writes
> Whereby in sparinge him nowe I perceiue
> I hatid him much for with hate he requites
> my loue thoughe a while he did me deceiue.
> (lines 69-72, p. 201)

Later he twice reiterates the same moral to the audience (lines 97-100, p. 218, and lines 157-66, p. 220), and as we have seen earlier he confesses direct to God his mistakes in this basic requirement of parental duty. But, lest the moral of the play should have escaped some sleepy Cambridge student less gifted with intelligence than his fellows, Misogonus himself points out the lesson the play has for university students in particular and for all children and scholars in general:

> O all ye youthfull race of gentle bloude take heed by this my fall
> trust not to much to your heritadge & fortunes vayne alurements
> take heed of ill company, flye cardes & dice, & pleasures bestiall
> eshcewe a hore as ye woud a scorpian & beware of hir intisments
>
> Children obay your parents wth dwe reverence & feare
> care not for your vaine pastymes for they be but momentarye
> schollers your maisters good lessones often reed & heare
> beside godliness & learninge all thinges in this worlde are but transitorye.
> (lines 33-9, p. 258)

The moral of the piece is thus not entirely a prudential one: fun and games in taverns, so Misogonus tells us, are "vayne pastymes," mere transitory pleasures in a world where godliness and learning are the only permanent values. At least the authors of Misogonus, unlike their fellow Cambridge

graduate Ingelend, seem to have put godliness first. Furthermore learning seems acceptable almost as an end in itself rather than for the worldly prosperity and comfort it can bring with it, as was the attitude in Ingelend's play. Misogonus has misspent his time, it is true, but we are also asked to consider the fact that he has been "deservedly in state of perdition" (line 8, p. 256).

Another way in which Misogonus differs from The Disobedient Child is in its depiction of the prodigal's repentance. Once recovered from his despair, Misogonus repents and decides to return to his father, though, like the prodigal in the parable, he seems very unsure of what kind of reception he might receive (lines 21-2, p. 257). When he appears before his father, however, he utters the familiar words of his New Testament counterpart, although due to the state of the manuscript at this point these do not appear in full: ". . . e sinned in the sight o[f] god & against yow deare father" (line 42, p. 258). We then have to infer the father's response from what has just preceded this meeting since the manuscript breaks off at this point. Earlier Philogonus had promised to forgive Misogonus if he repented (lines 21-2, p. 251), and Liturgus, Philogonus' trusty servant, has just assured Misogonus of his father's good will. In addition we have the words of the Prologue which refer to the conversion of Misogonus:

> then after this the yonger sonne his lif doth leade anewe
> . . . erat together all the ioy and bankett at the last.
> (lines 35-6, p. 175)

Presumably the missing Act V showed this "bankett," something for which there is authority in the Bible, and presumably it showed the reconciliation between the two brothers, something for which, however, there is no Biblical authority. In any case it seems certain that the prodigal, in contrast to the protagonist of Ingelend's play and the two erring children in Nice Wanton, is forgiven for his evil life.

In this last respect Misogonus is very close to Acolastus. It is, however, something of an exception among those English Prodigal Son plays which deal with the theme of education. Usually (and the third play to be discussed in this chapter will be no exception) the prodigal in such plays is not let off so lightly. This is in order that youthful audiences may be suitably impressed with the sufferings incurred by the prodigal in this world as a direct result of his folly.

Misogonus is perhaps best-known to students of drama more for the fact that it introduces the topical figure of Sir John, the fast-living priest, together with a number of other unmistakably native figures, among whom are Alison, Codrus, Jack the parish clerk, Isbell Busby, Madge Caro ("Flesh") and Cacurgus who seems to be a mixture of the crafty intriguer of Latin Comedy, the Vice of the Moralities, and the Fool Will Summer whose name he assumes.[27] The use of English dialect, local allusions and references to contemporary events further help to give the work an atmosphere and tone that owe nothing either to Latin Comedy or the Christian Terence.[28]

It is thus an important play in that it shows, like earlier works such as Gammer Gurton's Needle and Ralph Roister Doister, the integration of Classical and native dramatic elements which would shortly lead to the full flowering of Elizabethan comedy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. But its chief relevance to our interests here is that in Misogonus one can see more clearly than in any other English Prodigal Son play how the example of Acolastus influenced English authors, just as it influenced authors of Prodigal Son plays in the Netherlands, Germany and France. Furthermore because of its strong native element we can see in Misogonus the meeting of the two dramatic traditions outlined in the previous chapter, both of which produced their own brand of Prodigal Son play. However, Misogonus was not the last English Prodigal Son play to adapt the parable so as to present a lesson on education in the manner of the Christian Terence: we have yet to consider Gascoigne's most famous play.

The Glasse of Governement

The date on the dedicatory epistle to Sir Owen Hopton which prefaces Gascoigne's The Glasse of Governement is 26 April, 1575. This suggests that the work was written just after Gascoigne returned from his second spell of soldiering in the Netherlands in October, 1574. The fact that he had been in the Netherlands is important since an acquaintance with the dramatic works of the Dutch Humanist writers of the Christian Terence seems to be reflected in the play, as we shall see. Also of significance is the fact that in 1575 Gascoigne

appears to have undergone a radical moral and religious reformation. One would expect the parable of the Prodigal Son to have especial meaning for such a person.

In his youth Gascoigne had been a noted prodigal, and when he was an aspiring young courtier at the court of Queen Elizabeth in the years immediately following her accession, he is known to have incurred heavy debts.[29] As he himself says in the 1575 edition of Posies when relating his efforts to maintain the expenditures required to cut a dashing figure at court,

> Of every farme I then let flye a lease,
> To feede the purse that payde for peevishnesse:
> Till rente and all were falne in suche disease,
> As scarse coulde serve to mayntayne cleanlynesse:
> They bought, the bodie, fine, ferme, lease, and lande,
> All were to little for the merchauntes hande.
> (Works, I, 67)[30]

Forced to leave court in 1563 he retired to the country but became involved in costly law-suits which continued and increased until he was brought to financial ruin.[31] In April, 1570, Gascoigne was in Bedford Gaol for debt, although it is not known how long he stayed there. By the winter of 1572, however, Gascoigne seems to have recovered from his earlier misfortunes, and it would appear that he had managed to get himself elected to Parliament as a Burgess for Midhurst after his return from Holland in October. Certain unknown persons (probably Gascoigne's creditors) then sent a petition to the Privy Council, objecting to Gascoigne's election. The petition first accuses Gascoigne of being "indebted to a greate number of personnes, for the which cause he hathe absented him-

selfe from the citie, and hath lurked at villages neere unto the same citie by a longe time, and nowe beinge returned for a burgesse of Midehurste in the countie of Sussex, doethe shewe his face openlie, in the despite of all his creditors."[32] More serious charges are then made, and Gascoigne is accused of being "a defamed person and noted as well for manslaughter, as for other greate crymes." In addition he is accused of being "a common rymer and a deviser of slaunderous pasquelles againste diverse personnes of greate callinge" and of being "a notorious ruffianne and especialle noted to be both a spie, an atheist, and godlesse personne."[33] What action the Privy Council took (if any), and what the reaction of Parliament was to these charges is not known. What is clear, however, is that Gascoigne did not take his place in Parliament, for, in the hope, perhaps, that the affair would blow over, he returned to Holland in the spring of 1573 with a group of English volunteers to fight once more for the cause of Protestantism. When he returned to England in 1574, he found himself in trouble over A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres. From this moment on Gascoigne is the repentant prodigal. He prefaces a new edition of Flowres with apologies while taking up his pen to write moral and godly works. Among these is The Glasse of Governement, and, as Gascoigne's biographer has pointed out concerning the plot of this play, "the actions of the wayward youths who neglect their studies and come to ruin bear only too close a parallel to Gascoigne's own career."[34]

Like that other penitent Greene, Gascoigne found

inspiration (and perhaps solace) in the parable of the Prodigal Son and wrote his adaptation as a mark of his reformation.[35] Greene's Mourning Garment (1590) purports to "discover the forwardnesse of youth to ill" and "the fatal detriment that followes the contempt of grave and advised counsaile."[36] Its overt aim is to show the "Gentlemen Schollers of both Universities" how "ripe wits are soonest inveighed, and Schollers of all men deepest intangled."[37] Gascoigne, writing some fifteen years earlier, professes similar objectives. As he states it, his purpose is to show "howe hygh the vertuous clyme, /Howe low they fall which lyve withouten feare /Of God or man" (p. 6). As the Prologue says,

> Reformed speeche doth now become us best,
> Mens wordes muste weye and tryed be by touche
> Of Gods owne worde, wherein the truth doth rest.
> Content you then (my Lordes) with good intent,
> Grave Citizens, you people greate and small,
> To see your selves in Glasse of Governement:
> Beholde rashe youth, which daungerously doth fall
> On craggy rockes of sorrowes nothing softe,
> When sober wittes by Vertue clymes alofte.
> (p. 6)

Recognizing that his own misfortunes are largely the consequence of a misspent youth, Gascoigne uses the parable as the basis for a presentation of the problems of educating youth in what often seems more like a moral tract than a play. Almost certainly the work is designed to be read by young people, though in the Prologue he addresses himself to "my Lordes" and "Grave Citizens." Less likely is it that the work was intended for performance, since the long lessons of the schoolmaster to his pupils are written virtually in the form of sermons and do not seem designed for dramatic presentation

on a stage, although in thinking this one may possibly be underestimating the willingness of a sixteenth century audience to listen to such blatent didacticism in such extended form. But whether it was performed or not, the work, which Schelling, writing before the first publication of Misogonus, called "the sole representative . . . in the history of English literature" of school dramas based on "that wider cycle, 'The Prodigal Son'," [38] belongs, I feel, with the other "School Dramas" in this chapter.

Gascoigne's play is Terentian in a number of respects, though, as Gascoigne points out in his Prologue, his source is not so much Terence as "Gods owne worde," by which he obviously means the parable. The play is carefully divided into five acts. The unity of place is preserved, though not that of time, and an attempt is made to observe the unity of action. Perhaps Gascoigne was here drawing on his earlier experiments in translating Dolce's Giocasta and Ariosto's I Suppositi and certainly his use of a Chorus would appear to derive from Dolce and Senecan tragedy, though it would also seem likely that structurally his play also owes something to the Dutch writers of the Christian Terence. After all, Gascoigne had just spent some years fighting in the Low Countries where it is virtually certain that he would have come across the works of the Dutch dramatists even if he had not done so before.[39]

It is surely his acquaintance with all things Dutch which caused him to set his play in Holland. Nor is it without significance that one of his prodigals is named after

Philautus in Acolastus. Furthermore the constant anxiety of Phylopaes, the father of one of the prodigals in Gascoigne's play, is reminiscent of the disquietude shown by Pelargus in Gnapheus' play.[40]

In contrast to the works of Terence and to Acolastus, Gascoigne's play is in prose except for the Prologue, Epilogue and Choruses, but at the same time the plot involves a number of the stock figures of Latin Comedy. These include fathers and sons in opposition to one another, a courtesan, a bawd, an intriguing servant, a parasite, a schoolmaster and messengers. The play is unusual in that it appears to have a contemporary setting. The Greek names of the characters for the most part have been Latinized as is traditional in the plays of the Christian Terence, and throughout the work, in fact, Gascoigne seems very conscious of his relationship to the Christian Terence, though the words of his Prologue are a little misleading as to his attitude:

> A Comedie, I meane for to present,
> No Terence phrase: his tyme and myne are twaine:
> The verse that pleasde a Romaine rashe intent
> Myght well offend the godly Preachers vayne.
> (p. 6)

Later, however, his views are clarified when the schoolmaster, Gnomaticus, after mentioning that "out of Terence may also be gathered many morall enstructions amongst the rest of his wanton discourses," and after saying that "the true christian must direct his steppes by the infallible rule of Gods woord," nevertheless goes on to say,

I would not have you thinke hereby that I do holde in contempt

the bookes which you have redde heretofore, but wee will (by Gods grace) take in assistance such and so many of them as may seeme consonant to the holy scriptures, and so joyning the one with the other, we shalbe the better able to bring our worke unto perfection.

(I, iv, p. 17)

In the same vein the Chorus elsewhere says,

> Let shame of sinne, thy Childrens bridle be,
> And spurre them foorth, with bounty wysely used:
> That difference, each man may plainly see,
> Tweene parentes care, and maisters bodes abused:
> So Terence taught, whose lore is not refused.
>
> (I, v, p. 26)

Gascoigne's view that Terence is a storehouse of moral precepts which can be integrated with Christian thought, and his use of Terentian form, are quite in harmony with the other writers of the Christian Terence. That he does not in this play exploit the comic potential for entertainment derived from scenes of intrigue and dissipation prevalent in Latin Comedy is perhaps a sign that he was more sincere about practising what he preached than were certain other authors of the Christian Terence.

The plot of The Glasse of Governement concerns two fathers, Phylopaes and Phylocalus, who each have two sons. All four sons are considered almost ready to be sent to university, and the two fathers hope to send them away from Antwerp, where they live, to Douai but decide to place them under the schoolmaster, Gnomaticus, for a short period first. We are then treated to an example of the schoolmaster's teaching in the form of a very long sermon on the duties a Christian owes to God and his ministers on earth. After a break for dinner the sermon is continued at equally great

length, and Gnomaticus discourses on the duties owed to the King, magistrates, country, elders, and parents, the last-named receiving special emphasis. Finally the boys are urged to honour their own bodies as being the Temples of God.

At this point the true characters of the young scholars emerge. The two elder sons from each family, Phylautus and Phylosarchus ("Self-love" and "Loving flesh" respectively) express their impatience to be rid of the schoolmaster's commonplaces and show themselves anxious to be off to university:

> . . . at the Universitie we should have choyse company of gallant young gentlemen, with whom we might acquaint our selves, and passe some times in recreation: yea, shall I tell you? if a man list to play the good fellow and be mery sometymes, hee shall not want there (as I have heard) that wyll accompanie him.
>
> (II, ii, p. 35)

Before long the pair are introduced by Eccho, a parasite, to Lamia, a courtesan, and her aunt Pandarina, while the younger sons, Phylomusus and Phylotimus ("Loving the muses" and "Loving honour" respectively) endeavour to put into verse what they have learned from Gnomaticus. In this way Gascoigne gives us full value in his adaptation of the parable for we are presented with two prodigals, two virtuous brothers and two fathers. For some reason, however, it is the two elder brothers who are the prodigals.

In traditional fashion the two prodigals attend a banquet at Lamia's house, though in contrast to analogous scenes in most Prodigal Son plays this is not given on stage (V, vii, p. 82). On hearing of this escapade, the fathers

decide in consultation with Gnomaticus to send all four boys immediately to Douai University. Once there the prodigals, however, are "seldome from the Bordelles or Taverns" (p. 75), while the virtuous brothers by contrast soon find themselves rising in the world. One is made secretary to the Palsgrave, while the other enters the ministry, preaches at the university with great success and, so we are told, "meaneth shortly to go unto Geneva" (V, ii, p. 75), which he later does "moved with an earnest zeale and spirit, and there he is in singuler commendation and much followed" (V, ix, p. 85).

The fates of the prodigals, however, are quite different and in deliberate contrast to the parable. Phylosarchus in keeping with his name, is arrested for fornication in Geneva and there "whipped openly three severall dayes in the market, and . . . banished the Towne with great infamie, notwithstanding that his Brother Phylotimus was an earnest suter unto the congregation for him" (V, ix, p. 87). There are fears that Phylosarchus may die, and if so, he would find himself in the company of Phylautus who is executed for robbery at the Palsgrave's court, "yea even in sight of his Brother, and notwithstanding the favour that hee is in there" (V, ix, p. 86). The play ends with Ambidexter, the intriguing servant who has accompanied Phylosarchus, and Eccho, the parasite who first inveigled the prodigals into dissipation, being "whyped aboute the Towne three severall market dayes, with papers declaring their faults set upon their heds" (V, ix, p. 87).

This rather startling catastrophe is quite in keeping with the description of the play, which appears on the title page of the 1575 edition: "A tragicall Comedie so entituled, bycause therein are handled aswell the rewardes for Vertues, as also the punishment for Vices" (p. 1). Such a dramatic theory seems based on a moral premise which leaves little room for repentance or forgiveness. In terms of the parable the ending of the play is, of course, a distortion of the plot-pattern of the original and a distortion furthermore of its spirit. This is not so unusual for a Prodigal Son play, as we already know, but it is still a matter for comment.

Such a stern and rigorous insistence on the penalties for sin, and a possible allusion to the Doctrine of Predestination by the Chorus when it states that "vertue seldome can prevaile, where vice so rooted is" (p. 71), suggest a Calvinist point of view on the part of Gascoigne. This possibility is made to seem more likely by the fact that the punishments of the sinners are exacted in Antwerp and Geneva, both strongholds of Calvinism.[41] As was the case with the prodigals in Nice Wanton, the erring youths in Gascoigne's play are presented in a rigidly consistent form with the consequent implication that they may be unalterably damned from the beginning. But where at the end of Nice Wanton some grounds for hope were given that the sinners might still be saved, none are given in Gascoigne's play. Instead the wages of sin are paid in full.

The harsh fate of the prodigals in The Glasse of

Governement occurs ironically at the expense of the schoolmaster who consistently has advocated a more tolerant view of sin and has maintained less stern views on punishment than the other plays of this type all seem to have manifested. At one point, for example, Gnomaticus states,

> . . . greate difference there is betweene children and young men, for in childhoode all punishment is terrible, but in florishing youth every punishment may not be used, but discretion must foresee what kynde of punishment wil most prevaile and best gayne reformation in the mind of the offender.
> (III, v, p. 53)

It is Gnomaticus who says of the prodigals' sinful behaviour,

> But surely to confesse a trueth, I judge that it rather proceeded by the entisements of others, then by their own default. Oh how perillous is lewde company unto youngmen?
> (IV, vii, p. 69)

Ironically too it is Gnomaticus (whose name means "discerning") who is deceived by Eccho in II, iv, when the latter comes with a false message designed to get Phylautus and Phylosarchus out of the house. It is Gnomaticus who is so keen to recommend that the boys all go immediately to university, and who then entrusts a vital letter to the rogue Ambidexter. Similarly it is the schoolmaster who in V, iii, tries to persuade the two fathers that all "will fal out better then you looke for" with regard to the two prodigals (p. 77). It looks very much as though Gascoigne is attacking the lenient attitudes of Gnomaticus (and perhaps of English Humanist schoolmasters such as Ascham), although at the same time Gascoigne surely does not expect us to question the content of Gnomaticus' teaching. However, this is not the only problem in the interpretation of this play.

Gnomaticus would appear to be modeled on an actual schoolmaster of Brabant. In the play, we are told that he comes from St. Antlines and has been a tutor in "the Lord of Barlemontes house, whose children he hath in small time made excellent Schollers, and now hath dispatched them to the Universitie of Doway" (I, i, p. 11). As A.B. Feldman has pointed out, "the baron Berlaymont of Gascoigne's time was a financial minister to the Duchess of Parma, whom Philip II had made regent of the Netherlands."[42] The implication here is that Gnomaticus is a Catholic, and this ties in very well with the fact that he habitually recommends his youthful charges to the University of Douai, founded in 1562 by Philip II, and a bulwark of Roman Catholicism at the time Gascoigne was fighting for the Prince of Orange. The fact that Douai was also the site from 1568 to 1578 of Father William Allen's English College from which numbers of Catholic missionaries left for England makes it even more surprising that Douai "but lately erected" (III, v, p. 53) should be accorded any praise in a work by Gascoigne. Yet this is precisely what Gnomaticus does:

> For mine owne opinion I lyke Doway very well, bothe for that it is neare, and from thence you maye allwayes within shorte tyme be advertised, and also because I do knowe very learned and faythfull men there, and herewithall it is but a lyttle Towne, and the Universytie but lately erected, wherby the roote of evill hath hetherto had least skope, and exercise hath beene (and is) the more streightly observed.
> (III, v, p. 53)

Surely such comments are meant by Gascoigne to be taken ironically, especially as the two prodigals, who know Douai as a town of "fayre women" (II, ii, p. 35), find so much entertain-

ment in brothels and taverns there. But if this is so, how are we to take the matter of the younger brothers, both of whom pursue their studies diligently there, one finding preferment with the Palsgrave, and the other becoming a leading citizen and preacher in Geneva? Are we to take the two younger brothers as heretics?

An explanation to the puzzle might be that Gascoigne, as he did in his earlier dramas, is adapting for his own purposes the work of some other dramatist, in this instance some Catholic dramatist whose work he had come across while in the Netherlands. The startling inconsistencies caused by the juxtaposition of reverence for Douai with even greater reverence for the Calvinists of Antwerp and Geneva would thus be explained as faults in his adaptation of a Catholic work to a Protestant context.

There is, however, another possibility and it is one which can only be suggested with some caution. Could Gascoigne, one asks, be mounting an attack in this work on those Puritanical tendencies of his age which had, during his lifetime and particularly on his return from the Netherlands, caused him so much trouble with his writings?[43] Perhaps Gascoigne feels he has more than a little in common with the prodigals in his play, one of whom is a poet and writes verses to his mistress Lamia, and both of whom express impatience with the kind of learning offered by the schoolmaster, but at the same time show themselves eager for another kind of learning:

> . . . at the Universitie we should heare other maner of teaching: There be lectures daily read of all the liberall sciences, of all languages, and of all moral discourses.
> (II, ii, p. 35)

Furthermore it is made quite clear in the play that it is the elder brothers who possess the greater wit and the greater potential (II, iv, p. 38), although as Gnomaticus points out when he alludes to the commonplace Elizabethan contrast between "quick" wits and "hard" wits,[44]

> Yea but what is that to the purpose? the quickest wits prove not alwayes best, for as they are readie to cõceive, so do they quickly forget, & therewithall, the finenesse of their capacitie doth carie such oftẽtimes to delight in vanities, since mans nature is such, that with ease it inclyneth to pleasure, and unwilling it is to indure pain or travell, without the which no vertue is obteyned.
> (II, iv, p. 38)

It may be that the play, just as it ostensibly purports to be, is intended to be a demonstration of the truth of Gnomaticus' words, but it may just be that Gascoigne is attempting to demonstrate what he sees as a threat to wit and artistic potential. This threat for him would be represented by the oversevere reaction of those of Calvinist views towards the sowing of wild oats by young wits. If such is the case and Gascoigne's work is satirical, it is plainly out of character with the extreme asceticism and moral concern of his later works which include translations of Pope Innocent's De Contemptu Mundi and Augustine's sermon on drunkenness which both appeared in The Droomme of Doomes Day (1576). Nevertheless The Glasse of Governement might still be a last attempt at criticizing the system which he then promptly decided to join. The question remains as to when exactly did the

"Italianate courtier" become the "Calvinist moralist."[45]

Returning to our consideration of The Glasse of Governement as a Prodigal Son play and bearing in mind the slight possibility that it may not be quite what it seems, we should note once again that, as with other works in which the prodigals came to a bad end, the moral of Gascoigne's play is primarily a prudential one: virtue is repaid with worldly success and vice with fierce physical sufferings, ruin, and even death. The lesson for students clearly concerns the necessity of obedience to parents, schoolmasters and magistrates. As far as parents are concerned, there appears to be no specific moral in this play in contrast to the other two works considered in this chapter. Phylopaes and Phylocalus appear to do all in their power to bring up their four children correctly, yet they are only successful with two. The lesson to a Calvinist would be clear, always provided that Gascoigne means what he says.

Looking back over the three plays discussed in this chapter one can see how the fascination which the parable had held for European schoolmaster-dramatists came to be shared by teachers in England.[46] Gascoigne does not quite fit this pattern, though possibly his play was designed for performance at Gray's Inn with which he had been associated during his life; nevertheless he does seem to share a common moral purpose with Ingelend and the author (or authors) of Misogonus. All three dramas make use of the parable as a means of inculcating filial obedience in youth. Obedience, as we have seen,

does not only apply to fathers. It also applies to other "fathers" who include elders, spiritual ministers and magistrates, but, most important of all, the school and university teacher.

In this way the plays all reflect the enormous value which Protestant thought placed upon education. For Protestants, education provided the means by which each individual could approach the Bible without the necessity of the intermediary role of the Church. At the same time education was, in the view of many Protestants, the means whereby a formerly corrupt and ignorant clergy might be reformed and better fitted to engage in ministering spiritual aid to mankind. Education was also seen as the means to prosperity and higher social status, the two rewards for those who submitted themselves diligently and in a disciplined fashion to the educative process. Such rewards were at the same time regarded as the signs of God's favour. Those who, like the Prodigal Son, did not strive to better themselves by education had their deserts: ruin, both financial and social, and a life of material misery and spiritual desperation to follow. Great stress is paid to the prudential aspect of this moral. Furthermore it is made clear that it also applies to parents, who, if they neglect their duties towards their children, will be liable to suffer misery and anxiety as a result. Again the moral is a prudential one.

Two of the plays discussed in this chapter, The Disobedient Child and The Glasse of Governement, also reflect

their Protestant milieu in that both are Calvinistic in their attitudes to sin and punishment for sin, whereas the other play, Misogonus, seems to be more Lutheran in character in that it places, like Acolastus, a great deal of emphasis on God's ability to work good from evil and man's consequent responsibility to have faith in the belief that God has a plan and that the plan is merciful.

CHAPTER IV

ALLEGORICAL TREATMENTS OF THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON

Although the majority of English Prodigal Son plays are not allegorical, there are a number of exceptions. Of these there are some plays which make use of allegorical elements derived from the Moralities, while others would appear to be influenced by certain allegorical treatments of Wealth in Classical literature. In this chapter I shall discuss the anonymous comedy The Prodigal Son (ca. 1590-1620) as an example of a Prodigal Son play containing allegorical elements derived from the Morality tradition, and two of Jonson's plays, Cynthia's Revels (1600) and The Staple of News (1626), as examples of Prodigal Son plays in which the dual influence of Classical allegory and the Moralities is to be discerned. I shall also include short discussions of several other plays employing allegorical techniques in their adaptations of the Prodigal Son story. Though strictly speaking some of these last-named fall outside the period with which this study is concerned, I have included them in order to demonstrate how attractive allegorical presentations of the parable seem to have remained for playwrights well into the third and fourth decades of the seventeenth century.

The Prodigal Son

This work is known only in the German version which

was included among the Englische Comedien und Tragedien published in 1620, perhaps in Leipzig. Like the other works in this volume, The Prodigal Son was one of the plays acted by the English companies in Germany during the 1590's and early 1600's up to the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1618 when their very popular activities appear to have been greatly curtailed.[1] There exist records of performances by the English comedians of a Von dem verlohrnen Sohn in Nördlingen in 1604 and in Passau in November, 1607; and in addition a Comoedi von dem verlornen Sohn was performed by them in Graz in February, 1608,[2] but one cannot be absolutely sure that these records refer to the play printed in 1620. The date of composition of the play is unknown, but it may well predate such plays as Misogonus and The Glasse of Governement, as Bond believes.[3] The fact that the play as we have it is in German merely suggests that in its extant form the text can be dated between about 1600, when the English comedians began to perform plays in German,[4] and 1620, the date of its publication.

Richard Simpson in The School of Shakespere at one time argued that The Prodigal Son was by Shakespeare. This theory of authorship depended upon the identification of Posthaste in Histriomastix (1598-99) as Shakespeare, and the assumption that the parody of Posthaste's Prodigal Son play in Histriomastix was in fact a parody of the play performed by the English comedians in Germany.[5] Most literary historians now agree, however, that Posthaste is almost certainly

Anthony Munday, and a comparison of the parody play in Histriomastix with the Prodigal Son play performed in Germany reveals that they have little more than their titles in common, which is certainly not sufficient to justify the idea that one is a parody of the other. Simpson's theory would thus appear to be little more than wishful thinking. Nevertheless, Simpson did perform the service of translating the German play back into English, and, in the following discussion, references will be to Simpson's translation, quotations being drawn from the same source.[6]

A reading of The Prodigal Son reveals that it keeps far closer to the original narrative pattern of the parable than any other English Prodigal Son play, while at the same time it appears to make use of a number of motifs concerning the Prodigal Son's dissipated living derived from popular iconographic tradition. Indeed if one were to look for a representative Prodigal Son play, this work would be a good choice--an even better one, I believe, than Acolastus.

The work, which does not become allegorical until Act V, begins with the Prodigal Son, who is about to leave his father, in the act of demanding his patrimony. His motive for leaving is that he wishes to learn the "various manners and tongues" of the world (p. 92). In this way he will earn praise and respect from his friends on his return when he tells them of all he has seen. With implied criticism of his elder brother, who is described in the stage directions as "a simple plain man," the younger son says,

> Dearest father, I ask, what is he for a man, who always lies there at home like a wolf in his den, and never comes from his mother's apron-string?
>
> (p. 92)

The father then draws a very interesting distinction between the two kinds of behaviour open to a young man who travels. The God-fearing young man, he explains, will take service with honest people, will see and experience much, will learn the liberal sciences, and will study to be virtuous. In this, one sees a reflection of the educational aims of those who advocated the foreign tour as an indispensible part of a gentleman's education during the second half of the sixteenth century and onwards.[7] That a young man might equally well be led astray is recognized by the father, however, when he describes quite another kind of behaviour, which he associates with those young men who take a great fortune with them, behave godlessly, "live day and night in a din, . . . lose the bloom of their youth with good-for-nothing companions, or even with whores and ingles; . . . study every vice till they have spent all their fortune; and after all they have learnt nothing in their youth, they cannot take service in good houses, nay, God's judgement comes down upon them" (p. 93).[8]

The father then goes off to fetch the younger son's patrimony and it is made clear which kind of traveller the latter will be when he says,

> Now may I be joyful, that my father is gone to fetch my Patrimony, with which I go into the world, and make myself jolly and frolic, and am my own master.
>
> (p. 93)

Obviously our prodigal in this play will be typical of those

Elizabethan youths, of whom there must have been many, who, having been sent off on a tour abroad to further their education, used their opportunity to explore all kinds of forbidden knowledge.

In The Prodigal Son the elder brother then tries to persuade his younger brother to stay at home, warning him that he will soon find himself a beggar. As in the parable, his air of self-righteousness is his chief characteristic, and it is interesting that the author of the play has chosen to bring the elder brother into the story at the very beginning of his play, thereby avoiding the somewhat awkward manner in which the elder brother appears, quite unprepared for, at the end of the parable in the Bible.

When the father returns with the money for his younger son, he delivers a speech of advice, and in this we must see, I believe, a reflection of the many books and "Letters of Advice" that were written during the period when foreign travel was so fashionable a part of a young gentleman's education. Such works on travel, together with many collections of precepts written by fathers for their sons, became a minor literary form, "a special branch of the extensive literature bearing on education and upbringing."[9] Shakespeare, as pointed out earlier (Ch. II, Note 75), gently mocks the form when he has Polonius "lecture" Laertes, but in The Prodigal Son the author intends no comedy at the expense of the father when the latter warns his son against tippling, unchastity, evil company and gambling (p. 95).

All such advice, however, is wasted on the youth, who, once his father and brother have gone, talks of the girls his money will buy in foreign lands. He and his servant ride away to the sound of trumpets (p. 97), in a manner reminiscent, perhaps, of the triumphant departure of the Prodigal Son depicted in the magnificent early sixteenth century Flemish tapestry now in the Musée Cluny in Paris.

Act II shows the arrival of the young man at a town in Italy, that land from which, according to Roger Ascham, many an English traveller so often returned "worse transformed than ever was any in Circe's court."[10] In this town the young man puts up at an inn where the inn-keeper's daughter, who has been a whore some three years (p. 101), agrees to be "body servant" to him, while the inn-keeper's wife offers herself to the servant (p. 99). The conspiracy between the two women to fleece the young man of his money is acted out in various stages, all of them strongly reminiscent of traditional iconographic representations of the parable such as were described in Chapter I of this study. First the young man gives a feast at which there is music and drinking, and much amorous dalliance between himself and the courtesan, during which she asks him to give her the gold chain from around his neck (p. 104). It is interesting to note in passing that Lais in Acolastus makes a similar request. Just possibly the author of The Prodigal Son knew the earlier play, but Carver's contention that The Prodigal Son "is not another play on the theme of Acolastus but Acolastus itself with some superficial

changes" is quite unacceptable.[11] The fact that the two plays both depict the arrival of the prodigal at an inn, the loss of the prodigal's money, the prodigal's appeal for mercy, and his subsequent violent expulsion, merely attests to the strength of the tradition governing representations of the parable. It is no proof of the dependence of one play upon another. In The Prodigal Son the young man also puts rings on the girl's fingers (p. 105), and this is followed by the traditional gambling scene. Because he has had too much to drink, the prodigal asks the inn-keeper's daughter to play his cards for him. Naturally she is careful to lose to her parents, and, when she goes to bed with the prodigal, she further adds to his losses by stealing his purse.

The next morning the prodigal (his name is not given), unaware of the theft, decides to indulge in a version of "strip poker" with the girl ("my greatest joy is to play with pretty maids for their clothes, and to make them strip before me" p. 108). At the same time he orders another banquet, but it is then he discovers that his purse is missing. This is the cue for all to demand payment. The inn-keeper, his wife and his daughter all combine in confiscating the young man's horses and trunks and in stripping the clothes off his back, although, when he asks for pity, the wife throws him some old clothes. Finally, as in so many pictorial representations of the parable, the two women beat the prodigal out of the house.

In Act V we see the prodigal "in his beggar's clothes" begging unsuccessfully from door to door for food during a

famine (p. 113). He now realizes the error of his ways and prays for forgiveness. It is at this point that the most interesting section of the play begins, for now the action, which hitherto has apparently been quite straightforeward, suddenly takes on an allegorical dimension. Carrying a drawn sword, Despair enters and, echoing the words of the Elder Brother in the parable, recounts the prodigal's sinful behaviour:

> Thou knowest thou wast not obedient to thy father; thou madest him give thee thy patrimony, wherewith thou wentest forth into a far country, didst waste and consume it in a twinkling, with harlots and wanton companions.
> (p. 114)

Despair, in keeping with his nature, then suggests that the prodigal's sins are too great to be forgiven. He appeals to the prodigal's sense of pride, pointing out the shame the prodigal would feel were he to meet with his former acquaintances. Finally Despair suggests suicide:

> The Judgement of God is now upon thee, and thou shalt never more come into His grace, but must be damned eternally. Thou shalt now utterly perish with hunger, and it would be an eternal shame if any man saw thee who knew thee heretofore. Therefore thou must now fall into Despair. Take this sword and cut short thy life.
> (p. 114)

We have already discussed in Chapter I the traditional association of despair with the protagonist of the Moralities and with the Prodigal Son parable. We have seen too how despair entered the thoughts of the protagonist in almost every Prodigal Son play discussed thus far, and we have also remarked upon plays such as Skelton's morality Magnyfycence, Wapull's The Tyde Tarrieth No Man,[12] and Greene's Looking

Glass for London, in all of which the allegorical figure of Despair appears on stage. Now, in The Prodigal Son, we have the only English Prodigal Son play in which Despair is presented in personified form on stage.

It will be remembered also that in Spenser's portrayal of Despair in Book I of The Faerie Queene, Red Cross, the intended victim of Despair, is saved by Una, who represents, among other things, the True Church, while in Skelton's play the intended victim is saved by Good Hope. This last-named figure is the usual opponent of Despair in traditional allegories of the Vices and Virtues,[13] and it is Hope who enters running in The Prodigal Son in order to save the prodigal. Driving out Despair, Hope imparts the traditional remedy for the sinner who fears damnation:

> . . . though thy sins were as many as the sand of the sea, if thou only hast sorrow and hatest them in thy soul, and hast a believing and penitent heart, God will indeed forgive them. (p. 115)

In this, of course, we are reminded strongly of those interpretations of the parable quoted in Chapter I which stressed the idea that the parable provided a demonstration of the fact that God's mercy is always greater than the requirements of the sinners who stand most in need of it. Sinners who are like the prodigal in this play and lack faith in this fundamental Christian teaching are doing what Chaucer's Parson called "sinning in the holy gost."[14] Such sinners may well be repentant but if, as happens initially in this play, they lack hope, then they are especially vulnerable to the extreme spiritual peril represented here by Despair. Calvin put the

matter most graphically in his Institutes:

> The more severe we are toward ourselves, and the more sharply we examine our own sins, the more we ought to hope that God is favorable and merciful toward us. And truly, it could not happen otherwise than that the soul itself, stricken by dread of divine judgment, should act the part of an avenger in carrying out its own punishment. Those who are really religious experience what sort of punishments are shame, confusion, groaning, displeasure with self, and other emotions that arise out of a lively recognition of sin. Yet we must remember to exercise restraint, lest sorrow engulf us. For nothing more readily happens to fearful consciences than falling into despair.[15]

This is the danger which Despair represents for the prodigal in this play and from which the prodigal is saved by Hope.

When Hope has left the prodigal, "a citizen of mean condition" enters and offers the young man a job feeding pigs. For the moment the drama shifts onto a non-allegorical level when the prodigal, like his counterpart in the parable, suffers the pangs of hunger:

> O how fain would I now eat with the swine their food of husks, but I cannot get it. For the swine themselves have none, and I must tend them here, where they may grub for roots.
> (p. 116)

He prays to God for mercy, and, in words that echo the parable, he again admits his folly in not following his father's good advice:

> O, my dearest father, had I followed your precepts which you rehearsed to me, and gave me as the best viaticum for my journey, alack, it would never have come to this pass with me. But I was wanton and petulant, and would not even listen to advice from him. O, dearest father, how many hired servants hast thou who have their fill of bread, while I perish here with hunger.
> (p. 117)

At this point the prodigal's spiritual state is again allegorized, for Despair re-enters and says,

> Poor miserable wretch, lo, where thou liest, there must thou

likewise perish of hunger. Thou sayest that if thou hast a penitent heart God will be merciful to you; but it is quite otherwise. Thy sins are too great to be forgiven. Thou seest now plain enough how God hath forsaken thee, and will no longer help thee; thou art undone for ever. Only take this sword, and take thy life.

(p. 117)

In the tradition of the Psychomachia and of the Moralities, Virtue, here in the form of Hope, now engages in battle with Vice for possession of Man's soul. Hope is victorious, and Despair is driven away:

Thou shameless devil, how darest thou be so bold, as again to tempt such a penitent? No thou shalt never get this man into thy claws. His Faith and Hope are too great. Therefore take yourself off to the abyss of hell, and pack hence, for thou shalt have no part in him.

(p. 117)

Then, in keeping with her allegorical role, Hope offers to lead the sinner home to his father.[16] At the same time it is Hope who suggests to the prodigal what he should say on his return:

Thou miserable man, abide constant in hope, rise up, and go to thy father, and say to him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am henceforth no more worthy to be called thy son. Make me as one of thy hired servants.

(p. 117)

The departure of Hope and the prodigal marks the end of this very striking allegorical episode. Not only does it demonstrate the strong influence of the Morality tradition on the anonymous author of The Prodigal Son, but it also suggests that he was aware of the traditional associations of the sin of despair with the parable. Possibly the episode is somewhat incongruous, since the shifts in and out of the allegorical dimension are quite abrupt and unprepared for. On the other hand, the episode as a consequence draws a great deal of

attention to itself, and one might argue that it is dramatically effective in that it highlights at a crucial moment the spiritual dilemma of the protagonist. By externalizing in this way the prodigal's inner conflict, the anonymous author of The Prodigal Son is being no less dramatically effective, perhaps, than is Marlowe in the scene in Dr. Faustus in which Mephostophilis offers the despairing Faustus a dagger while the Old Man (here intended as a figure of Hope) reminds Faustus of God's precious grace and the need to avoid despair.[17]

The remainder of The Prodigal Son follows the original parable very closely indeed, more so than any other English Prodigal Son play. The prodigal returns, falls on his knees before his father and makes the same confession as his counterpart in the Bible. The father forgives him and calls for fresh clothes, a ring, and shoes, and he orders the fatted calf to be killed, "for this my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found" (p. 119). The play ends with the episode involving the elder brother whom we see returning from a day's sowing in his father's fields. As in the Bible, he is surprised at the sounds of merriment, and he is angry when the servant explains the cause of the rejoicing. The words used by the father and the elder son in the Bible are reiterated here in the play with some additions, of which the final two speeches are of especial interest since they illuminate the author's own interpretation of the parable. The last words of the father are:

O have not so stony a heart. Rejoice with me, for thy brother was in the devils claws, but now has he come to his right mind, and is converted, and is come to us with penitent heart, and now he is heir with us of eternal life and Paradise. Therefore be joyful with us, dearest son.

(p. 120)

To this the elder brother replies:

Dearest father, you have rightly corrected me, I am heartily glad that my brother is converted, that he with us may inherit God's kingdom. Now I will go in with you and be merry.

(p. 120)

Clearly the author of this play interprets the return of the prodigal in the parable as a representation of the entry of a penitent into the ranks of the saved. The emphasis is not so much upon the willing forgiveness of the father as upon the fact of the prodigal's spiritual conversion. At the same time, the elder brother's initially hostile attitude derives not so much from an unwillingness to forgive (although he is not entirely guiltless of this) as from his failure to realize that his younger brother is now converted and in a position to inherit God's kingdom.

All this suggests a very Protestant concern on the part of the author with the matter of conversion, and it is this same concern which is so much to the fore in the allegorical battle between Despair and Hope. The conflict between these two represents the mind of the sinner at a crucial stage, since the prodigal's sense of sin can lead him either to Hell or to the inheritance of God's kingdom, which, but for the aid of Hope, would certainly have been lost to him.

It is the use of the allegorical techniques of the Moralities and of the traditional association of despair with

the Prodigal Son parable that constitute the chief interest of The Prodigal Son in this study. However, it might also be mentioned before we leave this play that, by having the elder brother change his attitude towards the prodigal, the author has made a notable change in the original pattern of the parable in which the conflict between the father and the elder son remains unresolved when the parable ends. The play is also remarkable for the manner in which it follows so closely the traditional iconographic renderings of the parable as well as for the way it retains most of the dialogue of the Biblical original. These last-named features result in this play's being perhaps the most representative of the English Prodigal Son plays, but this fact renders the work far less interesting than those plays which depart more radically in some way or another from their source.

Jonson and the Sources for 'Cynthia's Revels' and 'The Staple of News'

Since I believe that Jonson's allegorical presentations of the Prodigal Son parable in both Cynthia's Revels and The Staple of News are in part based on the ideas of the first chapter in Book IV of Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics, it might be worthwhile before discussing the plays in detail to point out certain features of this chapter in the Ethics which Jonson almost certainly had in mind when writing these two plays. First one should note that the name of Jonson's prodigal in Cynthia's Revels is Asotus. Jonson may have derived it from Macropedius' drama of the same name, but more

probably he found it in this section of the Ethics. Aristotle uses the word when he is discussing liberality as the ideal mean in dealings with material goods, the extremes being illiberality or avarice on the one hand and prodigality on the other. Both these extremes are to be seen as vices which, if subjected to due measure, would be transformed into virtue (that of liberality in this instance). This concept is of particular relevance, as will be seen, to both Cynthia's Revels and The Staple of News. In the latter, for example, it provides the basic idea for the contrasts between Pennyboy Canter (the liberal man), Pennyboy Senior (the illiberal man) and Pennyboy Junior (the prodigal). In addition it furnishes us with an explanation of the nature of the eventual conversions of the two last-named characters into liberal men.

In this chapter of the Ethics, Aristotle gives a definition of prodigality, and this is worth quoting here, both from the point of view of our understanding of his discussion of liberality, and also because it provides the context from which Jonson appears to have taken the name "Asotus" ("ἄσωτος" or "past saving") for his prodigal:

> . . . the word "prodigality" has sometimes in our use of it wider implications, since debauchees and men who squander their money on vicious self-indulgence are also called prodigal. For this reason prodigality is looked upon with extreme disfavour as including more than one vice. But this is an improper use of the term, for prodigality does not imply the possession of more than one vice, that of squandering one's means. The man who is the cause of his own ruin is "past saving", the general opinion being that to exhaust one's means is much the same as ruining oneself, because our "means" are our means of living. --This, then, we take to be the meaning of "prodigality".[18]

A little later, Aristotle further defines the nature of the

prodigal by describing him as one "who gives to the wrong persons or from some ignoble motive" (p. 110). Prodigals, so Aristotle explains,

> . . . never think of giving to persons of good character, but lavish their favours on toadies or anybody who ministers to their pleasures. That is why most prodigals are intemperate as well.
>
> (p. 114)

Where the liberal man would feel pain in giving wrongly or ignobly, the prodigal "does not feel pleasure or pain on occasions when he should, nor feel them in the right way" (pp. 112-3), and, as we shall see, this is a feature of which Jonson makes a great deal when he depicts the misuses of wealth by his prodigals.

Aristotle also points out, however, that in the case of the prodigal,

> Poverty and the passage of the years will soon cure him and make it possible for him to arrive at the mean. For he has the natural bent towards liberality--the instinct to give and to shrink from taking; only he does both in a wrong and morally unsound way. If this error could be rectified, by training or in some other way, he would be a liberal man, giving his money to the right persons and not accepting it at the wrong hands. It is this that makes people think him not a bad fellow at heart, for to carry too far the habit of giving without getting may show that you are silly but does not prove you to be a scoundrel or a cad. So the man whose prodigality takes this turn is held to be a much better type than the mean man both for the above-mentioned reasons and because he benefits a number of people, whereas the niggard benefits nobody, not even himself.
>
> (p. 113)[19]

Aristotle seems to be implying here that there is less hope of reform for the illiberal man than for the prodigal, and perhaps we are led to an instinctive agreement with this at the end of The Staple of News where we are willing to accept the prodigal's reform but find it hard to believe in the

reform of the prodigal's covetous uncle.

In both of these Prodigal Son plays Jonson personifies prodigality, very much as it is defined by Aristotle, in the two characters, Asotus and Pennyboy Junior, and in passing one might also mention that in Cynthia's Revels Aristotle's accusation that the prodigal gives without feeling to the wrong people is found as a character trait in Anaides as described by Mercury:

> One other genuine qualitie he has, which crownes all these, and that is this: to a friend in want, hee will not depart with the waight of a soldred groat, lest the world might censure him prodigall, or report him a gull: mary, to his cockatrice, or punquetto, halfe a dozen taffata gownes, or sattin kertles, in a paire or two of moneths, why they are nothing.
>
> (II, ii, 97-103)

In both plays Jonson also presents wealth in personified form, and this too may derive from Aristotle's discussion of liberality, at the beginning of which the liberal man and the prodigal man are so categorized according to their respective treatments of wealth (p. 109). Then, a few lines later, Aristotle says,

> Wealth is a commodity, and commodities may be used in a good or a bad way: every commodity is best used by the man who has the appropriate virtue; therefore wealth will be used best by the man who has the virtue which comes out in dealing with wealth. This is the liberal man.
>
> (pp. 109-10)

If the misuse of the commodity wealth is what distinguishes the prodigal and the miser from the liberal man, then the fact that Jonson chose in both his plays to allegorize just such an idea is surely significant. In Cynthia's Revels wealth appears in the form of Lady Argurion, and in The Staple

of News wealth again appears as a female, this time in the form of Lady Pecunia. Both of these characters, in keeping with what Aristotle has said on the subject, are sorely mistreated by the prodigals, Asotus and Pennyboy Junior, and by the miser, Pennyboy Senior.

In Cynthia's Revels there are no characters who represent either the mean of liberality or the extreme of illiberality or avarice, but in The Staple of News, as already mentioned, liberality is represented in the person of Pennyboy Canter, the prodigal's father, and illiberality in the person of Pennyboy Senior, the prodigal's uncle. Both plays, however, explore the idea put forward by Aristotle that "men who have inherited money are more open-handed than those who have made it" (p. 111). Aristotle admits that this is a common opinion, and it was certainly one that was shared by the Elizabethans and Jacobeans, as can be seen in two proverbs of the time: "A sparing Father and a spending (prodigal) son" and "What the Rake gathers the fork scatters."[20] As if in illustration of this opinion, both of Jonson's prodigals inherit their money, although in Pennyboy Junior's case the announcement of the father's death is a pretense, and both prodigals then scatter their wealth like the fork in the proverb just quoted, Pennyboy Junior even being referred to at one point as "young Scatter-good" (V, ii, 60).

If I suggest that Aristotle is Jonson's starting point for his allegorical presentation of the misuse of money, this is not to deny the influences of other works concerned with the same theme. Among these, Aristophanes' Plutus and Lucian's

Misanthropos are of importance in that they both contain personifications of wealth.[21] These two works also allegorize the mistreatment of riches by those who are either prodigal or illiberal. In Aristophanes' play, for example, Plutus, the personification of wealth, complains about the mistreatment he has commonly had whenever he has entered a stranger's house:

> Was it a miser's house; the miser straight
> Would dig a hole and pop me underground;
> And if some worthy neighbor came to beg
> A little silver for his urgent needs,
> Would vow he'd never seen me in his life.
> Or was it some young madcap's: in a jiffy
> Squandered and lost amongst his drabs and dice
> I'm bundled, naked, out of house and home.[22]

In Lucian's work, Riches complains of much the same problem, and his words are especially interesting in that they not only appear very close to those of Aristotle, when the latter talks about the inheritance of money and the manner of its misuse by prodigals, but furthermore Lucian would seem, like Aristotle, to anticipate the Elizabethan proverb of the rake and the fork, mentioned above. Explaining to Zeus why he does not want to go to Timon, Riches says,

> . . . he [Timon] treated me contumeliously, bundled me out, made ducks and drakes of me, although I was his father's friend, and all but thrust me out of the house with a pitch-fork, throwing me away as people throw hot coals out of their hands. Am I to go back, then, and be betrayed into the hands of parasites and toadies and prostitutes?[23]

In another incident in Lucian's work, Poverty gives the prodigal, Timon, a coat of skin to replace his soft mantle of wool (p. 369), and this may be a part source for the incident at the end of Act IV of The Staple of News when

the beggar (Pennyboy Canter) gives Pennyboy Junior his patched and ragged cloak.

From Aristophanes may derive the repeated ironic insistence in The Staple of News on Pecunia's divine qualities. She is referred to, for example, as the "talke o'the time! th'aduenture o'the age!" (I, vi, 63), and the "Venus of the time, and state" (II, v, 34), while in Plutus the same satiric point is made about man's attitude to wealth when Chremylus tells Plutus that "every mortal thing subserves to Wealth" (p. 469), and that "everything that's done is done for you" (p. 470). "Pecunia obediunt omnia" is a well-known adage in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, appearing, for example, in Richard Taverner's translation of Erasmus' Adages where it is stated that "Unto money be all things obedient," and that "this Proverbe was neuer better verified than at this daye amonges Christen men, whiche neuertheles by theyr profession, ought to despise worldly goodes."[24] In Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, the basic idea of the proverb is developed as follows:

> Our summum bonum is commodity, and the goddess we adore Dea Moneta, Queen Money, to whom we daily offer sacrifice, which steers our hearts, hands, affections, all: that most powerful goddess, by whom we are reared, depressed, elevated, esteemed, the sole commandress of our actions, for which we pray, run, ride, go, come, labour, and contend as fishes do for a crumb that falleth into the water.[25]

Of even greater importance is the theme of the Golden Mean as applied to the treatment of wealth. This theme is basic to the meaning of the two allegories of Jonson under discussion here, and it occurs not only in Aristotle, but in

Aristophanes and Lucian as well, for, just as Plutus' great misfortune is never to have met a moderate man (p. 472), Riches' praise in Misanthropos is reserved for those "who will do what is best and observe moderation in the thing, neither holding hands off altogether nor throwing me away outright" (pp. 344-5).

However, when Jonson wrote Cynthia's Revels, his first dramatic allegory on the theme of the misuse of wealth, he also had the Morality tradition of his own age to draw on for inspiration. Thomas Lupton in All for Money (1559-78), for example, had written a Morality in which Money appears as a central figure. The implied theme of the play is the familiar dictum that "Money is the root of all evil," although the Prologue makes clear that money is not necessarily evil in itself:

> . . . we may cut our necessaries and meate with our knyfe
> Wherewith many have cut their owne throates and bereved them of their lyfe.[26]

This agrees with Aristotle's views on the commodity of wealth. In addition, just as in Aristophanes' play everything that is done in the world is seen to be done for Plutus (a theme taken up by Jonson when he depicts the courtship of Lady Pecunia), in Lupton's play, Money enters claiming that he is worshipped and served by all classes and conditions of men. Lupton's allegory is further developed when Money becomes sick and vomits up Pleasure, who proceeds to vomit up Sinne, who in turn produces Damnation. After a scene in which the evil magistrate, All-for-Money, gives a series of biased legal

judgements by which the wealthy defendants are pardoned because of their riches while the poor are harshly treated because of their lack of money, Judas and Dives are presented as *exempla* of the damned fates of those who allow themselves to be motivated by monetary gain alone.

Another Morality in which money appears in allegorical form is Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* (*ca.* 1581). In this play money is allegorized in the form of Lady Lucre, her sex perhaps anticipating that of her two counterparts in Jonson, although it might be noted here that money is also presented in female form in the Morality called *The Trial of Treasure*, published in 1567, in which Lady Treasure appears as the lady-love of Lust.[27] The direct sources for Jonson's female personifications of money, however, may also owe something to Horace's "regina Pecunia" (*Epistles* I, vi, 37), and to Richard Barnfield's *The Encomion of Lady Pecunia* (1598), which not only contains an anticipation of the figures of Lady Argurion and Lady Pecunia, but in its ninth stanza seems also to contain in miniature a suggestion for the plot patterns of both *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Staple of News*:

> The young man, carelesse to maintaine his life
> Neglects her [Lady Pecunia's] love (as though he did abhor her)
> Like one that hardly doeth obtaine a wife,
> And when he hath her once, he cares not for her:
> Shee, seeing that the young man doeth despyse her,
> Leaves the franke hart, and flies unto the Myser.[28]

One might also mention Thomas Acheley's allegorical poem, *The Massacre of Money* (1602), in which Prodigus, Avarus and Liberalis are rivals for the love of Lady Pecunia. This work

could not have influenced Cynthia's Revels, of course, but it may well have been in Jonson's mind when he came to write The Staple of News. Three other contemporary works which Jonson may have known are worth mentioning also. The first of these is a ballad, The Silver Age, or, The World turned backward (1621), in which the powers of Lady Pecunia are described. Significantly, the figure of the prodigal is brought into the second stanza:

> The Lord and the Lady, the Begger and Knight,
> For Lady Pecunia cares not a Doit:
> Redeemed from prison, she taketh delight,
> To give to the Prodigall spender aright.
> Oh this is a silver age,
> Oh this is a wasting age.[29]

The other two works are Matthias Leius' Reginae Pecuniae (1623) and the same author's Reginae Pecuniae Regia (1623), written in collaboration with Johannis Secundi. Both of these works are Latin poems, and the latter ends with a section in English entitled "Money, as a Queen Apologizing for her selfe."

Returning for a moment to Wilson's play, we find that it also anticipates the courtship motif in Jonson's two allegories. At the beginning the two ladies, Love and Conscience, complain that men are more interested in Lady Lucre than in them. As the play progresses, the virtuous Love and Conscience are eventually overcome by the machinations of Lady Lucre and her followers, who include Usury, Dissimulation, Fraud and Simony. As a result of her poverty, Love is seduced into a marriage with Dissimulation, and Conscience is forced to keep a cottage where Lady Lucre can indulge privately in

such dubious activities as her neighbours and local constables might take objection to.

There is also a sequel to this play, The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (1588-90), in which the same three ladies appear together with a number of other allegorical figures. Lucre is again courted, but she appears to have undergone a moral conversion and pointedly refuses the services of her former followers. At the end of the play she is married to Pomp, and Love and Conscience are married to Policy and Pleasure respectively, the play being in part an allegorical demonstration of the proper use of wealth.[30]

One other Morality should be mentioned briefly. This is The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality, which was performed at Court on 22 February, 1601,[31] though it may have been written as early as 1567-8 when a work entitled Prodigality was mentioned in the Revels Office Accounts.[32] In this work we are reminded of Aristotle's discussion of liberality, for not only does this particular virtue appear in allegorical form, but also there appear the characters Prodigality and Tenacity, who represent the extremes of thriftlessness and covetousness. In addition, the commodity of wealth appears in the form of Money, a small boy. Both Prodigality and Tenacity are suitors to him, but fickle Fortune awards him to Prodigality who proceeds to mistreat him in a tavern in the company of the hostess Dandaline, Tom Toss, and the gambler Dick Dicer. Money, who is badly mistreated (an obvious allegorical representation of prodigality),

then flees from the rioters but comes into the hands of Tenacity who promptly ties him up. Later Money is abducted by Prodigality, Tom Toss and Dick Dicer, who murder Tenacity. Prodigality is apprehended and Money is delivered to Liberality, Virtue's steward, who frees him from his bonds and rewards Captain Well-done and two other deserving suitors.[33] Clearly the central theme of the play concerns the Aristotelian concept of liberality as a mean which lies between the extremes of tenacity and prodigality, and this is made especially apparent in Act V, scene iii, when Virtue and Equity discuss the place of reason, as opposed to will, in men's lives:

Vertue. But man with reason is endued: he reason hath
for stay; Which reason should restrain his will
from going much astray.
Equity. Madam, 'tis true:
Where reason rules, there is the golden mean.
Vertue. But most men stoop to stubborn will,
Which conquereth reason clean.[34]

These examples of English Moralities on the subject of money prove the existence of a strong native dramatic tradition which Jonson was able to draw upon in his own dramatic allegories. Nowhere is this more evident than in The Staple of News in which, at one point, the following conversation takes place among the characters of the Intermeane which ends the second act:

Mirth. How like you the Vice i'the Play?
Expectation. Which is he?
Mirth. Three or foure: old Couetousness, the sordid
Penyboy, the Money-bawd, who is a flesh-bawd
too, they say.
Tatle. But here is neuer a Fiend to carry him away.
Besides, he has neuer a wooden dagger! I'ld
not giue a rush for a Vice, that has not a
wooden dagger to snap at euery body he meetes.
Mirth. That was the old way, Gossip, when Iniquity came

> in like Hokos Pokos, in a Iuglers ierkin, with false skirts, like the Knaue of Clubs! but now they are attir'd like men and women o' the time, the Vices, male and female! Prodigality like a young heyre, and his Mistresse Money (whose fauours he scatters like counters) prank't up like a prime Lady.
> (2nd Intermeane, lines 5-19)[35]

As for Jonson's debt to the Classics, and to Aristotle in particular, one need only mention Lady Pecunia's final speech:

> And so Pecunia her selfe doth wish,
> That shee may still be ayde vnto their vses,
> Not slaue vnto their pleasures, or a Tyrant
> Ouer their faire desires; but teach them all
> The golden meane: the Prodigall how to liue,
> The sordid, and the couetous, how to dye:
> That with sound mind; this, safe frugality.
> (V, vi, 60-6)[36]

We are now in a position to turn to a more detailed discussion of Jonson's two Prodigal Son plays. It will be clear from what has just been said about the Classical and native traditions upon which he drew in his allegorical presentations of the misuse of wealth that his treatment of the Prodigal Son figures will be quite unlike that in any of the other Prodigal Son plays thus far discussed. Jonson's prodigals will be neither representatives of fallan mankind, like those in Acolastus, Nice Wanton, or The Prodigal Son, nor will they be used to depict the dire results of one's neglecting education, like the errant youths in The Disobeient Child and The Glasse of Governement. Instead we shall find that both Asotus and Pennyboy Junior are primarily social and economic figures, who exemplify in allegorical form the misuses of inherited wealth in the topical setting of the court in Cynthia's Revels and of a news office in The Staple of News.

Cynthia's Revels

In this play only one section of the plot is taken up with a Prodigal Son narrative. The prodigal, Asotus, is one of a group of would-be courtiers who meet with the traveller, Amorphus, at the beginning of the play. Amorphus has drunk of the fountain of self-love, and the courtiers, on hearing of the wonders of its waters, send their pages with bottles to fetch some of the water. Much of the play is then taken up with the antics of the courtiers as they await the arrival of the water which does not appear until the end of Act IV. During this time Jonson gives us an allegorical presentation of the Prodigal Son parable.

From the Induction we learn that Asotus is a citizen's heir (line 68), and, when Asotus first appears, we hear that Philargyrus, his father, has just died, leaving his son well off (I, iv, 30-1, 69-70). Like most prodigals, Asotus is very well-dressed at the beginning of his thriftless career (I, iv, 120-2), and like others of his kind he is soon deceived into false friendships. In this instance Asotus mistakes the foppish self-loving Amorphus ("Deformed") for "a most excellent rare man" (I, iv, 57-8), and he persuades his companion Crites ("the judicious one") to introduce him. Amorphus then shows his nature. He so flatters Asotus that the latter willingly exchanges his expensive beaver for Amorphus' cheap one (I, iv, 150-69). At the same time Amorphus offers to introduce Asotus to such "gallants, as ANAIDES of the ordinarie HEDON the courtier, and others" (I, iv, 174-5),

and he urges Asotus to forsake the company of the scholar, Crites, as being "a triuiall fellow, too meane, too cheape, too course" (I, iv, 176-7).

Thus in one short scene Jonson has exhibited the traditional behaviour of the prodigal by depicting Asotus' lack of concern for the true value of money, his deception by the flattery of a false friend, and the tendency to spurn the company and advice of virtuous companions. Here it is worth mentioning that, although the flattery of the prodigal by false friends is a common element in Prodigal Son plays, having its original source in the parable, Jonson may also be drawing upon another tradition. By connecting self-love, as exemplified in Amorphus, with flattery, Jonson possibly has in mind Erasmus' Moriae Encomium in which Philautia ("Self-love") and Kolakia ("Flattery") appear as the third and fourth nymphs of Folly.[37] The possibility that Jonson has Erasmus in mind appears more likely when in Cynthia's Revels we read Eccho's statement that "slieke flatterie and shee [Self-love] /Are twin-borne sisters, and so mixe their eyes, /As if you seuer one, the other dies" (I, ii, 37-9).[38]

The scene depicting the meeting between Asotus and Amorphus concludes when Asotus, in imitation of Amorphus, engages a servant. The servant's name is Prosaites, which Asotus, not knowing his Greek, considers to be a very fine name. Crites points out, however, that the name is a very old one and means "Beggar" (I, v, 21). Crites, the chief satiric spokesman in the play, then makes clear in a long

soliloquy the moral of the allegory thus far. Alluding to Asotus' prodigality and to his employment of Prosaites, Crites says, in answer to Asotus' command to Prosaites,

> He will ranke euen with you (er't be long)
> If you hold on your course. O vanitie,
> How are thy painted beauties doted on,
> By light, and emptie ideots! how pursu'de
> With open and extended appetite!
> How they doe sweate, and run themselues from breath,
> Rais'd on their toes, to catch thy ayrie formes,
> Still turning giddie, till they reele like drunkards,
> That buy the merrie madnesse of one houre,
> With the long irkesomenesse of following time!
> (I, v, 23-32)

In Act II, which takes place at Court, we learn more of Asotus' choice of companions. Hedon is "a gallant wholy consecrated to his pleasures" (II, i, 34-5), one who much affects Madam Philautia ("Self-love"), while Anaides is "impudence it selfe," having "two essentiall parts of the courtier, pride, and ignorance" (II, ii, 77-9). At the same time a further step is made in the allegory with respect to Prosaites. When Asotus calls for him, Cos, who is Amorphus' servant, and whose name in Latin means "Whetstone," is found to be close at hand. As Mercury, who is watching the action, comments, Asotus is "one, that hath newly entertain'd the begger to follow him, but cannot get him to wait neere enough" (II, iii, 81-3).

We also learn something of the character of Lady Argurion. In Cupid's words, she is, among other things, a "Nymph of a most wandring and giddy disposition, humorous as the aire, shee'le runne from gallant to gallant (as they sit at primero in the presence) most strangely, and seldome

stayes with any" (II, iii, 164-7).[39] Like the two other ladies, Phantaste ("Fancy" or "a light Wittiness") and Philautia, Argurion is in the charge of Madam Moria, or Mistress Folly, one who "will thinke her selfe wise against all iudgements that come" (II, iv, 12-13). Meanwhile in a series of scenes, Asotus is introduced by Amorphus to a number of courtly affectations.

At the beginning of Act IV we learn that Argurion is anxious to bestow her favours upon Asotus, and we are reminded of the proverb of the rake and the fork when Philautia says that Argurion "dotes more palpably vpon him [Asotus], then ere his father did vpon her" (IV, i, 108-9). When Amorphus and Asotus enter, the former reminds Asotus that Argurion was Philargyrus' love, and he urges Asotus to direct all his courtship in her direction (IV, iii, 1-4). Asotus then begins his courtship. Argurion asks him if he will be constant. To this he replies:

> Constant, Madam? I will not say for constantnesse, but by this purse (which I would be loth to sweare by, vnlesse 'twere embroider'd) I protest (more then most faire ladie) you are the onely, absolute, and vnparalelld creature, I doe adore, and admire, and respect, and reuerence in this court, corner of the world, or kingdome.
>
> (IV, iii, 29-34)

Argurion then gives him a chain and a diamond to wear and says,

> Nay, these are nothing to the gems I will hourely bestow vpon thee: be but faithfull, and kind to me, and I will lade thee with my richest bounties: behold, here my bracelets, from mine armes.
>
> (IV, iii, 56-9)

Asotus promises to treat Argurion ("Money") well, but, of course, this is not possible for a prodigal.

A little later Asotus complains once again about Prosaites:

> I must sute my selfe with another page: this idle PROSAITES will neuer be brought to wait well.
>
> (IV, iii, 210-11)

Immediately Moria offers him another servant, a kinsman of hers, and Asotus decides to keep both. The new servant is called Morus ("Folly" or "the Fool"), and again the allegorical nature of Asotus' choice of servants is made clear by a statement from Mercury, who says that Morus will "wait close, you shall see, though the begger hang off, awhile" (IV, iii, 373-4).

There follows an allegorical presentation of the prodigal's misuse of money, for at this point in the play he transfers his affections appropriately to Madam Moria and forsakes Argurion. Like the prodigals in Acolastus and The Prodigal Son, Asotus gives his jewelled chain to the woman, in this instance Moria, who is the chief object of his folly. Then referring to Phantaste and Philautia, Asotus says,

> I doe wish all varietie of diuine pleasures, choice sports, sweet musique, rich fare, braue attire, soft beds, and silken thoughts attend these faire beauties. Will it please your ladiship to weare this chaine of pearle, and this diamond, for my sake?
>
> (IV, iii, 393-7)

Asotus then proceeds to present Philautia and Phantaste with jewels that Argurion gave him, and in return he receives such meaningless favours as a glove and a garter. In the midst of this display the allegory is further developed when Asotus commands Argurion to leave him. When he gives gifts to Amorphus and Hedon, Argurion is taken with a consumption, and,

when Asotus goes to her aid, Jonson wittily has Mercury say,

> Well, I doubt, all the physique hee has will scarce recouer her: shee's too farre spent.
> (IV, iii, 449-50)

A little later we hear that Argurion now loves Morus as she once loved Asotus. The prodigal continues to squander what is left of his wealth, however, as is seen when he presents Anaides with a ruby ring (IV, v, 111-12). Asotus then plays a major role in the courtship contest in which he bears the name "ACOLASTVS-POLYPRAGMON-ASOTVS" ("Unbridled-Busybody-Prodigal"),[40] which, as pointed out in an earlier chapter, suggests that Jonson was aware of Gnapheus' famous Prodigal Son play. Just previous to this, however, Asotus' sister arrived at the court, and a further step in the allegory occurred when it was announced that her name was Mistress Downfall, which suggests that the prodigal's fortunes are about to change for the worse. Indeed this is borne out after the contest has been broken up by Crites and Mercury and all the courtiers disgraced, for Asotus turns to his sister and says, "Sister, come away, I cannot endure 'hem longer" (V, iv, 607).

Asotus' departure with Downfall is Jonson's equivalent of the dramatic change of fortune which besets the Prodigal Son in the parable. Asotus' fate, however, is not yet sealed. His final disgrace occurs in the last part of the play where his pretensions are exposed before Cynthia (Elizabeth) in the second masque, together with those of Amorphus, Hedon and Anaides. In the masque the four men appear in the guise of

the virtues most nearly related to their own vices, a motif that suggests the Aristotelian conception of virtues as being vices restricted by due measure. However, the disguise of vices as virtues is a common motif of the Moralities, some of which, for example Skelton's Magnyfycence and the anonymous Respublica (1553), seem to have modeled their ideas of the nature of virtue and vice along Aristotelian lines.[41] On this point one might also mention Plutarch's "How to tell a flatterer from a friend," an essay mentioned earlier in this chapter for the connection its author made between flattery and self-love. In a passage which may well have been in Jonson's mind when he wrote the masques in Cynthia's Revels, Plutarch says of flatterers:

> Those who with their praises pierce to the man's character, and indeed even touch his habit of mind with their flattery, are doing the very thing that servants do who steal not from the heap but from the seedcorn. For, since the disposition and character are the seed from which actions spring, such persons are thus perverting the very first principle and fountain-head of living, inasmuch as they are investing vice with the names that belong to virtue.[42]

When we look at the way Jonson has invested "vice with the names that belong to virtue" in the masques in Cynthia's Revels, we find that the disguise in which the prodigal Asotus appears is that of Eucolos ("good-natured"), who seems intended for a figure of Aristotelian liberality, since he clearly manifests the proper art of giving as defined in the passage of the Ethics discussed earlier. As such Eucolos represents the virtue which Asotus would possess were the wasteful and indiscriminate squandering of his wealth subject to due measure: The fourth, in watchet tinsell, is the kind, and truly benefique

EVCOLOS. Who imparteth not without respect, but yet without difficultie; and hath the happinesse to make euery kindnesse seeme double, by the timely, and freely bestowing thereof. He is the chiefe of them, who (by the vulgar) are said to be of good nature. His Symbole is, DIVAE MAXIMAE. An adiunct to signifie thy greatnesse, which in heauen, earth, and hell is formidable.

(V, ix, 45-52)

When the dancers in the masque take off their disguises, it is immediately apparent that they have no real place in Cynthia's court, for, as has been made clear throughout the play, Asotus' new-found acquaintances are not true courtiers. Instead they are would-be courtiers, mere pretenders to civility and not of the "better race in court /That haue the true nobilitie, call'd vertue" (V, i, 30-1). As such they have no place in courtly society, although presumably Jonson is implying that such unworthy creatures have unfortunately succeeded in insinuating themselves into positions of power at Elizabeth's court. In the play, when those "who with their apish customes, and forc'd garbes, /Would bring the name of courtier in contempt" (V, i, 35-6) have been exposed, Cynthia charges Lady Arete ("Virtue") and Crites with settling the pretenders' fates. In answer Crites points out that vice can be its own punishment:

> But there's not one of these, who are vnpain'd,
> Or by themselues vnpunished: for vice
> Is like a furie to the vicious minde,
> And turnes delight it selfe to punishment.
> (V, xi, 130-3)

Together with the others, Asotus then confesses his faults (like his counterpart in the New Testament parable) and admits that he merits "sharpe correction" (V, xi, 137). Crites then urges all the offenders to do penance, and he tells them that

he expects them to become what hitherto they have only pretended to be. They are then promised the chance to return and be reconciled with Cynthia (V, xi, 156-7). Asotus, of course, is included in this promise, and in this we can see a parallel to the reconciliation of father and son in the New Testament parable. In Jonson's play Asotus' chief sin is to have offended Cynthia (his prodigality and pretended civility being the cause of his offense). It is thus fitting that he should be promised reconciliation with Cynthia at the end of the play, just as in the Bible the Prodigal Son is finally granted reconciliation with the father against whom he has sinned.

In the total scheme of the play Asotus' role is clearly more than just that of an allegorical presentation of the misuse of wealth, since he also represents for Jonson one aspect of the false values which can so easily intrude into the affairs of the Court. This is why Asotus and the other would-be courtiers are carefully balanced against the true courtiers Crites, Arete, Phronesis ("Good Sense"), Thauma ("Wonder"), Timē ("Honour"), Chrestus ("Good"), Euthus ("Honest"), and Phronimus ("Prudent").[43] Asotus, the citizen who aspires to be a courtier, believes that he can learn to be a courtier merely by the imitation of certain characteristics of external behaviour, but like the other would-be courtiers he fails to understand that true civility is concomitant with moral virtue. As Cynthia herself says,

> Our selfe haue euer vowed to esteeme,
> (As virtue, for it selfe, so) fortune base;

> Who's first in worth, the same be first in place.
> (V, vi, 105-7)[44]

A place at court, even among mere would-be courtiers, cannot be bought, as Asotus discovers to his cost, since his reckless attempt to buy himself a position merely earns him ridicule. At the same time it costs him the love of Argurion. It is this last-named feature of Asotus' behaviour which links Jonson's allegory on the mistreatment of money with the larger scheme of this "Comicall Satyre" in which his chief purpose is to expose and reform pretended civility at court.

The Staple of News

Act I of Jonson's second allegorical Prodigal Son play opens with that stock scene of seventeenth century comedy in which a young man is seen to dress himself in the fashionable attire of the gallant. The young man in Jonson's play draws out a watch, and, when it strikes six, he throws off his gown as a sign that he is now twenty-one and that he has newly come into money. It is thus by means of an inheritance, rather than the receipt of a "portion," that the means for Pennyboy Junior's prodigality are established, as was the case with Asotus in Cynthia's Revels:

> . . . The houre is come
> So long expected! There, there, drop my wardship,
> My pupill age, and vassalage together.
> And Liberty, come throw thy selfe about me,
> In a rich suite, cloake, hat, and band, for now
> I'le sue out no mans Liuery, but mine owne,
> I stand on my owne feete, so much a yeere,
> Right, round, and sound, the Lord of mine owne ground,
> And (to ryme to it) threescore thousand Pound!
> (I, i, 14-22)

We then see our future prodigal being visited by Tailor,

Barber, Haberdasher, Linener, Hatter, Shoemaker and Spurrier, and his prodigality is amply demonstrated when he reads only the sums on their bills before agreeing to pay them.

Pennyboy Canter, who now appears in a patched and ragged cloak, them comments upon Pennyboy Junior's behaviour by wittily comparing the miser and the prodigal, thereby establishing a contrast between two specific character types which is to prevail throughout the play and which is intended to be seen in relation to the Aristotelian mean of liberality:

> See!
> The difference 'twixt the couetous, and the prodigall!
> "The Couetous man neuer has money! and
> "The Prodigall will haue none shortly!
> (I, iii, 38-41)

Pennyboy Canter is the man who, one week before, informed the prodigal that the latter's father had died, but he is, in fact, the father himself in disguise. We learn later that the old man, because of the news he brought, has been taken on as a companion by Pennyboy Junior (I, v, 92), and it is certain that Jonson, in depicting "an old Canting Beggar" (I, v, 89) in the company of the prodigal, is making the same allegorical point that he made in Cynthia's Revels where he had shown Asotus followed by Prosaites. At the same time, Pennyboy Canter, as we shall see, is also a figure of the mean Liberality in Jonson's allegory, besides being the chief satiric spokesman in the play.

Father and son then visit the newly established news office, which has been set up for the profitable vending of news, and which is the chief object in Jonson's satire on the

contemporary fad for news-pamphlets, particularly those of Nathaniel Butter, who is almost certainly satirised in the figure of the clerk, Nathaniel. At the news office Pennyboy Junior hears from his lawyer, Picklock, that the manager of the office, Cymbal, has designs upon a gentlewoman who was once intended for Pennyboy Junior. The lady's name is Mistress Pecunia Do-all,[45] and the meaning of Jonson's allegory begins to become more apparent when Picklock explains that

> Old Master Peni-boy, of happy memory,
> And wisdom too, as any i' the County,
> Careful to finde out a fit match for you,
> In his owne life time (but hee was preuented)
> Left it in writing in a Schedule here,
> To be annexed to his Will; that you,
> His onely Sonne, vpon his charge, and blessing,
> Should take due notice of a Gentlewoman,
> Soiourning with your vncle, Richer Peni-boy.
> (I, vi, 30-8)

Pecunia's servants are Broker, Statute, Band, Wax, Mortgage and Pawn, and further elaboration of the allegory occurs when Picklock explains that Cymbal expects that the novelty of his new establishment will draw Pecunia to visit him. At the same time Pennyboy Canter describes how highly she is regarded (I, vi, 63), before going on to mention some of her numerous suitors, among whom are doctors, divines, "some of your veluet coate," and the sea-captain Shunfield. The scene concludes with Pennyboy Junior's decision to go and woo Pecunia for himself, thereby adding one further step in the allegory.

Having introduced us to his allegorical figures of prodigality, beggary, and wealth in the first act, Jonson begins Act II with an amusing scene in which covetousness, or

what Aristotle called "illiberality," is depicted in the form of Pennyboy Senior, the uncle of Pennyboy Junior. He is accompanied by Pecunia, whom he refers to as his "goddess," and before whom he adopts a servile attitude, which is quite out of keeping with that he ought to have, since he is supposed to be Pecunia's guardian (IV, iii, 17):

> . . . yet am I,
> Your Graces seruant still: and teach this body,
> To bend, and these my aged knees to buckle,
> In adoration, and iust worship of you.
> Indeed, I doe confesse, I haue no shape
> To make a minion of, but I'm your Martyr,
> Your Graces Martyr.
> (II, i, 5-11)

It is for Pecunia's sake, so Pennyboy Senior informs her, that he suffers the torments of semi-starvation and the taunts of his fellow men. It is also revealed that he intends to gull his nephew out of his money. The allegorical meaning of this situation is matched by further allegory when Pennyboy Junior arrives with Pennyboy Canter to see Pecunia, for Pennyboy Senior, expressing his increased confidence that his plot will succeed, says,

> Here hee is! and with him--what! a Clapper-Dudgeon!
> That's a good signe; to haue the begger follow him,
> So neere at his first entry into fortune.
> (II, iv, 209-11)[46]

Pennyboy's brief courtship of Pecunia is successful, and the confident Pennyboy Senior allows his nephew to take her off immediately. Pennyboy Junior then proposes "Sack and Fidlers" (II, v, 104), his prodigal temperament coming to the fore, when, like Acolastus, he compares himself to a prince:

> I will be princely,
> While I possesse my Princesse, my Pecunia.
> (II, v, 110-11)

The scene ends when Pennyboy Junior and Pecunia go off to dine in the Apollo Room at the Devil Tavern in Temple Bar, the young prodigal having already agreed, at Picklock's suggestion, to take Pecunia to the news office.

Acts III and IV depict Pennyboy Junior's mistreatment of Pecunia. First he takes her to the news office where his first action is to make her kiss Cymbal, which is Jonson's way of allegorizing the prodigal's abuse of his wealth. Later at the Devil Tavern, Pennyboy Junior orders a feast, and, in demonstrating his prodigal's lack of thrift in this particular way, Jonson is, of course, following tradition. Further mistreatment of Pecunia then occurs when Pennyboy Junior urges her to kiss various of his parasitical acquaintances who have been flocking round both him and his mistress ever since their arrival at the news office, and the point of the allegory becomes clear when Canter says, "Why here's the Prodigall prostitutes his Mistresse!" (IV, ii, 123).

At this point Pennyboy Canter comments on the behaviour of Pennyboy Junior's companions ("that tayle of Riot" V, i, 18), and it is made clear that both they and the prodigal are to be seen as topical representatives of an age in which, as Jonson sees it, money has become a false idol which has replaced true values:

> Look, look, how all their eyes
> Dance i'their heads (obserue) scatter'd with lust!
> At sight o' their braue Idoll! how they are tickl'd,
> With a light ayre! the bawdy Saraband!
> They are a kinde of dancing engines all!
> And set, by nature, thus, to runne alone
> To euery sound! All things within, without 'hem,
> Moue, but their braine, and that stands still!
> monsters,

> Here, in a chamber, of most subtill feet!
> And make their legs in tune, passing the streetes!
> These are the gallant spirits o' the age!
> The miracles o' the time!
> (IV, ii, 130-41)

Earlier Pennyboy Senior, for somewhat different reasons, had criticized this tendency of contemporary society with equal vigour:

> . . . now the publike Riot
> Prostitutes all, scatters away in coaches,
> In foot-mens coates, and waiting womens gownes,
> They must haue veluet hanches (with a pox)
> Now taken vp, and yet not pay the vse;
> Bate of the vse? I am mad with this times manners.
> (III, iv, 37-42)

Thus Pennyboy Junior is to be seen not only as an allegorical figure of prodigality in the abstract, but also as an allegorical presentation of the decayed value-system of English society in the early seventeenth century, for money has become the "Venus of the time, and state" (II, v, 34), and a false equivalent of true nobility, wisdom and honesty,[47] as we discover when Pennyboy Junior talks of Pecunia to his uncle, describing her as

> My Princesse, here. She that had you but kept,
> And treated kindly, would haue made you noble,
> And wise, too: nay, perhaps haue done that for you,
> An Act of Parliament could not, made you honest.
> (IV, iii, 24-7)

When Pennyboy Junior's prodigality reaches its climax in his scheme to build a Canter's College with the aid of Pecunia, his father, no longer able to restrain himself, throws off his beggar's cloak and reveals his true identity. At the same time he reveals the motive for his deception. Addressing his son, Pennyboy Canter says that he is

> Your worships louing, and obedient father,
> Your painefull Steward, and lost Officer!
> Who haue done this, to try how you would vse
> Pecunia, when you had her.
> (IV, iv, 117-20)

In this same speech Pennyboy Canter goes on to say that he will now take Pecunia and her servants in charge, since his son could not treat them properly, and he asks,

> . . . and dost thou prostitute,
> Scatter thy Mistresse fauours, throw away
> Her bounties, as they were red-burning coales,
> Too hot for thee to handle, on such rascalls?
> Who are the scumme, and excrements of men?
> If thou had'st sought out good, and vertuous persons
> Of these professions: I'had lou'd thee, and them.
> (IV, iv, 130-6)

This speech reminds us of Aristotle's distinction between the prodigal and the liberal man, while a little later the vices of Pennyboy Junior's companions are placed in a topical context when Pennyboy Canter says,

> Away, I am impatient of these vlcers,
> (That I not call you worse) There is no sore,
> Or Plague but you to infect the times. I abhorre
> Your very scent.
> (IV, iv, 169-72)

With this, Pennyboy Canter goes off, and a further step in the allegory occurs when he leaves the prodigal his cloak:

> Farewell, my Begger in veluet, for to day,
> To morrow you may put on that graue Robe.
> (IV, iv, 176-7)

Act V opens with the appearance of Pennyboy Junior who now wears the beggar's cloak. Like the prodigal in the parable, the loss of his money has made him consider the error of his ways, and, like his Biblical counterpart, he has also been deserted by his former companions in riot:

> Me thinkes, I should be, on euery side, saluted,
> Dauphin of beggers! Prince of Prodigalls!
> That haue so fall'n vnder the eares, and eyes,
> And tongues of all, the fable o' the time,
> Matter of scorne, and marke of reprehension!
> I now begin to see my vanity
> Shine in this Glasse, reflected by the foile!
> Where is my Fashioner? my Feather-man?
> My Linnener? Perfumer? Barber? all
> That tayle of Riot, follow'd me this morning?
> Not one! but a darke solitude about mee,
> Worthy my cloake, and patches; as I had
> The epidemicall disease vpon mee.
> (V, i, 9-21)

The repentant prodigal now partly redeems himself by exposing Picklock's plot to gull Pennyboy Canter out of his money. This show of penitence on the part of the prodigal son results in reunion with his father. At the same time, and like the prodigal in the parable, Pennyboy Junior is able to get rid of his beggar's clothes:[48]

> Put off your ragges, and be your selfe againe,
> This Act of piety, and good affection,
> Hath partly reconcil'd me to you.
> (V, iii, 22-4)

The use of the word "partly" here indicates that the father's forgiveness at this stage is somewhat qualified. This is rather surprising if we reflect on the New Testament parable. We would expect Pennyboy Canter's forgiveness to be totally unqualified like his counterpart in the Bible, but perhaps one should remember here that Pennyboy Canter's behaviour is in keeping with one who represents the virtue of the mean. Too sudden and too complete a forgiveness would have been unwarranted in the circumstances, and as such could be interpreted as an excessive expression of joyful emotion at the return of a penitent son. Pennyboy Canter's actual behaviour,

on the other hand, is both rational and devoid of any hint of emotional excess. If this is a correct reading of Jonson's intentions, then we have in this detail an interesting alteration of the original pattern of the parable, and also, perhaps, an implied criticism by Jonson of the behaviour of the father in the Biblical source.

The final section of the play begins when Pennyboy Canter arrives at the house of his covetous brother to "vindicate the Prodigall, from stealing /Away the Lady" (V, vi, 18-19). The moral of the play is given when Pennyboy Canter says,

> . . . Nay, Pecunia her selfe,
> Is come to free him fairely, and discharge
> All ties, but those of Loue, vnto her person,
> To vse her like a friend, not like a slaue,
> Or like an Idoll. Superstition
> Doth violate the Deity it worships:
> No lesse then scorne doth. And beleeue it, brother,
> The vse of things is all, and not the Store;
> Surfet, and fulnesse, haue kill'd more then famine.
> The Sparrow, with his little plumage, flyes,
> While the proud Peacocke, ouer-charg'd with pennes,
> Is faine to sweepe the ground, with his growne traine,
> And load of feathers.
>
> (V, vi, 19-31)

This speech, together with the seemingly miraculous resurrection of Pennyboy Canter, has the effect not only of restoring Pennyboy Senior from the madness into which he has fallen during the course of the play, but also has the effect of converting him from his former illiberality:

> . . . Wise, and honour'd brother!
> None but a Brother, and sent from the dead,
> As you are to me, could haue altered me:
> I thanke my Destiny, that is so gracious.
> Are there no paines, no Penalties decreed
> From whence you come, to vs that smother money,
> In chests, and strangle her in bagges?
>
> (V, vi, 31-7)

In the motif of the miraculous restoration of a character from the dead, which is referred to in this speech and which has also been referred to some lines earlier ("Who's this? my brother! and restor'd to life!" V, vi, 12), there is a possible allusion to the original parable in which the father describes the returning prodigal as one who "was dead and is alive again" (Luke 15: 24, 32). As it occurs in Jonson's play, of course, it is not applied to the prodigal but to the prodigal's father, and it is used to provide some kind of motivation for Pennyboy Senior's sudden conversion. However, when we remember that in Misogonus this same motif was also transferred to the seemingly miraculous return of someone (Eugonus) other than the Prodigal Son (Misogonus), it is not so hard to believe that Jonson might also be consciously altering his source in a similar manner.

Now that the prodigal son and the covetous uncle have reformed and have become, one assumes, liberal men, it rests with Pecunia to end the play in one final statement of the Aristotelian concept of the proper use of wealth, the misuses of which Jonson has so wittily allegorized in his version of the Prodigal Son parable:

> And so Pecunia her selfe doth wish,
> That shee may still be ayde vnto their vses,
> Not slaue vnto their pleasures, or a Tyrant
> Ouer their faire desires; but teach them all
> The golden meane: the Prodigall how to liue,
> The sordid, and the couetous, how to dye:
> That with sound mind; this, safe frugality.
> (V, vi, 60-6)

Other Allegorical Dramatisations of the Parable

Several other English Prodigal Son plays also use allegory in their adaptations of the parable. Dekker's If This Be Not Good (1610-12) will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, since its chief interest for our purposes is its depiction of a prodigal prince. However, a few points need to be made here. It should be noted that the work contains opening and closing scenes set in Hell in which the mythological figures of Pluto and Charon appear, together with a prodigal,

> Who (in one yeare,) spent on whores, fooles and slaues,
> An Armies maintenance, now begges for cromes, and raues
> To see his sumptuous buildings, pastures, woodes,
> That stood in vplands, dround in Rhenish floodes.
> (V, iv, 171-4)

During the play three devils go up to earth and, like three Vices from a Morality, attempt to win souls for Hell. They succeed in corrupting a king, a merchant and the inmates of a priory, but only the merchant is successfully brought to Hell. Wealth appears from Hell in the form of a golden head called Glitterbacke, elsewhere referred to as the "head of Dis" (I, i, 87) or Dives. The golden head scatters gold on the ground of the priory and corrupts Scumbroth, the priory cook, who finds it. Scumbroth spends the money and is shortly reduced to beggary. In Act IV, ii, Scumbroth, in a passage quoted in Chapter I, enters dressed like a beggar and compares his state to that of the Prodigal Son as commonly portrayed in painted hangings:

What saies the prodigall child in the painted cloth? when all his mony was spent and gon, they turnd him out vnnecessary;

then did hee weepe and wist not what to don, for he was in's hose and doublet.

(IV, ii, 1-4)

Dekker's allegorical portrayal of wealth is that of a hellish force which has the power to corrupt men and bring them to Hell, were they, like Scumbroth or the Prodigal who is already in Hell, to spend thriftlessly and for selfish ends. As such Dekker's portrait is in harmony with the proverb "Money is the root of all evil," and in keeping with this, gold is referred to at one point as "theefe to the soule of man" (III, ii, 62).[49] However, Dekker also suggests that the proper use of money can lead to Heaven, for the Subprior, pointing to the heap of gold, says,

> Good workes are keyes opening the gates of blisse;
> That golden key, thou in that heape maist find,
> If with it thou relieue the lame, sick, blind,
> And hungry.
>
> (III, ii, 129-32)

Clearly, as in the other allegorical portrayals of wealth which we have discussed, the evil that is associated with money derives from man's own tendency to misuse the commodity of wealth rather than the nature of the commodity itself, and Dekker's golden head is more properly to be understood as an allegory of man's corrupt impulses when confronted by wealth.

Allegorical elements also play a significant part in The Sun's Darling, a masque which has strong parallels to the Prodigal Son parable and which Dekker wrote in collaboration with John Ford. It was licensed on 3 March, 1624, "For the Cockpit Company,"[50] and revised late in 1638 or early in 1639, this revised version being published in 1656. Considerable doubt exists as to whether or not the work was intended for a court

or a theatre performance in 1624. Also it is not clear from the text as we now have it whether or not the work was originally a play or a masque, but what is more important for our purposes is the fact that the later revisions appear so to have distorted the original allegory as to render much of the meaning of the work unintelligible. Since Fredson Bowers and Gerald Bentley have both discussed the problems posed by the 1656 text and its possible relationship to the work performed in 1624, I see no need to go over the same ground here.[51] Suffice it to say that the work presents Raybright, the son of Phoebus (the Sun), travelling through the different seasons of the year. He is an allegorical representation of youth and mankind. In the original work he may have been intended as a portrait of Prince Charles, newly-returned on 5 October from his journey to Spain, but in the 1638-9 revision he is associated with Charles after his coronation.[52]

Raybright is also a prodigal. At the beginning of the play he asks the Sun to allow him to enjoy "the several pleasures here, /Which every season in his kinde, /Can bless a mortal with" (I, i, 189-91) for the space of one year. In this he is acting like the Prodigal Son asking for his portion. Initially Raybright, who is enamored of the virtuous lady Spring, is accompanied by Youth, Health and Delight, who can be seen as descendants of the Virtues who accompanied Youth in the Moralities. However, Raybright rejects them all in favour of Lady Humor and Folly, both descendants of the Vices of the Moralities. Folly's character is of particular interest

here in that it is the essence of prodigality:

> I will rore and squander,
> Cozen, and bee drunk too;
> I will maintein my Pander,
> Keep my Hors, and Punck too;
> brawl and scuffle,
> shift and shuffle,
> Swagger in my Potmeals:
> Dammes rank with,
> do mad pranck with
> Roaring boies and oatmeals.
> (I, i, 90-9)

Under the influence of Folly, Raybright collects around him a set of followers who represent other traits associated traditionally with prodigality. There is a soldier (in reality a roaring boy), a Spaniard to provide confections, an Italian to teach dancing, and a French tailor to provide fine clothes.

When Spring dies, Raybright is at first repentant and accuses Folly and Humor of tearing Spring away from him and robbing him of Youth, Health and Delight. However, Raybright is persuaded to continue with Folly and Humor. He acts disdainfully towards Summer, and when he encounters Autumn, a bacchanal ensues, which ends when Autumn leaves. In the final lines of Act IV and for the whole of Act V, Raybright is transformed by the 1638-9 revision of the text into an allegorical representation of Charles I journeying towards Scotland, the region of Winter, at the time of the so-called "Bishops' Wars" which were caused by Charles' attempt to force Archbishop Laud's prayer-book on the Kirk.[53] The description of Raybright (Charles I) by Winter as the former journeys towards Scotland has virtually nothing in common with the

prodigal Raybright we have known hitherto:

> A prince who is so excellently good,
> His virtue is his honor, more then blood;
> In whose clear nature, as two Suns, do rise
> The attributes of Merciful, and Wise:
> Whose laws are so impartial, they must
> Be counted heavenly, cause th'are truly just:
> Who does with princely moderation give
> His subjects an example how to live.
> (V, i, 23-30)

Only in the final speech of the Sun, in which the allegory of the masque is supposedly explained, is there a return to the kind of allegorical meaning dominant in the first four acts. Sun says that the work is a mirror in which a person may behold the "circuit of his fortunes" (V, i, 306). The cycle of the four seasons is like that of the four ages of man (Childhood, Youth, Manhood, Age). Health, Youth and Delight are given to man in order that he may

> . . . rectifie his carriage: to be thankful
> Again to them, Man should casheer his riots,
> His bosom whorish sweet-heart, idle Humor;
> His reason's dangerous seducer, Follie.
> (V, i, 321-4)

Dekker's debt to the allegorical tradition of the Moralities in his use of such characters as Humor, Folly, Youth, Health and Delight is obvious, as are the similarities which his plot has to that of the Prodigal Son parable. Possibly in his original Act V, Dekker had a reconciliation scene between father and son (Phoebus and Raybright), but, with only the 1656 text to go on, this is merely a supposition. Had there been such a scene, it would have been very appropriate for a play of 1624, since it would have suggested Prince Charles' return to the anxious James. That Dekker and

Ford should have got away with depicting the Prince in such a bad light in the early part of the play, however, is difficult to understand. Curiously neither Bowers nor Bentley mention this problem.

Another Prodigal Son play which shows the influence of the Morality tradition is Robert Davenport's A New Trick to Cheat the Devil. Bentley dates this play as close to 1639,[54] and consequently it falls well outside the period with which this study is concerned. However, it is worth a brief mention here, since it demonstrates the longevity of the allegorical tradition where the English Prodigal Son plays are concerned. The prodigal's name in Davenport's play is Slightall. Having been rejected by the girl he loves, he deliberately decides to lead a prodigal and dissipated life:

> Licentiousness shall be my Mistresse now,
> Voluptous pleasure, riot and excesse
> My future study; Ile let loose desire
> And appetite unbridled; and the more
> Of that intemperate Sexe I can corrupt
> Count it my greatest deede of Charity.
> (I, i, p. 197)[55]

Slightall's honest servant Roger, like some descendant of Eubulus or of one of the Virtues in the Moralities, chides the prodigal for his behaviour with an explicit allusion to the New Testament parable:

> Can this world last ever? you sell, and sell,
> But when the mony is spent, are you resolv'd
> To feede on Huskes and Acornes? I am plaine.
> How many monthes did your old Father spend
> To purchase that you in few houres consume?
> (I, ii, p. 205)

Before long, Slightall is reduced to a state of beggary (II, iii, pp. 220-2), and it is shortly after this stage of the

play, as in the anonymous The Prodigal Son, that the action shifts into allegory. Suffering from the prodigal's characteristic despair, Slightall calls appropriately upon the Devil, but first he is confronted by a Dumb Show in which appear a Scrivener, a Knave, a Prodigal, a Beggar, a Puritan, a Whore and a Usurer. Slightall himself explains the allegory. He himself has been Knave, Prodigal and Beggar, while the Whore and the Usurer played a part in his downfall. As the Dumb Show ends, Slightall says,

> The Scrivener beares away the Knave; good Morrall.
> The Prodigall the Beggar; ever so.
> The Familist [the Puritan] the Strumpet; not amisse.
> Oh but the Usurer still the Divell and all,
> Whom I so faine would speake with. (IV, i, p. 252)

The allegory continues in which Slightall agrees to hand over his soul to the Devil in return for having his debts paid, but, with the help of Friar Bernard, Slightall is later able to trick the Devil out of his bond. It turns out, however, that the Devil has been impersonated by Changeable, the father of the girl Slightall wants to marry, and the play ends with the prodigal marrying the girl and begging forgiveness of his new father-in-law and mother-in-law who thereby provide at this juncture a substitute for the role of the father in the parable.

Finally, brief mention should be made of Thomas Randolph's The Drinking Academy, or The Cheaters' Holiday (1626-31), a play which was written just outside the period with which we are concerned. However, its interesting use of allegory, which is obviously indebted to Jonson's The

Staple of News, warrants a passing mention here.[56] The plot centres upon the pursuit of Lady Pecunia's hand by Knowlittle, the prodigal son of Worldly, an old miser and usurer, although Lady Pecunia, the daughter of Lady Inconstantia Fortune, never actually appears on stage. In the course of the play, Worldly and Knowlittle are tricked by some rogues, one of whom, Timothy Shirke, is himself a suitor to Pecunia. The rogues intercept a letter from Pecunia to Knowlittle and replace it with a letter arranging an assignation "at ten a cloake in suburbs wherfor more priuicy she will expect you amoung the ruinous buildings" (IV, iii, lines 568-70). Shirke then appears before father and son among the ruins. He is disguised as the ghost of Pecunia, who then summons her father, Plutus, claiming that Worldly has ravished her out of her father's kingdom and has confined her in mouldy coffers where she has been suffocated (lines 788-91). The cheaters then take Worldly's keys in order to go take custody of Pecunia's body, and "Plutus" orders that both Worldly and Knowlittle be stripped of their fine clothes lest "about them they retaine /My sacr'd relics" (lines 853-4). Then "Pecunia" condemns the usurer and the prodigal to "walke the woods without ther clothes" (line 882) for three days and nights, a device which will enable the rogues to carry off all of Worldly's wealth.

Clearly the plot of this play is somewhat more removed than is Jonson's The Staple of News from that of the Prodigal Son parable, but it is still relevant to this study, since

Knowlittle's style of prodigality, his eventual loss of wealth to tricksters and the violent loss of his clothes are all traditional elements in Prodigal Son plays. However, the chief interest of the play for us must lie in its entertaining use of an allegorisation of man's misuse of wealth, which derives, in this case, directly from Jonson, but which, as we saw earlier, can be traced back through literature to the works of Aristophanes and Lucian and to the discussion, itself not an allegory, however, of liberality in Book IV of Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics.

In this chapter I have tried to show how the parable of the Prodigal Son, which was in any case traditionally subject to allegorical interpretation, inspired a number of dramatists to adapt its plot-pattern to form an allegory. In doing so these authors were not so much influenced by traditional interpretations of the parable, although both The Prodigal Son and Davenport's play do exploit the traditional association between Despair and the parable, as by the themes and techniques of the native Moralities on the one hand, and by Aristotle's Ethics and the allegorisations of Wealth in the works of Aristophanes, Lucian, and English poets and playwrights on the other. Such influences are not mutually exclusive, and we have seen, for example, how native and Classical influences are fused in Jonson's The Staple of News and combined harmoniously with the one common source of all of the plays discussed in this chapter--the Biblical parable of the Prodigal Son.

We have seen too how the intentions of those authors who have employed allegory in their dramatisations of the parable have been just as various as those of other authors discussed in previous chapters, ranging from the eschatological concern of the author of The Prodigal Son, to the concern for courtly civility in Cynthia's Revels, the concern for the materialistic values of the whole of society in The Staple of News, and the possibly political concern with the conduct of a prince in The Sun's Darling. Of the plays discussed here, as is the case with other groups of Prodigal Son plays, variety would seem to be the most startling characteristic.

CHAPTER V

PRINCELY PRODIGALS

Before discussing the small group of plays which depict prodigal princes, I wish first to give some consideration to the literature de regimine principum and other related types of homiletic and courtesy literature. In this large body of material are to be found a great many clues to the manner in which the vice of prodigality in a prince would have been viewed during the period with which we are concerned in this study. In the following pages I shall isolate certain broad common precepts of homiletic and courtesy literature, and of the literature de regimine principum in particular, which I believe to be of special relevance to our understanding of the plays to be discussed in this chapter.

Behind all the literature concerned with the conduct and education of princes and other men of authority rests the basic assumption that "to Princes and great men, it is a rule, to rule themselves that rule others."[1] This, of course, is the idea which is basic to Plato's conception of the Philosopher King,[2] and it is one which is found in two of Aristotle's most influential works: the Nichomachean Ethics and The Politics.[3] It is also found in Cicero's De Officiis and Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria, in both of which moral virtue is seen as a prerequisite for the man of public affairs and for the orator in particular. Humanist writers during

the Renaissance took up this idea, as found in the Classics, and applied it to all manner of categories of the vita activa, but that of governing a state was given special consideration. If one takes into account the assumption of the Humanists that the whole of society benefits from good rule, and their belief that men were naturally reasonable and educable, then one begins to understand why they turned themselves so ardently to writing on the subject of the moral conduct and education, not only of rulers, but of all "governors" and "magistrates," whether nobles, courtiers, great householders, or quite lowly justices.

This assumption that all "governors" and "magistrates" should be virtuous is so much of a commonplace in sixteenth and early seventeenth century thought that perhaps it hardly needs illustrating here. Suffice it, then, to mention Erasmus' statement in the Institutio principis Christiani (1516) that a prince "should be taught that the teachings of Christ apply to no one more than to the prince,"[4] James Chillester's translation of Pierre Bovaisteau's A most excellent hystorie of the institution of christian princes (1571) in which the third chapter is devoted to "How that those which shall command others, ought first to master them selves," Book IV of Castiglione's The Courtier (1528) in which the author discusses the importance of virtue in both prince and courtier, the enthusiastic translation of some verses of Claudian in Elyot's The Governor (1531) in order to persuade "governors" to embrace virtue, and William Baldwin's verse summary at the end of his chapter on "Kings, and Gouernours, and how

they should rule their subjects" in Book III of his A Treatise of Morall Philosophie (1547), which states:

> A King which in earth is euen the same
> That God is in heauen, of Kings King eterne,
> Should first feare God, and busily frame
> Himselfe to rule, and then his Realme to gouerne.[5]

As a final example, perhaps, one might quote the opening words of King James' Basilikon Doron in the 1603 edition:

> AS HE CANNOT BE thought worthie to rule and command others, that cannot rule and dantone his owne proper affections and vnreasonable appetites, so can he not be thought worthie to gouerne a Christian people knowing and fearing God, that in his own person and harte, feareth not and loueth not the Diuine Majestie.[6]

This same belief in the necessity for virtue in those invested with authority is a major concern of a number of influential Protestant reformers. Luther, for example, saw princes as divinely authorized protectors of the true Christian life, and from 1520 onwards he taught that it was the duty of the secular authorities to undertake the reform of the Church.[7] That the princely heads of these secular authorities should be godly men was thus of great concern to Luther. Similarly Melanchthon, one of the most influential German reformers, also believed at first that hope for reform rested in the hands of godly princes.[8]

In England, as a direct result of Henry VIII's first divorce and of the growth of a strong national consciousness, the view that a nation's king should also rule its church was widely accepted and was a fundamental assumption of the Act of Supremacy in 1534. That such an office was, in Latimer's words, "a chargeable dignity when account shall be

asked of it" made it a necessity that the king should be a godly man.[9] A further reason why a king should be pious is put forward in an official Homily on the subject of obedience to rulers and magistrates which was published in 1547. In it we are reminded that a king is God's representative on earth and ordained by God to rule:

> Let vs learne also here by the infallible and vndeceiuable word of GOD, that kinges and other supreme and higher officers, are ordeined of GOD, who is most highest: and therefore they are here taught diligently to apply and giue themselues to knowledge and wisedome, necessary for the ordering of GODS people to their gouernance committed, or whom to gouerne they are charged of GOD.[10]

Such ideas are the inspiration for Holbein's title-page for the first official translation of the Bible into English in 1536. At the foot of the woodcut is a picture of Monarchy sitting upon a throne, the sword of Justice in his right hand. With his left hand he delivers a Bible to his people. Significantly, Henry is praised in the dedication as "in this world present, the person of God . . . he only under God is the chief head of all the congregation and church of the same." At the time of the Reformation, as Roy Strong has pointed out, "while churches were emptied of religious images they were filled with symbols of royal power in the form of the royal arms put up over the chancel arch and books issued by royal authority."[11]

Although the desire for virtuous and godly rulers is by no means peculiar to the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, it is a concern which is especially topical at that time, and particularly so in England where, in the six-

teenth century and after a long period of intermittent civil wars, there now seemed every hope that the rule of godly princes might prevail. This hope, however, is always accompanied by the fear of civil anarchy should a bad ruler come to the throne. Such hopes and fears provide much of the underlying inspiration for both the literature de regimine principum of the period, and, as we shall see, for the Prodigal Son plays to be discussed in this chapter.

Listed on the table of virtues which a good prince and others in authority are expected to display are a number of qualities which are conspicuously lacking in those prodigal princes to be dealt with later in this chapter. The first of these qualities are the Aristotelian virtues of liberality and magnificence, this latter being liberality on a grand scale such as would be particularly appropriate to princes, nobles and others of superior rank:

> . . . the magnificent man must make the appropriate gesture on the great occasion, for, though the magnificent man is always liberal, the liberal man is not necessarily magnificent.[12]

This type of liberality is discussed in many early books of conduct, and passages devoted to the subject are to be found in the influential pseudo-Aristotelian Secretum Secretorum and its numerous translations, which include Lydgate and Burgh's Secrees of Old Philisoffres (ca. 1452), and the three prose translations printed by the Early English Text Society (Extra Series, No. 74), one of which may have been the work of James Yonge in 1422. Thomas Hoccleve in The Regement of Princes (1412), a work intended for the Prince of Wales, who

became King Henry V on 21 March, 1413, not only entitles a whole section of his poem "De Virtute Largitas, & De Vicio Prodigalitas," but also tells the story of his own past prodigality as an implied warning to Henry of the ease with which prodigality can lead to beggary. At the same time Hoccleve's poem is prefaced by a long section in which a beggar tells Hoccleve a similar story to illustrate the dangers of prodigality.[13] The intended moral for Henry is very clear, and it is a most appropriate one in view of the prodigal youth of the prince.

In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries discussion of the virtue of liberality can be found, for example, in the Treatise of Morall Philosophie in which William Baldwin represents liberality as one"of the seaven cardinall Vertues, following in their order, against the seaven capitall Vices" (p. 225) and in which a whole chapter (Book VI, ch. V) is devoted to the subject. Elyot provides another example in The Governor, which has a chapter on the subject. Alluding to Aristotle, Elyot defines liberality as the mean between avarice and prodigality and as a virtue that "resteth not in the quantity or quality of things that be given, but in the natural disposition of the giver."[14] As examples of liberal princes, he refers to the Emperors Antonine and Alexander Severus who, he says,

> gave of the revenues of the Empire innumerable substance, to the re-edifying of cities and common houses decayed for age, or by earthquakes subverted, wherein they practised liberality and also beneficence.
>
> (Bk. II, ch. X, pp. 130-1)

On the other hand, princes like Tiberius, Nero, Caligula, Heliogabalus "and other semblable monsters" are not liberal but prodigal since they

> exhausted and consumed infinite treasures in bordel houses, and places where abominations were used, also in enriching slaves, concubines and bawds.
>
> (Bk. II, ch. X, p. 131)

Elyot sums up his discussion by stressing the point made originally by Aristotle that liberality, especially in one of high rank, should either be directed to the betterment of society as a whole or to the reward of truly deserving men:

> Wherefore next to the helping and relieving of a commonalty, the great part of liberality is to be employed on men of virtue and good qualities.
>
> (Bk. II, ch. X, pp. 131-2)

Similar discussions (to mention only a few) can be found in the anonymous The Institution of a Gentleman (1555), the second book of Laurence Humphrey's The Nobles or of Nobilitye (1563), and in Robert Peterson's translation of Giovanni della Casa's Il Galateo (1576). In the last-named work it is said at one point that "liberalitie, or magnanimitie, of themselues beare a greater prayse, then, to be a well taught and manored man" (p. 2). We find James, in the Basilikon Doron, urging his son to "Vse true Liberalite in rewarding the good, and bestowing frankly for your honour & weale," but warning him against letting his liberality "declyne to Prodigalitie" (I, 157), while in Jacques Hurault's Politicke, moral, and martial discourses, translated from the French by Arthur Golding in 1595, we find a whole chapter devoted to

showing "That a Prince ought to be liberall, and to shun nigardship and prodigalitie" (Part II, ch. 4). Of prodigality in princes, Hurault says,

> He therefore that spendeth without aduisement and skill, not considering how or to whom he giueth, or how his liuing is able to maintaine it: is counted a prodigall person, which is a very dangerful vice. For it causeth a prince to take from his subiects by force, wherewith to maintaine his prodigalitie: and it is vnpossible that he which cannot husband wel his own, should husband well that which is another mans. (p. 229)

Clearly a prince who misuses his wealth in rewarding undeserving rather than deserving persons, who spends money for his own pleasure rather than in ways beneficial to the state, or who allows his liberality to grow to excess, is a prodigal rather than a liberal man, and, as we shall see, the first two of these traits are particularly applicable to the prodigal princes to be discussed in this chapter.

We shall also find that the prodigal princes in these plays show a disregard for another admonition of the literature de regimine principum and other forms of related homiletic writing when they reject the advice of wise counsellors and surround themselves with evil men, flatterers and parasites.[15] Again one need do no more than mention a few examples of the warnings against such conduct in persons of authority. In Castiglione's The Courtier, for example, it is stated that

> . . . there is no treasure that doth so universally profit, as doth a good prince, nor any mischiefe so universally hurt, as an ill Prince. Therefore is there also no paine so bitter and cruel that were a sufficient punishment for those naughtie and wicked Courtiers, that make their honest and pleasant manners, and their good qualities a cloake for an ill end,

and by meane [sic] of them seeke to come in favour with their Princes for to corupt them, and to cause them to stray from the way of vertue, and to lead them to vice.

For a man may say, that such as these be, doe infect with deadly poyson, not one vessel whereof one man alone drinketh, but the common fountaine that all the people resorteth to.[16]

From a similar desire that princes should have virtuous and wise counsellors derives the basic inspiration for Furio Ceriol's A very briefe and profitable Treatise declaring how many counsells, and what maner of Counselers a Prince that will governe well ought to have. This work was translated into English in 1570 by Thomas Blundeville who summarized Ceriol's purpose at one point in a sentence which is notable for its ugliness if for nothing more:

Wherefore, sith so many euils doe rise of the euil choise, and so many good things of the good choyse, the Prince therefore in mine opinion can not be to choyse in his choyse. (sig. N3^{r})

In this work Ceriol says that a counsellor must be just, liberal, and not afraid to speak the truth. This last-named virtue is often referred to in such literature, and it is one that princes are repeatedly advised to encourage, for, as Humphrey says in The Nobles or of Nobilitye, it is better to "loue rather the stripes of a frendely blamer, than the kisses of a training flatterer," it being "Better to be whipped with the tongue of man, than the rodde of God" (sig. B1^{r}).[17] Chillester in the Institution of Christian Princes (1571) says in his prefatory table of contents that a prince ought to have "continuall conference and Counsell with sage and wise men, which shalbe as the sinnews and life wherby his Realme shall be sustained and maintained," while Cleland

in The Institution of a young Noble-Man (1607) warns against evil company by saying that "He that toucheth pitch (saith Iesus of Syrach) shalbe defiled therewith" for "vices are plagues whereby vitious persons are infected."[18]

On the subject of a king's familiarity with his subjects the literature de regimine principum is not entirely consistent. On the one hand there is the view of Erasmus and of Chillester that a prince should be familiar with humble people,[19] as well as James' advice to his son to be "homelie with your souldiers as your companions, for winning their harts" in time of war,[20] and also the advice to princes given in The Mirror for Magistrates by Lord Hastings:

> Disdayne not prynces easye accesse, meeke cheare.
> We knowe, then Angells statelyer port ye beare
> Of God hym selfe: to massye a charge for sprytes.
> But then, my lordes, consyder, he delyghts
> To vayle his grace to vs poore earthely wants,
> To symplest shrubbes, and to the dunghyll plantes.
> Expresse hym then, in myght and mercyes meane.
> So shall we wynne, as now ye welld, the realme.
> (p. 272)[21]

On the other hand, Erasmus is careful to point out the dangers of corruption a prince risks by coming into contact with lesser mortals,[22] while Hoccleve a century earlier also warned against the dangers of familiarity, though on different grounds:

> Bet is, the peples eres thriste and yerne
> Hir kyng or princes wordes for to here,
> That that his tonge goo so fast & yerne
> That mennes eres dul of his mateere;
> ffor dullynge him, dulleth the herte in fere
> Of hem that yeuen to him audience;
> In mochil speche wantith not offence.
> (st. 347, lines 2423-9)

A marginal gloss in Hoccleve refers the reader to the pseudo-Aristotelian Secretum Secretorum, an English prose translation of which reads:

> . . . a king oweth not to shew him ouer oftene to his peple, ne ouer oft haunte the company of his sugetis, and specially of chorlis and ruralle folke, for bi ouyr moche homelynes he shalle be the lasse honourid.[23]

Clearly the somewhat conflicting views on a prince's relationship with his subjects were reconcilable if the prince applied due measure to his conduct. Hal shows that he understands that certain kinds of familiarity are wrong when, on becoming king, he banishes his former riotous companions from his presence. That certain forms of familiarity were acceptable, however, is clear from the various encounters between king and commons depicted in such plays as Dekker's The Shoemakers' Holiday (1599), Heywood's Edward IV (1599) and his If You Know Not Me: Part Two (1605).[24] Nevertheless, although a prince on occasions might be expected to show some familiarity, this does not qualify in any way what was said earlier concerning his choice of advisors and companions, and in drama, as in other writings, the awareness of the potential dangers involved when a prince surrounds himself with the wrong kind of people is very strong, as can be seen in such works as Skelton's Magnyfycence, the anonymous Respublica, Norton and Sackville's Gorboduc, Preston's Cambyses, Marlowe's Edward II, Shakespeare's Richard II, and Jonson's Sejanus, all of which depict the devastating effects bad counsel and flattery can have on a prince.[25]

We have already seen in previous chapters how the

neglect of good advice, coupled with the choice of evil companions, is one of the major features of the behaviour of the typical Prodigal Son. The prodigals to be discussed in this chapter are no exception to this. As in other Prodigal Son plays, we are shown the ill effects of the neglect of the wise counsel of a father or some other older man by the youthful prodigal, but, where in other plays it was the prodigal who suffered, in the plays to be discussed here the whole kingdom stands to suffer as well.

Finally, one might mention the concern for certain private passions which are considered particularly inappropriate in a person of authority and which are given special prominence in homiletic and courtesy literature and in the literature de regimine principum. Elyot, in The Governor, for example, recounts the famous episode of Prince Hal's wrath. This incident is presented on stage in one of the plays to be discussed presently, and in Elyot's work it is used to demonstrate how a prince, "incensed by light persons about him" and "in furious rage," was led to disregard the authority of the Lord Chief Justice. In this episode, Hal is depicted as lacking in concern for that virtuous practice of justice, which all the literature de regimine principum so insists upon. At the same time Elyot makes us see that, in behaving as he does, Hal is also ignoring the "double obedience" he owes to the King, his "sovereign lord and father" (Bk. II, ch. VI, p. 114), Elyot's final comment being that "nothing is so detestable, or to be feared in such one,

as wrath and cruel malignity" (Bk. II, ch. VI, p. 115).

Elsewhere in his book, Elyot warns against lechery (Bk. III, ch. XVII, p. 200) and immoderate eating and drinking (Bk. III, ch. XXII, p. 214), as does almost every writer who concerns himself with the virtues appropriate to men of authority. Skelton in his "Speculum Principis" (1500-1), for example, offers the following warning to Prince Arthur on the eve of the ceremony joining him to Catherine of Aragon:

> Abhor gluttony before all else. Cultivate sobriety and temperence. Outlaw drunkenness. Curse lechery. Flee the brothels of harlots. Do not defile married women. Do not deflower virgins. Do not violate widows.[26]

Much later we find James I urging his son, Prince Henry, to keep his body "cleane and vnpolluted, till ye giue it to your wife," even though "Fornication is thought but a light & veniall sinne, by the most part of the world" (I, 123). To give added weight to his admonition, James then draws a lesson from the life of his grandfather, on his mother's side, the reward for whose incontinence,

> . . . (proceeding from euill education) being the suddaine death at one time, of two pleasant young Princes; and a daughter only borne to succeede to him, whome he had neuer the hap, so much as once to see or blesse before his death: leauing a double cursse behinde him to the lande, both a Woman of sexe, & a newe borne babe of age to raigne ouer them.
>
> (I, 125)

Later James also warns against "vsing excesse of meate & drinke," and ironically, in view of his own later example, he says,

> . . . and chieflie, be warre of drunkennesse whiche is a

> beastlie vice, namelie in a King: but speciallie be warre with it, because it is one of those vices that increaseth with age.
>
> (I, 169)

The vices of such types of incontinence are, of course, traditionally associated with the Prodigal Son, as we have seen many times already, but, since the faults of a prince are so much greater in that they provide an example whereby a whole nation might be led astray,[27] the sins of the prodigal princes in the plays to be discussed here are to be seen in a particularly serious light. One recalls the words of the Homilie Against Disobedience and Wilfull Rebellion:

> Well is thee, O thou land (saith the Preacher) whose King is come of Nobles, and whose princes eate in due season, for necessity, and not for lust. Againe, a wise and righteous King maketh his Realme and people wealthy: and a good, mercifull, and gracious Prince, is as a shadow in heate, as a defense in stormes, as deaw, as sweete showres, as fresh water springs in great droughts.
>
> Againe the Scriptures, of vndiscreet and euill Princes, speake thus, Woe be to thee (O thou land) whose King is but a child, and whose Princes are early at their bankets. Againe, when the wicked doe raigne, then men goe to ruine.
>
> (pp. 278-9)

From this brief survey of certain common injunctions of homiletic and courtesy literature and of the literature de regimine principum in particular, I hope it is apparent that the sins of a prodigal prince would have been viewed by men of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in a rather different light from that in which they viewed the sins of the usual prodigal. English subjects of this period believed that "the teachings of Christ apply to no one more than to the prince,"[28] that a prince should be regarded as "a god on earth,"[29] that princes should "expresse and represent

(as in a liuely Image) the example of their Lorde and maister,"[30] and that "the goodnes or badnes of any realme lyeth in the goodnes or badnes of the rulers."[31] English subjects would also expect their prince to be free from vices, including those which are traditionally associated with prodigals, namely prodigality, lechery, intemperance in eating and drinking, disorderly and riotous behaviour,[32] and the favouring of base companions and flatterers. Their ideal, as far as these particular matters are concerned, was of a prince who was liberal (in the Aristotelian sense of the word), wise in his choice of counsellors and friends, and, above all, master of himself.

Always the vision of the ideal was balanced against the fearful vision of the calamities that might befall a kingdom which was so unfortunate as to be governed by a prince who lacked moral virtue. This fear is reflected in varying degrees in the plays which are the subject of this chapter, and nowhere more vividly than in Shakespeare's 2 Henry IV when the dying King Henry envisages the fate of England as it might be when ruled by his prodigal son [IV, v, 119-23]:

> For now a time is come, to mock at Forme.
> Harry the fift is Crown'd: Vp Vanity,
> Downe Royall State: All you sage Counsailors, hence:
> And to the English Court, assemble now
> From eu'ry Region, Apes of Idlenesse.
> (IV, ii, 2651-5)

Henry goes on in a similar vein for a further ten lines, before concluding as follows [IV, v, 134-8]:

> O my poore Kingdome (sicke, with ciuill blowes)
> When that my Care could not with-hold thy Ryots,

> What wilt thou do, when Ryot is thy Care?
> O, thou wilt be a Wildernesse againe,
> Peopled with Wolues (thy old Inhabitants.
> (IV, ii, 2666-9)

Such would be the fate of the country whose prince was a prodigal, but, by depicting the reform of a prodigal prince, a dramatist could also present his ideal of kingship, and this is precisely what happens in The Famous Victories, in Shakespeare's two Henry IV plays, and to a lesser extent in Dekker's If this be not good. The use of the motif of the reformed prodigal might almost be sufficient to earn these plays a place in this study, but, as will be seen, each author also displays in various ways an awareness of the parallels between his plot-pattern and that of the Prodigal Son parable, and it is this awareness which, more than anything else, leads me to include a discussion of these plays in this study.

The Famous Victories

Of the numerous historical examples of prodigal princes, among whom Richard II is, perhaps, the most frequently referred to in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,[33] none came closer to providing a parallel to the Prodigal Son in the parable than the Prince Henry who later became Henry V. It is perhaps not so surprising then that the first three of the four plays with which we shall be concerned here provide dramatisations of Henry's prodigality in youth and his reformation on becoming king.

The Chroniclers, including those writing in the fif-

teenth century,[34] agree on the wildness of Prince Henry in his youth. He was, we are told, "wylde, recheles, and spared nothyng of his lustes ne desires, but Accomplysshed theym after his lykyng."[35] He "applyed hym unto all vyce and insolency & drewe unto hym all ryottours & wyldly dysposed persones,"[36] who are described by another Chronicler as "wanton familiars & flatterers,"[37] and by Holinshed as "misrulie mates of dissolute order and life."[38] At the same time the Chroniclers also insist upon the sudden reformation undergone by the Prince when he ascended the throne. Fabyan, for example, says,

> But after he was admitted to the rule of the lande, anon & sodaynly he became a newe man, & turned all that rage & wildenesse into sobernes and wise sadnes, & the vice into constant vertue. And for he wolde continew yn vertue, and not be reduced therunto by the familiarite of his old nise [sic] company, he therefore after rewardes to them geuen, charged them vpon payne of theyr lyues, that none of them were so hardy to come within .x myle of such place as he were lodged after a daye by hym assygned.[39]

Elsewhere in the Chronicles we find descriptions of the interviews between the Prince and his father during which the Prince asks forgiveness and promises to amend his life.[40] The major ingredients for the plot of a Prodigal Son play to be based on the life of Prince Henry thus already existed in historical writings when The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth was written just prior to 1588.[41]

This anonymous play begins with the appearance of the young Prince with two of his riotous companions, Ned and Tom. The Prince has just organised a robbery of his father's Receivers.[42] Having got hold of the money, Prince Henry then

shows his prodigal nature by stating that he "wil haue the halfe / Of this spent to night."[43] The manner in which he intends that he and his "fellowes" (as he familiarly calls them) should spend the money further links him with many another Prodigal Son figure:

> . . . you know the olde Tauerne in Eastcheape,
> There is good wine: besides, there is a prettie wench
> That can talke well, for I delight as much in their
> tongies [sic]
> As any part about them.
>
> (p. 326)

The traditional tavern scene is thus prepared for, although in this play what happens at Eastcheap is not enacted on stage, but related by the Vintner's boy and later by the Mayor. Speaking to the Cobbler, the boy says,

> Why this night about two houres ago, there came the young Prince, and three or foure more of his companions, and called for wine good store, and then they sent for a noyse of Musitians, and were very merry for the space of an houre.
>
> (p. 330)

The Prince's call for "a noyse of Musitians" is significant and may almost be considered as a traditional detail of prodigal behaviour, for, as can be seen in Acolastus and The Prodigal Son, the employment of musicians demonstrates not only the prodigal's careless expenditure of money but his lecherous nature as well, since it was generally recognised that music, particularly that of the tavern, brothel or theatre, could excite lascivious desires.[44] However, this particular visit to the tavern appears to have ended for the Prince, not in a harlot's bed, but in prison:

> . . . then whether their Musicke liked them not, or whether they had drunke too much Wine or no, I cannot tell, but our

pots flue against the wals, and then they drew their swordes, and went into the streete and fought, and some tooke one part, & some tooke another, but for the space of halfe an houre, there was such a bloodie fray as passeth, and none coulde part them vntil such time as the Maior and Sheriffe were sent for, and then at last with much adoo, they tooke them, and so the yong Prince was carried to the Counter.
(p. 330)[45]

Like that of the prodigals in The Disobedient Child and Misogonus, young Henry's style of "riotous living" obviously tends towards violence.

A little further on in the play occurs the incident in which the Prince, just having been released from Newgate, abuses the Lord Chief Justice when the latter insists that a thief, who has been arraigned before him, must be treated according to the law, even though the man happens to be one of the Prince's followers. This incident in Hal's life is derived from Elyot's The Governor, either directly or via Stow, who reproduces Elyot's account almost verbatim.[46] Elyot's account, as we have seen, stresses Hal's wrath, his cruel malignity, his double disobedience in flouting the representative of one who was to Hal both King and father, and his flagrant disregard for Justice, a virtue considered by the literature de regimine principum of especial importance. In The Famous Victories the same basic moral is drawn from this scene. The Prince, we are informed, acts out of wrath:

Dericke: Why Iohn thou maist see what princes be in choller, A Iudge a boxe on the eare, Ile tel thee Iohn, O Iohn, I would not haue done it for twentie shillings.
(p. 336)

The Lord Chief Justice makes the point that he "must needs

do iustice" (p. 335), and Hal is lectured on the obedience he owes to the Lord Chief Justice's office, deriving as it does from the authority of the Crown. As the Justice explains to Hal, before sending him back to prison,

> . . . in striking me in this place, you greatly abuse me, and not me onely but also your father: whose liuely person here in this place I doo represent. And therefore to teach you what prerogatiues meane, I commit you to the Fleete, vntill wee haue spoken with your father.
>
> (p. 336)

In this speech the author makes use of the motif of filial disobedience, which, as we have seen in previous chapters, is often of key significance in the English Prodigal Son plays. When discussing this motif in other plays, I referred to the words of the Fifth Commandment and showed how these were customarily interpreted as an injunction to obey schoolmasters and elders in addition to parents. Now in this play we see a further extension to cover obedience both to the King and to those responsible for the administration of justice. That this particular extension of the Commandment would have been widely understood is certain, since such an interpretation occurs in the semi-official publication of 1543 often referred to as King Henry's Book.[47] This work was a revision and enlargement of The Institution of a Christian Man (1537) and this latter work, when explaining to the clergy how they should explicate the word "Father" in the Fifth Commandment, says,

> all byshops and preachers shall instruct & teache the people, comitted to their spiritual charge, first that by this word Father, is understanded here, not only the naturall father and mother, which dyd carnally begette vs, and brought vs

vppe: but also the spirituall father, by whom we be spiritually regenerated & nourished in Christe: and all other gouernours and rulers, vnder whome we be nourished and brought vp, or ordered and gyded.

(fol. 64^{r})

Later in the book the idea of the final section of this passage is expanded upon, and bishops and preachers are told to teach the people that the Commandment

. . . conteyneth the honour and obedience, which subiectes owe vnto theyr princes, & also the office of princes towardes their subiectes. For scripture taketh princis to be, as it were, fathers and nouryces to their subiectes.

(fol. 67^{v})

Concerning "other gouernours," the clergy are told to teach the King's subjects a similar lesson in obedience:

And lykewise they [the subjects] be bounde to obey all suche as be in auctoritie under their prince, as farre as he woll haue theym obeyed.

(fol. 67^{r})[48]

Thus to Prince Henry's sins of thriftlessness, wenching, drinking, rioting and of being "one of these taking fellowes"(p. 327), one can add that of the breaking of the Fifth Commandment, a sin which, as we have seen, is very common among prodigal sons. It is also interesting to note that, just as a son's disobedience is often seen in the Prodigal Son plays as related to a failure of the father to exercise proper control over his son, so too in The Famous Victories Henry's father admits to a similar failing. Furthermore it would appear that, not only has he been lacking in duty as a father, but as a king he has also failed in that he has not been able to control one of his subjects. This is why the King's expression of fear at what will happen when his son rules England is at the same time a confession of his own

weakness. Speaking of the Chief Justice, Henry IV says,

> Now truly that man is more fitter to rule the Realme then I, for by no meanes could I rule my sonne, and he by one word hath caused him to be ruled. Oh my sonne, my sonne, no sooner out of one prison, but into an other, I had thought once whiles I had liued, to haue seene this noble Realme of England flourish by thee my soone [sic], but now I see it goes to ruine and decaie.
> He wepeth.
>
> (p. 341)

Thus the theme of parental responsibility, which is so important in such Prodigal Son plays as Nice Wanton and Misogonus, to name only two examples, has its place in this play too, but, as we have seen, here it is related not only to a parent's upbringing of a child, but to a king's rule over a subject.

The passage I have just quoted also illustrates, of course, a concern for the fate of a kingdom should it be ruled by a prodigal prince. As I have already mentioned, this is a recurrent theme in all the plays dealing with such princes, though in fact it receives its weakest expression in this particular play. However, apart from its appearance in these lines, the theme does occur elsewhere in The Famous Victories, for it is to be found in the vision of anarchic misrule conjured up by Prince Henry's promise that, were he King, Ned, Tom and Sir John Oldcastle "would be all kings." Furthermore, there would be no more imprisonments, hangings or whippings, and Ned would have the office of Lord Chief Justice. In addition, as Henry says to Ned:

> . . . Ile turne all these prisons into Fence Schooles, and I will endue thee with them, with landes to maintaine them withall: then I wil haue a bout with my Lord chiefe Iustice, thou shalt hang none but picke purses, and horse stealers, and such base minded villaines, but that fellow that wil stand by the highway side couragiously with his sword and

buckler and take a purse, that fellow giue him commendations, beside that, send him to me, and I will giue him an anuall pension out of my Exchequer, to maintaine him all the dayes of his life.

(p. 339)

Although this vision of misrule is primarily comic in its dramatic context, and although it has the overtones of gaiety and make-believe suggestive of the atmosphere of an Elizabethan holiday,[49] the terrifying threat of real civil anarchy is not completely absent. This is demonstrated when the Lord Chief Justice, acting out of genuine fear, allows the thief whom he has imprisoned to go free when Prince Henry becomes king (p. 347). The Chief Justice certainly believes that the law and justice will now no longer be upheld, while Ned, on hearing of the old king's death, obviously expects the new king to keep his promises and make him Lord Chief Justice.

Possible civil anarchy is, of course, averted by Prince Henry's moral conversion, the first sign of which occurs without any forewarning whatever,[50] since, previous to the scene in which the Prince asks forgiveness of his father, he has displayed a completely intransigent attitude that is exemplified in his lack of respect for King Henry ("for the breath shal be no sooner out of his mouth, but I wil clap the Crowne on my head" p. 339), by his wearing of a cloak full of eyelet holes and needles as a sign that he stands upon thorns until the crown be on his head (p. 340), and by his refutation of the rumour that "the yoong Prince will bee a well toward yoong man" (p. 340). As such the conversion of the prodigal

in The Famous Victories is somewhat different from that of his New Testament counterpart whose hunger, poverty and loss of friends obviously play a part in bringing on his remorse. In The Famous Victories, however, what we have is more in the nature of a miracle,[51] in that the prodigal's change of heart is both sudden and inexplicable.

Looking closely at the conversion scene in The Famous Victories in which Prince Henry appears with a dagger before his father, we can, however, detect a number of elements that have parallels in other Prodigal Son plays. First it should be noted that Henry's pangs of conscience ("My conscience accuseth me" p. 342) are severe enough to lead him to the verge of despair, and this, of course, is a typical feature of most of the repentant prodigals in the plays discussed thus far. Indeed, the Prince's appearance with the dagger, which is apparently at first hidden beneath his cloak, could possibly have been played on stage so as to suggest the figure of Despair as traditionally portrayed by artists and poets.[52] When the Prince offers the dagger to his father so that the latter may take vengeance upon the body of his son (p. 342), the prodigal's despair is very apparent, as it is a little later when King Henry at first does not answer his son's speech of repentance. The Prince reacts as follows:

> But what shal I do? I wil go take me into some solitarie place, and there lament my sinfull life, and when I haue done, I wil lay me downe and die.
>
> (p. 343)

Secondly it should be noted that the Prince's words are strongly reminiscent of those of the Prodigal Son in the

parable. He refers to himself, for example, as "an vnworthie sonne for so good a father," and, making the extension from father to king which we have already noted as a feature of this play, he says, "tis not the Crowne that I come for, sweet father, because I am vnworthie" (p. 342). His double use of the word "vnworthie" is the strongest verbal link with the parable ("and am no more worthie to be called thy sonne"), but it should also be noted that, just as the Prodigal Son in the New Testament was prepared to be reduced to the status of the lowest order of servants ("make me as one of thy hired seruants"), Prince Henry refers to himself, when speaking to his father, as "your wild slaue," this phrase occurring in part of a sentence from which something has clearly been omitted and which in its original state may have been far closer to the Biblical parable.[53] Possibly, too, one can cite the Prince's use of the phrase "I am borne new againe" (p. 343), which, though it comes from John 3: 3 rather than Luke 15, nevertheless can be associated with the father's words in the last verse of the parable where the prodigal is described as "founde" and "aliue againe."

Thirdly the Prince, in submitting himself to his father and in leaving his former companions ("those wilde & reprobate company" p. 342), is deferring, like the other repentant prodigals we have seen, to the value-system of his elders, and to that of his father in particular. At the same time in this play, the prodigal is also taking a necessary step towards preparing himself for kingship. That he is fully aware of this

is apparent when he later accuses his former companion Ned of over-familiarity, flattery and deceit:

> I prethee Ned, mend thy manners,
> And be more modester in thy tearmes,
> For my vnfeined greefe is not to be ruled by thy flattering
> And dissembling talke, thou saist I am changed,
> So I am indeed, and so must thou be, and that quickly,
> Or else I must cause thee to be chaunged.
>
> (p. 349)

A few lines further on Henry banishes his former companions "vpon pain of death" not to come within ten miles of his presence (p. 349). In acting in this way, he is adhering to the precepts of the literature de regimine principum, which, as we have seen, warned kings against being over-familiar with their subjects and against surrounding themselves with sycophants rather than honest and wise men. Later Henry's choice of the Lord Chief Justice, the one man who formerly had been able to rule him, to act as his representative in England while he is in France ("my Protector ouer my Realme" p. 354) also demonstrates Henry's proper course of conduct following his conversion.

One further point needs to be made concerning the scene in which Henry is reconciled to his father. In the middle of his speech of repentance, the Prince says,

> . . . and this ruffianly cloake, I here teare from my backe, and sacrifice it to the diuel, which is maister of al mischiefe.
>
> (pp. 342-3)

We have already noted the special symbolic significance of the prodigal's clothing in several other Prodigal Son plays. We have seen how the putting-on of elaborate, and often

costly, clothes can be both a sign of prodigality and, as in the Moralities, an indication of the wearer's sinful state to be compared to Adam's first act after the Fall. The loss of these clothes, usually against the wishes of the prodigal, is often the first step in his progress towards repentance and reconciliation with his father, who then gives him new clothes, which were in the case of the Biblical parable traditionally interpreted by theologians as the "first royaltie which Adam lost."[54] Clearly in the Prodigal Son play which we are concerned with here, the unusual cloak which Prince Henry has devised for himself is a sign of his sinful state. Not only is it a mark of vanity in that it is designed to draw attention to himself, but the attitudes to father and crown implied by the message which the cloak has been devised to communicate demonstrate a sinful lack of reverence for higher authority on the part of the wearer. It is therefore highly appropriate that the repentant Prince should refer to it as "this ruffianly cloake" and that he should offer to "sacrifice it to the diuel" when he asks pardon of the man who is both his father and his king.

As for a parallel to the new clothes that the father in the parable gives to his son, one is perhaps to be found in The Famous Victories in the form of the crown itself, though I would not argue this very strenuously. The scene in which the Prince takes the crown from his dying father, whom he supposes to be dead, provides the occasion for a second reconciliation scene between father and son, which is

perhaps somewhat superfluous due to its close proximity to the first reconciliation scene.[55] However, this second scene does provide a context for the dying king to offer the crown to his son:

> . . . come neare my sonne,
> And let me put thee in possession whilst I liue,
> That none depriue thee of it after my death.
> (p. 346)

The Prince, of course, refuses this offer, but shortly afterwards his father dies. When the new king is crowned, an almost mystical change is seen to occur in him, and his new garment, the crown, is to be thought of as both a cause and a sign of this change. With the crown on his head, and dressed presumably in his coronation robes, Henry's transformation from sinful to virtuous man and from prodigal prince to perfect king is now seen to be complete. Oldcastle says,

> Oh how it did me good, to see the king
> When he was crowned:
> Me thought his seate was like the figure of heauen,
> And his person like vnto a God.
> (p. 348)[56]

1 Henry IV

We have already seen how Prince Hal, the future Henry V, was generally depicted in the Chronicles as a prodigal, and we have just seen how the anonymous author of The Famous Victories was able to adapt the stories of the Prince's wild youth into the first half of a play which has much in common with many other English Prodigal Son plays. The resemblances between Shakespeare's portrait of Prince Hal and the typical protagonist of the Prodigal Son plays has already been fairly

thoroughly discussed by John Dover Wilson,[57] but, since his study rather confusingly blurs the distinctions between the so-called "Moralities of Youth" and Prodigal Son plays proper, and since his study as a whole is more concerned with the nature and origins of Falstaff's character than with the Henry IV dramas as Prodigal Son plays per se, a case can be made, I feel, for the inclusion of a discussion of Shakespeare's two Prodigal Son plays in this study.

Before beginning my discussion, I should indicate that, while being aware of the long history of arguments for and against treating the two plays as one two-part play,[58] I have chosen here to discuss the works as two Prodigal Son plays, not one. As the following pages will attempt to show, each Henry IV play contains enough of the traditional ingredients of the Prodigal Son play to warrant inclusion in this study.

When 1 Henry IV begins, Hal has already left home, the break between himself and his father having occurred some time before. The Prince has been removed from the Privy Council on account of his misconduct and has incurred the hostility of the Court [III, ii, 32-5] (II, ii, 1851-54).[59] At this point in time the Elizabethan audience would probably have a notion of Hal's general mode of living that would not be in conflict with the picture given in Richard II where Bolingbroke refers to his "vnthriftie Sonne" whom he describes as a frequenter of taverns where he is accompanied by "vnrestrained loose Companions." He is also described as one who has engaged in beating the watch and robbing passers-by

[V, iii, 5-9] (V, iii, 2501-5). Furthermore, as Henry goes on to explain [V, iii, 10-12], this

> . . . yong wanton, and effeminate Boy
> Takes on the point of Honor, to support
> So dissolute a crew.
> (V, iii, 2506-8)

By "support" Shakespeare may be alluding to financial aid, in which case the young Prince would be acting out the traditional role of the prodigal by spending his money on undesirable, rather than deserving, companions in a fashion which is quite out of harmony with true liberality as described in the literature de regimine principum.[60]

In general this is certainly the view of Hal that would be familiar to audiences in Elizabethan England, and it is one that is derived from the Chronicles, from The Famous Victories and most probably from a related oral tradition. The general description of the Prince in Richard II follows tradition as does the description given initially in 1 Henry IV. In this latter play Hal's father uses the term "Ryot" [I, i, 85] (I, i, 88) when describing the Prince's behaviour, and it is worth noting that, according to the OED this word means "wanton, loose, or wasteful living; debauchery, dissipation, extravagance," all of them traits which are traditionally associated with prodigals. When the King uses this word, he is addressing Westmoreland and comparing Hal to Hotspur [I, i, 78-91]:

> Yea, there thou mak'st me sad, & mak'st me sin,
> In enuy, that my Lord Northumberland
> Should be the Father of so blest a Sonne:
> A Sonne, who is the Theame of Honors tongue;
> Amongst a Groue, the very straightest Plant,

> Who is sweet Fortunes Minion, and her Pride:
> Whil'st I by looking on the praise of him,
> See Ryot and Dishonor staine the brow
> Of my yong Harry. O that it could be prou'd,
> That some Night-tripping-Faiery, had exchang'd
> In Cradle-clothes, our Children where they lay,
> And call'd mine Percy, his Plantagenet:
> Then would I haue his Harry, and he mine:
> But let him from my thoughts.
> (I, i, 81-94)

A number of points need to be made concerning this passage. First it should be made clear that Hal is here only being described, much of the effect of the description depending upon the contrast drawn between the Prince and Hotspur. However, Hal's actual behaviour, as we shall see, belies this description, and this may in part be due to the fact that Holinshed, Shakespeare's chief source, is several times careful to stress that Hal's behaviour was not nearly so bad as it was made out to be.[61] In taking up this hint from Holinshed, Shakespeare, as the following pages will try to suggest, deliberately attempts to give the idea that Hal's supposed misbehaviour is merely a deliberate pretence, in which he engages for political ends. In reality, I would argue, the Prince is guiltless (or almost so) of the sins of which he is accused.

The second point to be made about this passage is that Shakespeare has deliberately chosen to set the supposedly riotous and prodigal Hal in direct contrast with the supposedly virtuous and honourable Hotspur. In this we may see a parallel with the contrast between the two brothers in the parable. Hotspur, of course, is not Henry IV's son, but when the King says, as he does here, that he wishes Hotspur were his son, the parallel with the parable seems a little closer, for each

of the young men is then placed in a filial relationship with Henry, the counterpart in this play of the father in the parable.[62] This parallel can be extended, for it should be noted that, to those who are not aware of his deception, Hal is like the Prodigal Son in the Bible in that he appears to attain true virtue through proper humility and contrition for his sinful behaviour, whereas Hotspur is like the Prodigal Son's elder brother in that his seeming virtue appears tarnished when fully revealed for what it truly is. This ironic structure is basic both to the parable and to 1 Henry IV, although in the parable the prodigal's sin is real, not assumed, and in Shakespeare's play the final working out of the irony is more drastic since Hal's reformation coincides with the death of Hotspur who is guilty, not of a misguided concept of the nature of true virtue, as is the elder brother in the parable, but of treason. My labelling Hotspur as a "traitor" is not a denial that he possesses a number of qualities that may even somewhat endear him to us during the course of the play. One thinks particularly of his vitality, his sense of humour and his plain-speaking which is so refreshing when seen in juxtaposition with the double-talk characteristic of many of the other characters. Moreover, the King's unpleasant treatment of Worcester and Hotspur in Act I, scene iii [I, iii], is extremely provocative, though it cannot, of course, justify rebellion. The fact remains, however, that Hotspur, the apparent "Theame of Honors tongue: / Among'st a Groue, the very straightest Plant," commits the

gravest crime of all.

In the scene which follows the King's description of his son, we meet the forces of "Ryot and Dishonor" personified in the figure of Falstaff. Hal also appears and at first would seem to be much as his father has described him in the passage just quoted and in Richard II. His relationship with Falstaff and Poins is one of familiarity, and he has undoubtedly been prodigal (in the Aristotelian sense of the word) in that he has given financial support to undeservers [I, ii, 58-63]:

Prin. Did I euer call for thee to pay thy part?
Fal. No, Ile giue thee thy due, thou hast paid al there.
Prin. Yea and elsewhere, so farre as my Coine would stretch, and where it would not, I haue vs'd my credit.
(I, ii, 164-7)

Hal appears also, as a result of deliberate policy on his part, to be a thief [I, ii, 110-13]:

Prin. Where shall we take a purse to morrow, Iacke?
Fal. Where thou wilt Lad, Ile make one: and I doe not, call me Villaine, and baffle me.
(I, ii, 207-9)

In addition Hal appears to be little concerned about the loyalty of his future subjects [I, ii, 164-6]:

Fal. Ile be a Traitor then, when thou art King.
Prin. I care not.
(I, ii, 250-1)

Thus at first glance Hal would indeed appear to be what his father says he is, and he would certainly appear to be at one with the two rogues, Falstaff and Poins.

A closer look at the scene, however, reveals that this is not entirely so. Throughout Hal displays an attitude of detached realism that sets him apart from his two companions.

When Falstaff, for example, develops his highly imaginative fantasy in which thieves are compared to "Dianaes Forresters, Gentlemen of the Shade, Minions of the Moone" and "men of good Gouernment, being gouerned as the Sea is, by our noble and chast mistris the Moone" (I, ii, 139-43) [I, ii, 27-33], Hal replies with words which undercut Falstaff's comic dream and hint at the nature of reality [I, ii, 34-43]:

> Thou say'st well, and it holds well too: for the fortune of vs that are the Moones men, doeth ebbe and flow like the Sea, beeing gouerned as the Sea is, by the Moone: as for proofe. Now a Purse of Gold most resolutely snatch'd on Monday night, and most dissolutely spent on Tuesday Morning; got with swearing, Lay by: and spent with crying, Bring in: now, in as low an ebbe as the foot of the Ladder, and by and by in as high a flow as the ridge of the Gallowes.
>
> (I, ii, 144-52)

Typical of Falstaff is the way in which he then immediately changes the subject and refuses to face reality [I, ii, 44-5]:

> Thou say'st true Lad: and is not my Hostesse of the Tauerne a most sweet Wench?
>
> (I, ii, 153-4)

Falstaff's question is an obvious echo of Hal's own praise in The Famous Victories for "a prettie wench / That can talke well," but the reply which Shakespeare gives to Hal here demonstrates that the prodigal prince in 1 Henry IV is not at all the same man as the protagonist of The Famous Victories [I, ii, 46-54]:

> Prin. As is the hony, my old Lad of the Castle: and is not a Buffe ierkin a most sweet robe of durance?
> Fal. How now? how now mad Wagge? What in thy quips and thy quiddities? What a plague haue I to doe with a Buffe-Ierkin?
> Prin. Why, what a poxe haue I to doe with my Hostesse of the Tauerne?
>
> (I, ii, 155-61)

Similarly, where Hal in The Famous Victories had promised

that on his accession he would make Ned his Lord Chief Justice, we are led to expect a like promise in 1 Henry IV [I, ii, 69-73]:

Fal. Doe not thou when thou art a King, hang a Theefe.
Prin. No, thou shalt.
Fal. Shall I? O rare! Ile be a braue Iudge.
(I, ii, 172-5)

However, Hal gives no such promise, and his immediate sardonic comment again completely undercuts Falstaff's exuberant expectations [I, ii, 74-76]:

Thou iudgest false already. I meane thou shalt haue the hanging of the Theeues, and so become a rare Hangman.
(I, ii, 176-8)

Again, where Hal in The Famous Victories was certainly "one of these taking fellowes" and as such was as guilty as his companions, in 1 Henry IV Hal is playing a part. Furthermore, when his part demands that he engage in a robbery, he robs Falstaff, not the travellers, later paying the money back to its rightful owners with advantage (II, iv, 1515) [II, iv, 599-600].

All this looks like a very careful attempt by Shakespeare to retain the traditional portrait of Hal, but to remove from it any suggestion of actual moral failing. It would seem that Hal is only acting the role of the prodigal. He is not really guilty of any faults. This impression is enforced by his soliloquy at the end of the scene. In this speech, which is crucial to our understanding of Hal's behaviour in both Henry IV plays, Hal even suggests that there is a certain political virtue in his actions. Using the familiar sun-king analogy, he says [I, ii, 218-26],

> I know you all, and will a-while vphold
> The vnyoak'd humor of your idlenesse:
> Yet heerein will I imitate the Sunne,
> Who doth permit the base contagious cloudes
> To smother vp his Beauty from the world,
> That when he please againe to be himselfe,
> Being wanted, he may be more wondred at,
> By breaking through the foule and vgly mists
> Of vapours, that did seeme to strangle him.
> (I, ii, 296-304)

Like a surprise holiday, his return to virtue will, so he believes, please all the more by being like an unexpected treat [I, ii, 227-34]:

> If all the yeare were playing holidaies,
> To sport, would be as tedious as to worke;
> But when they seldome come, they wisht-for come,
> And nothing pleaseth but rare accidents.
> So when this loose behauiour I throw off,
> And pay the debt I neuer promised;
> By how much better then my word I am,
> By so much shall I falsifie mens hopes, . . .
> (I, ii, 305-12)

The fact that Hal's reformation will only be a matter of contrived surface appearances is made even clearer by his final simile in which his political intent is clearly stated [I, ii, 235-40]:

> And like bright Mettall on a sullen ground:
> My reformation glittering o're my fault,
> Shall shew more goodly, and attract more eyes,
> Then that which hath no soyle [foile in Qq1-3]
> to set it off.
> Ile so offend, to make offence a skill,
> Redeeming time, when men thinke least I will.
> (I, ii, 313-8)

After the Gadshill episode we next see Hal during a tavern scene. Such a scene, as we know, is traditional in Prodigal Son plays and generally serves to demonstrate all the chief vices of the prodigal. In Shakespeare's play, however, this is not the case. Hal may be slightly tipsy

when he first comes on to the stage, but his high spirits may equally well be the effect of his exultant mood at having "sounded the verie base string of humility" (II, iv, 970-1) [II, iv, 5-6] so successfully, in keeping with his secret political intentions as expressed in the soliloquy just quoted. His proven ability to "drinke with any Tinker in his owne Language" (II, iv, 982) [II, iv, 20-21] and the assurance he has had that when he is King of England he "shall command al the good Laddes in East-cheape" suggest that his contrived familiarity has earned him its intended political rewards.

In this tavern scene it is consequently the "prodigal" who dupes his follows, the reverse of what normally occurs in Prodigal Son plays. Hal's detached superiority and control of the situation show themselves in his teasing of Francis, the Drawer, and in his exposure of Falstaff's cowardice. This last-named, who may be compared to the Bad Angel contending for the soul of Man in the Moralities, at one time compares himself to the Vice (II, iv, 1096-8) [II, iv, 150-51] and is referred to by Hal as "a Deuill" (II, iv, 1405) [II, iv, 492], "that reuerend Vice, that grey Iniquitie, that Father Ruffian, that Vanitie in yeeres" (II, iv, 1411-12) [II, iv, 499-500], "That villanous abhominable mis-leader of Youth," and "that old white-bearded Sathan" (II, iv, 1420-1) [II, iv, 508-9]. As such, Falstaff is Shakespeare's counterpart of the evil counsellor and parasite who plays such a key role in other Prodigal Son plays.[63] But Falstaff does not corrupt Hal, nor does he dupe him in any way. Indeed, as we have already

noted with regard to the first scene involving these two characters, it is Hal who possesses the ability to see things as they really are, a fact which enables him to maintain a detached superiority in his relationship with Falstaff, his supposed tempter. In the tavern scene we can see this very clearly in the section in which Falstaff acts the part of the King and questions Hal on the particulars of his life. Falstaff, eager to enter completely into his part, says [II, iv, 416-17],

> This Chayre shall bee my State, this Dagger my Scepter, and this Cushion my Crowne.
>
> (II, iv, 1334-6)

Hal, however, undercuts the imaginative comedy of this situation with a note of sardonic realism when he says [II, iv, 418-20],

> Thy State is taken for a Ioyn'd-Stoole, thy Golden Scepter for a Leaden Dagger, and thy precious rich Crowne, for a pittifull bald Crowne.
>
> (II, iv, 1337-9)

In the same vein, when Falstaff and Hal exchange roles and Hal plays the part of the King, he describes Falstaff in the various derogatory terms, already quoted, by which the old man is compared to a Vice and a devil. Hal's portrait is clearly far closer to the truth than Falstaff's own dream-like description of himself as "a goodly portly man" with "Vertue in his Lookes" (II, iv, 1380, 1385) [II, iv, 464, 470].

The climax of Shakespeare's carefully developed dissociation of Hal from the forces of "Ryot and Dishonor" which surround him, but which do not in reality taint him as his father wrongly believes, occurs when Falstaff, playing Hal,

urges that "olde Iack Falstaffe" not be banished from the Prince's company [II, iv, 525-7]:

> . . . banish not him thy Harryes companie; banish plumpe Iacke, and banish all the World.
>
> (II, iv, 1436-8)

However, Hal's reply of "I doe, I will" (II, iv, 1439) [II, iv, 528] both epitomizes his moral detachment and dramatically foreshadows Falstaff's fate in 2 Henry IV.

Finally, it is evident that Hal is completely in control of events, as is demonstrated by his protection of Falstaff from the Sheriff at the end of the tavern scene. Although it could be argued that Hal's role-playing has perhaps taken him too far and that his behaviour is here irresponsible and shows a disregard for the forces of law and order, the dramatic effect of the scene is primarily to make manifest the basic insecurity of Falstaff's position. There is no way in which the princely prodigal son in this play will fall into the snares of such a man. Instead, it is this man and other hangers-on who are the ones to be duped by the "prodigal" and eventually banished from his presence, a reversal of the normal pattern.

In the course of the tavern scene, Hal receives a call from the court to go to his father, and this prepares the way for the scene of reconciliation between father and son which is of such crucial importance, in this as in other Prodigal Son plays. Just as many a father in such scenes admits some responsibility for his son's misconduct, as indeed the King Henry in The Famous Victories did, Hal's father also possesses

a sense of guilt. Where in most Prodigal Son plays this guilt is depicted in terms of the father's failure to follow the precept of "Spare the Rod," here in Shakespeare's play the father's guilt derives from a sense that some past action of his has caused him to be punished by Heaven with a son like Hal. King Henry is at this point unable or unwilling to admit the specific nature of his own offense, but Shakespeare almost certainly intends us to interpret Henry's admission as an expression of subconscious guilt for his usurpation of the crown, an unusual, but highly appropriate variation on a motif that is present in many Prodigal Son plays [III, ii, 4-11]:

> I know not whether Heauen will haue it so,
> For some displeasing seruice I haue done;
> That in his secret Doome, out of my Blood,
> Hee'le breede Reuengement, and a Scourge for me:
> But thou do'st in thy passages of Life,
> Make me beleeue, that thou art onely mark'd
> For the hot vengeance, and the Rod of heauen
> To punish my Mistreadings.
> (III, ii, 1822-9)

The King then goes on to make specific charges concerning Hal's behaviour [III, ii, 11-17]:

> . . . Tell me else,
> Could such inordinate and low desires,
> Such poore, such bare, such lewd, such meane attempts,
> Such barren pleasures, rude societie,
> As thou art matcht withall, and grafted too,
> Accompanie the greatnesse of thy blood,
> And hold their leuell with thy Princely heart?
> (III, ii, 1829-35)

Hal's reply to this is very interesting, for he does not completely deny his guilt. On the one hand he claims that much of what his father has heard of him is the work of scandal-bearers [III, ii, 23-25], and he refers to

> . . . many Tales deuis'd,
> Which oft the Eare of Greatnesse needes must heare,
> By smiling Pick-thankes, and base Newes-mongers.
> (III, ii, 1841-3)[64]

On the other hand, Hal does make the following admission [III, ii, 18-21]:

> So please your Maiesty, I would I could
> Quit all offences with as cleare excuse,
> As well as I am doubtlesse I can purge
> My selfe of many I am charg'd withall.
>
> (III, ii, 1836-9)

Not only does Hal here confess to some measure of misconduct, which he later explains as the product of his youth, but he also asks pardon and submits to his father [III, ii, 26-28]:

> I may for some things true, wherein my youth
> Hath faultie wandred, and irregular,
> Finde pardon on my true submission.
> (III, ii, 1844-6)

Our reaction to this is, perhaps, a pleasurable one as we recognize that Hal is, after all, capable of human weakness. This earns him our sympathy rather than condemnation, yet at the same time we cannot but be aware that Hal may be deliberately attempting to obtain just this very reaction from his father. For all we know, Hal may in fact secretly feel that he has nothing whatsoever in his past to feel guilty about. Whatever the case, Shakespeare would seem to have succeeded in keeping his hero free from any real discredit while skillfully paying token allegiance to the Hal of the Chronicles, The Famous Victories and folk-lore tradition; the problem of how such a prodigal as the historical Hal could have later reformed so suddenly and become "the Mirror of all Christian Kings" (Henry V, Chorus, 468) [II, Prologue, 6] is solved by

making the Prince's reformation no reformation at all in the normal sense.

However, although Hal may be completely guiltless and consequently have no need to reform, for political reasons he has, of course, to go through all the outward motions of contrition and reform. Hence the ambiguity of his words when he says to his father [III, ii, 92-3],

> I shall hereafter, my thrice gracious Lord,
> Be more my selfe.
>
> (III, ii, 1911-12)

This could mean that in the future he will cease pretending to be a prodigal and instead conduct himself entirely according to his true character. King Henry, of course, is unable at this stage to perceive the true worth and purposes of his son beneath surface appearances, and the inherent drama of this situation is fully exploited in the King's two long speeches in which he compares Hal to the "skipping King" Richard (III, ii, 1879) [III, ii, 60]. When the King says that Hal, like Richard, has lost his "Princely Priuiledge, / With vile participation" (III, ii, 1905-6) [III, ii, 86-7] and that a king should be viewed with an "extraordinarie Gaze, / Such as is bent on Sunne-like Maiestie, / When it shines seldome in admiring Eyes" (III, ii, 1897-9) [III, ii, 78-79], we inevitably think of Hal's own use of the sun-king analogy in his soliloquy. We remember that Hal explained his policy of hiding for the moment his true self in order that he "may be more wondred at" when eventually, like the sun breaking through "base contagious cloudes," he should

reveal himself for what he really is. Hence the intense irony of the fact that, although father and son appear to have similar views on kingship, and although they even use the same sun-king analogy to express them, the father nonetheless still fails completely to understand his son's behaviour.

Given the King's inability at this point to comprehend Hal's actions, we can perhaps more easily understand why, unlike the father in the parable, Henry does not offer immediate pardon to his repentant son. When Hal says he wishes to "Finde pardon on my true submission," the King replies, "Heauen pardon thee" (III, ii, 1847) [III, ii, 29]. Where the Prodigal Son in the New Testament admitted to sinning against both Heaven and his father, and where his father gives him immediate forgiveness, in 1 Henry IV the father can only say "Heauen pardon thee" before beginning a long speech in which he berates his son for conduct unbecoming a prince. Hal's short interjection claiming that he will be more himself hereafter does nothing to stop his father's harangue which reaches a climax when he says [III, ii, 124-28],

> Thou, that art like enough, through vassall Feare,
> Base Inclination, and the start of Spleene,
> To fight against me vnder Percies pay,
> To dogge his heeles, and curtsie at his frownes,
> To shew how much thou art degenerate.
> (III, ii, 1944-8)

When Hal replies, he first denies his father's charge--"Doe not thinke so, you shall not find it so" (III, ii, 1949) [III, ii, 129]--and then reiterates the idea that he has been the victim of scandal-mongers, but he also demonstrates his

realization that the only way he can win his father's favour is by proving himself superior to Hotspur [III, ii, 132-4]:

> I will redeeme all this on Percies head,
> And in the closing of some glorious day,
> Be bold to tell you, that I am your Sonne.
> (III, ii, 1952-4)

Where the Prodigal Son in the Bible had told his father that he was "no more worthie to be called thy sonne," Hal has been forced into a situation in which he has to prove his own worthiness to the point where he can stand before his father and say, "I am your Sonne."[65] Realizing that he has not yet been fully forgiven, Hal ends his speech, in which he vows to "teare the Reckoning" from Hotspur's heart, with a further plea for forgiveness [III, ii, 153-56]:

> This, in the Name of Heauen, I promise here:
> The which, if I performe, and doe suruiue,
> I doe beseech your Maiestie, may salue
> The long-growne Wounds of my intemperature.
> (III, ii, 1973-6)

It is clear that Hal's father is sufficiently impressed to give his son "Charge, and soueraigne trust" in the impending clash with rebels (III, ii, 1981) [III, ii, 161], but his forgiveness of his son is obviously as yet only conditional.

In the following scene Hal returns to the tavern. His attitude to Falstaff is one of detached sardonic realism, as is seen, for example, when he says to Falstaff [III, iii, 173-75],

> But sirra: There's no roome for Faith, Truth, nor Honesty, in this bosome of thine: it is all fill'd vppe with Guttes and Midriffe.
> (III, iii, 2160-2)

Hal's statement that "I am good Friends with my Father, and

may do any thing" (III, iii, 2191-2) [III, iii, 203-4] is, as we know, not entirely accurate, and we may see in it a ploy by Hal to allay the fears of his tavern friends who may well have expected the King to order his son to avoid their company. Hal's words, I believe, are not an indication that he has not reformed, nor do they indicate a lapse on his part. They merely indicate that for the time being he is not yet going to reveal his true self before his tavern friends, a revelation that must inevitably involve their banishment from his presence. This aspect of his public display of reformation must wait until he is crowned. Meanwhile, ignoring Falstaff's attempt to engage him in another robbery, Hal sets his mind on war. Significantly, Shakespeare shifts Hal's speech from prose, the style of speech he has hitherto used when conversing with Falstaff and company, into a rather rough verse form. This small detail hints at the change that is to occur on the battlefield at Shrewsbury where the supposed former prodigal (according to his plans) is able to demonstrate in public an apparent reformation.

It is at the Battle of Shrewsbury that the "nimble-footed Mad-Cap, Prince of Wales" (IV, i, 2325) [IV, i, 95], as Hotspur calls him, is transformed, for all to see, into "the Sunne at Mid-summer" (IV, i, 2333) [IV, i, 102], thereby bringing to partial fruition the Prince's policy of imitating the sun so that he might be the more wondered at on suddenly appearing unexpectedly from behind "base contagious cloudes." Even before the battle begins, however, Hal publicly displays

the apparent change that has occurred in his character by declaring before his father and the leading men of his father's court that he has to his shame "a Truant beene to Chiualry" (V, i, 2731) [V, i, 94]. Vernon later describes the incident as follows [V, ii, 62-69]:

> He made a blushing citall of himselfe,
> And chid his Trewant youth with such a Grace,
> As if he mastred there a double spirit
> Of teaching, and of learning instantly:
> There did he pause. But let me tell the World,
> If he out-liue the enuie of this day,
> England did neuer owe so sweet a hope,
> So much misconstrued in his Wantonnesse.
> (V, ii, 2847-54)

Vernon is obviously convinced by Hal, as is King Henry when his life is saved by Hal on the battlefield [V, iv, 48-50]:

> Thou hast redeem'd thy lost opinion,
> And shew'd thou mak'st some tender of my life
> In this faire rescue thou hast brought to mee.
> (V, iii, 3009-11)

Hal further makes good on his promises by demonstrating his martial superiority to Hotspur, thereby rounding off the irony by which Hotspur, whom we identified earlier as an elder brother figure, turns out to possess an inferior form of virtue to that of the supposed prodigal with whom he has previously so advantageously been compared. By freeing Douglas, Hal also displays "high courtesy,"[66] and demonstrates the magnanimity and liberality that the literature de regimine principum so insists upon, while his words over the "dead" body of Falstaff reveal very clearly that the young prince is indeed untainted by all that his tempter stands for [V, iv, 105-6]:

> O, I should haue a heauy misse of thee,
> If I were much in loue with Vanity.
> (V, iii, 3070-1)

Shakespeare's Prince Hal in 1 Henry IV is thus only a prodigal in appearances and his reformation is equally a matter of contrived public display. Shakespeare's decision to portray his hero in this way undoubtedly has much to do with the problem of reconciling the wild character of the legendary Prince Hal with contemporary idealization of Henry V. Shakespeare obviously wants to avoid presenting Hal as the kind of hooligan and buffoon who appeared in The Famous Victories. Furthermore, he is anxious to give some explanation for Hal's apparently sudden reformation. Not for Shakespeare is the "Damascus Road conversion of The Famous Victories," as one writer has described it.[67] Instead Hal's character is depicted as almost entirely free from failings, except perhaps for those minor things wherein his youth "Hath faultie wandred," but even here we cannot be certain that Hal is really guilty of what he says he is.

When we turn our attention to 2 Henry IV, Shakespeare's second Prodigal Son play, we find that Shakespeare's unusual presentation of a prodigal son hero is further elaborated upon. Although Hal has undergone the full cycle of dissipation, remorse, repentance and forgiveness, at least as far as appearances go in Part One, Shakespeare starts the whole cycle all over again in Part Two, and he is partly enabled to do this because, as we have noted earlier, Hal's relationship to Falstaff and company is as yet unresolved in that Hal has not

made clear to them his new mode of life. Consequently, where the climax of Part One showed Hal redeeming himself at the expense of Hotspur, the climax of Part Two, in which the cycle is repeated, occurs when the Prince, on becoming King, banishes Falstaff, the final public indication that the wild Prince Hal of popular belief is no more.

2 Henry IV

For Shakespeare to repeat the whole cycle of Hal's prodigal career and final conversion, Hal has to appear unreclaimed at the beginning of 2 Henry IV. It may be, as some critics have suggested, that Hal is enough of a folk-hero for this to happen without the necessity for any explanation on Shakespeare's part concerning the Prince's apparent lapse into his old ways.[68] Or perhaps, as A.R. Humphreys has suggested,

> Naturalistically, Hal would not, after redeeming himself at Shrewsbury, be thought of by almost everybody as a wastrel, his merits unrecognized. But symbolically, demonstratively, or parabolically he may be shown going through two quite separate moral evolutions which the play's chronology presents as successive but which in fact are in parallel.[69]

Whatever may be the explanation, it is nonetheless clear that, where Part One showed Hal's apparent reformation exemplified in his demonstration of chivalry at Shrewsbury, Part Two shows a similar reformation, but this time exemplified in his choice of Law and Order (the Lord Chief Justice) and in his rejection of the forces of Riot (Falstaff).

In 2 Henry IV our first view of Hal after the triumph of Shrewsbury does not occur until well into Act II. Previous

to this we hear Morton refer to his "swift wrath" in beating Hotspur to the ground (I, ii, 169) [I, i, 109], but for the most part we hear of the Prince only from Falstaff and his page. Falstaff offers no suggestion that there has been any abatement in the familiarity that formerly characterized his relationship with Hal. This is made clear, for example, when Falstaff refers to Hal as "the Iuuenall . . . whose Chin is not yet fledg'd" (I, iii, 293-5) [I, ii, 22-3]. When the Lord Chief Justice appears, Falstaff's page makes an explicit reference to one of the more infamous episodes in Hal's career--"Sir, heere comes the Nobleman that committed the Prince for striking him, about Bardolfe" (I, iii, 329-30) [I, ii, 63-4] --and Falstaff also refers to this same incident when he says to the Lord Chief Justice [I, ii, 218-22],

> For the boxe of th'eare that the Prince gaue you, he gaue it like a rude Prince and you tooke it like a sensible Lord. I haue checkt him for it, and the yong Lion repents: Marry not in ashes and sacke-cloath, but in new Silke, and old Sacke. (I, iii, 451-5)

Shakespeare's chief purpose here is to depict the gap between Falstaff's view and the reality. However, at the same time, the image of Hal's wildness is reinstated in our minds. Our impression is strengthened when the Lord Chief Justice accuses Falstaff of misleading the Prince and of following him "vp and downe, like his euill Angell" (I, iii, 424-5) [I, ii, 185-6], and when the Hostess later refers to some occasion on which the Prince broke Falstaff's head "for lik'ning [Henry IV] to a singing man of Windsor" (II, i, 692-3) [II, i, 97-8].

When Hal eventually appears and says that he desires

"small Beere" (II, ii, 797), it would appear that all is as before. Yet there is, I believe, a realization on Hal's part of the isolated situation into which his pretenses have taken him. Although he feels genuine sorrow on account of his father's sickness (II, ii, 824-7) [II, ii, 42-6], he knows that he cannot express his grief because "keeping such vild company . . . hath in reason taken from me, all ostentation of sorrow" (II, ii, 832-4) [II, ii, 53-4]. At the same time the sardonic detachment that was so characteristic of Hal in Part One is here, if anything, augmented, and he speaks in great distaste of the low mode of living with which he has made himself so familiar. Of his thirst, for example, Hal says, "Doth it not shew vildely in me, to desire small Beere?" (II, ii, 796-7) [II, ii, 6-7]. Later when he receives Falstaff's letter, he remarks, "I do allow this Wen [swollen excrescence] to bee as familiar with me, as my dogge" (II, ii, 888-9) [II, ii, 115-6], and it is in a tone of both regret and warning that he says to Poins [II, ii, 48-50],

> Thou think'st me as farre in the Diuels Booke, as thou, and Falstaffe, for obduracie and persistencie. Let the end try the man.
>
> (II, ii, 829-31)

Nevertheless, in suggesting the exploit of stealing upon Falstaff and his women at supper, Hal seems determined to play his old game. This is made very clear when he says at the end of this scene [II, ii, 192-6],

> From a God, to a Bull? A heauie declension: It was Ioues case. From a Prince, to a Prentice, a low transformation, that shall be mine: for in euery thing, the purpose must weigh

with the folly.

(II, ii, 952-5)

In the tavern scene which follows shortly after, Hal's role is chiefly that of observer. Many of the traditional elements of the tavern scene are present, such as music, food, drink, brawling and whoring, but they are all associated with Falstaff, for it is he who plays the prodigal in this scene, not Hal. Indeed this may in part explain Falstaff's role in both plays, for repeatedly, as was intimated earlier, the various sins traditionally associated with the Prodigal Son are embodied in the character of Falstaff, be they drunkenness, gluttony, lechery, prodigality ("Consumption of the purse"), vanity in dress, dicing, or brawling.[70] This transfer of the traditional sins of the prodigal to Falstaff, Hal's tempter, permits Shakespeare to keep Hal free from moral taint, and it is interesting that, in keeping with this process, Falstaff also appears to possess the prodigal's traditional concern with repentance. Throughout both plays he continually talks of his own sinful state and of how he should repent,[71] and it is no mere accident that Poins, when he first meets Falstaff in Part One, addresses him as "Monsieur Remorse" (I, ii, 219-20) [I, ii, 125]. Where Hal's concern with repentance appears to be chiefly an involvement with external appearances, Falstaff's, though frequently comic, has an underlying vein of seriousness which often suggests that he may well be genuinely concerned about the fate of his soul. Hence the pathos of such statements by Falstaff as the following [II, iv, 254-5]:

Peace (good Dol) doe not speake like a Deathshead: doe not bid me remember mine end.

(II, iv, 1257-8)

That Falstaff's fear of damnation is genuine and that he has good reason to be afraid is very clear. This, as we know, is normally the situation of the prodigal before conversion, but, since Shakespeare does not wish to depict his ideal king as one who has narrowly escaped hell-fire, it is Falstaff who must suffer the traditional pangs of the prodigal's remorse.

Consequently, it is not surprising that Hal should primarily be a mere observer in the great tavern scene of Act II. At the same time we notice that the detachment from Falstaff on the part of Hal is increasingly obvious, and this can be seen, for example, in the manner in which the latter barely speaks a civil word to the old knight throughout the entire scene. Then, when news comes of impending civil insurrection, Hal immediately reacts as the public figure he became at the end of 1 Henry IV and in marked contrast to the manner in which he reacted to the summons from the Court in the tavern scene in that same play (II, iv, 1246-7) [II, iv, 340-1]. Now it is Hal's turn to feel remorse, but it is of a very different kind from that of Falstaff, for it stems, not from concern for the state of his soul, but simply from the realization that his policy of deliberate familiarity and prodigality has led him to neglect his public duty [II, iv, 390-5]:

> By Heauen (Poines) I feele me much to blame,
> So idly to prophane the precious time,

> When Tempest of Commotion, like the South,
> Borne with black Vapour, doth begin to melt,
> And drop vpon our bare vnarmed heads.
> Giue me my Sword, and Cloake:
> Falstaffe, good night.
>
> (II, iv, 1387-93)

Given that this is the last time that Hal and Falstaff are together before the final rejection scene in Act V, the final words of Hal's speech are perhaps more meaningful than all the other remarks he has addressed to Falstaff in this scene. Certainly Shakespeare has carefully prepared us for the final meeting of the two men and for its inevitable consequences.

Meanwhile, as the play progresses, Shakespeare presents us with indications regarding the possible effects on society, were Prince Hal to live up to his reputation and were anarchy to prevail on the death of King Henry. The literature de regimine principum, as we saw earlier, makes it very clear what these effects would be, and they are demonstrated here, for example, by Falstaff's misuse of his authority by allowing himself to be bribed (III, ii, 1777-8) [III, ii, 260-1], and Justice Shallow's corrupt administration of justice, as exemplified in his countenancing the knave Visor at his friend's request (V, i, 2843) [V, i, 58]. These are clear signs of the sickness (2 Henry IV is full of disease-imagery) which it will be Hal's job to cure.[72] Falstaff, the personification of Riot, does not understand that Hal will turn away from him and all that he stands for, and this accounts for the irony which we find underlying Falstaff's remark that he "will diuise matter enough out of this Shallow, to keepe Prince Harry in continuall Laughter, the wearing out

of sixe Fashions" (V, i, 2867-9) [V, i, 86-90].

Falstaff then hears of King Henry's death, and, as in The Famous Victories, the rogues envision a dream-world in which anarchy reigns supreme. However, where in the earlier play the Prince was the creator of such a vision, significantly it is here entirely the product of Falstaff's imagination [V, iii, 129-31]:

> Master Robert Shallow, choose what Office thou wilt
> In the Land, 'tis thine. Pistol, I will double
> charge thee
> With Dignities.
>
> (V, iii, 3149-51)

A few lines later Falstaff's vision grows to include the overthrow of the Lord Chief Justice himself, the embodiment of Law and Order [V, iii, 143-5]:

> The Lawes of England are at my command'ment. Happie are they, which haue beene my Friendes: and woe vnto my Lord Chiefe Iustice.
>
> (V, iii, 3161-4)

Here we see clearly what would be the results if Hal were to behave in a prodigal fashion now that he is King. Incidentally, even the Chief Justice now thinks that the time "cannot looke more hideously vpon me, / Then I haue drawne it in my fantasie" (V, ii, 2895-6) [V, ii, 12-13] and that "all will be ouer-turn'd" (V, ii, 2904) [V, ii, 19]. We of the audience, of course, are enabled to appreciate the full irony of both Falstaff's and the Lord Chief Justice's reactions to the King's death because we have earlier been able to witness the crucial reconciliation scene, so important a part of most Prodigal Son plays, between the prodigal, Hal, and his father, King Henry.

Even before the two meet, however, the King has admitted that there are some good qualities in his son [IV, iv, 30-2]:

> For hee is gracious, if hee be obseru'd:
> Hee hath a Teare for Pitie, and a Hand
> Open (as Day) for melting Charitie.
>
> (IV, ii, 2404-6)

Nevertheless, the King still believes that his son suffers from the fault of an uneven disposition and will require very careful handling by those around him [IV, iv, 33-41]:

> . . . being incens'd, hee's Flint,
> As humorous as Winter, and as sudden,
> As Flawes congealed in Spring of day.
> His temper therefore must be well obseru'd:
> Chide him for faults, and doe it reuerently,
> When you perceiue his blood enclin'd to mirth:
> But being moodie, giue him Line, and scope,
> Till that his passions (like a Whale on ground)
> Confound themselues with working.
>
> (IV, ii, 2407-15)

Then, on hearing that Hal has been "With Pointz, and other his continuall followers" (IV, ii, 2430-1) [IV, iv, 53], Henry reverts to the entirely hostile view of his son that he had held during most of Part One [IV, iv, 54-6]:

> Most subiect is the fattest Soyle to Weedes:
> And hee (the Noble Image of my Youth)
> Is ouer-spread with them.
>
> (IV, ii, 2432-4)

Like many of the other fathers with prodigal sons, Henry is grief-stricken ("my griefe / Stretches it selfe beyond the howre of death" IV, ii, 2434-5) [IV, iv, 56-7], but at this point Warwick steps forward, and, like the wise counsellor Eubulus in Acolastus, he offers an explanation for the prodigal's behaviour although it is a very different kind of

explanation from that given in Acolastus, in keeping with Shakespeare's very different intentions in this play [IV, iv, 67-78]:

> My gracious Lord, you looke beyond him quite:
> The Prince but studies his Companions,
> Like a strange Tongue: wherein, to gaine the Language,
> 'Tis needfull, that the most immodest word
> Be look'd vpon, and learn'd: which once attayn'd,
> Your Highnesse knowes, comes to no farther vse,
> But to be knowne, and hated. So, like grosse termes,
> The Prince will, in the perfectnesse of time,
> Cast off his followers: and their memorie
> Shall as a Patterne, or a Measure, liue,
> By which his Grace must mete the liues of others,
> Turning past-euills to aduantages.
> (IV, ii, 2445-56)

Ironically the King is unable to accept this explanation, which we, of course, know to be correct, and he suggests that his son is most unlikely to forgo his former pleasures [IV, iv, 79-80]:

> 'Tis seldome, when the Bee doth leaue her Combe
> In the dead Carrion.
> (IV, ii, 2457-8)

This is the situation when Hal finally comes before his father. The latter is asleep at the time, and this enables Shakespeare to give the Prince a soliloquy in which he reveals his true thoughts. This is important, since Hal has deliberately refrained for the most part from revealing his true self except through the irony and ambiguity of his conversations with Falstaff and the other companions of his supposedly riotous living, and through the short aside at the end of II, ii. Now, however, we see Hal in full consciousness of the responsibilities of the kingship which he is about to assume [IV, v, 21-5]:

> Why doth the Crowne lye there, vpon the Pillow,
> Being so troublesome a Bed-fellow?
> O pollish'd Perturbation! Golden Care!
> That keep'st the Ports of Slumber open wide,
> To many a watchfull Night.
> (IV, ii, 2544-9)

When the Prince mistakenly deduces that his father is dead, he reacts in the dual role of son and heir [IV, v, 34-7]:

> . . . My gracious Lord, my Father,
> This sleepe is sound indeede: this is a sleepe,
> That from this Golden Rigoll hath diuorc'd
> So many English Kings.
> (IV, ii, 2557-60)

As a son, Hal is filled with grief and thereby demonstrates the love for his father which his seeming prodigality has hitherto belied [IV, v, 37-40]:

> . . . Thy due, from me,
> Is Teares, and heauie Sorrowes of the Blood,
> Which Nature, Loue, and filiall tendernesse,
> Shall (O deare Father) pay thee plenteously.
> (IV, ii, 2560-3)

As heir to the throne, Hal takes upon himself the full responsibilities of kingship [IV, v, 41-6]:

> My due, from thee, is this Imperiall Crowne,
> Which (as immediate from thy Place and Blood)
> Deriues it selfe to me. Loe, heere it sits,
> Which Heauen shall guard:
> And put the worlds whole strength into one gyant Arme,
> It shall not force this Lineall Honor from me.
> (IV, ii, 2564-9)

The public and the private aspects of Hal's "reformation" are thus combined when the mourning Prince here affirms his determination to maintain the authority of his new office.

As yet, however, the reconciliation which we expect between a father and his prodigal son has not taken place, and it is further delayed by the fact that, when Henry wakes up, he assumes the worst, wrongly believing that it was Hal's

haste to get the crown which caused him to mistake his father's sleep for death and that Hal's proper filial nature has been corrupted by materialistic desire. Once again, however, it is Warwick who acquaints the King with the truth [IV, v, 84-8], saying that he found Hal in the next room,

> Washing with kindly Teares his gentle Cheekes,
> With such a deepe demeanure, in great sorrow,
> That Tyranny, which neuer quafft but blood,
> Would (by beholding him) haue wash'd his Knife
> With gentle eye-drops.
> (IV, ii, 2615-9)

Once again, however, Hal's father is sceptical: "But wherefore did hee take away the Crowne?" (IV, ii, 2620) [IV, v, 89].

When father and son are left alone, the King launches into a long speech in which he demonstrates that he has yet to learn the true worth of his son. He accuses Hal of not comprehending "the Greatnesse, that will ouerwhelme thee" (IV, ii, 2630) [IV, v, 99], and paints a terrifying picture of the rule of riot which he imagines will descend upon the state of England when Hal is crowned (IV, ii, 2650-70) [IV, v, 118-38]. The reconciliation between Hal and his father now occurs when the former, like his New Testament counterpart, in "most true, and inward duteous Spirit" (IV, ii, 2681) [IV, v, 148], kneels, asks pardon, and affirms that he has reformed [IV, v, 152-5]:

> . . . If I do faine,
> O let me, in my present wildenesse, dye,
> And neuer liue, to shew th'incredulous World,
> The Noble change that I haue purposed.
> (IV, ii, 2685-8)

With Henry's acknowledgement of his son's words, the reconciliation is finally complete [IV, v, 178-81]:

> O my Sonne!
> Heauen put it in thy minde to take it hence,
> That thou might'st ioyne the more, thy Fathers loue,
> Pleading so wisely, in excuse of it.
> (IV, ii, 2712-5)[73]

Hal's statement concerning his "present wildenesse," like certain other admissions which follow (see lines 3014-18 and 3270 [V, ii, 129-33 and V, v, 62], quoted in the following pages), do not, in my opinion, constitute a contradiction to the argument that Hal's prodigality is deliberate pretense. Admissions of guilt, of the kind referred to here, are, on the contrary, an essential part of Hal's pretense, I would argue, as was his earlier apparent misconduct. Even Falstaff's allusion to Hal's drinking (IV, i, 2354-9) [IV, iii, 126-32] is not necessarily anything more than further demonstration that Hal has succeeded in having his contrived outward manifestations of prodigality mistaken for the reality of his inner nature.

Although we are aware that Hal has indeed "purposed" his "Noble change" as a deliberate act of political strategy, and even though his explanation as to why he picked up the crown is not so much in accordance with the truth as a calculated ploy to earn him sympathy from his father (IV, ii, 2689-2711) [IV, v, 156-77], we should not, I feel, be too quick to condemn Hal for his deceptions. I say this because it is clear that Shakespeare in 2 Henry IV has deliberately shown Hal as being deeply concerned at having to behave unnaturally, especially towards his father who is depicted as continually tormented by the sadness he feels at Hal's apparent misconduct.

These emotional tensions, which in 2 Henry IV have verged at times on the tragic, are now resolved, and, although we may feel uncomfortable about Hal's original plan to play the Prodigal Son, our response is here primarily one of relief that the reconciliation has indeed been effected.

In this crucial scene with his father, Hal demonstrates his conversion on a private level. It is still necessary for him to demonstrate his "Noble change" in public if his original plan is to be effective. This he does in a number of ways, but chief among them is his investiture of the Lord Chief Justice with "the Ballance, and the Sword" (V, ii, 2988) [V, ii, 103] with the hope that the Justice will continue to use "the like bold, iust, and impartiall spirit" (V, ii, 3001) [V, ii, 116] that he originally observed when he sent the "immediate Heire of England" to prison (V, ii, 2956) [V, ii, 71]. In doing this, Hal makes it amply clear that the forces of Riot will have no place in his kingdom and that Justice, the supreme kingly virtue according to the literature de regimine principum, will have first place in his reign. In addition Hal chooses the Justice as a counsellor [V, ii, 118-21]:

> You shall be as a Father, to my Youth:
> My voice shall sound, as you do prompt mine eare,
> And I will stoope, and humble my Intents,
> To your well-practis'd, wise Directions.
> (V, ii, 3003-6)

In this Hal is following a basic precept of good government as defined by the literature de regimine principum in which the need for wise counsel is so frequently insisted upon. At

the same time his choice of the Chief Justice is a sure indication that Falstaff, "That villanous abhominable mis-leader of Youth" (1 Henry IV, II, iv, 1420-1) [II, iv, 508-9], will have no place at Court, and his final statement in V, ii, is in keeping with Hal's desire to surround himself with the right kind of men [V, ii, 134-7]:

> Now call we our High Court of Parliament,
> And let vs choose such Limbes of Noble Counsaile,
> That the great Body of our State may go
> In equall ranke, with the best gouern'd Nation.
> (V, ii, 3019-22)

All this, of course, is in fulfillment of Hal's purpose [V, ii, 126-9]:

> To mocke the expectation of the World;
> To frustrate Prophesies, and to race out
> Rotten Opinion, who hath writ me downe
> After my seeming.
> (V, ii, 3011-14)

Hal's auditors, unless they are possessed with Warwick's insight, do not know that these words are ambiguous since Hal's conversion was indeed planned; nor can those who are listening to the young king share the audience's knowledge that Hal's words which then follow the above statement are probably a continuation of the policy whereby he pretended that he was by nature inclined to "Ryot and Dishonor" [V, ii, 129-33]:

> . . . The Tide of Blood in me,
> Hath prowdly flow'd in Vanity, till now.
> Now doth it turne, and ebbe backe to the Sea,
> Where it shall mingle with the state of Floods,
> And flow henceforth in formall Maiesty.
> (V, ii, 3014-18)

The other principal way in which Hal publicly demonstrates his "Noble change" is in his rejection of Falstaff.

This is the final manifestation that the apparently prodigal prince has chosen the path of political and moral virtue. It is something that has been prepared for from the time of Hal's important soliloquy in 1 Henry IV, and it marks the final stage in Hal's strategy and the beginning of what for the Elizabethans was an exemplary reign. The public statement which Hal makes before Falstaff would, I believe, have struck Shakespeare's contemporaries as perfectly appropriate.[74] Hal is not only a new man on account of his apparent conversion, he has also been crowned king, the coronation ceremony being regarded as "virtually an eighth sacrament."[75] He has now been consecrated in the office of king, and has become what one political historian of Elizabethan England has described as

> . . . the wielder of primaeval quasi-priestly magic, the Lord's anointed and the transmitter of the wonder-working blood royal, the tribal leader and protector in time of war, the feudal overlord of all the land, the fountain of justice and of honour, the guardian of "the king's peace", the sovereign giver or declarer of the law, the bearer of the secular sword on behalf of Holy Church.[76]

Hal has indeed undergone a "Noble change" which may quite well far transcend the one he "purposed" [V, v, 60-3]:

> Presume not, that I am the thing I was,
> For heauen doth know (so shall the world perceiue)
> That I haue turn'd away my former Selfe,
> So will I those that kept me Companie.
> (V, v, 3268-71)

In the lines that follow immediately upon those just quoted, Hal goes on to say more of the change that has occurred in him.[77] He claims that Falstaff was "The Tutor and the Feeder of my Riots" (V, v, 3274) [V, v, 66], but this we know to be

a matter of appearances only. Nevertheless, in order to make public demonstration of his reformation, Hal has to follow through with his strategy. That he then treats Falstaff and company as kindly as is compatible with his newly-assumed kingship is a sign, I believe, that Hal is not insensitive with regard to the lie he has perpetrated on his tavern "friends." I also believe that the Elizabethans did not share to anything like the same degree, if at all, the misgivings that many modern critics and audiences feel when watching this final implementation of Hal's policy. To them, Hal's obvious insincerity would have been regarded more as the positive virtue of a practical politician, a virtue that is in keeping with the kind that Hal displays consistently throughout Henry V.

Looking at Hal's speech as a whole, and bearing in mind the effects of his coronation, one can understand that the Elizabethans would have felt that it was right and proper that Hal should remind Falstaff, as Falstaff had been reminding himself throughout both plays, of the need to repent. It would also have been felt appropriate that Hal should remind Falstaff, as the Lord Chief Justice had done earlier (I, iii, 421-2) [I, ii, 182-3], of the proper dignity and conduct befitting an old man [V, v, 51-2]:

> I know thee not, old man: Fall to thy Prayers:
> How ill white haires become a Foole, and Iester?
> (V, v, 3259-60)

Similarly, although Hal (or was it Shakespeare?) cannot resist a touch of humour at this point, it would surely have been felt right that the new king should remind Falstaff, as Doll had done earlier, of death [V, v, 56-8]:

> Make lesse thy body (hence) and more thy Grace,
> Leaue gourmandizing; Know the Graue doth gape
> For thee, thrice wider then for other men.
> (V, v, 3264-6)

In this way Shakespeare brings his second Prodigal Son play to a close. The prodigal, whose vices seem to have gone against all the precepts of the literature de regimine principum, and whose imminent accession to the throne was seen as a threat to the political and moral stability of a whole realm, has apparently reformed both in his role as a son and in that of the future ruler. Furthermore, in keeping with the expectations held of a folk-hero, he has exceeded all hopes in his almost miraculous transformation. We in the audience know, however, that Shakespeare, in order to keep his "Mirror of all Christian Kings" free from the taint of "Ryot and Dishonor" of which history accused him, made Hal only imitate the behaviour of a prodigal son and heir, while the real sins traditionally associated with the Prodigal Son were embodied in the young Prince's tempter, Falstaff.

In the play Shakespeare has employed most of the traditional elements of the Prodigal Son play, including a tavern scene with two women, the portrayal of the vices of prodigality, gluttony, lechery and vanity in dress, all of them being associated with Falstaff, and a reconciliation scene between father and son, who are also King and heir respectively. As if to show that he is very conscious of the relationship of his play to the New Testament parable and to other Prodigal Son plays, Shakespeare includes, as he did in 1 Henry IV, a specific reference to the parable when Falstaff says to the Hostess that "for thy walles a pretty slight Drollery, or the Storie of the Prodigall, . . . is worih [sic] a thousand of these Bed-hangings, and these Fly-bitten Tapistries" (II, i, 739-43) [II, i, 155-9]. Only the part of the Elder Brother

appears to have been omitted. We have seen, however, how in 1 Henry IV Shakespeare presented Hotspur in such a way as to fulfil this role, and in 2 Henry IV it can be argued, though less forcibly, that Henry's younger (rather than elder) brother John provides the kind of contrast with the "prodigal" that the Elder Brother in the parable supplied.

The contrast between Hal and John is made explicit by Falstaff, although Falstaff's explanation of the differences between the two brothers is obviously quite specious. Of John he says [IV, iii, 93-7]:

> Good faith, this same young sober-blooded Boy doth not loue me, nor a man cannot make him laugh: but that's no maruaile, hee drinkes no Wine. There's neuer any of these demure Boyes come to any proofe.
>
> (IV, i, 2324-8)

In contrast to Lancaster's cold and sober blood is that of Hal [IV, iii, 126-32]:

> Prince Harry is valiant: for the cold blood hee did naturally inherite of his Father, hee hath, like leane, stirrill, and bare Land, manured, husbanded, and tyll'd, with excellent endeauour of drinking good, and good store of fertile Sherris, that hee is become very hot, and valiant.
>
> (IV, i, 2354-9)

But even more important than Falstaff's comparison is the fact that John's conduct at Gaultree demonstrates a total disregard for honour in that he deliberately makes a promise to the rebels which he then, just as deliberately, breaks. This act is then followed by a rigorous application of the letter of the law, quite untempered by any mercy, for John condemns his prisoners to summary execution [IV, ii, 122-3]:

> Some guard these Traitors to the Block of Death,
> Treasons true Bed, and yeelder vp of breath.
>
> (IV, i, 2233-4)

Both of John's acts are in plain contradiction of what one may take as the orthodox Elizabethan view. We find the assertion in Elyot's The Governor, for example, that even with regard to enemies "consideration ought to be had of justice and honesty,"[78] and in the story of Thomas Montague in The Mirror for Magistrates we read that "God hateth rigour though it furder right," and that "Who furdereth right is not therby excused, / If through the same he do sum other wrong."[79] We remember the claim by Portia in The Merchant of Venice that "earthly power doth then shew likest Gods / When mercie seasons Iustice" (IV, i, 2107-8) [IV, i, 196-7]. Significantly we find the professional soldier, Barnabe Riche, in his Allarme to England (1578) expressing horror at the kind of perjury and deceit that is practised at Gaultree, though he does not in fact cite this example, when he complains that in contemporary wars,

> . . . fraud and deceipte is reputed for policie, and treason and trecherie are called gravite and wisedome, and he is holden the noblest champion, that by any of these meanes can best deceive: where, in the opinion of all men, whiche exactly doe honour iustice, it hath ever ben condemned, & accompted most horrible.[80]

And on this same matter of the use of deceit, one remembers, as Jorgensen points out, the distaste in Henry V's description of the French as "an enemie of Craft and Vantage" (Henry V, 1594) [III, vi, 153],[81] the words of the pirate Pompey in Antony and Cleopatra when he refuses to take advantage of a parley and gain control of the whole empire (lines 1419-26) [II, vii, 79-83], and the words of Sigismund in Tamburlaine: Part Two:

> Discomforted is all the Christian host,
> And God hath thundered vengeance from on high
> For my accursed and hateful perjury.
> O just and dreadful punisher of sin.
> (II, iii, 1-4)[82]

Mowbray thus has a traditional code of conduct on his side in 2 Henry IV when he asks of Lancaster, "Is this proceeding iust, and honorable?" (IV, i, 2220) [IV, ii, 110]. Lancaster, on the other hand, though claiming that he is acting with "a most Christian care" (IV, i, 2226) [IV, ii, 115] and that "Heauen, and not wee, haue safely fought to day" (IV, i, 2232) [IV, ii, 121], is clearly doing nothing of the kind, for he is acting out of pure necessity, his army lacking the superior numbers of the rebel forces,[83] and out of a desire to succeed, whatever the cost in honour or true justice.

It may be, as Humphreys suggests, that Shakespeare "saw moral fitness behind the Gaultree stratagem,"[84] but it is a very inferior kind of moral fitness, and, as for Lancaster's Pharisaical application of justice, one cannot help making a comparison with Hal's magnanimous pardon of Douglas at the close of 1 Henry IV and his careful provision "for competence of life" which he allows Falstaff at the end of 2 Henry IV (V, v, 3278) [V, v, 70]. One can justifiably argue, I think, that John's strict adherence to the letter of the law, combined as it is with his conspicuous lack of charity, make him a fitting counterpart in this play for the Elder Brother in the New Testament parable. This may explain why Shakespeare, in making it a brother of Hal who plays the

leading role at Gaultree, deliberately altered his sources in which it was originally Westmoreland who "subtillie deuised how to quaile" the forces of the rebels.[85] As in the case of the changes he made in 1 Henry IV with respect to the age of Hotspur, Shakespeare's purpose here seems to be that of deliberately trying to create the kind of contrast between two young men that is basic to the final section of the Prodigal Son parable. Although in 2 Henry IV the behaviour and attitudes of John are not openly discredited in the way in which both Hotspur's and the Elder Brother's are, his moral inferiority to Hal is, I feel, abundantly clear. Thus even the motif of the Elder Brother, which is, as we have seen, often omitted in the English Prodigal Son plays, is included in both of Shakespeare's contributions to the type.

If This Be Not Good, The Diuell Is In It

This work, which was published in 1612, has already been briefly mentioned in Chapter Four where a sketch of the plot was given, together with a description of the Hell scenes, which were seen to contain a Prodigal and thereby to provide an indirect comment on the main action of the play. Also noted was the corruption of the cook, Scumbroth, by wealth, his reduction to beggary and his own comparison of himself to the "prodigall child in the painted cloth" (IV, ii, 1). In this chapter, however, we shall be concerned chiefly with King Alphonso, the central character in the play, and with the manner in which he is tempted by the devil Rufman,

falls into sin, and eventually reforms. This cycle of fall and redemption parallels that of the Prodigal Son, and Dekker's references in the play to the Prodigal in Hell and more especially to the "prodigall child" suggest that he was not unaware of the parallel. There is, however, no Elder Brother figure nor any equivalent for him, as there is in the two plays of Shakespeare that have just been discussed, nor does the prodigal prince have a father, although Octavio, Alphonso's uncle, seems to combine the traditional roles of both father and elderly counsellor. The play is consequently not so obviously a Prodigal Son play as the others discussed thus far in this chapter. Nevertheless I believe that it has enough qualities in common with other Prodigal Son plays to justify its inclusion, its particular interest for the purposes of this chapter being its portrayal both of a prodigal prince and the effects of his prodigality on his kingdom.

We first hear of King Alphonso in the Hell scene which begins the play. Rufman, one of the devils, is charged to go to Naples and "play the court diuell" (I, i, 104). There he will find a young king who is newly-crowned. The plan is to corrupt the king and hence the whole state, and in this, of course, we are reminded of a major dictum of the literature de regimine principum which, in the words of William Baldwin, states that

> . . . where offices are duly ministred, it can not be chosen, but the people are good, whereof must nedes folow a good common weale. For if the officers be good, the people cannot be yll. Thus the goodnes or badnes of any realme lyeth in the goodnes or badnes of its rulers.
> (Preface to The Mirror for Magistrates, p. 64)

And to this may be added James' advice in the Basilikon Doron, in which he says to Prince Henry at one point,

> Thinke not therefore, that the highnes of your dignity diminisheth your faults (muche lesse giueth you a licence to sinne) but by the contrarie, your fault shall be aggrauated, according to the height of your dignity; any sinne that ye committe, not being a single sinne procuring but the fall of one; but being an exemplare sinne, & therefore drawing with it the whole multitude to be guiltie of the same.
>
> (I, 27)

The forces of Hell in Dekker's play show that they clearly understand this when Rufman is instructed to corrupt Alphonso and thereby the whole state of Naples:

> . . . wey down his loftiest boughes
> With leaden plomets, poison his best thought with tast
> Of things most sensuall; if the heart once wast
> The body feels consumption; good or bad kings
> Breede Subiects like them: cleere streames flow
> from cleere springs.
> Turne therefore Naples to a puddle.
>
> (I, i, 98-103)

The first scene in which Alphonso appears depicts him as the "Mirrour of Kings" (I, ii, 37). His first "Princely Act" (I, ii, 55) is a demonstration of his magnanimity, for he pardons a group of conspirators ("Yong Catilines, and farre more desperate" I, ii, 40).[86] He then assigns various tasks to each day of the week and has them written down in a book,

> The booke being but six leaues (six dayes,) the seuenth
> Be his that owes it; sacred is that and hye;
> And who profanes one houre in that, shall dye.
>
> (I, ii, 69-71)

On Monday he will act in his capacity as judge and "wey out lawes / With euen scales" (I, ii, 85-6). By putting Justice in first place, Alphonso is, of course, following the precepts of the literature de regimine principum which always defined Justice as the chief and most God-like virtue of a good king.

To quote Baldwin's Preface once again:

> For as Iustice is the chief vertue, so is the ministracion thereof, the chiefest office: & therefore hath God established it with the chiefest name, honoring & calling Kinges, & all officers vnder them by his owne name, Gods.
> (Preface, p. 65)

On Tuesdays Alphonso will engage in acts of charity, and in his determination to use his wealth in a proper manner, we can detect the Aristotelian virtue of liberality, for Alphonso explicitly states that he will be careful not to allow his money to go to the undeserving, something which, in the view of Aristotle, would be defined as prodigality:

> Churles (with Gods mony) shall not feast, swill wine,
> And fat their rancke gutts whilest poore wretches pine.
> (I, i, 111-2)

Wednesdays will be spent in "th'affaires / Of forren states" (I, ii, 117-8), and Thursdays in the training of and care for soldiers, a concern which reflects a particular interest of Dekker, though it was one which was especially topical during the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras:

> Our Neapolitane youths (that day) shall try
> Their skill in armes, poore scorned Soldiers
> Shall not be suffer'd beg here (as in some landes)
> Nor stoope slaue-like to Captaines proud commands,
> Starue, and lie nastie, when the selfe-same pay,
> The Souldier fights for, keepes the Leaders gay.
> (I, ii, 122-7)

Friday will be "spent it'h reuerent Schooles, / Where weele sift branne from floure" (I, ii, 143-4), and here we are reminded both of Shakespeare's description of Henry V's ability to "reason in Diuinitie," and of topical concern that a monarch, especially if he were the Head of the Church, should indeed be concerned with the Church. Alphonso also says that

he will stamp out the abuse by which one man "by Symonious gold" (I, ii, 146) holds three or four Church livings while "greater Schollers languish in beggery" (I, ii, 148).

It is at this point that Rufman, alias Shalkan Bohor, arrives at the court, and Alphonso begins on his downhill path to corruption by giving in to the temptation that is presented when Rufman suggests that Saturdays be set aside for the King's own pleasure:

> Bohor tha'st warm'd our yong blood; Al cares of state,
> Shall that day sleepe, to our selfe weele Saterday haue,
> Pleasure (the slaue of Kings) shall then be our slaue,
> Lords let there be a proclamation drawne,
> What man soeuer (strange or natiue borne,)
> Can feast our spleene, and heigthen our delight,
> He shall haue gold and be our fauorite.
> Tilts, turneys, masques, playes, dauncing, drinking deepe
> Tho ere noone all Naples lye dead-drunke a sleepe.
> (I, ii, 199-207)

As for the kind of pleasure that Rufman has in mind for the King, further indication is later given when he suggests to Alphonso that he might like to see "A thousand wenches / Stark-nak'd, to play at Leap-frog" (III, iii, 166-7).

But in the early stages of Act I all is not yet lost. Erminhild, the King's intended bride, arrives, and Alphonso demonstrates that he possesses a proper concern to ensure his succession, a concern, one remembers, which Elizabeth's subjects frequently accused her of lacking:

> . . . We Twaine
> Will wed, and bed, and get a Prince shall raigne
> In Naples brauely, when wee both lye dead.
> (I, ii, 255-7)

In the second scene in which Alphonso appears, his uncle, Octavio, is able to exert a good influence over his

nephew. When Alphonso suggests that the book of laws be put away, Octavio, using the commonplace image of the "Ship of State," replies:

> No no, thy lawes ile fix full in thy sight, Hangs a table vp.
> (Like sea-markes,) that if this great ship of sway
> And kingly ventures, loose her constant way,
> Ith bottomles gulph of state, (beaten by the stormes
> Of youthfull follie, raging in monstrous formes)
> Shee may be sau'de from sinking and from wrack,
> (Steerd by this compasse,) for the point of it
> Shall guide her so, on rockes she cannot split.
> (II, i, 12-19)

For the moment the threat of what could happen should Alphonso choose the path of youthful folly and anarchy is averted, and the King says to his uncle,

> You are our carefull pilot. In this voiage
> Of Gouernment, be you our Admirall.
> Wisedome and Age being props, realmes seldome fall.
> (II, i, 20-2)

So far, it seems the customary rejection of old age and wise counsel, which, as we know, is frequently the way of the prodigal, has not yet occurred, and for the moment Alphonso would appear to be like Shakespeare's Henry V in that he has deliberately chosen to allow an older and more experienced man to guide him in affairs of state.

However, it is soon apparent that Alphonso resents his uncle, and, when Octavio goes off to fetch in a series of entertainments that he considers fitting for Alphonso to see, as opposed to those which Alphonso would prefer to have, the latter remarks,

> Sdeath! if these doting gray-beards might haue their wills,
> We neuer shall haue ours: let vs crosse them
> As they crosse vs.
> (II, i, 92-4)

Significantly the entertainments that Octavio presents are of a soldier with a wooden leg, a scholar, and a sea-man. Alphonso allows his courtiers to mock the three men, but both soldier and sailor issue warnings to Alphonso when they leave, and these are matched by what Octavio says:

> Now by my life I haue patient stood too long,
> To see rich merit and loue, payde with base wrong:
> Learning! and Armes! and Traffique! the triple wall
> That fortifies a Kingdome, race em down All!
> (II, i, 169-72)

Rufman is now allowed to provide an entertainment for the King, and the latter symbolically embraces the devil before the scene closes.

The King now begins to indulge in some of the vices traditionally associated with the prodigal, and in doing so he demonstrates how far he is from being the "Mirrour of Kings" that he was at the beginning of the play. Like Shakespeare's Richard II and Marlowe's Edward II, he gathers around himself a "luxurious traine, / Of parasites, knaues, and fooles, (a kingdomes bane,)" (III, i, 37-8), he shows himself to be "far more ydle than a mad-mans dreame" (III, i, 47), and he rejects Erminhild in order to have more scope to give free rein to his sexual desires, thereby showing a complete disregard for the matter of ensuring his succession:

> . . . tho heauen can abide but one sun, I hope we on earth may loue many mens daughters: Tell Erminhilda so: send her home to the duke her father: And tell him too, because the disease of mariage brings the stone with it, I hate a woman; I loue not to be cut: inclosde grounds are too rancke.
> (III, i, 20-4)

Like the other prodigal princes discussed in the chapter, Alphonso's sins involve him both as a man and as a king.

As a man he stands to lose his chance of salvation on account of his Godless ways, but as a king he may cause the downfall of an entire state. This is what Octavio in fact has in mind when he says of Alphonso,

> If he persue,
> These godles courses, best we leaue him too,
> That land to it selfe must a quick downefall bring,
> Whose King has lost all, but the name of King.
> (III, i, 53-6)

When we next see Alphonso, he ignores yet more of the precepts of good kingship. He acts completely unjustly when he refuses to hear the pleas of those of his poverty-stricken subjects who have been undone by unprincipled men such as those in the court itself "who goe gay, / Weare't out, booke downe more, set to their hands but neuer pay" (III, iii, 71-72), and, as Octavio goes on to complain,

> Neuer in deare yeares was there such complayning
> Of poor staru'd seruants, or (when plagues are raigning)
> Mourne orphans so and widdowes, as those doe
> That owe these sorrowfull papers.
> (III, iii, 73-6)

In addition we see Alphonso farm out the living of a local convent to one of his courtiers (III, iii, 117-9), and this not only shows him going back on his original promise to safeguard Church livings, but, by rewarding the undeserving Brisco in this way, Alphonso is acting in a prodigal fashion. Alphonso also suggests that his law book be burned (III, iii, 93), and he shows complete unconcern when told of the corruption in the Church, even though it is pointed out to him that as King he possesses the power to do something about it (III, iii, 109-10).

War is now declared against Alphonso by Erminhild's father, and the full effects of Alphonso's devotion to pleasure are felt. The image of the Ship of State is again evoked, but this time to suggest the devastating effects of the King's irresponsible behaviour:

> Thy kingdome is a weake ship, bruizd, split, sinking,
> Nor hast thou any pilot to waft vs o're
> Out of this foule Sea, to some calmer shore.
> Thy peoples hearts are turnd to rocks of flint,
> The Scholler, Souldier, and the Mariner,
> Whom (as themselues say) once thou trodst vpon,
> Now serue as wheeles of thy destruction.
> (V, i, 18-24)

The flattering courtiers now flee from the King and in his time of need, just as the Prodigal Son's false friends fled from him when his money was exhausted. Like many of the prodigals discussed thus far in this study, Alphonso now falls into despair, and significantly it is the devil Rufman who suggests suicide when he says that nature teaches man "a thousand waies / To leade him out this horrid giddy maze" (V, i, 48-9). To this Alphonso replies,

> I apprehend thee, a small daggers point,
> Opens the vaines to cure our plurizy.
> (V, i, 50-1)

On the verge of following Rufman's advice, Alphonso appears suddenly to come to himself. He remembers that "there is a hand / That fights for Kings" (V, i, 75-6), and that his religion binds him "To helpe distressed men" (V, i, 87), and he discovers how he has been surrounded by flatterers and traitors. Using the very image that Hal employed in his soliloquy in 1 Henry IV, Alphonso now reveals his new selfe:

> . . . thinkst thou (base Lord)

> Because the glorious Sun behind blacke cloudes
> Has a while hid his beames, hees darkned for euer?
> Ecclipsd neuer more to shine, yes, and to throw
> Fires from his sparkling eyes, thee to confound.
> (V, iii, 56-60)

At the same time he asks forgiveness of Erminhild and is reconciled both to her and to his uncle Octavio:

> Oh noble constant maid, forgiue my wrongs,
> The warmth of heauen to a pyning spring
> Cannot such comfort giue as thy glad presence
> Does to my bosome.
> (V, iii, 94-7)

He is now ready to begin his reign anew and to be the "Mirrour of Kings" as he initially promised to be:

> Here we begin
> Our reigne anew, which golden threds shall spin,
> Iustice shall henceforth sit vpon our throne,
> And vertue be your Kings companion.
> Warre here resignes his black and horrid stage
> To sportfull Hymen, God of Mariage.
> (V, iii, 156-61)

Dekker's prodigal prince has thus reformed both as a man and as a king. Throughout the play, as in the other works discussed in this chapter, we have been made aware of the dangers which threaten a state which is unfortunate enough to have a ruler who is a prodigal. Like the Prodigal Son in the parable, Alphonso reforms before it is too late, and, because we are asked to see him as a king as well as a representative of mankind, his personal salvation is matched by the salvation of his country, which for a time is threatened by war and various civil evils. The final scene of the play, as mentioned in Chapter Four, is set in Hell, and among the inmates is a Prodigal "Who (in one yeare,) spent on whores, fooles and slaues, / An Armies Maintenance"

(V, iv, 171-2). This is surely meant as a reminder that Alphonso, in following his own pleasures and in neglecting his state, has come close to damnation. The devil Rufman's plot, like that of Guy Fawkes, who is a fellow inmate of the Prodigal in Hell, has failed, but, had it succeeded, its effects would have been just as disastrous for king and country as the Gunpowder Plot could have been. Perhaps Dekker is here offering a lesson to the man who was not only the intended victim of Guy Fawkes but something of a prodigal too.[87]

In this chapter I have tried to show how three authors wrote plays in which the protagonist was both a prodigal and a prince. Three of the plays discussed were seen to be dramatisations of the youth of the historical Henry V, who, according to the Chronicles, led a wild and dissipated life before suddenly reforming and being reconciled to his father. Even though they are working from history, the authors of all three plays show, however, that they are probably aware of the parallels between their plots and that of the parable of the Prodigal Son. What distinguishes their plays from other English Prodigal Son plays, however, is the manner in which the behaviour of their princely protagonists, both before and after repentance, is seen in the context of a whole body of thought, which is concerned with the conduct properly befitting a prince, and which is most obviously reflected in the contemporary literature de regimine principum and other related forms of homiletic writing. Such literature, as we

have seen, concerns itself with the moral health of the ruler as an individual, but its chief concern is with the effects upon the body politic of the quality of kingship displayed by that individual. These interests, we found, are of great importance to the writers of the plays discussed in this chapter, all of whom, in varying degrees, depict their respective prodigal princes in such a way as to show the threat to a state which is posed should its ruler be a prodigal. At the same time, the authors are able to show the well-being of a state that is fortunate enough to be ruled by an exemplary ruler, as both Shakespeare and the author of The Famous Victories do when they depict the actions of Henry V, and as Dekker does both at the beginning of his play, before his prince has become a prodigal, and at the end of the drama, when Alphonso announces his intention to lead a new life.

Chapter VI

PRODIGAL SON PLAYS AND THE LONDON BOURGEOISIE

In previous chapters we have seen how the Prodigal Son parable lent itself, in the hands of different dramatists, not only to the portrayal of father-son relationships, but to various other relationships, such as teacher and pupil, king and prince, and elderly counsellor and youthful king. The prodigals in the plays to be discussed in this chapter are, in the main, merchants' sons, merchants' apprentices, or City gallants. The plays are all set in London or its suburbs. They all date from between 1603 and 1625, and for the most part share in a common plea for certain bourgeois prudential ethics that can be taken as basic to the value-system of the London middle-classes in the Jacobean era. The best-known stage spokesman of the middle-class values of this period, Thomas Heywood, is represented in this chapter by two plays. Like the majority of the other writers to be discussed in this chapter, Heywood insists upon the fact that drunkenness, gambling, thriftlessness and riotous living are ruinous and bring suffering and misfortune in the place of financial stability, favourable social status and comfortable living, which are the desirable rewards of thrift, temperance and industry. It is these three last-named virtues that are the most commonly upheld in the Prodigal Son plays with which we shall be concerned here, while the various prodigals' lives

are to be seen as the direct antithesis of this basic set of virtues.

The London Prodigal

This work was first published in 1605, with a title-page that claimed the play "was plaide by the Kings Maiesties seruants" and that it had been written "By William Shake-speare."[1] This last statement is now considered untrue by the majority of scholars, who generally agree that the work must be considered anonymous.[2]

In the first scene, Flowerdale Senior, "a Merchant trading at Venice," informs his brother, Flowerdale Junior, that he has returned from abroad "being thus disguisde, . . . to proue the humours of my sonne" (I, i, 1-2). Flowerdale Junior has been left as patron and guide of Flowerdale Senior's son, Matthew Flowerdale, who, it is revealed, has not only spent all his allowance but has engaged in borrowing, "is a continuall swearer, and a breaker of his oathes" (I, i, 42-3), "a mighty brawler" (I, i, 50), "a great drinker" (I, i, 57), and a wearer of sumptuous clothes (I, i, 153-62). The reaction of the prodigal's father to this news is somewhat unexpected. He appears unmoved and claims that, provided his son's offences do not "rellish altogether of damnation, his youth may priuiledge his wantonnesse" (I, i, 22-3). Even more surprising is his claim that he himself "ranne an vnbrideled course till thirtie, nay, almost till fortie" (I, i, 24-5) and his stated policy of non-interference, which, he explains, is based on the assumption that "they that dye most

vertuous hath in their youth liued most vicious, and none knowes the danger of the fire more then he that falles into it" (I, i, 37-40).[3]

The disguised Flowerdale Senior then instructs his brother to inform the prodigal youth that his father has died. He asks Flowerdale Junior to say also that a will has been drawn up. When the young man arrives to borrow money from his uncle, the father pretends to be the bearer of the bad news and reads the will in which his son is left "two bayle [pair] of false dyce" and some advice in the form of the following riddle:

> These precepts I leaue him: let him borrow of his oath, for of his word no body will trust him. Let him by no meanes marry an honest woman, for the other will keepe her selfe. Let him steale as much as he can, that a guilty conscience may bring him to his destinate repentance.
>
> (I, i, 223-9)

When Flowerdale Senior offers to lend Matthew ten pounds, the latter takes him into employment as a servant,[4] and the scene ends with a final statement of the father's policy of non-interference (I, i, 278-83). This is in direct contrast to that of most of the fathers we have seen in previous plays. One remembers, however, that Eubulus advised Acolastus' father to follow a somewhat similar line of action (Acolastus I, i, 6-8, p. 36; 1-6, p. 37). One also remembers that Erasmus described the father in the parable as "indulgent" when suggesting that the latter, in agreeing to divide his substance, did so with the hope that his erring son would ultimately reform.[5]

The second scene of The London Prodigal takes place

in Croydon at an inn where Matthew calls for music, talks of his clothes and of giving a present to Luce, who is Sir Launcelot Spurcock's daughter and whom Matthew hopes to marry. There is no time for the development of the traditional features of the usual tavern scene, for Sir Launcelot invites Matthew and Monsieur Civet, the suitor to another of his daughters, to his house at Lewsome (?Lewisham). Once into Kent, the party meets Sir Arthur Green-shood and Oliver who are both suitors to Luce. Although Arthur is a "most gallant knight, /A worthie souldier, and an honest man" (II, i, 84-5), he has not the fat purse of the plain, unpolished Devonshire man, Oliver. As for Matthew, his chances, according to Sir Launcelot, are very slim:

> And for this wilde oates here, young Flowerdale,
> I will not iudge: God can worke myracles,
> But hee were better make a hundred new,
> Then thee a thrifty and honest one.
> (II, i, 89-92)

However, Matthew's father, playing the role of the intriguing Plautine servant, draws up another false will in which it appears that Matthew possesses a vast fortune of which Luce and her father are the executors (II, iv, 159-61). Sir Launcelot, on hearing of this, immediately changes his mind and agrees that Matthew rather than Oliver should marry Luce. As soon as the marriage is decided upon, however, Matthew imagines to himself how Luce's dowry will be like a second portion to him, providing the means to "spend full many a merry hower"(III, ii, 152). On hearing this, the prodigal's father comments as follows:

> Ist possible, he hath his second liuing,
> Forsaking God, himselfe to the diuel giuing?
> But that I knew his mother firme and chast,
> My heart would say my hed she had disgrast:
> Else would I sweare he neuer was my sonne,
> But her faire mind so fowle a deed did shun.
> (III, ii, 155-60)

In talking to Flowerdale Junior, the prodigal's father expresses the opinion that things have gone too far, and he announces his decision to intervene:

> . . . and thus I meane to curbe him.
> This day, brother, I will you shall arrest him:
> If any thing will tame him, it must be that,
> For he is ranck in mischiefe, chained to a life,
> That will increase his shame, and kill his wife.
> (III, ii, 179-83)

The arrest for debt occurs as Matthew and his new wife leave the church. Luce remains faithful to the husband her father has forced her to marry.[6] She pleads with Flowerdale Junior who, out of pity for her, releases the prodigal (III, iii, 229-31) and gives her one hundred angels. The prodigal, however, then takes the money and tells the girl to return home. He then abuses the name of his father. Flowerdale Senior, who is now very angry at his son, says,

> Did not this whining woman hang on me,
> Ide teach thee what it was to abuse thy father:
> Goe! hang, beg, starue, dice, game, that when all
> is gone,
> Thou maist after dispaire and hang thy selfe.
> (III, iii, 275-8)

When we next see Matthew, he has lost all his money at dice as his father had predicted. He then decides to rob his sister-in-law, Delia, but he is prevented by the arrival of Arthur and Oliver. He then alludes to the parable of the Prodigal Son while thinking of his condition, and at the same

time the words of his father come nearer to being fulfilled. Speaking of Oliver, he remarks,

> His hart as fat and big as his face;
> As differing far from all braue gallant minds
> As I to serue the hogges, and drinke with hindes,
> As I am very neere now. Well, what remedie?
> When mony, meanes, and friends doe growe so small,
> Then farewell life, and ther's an end of all.
> (IV, ii, 59-64)

Matthew is now on the verge of despair, the state of mind traditionally associated with fallen prodigals, and this is confirmed a little later when Matthew appears again and claims,

> I haue passed the very vtmost bounds of shifting, I haue no course now but to hang my selfe.
> (V, i, 2-4)

He is penniless, starving and friendless, and, when he attempts to obtain help from a former whore of his, he is sent packing and forced to resort to begging and offering "secret seruice" to citizens' wives (V, i, 89).

The prodigal is then accused of murdering his wife, whom nobody has seen since the wedding, but, when he is about to be taken to prison, Luce throws off her disguise and astounds everyone by her fidelity to her husband whom she has followed, unknown to him. Luce's show of virtue succeeds in affecting Matthew as nothing else has, and he reforms on the spot:

> . . . wife, wonder among wiues!
> Thy chastitie and vertue hath infused
> Another soule in mee, red with defame,
> For in my blushing cheekes is seene my shame.
> (V, i, 320-3)

When Flowerdale Senior throws off his disguise, the tradi-

tional reconciliation between father and son occurs:

Flowerdale. My father! O, I shame to looke on him.
Pardon, deare father, the follyes that are past.
Father. Sonne, sonne, I doe, and ioy at this thy change,
And applaud thy fortune in this vertuous maide,
Whom heauen hath sent to thee to saue thy soule.[7]
(V, i, 418-22)

As in the parable, the prodigal's reform and reconciliation are celebrated in a feast, but not before the father has issued a solemn warning to his son--which serves as a strong enforcement to the moral of the play--that prodigal living, though it can be regarded with some indulgence in a young man, can in extremes lead to great physical and spiritual peril if it goes unchecked or if it constantly recurs:

> And, sirra, see you runne no more into
> That same disease:
> For he thats once cured of that maladie,
> Of Ryot, Swearing, Drunkennes, and Pride,
> And falles againe into the like distresse,
> That feuor is deadly, doth till death indure:
> Such men die mad as of a callenture.
> (V, i, 430-6)

The eschatological bias of this moral is not characteristic of the other plays to be discussed here, but such heavy insistence upon a moral is very common. Indeed, the emphatic didacticism so typical of the bourgeois Prodigal Son plays of the early seventeenth century is, as will be seen in the next chapter, a major target for satiric dramatists in their ironic dramatisations of the parable. In addition there are also several other typical features of bourgeois drama which are found in The London Prodigal. First, one should note the predominantly middle-class status of the characters involved and the fact that the prodigal's father

is a prosperous London merchant of a kind that must have been very familiar to audiences at the public theatres of the time. As a thrifty and successful merchant he naturally has certain expectations of his son which differ from those, for example, of the land-owning father in the parable or the father in Shakespeare's Henry IV plays. One should also note that the play is set in and around London, which again makes for familiarity, while the vices of the prodigal, though traditional, are at the same time made especially topical, being those of the typical City gallant. In the same vein, the misery associated in the parable with the prodigal's feeding of pigs is here made more topical in that Matthew is threatened with debtor's prison. A new motif, that of the "Patient Wife," is added, and this, as was noted, is a favourite of bourgeois dramatists and must have appealed to their audiences who found such dramatisations of domestic themes so much to their liking.

At the same time, Prodigal Son plays like The London Prodigal which were intended for bourgeois audiences did not ignore the traditional motifs such as the prodigal's despair, his rejection by a whore, his reconciliation with his father, and the final feast. Even the role of the Elder Brother, which is commonly omitted in English Prodigal Son plays, appears not to have been completely forgotten, since vestiges of it are clearly apparent in the prodigal's uncle, Flowerdale Junior, who shows himself to be something of a Pharisee when he is unable to share Flowerdale Senior's initial indulgent

attitude towards Matthew and who even adopts a rather self-congratulatory attitude when Matthew shows no signs of repentance (III, ii, 161, 174).

The London Prodigal, which was probably written for performance at the Globe,[8] a more fashionable public theatre than any of the others, may, I believe, still be taken as typical of the manner in which playwrights catering to bourgeois tastes chose to adapt the parable of the Prodigal Son. However, as I pointed out, the eschatological bias of the moral of The London Prodigal is not characteristic.

Greene's Tu Quoque, Or, the Cittie Gallant (1611)

This comedy by John Cooke, of whom nothing seems to be known except that he was the author of this play and a friend of Thomas Heywood's,[9] depicts the prodigal life of a character who is appropriately named Spendall. When we first see him, he is working in his master's shop. He appears to be a very diligent salesman (pp. 183-5), but it would seem that he has a weakness for a certain Nan Tickleman, a courtesan, who sends him a letter inviting him to a rendezvous:

> Sweet rascal; if your love be as earnest as your protestation, you will meet me this night at supper: you know the rendezvous. There will be good company; a noise of choice fiddlers; a fine boy with an excellent voice; very good songs, and bawdy; and, which is more, I do purpose myself to be exceeding merry.
>
> (p. 182)

All the traditional features of a scene depicting the prodigal's dissipations are thus prepared for, but, before the rendezvous takes place, Spendall's master, Sir Lionel Rash, who has just bought himself a knighthood, returns to his shop

and announces that Spendall will take over the shop on his behalf (pp. 185-6). In this way the prodigal apprentice is furnished with the financial means to purchase his downfall, just as the Prodigal Sons's receipt of his patrimony in the parable supplied him with the means to engage in dissipated living.

The traditional tavern scene then takes place, and we see Spendall in the company of Nan and her Bawd, Sweatman. Once the drink has begun to flow, Spendall takes Nan off on his own, and later we see him carelessly disbursing money to all and sundry (pp. 212-4). At one point Spendall is informed of his growing reputation as "one of the madd'st wags of a citizen i' th' town," but his rejoinder merely emphasizes the degree to which his prodigality has grown:

> I pay scot and lot, and all manner of duties else, as well as the best of 'em. It may be they understand I keep a whore, a horse, and a kennel of hounds; what's that to them? no man's purse opens for it but mine own; and so long my hounds shall eat flesh, my horse bread, and my whore wear velvet. (p. 218)

Before long Spendall is engaged in a game of dice. He loses and then gets involved in a duel (p. 224). Clearly Cooke wants to depict his prodigal apprentice as engaging in all the fashionable vices of the City gallant, and, in doing so, he is making his prodigal as familiar and as topical for his audience at the Red Bull as he can.

A little later Sir Lionel is informed of the actions of his apprentice. Significantly, stress is placed on Spendall's lack of thrift and what this will cost Sir Lionel in financial terms. There seems to be absolutely no concern

for Spendall's soul:

> . . . your man Francis riots still;
> And little hope of thrift there is in him.
> Therefore I come to advise your worship
> To take some order while there's something left:
> The better part of his best ware's consum'd.
> (p. 238)

Shortly after, in keeping with the fate of the typical London prodigal, Spendall is arrested for debt. Now that he has no more money, the bawd and the whore, just like their counterparts in the stained glass windows at Chartres, throw the prodigal out:

> Sweatman. Nay, I did ever think the prodigal would prove
> A bankrupt: but, hang him, let him rot
> In prison; he comes no more within these doors,
> I warrant him.
> Tickleman. Come hither! I would he would but offer it;
> We'll fire him out, with a pox to him.
> (pp. 244-5)

As yet, Spendall has not lost all his clothes, as was traditional in such situations, but once in jail he is forced to sell them in order to buy food from Lodge, the master of the prison. With nothing left at all, he is then removed to the Hole to feed from "the alms-basket, where charity appears in likeness of a piece of stinking fish, such as they beat bawds with when they are carted" (p. 258).[10] Where in The London Prodigal it was the threat of prison which was seen to have replaced the swine-feeding scene of the original parable, in Cooke's play imprisonment actually occurs, and, as in the parable, the prodigal is reduced to starvation and the lowest form of existence imaginable to the author--not that of eating pigs' food, but that of eating from the alms-basket in the common Hole.

As might be expected, Spendall now repents, and again we notice that his chief sin is depicted in terms of his lack of thrift. The moral for Cooke's audience is also primarily a prudential one:

> . . . I could write my repentance to the world,
> And force th' impression of it in the hearts
> Of you of my acquaintance: I might teach them
> By my example, to look home to thrift,
> And not to range abroad to seek out ruin.
> (pp. 260-1)

His debts are then paid off by one Widow Ragsby and Sir Lionel, his former employer. Once he has been released, Spendall comes to Sir Lionel to ask for forgiveness. This is granted, but Cooke does not miss the opportunity to press home once again his lesson on the subject of thrift, for both Widow Ragsby and Sir Lionel offer advice of the following kind to the repentant prodigal:

> Widow. Be thankful unto heaven and your master:
> Nor let your heart grow bigger than your purse,
> But live within a limit, lest you burst out
> To riot and to misery again:
> For then 'twould lose the benefit I mean it.
>
> Sir Lionel. O, you do graciously; 'tis good advice:
> Let it take root, sirrah, let it take root.
> (pp. 269-70)

Spendall also learns that a "man must trust unto himself," since "Friendship will prove but broken crutches" to a man who has fallen "in his estate" (p. 272). Such a belief in the power of money to provide the foundation for a man's self-reliance would have undoubtedly struck a sympathetic chord among bourgeois audiences, who would no doubt have approved of Spendall's somewhat brazen but ultimately successful wooing of the rich Widow Ragsby which ends the

play.

Like the author of The London Prodigal Cooke has thus adapted the original narrative pattern of the parable in such a way as to portray the activities of a prodigal in the contemporary urban setting of the English commercial classes. By making his prodigal an apprentice and by so placing him in the familiar setting of London itself, Cooke has attempted to give added force to the prudential moral of his play. His moral is intended to exhort thrift and industry, and to appeal as directly as possible to his bourgeois audience at the Red Bull by demonstrating the ill effects of prodigality and neglect of one's vocation. Unlike The London Prodigal, however, Cooke's play shows little concern for the fate of the prodigal's soul.[11] Instead the author seems far more concerned with the cost of the prodigal's dissipations as measured in terms of hard cash, and this, as we shall see in the two plays of Heywood's now to be discussed, is a trait that is typical of Prodigal Son plays designed for bourgeois audiences during the early years of the seventeenth century.

If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody: Part II

This play of Heywood's was written in 1604-5 and first published in 1605.[12] Its plot reaches a triple climax with Sir Thomas Gresham's building of the Royal Exchange, the conspiracy of Doctor Parry to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada.[13] In the play Gresham is an idealization of the successful City merchant whose enterprise, thrift and industry eventually raise him to a position

in which he can be on as good terms with Elizabeth as any of her noblemen. In contrast to this level-headed and thrifty paragon of bourgeois virtues is his prodigal nephew, John Gresham, and much of the early part of the drama is taken up with the affairs of this young man.

When the play opens, Gresham, who is to be thought of as the equivalent of the father in the parable, provides his nephew with some good counsel, and we have one of those "advice scenes" which, as we have already discovered, are a common feature of Prodigal Son plays:

> I haue tane note of your bad husbandrie,
> Carelesse respect, and prodigall expence,
> And out of my experience counsell you.
> (lines 91-3)

After Gresham has warned him against disrespect for his elders (lines 98-100), attempting to seduce other men's wives (line 115), consorting with whores (line 123), and prodigality (line 127), John agrees to become a new man and forsake the tennis-court, ordinaries, "Dicing and Drabbing" (lines 137-40), and he agrees to be bound over to another merchant, one Master Hobson, who needs a new representative in France. Like the prodigal in Cooke's play, John will thus be an apprentice, and in place of the traditional demand of the prodigal for his portion and his consequent journey abroad, John agrees to the following plan:

> the onely way to curbe a dissolute youth as I am, is to send him from his acquaintance, and therefore send mee farre inough good Vncle, send mee into France and spare not, and if that reclaime me not, giue me ore as one past all goodnes.
> (lines 159-62)

John, as we might expect, has no intention of keeping

his promise, and, before he leaves for France, steals one hundred pounds from Gresham to provide himself with the means to lead a riotous life:

> Foote, t'will make a man merry halfe a yere together in France, command wenches or any thing: . . . shall a yong man as I am, and though I say it indifferent proper, goe into a strange countrey, and not shew himselfe what mettell hee is made of when a comes there.
>
> (lines 689-94)

On his way to France, John writes a letter to Gresham in which he claims that the latter has prevented him from receiving the portion which was his due:

> My father gaue me a portion,
> You keepe away my due:
> I haue payd my selfe a part to spend,
> Here's a discharge for you.
> (lines 922-5)

Like Flowerdale Senior, Gresham not only adopts an indulgent attitude toward the prodigal (lines 953-8) but claims that he too was guilty of similar knavish behaviour in his youth:

> When I was yong I doe remember well,
> I was as very a knaue as he is now.
> (lines 961-2)

When we next hear of John, he is reported as having been seen in a French tavern "in company with Madona such a one, or such a one, it becomes not flesh and blood to reueale" (lines 1724-5). Shortly after, when the scene shifts to France, we see him keeping his "french Reuels" (line 1787) with a courtesan, but they are interrupted in their "woing Roome" (line 1813) by the arrival of Hobson who has come post-haste from England, still wearing his slippers, having heard of John's behaviour. Hobson, who cannot understand any French, is first deceived into thinking that John's whore is a gentle-

woman of some repute (lines 1898-9), and then blackmailed into keeping silent about John's behaviour when the latter threatens to tell the merchant's wife that her husband came to France expressly to see a whore (lines 1983-9).

John then returns to England with Hobson, and somewhat later he reappears, in a miserable state, having spent all (line 2383) and having been threatened with imprisonment for debt (line 2386). In order to get out of his predicament, he presents himself as a suitor to a rich widow, Lady Ramsey, and promises to reform (lines 2441-4). She pays all his debts, although she does not marry him, and it would appear that the prodigal is indeed about to reform:

> And now I faith I haue all my wilde oates sowen,
> And if I can grow rich by the helpe of this,
> Ile say I rose by Lady Ramsies kisse.
> (lines 2532-4)

Unfortunately the play ends somewhat abruptly with scenes in which Elizabeth is portrayed with her soldiers awaiting the outcome of the Armada, and we hear no more of John Gresham or his uncle. The possibility that the text of the play as we have it is an amalgamation of two plays, the resolution of Gresham's story having been cut from one and replaced by the Armada scenes from another, seems very likely and would explain the rather incongruous ending to the work as it now stands.[14] It would therefore seem probable that in the original form of the text Heywood would have included a scene in which the prodigal and his uncle were reconciled, but we cannot, of course, be sure of this. Also missing is the motif of the Elder Brother and any verbal allusion to the Biblical parable apart

from the reference to "a portion" (line 922) but the whole pattern of John Gresham's prodigal living, his journey abroad, his neglect of advice by an elder, his propensity to frequent whores and taverns, his eventual reduction to poverty and beggary, and his promise of reform are sufficient to warrant the inclusion of the play here.

Like The London Prodigal and Greene's Tu Quoque, Heywood's play is characterized by its London setting, its focusing of interest upon the familiar merchant classes, and its insistence upon the virtues of industry and thrift which are seen to receive their rewards in the gratification that Hobson feels when the Queen asks for a loan of a hundred pounds, and in the praise and status which Gresham has earned for himself. The play thus presents a prudential moral on the rewards of virtue, and, in showing the misery and threat of imprisonment that are the eventual lot of John, it also presents a prudential moral on the ill effects of idleness and prodigality, the two vices which are so contrary to the ethical values of the London middle-classes in the early seventeenth century. One play of Heywood's that might possibly have been included in this study is The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (ca. 1604) which concerns the activities of Chartley, a young London gallant, but although the final scene depicting his reconciliation with his father and the earlier scenes of his riotous living have a certain amount in common with the Prodigal Son plays, there were not sufficient parallels, in my opinion, to warrant inclusion of this play here. However,

as already intimated, If You Know Not Me was not the only Prodigal Son play which Heywood wrote.

The English Traveller

Some twenty years after writing If You Know Not Me, Heywood again made use of the Prodigal Son play tradition when he wrote The English Traveller (1621-33).[15] The sub-plot of this work concerns a young prodigal, Lionel, who is the son of Old Lionel, a merchant, who has, like Flowerdale Senior, gone abroad on business. In the first scene in which the prodigal appears, there is an argument between two of his servants, Robin and Reignald. Robin, who is the epitome of the good and faithful servant, complains of the way Reignald and Young Lionel have been living. In the absence of Old Lionel the family's formerly modest house has been "Turned to a common stews" and its "buttery hatch /Now made more common than a tavern's bar"; in place of civil guests the house is frequented by "pandars, whores and bawds, /Strumpets, and such" (I, ii, p. 165):

> Waste, riot, and consume, misspend your hours
> In drunken surfeits, lose your days in sleep,
> And burn the nights in revels, drink and drab.
> Keep Christmas all year long, and blot lean Lent
> Out of the calendar; all that mass of wealth
> Got by my master's sweat and thrifty care,
> Havoc in prodigal uses; make all fly,
> Pour't down your oily throats, or send it smoking
> Out at the tops of chimneys.
>
> (I, ii, p. 165)

With Young Lionel's full approval, Robin is sent packing back to the country by Reignald, who, acting the familiar role of evil counsellor and parasite, encourages the prodigal in his

dissipations.

We then see the prodigal ordering a sumptuous and extravagant feast for some revels which he intends to hold that night, and here again Heywood is following the traditional pattern of the Prodigal Son play. This preparation is followed by a long soliloquy from Lionel in which he applies the analogy of the well-built house, which is allowed to go to ruin by a "lazy and debauched" tenant, to himself, one who has been carefully brought up by his parents, well-counselled, and well-educated. The "Lust, disobedience, and profuse excess" of which he accuses himself, he claims, are the effect of "that lazy tenant" love (I, ii, p. 168). For once we would appear to have a prodigal who is possessed of some degree of self-awareness, although this makes no apparent difference to his subsequent behaviour.

Lionel then overhears Blanda, a woman of most doubtful reputation, being advised by her mother, Scapha, who would appear to be acting as her bawd, that it would be unwise to put too much reliance on such a prodigal as Lionel:

> Thou seest, here's nothing but prodigality and pride, wantoning and wasting, rioting and revelling, spoiling and spending, gluttony and gormandising--all goes to havoc. And can this hold out? When he hath nothing left to help himself, how can he harbour thee? Look at length to drink from a dry bottle, and feed from an empty knapsack; look to't, 'twill come to that.
>
> (I, ii, p. 170)

Lionel, who then reveals his presence, appears unimpressed by Scapha's prophecy, and he continues with his preparations for the revels he is planning and which provide an equivalent for the traditional tavern scene, being among the wildest

that we have yet come across. They are described by a servant to Wincott, a neighbour of Old Lionel, who talks of the "feeding and frolicking, carving in kissing [sic], drinking and dancing, music and madding, fiddling and feasting" (II, i, p. 175), all of which is being paid for by Lionel, "the adamant of this age, the daffodil of these days, the prince of prodigality, and the very Caesar of all young citizens" (II, i, p. 177).

Old Wincott's comment on what he hears is little more than an elaboration of the idea embodied in the proverb of the rake and the fork, already familiar to us from previous plays, but it is presented in terms which are particularly appropriate to Lionel's social status as the son of a merchant:

> Wife, it grieves me much
> Both for the young and old man: the one graces
> His head with care, endures the parching heat
> And biting cold, the terrors of the lands,
> And fears at sea, in travel, only to gain
> Some competent estate to leave his son;
> While all that merchandise, through gulfs, cross-tides,
> Pirates, and storms he brings so far, the other
> Here shipwrecks in the harbour.
>
> (II, i, p. 177)

Young Geraldine, a friend of the Wincotts, then describes how the revellers in their drunkenness, believing that they were at sea in a storm,[16] began to cast out of the windows everything they could lay their hands on to lighten the "ship." The crowd of spectators who had already gathered outside to watch the rioting inside then began to fight over the spoil, and the constable had to be called.

The revellers and their women, some of whom are still

too drunk to stand up, are seen on the morning after the debauch in front of Old Lionel's house. It is at this moment that Reignald arrives with news that Old Lionel has just returned from abroad, and Heywood's obvious debt to Plautus' Mostellaria is made even more apparent when the scheming servant tries to prevent the prodigal's father from entering the house by telling him that the place is haunted (II, ii, p. 191).[17] For some time Reignald succeeds in deluding the old man, but eventually all is revealed:

> . . . here they feast,
> Dice, drink, and drab; the company they keep,
> Cheaters and roaring-lads, and these attended
> By bawds and queans; your son hath got a strumpet
> On whom he spends all that your sparing left;
> And here they keep court, to whose damned abuses
> Reignald gives all encouragement.
> (IV, vi, pp. 229-30)

Shortly afterwards, Young Lionel appears, falls on his knees, and asks forgiveness of his father. Like Flowerdale Senior and Sir Thomas Gresham, he argues that some follies may be allowable in youth, provided that they lead to self-knowledge:

> Before you chide, first hear me; next your blessing,
> That on my knees I beg. I have but done
> Like misspent youth, which, after wit dear-bought,
> Turns his eyes inward, sorry and ashamed.
> (IV, vi, pp. 235-6)

Young Lionel goes on to claim that those things in which he offended most he now finds to be "mere shadows, toys and dreams, /Now hated more than erst I doted on" (IV, vi, p. 236), and he ends his confession with a renunciation of his former spendthrift ways:

> You have but paid so much as I have wasted,
> To purchase to yourself a thrifty son,
> Which I from henceforth vow.
>
> (IV, vi, p. 236)

Like that of the father in the parable, Old Lionel's forgiveness is unconditional:

> See what fathers are,
> That can three years' offences, foul ones too,
> Thus in a minute pardon; and thy faults
> Upon myself chastise, in these my tears.
> Ere this submission, I had cast thee off;
> Rise in my new adoption.
>
> (IV, vi, p. 236)

As in the parable, all ends with a feast, but in this case it occurs at the time of the father's home-coming rather than at the son's (IV, vi, p. 238).

Although written some two decades after If You Know Not Me, Heywood's The English Traveller, as far as its sub-plot is concerned, has much the same moral. The counterpart in each play for the father in the parable is a rich and successful London merchant, the class of man described with such admiration some fifty years or so earlier by the Lawyer in Thomas Wilson's A Discourse Upon Usury (1572):

> The merchaunt adventurer is and maye be taken for a lordes fellow in dignitie, aswell as for hys hardye adventurynge upon the seas, to carrye out our plentye, as for his royall and noble whole sales, that he makes to dyvers men upon hys retourne, when he bryngeth in our want.[18]

Where the fruits of Gresham's "Care how to get, and fore-cast to encrease" (line 15) bore fruit in his building of the Royal Exchange, Old Lionel, on a less elevated level, is at least not financially ruined by his son's excesses, having just had a successful voyage:

> . . . gentlemen, let not what's hereto past,
> In your least thoughts disable my estate:
> This my last voyage hath made all things good,
> With surplus too; be that your comfort, son.
> (IV, vi, p. 238)

This kind of "comfort" and such concern with financial matters has never been of much consideration at the end of other types of Prodigal Son plays that we have discussed in previous chapters, but in the eyes of those dramatists like Heywood, who are writing for the public theatre audiences, economic matters are of great importance. Indeed, concern for financial matters is common in Heywood's plays, as can be seen in the distaste expressed for the extortions of usurers in The Faire Maid of the Exchange (II, 29),[19] A Woman Killed With Kindness (II, 127-8), and Love's Mistress (V, 105). Of greater significance, however, is Heywood's constant insistence on the virtue of thrift. Numerous examples might be cited, but here it will suffice to mention Frankford's reproval of Nick, his servant, for unthriftiness in A Woman Killed With Kindness (II, 118), the incident in Love's Mistress in which Apuleius introduces a prodigal ass, "who riots that, which most penuriously /His father hoorded, in drabs, drinke and play" (V, 105), the sermon on thrift by Philip in Fortune by Land and Sea in which he urges his riotous brother to "Spend but in compass, rioting eschew, /Waste not, but seek to encrease your patrimony" (VI, 424), and Berry's description of his debtors in The Faire Maid of the Exchange as "A crew of unthrifts, carelesse dissolutes, /Licentious prodigals, vilde taverne-tracers" (II, 28). Not surprisingly, Dekker, who

frequently (though not always) seems to be aiming at the same audience as Heywood both in his dramatic and non-dramatic works, also places strong insistence on the virtue of thrift. In A Strange Horse-Race (1613), for example, Thrift, who is named as the second virtue, runs a race with Prodigality and is "vigilant in his course, subtle in laying his wager, provident in not venturing too much, honest to pay his losses, industrious to get more (twenty sundry ways) if he should happen to be cheated of all."[20] To this may be compared the statement concerning thrift in Dekker's The Magnificent Entertainment: Giuen to King Iames (1604):

> London (to doo honour to this day, wherein springs vp all her happines) beeing rauished with vnutterable ioyes, makes no account (for the present) of her ancient title, to be called a Citie, (because that during these tryumphes, she puts off her formall habite of Trade and Commerce, treading euen Thrift it selfe vnder foote,) but now becomes a Reueller and a Courtier.[21]

Such notions as to the importance of thrift explain why the sin of Young Lionel which is most insisted upon in The English Traveller is that of his thriftlessness (I, ii, pp. 165, 168, 170; II, i, pp. 177, 178; IV, vi, p. 229). We can also see why the climax of Young Lionel's repentance speech is an avowal to be thrifty henceforth (IV, vi, p. 236), and why, in trying to deceive the prodigal's father, Reignald chose to describe Young Lionel in such a way as to make the latter's father twice express pride in his son's supposed thrift (III, ii, p. 205), this being a character trait that the old merchant would naturally find more appealing than any other.

As L.B. Wright has said in his survey of the exhortations to thrift of sixteenth and early seventeenth century preachers, poets, novelists and essayists,

> If there was a single maxim above others which the Elizabethan youth of the commercial classes heard constantly dinned into his ears, it was one which exhorted him to ways of thriftiness.[22]

Quoting a great many examples of such exhortations, which it would be superfluous to repeat here, Wright has also shown the essentially prudential nature of Elizabethan attitudes to thrift and prodigality, and he has further shown how the belief in the godliness of thrifty and industrious living became increasingly ingrained as a central part of bourgeois ethics as the period with which we are concerned in this study continued.[23] Heywood's The English Traveller and the other plays discussed in this chapter clearly belong to the kind of literature Wright has so fully described and they certainly would seem to bear out his conclusions for the most part. However, one small qualification should perhaps be made.

The Prodigal Son plays discussed in this chapter, with the possible exception of 2 If You Know Not Me, all have happy conclusions. This is perhaps slightly unexpected, for, as we saw in John Carr's The Ruinous fal of Prodigalitie, and in treatments of the parable such as Nice Wanton, The Disobedient Child, and The Glasse of Governement, and as can be seen in many early seventeenth century works which exhort their readers to thrift,[24] prodigals are liable in prudential literature to be brought to a bad end in order to demonstrate as forcefully as possible the miseries that thriftlessness can bring. Yet

there are a number of works on thrift with prudential morals which, like the plays being discussed in this chapter, depict prodigals who repent and even become rich and successful in later life. Wright, however, does not comment on this fact, and his discussion of the literature of thrift is slightly misleading as a result.

Two such works will be mentioned here. Both demonstrate that the Prodigal Son plays are not exceptional in having their protagonists come to a good end. Indeed, one can deduce that readers and audiences, of the kind Wright has described, almost certainly felt as much edified by the spectacle of a prodigal's repentance as by that of the unmitigated human misery which lack of thrift could cause. Deloney, for example, in Thomas of Reading (1598-1600) tells the story of Tom Dove, who, having consumed his substance and having been forsaken by his friends, is taunted by his servants ("But if you be poore, you may thanke your selfe, being a iust scourge for your prodigalitie").[25] The servants trick Tom and have him arrested, but he is saved from prison by Master Cole, a clothier. Tom ends up richer than ever. His friends and servants return, but, although he forgives them, he never trusts them again. Demonstrating a similarly prudential moral on the miseries resulting from prodigality and the constrasting material successes to be derived from thrift and industry is Dekker's Penny-Wise, Pound Foolish (1631). This work combines the story of the Prodigal Son with the motif of the "Patient Wife" and tells of a rich young merchant

who twice spends all his money in dissipated living and is twice reclaimed with the aid of his forgiving wife. After each conversion he becomes rich again on applying himself to his vocation.

In the stories of both Dekker and Deloney, the respective protagonists are used to demonstrate not only the negative sides of contemporary middle-class morality relating to thrift and industry but the positive aspects as well. Heywood and the authors of the other Prodigal Son plays under discussion here do much the same thing, except that the positive side of the prudential moral is not demonstrated by a portrayal of the prodigal's later material successes but instead is embodied in the father-figure whose code of values the prodigal vows to emulate at the time of his conversion. As such, these plays offer an interesting variation on the technique employed, for example, in Nice Wanton, Misogonus and The Glasse of Governement, where the positive manifestation of the author's moral was embodied in the respective counterparts for the Elder Brother in the parable.

In conclusion we can say of the plays discussed in this chapter that they represent a small but highly significant type of English Prodigal Son play. Designed to appeal to a predominantly middle-class audience drawn from London commercial society, they are invested by their authors with what is for the most part an entirely prudential interpretation of the plot-pattern of the Biblical parable. The father-son relationship of the parable has been made specifically

that of merchant-apprentice or that of a merchant and his son, and the Prodigal's sins are depicted in terms of the dominant values of the London commercial classes. As such, the prodigal's greatest failings are considered to be his lack of thrift and industry, and he is punished with material hardship and debtors' prison, while his repentance is seen in terms of his acceptance of the basic tenets of the bourgeois code of ethics, the very antithesis of that which governed his former prodigal way of life. Undoubtedly such an interpretation of the parable is a narrow one, for it largely neglects the eschatological element which, as we have seen, most theologians commented upon in their interpretations of the parable. It is this narrowness of moral outlook and its equation of godliness with good financial practice that provided, as we shall observe in the next chapter, the target for much of the satire in certain other Prodigal Son plays that were designed to ridicule bourgeois adaptations of the parable such as those we have been discussing here.

CHAPTER VII

PARODIES AND IRONIC ADAPTATIONS OF THE PARABLE

Earlier chapters have in part demonstrated the continuing popularity of Prodigal Son plays over a period of ninety years or so. It is clear that during this period such plays appealed to a variety of audiences, among which were the school and university audiences that watched performances of plays like Acolastus and Misogonus, the Court audience for which Dekker and Ford's The Sun's Darling seems originally to have been designed, the audiences at the exclusive private theatres that were entertained by such plays as Cynthia's Revels, and the bourgeois audiences at public theatres such as the Red Bull at which the plays of men like Cooke and Heywood were performed. Among the playwrights who catered to the more sophisticated audiences, however, can be discerned a dissatisfaction with the traditional Prodigal Son play and particularly with the type which the bourgeoisie seems to have found so much to its liking. This dissatisfaction finds expression in dramatic parodies and ironic adaptations of the parable; this chapter will be concerned with these.

Histriomastix. Or, The Player Whipt

There is now general acceptance among critics that this work was written by Marston, that the text as we have it is not, as was once thought, a revision of some earlier play,

and that it was written and performed in 1598-9 at the Middle Temple.[1] Its audience would consequently have been a fairly select one, and one which would have prided itself, as befitting its membership in the "third university," on its sophisticated and intellectual literary tastes. As Armstrong has pointed out, Inns of Court men formed an important section of the audiences at the private theatres,[2] a fact which makes my grouping of Histriomastix with private theatre plays in the following discussion less incongruous than it might at first seem.

In the course of Marston's play, a group of players, who invent for themselves the title of Sir Oliver Owlet's Men and who are led by an actor-playwright by the name of Posthaste, announce a performance at the Town Hall, but this actually takes place before Lord Mavortius.[3] The actors attempt to perform two plays, both of which seem intended by Marston to parody uneducated popular tastes. One of these plays is called "The Prodigall Childe," but prior to its ill-fated performance part of it is read by Posthaste to his actors, one of whom has asked how far he has progressed in the composition of his new play. Posthaste assures the actors that his "wit's grown no lesse plentiful then the time" and that "Ther's two sheets done in follio, w[i]ll cost two shillings in rime" (sig. C 1^{r}). He then begins his reading with a recitation of the Prologue in which conventional sentiments are made to seem pretentious, presented as they are in such execrable verse. Presumably Marston is making

the ironic point that such writing was found to be perfectly acceptable to Posthaste's usual audiences:

> When Aucthours quill, in quiuering hand,
> His tyred arme did take:
> His wearied Muse, bad him diuise,
> Some fine play for to make.
> (sig. C 1r)

Posthaste then asks for "Canadoe" ("drink")--doubtless to aid "his wearied Muse"--and the reading of the play proper begins:

> (Enter the Prodigall Child; fill the pot I would say),
> Huffa, huffa, who callis [sic] for mee?
> I play the Prodigall child in iollytie.
> (sig. C 1r)

Immediately the audience would recognize this particular prodigal as kin to certain of the swaggering bullies of the Mysteries and Moralities, for "Huff" or "Huffa" was an exclamation of which such characters were particularly fond. Indeed this line might almost be a direct allusion to the words of Imagination in Hickscorner:

> Huffe! huffe! huffe! who sent after me
> I am Imagynacyon, full of jolyte.[4]

Clearly Marston is here emphasizing the out-moded nature of Posthaste's play, presumably much to the amusement of the self-styled intelligentsia at the Middle Temple. The very different attitude of Posthaste's actors, and by inference that of their customary audiences, is, however, made clear by one of the players who, commenting on what he has heard of Posthaste's play so far, remarks that everything is "detestable good" (sig. C 1r).

The fact that Posthaste's Prodigal Son play is in the

style of such Moralities of Youth as Hickscorner, Youth and Lusty Juventus (the prodigal in Posthaste's play being later referred to as "Iuventus," sig. C 4^{r}) is then further made obvious by the appearance of Dame Vertue, who, in Marston's parody, comes on stage in the traditional fashion of the Moralities to offer good advice to the youthful protagonist:

> (Enter to him Dame Vertue):
> My Sonne thou art a lost childe,
> (This is a passion, note you the passion?)
> And hath many poore men of their goods beguil'd:
> O prodigall childe, and childe prodigall.
> (sigs. C 1^{r-v})[5]

At this point Posthaste is so affected by the power of the "passion" which he has urged his auditors to note that he is prevented from continuing his recital by his tears,[6] and we hear no more of the play itself until its actual performance some time later. Marston has already made his point, however, by ridiculing the poet, the atrocious verses of the poet's play, the stock figures of the Prodigal Son and the Virtuous Counsellor, and the misguided values of the poet's auditors who believe that his play is "detestable good."

What more we see of Posthaste's play only adds to the comedy which Marston creates at the expense of popular uneducated literary taste. Posthaste's players begin a drama on the subject of Troilus and Cressida, but this is suddenly and inexplicably interrupted by a section of "The Prodigall Childe" in which more of the traditional characters of the Moralities appear and engage in the kind of horseplay that we know popular audiences delighted in:

> Enter a roaring Diuell with the Vice on his back, Iniquity

in one hand; and Iuventus in the other.
Vice. Passion of me sir, puffe puffe how I sweat sir,
The dust out of your coate sir, I intend for to beat sir.
Iuventus. I am the prodigall child, I that I am,
Who sayes I am not, I say he is too blame.
Iniquity. And I likewise am Iniquitie
Beloued of many alasse for pitty.
Diuell. Ho ho ho, these babes mine are all,
The Vice, Iniquitie and child Prodigall.
(sig. C 4^{r})

At this point, however, Mavortius and company can stand the performance of Posthaste's players no longer and the play is brought to a halt:

Landulpho. Fie what vnworthy foolish foppery,
Presents such buzzardly [stupid] simplicity.
Mauortius. No more, no more, vnlesse twere better,
And for the rest yee shall be our debter.
(sig. C 4^{r})

Marston's parody of a Prodigal Son play is chiefly notable for its attack on the kind of verse style and the kind of stock characters and stock horseplay which bourgeois audiences evidently delighted in. Marston has not, however, greatly concerned himself with parodying the strong didactic element that was so much a feature of many Prodigal Son plays, particularly those designed for less sophisticated audiences. However, in another parody Prodigal Son play, Eastward Ho (1605), in which he collaborated with Chapman and Jonson, the didactic tendency of Prodigal Son plays, and more specifically that of the type discussed in the previous chapter, is a major target for literary parody.

Eastward Ho

This work was performed in 1605 at the Blackfriars by the Children of the Queen's Revels.[7] Like Histriomastix

it was thus designed for a coterie audience consisting of the more fashionable and intellectual section of London society. Several modern critics have maintained that the work was written as a reply to Dekker and Webster's Westward Ho, which was staged late in 1604 by the rival Children of Paul's at their own singing school near St. Paul's. L. B. Wright, for example, has suggested that Eastward Ho "reveals an ideal of morality approved by citizens" and that in Touchstone, Golding, and Mildred "the virtues that commoners regarded as the keystones of society were glorified rather than derided as in the rival play, Westward Ho!, and its successor, Northward Ho!"[8] Wright goes on to suggest, though he later admits the possibility of parody, that

> Jonson, Chapman, and Marston all possessed a strong moral streak, and what they were doing was to protest against the twisted and false ethics of a play with which their rivals were winning plaudits. From the Blackfriars stage, a play presenting a favorable picture of bourgeois conduct must have been something of a tour de force.[9]

To Wright's view may be added that of Parrott, the editor of the standard edition of Chapman's plays, who some twenty or so years earlier had described Westward Ho as representative of a species of newly-fashionable type of comedy, characterised "by a satiric note, a partiality for questionable scenes and characters, and a general moral laxness."[10] For Parrott, Eastward Ho was "a conscious moral protest" against this new type of comedy, and the play itself presented a picture of "honesty, industry, and sobriety victorious over roguery, idleness, and dissipation."[11]

Recent critics, however, have been more prone to take

the view that there is a strong element of parody in Eastward Ho at the expense of Touchstone and company.[12] Anthony Caputi in his recent book on Marston, for example, suggests that "Throughout Eastward Ho . . . the satire is double-edged, cutting finely but surely into the complacency of Touchstone and his group just as it cuts into the humorous extravagance of Sir Petronel and his associates."[13] Madeleine Doran appears to hedge on the issue and does not say whether she feels "the moral is to be taken seriously, or tongue in cheek."[14] Muriel Bradbrook, however, comes firmly down on the side of parody,[15] and her view is shared by Marchette Chute in her biography of Jonson.[16]

The view adopted here is that Eastward Ho is indeed a parody. It is not, however, merely a parody of the popular plays of the previous decade which had "hymned the virtues of prominent London citizens or the noble thrift and impossible achievements of idealized London apprentices," as Marchette Chute believes,[17] for we know from the preceding chapter that such plays remained popular throughout the first two decades of the seventeenth century. What Chapman, Jonson and Marston were parodying in their presentation of the virtuous and thrifty Touchstone and company was not the taste of an earlier generation but that of the current generation, albeit the bourgeois sector of it, whose tastes are reflected in such works as The London Prodigal and Heywood's If You Know Not Me, the latter having been written and performed only a few months before Eastward Ho.[18] Furthermore, not

only did the authors of Eastward Ho parody the general characteristics of popular taste, they also parodied a specific manifestation of it as found in Prodigal Son plays such as those discussed in the previous chapter.

Where the early critics who wrote on Eastward Ho seem to have been misled was in their failure to distinguish the play from those of Heywood and his kind. Such critics explained the incongruity by which such an apparently pro-bourgeois play was put on at Blackfriars by saying that it was a form of protest against the "immoral" plays at Paul's. Closer to the truth, I feel, would be the explanation that Eastward Ho was an attempt to capitalize on the success of Westward Ho by the use of a similar title, the chief comedy of the play as a whole deriving from the authors' pretence of attacking the "naughty" Westward Ho by extolling the moral values so dear to the London citizenry. It was not intended, of course, that anyone should be fooled. There was no real attack on Westward Ho, and furthermore the bulk of the humour for the Blackfriars' audience was at the expense of popular middle-class values and theatrical tastes.[19]

In addition the audience at Blackfriars would have been entertained by a whole vein of satire directed against those social climbers in the middle-class who endeavoured to attain the status of the gentry, either by buying knighthoods or by marrying into land, both of which Sir Petronel does, or by marrying into the gentry, as Gertrude tries to do, or by aping the manners of the gentry as both Quicksilver and

Gertrude attempt to do. The laughs in the fashionable Blackfriars theatre when Eastward Ho was first performed were thus nearly all at the expense of the bourgeoisie.[20]

In writing their parody, the authors of Eastward Ho duly presented all the stock ingredients of the typical bourgeois Prodigal Son play.[21] The work is set, as were all the plays discussed in the preceding chapter, in and around London, in this instance, specifically in "London, and Thames-Side." The plot chiefly concerns a London goldsmith, Touchstone, and his two apprentices, Golding and Quicksilver, and these three characters must be thought of as the respective counterparts of the Father, the Elder Brother and the Prodigal Son in the Biblical parable, the father-son relationships of the parable having been changed here to those of master and apprentices.

Touchstone, whom Herford and Simpson describe as a "model of bourgeois morality," is a living manifestation of the virtues of industry and thrift:

> I hired me a little shop, fought low, tooke small gaine, kept no debt booke, garnished my shop for want of Plate, with good wholsome thriftie sentences; As, Touchstone, keepe thy shopp, and thy shoppe will keepe thee. Light gaines makes heauy purses. (I, i, 47-51)

Touchstone's love of proverbial wisdom, a trait he shares with such paragons of bourgeois virtue as Simon Eyre in The Shoemakers' Holiday and Hobson in 2 If You Know Not Me, is one of his most marked characteristics, for proverbs and "sentences" pervade his speech throughout the play. When one considers the popularity of books of aphorisms, similes,

proverbs, adages and precepts among the middle-classes, one has no doubt that the speech of characters like Eyre, Hobson and Touchstone would have greatly appealed to bourgeois tastes.[22] That the intellectuals and would-be intellectuals at the Blackfriars would have found such "potted" wisdom either tiresome or comic seems just as certain.

When Eastward Ho opens, Touchstone is berating his prodigal apprentice, Quicksilver, who is dressed in the fashionable attire of a City gallant, for his lack of thrift and industry (I, i, 70-3). Then, referring to the New Testament parable, Touchstone warns Quicksilver of the probable outcome of such ways:

> As for you, Maister Quick-siluer, thinke of huskes, for thy course is running directly to the prodigalls hogs trough, huskes, sirra. Worke vpon that now. (I, i, 98-100)

Golding, the virtuous apprentice, whom Touchstone has been praising for his "most hopefull Industrie" (I, i, 82-3), also berates Quicksilver, calling him a "prodigall coxcombe" and "a drunken whore-hunting rakehell" (I, i, 128-30), and he warns the prodigal of possible future beggary. Like Touchstone, Golding also lives by proverbial wisdom and the first scene ends with the latter's comically self-righteous declaration that

> As for my place and life thus I haue read:--
> What ere some vainer youth may terme disgrace,
> The gaine of honest paines is neuer base:
> From trades, from artes, from valor honor springs,
> These three are founts of gentry, yea of Kings.
> (I, i, 146-51)

Before long we see Golding rewarded for his thrift

and industry with Touchstone's offer of his daughter Mildred, a modest and contented young lady in complete contrast to her sister, Gertrude, who is an affected social climber with plans to marry Sir Petronel Flash, the thirty-pound knight. In the following scene, Quicksilver, tipsy following the wedding of Gertrude and Sir Petronel, is presented as the antithesis of both Mildred and Golding. At one point, this last-named addresses his bride in his customary sober and pretentious manner. The effect is most amusing:

> How deare an obiect you are to my desires I cannot expresse, whose fruition would my maisters absolute consent and yours vouchsafe me, I should be absolutely happy. And though it were a grace so farre beyond my merit, that I should blush with vnworthinesse to receiue it, yet thus farre both my loue & my meanes shall assure your requitall; you shall want nothing fit for your birth and education; what encrease of wealth and aduancement the honest and orderly industrie & skill of our trade will affoorde in any, I doubt not will be aspirde by me; I will euer make your contentment the end of my endeuours; I will loue you aboue all; and onely your griefe shall be my miserie; and your delight, my felicitie.
> (II, i, 71-83)

Touchstone meanwhile fusses about the cost of the wedding party:

> I thanke Time, the night is past; I nere wakt to such cost; I thinke we haue stowd more sorts of flesh in our bellies, then euer Noahs Arke receiued.
> (II, i, 41-4)

This comic show of thrift on Touchstone's part is, however, capped by Golding's consequent offer:

> Let me beseech you, . . . the superfluitie and colde meate left at their Nuptialls, will with bountie furnish ours. The grossest prodigallitie is superfluous cost of the Bellye: nor would I wish any inuitement of States or friendes, onely your reuerent presence and witnesse shall sufficiently grace and confirme vs.
> (II, i, 156-61)

The possible glance at Hamlet ("Thrift, thrift, Horatio: the

Funerall Bakt-meats / Did coldly furnish forth the Marriage Tables" I, ii, 368-9) in Golding's lines adds to the comedy of the situation which reaches a climax when Touchstone concludes the scene with more of his shopkeeper's wisdom:[23]

> Fit birth, fit age, keepes long a quiet bed.
> Tis to my wish; for Tradesmen (well tis knowne)
> Get with more ease, then Gentrie keepes his owne.
> (II, i, 173-5)

The response of the Blackfriars audience to all this, and to these last two lines in particular, was surely one of great amusement, for we are indeed in a different world from that of audiences at the Red Bull who no doubt found Heywood's sober didacticism both edifying and anything but comic.

In this same scene Quicksilver is thrust from Touchstone's house and forbidden to return (II, i, 120-6), an interesting variation on the normal pattern of the Prodigal Son plays in which it is usual, as in the Biblical parable, for the prodigal to leave the house of the father-figure of his own free will. In the next scene we see our prodigal, who is still drunk, in the company of his whore, who is aptly named Sindefy. The scene is not set in the traditional tavern but at the house of Securitie, the usurer. We see Quicksilver take off his apprentice's coat and flat cap, which he then replaces with the doublet, cloak, rapier and dagger of the City gallant. Here one is reminded, of course, of the symbolic use of clothes in other Prodigal Son plays, and this theme is further elaborated upon when Touchstone later claims not to recognize Quicksilver (III, ii, 130-2), when the latter is forced to wear prison clothing,[24] and when

he refuses Touchstone's offer of fresh clothes on his release (an interesting variation on the Gospel parable), preferring to walk through the City "as a Spectacle, or rather an Example, to the Children of Cheapeside" (V, iv, 202-4).

Before his final repentance, however, we watch Quicksilver brought to shame, misery and the verge of the traditional state of despair:

> O, which way shall I bend my desperate steppes,
> In which vnsufferable Shame and Miserie
> Will not attend them?
>
> (IV, i, 130-2)

Eventually he finds himself in the Counter. When he is arrested along with Sir Petronel, Touchstone says,

> One of 'hem was my prentise, Maister Quicksiluer, here, and when he had 2. yeare to serue, kept his whore, & his hunting Nag, would play his 100. pound at Gresco, or Primero, as familiarly (& al a' my purse) as any bright peice [sic] of Crimson on 'hem all.
>
> (IV, ii, 227-31)

By contrast, Golding, in keeping with the pattern of bourgeois prudential morality, has been rewarded with preferment in the City and has been made a Deputy of the Alderman in the ward where he lives (IV, ii, 38-43), and the whole point of the parody is made amply clear when Touchstone, in an obvious allusion to two current plays (the lost Richard Whittington and Heywood's If You Know Not Me), says,

> I cannot containe my selfe, I must tell thee, I hope to see thee one o' the Monuments of our Citty, and reckon'd among her worthies, to be remembred the same day with the Lady Ramsey, and graue Gresham: when the famous fable of Whittington, and his Pusse, shalbe forgotten, and thou and thy Actes become the Posies for Hospitals, when thy name shall be written upon Conduits, and thy deeds plaid i' thy life time, by the best companies of Actors, and be call'd their Get-peny.
>
> (IV, ii, 69-77)[25]

The prudential moral is complete when Golding sits in judgement on Quicksilver, whom he accuses in one of his characteristically long and pretentious utterances of "dissolute, & lewd" living, of vanity in dress, and of haughty and rebellious behaviour. Like the Elder Brother in the parable, and in almost the exact words, Golding also accuses his "brother" of prodigality ("thou hast prodigally consumed much of thy Masters estate" IV, ii, 269-70). Golding then sends the prodigal to prison, and Touchstone, after pointing out how Quicksilver's friends have all deserted him, concludes with a moral which is undoubtedly intended by the playwrights as a comic over-statement, designed to elicit laughter from the audience rather than sober reflection:

> Nay on, on: you see the issue of your Sloth. Of Sloth commeth Pleasure, of Pleasure commeth Riot, of Ryot [sic] comes Whoring, of Whoring comes Spending, of Spending comes Want, of Want comes Theft, of Theft comes Hanging; and there is my Quickesiluer fixt.
>
> (IV, ii, 324-8)

Eastward Ho concludes with an hilarious parody of the traditional repentance of the prodigal, the basic technique employed again being that of comic over-statement. We hear that Quicksilver has actually asked to be placed in the Hole "and will eate o'the Basket, for humilitie" (V, iii, 54) and that along with his fellow-prisoners, Sir Petronel and Securitie, he has turned godly. The comic manner in which this information is presented, however, is all-important for our understanding of the authors' intentions which manifestly do not include the desire to edify their audience in the

manner of the bourgeois Prodigal Son plays. A fairly lengthy passage is worth quoting, I feel, because it is of such crucial importance to our interpretation of the play as parody:

Woolfe. The Knight will i'th Knights-Ward, doe what wee can Sir, and Maister Quickesiluer, would be i'the Hole, if we would let him. I neuer knew, or saw Prisoners more penitent, or more deuout. They will sit you vp all night singing of Psalmes, and aedifying the whole Prison: onely, Securitie sings a note to high, sometimes, because he lyes i'the Two-penny Ward, farre of, and can not take his tune. The Neighbours can not rest for him, but come euery Morning to aske, what godly Prisoners we haue.

Touchstone. Which on 'hem is't is so devout, the Knight, or t'other?

Woolfe. Both Sir. But the young Man especially! I neuer heard his like! He has cut his hayre too. He is so well giuen, and has such good gifts! Hee can tell you, almost all the Stories of the Booke of Martyrs, and speake you all the Sicke-Mans Salue without Booke.

Touchstone. I, if he had had grace, he was brought vp where it grew, Iwis. On Maister Wolfe.

Wolfe. And he has conuerted one Fangs a Sarieant, a fellow could neither write, nor read, he was call'd the Bandog o'the Counter: and he has brought him already to pare his nailes, and say his prayers, and 'tis hop'd, he will sell his place shortly, and become an Intelligencer.

(V, ii, 42-65)

This delightfully comic description is followed up in the next scene when we see Quicksilver himself, berating Securitie for profanity ("Fie, Father Securitie, that you'le bee still so prophane, will nothing humble you?" V, iii, 33-4) and distributing the money Golding has sent him among his fellow-prisoners. Golding then arrives, and in one enormous thirteen-line sentence, so characteristic of his long-winded and pretentious utterance, he announces his intention of aiding Quicksilver (V, iii, 104-16).

In the final scene of the play we are treated to a rendition of Quicksilver's Repentance or Last Farewell, a poem

which he has written in prison and which is clearly intended as a parody of a popular genre of poetry which not uncommonly issued from the cells of the condemned at the time. Indeed Quicksilver even acknowledges (V, v, 44) his debt to A woeful Ballad made by Mr. George Mannynton, an houre before he suffered at Cambridge Castell (1576) which was printed in Clement Robinson's A Handefull of Pleasant Delites in 1584,[26] and which was considered by contemporaries as a "good-night," or "last farewell" par excellence.[27] Rollins, when referring to Mannington's ballad in his edition of A Handefull of Pleasant Delites, points out that "no other ballad in the Handful was so popular" and that "none is more frequently alluded to."[28] He also demonstrates that the first line of Mannington's ballad ("I Waile in wo, I plunge in pain") to which Quicksilver refers is alluded to by Samuel Rowlands in his Melancholie Knight (1615) in which he speaks scornfully of "Thou scuruie Ballat of I wale in woe," and in his Good News (1622) in which he says, "I wale in woe, my Knight doth plunge in paine."[29] It is also alluded to in Heywood's How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad (1601-2), and burlesqued in William Rowley's Match at Midnight (1621-3) where Randall sings, "Hur wail in woe, hur plunge in pain" (V, i, 94).[30] Quicksilver's song in Eastward Ho is thus a parody of a well-known song and of the repentance scenes in traditional Prodigal Son plays, and both these veins of parody merge to create a mocking indictment of unsophisticated popular literary tastes and apparent love of simplistic

didacticism.

In this final scene we learn that Quicksilver, like Falstaff with his Psalms, is hoarse from singing (V, v, 16-17). This is hardly surprising, for his repentance ballad consists of some forty-nine lines of doggerel, of which the following should be a sufficient sample:

> O Manington thy stories shew,
> Thou cutst a Horse-head off at a blow:
> But I confesse, I haue not the force
> For to cut off the head of a horse,
> Yet I desire this grace to winne,
> That I may cut off the Horse-head of Sin,
> And leaue his body in the dust
> Of sinnes high way and bogges of Lust,
> Wherby I may take Vertues purse,
> And liue with her for better, for worse.
> (V, v, 94-103)

Those listening are all highly impressed, especially Touchstone, who says, "I am rauished with his Repentance, and could stand here a whole prentiship to heare him" (V, v, 109-10), and in this there is once again a hit intended at the expense of bourgeois literary tastes.

When Quicksilver's ballad has ended with a characteristic moral lesson in which apprentices are warned to "Shun Vsurers, Bauds, and dice and drabs" and instead to "thriue by little and little" and so "Scape Tiborne, Counters, & the Spitle" (V, v, 117-22), Sir Petronel, the erring son-in-law, and Quicksilver both fall on their knees before Touchstone and there then occurs a parody of the words and actions of the characters in verses 20-22 of the parable.[31] At this stage of the play the sight of Quicksilver on his knees would have been funny enough, but, when he is joined by Sir Petronel,

the full ludicrousness of the scene reaches its peak:

Quicksilver. Master!
Petronel. Father!
Touchstone. I can no longer forbeare to doe your humility right: Arise, and let me honour your Repentance, with the hearty and ioyfull embraces, of a Father, and Friends love. Quicksiluer, thou hast eate into my breast, Quicksiluer, with the dropps of thy sorrow, and kild the desperate opinion I have of thy reclaime.
Quicksilver. O sir, I am not worthy to see your worshipfull face.
Petronel. Forgiue me Father.
Touchstone. Speake no more, all former passages, are forgotten, and here my word shall release you.
(V, v, 125-36)

Parody is also the chief characteristic in the repentance song of Securitie which follows, as it is also of Gertrude's submissive listing of her sins which, she claims, have ranged from scorning her sister's velvet cap and saying that her father looked like Twierpipe, the Taborer, to being proud and lascivious (V, v, 162-71). The high-minded Golding then insists on the rather dubious plan that Quicksilver should marry Mistress Sindefy, and the play ends with a final parody of the typical moral of the bourgeois Prodigal Son play:

Now London, looke about,
And in this morrall, see thy Glasse runne out:
Behold the carefull Father, thrifty Sonne,
The solemne deedes, which each of us haue done;
The Vsurer punisht, and from Fall so steepe
The Prodigall child reclaimd, and the lost Sheepe.
(V, v, 205-10)

For the fashionable and sophisticated audience at Blackfriars the "solemne deedes" of which Touchstone speaks were, of course, nothing of the kind. Instantly recognisable as typical of bourgeois tastes, they instead provided the

audience in the private theatre with five acts of highly amusing comedy at the expense of middle-class theatrical tastes, and more especially they provided an extremely amusing commentary on bourgeois morality with its insistence on the prudential values of industry and thrift. Characters such as Touchstone, Golding and Mildred, who would represent the norms of virtuous behaviour in the minds of the bourgeoisie, are good-humoredly mocked, while social climbers like Gertrude and Sir Petronel are firmly put back in their place among the ranks of the citizenry. Equally comic is the apprentice Quicksilver who fails in his attempt to become a City gallant and ends by returning to the flat caps. In order to provide a common thread to bind together their various strands of parody, the three authors chose to dramatise the parable of the Prodigal Son, itself a story dear to bourgeois hearts and one which seems to have been particularly popular at this period in the public theatres.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle

Two years after the production of Eastward Ho, another play which burlesqued unsophisticated bourgeois drama and satirized the literary tastes of the middle-classes was written by Francis Beaumont and produced at the Blackfriars by the Children of the Queen's Revels.[32] Walter Burre in his Prefatory Epistle to the first quarto of 1613 says that the play was "utterly rejected" (Epistle, line 9) when first produced and gives as a reason the fact that "the wide world" did not understand "the privy mark of irony about it" (Epistle,

lines 7-8). Alfred Harbage and William Appleton, however, have conjectured that the early failure of the play was due to a miscalculation on the part of Beaumont, who, they believe, failed to satirize the middle-class with sufficient animosity and consequently displeased the fashionable and aristocratic audience at the Blackfriars.[33] It is more likely, I feel, that the audience was confused by the play's carefully contrived dramatic disorder which stems from the manner in which The Knight of the Burning Pestle combines three main elements: the Induction plot concerning George, the London grocer, and his family, the parody of a bourgeois domestic comedy entitled The London Merchant, which centres upon the love of a witty and knavish apprentice for his master's daughter, and the parody of a chivalrous romance of the type represented by Heywood's Four Prentices of London (1592-ca. 1600). The seemingly haphazard way in which these three elements mix and interact may well have been too much even for the sophisticated tastes of the Blackfriars audience, and perhaps this is indeed what Burre meant when he spoke of the failure of the audience to perceive "the privy mark of irony about it."

For the purposes of this study, we shall be concerned mainly with the plot of The London Merchant, for in this is embodied a parody of a bourgeois Prodigal Son play.[34] The method of the parody, however, differs radically from that of Eastward Ho. The latter play used over-statement as its chief comic technique, but in The London Merchant what Beaumont does is to invert the traditional pattern of the Prodigal Son

play in order to satirize the bourgeois identification of material and moral values.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle begins with an induction in which a Grocer in the audience of the theatre climbs on to the stage and interrupts the Prologue who has come to announce The London Merchant. He cannot know that The London Merchant is going to satirize bourgeois tastes, yet the Grocer is nonetheless suspicious:

> This seven years there hath been plays at this house, I have observed it, you have still girds at citizens. And now you call your play The London Merchant. (Induction, lines 6-9)[35]

The Grocer clearly has tastes similar to Touchstone's for he too would like to see Heywood's If You Know Not Me or Richard Whittington:

> Why could not you be contented, as well as others, with The Legend of Whittington; or The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham, with the Building of the Royal Exchange; or The Story of Queen Elenor, with the Rearing of London Bridge upon Woolsacks? (Ind., lines 19-23)

The Grocer is joined by his wife and his son, Rafe, and a compromise is agreed upon with the players whereby Rafe shall act the part of the chivalrous knight in a play to be entitled The Knight of the Burning Pestle, though it is not explained how this will be integrated into the plot of The London Merchant which then begins while Rafe goes off to put on his costume. With Rafe's departure, the situation is set up whereby for the rest of Beaumont's work the literary and dramatic tastes of the bourgeoisie can be satirized both in the plot which the Grocer and his wife invent for their son

and in the way in which husband and wife respond to whatever happens on the stage, whether it be the activities of Rafe or those of the characters in The London Merchant.

The first scene involves Venturewell, who is the London merchant himself, and his apprentice, Jasper. It appears that Jasper, like Golding, is a model of thrift, industry and loyalty:

> Sir, I do liberally confess I am yours,
> Bound both by love and duty to your service,
> In which my labor hath been all my profit.
> I have not lost in bargain, nor delighted
> To wear your honest gains upon my back,
> Nor have I given a pension to my blood [sexual appetite],
> Or lavishly in play [gambling] consum'd your stock.
> These, and the miseries that do attend them,
> I dare with innocence proclaim are strangers
> To all my temperate actions.
>
> (I, 16-25)

However, Venturewell, who one would expect to be a model of the virtuous tradesman employer, is not very impressed by Jasper since he discharges his apprentice for having fallen in love with his daughter, Luce. Where Touchstone was willing to marry Golding to his daughter and was utterly opposed to Gertrude's attempt at social climbing, Venturewell is very different. Not only does he want to be rid of Jasper, but he wants his daughter to marry into wealth and gentility. A merchant-apprentice relationship is presented here, and this, as we know, is the usual counterpart in bourgeois Prodigal Son plays for the father-son relationship of the parable. However, in this instance, instead of the apprentice being a prodigal who neglects his work and discharges himself voluntarily from his master, it is the master who is at fault

in discharging a virtuous apprentice. By means of this incident Beaumont is able to make an early jibe at the expense of bourgeois morality, for Venturewell claims he is acting according to virtuous precepts, but in fact these precepts amount to no more than concern for material gain and social status. As we might expect, the Grocer and his wife fail to perceive this (I, 61-4), and they are quick to take the side of Venturewell when Jasper and Luce speak of their plan to outwit the materialistic Venturewell (I, 54-60).

We then see Venturewell offering his daughter to Master Humphrey, a young man who is both rich and of "gentle blood" (I, 82). At the same time the merchant refers to Jasper in terms which are quite unjust:

> My wanton prentice,
> That like a bladder blew himself with love,
> I have let out, and sent him to discover
> New masters yet unknown.
>
> (I, 76-9)

As might be expected the Grocer and his wife allow Venturewell's injustice to pass without comment, and instead they praise Master Humphrey, saying that they have never seen "a prettier child" (I, 93) and that he "is e'en the kindest young man that ever trod on shoe leather" (I, 200-1).

We next see Jasper when he returns home. Here we are reminded of the familiar reconciliation scene, but Jasper's mother (the father is not present at this stage) refuses to give her son the traditional blessing:

> Give thee my blessing? No, I'll ne'er give thee my blessing. I'll see thee hang'd first. It shall ne'er be said I gave thee my blessing.
>
> (I, 308-10)

This obvious reversal of the traditional home-coming of the prodigal is made even more apparent when Jasper's mother states that her refusal to bless her son is based on her belief that he is a prodigal who has run away from his loving master. Furthermore the "prodigal's" brother, according to Mistress Merrythought, will inherit all that she has to pass on at her death. Addressing herself to Jasper, she says,

> And thou art a wastethrift, and art run away from thy master, that lov'd thee well, and art come to me; and I have laid up a little for my younger son, Michael, and thou think'st to bezzle that; but thou shalt never be able to do it.--Come hither, Michael; come, Michael; down on thy knees. Thou shalt have my blessing.
>
> (I, 314-20)

Even though he is a "younger son," Michael is clearly a counterpart for the stay-at-home Elder Brother of the parable. Like Golding he is obsequiously loyal, but his speech, unlike that of Golding, is marked by its brevity, a sign of his complete passivity:

> Michael. I pray you, mother, pray to God to bless me.
> Mistress Merrythought. God bless thee. But Jasper shall never have my blessing. He shall be hang'd first; shall he not, Michael? How say'st thou?
> Michael. Yes, forsooth, mother, and [i.e., if it is] grace of God.
> Mistress Merrythought. That's a good boy.
>
> (I, 321-6)

In further demonstration of their complete lack of moral judgement, Beaumont then has the Grocer and his wife praise Michael ("I'faith, it's a fine spoken child" I, 327) and criticize Jasper for being an "ungracious child," worthy only to be hung by the heels and whipped (I, 332, 335-6). At the same time Jasper shows his virtue and claims that he

has come to beg his mother's love (I, 337) rather than her financial support ("I ran not from my master, nor return /To have your stock maintain my idleness" I, 330-1).

Like just about everyone else we have met so far in the play (Michael being an exception), Jasper's father, Old Merrythought, is the reversal of a stock figure in the Prodigal Son plays. In this particular instance, Old Merrythought is the reverse of the type of father we expect. Where Mistress Merrythought, as we discover later, is a miser whose values are entirely subverted by her acquisitive instincts, Old Merrythought is the one true prodigal in the play:

> Not a denier left, and yet my heart leaps. I do wonder yet, as old as I am, that any man will follow a trade, or serve, that may sing, and laugh, and walk the streets. My wife and both my sons are I know not where. I have nothing left, nor know I how to come by meat to supper, yet am I merry still; for I know I shall find it upon the table at six o'clock. Therefore, hang thought.
>
> (IV, 326-32)

That the father-figure should be a prodigal is an obvious reversal of tradition. However, compared with most prodigals, there is nothing vicious in Old Merrythought's nature, and he is the soul of merriment, continually breaking into mirthful song and laughter. In sharp contrast to Venturewell's worldliness and to his wife's greed, he has not a care in the world. As such he represents an extreme, just as surely as his wife and the merchant represent the opposite extreme, while Jasper appears to exemplify the mean.[36] Nevertheless, as Aristotle implied in his discussion of liberality in the Ethics, prodigality is a more attractive extreme than its

opposite.[37] This is perhaps the reason why the Grocer's wife, though she expresses her disapproval of Merrythought's thriftless folly (I, 372), nevertheless elsewhere admits some liking for him (I, 430).

When Old Merrythought comes on to the stage, there occurs a counterpart to the incident in the parable in which the father gives the Prodigal Son his portion. Mistress Merrythought, who has "laid up for Michael," commands her husband to "pay Jasper his portion" (I, 377-8). Old Merrythought agrees ("He shall have his portion" I, 390-1), and he proceeds not only to give Jasper his blessing along with ten shillings but to furnish his son with some good advice, an obvious parallel to the customary advice scene in traditional Prodigal Son plays:

> Welcome Jasper, though thou run'st away, welcome; God bless thee. 'Tis thy mother's mind thou should'st receive thy portion. Thou hast been abroad, and I hope hast learn'd experience enough to govern it. Thou art of sufficient years. Hold thy hand: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, there's ten shillings for thee. Thrust thyself into the world with that, and take some settled course. If fortune cross thee, thou hast a retiring place. Come home to me; I have twenty shillings left. Be a good husband, that is, wear ordinary clothes, eat the best meat, and drink the best drink; be merry and give to the poor, and believe me, thou hast no end of thy goods.
> (I, 393-404)

We next see Jasper awaiting the arrival of Luce in Waltham Forest where she has promised to meet him. Jasper speaks of the "desperate wheel" of Fortune (II, 141) and of his misery and poverty ("I am only rich in misery" II, 146). We thus have a counterpart to the despair of the prodigal, who, in the Bible, was forced to feed swine. Beaumont,

however, reverses the whole situation, for it is at this very moment that Jasper finds his mother's money which she dropped in her flight when confronted by Rafe, dressed as the Knight of the Burning Pestle. Significantly, Beaumont makes an allusion to swine when Jasper finds the money ("These pearls, I take it, were not left for swine" II, 156).[38] The Grocer's wife, as we might expect, sees the situation from the point of view of Mistress Merrythought:

> I do not like that this unthrifty youth should embezzle away the money. The poor gentlewoman, his mother, will have a heavy heart for it, God knows.
>
> (II, 157-9)

The Grocer's wife is correct, and Mistress Merrythought is indeed upset when she reappears, while Michael, her ineffectual companion, can do nothing but weep for the loss of his inheritance (II, 186-8).

Shortly afterwards, Jasper runs off with Luce, who has been brought to the forest by Master Humphrey. Once more the Grocer and his wife show that their moral values have been perverted by their sympathy for the party of vested interest (i.e. Venturewell, Master Humphrey, Mistress Merrythought and Michael), and they condemn Jasper's action while giving Humphrey some green ginger to help him forget the beating he has just received from Jasper (II, 245-57).

Having got no sympathy from Old Merrythought for the loss of Luce, Venturewell decides to pursue Jasper ("I'll be reveng'd, by Heaven" II, 516), and he manages to carry Luce off. Jasper is again reduced to the state of despair, and at this point Beaumont would appear to have the Morality plays

in mind in which, as in The Prodigal Son, Despair is combated by Hope:

> They are gone, and I am hurt; my love is lost,
> Never to get again. O, me unhappy!
> Bleed, bleed, and die, I cannot. O my folly,
> Thou has betray'd me. Hope, where art thou fled?
> Tell me if thou be'st anywhere remaining.
> (III, 117-21)

Hope does not appear, however, and Jasper goes off disconsolately in search of his Luce.

When Venturewell arrives home, he has Luce locked up so that there will be no more danger of her running off with "prodigals" ("I'll keep you sure hereafter /From gadding out again with boys and unthrifts" IV, 131-2). A letter then arrives from Jasper, purporting to be a confession and a plea for forgiveness. In this way the traditional plea for forgiveness is initiated. Venturewell duly pronounces his forgiveness of Jasper, who is supposedly now dead, but the merchant's attitude is little more than a stock response which barely disguises his real pleasure at having Jasper out of the way. The situation is virtually the reverse of that in the parable where the father is overjoyed to have his son "alive" again:

> God's hand is great in this. I do forgive him;
> Yet I am glad he's quiet, where I hope
> He will not bite again. (IV, 209-11)

Jasper is then secretly reunited with Luce and pretends to be his own ghost. When the money-conscious merchant is alone contemplating the frugal wedding he proposes for Luce (another jibe at bourgeois material instincts), Jasper's "ghost" enters and accuses the merchant of being a "Fond worldly

wretch" (V, 8). Venturewell begs forgiveness, thereby reversing the traditional pattern of the master-apprentice relationship in bourgeois Prodigal Son plays, and Jasper tells him what to do to earn it:

> Repent thy deed, and satisfy my father,
> And beat fond Humphrey out of thy doors.
> (V, 33-4)

A little later Jasper, the personification of moderation, persuades his father, who has thrown out Mistress Merrythought and Michael, to re-admit them into his house. Venturewell then duly arrives and begs forgiveness of Merrythought for the wrongs he has done to the virtuous Jasper (V, 242-55), thereby once more reversing the traditional pattern of the parable. The prodigal Merrythought then gets Venturewell to promise to give Luce to Jasper, and to this the merchant agrees, much to the annoyance of the Grocer (V, 269).

Looking back at the play as a whole, we can see how Beaumont has carefully selected a series of the stock situations of the bourgeois Prodigal Son play. The citizens sitting on the stage respond to them in a stock manner, but they fail to perceive that Beaumont has in almost every case presented his stock situations in a reversed form. The citizens, for example, automatically side with Venturewell, believing that he has right on his side when he throws out his apprentice, Jasper, who is automatically assumed to be a prodigal. They approve of Mistress Merrythought's treatment of her son, even though this consists of rejection rather

than reconciliation. They approve of Michael, as doubtless they would have done of Golding, and they feel sorry for the cowardly rich boy, Humphrey. In all instances, like Venture-well and Mistress Merrythought with whom they identify, the Grocer and his wife demonstrate that they possess moral standards which are determined entirely by material concerns. By their naive failure to perceive that what is going on in the play is the reverse of the traditional Prodigal Son play, they also demonstrate their lack of sophistication in artistic matters. Beaumont, like the authors of Histriomastix and Eastward Ho, has thus made use of the traditional form of the Prodigal Son play to satirize the middle-class in order to delight an audience which would be more intellectually sophisticated than the average Red Bull audience and which would undoubtedly be hostile to the characteristically bourgeois equation of moral and material values.

Northward Ho, A Mad World My Masters, A Trick to Catch the Old One

In the final section of this chapter a further type of mockery of the stock form of the Prodigal Son play will be discussed. In the works with which we shall be concerned here, however, the parody is not primarily directed at any specific type of Prodigal Son play. What the respective authors do is reverse the moral pattern common to all types of the traditional Prodigal Son play. The father-figure in these plays is often an object of ridicule and an example of moral turpitude rather than representative of a moral norm to

which the prodigal ultimately submits. The Prodigal Son figure, on the other hand, is no longer represented as a character who is metaphorically "lost." Instead he is a figure of sympathy whose wit and vitality cause us to suspend our moral judgement and ignore the moral implications of the pranks he engages in. Although he is eventually reconciled with the father-figure, this is not symbolic of any submission on the prodigal's part to the value-system of the father, for in these plays the world of youth is victorious. Where in the parable and in the traditional Prodigal Son play one could often perceive in Christian terms the epitome of the entire spiritual history of man's exile and his eventual return home to his heavenly father (the Divine Comedy, as Dante called it), in the plays to be discussed here a different pattern asserts itself, for age and experience, the source of the father's authority, are overthrown and forced to submit to the vitality and youth of the Prodigal Son figure.

In Dekker and Webster's Northward Ho, which was first performed in 1605 by the Children of Paul's,[39] one strand of the plot concerns the poet and playwright Bellamont and his son Philip. In the second scene of the play Philip is brought on to the stage just after he has been arrested in a tavern for debt. Doll, his courtesan, is with him, and after he has gone off to persuade his uncle in Pudding Lane to bail him, she provides a comment which for us clearly places Philip as the traditional prodigal:

Philip is a good honest Gentleman. I loue him because heele spend, but when I saw him on his Fathers Hobby, and a brace

of Punkes following him in a coach, I told him hee would run out.

(I, ii, 32-4)

The fact that he was arrested at a tavern, the presence of Doll, and the Drawer's reference to Philip's dicing (I, ii, 29) further confirm our impression of Philip as the traditional prodigal. When Bellamont is informed of his son's plight, he agrees to pay off the youth's debts, and several allusions are here made to the Biblical parable, the payment of debts being referred to as equivalent to the portion of the Prodigal Son in the New Testament:

Bellamont. Shall I neuer see that prodigall come home.
Seruingman. Yes Sir, if youle fetch him out, you may kill a Calfe for him.
Bell. For how much lyes he?
Seru. The debt is foure score pound, marry he chargde mee to tell you it was foure score and ten, so that he lies onely for the odde ten pound.
Bell. His childs part shal now be paid, this mony shalbe his last.

(I, iii, 56-62)

When Philip is released and appears before his father, there is again a religious note (though a somewhat irreverent one in this instance) when he says he has come "From the house of praier and fasting--the Counter" (I, iii, 150). Like the Elder Brother in the parable, the father then accuses the prodigal of spending his coin and credit "vpon a light woman" (I, iii, 153-4). He follows this with an advice speech to his son, of a kind we know to be traditional in Prodigal Son plays, and this ends with a warning concerning the usual fate of prodigals:

Stay, looke you Sir, as hee that liues vpon Sallades without Mutton, feedes like an Oxe, (for hee eates grasse you knowe) yet rizes as hungry as an Asse, and as hee that makes a

dinner of leekes will haue leane cheekes, so, thou foolish Londoner, if nothing but raw mutton can diet thee, looke to liue like a foole and a slaue, and to die like a begger and a knaue.

(I, iii, 180-6)

Like any other prodigal, however, Philip refuses to take notice of his father and wittily maintains that he will not give up Doll:

Nay father, if destiny dogge mee I must haue her: you haue often tould mee the nine Muses are all women, and you deale with them, may not I the better bee allowed one than you so many? looke you Sir, the Northerne man loues white-meates, the Southerly man Sallades, the Essex man a Calfe, the Kentishman a Wag-taile, the Lancashire man an Egg-pie, the Welshman Leekes and Cheese, and your Londoners rawe Mutton, so Father god-boy, I was borne in London.

(I, iii, 172-9)

So far we would appear to be observing the traditional pattern of the Prodigal Son play. A reversal occurs, however, when Philip and Doll so engineer things that Bellamont is caught in a compromising situation with Doll. Believing that Doll is a gentlewoman, Bellamont comes to her house. Philip has concealed himself there beforehand and is able to surprise his father with Doll, thereby demonstrating that age is in no way superior to youth:

Ile tell you why I sent for you, for nothing but to shew you that your grauity may bee drawne in: white haires may fall into the company of drabs aswell as red beardes into the society of knaues: would not this woman deceiue a whole camp ith Low-countries, and make one Commander beleeue she only kept her cabbin for him, and yet quarter twenty more in't.

(III, i, 91-6)

That this lesson is not lost on Bellamont is demonstrated a short time later when Doll, who claims she has fallen in love with the poet (III, i, 135-6), confronts the sprightly old poet, who then says,

If I were a yonker, It would be no Imodesty in me to bee seene in thy company; but to haue snow in the lap of Iune; vile!
(IV, i, 131-2)

In his use of the word "yonker" Bellamont probably has his son in mind, for, although it can mean "gay, fashionable young man" (OED), it can also mean "prodigal" as is clear from Falstaff's demand "will you make a Younker of me?" (1 Henry IV, III, iii, 2083-4) [III, iii, 92] and Gratiano's metaphor in The Merchant of Venice [II, vi, 14-19]:

> How like a yonger or a prodigall
> The skarfed barke puts from her natiue bay,
> Hudg'd [sic] and embraced by the strumpet winde:
> How like a prodigall doth she returne
> With ouer-wither'd ribs and ragged sailes,
> Leane, rent, and begger'd by the strumpet winde?
> (III, 910-15)

Bellamont would thus seem prepared to tolerate Philip's relationship with Doll as being the natural behaviour of a young man, and this seems borne out by the fact that he never again berates Philip. Youth has certainly had its way in spite of the apparent initial opposition of Bellamont (e.g. I, iii, 162). That Bellamont has overcome any objections he may have had is emphasized in the remainder of the play which is taken up with a series of pranks, largely engineered by the elderly poet himself. These give the impression that the "merry old Gentleman" (I, i, 143) is unconcerned with the sobriety and parental responsibilities normally associated with age and fatherhood, if indeed he ever really was. Neither Bellamont nor Philip make any further comments to each other concerning their respective relationships with Doll, and this matter, together with the matter of Philip's prodigal living, appears

to be of no further concern either to the father or to his son. As such, the issues which are raised in the meeting between father and son at the beginning of the play, which are, as we have seen, the traditional ones of the Prodigal Son play, remain unresolved. We have to infer, as I have done, that Philip's value-system has prevailed and that his father is now willing to accept his son's way of life. Consequently we can say that in Northward Ho it is not the prodigal who is converted but his father, for at the end of the play Bellamont is the reverse of the "carefull Father" that we expect, the "Prodigall child" is not reclaimed, and the "deedes" we witness are far from "solemne." The audiences at Paul's doubtless found this as comic as they did the very different type of mockery to be found in Histriomastix or Eastward Ho.

Two of Middleton's plays, A Trick to Catch the Old One (1605-6) and A Mad World My Masters (1605-6), were also written for the Children of Paul's,[40] and they too exploit the comic potential of the inversion of the values of the traditional Prodigal Son play. A Trick to Catch the Old One concerns the fortunes of Witt-Good, a prodigal landed gentleman, who, it appears, has been brought to the verge of ruin by his own riotous living:

> All's gone! still thou'rt a Gentleman, that's all; but a poore one, that's nothing: What Milke brings thy Meadowes forth now? where are thy goodly Up-lands and thy Downe-lands, all sunck into that little pitte Lecherie? why should a Gallant pay but two shillings for his Ordnary that nourishes him, and twenty times two for his Brothell that consumes him?
>
> (I, i, 1-6)

Throughout the play there are repeated references to Witt-

Good as a prodigal, a rioter, a waste-thrift, a beggar, a dissolute fellow, a midnight surfeiter, and a gamester,[41] and these firmly establish him in our minds as the traditional figure of the prodigal. His relationship with his uncle is the counterpart to that of the father and son in the parable, while his desire to return to his uncle's favour on having become destitute is here presented as an ironic equivalent to the return of the Prodigal Son in the Bible.

Witt-Good's uncle, Penurious Lucre, is partly responsible for the prodigal's plight having tricked him out of some land. Lucre is the younger son of a landed family, but one who has become the epitome of the close-fisted and usurious City capitalist. A rival businessman, Hoord, describes him as follows:

> Thou that canst defeate thy owne Nephew, Lucre, lap his lands into bonds, and take the extremity of thy kindreds forfeitures, because hee's a rioter, a wast-thrift, a brothellmaister, and so forth--what may a Stranger expect from thee, but Vulnera delacerata, as the Poet sayes, delacerate dealing? (I, iii, 24-8)

Like Venturewell in Beaumont's play, Lucre is also presented as a hostile manifestation of the bourgeois equation of virtue and material profit:

> Why may not a vertuous uncle have a dissolute Nephewe? what tho hee bee a Brotheller, a wast-thrift, a common Surfetter, and to conclude a beggar, must sinne in him, call up shame in mee: since wee have no part in their follies, why should wee have part in their infamies? for my strickt hand toward his morgage that I denie not, I confesse I had an Uncles pennorth, let me see, halfe in halfe, true, I sawe neyther hope of his reclayming, nor comfort in his beeing. (II, i, 2-9)[42]

Just as the Grocer in The Knight of the Burning Pestle com-

plained, there certainly seems to have been little room for

a sympathetic treatment of bourgeois London society in the plays of the private theatres.

The plot of A Trick to Catch the Old One revolves about the intrigues of Lucre's prodigal nephew to recoup some of his lost fortune at the expense of the uncle. Witt-Good's schemes are based on the assumption that a rich citizen will do anything to obtain some land in the country. Accordingly Witt-Good disguises his whore, who has been "the secret consumption" of his purse (I, i, 28-9), as a rich country widow with "foure hundred a yeare valiant, in Woods, in Bullocks, in Barnes and in Rye-stacks" (I, i, 60-1). Lucre will be told that his nephew is shortly to marry the "widow" so that, as Witt-Good explains, "hee cannot otherwise choose (tho it bee but in hope to coozen mee agen) but supply my hastie want" (I, i, 79-81).

The plan eventually succeeds, but first there are all manner of complications. Lucre's adversary, Hoord, woos the "widow" for himself, but on the advice of Witt-Good she accepts her new suitor who is thus deceived by his desire for material gain into marrying a penniless whore.[43] Meanwhile Lucre has agreed to hand back his nephew's lands and to make him his heir (IV, i, 75-8, 81-4). On receipt of the mortgage, Witt-Good, once he is alone, announces his intention of leading a new life, but what he says is hardly equivalent to the traditional professions of the repentant prodigal, for his words suggest that in future he will merely be more careful rather than more virtuous. Grasping his mortgage,

he exclaims,

> Thou soule of my estate I kisse thee,
> I misse lifes Comfort when I misse thee.
> Oh never will we part agen,
> Untill I leave the Sight of men,
> We'le nere trust conscience of our kin,
> Since Coosenage brings that title in.
> (IV, ii, 93-8)

Shortly after this, Witt-Good is arrested by his creditors, but Hoord's new wife then pretends that she has a pre-contract with Witt-Good, and, in return for Witt-Good's release from this supposed contract, Hoord pays the prodigal's debts.

The play ends with the exposure of the tricks Witt-Good and the courtesan have played on Hoord and Lucre. It would seem that the vitality and wit of youth have again triumphed over age and experience. However, before the play comes to a close, there are token pleas for forgiveness from both Witt-Good and the whore. These are surely intended ironically, and they operate as parodies of the speeches of the repentant sinners in traditional Prodigal Son plays. Where Witt-Good's short soliloquy quoted above was an expression of his true sentiments, his public utterance at the end of the play is mere convention ("I must confesse my follyes" V, ii, 180). He knows this, and the audience knows it, and the total effect is highly amusing:

> . . . Here for ever I disclaime,
> The cause of youths undooing. Game:
> Cheifly dice, those true outlanders,
> That shake out Beggars, Theeves and Panders,
> Soule wasting Surfets, sinfull Riotts,
> Queanes Evills, Doctors diets.
> Pothecaries Drugs, Surgeons Glisters,
> Stabbing of armes for a common Mistris,
> Riband favours. Ribauld Speeches,
> Deere perfumde Jacketts, pennylesse breeches,

> Dutch Flapdragons, healths in Urine,
> Drabs that keepe a man to sure in
> [i.e. imprison a man too securely]:
> I do defie you all.
> Lend me each honest hand, for here I rise,
> A reclaymde man loathing the generall vice.
> (V, ii, 181-95)

Thus not only is the stock moral of the traditional Prodigal Son play inverted by the fact that the prodigal outwits the father-figure and thereby demonstrates the superiority of youth over age, but, by giving Witt-Good a token repentance speech, Middleton also introduces the element of burlesque akin to that which Jonson employed in Quicksilver's Repentance and in Gertrude's submission to her father. In addition, as in other private theatre plays we have looked at in this chapter, much of the comedy which derives from the mockery of the traditional Prodigal Son play is also at the expense of the values of the money-conscious commercial classes who were receiving such sympathetic presentations in the public theatre Prodigal Son plays of men such as Heywood and Cooke.

The technique of A Mad World My Masters is much the same as that of A Trick to Catch the Old One. At the beginning of the play we learn that Follywit, who was once "well given" and the hope of his grandsire, Sir Bounteous Progress, is now very different, as he explains:

> I'm quite altered, blown into light colors, let out oaths by th' minute, sit up late till it be early, drink drunk till I am sober, sink down dead in a tavern and rise in a tobacco shop. Here's a transformation. I was wont yet to pity the simple, and leave 'em some money; 'slid, now I gull 'em without conscience. I go without order, swear without number, gull without mercy, and drink without measure.
> (I, i, 16-22)

In his anxiety to get hold of some of his inheritance without waiting for the death of Sir Bounteous, Follywit first disguises himself as a lord whose name appropriately is Lord Owemuch. He then samples the old man's hospitality and is feasted and entertained with music before being shown to a bed, the curtains of which are aptly "wrought in Venice, with the story of the prodigal child in silk and gold; only the swine are left out, . . . for spoiling the curtains" (II, ii, 5-7).

Follywit, wearing another disguise, then robs his uncle ("What I take, then, / Is but a borrowing of so much beforehand" II, ii, 35-6), after which in his disguise as Lord Owemuch he is recompensed by Sir Bounteous for the supposed losses he too has had at the hands of the thieves (III, iii, 14-17). On discovering that the remainder of his grandfather's fortune might be made over to Frank [i.e. Frances] Gullman, Sir Bounteous' whore, Follywit disguises himself as the courtesan and keeps an assignation with his grandfather in her place. Once let into the house, he steals Sir Bounteous' casket full of money and escapes.

Not everything goes according to the prodigal's plans, however, for he finds himself in love with a young lady:

> The wonder of our time sits in that brow;
> I ne'er beheld a perfect maid till now.
> (IV, v, 68-9)

Ironically the "perfect maid" who Follywit then marries is in reality his grandfather's whore. Thinking to surprise Sir Bounteous, Follywit sends his new wife down to the country and arrives himself at his grandfather's house with

some of his friends disguised as actors, and for the time being he keeps his marriage a secret. More thievery takes place and Follywit is eventually exposed, but Sir Bounteous, who is in any case a merry-natured old man and not unlike Bellamont in this respect, is amused by the jest (V, ii, 163-5).

Before Follywit's exposure, however, the prodigal, "in his own shape" for once, asks for his grandfather's blessing, but his aside to the audience implies that his show of filial respect is all part of the deception. The dramatic effect of this particular incident is thus the exact opposite of the corresponding scene in the New Testament parable when the Prodigal Son returns and falls on his knees before his father:

> Follywit. Pray, grandsire, give me your blessing.
> Sir Bounteous. Who? Son Follywit?
> Follywit [aside]. This shows like kneeling after the play, I praying for my Lord Owemuch and his good countess, our honorable lady and mistress.
> Sir Bounteous. Rise richer by a blessing; thou art welcome.
> Follywit. Thanks, good grandsire. I was bold to bring those gentlemen, my friends.
> (V, ii, 178-85)

It is shortly after this that Follywit is exposed as a thief and finds himself married, much to the amused satisfaction of his grandfather, to Gullman. Like the whore in A Trick to Catch the Old One, Gullman then renounces her past life, while Sir Bounteous good-humoredly comments on the rough justice of Follywit's fate. Sir Bounteous, the father-figure, is thus not entirely the loser, unlike his counterpart in A Trick to Catch the Old One, nor is the prodigal

completely triumphant, for there is irony at everyone's expense in the denouement of this comedy. Nevertheless, Sir Bounteous, like Bellamont in Northward Ho, shows himself sympathetic to the world of youth and wit and eventually lets it have its way in direct contrast with the normal father-figure of the Prodigal Son plays who is eventually enabled to demonstrate the superiority of his own value-system over that of his erring son.

Some Later Ironic Adaptations of the Parable

Although such hostile attitudes towards the form and morals of the traditional Prodigal Son play seem to have been something of a hit with private theatre audiences between 1605 and 1607, the vogue for this kind of thing soon passed, and as the Jacobean era continued little attention appears to have been paid in the private theatres to Prodigal Son plays of the kind discussed in this chapter. Massinger's A New Way to Pay Old Debts (1621-5),[44] which is partly based on A Trick to Catch the Old One and written some twenty years after the two plays of Middleton discussed here, is an exception. In this work the father-figure, Sir Giles Overreach, who is actually the prodigal's uncle, is a ruthless and avaricious villain who will stop at nothing to marry his daughter into the ranks of the gentry. He is a portrait of an upper-middle-class citizen whose actions are entirely motivated by his desire for wealth and social status. As such he is both a threat to gentility and a target for their laughter. His value-system is hardly likely to prevail. On the other hand,

his prodigal nephew, who, like Witt-Good, has been partly ruined by his uncle, is a sympathetically drawn character. After he has recovered his fortunes, he asks for a commission in a regiment and in this way hopes to redeem his honour. As such, the values which he represents are clearly very different from those which triumph in Middleton's two plays. The fact remains, however, that the customary value-structure of the Prodigal Son play has been inverted, with the son, in this case a man of generous impulses (not unlike that later prodigal, Charles Surface), finally emerging victorious over the morally inferior father-figure.

In the sub-plot of Thomas Randolph's The Jealous Lovers (1632) and in William Cartwright's The Ordinary (1634-5),[45] both of them university plays and both by reason of their dates outside the limits of this study, the traditional pattern of the Prodigal Son play is also reversed, but in a very different way. In both these works the prodigals, Andrew and Asotus respectively, are incompetent fools who are blessed with equally foolish fathers who dotingly shower money on their sons, thereby reversing the proverbial dictum concerning the rake and the fork. Both plays also mock the social aspirations of the bourgeoisie, for the two prodigals are supposedly being trained to be fashionable gallants, though neither succeeds. Andrew, for example, is continually cheated and, incapable of distinguishing the real gentry from its imitation, he marries a maid-servant instead of a gentle-woman. Asotus too proves incapable of living his part, and

the moral of each play would seem to be that the qualities of class are not acquired by study, nor are they (as Sir Giles Overreach also discovered) to be equated with riches. Thus, almost thirty years after plays like Eastward Ho, we can still find Prodigal Son plays being written for sophisticated audiences that deliberately set out to satirize middle-class values by adapting the parable in an ironic fashion.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The English Prodigal Son plays of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are small in number when compared with the European Prodigal Son plays. Nevertheless there are sufficient extant English works for us to be able to talk, as I have done, in terms of a popular native tradition. Looking back over our study of this tradition, what strikes us, I believe, is primarily the great adaptability of the plot-pattern of the parable. This adaptability enabled dramatists to present various topical concerns of a social, religious and political nature. We saw in the second and third chapters, for example, how topical concerns with education, which were strongly influenced by Humanist and Reformist thought, led a number of dramatists to adapt the parable in a way designed to impress upon a youthful audience the importance of education and the consequent folly of neglecting it. In these same chapters we also saw how the influence of Calvinist ideas concerning predestination and the frequent desire to produce a prudential moral caused some playwrights deliberately to alter the narrative sequence of events derived from the parable so that the prodigal should not achieve any final reconciliation with the father. Other plays, expressing a topical concern with the conduct of princes and the

possible ill-effects of bad government on a country as a whole, presented their prodigals as princes, while those writers who endeavoured to appeal especially to bourgeois interests depicted prodigals as either apprentices or merchants' sons in order to provide lessons on the wisdom of thrift and industry.

Just as topical was the tendency of the private theatre authors of the early seventeenth century to ridicule the traditional form of the Prodigal Son play and the values embodied in the bourgeois Prodigal Son play in particular, for such ridicule reflected the unease of the aristocratic sector of society in the face of an increasingly powerful middle class whose wealth and growing influence threatened the traditional privileges of the well-bred or the well-educated.

However, aside from its popularity in terms of its ability to deal with topical issues, the parable is also to be considered as popular in a more permanent sense. This is evident from the interest in it which artists of all ages have shown and continue to show. Clearly there is something in the parable to which the imagination of mankind intuitively responds, regardless of immediate topical interests. The origin of this universal response may perhaps be found in the implicit movement within the parable's sequence of narrative events from death, bondage and loss to re-birth, freedom and restitution ("For this my sonne was dead, and is aliue againe: and he was lost, but he is founde"). In mythic terms, I would

suggest, this relates to the cycle of the seasons from the sterility and darkness of winter, through the awakening of spring ("He came to him selfe"), to the fruition and light of summer, while the prodigal himself can be likened to the mythic wanderer who goes on a journey and is lost in a forest, maze or underworld, only to return and be reunited with all he left behind.

In Christian terms the parable embodies the central myth of the Gospel message--what Dante, as has already been remarked, called the Divine Comedy. As such, the parable could be presented in terms of the spiritual journey of man, which, by reason of his essentially fallen nature, inevitably takes him into a world of sin and temptation, far removed from his heavenly origins. Remorse and a desire for forgiveness, prompted perhaps by fear and despair, end in persuading man to journey back towards his father, who, in accordance with the lesson of the parable, shows mercy and receives the sinner unconditionally.

Implicit in this pattern are a number of related paradoxes that are central to Christian thought. When presented in dramatic form, these provide a basis for the kind of tension upon which all art is partly built. I have already mentioned the paradox of dying in order to be re-born, and of being lost in order to be found, but there is also the sense in which the prodigal chooses what he thinks is freedom only to discover instead the bondage of sin. By submitting to his father, the prodigal then embraces not bondage but freedom,

while the Elder Brother, who complains about his life at home, lacks this understanding which has cost the prodigal so dear. Of paramount significance for the Christian, of course, is the paradox of the Fortunate Fall which certain of the authors we discussed, and Gnapheus in particular, incorporated into the thematic structure of their plays. Gnapheus, we remember, even aptly incorporated this theme into his dramatisation of the debate between Erasmus and Luther on the problem of Free Will.

In those plays that chose to present the parable ironically, Christian myth was seen to be subverted. The father-figure, who represented God and the light and perfection towards which the prodigal moves in the parable, was instead presented by certain authors as representative of folly and bondage, over which the prodigal's way of life eventually triumphed. This is very much the pattern of Terentian New Comedy, and it is one that is found increasingly popular in the private theatres in the early seventeenth century, providing a substitute myth for that which had formerly been central to the Miracle and Morality plays and so strongly felt in Elizabethan secular dramas.

Were we to continue this study and consider later English dramatic works, among them Lille's The London Merchant (1731), Sheridan's The School for Scandal (1777) and St. John Hankin's The Return of the Prodigal (1904), we should eventually come to William Plomer's libretto for Benjamin Britten's dramatic cantata, The Prodigal Son (1968). With

this work we should almost have come full circle, since, though showing some Asian influence, it returns to the Christian didacticism of the Morality play, even employing some of the same techniques, together with many of the motifs that were traditional in early English Prodigal Son plays, such as the prodigal's despair and the symbolic use of clothes. It would seem that the parable still retains in the twentieth century a measure of the appeal it possessed during the brief period of time with which this study has been concerned.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A

Three Texts of the Parable of the Prodigal Son and a Buddhist Parable

(a) [Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Clementium, 3rd. ed. (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1959), pp. 1067-8.] Luke 15: 11-32.

11. Ait autem: Homo quidam habuit duos filios:
12. et dixit adolescentior ex illis patri: Pater, da mihi portionem substantiae quae me contingit. Et divisit illis substantiam.
13. Et non post multos dies, congregatis omnibus, adolescentior filius peregre profectus est in regionem longinquam, et ibi dissipavit substantiam suam vivendo luxuriose.
14. Et postquam omnia consummasset, facta est fames valida in regione illa, et ipse coepit egere.
15. Et abiit, et adhaesit uni civium regionis illius. Et misit illum in villam suam ut pasceret porcos.
16. Et cupiebat implere ventrem suum de siliquis, quas porci manducabant: et nemo illi dabat.
17. In se autem reversus, dixit: Quanti mercenarii in domo patris mei abundant panibus, ego autem hic fame pereo.
18. Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum, et dicam ei: Pater, peccavi in caelum, et coram te:
19. iam non sum dignus vocari filius tuus: fac me sicut unum mercenariis tuis.
20. Et surgens venit ad patrem suum. Cum autem adhuc longe esset, vidit illum pater ipsius, et misericordia motus est, et accurrens cecidit super collum eius, et osculatus est eum.
21. Dixitque ei filius: Pater, peccavi in caelum, et coram te, iam non sum dignus vocari filius tuus.
22. Dixit autem pater ad servos suos: Cito proferte stolam primam, et induite illum, et date annulum in manum eius, et calceamenta in pedes eius:
23. et adducite vitulum saginatum, et occidite, et manducemus, et epulemur:
24. quia hic filius meus mortuus erat, et revixit: perierat, et inventus est. Et coeperunt epulari.
25. Erat autem filius eius senior in agro: et cum veniret, et appropinquaret domui, audivit symphoniam et chorum:
26. et vocavit unum de servis, et interrogavit quid haec essent.
27. Isque dixit illi: Frater tuus venit, et occidit pater tuus vitulum saginatum, quia salvum illum recepit.

28. Indignatus est autem, et nolebat introire. Pater ergo illius egressus, coepit rogare illum.
29. At ille respondens, dixit patri suo: Ecce tot annis servio tibi, et nunquam mandatum tuum praeterivi, et nunquam dedisti mihi haedum ut cum amicis meis epularer:
30. sed postquam filius tuus hic, qui devoravit substantiam suam cum meretricibus, venit, occidisti illi vitulum saginatum.
31. At ipse dixit illi: Fili, tu semper mecum es, et omnia mea tua sunt:
32. epulari autem, et gaudere oportebat, quia frater tuus hic mortuus erat, et revixit; perierat, et inventus est.

(b) [The Holie Bible. Bishops' Version of 1568. The official Bible of the English Church between 1568 and 1611. STC 2099, fols. xlvi^{r-v}.]

11. And he sayde. A certayne man had two sonnes:
12. And the younger of them sayde to his father: father, geue me the portion of the goodes, that to me belongeth. And he deuided vnto them his substaunce.
13. And not long after, when the younger sonne had gathered all that he had together, he toke his iourney into a farre countrey, and there wasted his goodes with riotous lyuyng.
14. And when he had spent all, there arose a great dearth in all that lande, and he began to lacke.
15. And he ioyned hym selfe to a citizen of that countrey: and he sent hym to his farme, to feede swyne.
16. And he woulde fayne haue fylled his belly with the coddes that the swyne dyd eate: and no man gaue vnto hym.
17. Then he came to hym selfe, and sayde: Howe many hyred seruauntes at my fathers house haue bread inough, and I perishe with hunger:
18. I wyll aryse, and go to my father, and wyll say vnto hym: Father, I haue sinned agaynst heauen, and before thee,
19. And am no more worthy to be called thy sonne, make me as one of thy hyred seruauntes.
20. And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way of, his father sawe him, & had compassion, and came, and fell on his necke, and kissed hym.
21. And the sonne sayde vnto hym: Father, I haue sinned agaynst heauen, and in thy syght, and am no more worthy to be called thy sonne.
22. But the father saide to his seruauntes: bryng foorth the best garment, and put it on hym, and put a ryng on his hande, and shoes on his feete:
23. And bryng hyther that fat calfe, and kyll it, and let vs eate and be mery:

24. For this my sonne was dead, and is aliue agayne, he was lost, and is founde. And they began to be mery.
25. The elder brother was in the fielde: and when he came and drewe nye to the house, he hearde minstrelsie & daunsing,
26. And called one of his seruauntes, and asked, what those thynges meant.
27. And he sayde vnto hym: thy brother is come, and thy father hath kylled the fat calfe, because he hath receaued hym safe and sounde.
28. And he was angry, and woulde not go in: Therfore came his father out, and entreated hym.
29. He aunswered and sayde to his father: Lo, these many yeres haue I done thee seruice, neither brake I at any tyme thy commaundement, and yet thou neuer gauest me a kidde to make mery with my friendes:
30. But assoone as this thy sonne was come, which hath deuoured thy goodes with harlottes, thou hast for his pleasure kylled that fat calfe.
31. And he sayde vnto hym: Sonne, thou art euer with me, and all that I haue, is thyne,
32. It was meete that we shoulde make mery and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alyue agayne: and was lost, and is founde.

(c) [The New English Bible. New Testament (Oxford University Press & Cambridge University Press, 1961), pp. 128-9.]

11. Again he said: "There was once a man who had two sons;
12. and the younger said to his father, 'Father, give me my share of the property.' So he divided his estate between them.
13. A few days later the younger son turned the whole of his share into cash and left home for a distant country, where he squandered it in reckless living.
14. He had spent it all, when a severe famine fell upon that country and he began to feel the pinch.
15. So he went and attached himself to one of the local landowners, who sent him on to his farm to mind the pigs.
16. He would have been glad to fill his belly with the pods that the pigs were eating; and no one gave him anything.
17. Then he came to his senses and said, 'How many of my father's paid servants have more food than they can eat, and here am I, starving to death!
18. I will set off and go to my father, and say to him, "Father, I have sinned, against God and against you;
19. I am no longer fit to be called your son; treat me as one of your paid servants."'
20. So he set out for his father's house. But while he was still a long way off his father saw him, and his heart went out to him. He ran to meet him, flung his arms round him, and kissed him.

21. The son said, 'Father, I have sinned, against God and against you; I am no longer fit to be called your son.'
22. But the father said to his servants, 'Quick! fetch a robe, my best one, and put it on him; put a ring on his finger and shoes on his feet.
23. Bring the fatted calf and kill it, and let us have a feast to celebrate the day.
24. For this son of mine was dead and has come back to life; he was lost and is found.' And the festivities began.
25. Now the elder son was out on the farm; and on his way back, as he approached the house, he heard music and dancing.
26. He called one of the servants and asked what it meant.
27. The servant told him, 'Your brother has come home, and your father has killed the fatted calf because he has him back safe and sound.'
28. But he was angry and refused to go in. His father came out and pleaded with him;
29. but he retorted, 'You know how I have slaved for you all these years; I never once disobeyed your orders; and you never gave me so much as a kid, for a feast with my friends.
30. But now that this son of yours turns up, after running through your money with his women, you kill the fatted calf for him.'
31. 'My boy,' said the father, 'you are always with me, and everything I have is yours.
32. How could we help celebrating this happy day? Your brother here was dead and has come back to life, was lost and is found.'"

(d) [Parable from The Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law, translated by H. Kern in Sacred Books of the East, edited by Max Müller (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901), Vol. X, 108-12.]

3. It is like (the history of) a young person who, seduced by foolish people, went away from his father and wandered to another country far distant.
4. The father was sorry to perceive that his son had run away and in his sorrow roamed the country in all directions during no less than fifty years.
5. In search of his son he came to some great city, where he built a house and dwelt, blessed with all that can gratify the five senses.
6. He had plenty of bullion and gold, money and corn, conch shells, stones, and coral; elephants, horses, and footboys; cows, cattle, and sheep;
7. Interests, revenues, landed properties; male and female slaves and a great number of servants; was highly honoured by thousands of kotis and a constant favourite of the king's.

8. The citizens bow to him with joined hands, as well as villagers in the rural districts, many merchants come to him, (and) persons charged with numerous affairs.
9. In such way the man becomes wealthy, but he gets old, aged, advanced in years, and he passes days and nights always sorrowful in mind on account of his son.
10. "It is fifty years since that foolish son has run away. I have got plenty of wealth and the hour of my death draws near."
11. Meanwhile that foolish son is wandering from village to village, poor and miserable, seeking food and clothing.
12. When begging, he at one time gets something, another time he does not. He grows lean in his travels, the unwise boy, while his body is vitiated with scabs and itch.
13. In course of time he in his rovings reaches the town where his father is living, and comes to his father's mansion to beg for food and raiment.
14. And the wealthy, rich man happens to sit at the door on a throne under a canopy expanded in the sky and surrounded with many hundreds of living beings.
15. His trustees stand round him, some of them counting money and bullion, some writing bills, some lending money on interest.
16. The poor man, seeing the splendid mansion of the householder, thinks within himself: Where am I here? This man must be a king or a grandee.
17. Let me not incur some injury and be caught to do forced labour. With these reflections he hurried away inquiring after the road to the street of the poor.
18. The rich man on the throne is glad to see his own son, and despatches messengers with the order to fetch that poor man.
19. The messengers immediately seize the man, but he is no sooner caught than he faints away (as he thinks): These are certainly executioners who have approached me; what do I want clothing or food?
20. On seeing it, the rich, sagacious man (thinks): This ignorant and stupid person is of low disposition and will have no faith in my magnificence, nor believe that I am his father.
21. Under those circumstances he orders a person of low character, crooked, one-eyed, maimed, ill-clad and blackish, to go and search that man who shall do menial work.
22. "Enter my service and cleanse the putrid heap of dirt, replete with faeces and urine; I will give thee a double salary" (are the words of the message).
23. On hearing this call the poor man comes and cleanses the said spot; he takes up his abode there in a hovel near the mansion.
24. The rich man continually observes him through the windows (and thinks): There is my son engaged in a low occupation, cleansing the heap of dirt.

25. Then he descends, takes a basket, puts on dirty garments, and goes near the man. He chides him, saying: Thou dost not perform thy work.
26. I will give thee double salary and twice more ointment for the feet; I will give thee food with salt, potherbs, and, besides, a cloak.
27. So he chides him at the time, but afterwards he wisely conciliates him (by saying): Thou dost thy work very well, indeed; thou art my son, surely; there is no doubt of it.
28. Little by little he makes the man enter the house, and employs him in his service for fully twenty years, in the course of which time he succeeds in inspiring him with confidence.
29. At the same time he lays up in the house gold, pearls, and crystal, draws up the sum total, and is always occupied in his mind with all that property.
30. The ignorant man, who is living outside the mansion, alone in a hovel, cherishes no other ideas but of poverty, and thinks to himself: Mine are no such possessions!
31. The rich man perceiving this of him (thinks): My son has arrived at the consciousness of being noble. He calls together a gathering of his friends and relatives (and says): I will give all my property to this man.
32. In the midst of the assembly where the king, burghers, citizens, and many merchantmen were present, he speaks thus: This is my son whom I lost a long time ago.
33. It is now fully fifty years--and twenty years more during which I have seen him--that he disappeared from such and such a place and that in his search I came to this place.
34. He is owner of all my property; to him I leave it all and entirely; let him do with it what he wants; I give him my whole family property.
35. And the (poor) man is struck with surprise; remembering his former poverty, his low disposition, and as he receives those good things of his father's and the family property, he thinks: Now am I a happy man.

APPENDIX B

Appendix B

THE IDENTIFICATION OF POSTHASTE IN HISTRIOMASTIX

The identification of Posthaste as Anthony Munday in Marston's Histriomastix rests chiefly upon the fact that Munday was a ballad-writer before becoming a playwright and that in Histriomastix there are some apparent allusions to this fact (1610 edition, sigs. $D4^{r}$, $F2^{v}$, $H1^{v}$, $H2^{r}$). In addition Munday, like Posthaste, was both an actor and a playwright. Furthermore, in the course of Histriomastix, Posthaste offers to act extempore (sig. $C1^{v}$), and we know that Munday was once taunted with having been hissed off the stage for attempting to act extempore.[1] Munday was also a pageant-writer from 1605, but possibly earlier,[2] and it may be significant that in Histriomastix Posthaste is at one point referred to as a "peaking Pagenter" (sig. $E4^{v}$),[3] while in Jonson's The Case is Altered (1597-8) Antonio Balladino, who is far more obviously a caricature of Munday, is several times referred to as a writer of pageants.[4]

Another point in favour of the identification of Posthaste as Munday is that in Histriomastix Posthaste is referred to as "a Gentleman scholler" (sig. $C3^{r}$). The first half of this title Munday may have earned through his post at Court, this being alluded to sarcastically in the line in Histriomastix: "Ist not pitty this fellow's not imploid in matters of State . . . ?" (sig. $C1^{v}$). Alternatively the allusion to Posthaste as "a Gentleman" may refer to the fact that in 1585

Munday had been placed on the Freedom List of the Drapers' Company, a matter which would entitle him to be called a "gentleman."[5] The second part of the title might have been earned by his many published translations and pamphlets, and here it may be significant that in A Caueat to the reader touching A.M. his discouery Munday is referred to as a "scholler" (sig. $E1^r$), while in The Case is Altered Onion certainly treats Balladino as such (I, ii, 23-7).

Finally it should be pointed out that the plain, simplistic style of the parody plays within Histriomastix and supposedly written by Posthaste are quite in character with the description Jonson gives of Munday's art in The Case is Altered. Speaking of his own work, Antonio says,

> I write so plaine, and keepe that old Decorum, that you must of necessitie like it; mary you shall haue some now (as for example, in plaies) that will haue euery day new trickes, and write you nothing but humours: indeede this pleases the Gentlemen: but the common sort they care not for't, they know not what to make on't, they looke for good matter, they, and are not edified with such toyes.
>
> (I, ii, 58-65)

In spite of these various indications that Posthaste is a caricature of Munday, it is my contention here that a better case can be made for the identification of Posthaste as Shakespeare.[6]

We may begin with the name "Posthaste." The primary connotation of this word is that of speed, and as will be seen in a moment, this is not inappropriate in connection with Shakespeare. The name, however, may be more deeply witty in that it could be a play on the name "Shakespeare." The word

"Post" can mean "quickly" as in the proverbs "A false report rides post" (Tilley R83) and "To talk post" (Tilley T61). The word "Shake" can also mean "quickly" as in the phrase "Thei went a nobull schakke" (OED), and allusions to haste in connection with Shakespeare are very apt in view of what his contemporaries, Jonson, Heminges and Condell, all implied concerning his methods of composition.[7] Of relevance too is the legendary story that Shakespeare, obliged by Queen Elizabeth "to write a Play of Sir John Falstaff in Love," succeeded in doing it "in a Fortnight; a prodigious Thing."[8]

Even more suggestive is the fact that the "haste" of "Posthaste" can be taken as an equivalent for the Latin word "hasta," meaning "a staff," "a shaft" or "a spear," and interestingly enough the names "Shakstaff" and "Shakeschafte" were not uncommon variants for the name "Shakespeare."[9] "Haste" therefore provides a perfect match for the second half of Shakespeare's name.

We have also to consider the most famous line in Histriomastix: "That When he shakes his furious Speare" (sig. $C4^{r}$). Though long disclaimed as an allusion to Shakespeare by such eminent critics as Chambers,[10] this could hardly be a jest at anyone else's expense, least of all Munday's, provided, of course, that a jest was indeed intended. This line occurs in Posthaste's "Troilus and Cressida," and we know that Shakespeare wrote a play of the same title, though it is not generally considered to date as early as 1599. More provoking is Cressida's reply to Troilus' offer

to wear her blue garter on his elbow:

> O knight with vallour in thy face,
> Here take my skreene weare it for grace,
> Within thy Helmet put the same,
> Therewith to make thine enemies lame.
> (sig. C4^{r})

Cressida's use of the word "skreene" for "veil" may be significant. A common piece of Elizabethan domestic furniture was a type of "fixed screen for warding off an air-draught," which was often in the form of a "wooden partition near the door or fire-place" (OED). This was referred to in Shakespeare's day as a "speer." Various alternative spellings for the word existed, including "spere," "speare," and "speere" (OED). That there may be some play on Shakespeare's name intended here seems more likely when, in the very next line, we find the use of the word "Helmet." This could be a play on the Latin form of Shakespeare's first name, but more obviously it could be an allusion to the meaning of "William" which is "Helmet of resolve."[11] The strained way in which Marston has juxtaposed the words "skreene" and "Helmet" appears even more significant when with equal strain he adds the allusion to Troilus making his "enemies lame." Here one remembers the conjecture, based on the evidence of Sonnets 37 and 89, that Shakespeare was lame.[12] That these possible allusions come in a cluster and in conjunction with the line "That When he shakes his furious Speare" makes it seem very probable, in my opinion, that Shakespeare is being mocked here. One might add, also, that if Munday were being satirised as

Posthaste, one would expect to find some word-play on his name, a homonym for the first day of the week, but I can find nothing of this kind in Histriomastix. There are, however, further matters which seem to allude to Shakespeare in the play.

Towards the end of Histriomastix, for example, a constable appears and says he wishes to talk with Posthaste and his fellows concerning "taxe mony" of which there is "not a penny paid yet" (sig. $H1^{v}$). Of relevance here, of course, is the fact that in 1597, 1598 and 1599 Shakespeare was cited officially in various documents as a tax delinquent.[13] On the same page in Histriomastix, Posthaste offers to buy the constable "a pot or two," but the latter refuses and says that the "dearth of Malt denies it." This too could be an allusion to Shakespeare who came from a town noted for its trading in malt and who was cited in 1598 on a government list, the purpose of which was to detect those who had been hoarding malt. On this list, Shakespeare is named as having holdings in malt amounting to 10 quarters (an amount exceeded by only a dozen of his fellow-townsmen), and this at a time when there was a serious dearth of corn, following the three wet summers of 1594, 1595 and 1596.[14]

In addition to these possible allusions in Histriomastix to Shakespeare, there may also be a number of allusions to his plays. On one occasion, when Posthaste and his players are discussing what parts they should play, one actor says that he would like to play the "conquering King," while

another says that he should play the "cowardly knaue" (sig. $F1^{r}$). Significantly, the title of the 1600 quarto of Henry V is The Chronicle History of Henry the fift, With his battel fought at Agin Court in France. Togither with Auntient Pistoll. The name "conquering King" not only fits Henry V, but more strikingly, Pistol, whose name is given such prominence on the title-page, is seven times referred to as a "knaue" in one scene (V, 2903, 2916, 2920, 2928, 2930, 2949, 2965) [V, i, 6, 19, 23, 31, 33, 55, 73], the seventh time specifically as a "cowardly Knaue."[15]

To suggest that Histriomastix post-dates Henry V is, of course, to go counter to the Christmas 1598-9 date proposed for the former play by Finkelpearl. However, Finkelpearl's "hypothesis," though a good one, is based only on "an interlocking set of probabilities" and is not backed by conclusive proof,[16] and the only thing we can be sure of is that Histriomastix was written before Jonson's Every Man Out of His Humor, a play which was almost certainly first performed in the Winter of 1599-1600, and which contains an allusion to "Plato's Histriomastix" (III, iv, 29) in a passage parodying Marston's style.[17] That there may be an allusion in Marston's play to Henry V, which was written during the Earl of Essex's absence in Ireland between March and September 1599, is consequently possible, even if Finkelpearl's hypothesis makes this seem improbable.

Further evidence that Histriomastix may post-date Henry V is the jibe in Marston's play which is directed at

Posthaste and which implies that this poet writes plays in which he makes promises that he never means to keep. This occurs in the Prologue to one of Posthaste's plays. The Prologue ends with the line "So promising that we neuer meane to performe /Our Prologue peaceth" (sig. E4^{v}). This naturally brings to mind the promise which was made in the Epilogue to 2 Henry IV (lines 3344-7) [lines 28-30] and which was not kept in Henry V:[18]

> One word more, I beseech you: if you be not too much cloid with Fat Meate, our humble Author will continue the Story (with Sir Iohn in it) and make you merry, with faire Katherine of France: where (for any thing I know) Falstaffe shall dye of a sweat, vnlesse already he be kill'd with your hard Opinions.

Perhaps Marston is alluding to this broken promise (since Falstaff does not actually appear), or perhaps he is referring to an earlier section in the same Epilogue in which the actor says, "I was lately heere in the end of a displeasing Play, to pray your Patience for it, and to promise you a Better" (lines 3332-3) [lines 8-11].

To the evidence of these possible allusions to 1 and 2 Henry IV and to Henry V one may add the fact that one of Posthaste's plays in Histriomastix is "The Prodigall Childe," and, as was shown in Chapter Five of this study, both Henry IV plays fit the pattern of the traditional English Prodigal Son play. For the most part, however, the parody in Histriomastix appears to refer to a play written in the style of a Morality and in the plain style which Jonson associated with Munday in The Case is Altered. The Henry IV plays possess,

as we have seen, many features of a Morality, but they lack any of the traditional horseplay such as is parodied in Histriomastix, and they are certainly not written in the crude style for which Jonson attacked Munday. On the other hand, it is worth noting that in Posthaste's "The Prodigall Childe," Dame Vertue accuses the prodigal of beguiling "many poore men of their goods" (sig. $C1^{v}$).[19] We know from previous chapters that this is an accusation that cannot be applied to the usual prodigal, but it is apt if it refers to Prince Hal's activities at Gadshill. The possibility that "The Prodigall Childe" is intended as a parody of the Henry IV plays can therefore by no means be ruled out. Certainly there is no evidence that Munday ever wrote a Prodigal Son play, nor did he, unlike Shakespeare, ever write one on the subject of Troilus and Cressida, the other play of Posthaste's which is performed in Histriomastix.

Two more of Shakespeare's early plays may also be alluded to in Histriomastix. When Posthaste and his fellow-actors are asked at one point what plays they have, Posthaste answers in a seemingly inconsequential manner: "For mine owne part, though [sic] this summer season /I am desperate of a horse" (sig. $C3^{r}$). This looks very much like an allusion to the well-known line in Richard III,[20] and it is not without significance, I feel, that Marston had earlier alluded in The Scourge of Villanie (VII, line 1) to Shakespeare's line which presumably he felt his contemporaries would have no great difficulty in identifying. Indeed, later he even

quoted it literally in What You Will (1607 edition): "A horse, a horse, my Kingdom for a horse" (sig. $C1^{r}$). In Eastward Ho, Marston parodied it ("A boate, a boate, a boate, a full hunderd Markes for a boate" III, iv, 5),[21] as he does in Parasitaster (1616 edition) where Dondola has the line "A foole, a foole, a foole my Coxcombe for a foole" (sig. $H3^{v}$).

The device in Histriomastix of the crude play as entertainment within the body of another play could be an allusion to Shakespeare's A Midsummer Night's Dream,[22] for not only does the play-within-a-play in Histriomastix, put on by a beard-maker, a fiddle-string maker, a peddler and a would-be poet, remind one of the Mechanicals' theatricals in Shakespeare's play,[23] but, as happens in A Midsummer Night's Dream, the band of players do not perform what they have rehearsed. In addition the "passion" which brings the reading of "The Prodigall Childe" to a premature close (sig. $C1^{r}$) may be an allusion to the line "Heere she comes, and her passion ends the play" which introduces Thisbe at the end of the Mechanicals' play in A Midsummer Night's Dream (V, 2109) [V, i, 320]. Significantly, the Mechanicals' play also comes to a premature end, for the Duke asks that the Epilogue be omitted. Finally it should be mentioned that the use of the word "passion" in Histriomastix may also be an echo of Theseus' statement some few lines earlier that "This passion, and the death of a deare friend, /Would go neere to make a man looke sad" (V, 2086-7) [V, i, 293-4].

Yet another adaptation of a device in A Midsummer Night's Dream may occur at the end of Act III in Histriomastix, when Mavortius and company "fall a sleepe on the Stage" (sig. $E1^{v}$). Music plays, and Envy enters and speaks "to all the Actors sleeping on the Stage" (sig. $E1^{v}$). At the same time "shee breaths amongst them" (sig. $E1^{v}$), and, after she has left the stage, the sleepers "all awake, and begin the following Acte" (sig. $E2^{r}$). This incident inevitably brings to mind Titania's long sleep on stage from II, ii, to III, i, in Shakespeare's play, but even closer is the sleep of the lovers from the end of Act III through the first part of IV, i, until awakened by the music of hunting horns. (line 1622) [line 106]. Even if one discounts the well-known Folio stage direction at the end of Act III of A Midsummer Night's Dream ("They sleepe all the Act" line 1507) as being relevant only to post-1609 stage performance practices, the striking similarities contained in Histriomastix are hardly diminished.[24] However, on the subject of this famous Folio stage direction, it is worth noting that Lawrence maintained that, while almost certainly added some time after 1609, the direction does not necessarily prove that "there were no act-intervals at the Globe for the lovers to sleep through before that year."[25] In possible support of Lawrence's argument is the extant "plot" of The Dead Man's Fortune in which the end of each of the first four acts is indicated by crosses which are accompanied by directions for music in the margins. However, this was an Admiral's or Strange's play of about 1590 and there-

fore not necessarily indicative of the stage-practices of Shakespeare's company, and, as has been pointed out, there is some indication that these directions for music in the "plot" of The Dead Man's Fortune are a later addition.[26]

A few more points may be added to the above. The description of Posthaste as "A Gentleman scholler," like Posthaste's statement that "A Gentleman's a Gentleman, that hath a cleane shirt on, with some learning, and so haue I" (sig. $C3^{r}$) could be an allusion to Shakespeare's social status, following the grant of arms (probably at the poet's behest) to his father in 1596. It should also be noted that Posthaste is one of the "maister-sharers" in his company (sig. $F2^{v}$), as opposed to a "hireling," and this matter is referred to with accompanying jibes at the financial prosperity of the sharers (sigs. $F2^{v}$ and $H1^{r}$). Shakespeare, of course, was not only a sharer in the Lord Chamberlain's Company at least as early as 1595,[27] but in 1599 he was among the original seven owner-sharers when the Globe was set up. Munday, on the other hand, does not appear to have been a sharer in the Admiral's Company, and this particular line of attack in Histriomastix hardly seems applicable to him.

Another significant point is that in Histriomastix it is stated of Posthaste that "It is as dangerous to read his name at a play-dore /As a printed bill on a plague dore" (sig. $E4^{v}$). This may simply mean that Posthaste's plays are ill-frequented. Since it is one of Posthaste's fellow-actors who makes the statement, however, it is more likely that what

is also being suggested is that it is "dangerous" for rival actors when a play by Posthaste is performed.[28] Thus, just as fifty plague notices were enough to threaten closure of the theatres and hence deprive the players of their means of livelihood, a play by the popular Posthaste could have the effect of emptying the theatres of the other companies.

If this interpretation of these lines is correct, what we may have is yet another apt allusion to Shakespeare whose popularity and success had been amply acknowledged by the envious rival poet, Greene, as early as 1592, and by the rather undiscriminating Meres in Palladis Tamia in 1598. By 1599, if one includes Henry V and The Merry Wives, Shakespeare had written nineteen plays that are now extant, together with his two very successful poems, Venus and Adonis and The Rape of Lucrece. By the same date, both poems had been published as had a total of eight of the plays. In the years 1597-9, three editions of Richard II were published, and two each of Richard III, 1 Henry IV and Romeo and Juliet. Whatever may have been the motivation for the publication of these works, the mere fact there was judged to be a market for printed copies of them suggests that they were both popular and successful. Admittedly, however, Munday was an even more prolific writer than Shakespeare, and he would have appeared to have achieved at least equal popular success, though not, significantly, as a playwright.[29]

Further possible evidence for the identification of Posthaste as Shakespeare may exist in the sudden and incon-

sequential question which Posthaste puts to the other actors at one point: "My maisters, what tire weares your lady on her head?" (sig. $C1^{V}$). One recalls Shakespeare's friendship with the French Huguenot tire-maker, Christopher Mountjoy, which dates at least as early as 1602, but very possibly earlier.[30] Mountjoy was resident in London a few years prior to 1600, and, although there is no record of Shakespeare living with him until 1604, the records for Shakespeare's place of residence in London in the few years immediately prior to 1599 are sparse enough not to exclude the possibility that he may have lived with Mountjoy prior to 1604.[31] One remembers also the sympathetic portrait of the character Mountjoy in Henry V. Was this intended as a subtle compliment to his friend? If in fact Shakespeare's friendship with Mountjoy had begun by 1599, the point of Marston's rather strained allusion to tires would then be clear, since it would be a sure aid in the identification of Posthaste.

Finally, in reference to the fact that Posthaste is referred to as a former ballad writer and as a writer of pageants, it should be said that, although this is admittedly strong evidence for believing that Anthony Munday is the actor-playwright being mocked in the form of Posthaste, it should not be forgotten that we have no idea as to what Shakespeare was doing between 1585 and 1592. Like Munday, he too could have been writing ballads, and, since the London pageants between 1592 and 1604 are missing, there is no proof that Shakespeare was not a pageant-writer.

Thus, although some of the evidence points to Anthony Munday as the target for Marston's mockery, the case for believing that Shakespeare was the model for Posthaste is not, I believe, an entirely negligible one. Were more concrete proof available, the identification I have suggested here would re-open the question of a possible early date for Troilus and Cressida and at the same time provide some material for speculation for those who seek the answer to Shakespeare's "lost years."

APPENDIX C

Appendix C

List of Extant Pictorial and Sculptural Representations of the Prodigal Son Parable Prior to 1700, with Sources of Descriptions and Reproductions

Abbreviations:

Kallensee - Kallensee, Kurt. Die Liebe des Vaters; das Gleichnis vom verloreren Sohn in der christlichen Dichtung und bildenden Kunst. Berlin, 1960.

Réau - Réau, Louis. Iconographie de l'art chrétien. Paris, 1955-9. Vol. II, pt. II.

Vetter - Vetter, Ewald. Der verlorene Sohn. Düsseldorf, 1955.

(For full references, where abbreviated titles have been used, see bibliography)

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Present Location if known	Reproduction or Description
11th cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Miniatures MSS	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris	Vetter, Plate 1
12th cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Stained Glass	Chartres Cath.	Merlet, Cath. de Chartres, p. 51
" "	"	" "	" "	Auxerre Cath.	Réau, p. 334
" "	"	" "	" "	Mortagne Cath.	" p. 334
" "	"	" "	" "	Poitiers Cath.	Mâle, L'art religieux, p. 239

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
12th Cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Stained Glass	Sens Cath.	Réau, p. 334
" "	"	" "	" "	Troyes Cath.	" p. 334
1146-78	"	Prodigal Son and Swine	Sculptured Capital	Church at St. Nectaire	Kallensee, Plate 2
12th Cent.	"	Prodigal Son	Miniatures MS	Biblioteca Laurentiana, Florence	Vetter, Plate 2
ca. 1230-40	"	Prodigal at Father's House (2 scenes)	Goslar Gospel	City Coll., Goslar	Kallensee, Plates 22-4
13th Cent.	"	Prodigal Son (17 scenes)	Stained Glass	Bourges Cath.	Cahier-Martin, Vitraux de Bourges, pp. 179-88
14th Cent.	"	Prodigal Son (12 scenes)	Sculptured Relief	Auxerre Cath.	Porée, Cath. d' Auxerre, pp. 60-2
" "	"	Prodigal Son	Wall Painting	Brooke Church, Norfolk	James, "Wall Painting in Brooke," pp. 14-25
" "	"	Prodigal Leaving Father's Home	Ivory Casket	Louvre, Paris	Réau, p. 336
ca. 1340	"	Prodigal Son	Miniatures in Velislav-Bible	Prague Univ. Library	Vetter, Plate 5

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
ca. 1340	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Miniatures from Codex. Velislav-Bible	Prague Univ. Library	Vetter, Plate 6
post 1351	"	Prodigal Son	Miniature in Concordantia Caritatis of Abtes Ulrich von Lilienfeld	Lilienfeld	Vetter, Plate 7
13th Cent. (mid)	"	Prodigal Son (16 scenes)	Miniatures in Bible moralisée	British Museum	Vetter, Plates 8-9
ca. 1400	"	Prodigal Son (8 scenes)	Tapestry	Marburg Museum	Kallensee, Plates 25-32
1440	"	Prodigal Son	Drawing in MS Speculum Humanae Salvationis	State Libr., Munich	Kallensee, Plate 4
ca. 1470	"	Prodigal Son (8 scenes)	Backcloth	German National Museum, Nürnberg	Kallensee, Plates 33-40
1471	"	Return of Prodigal	Woodcut in Biblia Pauperum	Landesbibliothek, Gotha	Kallensee, Plate 3
ca. 1478	Peter Drach (printer)	Prodigal Son (6 scenes)	Woodcuts in Spiegel menschlicher Behaltnis	State Mus., Munich	Kallensee, Plates 41-6
1495	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Woodcuts	J. Meder's Quadragesimale	Vetter, pp. xxiv-xxv

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
1498	Anon.	Prodigal Son (8 scenes)	Woodcuts (Book of Hours, printed for S. Vostre)	Possession of R.R.	R.R., "The Prodigal Son," pp. 136-7
ca. 1497-8	Dürer	Prodigal Son With Swine	Ink Sketch	British Museum	Dürer, Paintings, Drawings and Prints, Plate 8
ca. 1498	"	"	Engraving	State Mus., Berlin-Dahlem	Kallensee, Plate 47
Late 15th-early 16th Cent.	Jan Swart	Prodigal Leaving Home	Sketch	Kupferstich-kabinett, Berlin	Réau, p. 336
16th Cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Tapestry	Possession of Foget Family	" p. 335
ca. 1500	"	Prodigal Leaving Home	"	Musée Cluny, Paris	Vetter, Plate 17
1502	"	Prodigal Son (8 scenes)	Woodcuts	Book of Hours, printed for S. Vostre in possess. of R.R.	R.R., "The Prodigal Son," pp. 136-7
1505	"	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	"	Book of Hours, printed by T. Kerver. In possess. of R.R.	"

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
ca. 1510	Lucas van Leyden	Return of Prodigal Son	Engraving	?	Vetter, Plate 15
ca. 1512-1530	Jorg Breu	Prodigal Son	Woodcut	Bodleian Libr.	Craik, Tudor Interlude, Plate 2
Early 16th Cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Copy in reverse of Breu's woodcut	" "	" Plate 3
ca. 1515	Hieronymus Bosch	Prodigal Son	Oil	Boymans Mus., Rotterdam	Kallensee, Plate 48
1517	Anon.	" "	Tapestry	German Mus., Berlin	Réau, p. 335
ca. 1520	Hans Holbein	Prodigal with Swine	Pen and ink	Public Art Coll., Basle	Vetter, Plate 16
1527	Anon.	Prodigal Son (Title-Page of Waldis' Parabell vam verlorn Szohn)	Woodcut	Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel	Kallensee, Plate 5
1530-60	Follower of Brunswick Monogrammist	Prodigal Son Feasting	Oil	Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool	Wrongly attrib. to Holbein by Jameson and Eastlake, History of Our Lord, I, 386
1536	Jan van Hemessen	Prodigal's Dissipated Living	Oil	Musée Royal, Brussels	Vetter, Plate 23

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
1538	Hans Sebald Beham	Prodigal's Repentance	Engraving	?	Hind, History of Engraving, Fig. 33, p. 84
ca. 1540	Cornelis Anthonisz	The Prodigal Son (6 scenes)	Woodcuts	Bodleian Libr.	Chew, Virtues Reconciled (2 cuts) and Craik, Tudor Interlude, Plate 4 (1 cut)
1540	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Fresco	Arborea Monastery, Bucovine	Réau, p. 335
1540	Hans Sebald Beham	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Engravings	?	Vetter, Plates 19-22
ca. 1545	Anon.	Prodigal with Courtesans	Wood Relief	Reichs-museum, Amsterdam	Vetter, Plate 18
16th Cent.	Anon.	The Prodigal Son (6 scenes)	Tapestry Cushion Covers	Victoria and Albert Museum	Barnard and Wace, "Sheldon Tapestry Weavers," p. 311
"	"	The Prodigal Son (2 scenes)	"	Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, Swansea	" "
"	"	The Prodigal Son (6 scenes)	"	Possession of Frank Partridge	" "

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
16th Cent.	Anon.	The Prodigal Son (1 scene)	Tapestry Cushion Covers	Possession of Colonel Howard	Barnard and Wace, "Sheldon Tapestry Weavers," p. 311
mid. 16th Cent.	Giorgio Vasari	Allegory of Redemption of Man's Sin	Oil	Villa Albani, Rome	Vetter, Plate 28
"	Joachim de Beuckelaer	Prodigal's Dissipations	Oil	Musée Royal, Brussels	Réau, p. 336
? 2nd half 16th Cent.	Étienne Delaune	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Engravings	?	Réau, p. 335
"	Federigo Zuccaro	Prodigal with Swine	Wall Painting	Jesus Chapel, Rome	Réau, p. 337
late 16th Cent.	Ludovico Pozzoserrato	Prodigal's Return	Ornamentation	Mont-de-Piété at Trévise	Réau, p. 337
late 16th early 17th Cent.	Johann Liss	Prodigal's Dissipations	Oil	Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna	Réau, p. 336
late 16th Cent.	Anon.	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Cast-iron offertory plate	Museum des Kunsthandwerks, Leipzig	Kallensee, Plate 54
"	"	Prodigal Son (4 panels)	Wall Painting	Knightsland Farm, S. Mimms.	The Times, Aug. 29, 1935, pp. 13-14

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
early 17th Cent.	Leandro Bassano	Return of Prodigal	Oil	Prado	Réau, p. 337
"	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Wall Painting	Lenchwick, nr. Evesham (Worcs.)	W.C.B., "The Prodigal Son," 305
"	"	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Coverlet	?	Hallen, "The Prodigal Son," 195-6
ca. 1600-1624	Domenico Fetti	Return of Prodigal	Oil	Dresden Art Gallery	Réau, p. 337
ca. 1610	Lucio Massari	Welcome of Prodigal	Altar Panel	Pinacoteca Nazionale, Bologna	Vetter, Plate 30
ca. 1615	Rubens	Repentance of Prodigal	Oil	Musée des beaux arts, Antwerp	Vetter, Plate 25
1618	Le Guerchin	Return of Prodigal	Oil	Vienna Museum	Réau, p. 337
1620-5	van Dyck	Prodigal and others repenting before Virgin	Oil	Art Gallery, Kassel	Vetter, Plate 26
1623	Dirck Baburens	Dissipated Living of Prodigal	"	Art Collection, Mainz	Vetter, Plate 24

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
1625	Gerard van Honthorst	Prodigal's Dissipations	Oil	Munich	Réau, p. 336
1626	? Anon.	Prodigal Son (several scenes)	?	St. Athanasae Church, Kalamata	Millet, Récherches sur l'iconographie, p. 37
ca. 1600-1650	Anon.	Prodigal Son (2 cuts)	Woodcut	Martin Parker's A Warning To all Lewd Livers	Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. III, 23, 26
"	Anon.	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	"	Books of Hours, printed by Hardouyn	R.R., "The Prodigal Son," 136-7
1633	Frans Francken II	Parable of Prodigal Son	Oil	Louvre	Vetter, Plate 27
ca. 1634	Rembrandt	Departure of Prodigal	Pen and Ink Drawing	State Art Coll., Dresden	Kallensee, Plate 6
1634	Anon.	Prodigal Son	Woodcuts	Richard Climsell's The Forlorne Traveller	Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. III, 274-9
1635	Jacques Callot	La Vie de l'Enfant Prodigue	Engraving	?	Réau, p. 335
1636	Rembrandt	Return of Prodigal	Etching	?	Kallensee, Plate 50

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
ca. 1636	Rembrandt	Return of Prodigal	Pen and Ink Drawing	Teyler Mus., Haarlem	Kallensee, Plate 8
ca. 1636-1658	Pinaigrier (attrib.)	Prodigal Son	Stained Glass	Chapelle St. Clair, Abbey of St. Victor, Paris	Réau, p. 334
1642-3	Rembrandt	Prodigal in Tavern with Courtesans	Pen and Ink Drawing	Coll. of Baron von Hirsch, Basle	Kallensee, Plate 7
1644	David Teniers	Prodigal's Dissipations	Oil	Louvre	Réau, p. 336
mid. 17th Cent.	Georges de La Tour	The Cheat (Dissipations of Prodigal)	Oil	Landry Coll., Paris	Réau, p. 336
"	Francanzano	Return of Prodigal	"	Museum, Naples	Réau, p. 337
ca. 1650	Rembrandt	Prodigal at Home with Father	Pen and Ink Drawing	Coll. Frits Lugt, Paris	Kallensee, Plate 9
ca. 1650	Gabriel Metsu	Prodigal Son	Oil	The Hermitage, Leningrad	Kallensee, Plate 52
mid. 17th Cent.	Murillo	Prodigal Son (6 paintings)	Oil	Prado	Réau, p. 335

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
mid. 17th Cent.	Abraham Bosse	Prodigal Son (6 scenes)	Engravings	?	Réau, p. 335
"	Salvator Rosa	Prodigal Son	Oil	The Hermitage, Leningrad	Réau, p. 335
1656-60	Mattia Preti	Welcome of Prodigal Son	"	Palazzo Reale, Naples	Vetter, Plate 29
1659	Anon.	Return of Prodigal (Picture of Prodigal Son play)	Woodcut	Comenius' Orbis Sensualium, transl. Charles Hoole, p. 264	Nicoll, British Drama, opp. p. 129
1663	Barent Fabritius	Prodigal Son	Oil	Rikjsmuseum, Amsterdam	Réau, p. 335
1669	Rembrandt	Return of Prodigal	"	The Hermitage, Leningrad	Vetter, Plate 35
ca. 1670	Anon.	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Cut goblet lid	Nürnberg	Kallensee, Plate 66
ca. 1670	Murillo	Return of Prodigal	Oil	Nat. Gall., Washington	Réau, p. 338
ca. 1650-1700	Anon.	Prodigal Son (3 scenes)	Woodcut	A New Ballad; Declaring the Excellent Parable of the Prodigal Child	Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. II, 392, 393, 396

Date	Artist	Subject	Medium	Location	Reproduction or Description
ca. 1650-1700	Jacob Jordaens	Prodigal Son	Oil	State Art Gall., Dresden	Kallensee, Plate 53
[ca. 1620-1650]	Martin Droeshout	Prodigal Son (4 scenes)	Engravings	4th ed. of Goodman's The Penitent Pardon'd (1694)	W.C.B., "Shakespeare and Droeshout," p. 325

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Introduction:

[1]These two works are described by Muriel Bradbrook as being "based on the old Schools tradition of the Prodigal Son" in her The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy [1955] (Peregrine Books, 1963), p. 236.

[2]These anonymous works are referred to, erroneously I believe, as Prodigal Son plays by Hardin Craig in his "Morality Plays and Elizabethan Drama," SQ, Vol. I (1950), 71.

[3]This play is included on Craig's list, but does not appear in F.P. Wilson's discussion of the English Prodigal Son plays in The English Drama 1485-1585 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 97-101.

Chapter I:

[1]Luke 15: 11-32. I have quoted the version found in the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible (fols. 36^{v}-37^{r}) principally because, out of the various sixteenth century English translations of the Bible, this was probably the most widely read among the English laity, as is pointed out by Lloyd E. Berry in his introduction to The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), p. 13. All references to the Geneva Bible will be to this edition. Other texts of the parable are given in Appendix A, parts (a), (b) and (c).

[2]Luke 15: 1-3. Luke here may have been inventing a context since the parable of the Lost Sheep is also given in Matthew 18: 12-14, in quite a different connection. The issue is further complicated by the fact that, of the three parables in Luke 15, those of the Lost Coin and the Prodigal Son are peculiar to Luke. Perhaps it was Matthew who invented the context for the parable of the Lost Sheep. The practice of grouping parables on the same theme was apparently a frequent Rabbinical technique, according to William O.E. Oesterley, The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background (London: SPCK, 1936), p. 174.

[3]On this point, see Alfred Plummer's A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1896), p. 371.

[4]It may be argued that the father, by going out to meet his son (verse 20), does play an active role, but this is surely more in the nature of an expression of his joy at seeing his son return and compassion for his son's situation than an actual search as was the case in the first two parables. It is interesting that Alan Paton in his novel Cry, the Beloved Country (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), which has certain conscious affinities with the parable, chose to have the father go in search of his erring son.

[5]J.M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke [1930] (London: Macmillan, 1957), p. 196.

[6]B.S. Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1926), p. 236.

[7]C.G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels [1909], 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1927), Vol. II, 990.

[8]Adolf Jülicher, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, 2 vols., 2nd edition (Freiburg, Leipzig and Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1899), Vol. II, 334. Richard Chenevix Trench in Notes on the Parables of Our Lord [1861] (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1948) calls the parable "the pearl and crown of all the parables" (p. 141).

[9]Plummer, St. Luke, p. 371.

[10]Most of the following points are drawn from Oesterley's The Gospel Parables, pp. 183-91.

[11]Deuteronomy 21: 17. Though the younger son may in fact have possessed some legal right in demanding such a portion during the father's life-time, it is interesting to note that this aspect of Jewish social custom is deprecated in Ecclesiasticus 33: 19-23. What is said in Deuteronomy on this matter later received confirmation in the Mishnah, that important compilation of the whole range of Pentateuchal legislation compiled at the end of the second century A.D. We can thus assume that the law applied at the time of Christ's life. See, The Mishnah, edited by Herbert Danby (Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 377. There is an interesting contrast here with the ancient English and Welsh law of Gavelkind whereby property was distributed equally among the heirs of a man who had died intestate.

[12]Another explanation of this aspect of the story is given by Plummer (St. Luke, p. 372), who suggests that "we have here perhaps a survival of that condition of society in which testaments 'took effect immediately on execution, were not secret, and were not revocable,' and in which it was customary for a father, when his powers were failing, to ab-

dicate and surrender his property to his sons." On this matter, the situation at the beginning of Shakespeare's King Lear provides an interesting point of comparison.

[13]Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, translated by S.H. Hooke from the 6th edition (1962) of Die Gleichnisse Jesu (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), pp. 128-9.

[14]Ibid. p. 129.

[15]Ibid. p. 129n.

[16]Oesterley in The Gospel Parables points out, however, that "bondmen" and "menservants," though technically slaves, were protected by law, which required that they be treated well (p. 194).

[17]These would have included Berakoth 17, Midrash Shir-ha-Shirim on v.2, Midrash Shemoth rabba on xii. 4, and the Babylonian Talmud, Pesachim, 119a.

[18]Leslie Weatherhead, In Quest of a Kingdom (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943), p. 90. Cf. the Eastern proverb quoted by Trench (Notes on the Parables, p. 206n.): "If a man draws near to God an inch, God will draw near to him an ell."

[19]Cf. Genesis 33: 4. "Then Esau ran to mete him and embraced him, and fel on his necke and kissed him, and thei wept" (Geneva Bible).

[20]In certain MSS versions the words "make me as one of thy hired servants" appear in verse 21, but they are generally considered by Biblical scholars to be an interpolation. See, T.W. Manson's The Sayings of Jesus [1937] (London: SCM Press, 1949), p. 289.

[21]Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 130.

[22]Oesterley, The Gospel Parables, p. 188. Oesterley claims that the parable was uttered by Rabbi Meir, a disciple of Akiba, in the first half of the second century A.D., but he does not state definitely whether or not the parable was likely to have been known by the Scribes and Pharisees in Jesus' audience, though elsewhere he mentions the possibility that such parables had in fact been handed down orally from earlier times (p. 7).

[23]Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, p. 128n.

[24]Filius, populus Judaicus, ut in Evangelio: "Erat senior filius in agro;" quod vocato ad fidem populo gentili, plebs Judaica in exterioribus per errorem versatur. . . . Filius, populus gentium, ut in Evangelio: "Filius meus

mortuus fuerat,et revixit," id est, populus gentilis in mortem cecidit per incredulitatem, redit ad vitam per fidem.

The passage is from Beati Rabani Mauri, Allegoriae in Sacram Scripturam in J.P. Migne's edition of Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina, 221 vols. (Paris: Garnier, 1844-1905), Vol. CXII, col. 926. This latter work hereafter referred to as PLat.

[25]Augustine, Quaestionum Evangeliorum, Liber Secundus, in PLat, Vol. XXXV, cols. 1344-8.

[26]Jerome, Epistola XXI, in PLat, Vol. XXII, col. 390. An amusing modern variant of such an interpretation can be found in James Joyce's Portrait of the Artist [1916] (New York: Viking Press, 1964) when Stephen, confronting the Dean of his college, an English convert to Catholicism, is described as looking at him "with the same eyes as the elder brother in the parable may have turned on the prodigal" (p. 189). Frederick W. Robertson in a sermon on "The Prodigal and his Brother" in Sermons, 3 vols. (Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co., 1870), is remarkable for saying that the Elder Brother is not a Pharisee since the father claims he is always with him. According to Robertson, the Elder Brother is more akin to a saint (Vol. I, 326).

[27]Index Exegeticus: Parabolarum Novi Testamenti Praecipuarum, in PLat, Vol. CCXIX, col. 266.

[28]Ambrose, Expositionis in Lucam, Liber VII, in PLat, Vol. XV, col. 1848.

[29]Index Exegeticus, in PLat, Vol. CCXIX, col. 266.

[30]Quaestionum Evangeliorum, Liber Secundus, in PLat, Vol. XXXV, col. 1344.

[31]Hugh of St. Victor, Allegoriae in Novum Testamentum, in PLat, Vol. CLXXV, col. 820. Robertson in his Sermons suggests that the husks stand for earthly happiness (p. 319).

[32]Quaestionum Evangeliorum, Liber Secundus, in PLat, Vol. XXXV, col. 1346.

[33]Ambrose, Expositionis in Lucam, Liber VII, in PLat, Vol. XV, col. 1851; Bede, Opera, Vols. CXVIII-CXXV, in Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, edited by D. Hurst (Turnholti: Brepols, 1960), Vol. CXX, 291.

[34]Expositionis in Lucam, Liber VII, in PLat, Vol. XV, col. 1851.

[35]Augustine, Quaestionum Evangeliorum, Liber Secundus, in PLat, Vol. XXXV, col. 1346; Jerome, Epistola XXI, in PLat, Vol. XXII, col. 388. This same interpretation occurs in the

thirteenth century Bible moralisée where the illustration depicting the killing of the calf is paired with one depicting Christ's death on the cross. The series of eight pairs of medallions illustrating the parable has been reproduced from the copy in the British Museum in Ewald Vetter's Der Verlorene Sohn (Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1955), Plates 8-9.

[36]"Ante venit ad terram, quam ille domum confessionis intraret. Incubuit super collum ipsius, id est, corpus sumpsit humanum. Et sicuti Joannes super pectus Jesu recubuit, qui secretorum ejus effectus est particeps: ita et jugum suum leve, id est, mandatorum suorum facilia praecepta, ex gratia magis quam ex merito super juniorem filium collocavit" (PLat, Vol. XXII, col. 387).

[37]Henry O. Taylor, The Mediaeval Mind, 2 vols., 4th edition (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962), Vol. II, 82. In this context, Langland's interpretation of the Good Samaritan on one allegorical level as figurative of Christ is quite consistent with earlier Biblical exegesis (see below, note 46).

[38]Described by Vetter in Der Verlorene Sohn, p. xvi. In Charles Hoole's translation of Comenius' Orbis Sensualium (1659), a Latin primer with pictures, there is an illustration (no. CXXX) of a stage-play being presented in an indoor theatre (p. 264). The play being enacted is referred to as "the History of the Prodigal Son, and his Father by whom he is entertained being returned home" (p. 265). Present on stage are the Prodigal, his father, the Elder Brother, and also the mother.

[39]William Telfer (ed.), Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 177.

[40]"Josef bedeutet Christum, der da erschien seinen Jüngern, die beisammen waren am Ostertage, und ihn fürchten, da sprach er zu ihnen: Friede sei euch, ich bins, füchtet euch nicht." Biblia Pauperum nach dem Original in der Lyceumsbibliothek zu Constanz, edited by Pfarrer Laib and Deccan Dr. Schwarz (Zurich: Leo Worl, 1867), Plate XXX.

[41]Ibid. "Man liest im Evangelium des Lukas: da der verlorene Sohn sein Gut in fernem Lande böslich verzehrt hatte gegen die Huld seines Vaters, kam er mit betrübtem Herzen wieder zu seinem Vater, der ihm freundlich empfing und mit einem Friedenskusse tröstete. Dieser milde Vater bedeutet Christum, der seiner verlorenen Jüngern erschien, die da betrübt sassen, und sie tröstete mit seiner Gegenwart." In Berjeau's edition of a copy in the British Museum the inscription is in Latin but the interpretation of the parable is the same. See Biblia Pauperum, edited by J. Ph. Berjeau (London: John Russell Smith, 1859).

[42]MS Harl. 2276, fol. 32b-33. Quoted by G.R. Owst in Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England, 2nd edition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), pp. 59-60.

[43]The Scale of Perfection, edited by Evelyn Underhill (London: J.M. Watkins, 1923), Bk. II, Ch. XLIII, p. 445.

[44]H.H. Glunz, The History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon (Cambridge University Press, 1933), p. 88. It is interesting that Sidney in An Apologie for Poetrie (1595), edited by Geoffrey Shepherd (London: Nelson and Sons, 1965), states that the parables of the Prodigal Son and Dives and Lazarus "by learned Divines are thought not historical acts, but instructing parables" (p. 109).

[45]For an interpretation of this final level, see Ambrose, Augustine and Bede in PLat, Vol. XV, col. 1848, Vol. XXXV, col. 1345, and Vol. XCII, col. 523 respectively.

[46]William Langland, Piers Plowman, edited by Elizabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall (London: Edward Arnold, 1967), p. 150n. All references to Piers Plowman will be to this edition.

[47]Ibid. p. 5. The application of Patristic exegesis to the study of medieval literature is, however, a matter of debate. For an attack and a defense, see E. Talbot Donaldson's "Patristic Exegesis in the Criticism of Medieval Literature: the Opposition," and R.E Kaske's "The Defense," in Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature, Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1958-9, edited by Dorothy Bethurum (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp. 1-26. Cf. Morton W. Bloomfield's "Symbolism in Medieval Literature," MP, Vol. LVI (1958), 73-81.

[48]Sir John Harington, A Preface, or rather a Briefe Apologie of Poetrie, and of the Author and Translator, prefixed to translation of Orlando Furioso (1591), edited by Gregory Smith in Elizabethan Critical Essays, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1904), Vol. II, 201-2.

[49]Ibid. Vol. II, 205-6.

[50]The New Catholic Encyclopaedia, 15 vols. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), Vol. XII, 30.

[51]Creed, St. Luke, p. xxxvii.

[52]Bede, Opera, Vol. CXX, 288n. and 290n. See also Glunz's comment in History of the Vulgate, p. 87.

[53]"Pour moi, je pense qu'il faut entendre par celui-ci l'un de ces mauvais esprits qui, par le fait qu'ils

pèchent avec une obstination irrévocable, sont enfoncés dans une telle affection du mal et de l'iniquité qu'ils ne sont plus des hôtes et des étrangers, mais comme des citoyens, et si l'on peut dire, des habitants du péché." Sermon VIII, translated by M.M. Davy in Oeuvres, 3 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1945), Vol. II, 349. Bernard's interpretation is not, of course, an exact paraphrase of Ambrose's "princeps . . . istius mundi," but rather an extension of it, the metaphor of "the world" being transferred to "the city of sin."

[54]La Bible Moralisée Conservée à Oxford, Paris et Londres, edited by Alexandre de Laborde, 4 vols. (Paris: Société française de réproductions de manuscripts à peintures, 1911-27).

[55]Cecidit super collum eius eum amoris amplexibus constringendo, et hoc per misericordiam concomitantem. Per collum autem, quia mediat inter corpus et caput ea invicem copulando, intelligi potest penitentia peccatoris, que inter deum et hominem mediat. . . . Cecidit ergo super collum eius et osculatus est eum, ipsum perfecte reconciliando per gratiam subsequentem. Sciendum est hic quod communis littera est accurrens et sic habent Beda et Clemens. Ambrosius tamen habet occurrens; Ieronimus autem in epistola de filio prodigo habet occurrens. MS 305, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Quoted Glunz, History of the Vulgate, p. 361.

[56]Middle English Sermons, edited by Woodburn O. Ross, EETS OS, Vol. 209 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940), p. 169. In this quotation, as in other quotations from Middle English, I have modernised the thorn.

[57]Ibid. pp. 169-70.

[58]The Early English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum, edited by Sidney J. Herrtage, EETS ES, Vol. 33 (London: N. Trübner & Co., 1879), p. 444.

[59]For information on Udall's translation and on Edward VI's injunction regarding the work, see The Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible 1525-1961, revised and expanded by A.S. Herbert from the 1903 edition of T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968), p. 39.

[60]The First Tome Or Volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus vpon the Newe Testamente, translated by Nicholas Udall, fol. cccxxvii[r]. Quotations are from the edition of 1551. Although Udall was responsible for the translation of the section on Luke as well as the preliminary dedication, other parts of the work were translated by Thomas Key, Miles Coverdale, John Olde and Leonard Coxe. Princess Mary (later Queen) did the greater part of St. John's Gospel. It is

worth pointing out that elsewhere Erasmus objected strongly to over-elaborate treatments of the Scriptures. As an example he refers to a sermon on the Prodigal Son which he heard in Paris and which the preacher, by means of describing the Prodigal's journey in great detail, was able to extend for the full forty days of Lent ("Audivi quendam teologum Parisiensem qui de filio prodigo parabolam in quadraginta dies protraxit, ut aequaret quadragesimae numerum, affingens iter abeuntis ac redeuntis, . . ."). This passage is from Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam in Erasmus' Ausgewählte Werke, edited by A. and H. Holborn (Munich: Beck, 1933), p. 282.

[61]For a discussion of the relationship of this statement to Calvin, see Joseph Haroutunian and Louise Pettibone Smith's edition of Calvin: Commentaries (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958), p. 28, and for a brief discussion of the English Humanists' approach to Biblical and Patristic texts, see Pearle Hogrefe's The Sir Thomas More Circle (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959), pp. 76-94.

[62]William Tyndale, Doctrinal Treatises, edited by Henry Walter for The Parker Society (Cambridge University Press, 1848), p. 307.

[63]Ibid. p. 85. The quotation comes from Tyndale's The Parable of the Wicked Mammon (1527).

[64]Calvin: Commentaries, edited by Haroutunian and Smith, p. 108.

[65]Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958-68), Vol. XXXVI, 110. The translation here is by A.T.W. Steinhäuser.

[66]Alison Mary Turner in "The Motif of the Prodigal Son in French and German Literature to 1910," unpublished dissertation at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1966), says that from 1522 onwards Luther preached an annual sermon on Luke 15 on the third Sunday after Whitsun. His sermon was usually concerned either with the parable of the Lost Sheep or that of the Lost Coin. However, he would occasionally deal with the Prodigal Son also (pp. 76-7). For this information Turner refers to J.F.M. Kat's "De verloren Zoon als letterkundig Motief," unpublished dissertation at the University of Nijmegen (1952), pp. 37-8 and footnote 6, p. 210.

[67]Luther's Works, edited by Lehmann, Vol. XLIII, 275.

[68]Luther's Meditations on the Gospels, edited and translated by Roland H. Bainton (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), p. 78.

[69]An interesting refutation of this kind of interpretation is offered by Cardinal John Henry Newman, who, in his exegesis of the parable, put great stress on the phrase "make me as one of thy hired servants." He stresses the importance of Christian duties such as attending Church, saying prayers and reading the Scriptures regularly. Such activities for Newman represent a "form and a task." They must be rendered blindly, as a first step, even if the Christian does not fully understand why. Such a suggestion is in direct contradiction of Luther's idea concerning the manner in which the repentant sinner should approach God, and it clearly implies the absolute acceptance of the Catholic Church's authority in knowing what is best for a sinner. See Parochial and Plain Sermons, 8 vols. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908-18), Vol. III, 91-4.

[70]"Non qualem fabricavit papa, sed qua filius offensum patrem sibi placat: nam haec humilitas redimendis offensis omnino necessaria est." This passage is from the Commentarius in Harmoniam Evangelicam, reprinted in Opera quae supersunt omnia, Vols. 29-87 of Corpus Reformatorum (Brunsvigae: Schwetschke, 1891), Vol. LXXIII, col. 509.

[71]Ibid. "Humano autem patri, qui non tantum filii delictis ignoscit, sed redeunti ultro occurrit, Deum comparat, cui non satis est veniam deprecantibus ignoscere, nisi etiam paterna indulgentia eos praeveniat" (Vol. LXXIII, col. 507).

[72]Ibid. "Hoc posterius membrum parabolae inhumanitatis eos accusat, qui Dei gratiam maligne restringere vellent, quasi miseris peccatoribus invideant salutem" (Vol. LXXIII, col. 510).

[73]The Two Liturgies A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552, edited by Joseph Ketley for The Parker Society (Cambridge University Press, 1844); Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, edited by William Keatinge for The Parker Society (Cambridge University Press, 1847).

[74]An Homilie of Repentance, and of true reconciliation vnto God, reprinted in Certaine Sermons Or Homilies appointed to be read in Chvrches, In the time of the late Queene Elizabeth of famous memory, facsimile edition of issue of 1623 with introduction by Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1968), p. 257. All references to the Homilies will be to this edition.

[75]When Pope Innocent III was Pontiff, the 4th Lateran Council of 1215 issued a decree which made annual confession at Easter before a parish priest an obligation. The Council of Trent in 1551 denied, however, that Confession began with

the decree of the 4th Lateran Council, claiming that Confession had been a part of Christian practice from the beginning.

[76]Murners Deutsche Schriften, edited by M. Spanier, 8 vols. (Berlin & Leipzig: Walter de Grunter & Co., 1925), Vol. III, 134-41.

[77]Robert Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy, edited by Holbrook Jackson, 3 vols. (London: Dent, 1932), Vol. I, 290.

[78]For a chronological list of extant iconographic representations of the parable of the Prodigal Son, see Appendix C.

[79]Frank Kendon, Mural Paintings in English Churches During the Middle Ages (London: John Lane, 1923), p. 82; C.E. Keyser, List of Buildings in Great Britain and Ireland having mural and other painted decorations, 3rd edition (London: HMSO, 1883), p. 44.

[80]For this information I am indebted to Rev. George H. Hurst of Brooke, Norfolk.

[81]M.R. James, "The Wall Paintings in Brooke Church," in A Supplement to Blomefield's Norfolk, edited by Clement Ingleby (London, 1929), pp. 14-25.

[82]On the matter of the transference of Ira's characteristics to Despair, see Susan Snyder's "Despair in Renaissance Tradition," SRen, Vol. XII (1965), 55-6. Of especial relevance here is the manner in which Ira in Prudentius' Psychomachia, after failing to kill Patientia in battle, then commits suicide with one of her own weapons (Psychomachia, edited and translated by H.J. Thomson, in Prudentius, 2 vols. [Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949], Vol. I, lines 151-54).

[83]Edward Croft-Murray, Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837, 2 vols. (London: Country Life, Ltd., 1962), Vol. I, 186b. See also "An Elizabethan Wallpainting," in The Times (August 29, 1935), p. 13 (illustration, p. 14). A certain W.C.B., writing on "Shakspeare and the Prodigal Son" in N&Q, 7th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1891), 305, mentions some early seventeenth century murals on the subject of the parable on the ground floor of an old house at Lenchwick, near Evesham, Worcs., but so far I have found no further information on these.

[84]Robert Dodsley (ed.), A Select Collection of Old English Plays, revised by W.C. Hazlitt, 15 vols., 4th edition (London: Reeves, 1874-6), Vol. XIII, 8. This collection hereafter referred to as Dodsley.

[85]Leigh's statement is referred to in W.C.B.'s "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 7th Series, Vol. XII, 305.

[86]W.G. Thomson, A History of Tapestry from the Earliest Times until the Present Day, revised edition (London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1930), pp. 240, 247, 249, 250, 251, 254, 258.

[87]Ibid. p. 274.

[88]Thomas Middleton, A Mad World My Masters, edited by Standish Henning, Regents Renaissance Drama Series (Univ. Nebr. Press, 1965), Act II, scene ii, 5-7, p. 24. That the subject may also have been depicted in reredoses is suggested by Matthew Paris' statement that early in the twelfth century Geoffrey, Abbot of St. Albans, ordered a reredose on the subject of the Prodigal Son for his church (Thomson, A History of Tapestry, p. 49).

[89]According to E.A.B. Barnard and A.J.B. Wace in "The Sheldon Tapestry Weavers and Works," Archaeologia, Vol. LXXVIII (1928), 304, there are, besides the set in the Victoria and Albert Museum, two cushions from another set in the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery at Swansea, while a single cushion and a set of six were in the private possession of Colonel Howard and Frank Partridge respectively. On the subject of the popularity of tapestry cushions of this kind, see Barnard and Wace's article, p. 311.

[90]Dialogue both pleasaunt and pietifull [sic], wherein is a godlie regiment against the Feuer Pestilence, p. 119. All quotations are from the 1573 edition of this work.

[91]Other references to painted hangings may be found in the following: Nicholas Breton, No Whippinge, edited by A.E. Davenport in The Whipper Pamphlets (Liverpool: University Press, 1951), pp. 4, 13, 21; Edmund Gayton, Pleasant Notes Upon Don Quixot (1654) in which he says that "the Acts of Dives and Lazarus . . . are seen in Puppet plaies, or painted cloth" (p. 270); Edward Hall, Chronicle, edited by Sir Henry Ellis (London, 1809), p. 587; Thomas Heywood, The English Traveller, edited by A. Wilson Verity (London: Mermaid, 1888), p. 168; in the inventory of the household furniture of the Earl of Leicester of 1583, reprinted in HMC Report on the MSS of Lord De L'Isle and Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place (London: HMSO, 1925), Vol. I, 279; Henry Porter, The Two Angry Women of Abingdon, in Dodsley, Vol. VII, 301; Barnabe Riche, Soldier's Wishe to Briton's Welfare, p. 1; Rowley and ?Middleton's A Match at Midnight, in Dodsley, Vol. XIII, 23.

[92]The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1953-61), Vol. III, 179. All references will be to this edition.

[93]The Muses' Looking Glass (pr. Oxford, 1638), p. 41.

[94]William Shakespeare, The First Folio, Norton Facsimile Edition, prepared by Charlton Hinman (New York: Norton & Co., 1968). All references and line-numberings of Shakespeare's plays will be from this edition. However, because the act and scene divisions conventionally employed by modern editors do not always coincide with those found in the First Folio, I have also included act, scene and line references, which, for the convenience of readers, have been taken from Hardin Craig's edition of The Complete Works of Shakespeare (New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951). References to Craig's text are given in square brackets. It should be noted that Craig uses the line-numbering of the Globe edition of Shakespeare.

[95]English Publishers in the Graphic Arts 1599-1700 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1963), p. 45.

[96]W.C.B., "Shakspeare and Droeshout," N&Q, 6th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1885), 325.

[97]A.W.C. Hallen, "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 9th Series, Vol. I (Jan.-June, 1898), 195-6.

[98]The work is attributed to Holbein by Anna B. Jameson and Elizabeth Eastlake in The History of Our Lord As Exemplified in Works of Art, 2 vols. (London: Longman, Green & Co., 1892), Vol. I, 386. Edward Morris, Keeper of Foreign Art at the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, tells me, however, that the work is now attributed to a follower of the Brunswick Monogrammist, working about 1530-60.

[99]Edward Peacock, "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 8th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1897), 385.

[100]OED: entry under "Prodigal."

[101]The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton (London, 1710), Extracts reprinted in The Restoration Stage, edited by John I. McCollum, Jr. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), p. 109.

[102]Washington Irving, Bracebridge Hall (London, 1823), p. 134.

[103]Peacock, "The Prodigal Son," 385.

[104]In Catholic England, the parable was read, as it still is in Catholic churches, on the day before the Third Sunday in Lent.

[105]The print is reproduced by Samuel Chew in The Pilgrimage of Life (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), fig. 77. It is described by him on page 94.

[106]This work is reproduced in Samuel Chew's The Virtues Reconciled: An Iconographic Study (University of Toronto Press, 1947), Plate 16. A version with the figures labelled in German is reproduced in T.W. Craik's The Tudor Interlude (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1958), Plate IV.

[107]Index Exegeticus, in PLat, Vol. CCXIX, col. 266.

[108]Isidorus, Sententiarum, Lib. II, in PLat, Vol. LXXXIII, col. 617: "Amplius laetatur Deus de anima desperata, et aliquando conversa, quam de ea quae nunquam exstitit perdita. Sicut de filio prodigo, qui mortuus fuerat, et revixit, perierat, et inventus est, de cujus regressu magnum fit gaudium patris."

[109]Bernard of Clairvaux, "De fuga et reductione filii prodigi" in PLat, Vol. CLXXXIII, 757-61 (see especially col. 758).

[110]Geoffrey Chaucer, The Complete Works, edited by Walter W. Skeat [1912] (Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 700. All references to Chaucer's works will be to this edition.

[111]Dante Alighieri, "Hell," in The Divine Comedy, Cantica I, translated by Dorothy Sayers (Penguin Books, 1949), pp. 152-3.

[112]The horror with which despair leading to suicide was regarded is clear from the fate of suicides in Elizabethan England who were buried in the public highway with a stake driven through their bodies, afterwards being covered with flints and pebbles. On this subject see Arthur H.R. Fairchild's Shakespeare and the Arts of Design, University of Missouri Studies, Vol. XII, 80 n.

[113]Reproduced in Chew's Virtues Reconciled, Plate 18.

[114]Owst, Literature and Pulpit, p. 90.

[115]Hardin Craig, English Religious Drama (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 342.

[116]The painting is in the Villa Albani in Rome and is reproduced in Vetter's Der verlorene Sohn, Plate 28.

[117]For a study of this work, see Grace Frank's The Medieval French Drama (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 217-21.

[118]Arthur Martin and Charles Cahier, Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges, Part One (Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand, 1841-4), pp. 179-88. It is interesting to compare certain French Books of Hours which are described by R.R. in "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 9th Series, Vol. I (Jan.-June, 1898), 136-7. These are of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. All of them depict the Prodigal making merry with harlots at an inn, and all show him leaving the inn in rags being mocked by the women who have brought about his downfall.

[119]In the scene as it appears in the window at Sens, three women were apparently involved, according to Henry Adams in Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres [1913] (New York: New American Library, 1961), p. 171.

[120]In the sculptured relief at Auxerre, in which the parable is presented in twelve panels, the Prodigal's dissipation is suggested by a scene in which two courtesans give him a bath. While one of them massages him, the other holds a checked towel for him to sit on while being dried. Needless to say, in the next panel we see him, naked except for his breeches, being beaten from the door with sticks (see, Réau, Iconographie, Vol. II, pt. II, 335). With regard to the detail of the Prodigal's being turned out, it is interesting to note that, according to E.C. Brewer in his Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, revised edition (London: Cassell, 1952), at the time of the Romans "Prodigal is latin pro-ago or prod-igo, to drive forth, and persons who had spent all their patrimony were 'driven forth' to be sold as slaves to their creditors" (p. 731b).

[121]M. Paul Durand, Monographie de Notre-Dame de Chartres (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881), p. 51.

[122]Kurt Kallensee, Die Liebe des Vaters; das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn in der christlichen Dichtung und bildenden Kunst (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstadt, 1960), Plates 25-40. Vetter in Der verlorene Sohn includes a photograph of an oak relief dating from around 1545 and now in the Amsterdam Reichsmuseum. This shows the Prodigal feasting at a table where he is entertained by courtesans. In the background the hostess can be seen totting up his bill (Plate 18). Of about the same date is Beham's engraving of the scene which is dated 1540 and is also reproduced by Vetter (Plate 20).

[123]Kallensee, Die Liebe des Vaters, Plates 25-32.

[124]Jameson and Eastlake, The History of Our Lord, Vol. I, 386. Another depiction of the feast scene is the woodcut by Jörg Breu the Elder, accompanying a German verse version of the parable, and reproduced in Craik's The Tudor Interlude, Plate II. Craik also reproduces a copy in reverse by an unidentified engraver, with the names of the

characters of Gnapheus' Prodigal Son play, Acolastus (Plate III). A quite different iconographic detail which was perhaps traditional was referred to by Thomas Kyd when he testified against Marlowe. This latter he accused of making irreverant jokes about the Prodigal Son's "portion" since "in all pictures" he is represented as grasping his purse so near the bottom that it must have been almost empty. On this matter see C.F. Tucker Brooke's Life of Marlowe (London: Methuen, 1930), p. 107.

[125]The Book of Vices and Virtues, p. 53. Cf. Chaucer's reference in The Pardoner's Tale to the tavern as a "develes temple" (p. 470).

[126]Thomas Hoccleve, The Regement of Princes, edited by Frederick J. Furnivall, EETS ES, Vol. 72 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1897), p. 23.

[127]John Earle, Microcosmography, edited by Harold Osborne (London: University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1933), pp. 31-2.

[128]"Postquam omnia fuerunt dissipata cum meretricibus, lenonibus, histrionibus et assatoribus, les rotisseurs, quando vacua fuit bursa et amplius nihil erat fricandum, et qui'il n'y avoit plus que frire, mittitur pulchra vestis domini bragantis, calige, bombicinium; quisquam secum ferebant peciam de monsieur le bragard, chausses et pourpoint, chascun en emportoit sa piece, ita quod in brevi tempore mon gallant fut mis en cuilleur de pommes, habillé comme ung brulleur de maisons, nud comme ung ver; meus gallandus fuit positus sicut collector pomorum, vestitus sicut combustor domorum, nudus sicut vermis. Vix ei remansit camisia, nette comme ung torchon, nouee sur l'espaule pour couvrir sa povre peau. Si bien l'avoient entretenu en sa prosperité et en ses pompes ces galoises, munda sicut torsorium coquine, nodata supra humerum ut cooperiat suam pauperem pellem, huiusmodi mulieres vultu virgineo applaudentes, que durante prosperitate sua comitabantur ipsum in pompis suis." See Michel Menot, Sermons Choisis: 1508-18 (Paris: Champion, 1924), pp. 382-3.

[129]On the iconographic presentations, see Réau, Iconographie, Vol. II, pt. II, 333-8; for the composers, see Auber's opera L'enfant prodigue (1850), with its libretto by Scribe, Debussy's cantata L'enfant prodigue (1884), and Benjamin Britten's church parable The Prodigal Son (1968); on the ballet The Prodigal Son, see David Martin's "Is this man really the country's best athlete?" Life (June 6, 1969), pp. 48-58; the works by Kafka, Rilke, Gide, Faulkner and Miller which I have in mind are Heimkehr, Malte, Le retour de l'enfant prodigue, The Reivers and Death of a Salesman respectively.

Chapter II:

[1]Other terms, such as "School Drama" and "Comoedia Sacra" have been used for this literary species, and I have merely chosen the one which emphasizes its Classical dependency, although in a sense the term "Christian Terence" is misleading since it is used to denote Christian plays based not only on the model of Terence but on that of Plautus as well. From this latter writer derives in particular the tavern and brothel element which is retained to illustrate the temptations and sins to which a young man is prone, and here, of course, we have an interesting link with the idea considered in the previous chapter, that of the tavern as a traditional motif of homiletic literature.

[2]Lily B. Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959), 145-206; C.H. Herford, Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge University Press, 1886), pp. 84-164; M.W. Wallace (ed.) The Birthe of Hercules (Chicago University Press, 1903), pp. 20-7, 46-59.

[3]E.K. Chambers, The Mediaeval Stage (Oxford University Press, 1903), Vol. II, 207.

[4]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 145.

[5]This edition is in the Huntington Library and is described by Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama [1954] (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), pp. 33, 160, 225, and 399n.

[6]Ibid. p. 161.

[7]Thomas Elyot, The Book Named the Governor, ed. S.E. Lehmberg (London: Dent, 1962), Book I, Ch. xiii, p. 48.

[8]Thomas Becon, A New Catechism (1530-4), reprinted in Works of Thomas Becon, edited by John Ayre for The Parker Society (Cambridge University Press, 1844), p. 382.

[9]Quoted in Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, pp. 164-5. Foster Watson in The English Grammar Schools to 1660 (Cambridge University Press, 1908) called this the most famous collection of foreign plays to be used in English schools (p. 322).

[10]Preface to The Plays of Hrotswitha, translated by Christopher St. John (London: Chatto and Windus, 1923),

p. xxvi. Although Hrotwsitha claims Terence as her master, she does not imitate him at all in many respects. She appears indifferent to the unities, she writes in prose, and, as she admits in the passage quoted here, unlike Terence she deals with the heroic adherence of women to chastity rather than with their frailty.

[11]Herford, Literary Relations, p. 80.

[12]In fact as early as 1470 Jacob Wimpheling had written his Stylpho. See Wallace, The Birthe of Hercules, p. 46.

[13]Herford, Literary Relations, p. 84.

[14]The plot-structure of Latin comedy has been analysed by T.W. Baldwin in his Shakspere's Five-Act Structure (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1947), pp. 8-9, and by Northrup Frye in his essay "The Argument of Comedy" in English Institute Essays (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), pp. 58-73, and in his Anatomy of Criticism [1957] (New York: Atheneum, 1967), pp. 44, 163-86.

[15]In Viperanus' Filius Prodigus (1593) the comedy is made to resemble Terentian comedy even more closely in that the father desires to marry the prodigal's elder brother to the daughter of an old friend of his. The elder brother, who is in love with another girl, disappears on the wedding day, and the younger brother turns up in time to wed the girl instead. For a description of this play and of a number of other Neo-Latin Prodigal Son plays, see Leicester Bradner's "The Latin Drama of the Renaissance, 1340-1640," SRen, Vol. IV (1957), 31-54.

[16]The fragment has been reprinted in Malone Society Collections (Oxford University Press, 1907), Vol. I, i, 26-30, where a certain amount of bibliographical information is also given. Further information is given in Entry 19 of W.W. Greg's A Bibliography of the Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols. (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1939-59), Vol. I, 93.

[17]For an account of Textor's works, see W. Creizenach, Geschichte des Neueren Dramas, 3 vols. (Halle: Niemeyer, 1911-23), Vol. II, 56-62, Vol. III, 468-9.

[18]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 175.

[19]Ibid. p. 194.

[20]J. Ravisii Textoris dialogi aliquot festivissimi item eiusdem epigrammatica (London, 1581), fol. 136[r].

[21]Listed in the Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1959), Vol. CLXXXV, cols. 8-9, are editions of Textor's Dialogi dated 1530, 1534, 1536, 1542, 1558, etc. F. Holthausen reprints both Textor's Thersites and Juvenis, Pater et Vxor in "Studien zum älteren englischen Drama," Englische Studien, Vol. XXXI (1902), 77-103. On page 78 he wrongly states, however, that the first edition of Textor's plays was 1536.

[22]Frederick S. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age (Oxford University Press, 1914), p. 21.

[23]Frederick S. Boas, An Introduction to Tudor Drama (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 26. We can cite these dates because the epilogue prays for King Henry, the young Prince Edward, who was born on the 12th October, and his mother, "Lovely Lady Jane," who died on the 24th October.

[24]This work has been reprinted by J.S. Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays, 1st Series (London: Early English Drama Society, 1905), pp. 194-226.

[25]All quotations and references will be to the English edition of 1581. There appear to be certain errors of pagination in this edition and I have not renumbered the pages in any way.

[26]Creizenach, Geschichte, Vol. II, 61n.

[27]Tu quoniam consilio meo acquiescere recusasti perpetere quicquid meritò pateris. Nam quod pertulisti nihil est, longe plura passurus es. Quod si soli id contingere cogitas, audi turbulentam Socratis Xantippen. Audi quibus conuiciis maritum insectetur obtundere. (fol. 50^{v})

[28]Vide spectator, hic prodigorum finis, vbi omnia stulte decoxerunt, nudi redeunt ad mendicitatem. Meretrices vero similes sunt formicis, quae vacua granaria deserunt. (fol. 146^{r})

[29]Malone Society Collections, I, i, line 5, p. 27. All references to the English work will be to this edition. I have suggested here that Filius' cries are off-stage. At line 26, which follows the third of Filius' cries and immediately precedes his monologue, there is the stage direction "Here the sonne cometh in agayne lamentably sayenge as foloweth."

[30]Sir John, of course, is the name of the fast-living priest in John Heywood's Johan Johan, a farce which significantly also concerns itself with a shrewish wife and a henpecked husband. Furthermore Heywood's work was printed by

William Rastell in 1533. It is hard not to conclude that there is some connection between Heywood's Sir John and the character alluded to in the English fragment, though no critic, as far as I know, has commented on this interesting matter.

[31]Compare Textor's "O quam miseri sunt qui vxoribus suis nubunt, miseri inquam, quibus vxores imperant, verum nunc experior quid mihi pater praedixerat, multas in matrimonio esse miserias, miserum me, quid agam" (fol. 49[r]).

[32]Although the English fragment is very close to Textor's original with regard to the points I have mentioned, I should point out that it closes with an episode for which there is no parallel in Textor. Filius comes to his own house where he tries to sell wood to a servant who fails to recognize him. The servant "cometh in spekynge some straunge language" and Filius is forced to admit that he cannot understand Latin having never been at "Oxynby / No, nor yet in Cambrydge nor other insteuynste [sic]" (lines 57-8, p. 29). The servant then tells him to say "vniuersyte, not insteuynste" (line 59, p. 29). This amusing and delightfully dramatic elaboration is obviously designed to bring home the author's moral even more strongly.

[33]L. Petit de Julleville, Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au moyen âge (Paris: Leopold Cerf, 1885), p. 58. See also R.W. Bond (ed.), Early Plays from the Italian (Oxford University Press, 1911), pp. xciv and xcix. For discussions of most of these works, see Bond's Early Plays From the Italian, pp. xcii-ciii, and W.E.D. Atkinson's edition of Acolastus, University of W. Ontario Studies in the Humanities, No. 3 (London, Ontario, 1964), pp. 1-81 and 207-27.

[34]There has been some discussion among those who have written on the Continental Prodigal Son plays as to the extent Gnapheus may have been influenced by earlier dramatic versions of the parable. The various possibilities are summarized by Atkinson in his edition of Acolastus, pp. 207-25. Surprisingly no mention is made of Textor's De filio prodigo which, it seems to me, may well have contributed something to Acolastus, while Bolte's claim in his edition of Acolastus (Berlin, 1891) [Microfilm] that Acolastus was the first Biblical Latin school comedy is patently inaccurate (p. XIII).

[35]Atkinson (ed.), Acolastus, p. 2.

[36]Bond (ed.), Early Plays, p. xcix. Guicciardini is quoted by John Dover Wilson in "Euphues and the Prodigal Son," Library, n.s., Vol. X (1909), 341.

[37]Bolte (ed.), Acolastus, pp. XIV-VI and XXIV-XXVII. Bradner, "Latin Drama of the Renaissance," 61.

[38]The Governor, Book I, Ch. X, p. 28.

[39]P.L. Carver (ed.), Palsgrave's Acolastus, EETS OS, Vol. 202 (London: OUP, 1937), lines 16-27, p. 4, and lines 2-13, 30-4, p. 6. Unless otherwise stated all references to both Gnapheus' work and to Palsgrave's translation will be to this edition.

[40]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 163.

[41]Acolastus, lines 21-33, p. 3.

[42]Palsgrave's Dedication to Henry VIII, reprinted in Carver's edition, lines 16-33, p. 3. The fact that Lily's Grammar was not published until 1542, that is, two years after Acolastus, appears at first to be a problem. However, Carver has been able to show (pp. 183-4) how part of the grammar was printed in 1540 but was kept in the printer's control until 1542 when the whole book was ready.

[43]Herford in Literary Relations states that the 1585 edition was printed in London (p. 158). He does not clarify whether the text he refers to was a reprint of Gnapheus' or Palsgrave's work, but my correspondence with A. Halcrow, Sub-Librarian of Trinity College Library, Cambridge, has revealed that the 1585 edition of Acolastus, of which so far as I know Trinity College possesses a unique copy, was of the Latin text only.

[44]Acolastus, pp. 13-14. Palsgrave's exposition of the meaning of "Acolastus" appears to derive, as Carver points out, from Estienne's Thesaurus, which has "Acolastus, . . . Prodigus, intemperans, immodestus, lascivus, libidinosus, infraenis, immoderatus . . ." (Quoted by Carver, p. 186 n.).

[45]For the probable connection of Palsgrave with Sir Thomas More and others, see Hogrefe, The Sir Thomas More Circle, p. 154. Cf. Carver (ed.), Acolastus, pp. xvi-viii.

[46]The Works of Thomas Nashe, ed. R.B. McKerrow [1904-10], 5 vols., revised F.P. Wilson (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1958), Vol. II, 249-50, and Vol. IV, 274 n.

[47]Ibid. Vol. III, 247.

[48]Non licuit in hoc Dramate singula vitiorum genera, atque crassiora vulgi flagitia, more veteris comoediae flagellare. Id enim in Asoto, reliquisque doctissimae Germaniae comoediis, tum potissimum in concionibus quotidianis . . . abunde est praestitum.

BM Lansdowne 1073, quoted Herford, Literary Relations, p. 140n. Herford also notes that Foxe's work was first translated into English by John Day, the printer, in 1579 (see p. 139n.).

[49]The connection between The Anatomy of Wit and Acolastus is discussed in Wilson's "Euphues and the Prodigal Son," Library, New Series, Vol. X, (1909), 337-61.

[50]Of interest here is the fact that in Stymmelius' Studentes the father is actually named Eubulus, while in Richard Edwards' Damon and Pythias (1565) the name is used for a wise, out-spoken counsellor, as it is in Norton and Sackville's Gorboduc (1562).

[51]As Wilson points out ("Euphues and the Prodigal Son," 356), Lucilla, though a lady, is not so very far removed from Lais, the courtesan in Acolastus: "'Her Lilly cheeks dyed with Vermilion red,' her quite astonishing fickleness, her supper party and love of cards, and finally the 'awful end' that awaited her, all show her to be the 'meretrix' of the prodigal son story." It is interesting to note that The Anatomy of Wit was not the only work in which Lyly made use of the parable of the Prodigal Son. The pattern of the parable recurs several times in Euphues and his England. When Euphues and Philautus are travelling to England, the former tells the tale of Callimachus, a prodigal son. Callimachus has an uncle who is a prodigal who has repented. Not content with this number of former prodigals, which of course includes Euphues, Lyly introduces another, Fidus, whom Euphues and Philautus meet when they arrive in England.

[52]Ben Jonson: Works, edited by C.H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn M. Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52), Vol. IV, lines 100-101, p. 138. It is also interesting to note that there is a female character called Philautia in the same play.

[53]Barnfield in "An Ode" which appears in Poems: In diuers humors (1598) may possibly be demonstrating an acquaintance with Acolastus when he presents himself as a prodigal who has been beguiled, flattered, given women on command and then, when his money was spent, is rejected.

[54]Wilson, "Euphues and the Prodigal Son," 354, and Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 169.

[55]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 152.

[56]Atkinson (ed.), Acolastus, p. 84.

[57]Carver (ed.), Acolastus, line 8, p. 16.

[58]Ibid. lines 31-2, p. 16.

[59]This aspect is dealt with at length by Atkinson in the introduction to his edition of Acolastus, pp. 26-46.

[60]Desiderii Erasmusi, Operum Omnium: "Pater indulgens, partitus est inter duos filios substantium, . . . non tamen sine spe profectus" (Vol. VII, col. 406).

[61]For an argument that Gnapheus may have intended the meaning "admonish," see Carver, Acolastus, p. 185n.

[62]See also V, iii, 3, p. 164.

[63]Atkinson (ed.), Acolastus, pp. 51-67.

[64]Gnapheus later became a Protestant and a stalwart of the Zwinglian Church. See Abraham Bronson Feldman, "Gnapheus in England," MLN, Vol. LXVII (1952), 325.

[65]Atkinson (ed.), Acolastus, pp. 51-2.

[66]Of the seventeen panels in the window at Bourges, for example, six are devoted to such scenes. See Martin and Cahier, Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges, pp. 179-88.

[67]The plots of the two last-named works are summarized for purposes of comparison with Gnapheus' play by Atkinson in his edition of Acolastus, pp. 217-9 and pp. 208-10 respectively.

[68]Elyot, The Governor, Book I, Ch. xiii, pp. 47-8. Elyot is here advocating the reading of Terence and Plautus in spite of the charges of immorality against them, but his argument might equally well have been applied to Gnapheus.

[69]There is an interesting contemporary illustration of the banquet scene by an unidentified Flemish engraver. It is now in the Douce Collection at the Bodleian Library. It is a copy in reverse of a woodcut by Jörg Breu the Elder. In the copy the names of characters in Acolastus have been added and certain details of the scene changed in order that they might conform to the corresponding scene in the play. The characters in the copy include the flute-player as well as the more important figures involved in the scene. Both the original woodcut and its copy have been reproduced in Craik's The Tudor Interlude, Plates II and III.

[70]Another traditional element, referred to in Chapter I, might be mentioned here. Before Acolastus returns to his father, he goes through a state of despair in which he contemplates suicide (V, ii, 4-8, p. 161). Here Gnapheus may be following the Patristic interpretations of the word "perierat" in the parable as "in desperatione" or he may be influenced by iconographic versions of the parable which had associated the Prodigal Son with despair and suicide, an example preceding Acolastus being the mural in Brooke Parish Church. As will be seen, the motif of the prodigal's despair occurs frequently in later Prodigal Son plays.

[71]Cf. the lines in Richard Barnfield's "An Ode" in Poems: In Diuers Humors (1598) in which the poet speaks of himself as a former prodigal. Describing the flattery accorded prodigals, he says: "Bountifull, they will him call. / And with such-like flattering, / Pitty but he were a King" (lines 38-40). The poem is edited by Edward Arber in Barnfield's Poems 1594-8 (Birmingham: Arber, 1883), p. 121.

[72]F.J. Furnivall and Alfred W. Pollard (eds.), The Macro Plays, EETS ES, Vol. 91, (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1904), line 276, p. 85. All quotations from the Macro Plays will be from this edition.

[73]Ibid. line 17, p. 36.

[74]On the age of the protagonist, see W.R. Mackenzie, The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1914), pp. 82-83.

[75]This particular motif is also to be found in many works purporting to be fatherly advice to a son. An amusing use of the motif is to be found in the scene between Polonius and his two children in Hamlet [I, iii, 55-81] (I, iii, 520-46). Three of the best-known of such works have been edited by Louis B. Wright in Advice to a Son: Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1962). Wright's introduction contains a discussion of the genre. Many titles of other such works are listed by W. Lee Ustick in "Advice to a son: a type of seventeenth-century conduct book," SP, Vol. XXIX (1932), 409-41.

[76]In Everyman, as in the parable, the metaphor of the journey is used for mankind's passage through the world towards final salvation. In other works, such as The Castell and Mundus et Infans, we follow the protagonist through the various ages of man from infancy to the coming of death, the emphasis in the central metaphor here being chronological rather than geographical.

[77]Macro Plays, line 568, p. 94.

[78]Mundus et Infans, edited by John M. Manly, Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama (Boston: Ginn, 1897), Vol. I, line 73, p. 356.

[79]John S. Farmer (ed.), Lost Tudor Plays (London: Early English Drama Society, 1905), pp. 57-8; Lewis Wager, The Life and Repentaunce of Marie Magdalene, ed. Frederic Ives Carpenter, New and Revised Edition (Chicago University Press, 1904), lines 536-7, p. 26, lines 582-9, p. 28, lines 602-7, 610-13, p. 29.

[80]Farmer (ed.), Lost Tudor Plays, p. 57.

[81]The Book of Vices and Virtues: A 14th Century English Translation of 'Somme Le Roi' of Lorens D'Orleans, edited by W. Nelson Francis, EETS OS, Vol. 217 (London: OUP, 1942), p. 286.

[82]Mary Magdalene, Part One, in The Digby Mysteries, edited by F.J. Furnivall, EETS ES, Vol. 70 (London: N. Trübner and Co., 1882), pp. 72-5.

[83]Farmer (ed.), Lost Tudor Plays, p. 81.

[84]Farmer (ed.), Six Anonymous Plays, p. 19.

[85]Furnivall and Pollard (eds.), Macro Plays, line 602, p. 22.

[86]Ibid. line 880, p. 64.

[87]Hickscorner, edited by Manly, Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama, Vol. I, line 874, p. 415, and line 1000, p. 419.

[88]Furnivall and Pollard (eds.), Macro Plays, line 543, p. 53.

[89]Wager, Marie Magdalene, lines 1263-4, p. 56.

[90]Furnivall and Pollard (eds.), Macro Plays, lines 824-5, p. 31.

[91]Manly (ed.), Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama, Vol. I, lines 854-5, p. 381.

[92]Furnivall and Pollard (eds.), Macro Plays, lines 838-9, p. 31.

[93]G.R. Owst, Preaching in Medieval England (Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 335.

[94]MS Caius College Cambridge, 334, fol. 177 et seq. Quoted Owst, Preaching in Medieval England, p. 335.

[95]A.P. Rossiter, English Drama From Early Times To The Elizabethans (London: Hutchinson and Co. Ltd., 1950), p. 114.

[96]Manly (ed.), Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama, Vol. I, lines 779-88, p. 448.

[97]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 195.

[98]Ibid. p. 195; Doran, Endeavors of Art, p. 142.

[99]*Lusty Juventus*, edited by John S. Farmer in *The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend* (London: Early English Drama Society, 1905), p. 39. All quotations from this play will be from this edition.

[100]There are three extant undated editions of the play. That printed by William Copland and edited by J.S. Farmer and that printed by Abraham Vele have a prayer for the King at the end. That printed by Awdely has a prayer for Queen Elizabeth. Although the work was entered on the Stationers Register in 1560, and although these extant editions date from the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the play is still assumed to have been written during the reign of Edward VI.

[101]It has been pointed out that this song, in a slightly altered form, also appears in the play of *Sir Thomas More*. See Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama*, p. 196.

[102]At one point (pp. 17-18) in this scene Hypocrisy launches into a needlessly long list of articles and offices associated with Catholicism as examples of superstitions accepted in the guise of religion. While this advances Wever's anti-Catholic point of view, it is a somewhat awkward intrusion into the dramatic movement of the play.

[103]*Nice Wanton*, edited by J.S. Farmer, *Dramatic Writings of Wever and Ingelend*, pp. 95, 108, 109. All quotations from *Nice Wanton* will be from this edition.

[104]Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, Vol. II, 223, 460.

[105]Alois Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare* (Strasburg: Trübner, 1898), LXXII: "Eine deutliche Bearbeitung der Rebelles des niederländischen Rectors Macropedius, doch mit allerlei originellen Veränderung." That such a misleading view still has currency can be seen in a recent article dealing with Prodigal Son dramas in which John Doebler states, in "Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and the Prodigal Son plays," *SEL*, Vol. V (1965), that "*Nice Wanton* (1560) is an English adaptation of another Prodigal Son play by Macropedius called *Rebelles*" (p. 334). Cf. A.B. Feldman, "Dutch Humanism and the Tudor Dramatic Tradition," *N&Q*, Vol. 197 (Jan.-Dec., 1952), 358. The view that *Nice Wanton* is an adaptation of *Rebelles* has been questioned by C.F. Tucker Brooke in *The Tudor Drama* [1911] (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1939), pp. 124-5, and by Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama*, p. 197.

[106]The plot of *Rebelles* is summarised by Herford, *Literary Relations*, pp. 155-6, and Bond (ed.), *Early Plays from the Italian*, pp. xcix-c.

[107]Dalilah is "full of pain," "crooked," "stuff'd with diseases," her "flesh eaten with pox," her "bones full of ache," she is losing her hair, and she is going blind (p. 104). For the various symptoms of syphilis, see The British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice, edited by Sir Humphrey Rolleston, et al., 12 vols. (London: Butterworth & Co., 1936-9), Vol. XI, 526-92.

[108]Mackenzie, The English Moralities, p. 238.

[109]Ibid. p. 13. This idea is central to his thesis as to the development of the Morality play.

[110]Calvin: Commentaries, translated and edited by Haroutunian and Smith, pp. 293-4.

[111]Ibid. p. 298.

[112]Middle English Sermons, edited by Ross, p. 165.

[113]But see the hostile interpretation of the father in the parable in the exegesis by Edwin McNeil Poteat, Parables of Crisis (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), pp. 134-50. Poteat sees the father as also a prodigal--a materialist, casual and worldly in the rearing of the two sons and sentimental in his forgiveness.

[114]The Babees Book, edited by F.J. Furnivall, EETS OS, Vol. 32 (London: Trübner and Co., 1868), lines 25-36, pp. 71-2.

[115]William Baldwin, A Treatise of Morall Philosophie, edited by Robert Hood Bowers (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967), p. 163.

[116]Thomas Becon, A New Catechism in Works of Thomas Becon, p. 352.

[117]Richard Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy, edited by Holbrook Jackson, 3 vols. (London: Dent, 1932) Vol. I, 334-5. Significantly, there is a marginal annotation at this point giving the proverb "He that spareth the rod hates the son."

[118]For a discussion of this whole topic, see Christopher Hill's chapter "The Spiritualization of the Household" in Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England [1964] (London: Mercury Books, 1966), pp. 443-81.

[119]Richard Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, 2 vols. (London: Dent, 1907), Vol. I, 191.

[120]Many such works are referred to by Hill in Society and Puritanism, and by L.B. Wright in Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1935).

[121]Here one may surmise that an unusual transfer has been made. Where traditionally it was the Prodigal Son who was reduced to despair and to the contemplation of suicide, in this instance it is his erring parent.

[122]In the Geneva Bible in the "Brief Table of the Interpretation of the Propre Names," Barnabas is interpreted as "the sonne of consolation" and the reference to Acts 4: 36 is given (sig. HHh. iii^{v}).

Chapter III:

[1]E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923), Vol. III, 351; Edward Arber (ed.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554-1640, 5 vols. [1875-77] (New York: P. Smith, 1950), Vol. I, 398.

[2]Sidney Lee in DNB, Vol. X, 432, says that the author of the work "may be the Thomas Ingelend who married Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of Walter Apparye, and had a son William, who as heir of his mother claimed copyhold lands at Clyffe, Northamptonshire." The colophon is reproduced in Farmer's edition of The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend, p. 1. All references to the play will be to this edition. It is interesting to note that this is not the only connection Thomas Colwell had with literary versions of the parable of the Prodigal Son. In 1562-3 he had licence to print "The repentance shewed by the Prodigal Child" (Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. II, 391).

[3]Campbell, Divine Poetry and Drama, p. 199.

[4]Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, Vol. III, 351; Alfred Harbage, Annals of English Drama, 975-1700, revised by S. Schoenbaum (London: Methuen, 1964), pp. 36-7.

[5]The relationship between the two texts has been briefly discussed by F. Holthausen, "Studien zum älteren englischen Drama," ES, Vol. XXXI (1902), 101-3. Holthausen is more concerned with pointing out Ingelend's additions to the original, and in doing so he has neglected to show just how close to translation much of Ingelend's work is.

[6]It might be noted that the cook is a stock figure in a number of Plautus' plays. Ingelend's scenes may perhaps owe something to Aulularia, III, i and v, and Pseudolus, I, ii, and III, ii.

[7]George G. Coulton, Ten Medieval Studies [1906] (Becon Hill, Boston: Becon Press, 1959), pp. 191-2.

[8]Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism [1904-5], transl., Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958), p. 80. The whole concept of education implied by Ingelend's Prologue is, of course, related to the so-called "Protestant ethic." Weber's work is the classic study of this phenomenon. More specifically concerned with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are the following:

Hill, Society and Puritanism in Pre-revolutionary England, L.C. Knights, Society and Drama in the Age of Jonson [1937] (Peregrine Books, 1962), R.H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism [1926] (Pelican Books, 1938), and Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. All of these writers quote a great deal of material from the period, and, in making the assumptions that I have made concerning post-Reformation attitudes to education, work, thrift, and so on, I have drawn fairly heavily on these studies.

[9]Ross (ed.), Middle English Sermons, lines 14-20, p. 119. Cf. Thomas F. Simmons and Henry E. Nolloth (eds.), The Lay Folks' Catechism, or the English and Latin Versions of Archbishop Thoresby's Instruction for the People, EETS OS, Vol. 118 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1901), pp. 42-3; Francis (ed.), The Book of Vices and Virtues, p. 3; Rubi D.N. Warner (ed.), Early English Homilies, EETS OS, Vol. 152 (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1917), pp. 10, 11, 20-6; Edward Peacock (ed.), John Myrc's Instructions for Parish Priests, EETS OS, Vol. 31 (London: N. Trübner, 1868), p. 31.

[10]Becon, A New Catechism, set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son, p. 85.

[11]Ibid. p. 94.

[12]Ibid. pp. 385-6; Baldwin, A Treatise of Morall Philosophie, p. 162.

[13]Edward VI, A Short Catechisme, edited by Joseph Ketley in The Two Liturgies A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552, p. 497.

[14]Hogrefe, The Sir Thomas More Circle, p. 171. For what might be considered the various Elizabethan attitudes towards corporal punishment, see the preliminary dialogue on the subject in the Preface to the Reader of Ascham's The Scholemaster (1570), edited by R.J. Schoek (Don Mills, Ontario: Dent, 1966), p. 13. This passage also contains a well-known reference to the fact that "this morning, . . . divers scholars of Eton be run away from the school for fear of beating" (p. 12). In 1563 when the conversation in The Scholemaster is supposedly taking place, the headmaster at Eton was William Marlim. Christopher Hollis, Eton (London: Hollis and Carter, 1960) notes that in 1563 the scholars of Eton, probably under the supervision of Marlim, sent Elizabeth a book of verses now in the British Museum (King's MS. 12, A. XXX) petitioning her to give Marlim some preferment (p. 49). The work contained extravagant compliments comparing the Queen to Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Gideon, Sampson, Samuel, Judith, Minerva, Venus, Juno and Lucretia. The volume concludes with a Latin prayer that the Queen may be preserved from the plague (see H.C. Maxwell Lyte, A History of Eton College, London: Macmillan and Co., 1875, p. 176). Since

the conversation in Ascham's book is taking place at Windsor where the Queen is avoiding the plague, it would seem very likely that Ascham actually has Marlim in mind.

[15]One major change from the original parable which I have not so far mentioned is the total omission in The Disobedient Child of the Elder Brother. Had he appeared he would doubtless have had a role similar to that of Barnabas in Nice Wanton--a figure of virtue, attentive to wise advice, and a good student.

[16]David Bevington, "Misogonus and Laurentius Bariona," ELN, Vol. II (1964), 9.

[17]Bond (ed.), Early Plays from the Italian, pp. ciii-ciii. All references to the text of Misogonus will be to Bond's edition.

[18]Under the name "Laur. Bariona" was published a small Latin treatise entitled Cometographia concerning the comet which appeared on 10 November, 1577. The work contained an epistle by the author dated Kettering, January 20, 1578 ("Vale Ketteringa Januarij 20. 1578"). According to G.L. Kittredge, the epistle reveals the author as "an enthusiastic Anglican and a fervent admirer of Elizabeth." Kittredge also points out that Kettering is near Cambridge. G.L. Kittredge, "The Misogonus and Laurence Johnson," JEGP, Vol. III (1901), 338.

[19]Bevington, "Misogonus and Laurentius Bariona," 9-10. Bevington points out that in the very next verse Christ puns upon Peter's name: "thou art Peter, and upon this rocke I wil buyld my Church" (Matthew 16: 18). It was this well-known pun which probably gave Johnson the idea for his own.

[20]For an argument that Rudd was the author, that Richards wrote the Prologue, and that Johnson was the transcriber, see G.C. Moore-Smith's letter to the TLS (July 10, 1930), 576.

[21]Johnson's connection has already been mentioned. In 1571 a Thomas Richards proceeded to a B.A. at Trinity College, and in 1570 Antony Rudd graduated as an M.A. at Trinity College, Cambridge, becoming a B.D. in 1577, the year in which Johnson took his M.A. See Samuel A. Tannenbaum, "A Note on Misogonus," MLN, Vol. XLV (1930), 309. For a convincing argument that Richards, whether or not he was the same as Richards at Trinity in 1571, was only the scribe, see Samuel A. Tannenbaum's Shaksperian Scraps (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), pp. 132-5.

[22]Wilson in The English Drama, 1485-1585 suggests that the play was acted between 1568 and 1574 at Trinity College (p. 98). Presumably he bases his guess on the fact that a considerable number of plays are known to have been given at Trinity between 1568 and 1569, and between 1573 and 1574. See "Transcripts of Records of theatrical activities in Cambridge Colleges," ed. W.W. Greg, Malone Society Collections (1923), Vol. II, ii, 166-68.

[23]Clement Robinson, A Handefull of Plesant Delites (1584), edited by Hyder E. Rollins [1924] (New York: Dover Publications, 1965), pp. 120-1.

[24]Malone Society Collections, Vol. II, ii, 161 and 165. Some attempt has been made to date the play as early as 1560 (see Bond, Early Plays from the Italian, pp. 170-71), the 1577 manuscript then representing a later revision. Though an early dating is, in my opinion, difficult to accept, it would make it more likely that the author of Misogonus had seen the Dutch plays performed at Trinity College in the early 1560's.

[25]The crucial scene in which Eupelas and Misogonus meet is in fact missing from the MS but one can infer afterwards what has happened. See Misogonus, p. 192.

[26]It is interesting that the term "childes parte" is that used by Udall in his translation of Erasmus' Paraphrase in the section dealing with the Prodigal Son parable (fol. 327[r]).

[27]On Cacurgus, see Bernard Spivack, Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), pp. 328-31.

[28]For a note on the English character of Misogonus, see Bond, Early Plays from the Italian, pp. xci-ii, and Tucker Brooke, The Tudor Drama, pp. 166-7.

[29]Charles T. Prouty, George Gascoigne, Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier and Poet (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 20-1 and 25.

[30]All references to Gascoigne's works will be to The Complete Works of George Gascoigne, 2 vols., edited by John W. Cunliffe (Cambridge University Press, 1907 and 1910).

[31]For a summary of the various legal affairs in which Gascoigne was involved, see Prouty, George Gascoigne, Ch. II, pp. 22-48.

[32]"Petition Against the Return of George Gascoigne, The Poet, To Parliament" reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. XXXVI (1851), pt. ii, 241-44 (see p. 243 for the passage quoted in my text). The Petition and the charges made in it are discussed fully by Prouty in George Gascoigne, Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet, pp. 61-5.

[33]"Petition Against the Return of George Gascoigne," pp. 243-4.

[34]Prouty, George Gascoigne, p. 87.

[35]That there was a comparison to be made between Gascoigne and Greene was recognized by Gabriel Harvey who said in the second letter of Fovre Letters and certeine Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene (1592), "I once bemoned the decayed and blasted estate of M. Gascoigne: who wanted not some commendable parts of conceit, and endeuour: but vnhappy M. Gascoigne, how Lordly happy, in comparison of most-vnhappy M. Greene?" (G.B. Harrison, ed., Fovre Letters and certeine Sonnets, The Bodley Head Quartos [London: John Lane: The Bodley Head Ltd., 1922], p. 21.) The Mourning Garment follows the story of the parable throughout, preserving words and a number of phrases from the original. It also retains the episode of the elder brother, but a number of elaborate narrative digressions are added, an example being the long section devoted to the story of Alexis' love for Rosamond told to Philador by a Thessalian shepherd. Certain other works of Greene also contain elements derived from the parable. These have been pointed out by John C. Jordan, Robert Greene (New York: Columbia University Press, 1915), pp. 53-81.

[36]Grosart (ed.), The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, Vol. IX, 120.

[37]Ibid. Vol. IX, 123.

[38]Felix E. Schelling, The Life and Writings of George Gascoigne (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1893), p. 45. It was C.H. Herford, however, who first recognized Gascoigne's play as a Prodigal Son drama in his Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 149-52, and 158-64.

[39]On this point see Herford, Studies in Literary Relations, pp. 159-60, and Prouty, George Gascoigne, pp. 182-3. At pp. 162-3 of his book Herford gives a convenient and revealing summary in tabular form of the points in common which Gascoigne's play has with Acolastus, Studentes, and Rebelles.

[40]For examples of Phylopaes' behaviour, see especially V, ii, pp. 72-3; V, iii, p. 77; V, viii, p. 83.

[41]On the links between Calvinism and Geneva no comment is required, but for the matter of Antwerp, see New Catholic Encyclopaedia, Vol. I, 648.

[42]Abraham B. Feldman, "Dutch Humanism and the Tudor Dramatic Tradition," N&Q, Vol. 197 (Jan. - Dec., 1952), p. 359. See also John Lothrop Motley, The Rise of the Dutch Republic, 3 vols. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1906), Vol. I, 209.

[43]From the first of the letters which prefaced his expurgated and revised edition of A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres we learn that he had been attacked because some of his verses "have not onely bene offensive for sundrie wanton speeches and lascivious phrases, but further . . . the same have beene doubtfully construed, and (therefore) scandalous" (Works, Vol. I, 3). We can possibly infer who his attackers were since this letter is addressed in apology "To the reverende Divines, unto whom these Posies shall happen to be presented" (Works, Vol. I, 3). These "Divines" were probably the Queen's Majesty's Commissioners, later known (after 1580) as the Court of High Commission, who possessed the power to censor "ydle Bookes or wanton Pamphlettes" (Prouty, George Gascoigne, p. 79). On the matter of the Commissioners' powers of censorship, see Roland G. Usher's The Rise and Fall of the High Commission [1913], reprinted with a new introduction by Philip Tyler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 54.

[44]Lawrence V. Ryan, Roger Ascham (Stanford University Press, 1963), p. 333n. On this matter Ryan quotes More's translation of The Lyfe of Johan Picus Erle of Myrandula (?1510), "where wonder is expressed that Pico enjoyed both ready wit and an astonishingly retentive memory: 'For they that are swift in taking be oftentimes slow in remembering/ and they that with more labor and difficulty receive it: more fast and surely hold it' (fol. A_{iv}^{v})." For Ascham's own allusions to the commonplace comparison, see The Scholemaster, edited by Schoek, pp. 14, 25-6. Of especial significance is what Ascham says of "quick wits": "commonly, men very quick of wit be also very light of conditions; and thereby very ready of disposition to be carried over quickly, by any light company, to any riot and unthriftiness when they be young" (p. 26). Looking back on his own life Gascoigne undoubtedly must have seen himself as a "quick wit," particularly since, as Ascham points out, such wits are seldom "rich in living when they be old" (p. 26).

[45]I have taken these two terms from Prouty, George Gascoigne, p. 240.

[46]The enthusiasm for the parable was also shared by the Scottish schoolmaster-dramatist, Patrick Authinleck of St. Andrew's School. An entry, dated July, 1574, in the Kirk-Session of St. Andrews states: "The said day, anent the supplication given by Mr. Patrick Auchinlek, for procuring licence to play the comedy mentioned in St. Luke's Evangel of the Forlorn Son, upon Sunday, the 1st day of August next to come." Authinleck's play is not extant. The above entry is quoted by Thomas S. Graves in "Some Allusions to Richard Tarlton," MP, Vol. XVIII (1920-1), 496n.

Chapter IV:

[1]Ernest Brennecke, Shakespeare in Germany 1590-1700 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 11.

[2]Wilhelm Creizenach, Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten (Berlin & Stuttgart: W. Spemann, n.d.), p. L.

[3]Bond (ed.), Early Plays from the Italian, p. cviii.

[4]Brennecke, Shakespeare in Germany, p. 5.

[5]Richard Simpson (ed.), The School of Shakespere, 2 vols. (New York: J.W. Bouton, 1878), Vol. II, 8-15, 89, 121-2.

[6]Ibid. Vol. II, 90-120.

[7]For the educational role of travel in the Elizabethan era, see Kenneth Charlton's Education in Renaissance England (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), pp. 215-25.

[8]"Ingles" according to the OED can mean "Boy-favourites" (presumably of a homosexual type).

[9]Joan Simon, Education and Society in Tudor England (Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 352.

[10]The Scholemaster, p. 62.

[11]Carver (ed.), Acolastus, p. xcix.

[12]The Tyde Tarrieth No Man (p. 73) is particularly interesting in that the character who is confronted by Despair is a prodigal called Wastefullnesse. After this latter has been reduced to poverty, he is urged by Despair to end his life: "Thy prodigall sinnes are so manifold, /That God of mercy doth thee utterly denay, /Therefore, to ende thy life it is best." The 1576 edition of this work was reprinted in Paris in 1904 and the Paris copy has been reproduced on Micro-card in Three Centuries of English and American Drama (New York: Readex Microprint Corp.).

[13]Adolf Katzenellenbogen, Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art, Studies of the Warburg Institute (London, 1939), Vol. X, 20n., 82n..

[14]Chaucer, The Complete Works, edited by Skeat, p. 700.

[15]John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Book III, Ch. III, 15, translated by Ford Lewis Battles, edited by John T. McNeill, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), Vol. I, 608-9.

[16]No indication of the sex of Hope is given in the text, but I have assumed that the character is female in keeping with the traditional representations of Hope in allegories of the Vices and Virtues.

[17]In Marlowe's play, of course, shifts back and forth into the allegorical dimension recur throughout the play. The allegorical nature of the scene towards the end of Dr. Faustus, which I have just described, is thus not such a surprise as the corresponding scene in The Prodigal Son.

[18]The Ethics of Aristotle, translated by J.A.K. Thomson (Penguin Books, 1955), p. 109. All references to this work will be to this edition. It should also be noted here that the word "ἀσώτος" is used in Luke 15: 13, in the Greek New Testament text, to refer to the riotous living of the Prodigal Son.

[19]The idea that prodigality is a lesser evil than avarice is to be found in Elizabethan and Jacobean writings. Francis Thynne in his "Embleme on Prodigalitie" says, for example, that "witlesse vnthriftes, which superfluouslie do spende, /Doe much more good then such as hordinge do attende" (Emblemes and Epigrammes [1600], edited by F.J. Furnivall, EETS OS, Vol. 64, London: N. Trübner & Co., 1876, p. 47). Similarly in Richard Johnson's Look on me, London (printed 1613) we read: "Beggary is the end of prodigality, and death the end of covetousnesse; yet in my minde, of them both the covetous man is the worser; for with his riches he doth no man good, no not so much as himselfe, when the prodigall by the undoing of himselfe enricheth many" (Edited by J.P. Collier in Early English Popular Literature, 2 vols. [1863] New York: B. Blom, 1966, Vol. II, 12-13).

[20]Morris Palmer Tilley, A Dictionary of the Proverbs in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950), F91, R25. Out of a number of ballads dealing with the Prodigal Son theme, there is one, which is thought to be by Martin Parker, which is based on the second of these two proverbs ("What the Rake gathers the fork scatters"). In this ballad the father, who is a usurer, has the motto "Come, worldlings, see what paines I here do take, /To gather gold while here on earth I rake." The son, however, has as his motto "Come, Prodigals, your selves that loves to flatter, /Behold my fall, that with the Forke doth scatter." During the course of the ballad the father dies, leaving his money to the son who spends it in eating, wenching, smoking, drinking, music, dicing and cards. Eventually his money is all gone. His friends leave him, and he has nothing

to eat or drink, the moral being that we should "in a meane live, having a care how we doe scatter." The ballad was originally printed by Henry Gosson, who was publishing between 1607 and 1631. It has been reprinted, together with its two pictorial representations of the proverb, in The Roxburghe Ballads [1869-1901], 8 vols. (New York: AMS Press, 1966), Vol. I, 129-36.

[21]The influence of these works upon The Staple of News has long been recognized, as have the similarities between the treatments of wealth in Cynthia's Revels and The Staple of News as can be seen, for example, in De Winter's edition of The Staple of News, Yale Studies in English, Vol. XXVIII (1905), xx-xxi. It also seems likely that Jonson borrowed the idea of the pretended death of Pennyboy Canter, who in disguise then becomes the servant of his thriftless son, from the anonymous The London Prodigal (to be discussed in Chapter VI). In The London Prodigal the trick of the sham will is used, and the disguised father also has a brother as in The Staple of News. For a comparison of these two plays, see De Winter's edition of The Staple of News, pp. xxiii-xxxi.

[22]Aristophanes, Plutus, translated by B.B. Rogers in The Complete Plays of Aristophanes (London: Bantam Books, 1962), pp. 471-2.

[23]Lucian, Timon, or the Misanthrope, translated by A.M. Harmon in Lucian, 8 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1919), Vol. II, 339.

[24]Richard Taverner, Prouerbes or Adagies, gathered out of the Chiliades of Erasmus (1569 edition), sig. B6v.

[25]Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy, Vol. I, 65. Cf. Horace, Satires, II, iii, 94-7 and Jonson, Volpone, I, i, 1-27.

[26]All For Money, p. 108. The 1578 edition of this work was reprinted in J.O. Halliwell-Phillips' Literature of the 16th and 17th Centuries and this edition was then put on microcard in Three Centuries of English and American Drama (New York: Readex Microprint Corp.).

[27]Cf. the allegorical engraving, entitled "The Triumph of Pecunia" (1563), by Galle. It is reproduced in Craik's Tudor Interlude, Plate XI.

[28]Reprinted by J.P. Collier in Illustrations of Old English Literature [1866], 3 vols. (New York: B. Blom, 1966), Vol. I (unpaginated). Allegorical representations of money seem to have remained popular in the early seventeenth century as is shown by such works as Thomas Acheley's The Massacre of Money (1602), Thomas Deloney's "A new dittie in prayse of money" in Strange Histories (1607), William Rowley's A Search for Money (1609), John Taylor's A Shilling (1621), and the anonymous ballad The Silver Age (1621).

[29]Anonymous, The Silver Age, or, The World turned backward (1621), reprinted by Hyder E. Rollins in The Pepys Ballads, 8 vols. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929-32), Vol. I, 202.

[30]Another play which, like The Three Lords and Ladies of London, depicts money as a figure of virtue is Wealth and Health (1554-ca.1555). In this work, Wealth is brought to decay by Ill Will and Shrewd Wit, but later is restored to his former self by Remedy.

[31]W.W. Greg (ed.), Malone Society Reprints (Oxford, 1913), pp. v-vi. The 1601 date for The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality places it after the now generally accepted date for Cynthia's Revels of December, 1600, and obviously well before the date of The Staple of News.

[32]The reference to the earlier play is quoted in Appendix G of Glynne Wickham's Early English Stages 1300 to 1660, 2 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959-63), Vol. II, 339.

[33]Captain Well-Done, the brave soldier who has served in "Fraunce, in Flaunders: but in Ireland Most" and "whom starke need doth pince, at length the diuel driues to go," may well be a sympathetic portrait of Essex. If Greg is correct in supposing the play to have been performed before the Queen on February 22, 1601, a case might be made to suggest that the play was a last-minute plea on behalf of Essex, who, however, was executed three days later. On this matter, see Louis B. Wright's "Social Aspects of Some Belated Moralities," Anglia, Vol. LIV (1930), 146n.

[34]The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality, in Dodsley, Vol. VIII, 374.

[35]Jonson himself makes no secret of his allegorical intentions, as can be seen from his address "To the Readers" which begins Act III and in which he explains how "the allegory, and purpose of the Author hath hitherto beene wholly mistaken" (lines 3-4).

[36]Jonson's use of the words "Golden mean" suggests, of course, Horace (Odes, Book II, 10, 5 "Aurea mediocritas") rather than Aristotle, but the application of such a precept to the uses of wealth is more suggestive of the Nichomachean Ethics.

[37]Possibly the meaning of "Philautia" and its contemporary connotations was in Daniel's mind when he named the title-character of Philotas (1604). In Daniel's sources Philotas is apparently described as "noted of vaine-glory and prodigalitie." The name would certainly be an apt one for a character who is believed to have been a "shadow-portrait" of

the Earl of Essex. On the subject of Philotas and its connection with Essex, see Laurence Michel's edition of The Tragedy of Philotas (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), pp. 36-66. For Daniel's description of Philotas see p. 101.

[38]A work on flattery which was widely read during the Renaissance was Plutarch's "How to tell a flatterer from a Friend" in the Moralia. Significantly this opens with a passage in which the connection between flattery and self-love is discussed. Plutarch says, for example, that "In our love of self he [the flatterer] has an excellent base of operations against us. It is because of this self-love that everybody is himself his own foremost and greatest flatterer, and hence finds no difficulty in admitting the outsider to witness with him and to confirm his own conceits and desires" (Moralia, edited and translated by Frank Cole Babbit, 15 vols., London: Heinemann, 1927, Vol. I, 265).

[39]Jonson's characterisation of Money as of "giddy disposition" would appear to be a witty substitution for the traditional blindness of Plutus. On the subject of Plutus' blindness, see Erwin Panofsky's Studies in Iconology [1939] (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 97.

[40]For the first two of these translations, see Herford and Simpson's note in Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 520.

[41]On the matter of the disguise of Vices as Virtues on the English stage, see Charles R. Baskervill's English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy, University of Texas Bulletin, No. 178 (1911), pp. 249-57. Of significance here are the words of the character God in Everyman who complains that "the people do clean forsake me: /They use the seven deadly sins damnable, /As pride, covetise, wrath, and lechery /Now in the world be made commendable" (lines 35-38, p. 208). One might also note the manner, for example, in which Avaritia in Prudentius' Psychomachia disguises herself so as to be thought not a greedy pest but a thrifty Virtue ("non ut avara lues, sed Virtus parca putetur" line 558).

[42]Moralia, pp. 301, 303. It is especially interesting, in view of what has been said about Aristotle's discussion of liberality, to note that Plutarch goes on to say that "in attempts at flattery we should be observant and on our guard against prodigality being called 'liberality'" (p. 303).

[43]The last three named here are only mentioned (III, iii, 18-19), while Phronesis, Thauma and Timé do not speak. I have used the translations given by Allan H. Gilbert in "The Function of the Masques in Cynthia's Revels," PQ, Vol. XXII (1943), 216.

[44]In this we may see part of an unsuccessful appeal to Elizabeth by Jonson, who later has Cynthia justify her preferment of the commoner Crites (Jonson) to the elevated milieu of the court. Cynthia describes Crites as one "whom learning, vertue, and our fauour last, /Exempteth from the gloomy multitude. /'With common eye the Supreme should not see. /Henceforth be ours, the more thy selfe to be" (V, viii, 32-5).

[45]See Philip Stubbes, Anatomy of Abuses (1583): "For, as the saying is--Pecunia omnia potest--money can do all things." Edited by W.B.D.D. Turnbull (London, 1836), p. 223. Pecunia's full name, Aurelia Clara Pecunia (I, vi, 46), as has frequently been pointed out, bears a close resemblance to that of the Infanta of Spain, Isabella Clara Eugenia, who was, of course, very much in the minds of the English in 1623 and just after. The references to Pecunia as an "Infanta" confirm the impression that a resemblance is intended (see, for example, I, vi, 42, and II, ii, 4). However, the constant stress on the word "Grace" as an address for Pecunia (13 times in 62 lines in II, ii) suggests that Jonson may have a countess in mind. The references to Pecunia's complexion (II, i, 48, 51) could allude to the Countess of Bedford, who, after a serious illness, had to leave off her make-up, a cause for some comment when she appeared among the painted ladies of the court (see Marchette Chute's Ben Jonson of Westminster [1953], New York: Dutton, 1960, pp. 225-6).

[46]A "Clapper-Dudgeon," according to De Winter, is "a thorough-bred beggar, a beggar born of a beggar," literally "one who claps his wooden dish at the door, for broken meat, etc." (De Winter, ed., The Staple of News, p. 165). Frank Aydelotte in Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds [1913] (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967) gives a different definition, however, and suggests that a Clapperdudgeon was a type of beggar who tied certain objects against his skin in order to produce sores which would then make it easier for him to be a successful beggar (p. 37).

[47]This theme is cleverly enforced by the behaviour of the "Gossips" in Jonson's Intermeans, who, on several occasions in the play, fail to distinguish vice from virtue. Tattle, for example, dislikes Pennyboy Canter because he is not "a Begger in veluet" (1st Intermean, lines 13-14). Censure believes that in Act IV "the young heyre grew a fine Gentleman," and Expectation concurs, saying that he "kept the best company" (4th Intermean, lines 14 and 16), while Mirth describes Pennyboy Canter, when he takes away Pecunia from his son, as "a foolish old fornicating Father, to rauish away his sonnes Mistresse" (4th Intermean, lines 40-1).

[48]On the symbolic use of clothes in The Staple of News and other later plays of Jonson, see Edward B. Partridge, "The Symbolism of Clothes in Jonson's Last Plays," JEGP, Vol. LVI (1957), 396-409. Partridge does not, however, point out the obvious parallels between The Staple of News and the parable of the Prodigal Son.

[49]Elsewhere in the play wealth in the abstract is referred to as "this Idoll, . . . the worlds Saynt" (I, ii, 10-11), and "The yongmans whore, the saint of him thats old" (II, ii, 191).

[50]Joseph Quincy Adams, The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917), p. 27.

[51]Bowers (ed.), Dramatic Works of Dekker, Vol. IV, 3-13; Gerald E. Bentley, The Jacobean and Caroline Stage (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), Vol. III, 459-61.

[52]As Bowers points out, "One of the oddities about the plot is the invention of Raybright to perform the duties that would ordinarily be assigned to the Sun, the travel through the four seasons. The 1638/9 revision in associating Raybright with Charles I promoted the Sun to divinity, perhaps with some strain. Usually the Sun would be the king, and Raybright, as his son, would be prince" (IV, 12).

[53]On this subject see W.J. Lawrence in TLS, Dec. 20, 1923, p. 894. As Bowers points out, Charles' entry into Scotland is anticipated by the masque (IV, 11).

[54]Bentley, Jacobean and Caroline Stage, Vol. III, 235.

[55]A New Trick to Cheat the Devil, edited by A.H. Bullen in The Works of Robert Davenport, in Old English Plays, New Series [1882-9] (New York: Benjamin Blom Inc., 1964), Vol. III, 187-299. All quotations are from this edition.

[56]Since Randolph's work shows a number of debts to Jonson's The Staple of News, one can be fairly sure that it was written after 1626 when Jonson's play was first performed, or possibly after 1631, the date of the publication of The Staple of News, though Randolph, as a "Son of Ben," may possibly have seen Jonson's play in manuscript even a year or so before 1626. On the question of the dating of Randolph's play, see Samuel A. Tannenbaum's and Hyder E. Rollins' introduction to their edition of The Drinking Academy (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1930), p. xxii. Quotations from the play are from this edition.

Chapter V:

[1]Thomas Hoby, Epistle to Lord Hastings, prefacing Hoby's translation of The Courtier (1561), reprinted in Everyman's Library with introduction by W.H.D. Rouse (London: J.M. Dent, 1928), p. 2. All quotations will be from this edition.

[2]Plato, The Republic, Part Seven, transl. by H.D.P. Lee (Penguin Books, 1955), p. 247.

[3]Aristotle, The Ethics, Book IV, ch. III, p. 121; Aristotle, The Politics, transl. by J.A. Sinclair (Penguin Books, 1962), Book I, ch. XIII, p. 51.

[4]Desiderius Erasmus, The Education of a Christian Prince, transl. Lester K. Born (New York: Octagon Books Inc., 1965), p. 148. All quotations from this work will be from this edition.

[5]Baldwin, Treatise of Morall Philosophie, p. 136.

[6]The Basilikon Doron of James VI, edited by James Craigie for the Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons Ltd., 1944), Vol. I, 25. Craigie gives three texts of James' work. All my quotations will be from the first public edition, printed in Edinburgh in 1603. The titles of some of the books collected for James between 1573 and 1583 by his tutor, Peter Young, provide an interesting sample of the literature de regimine principum to which James' work properly belongs. Titles include: Budaeus' L'Institution du Prince, Chelidonius' Institutio Principis, North's translation of Guevara's The Diall of Princes, Heresbach's De Educandis Erudiendisque Principum Liberis, Lorich's De Institutione Principis Communes Loci, Maugin's Le Paraugon de Vertu pour l'institution de tous Princes, Osorio's De Regis Institutione et Disciplina, Synesius' De Regno, Castiglione's Il Cortegiano, and Elyot's The Governour. This list is given in Sir George Warner's The Library of King James VI, 1573-83, Scottish Hist. Soc., Miscellany Vol. I (1893), xxxi-lxv.

[7]J. W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century [1928] (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1960), pp. 22-3

[8]Ibid. pp. 30-1. Melanchthon, when he later shifted towards Calvinism, moderated this hope, but it remains a common element in many reformist writings. Perhaps its most

dramatic rendering was given by Tyndale, whose last words at the stake were "Lord, open the King of England's eyes," quoted by Christopher Morris in Political Thought in England: Tyndale to Hooker (Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 32.

[9]Hugh Latimer, Sermons, ed. by George E. Corrie for The Parker Society, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1844), Vol. I, 152.

[10]An Exhortation concerning good Order, and obedience to Rulers and Magistrates [1547] in Homilies, p. 70.

[11]Roy Strong, The Elizabethan Image, Catalogue for an Exhibition Organised by the Tate Gallery, November 1969 to February 1970 (London: Tate Gallery Publications Department, 1969), p. 12.

[12]Aristotle, Ethics, Book IV, ch. II, p. 116. The virtue of magnificence tended increasingly to become equated somewhat with another Aristotelian virtue, that of magnanimity. The various meanings that the terms "magnificence" and "magnanimity" had during the Renaissance have been discussed at length by Margaret Greaves in The Blazon of Honour (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1964). Cf. William O. Harris' Skelton's 'Magnyfycence' and the Cardinal Virtue Tradition (Chapel Hill: University of N. Carolina Press, 1965).

[13]Hoccleve tells his own story in stanzas 623-7. The Beggar's story could almost have been patterned on that of the Prodigal Son, for he tells of how in his youth he used to go to the tavern, "which be-for vnthrift berith the lanterne" (st. 88), where he paid out his Church-tithes, gambled all night (st. 90), swore (st. 90), spent great sums of money (st. 93), had numerous women (sts. 93-4), and eventually lost everything except the suit of beggar's clothes he now wears. His friends and the rest of his clothes are all gone (st. 100), and now he is repentant (st. 106).

[14]The Governor, Book II, ch. X, p. 130. Cf. Jacques Hurault, Politicke, moral, and martial discourses, dedicated to the French King in 1588, and translated into English by Arthur Golding in 1595, pp. 214-5.

[15]Cf. Jonson's statement in Timber: Or, Discoveries (1641) where he remarks that "Flattery is a fine Pick-lock of tender eares: especially of those, whom fortune hath borne high upon their wings" (edited by G.B. Harrison for the Bodley Head Quartos [1922-6], reprinted New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966), p. 43. Other relevant remarks concerning this subject are made by Jonson in this work on pages 45 and 62.

[16]The Courtier, pp. 265-6.

[17]The dangers of flattery are a constant theme in the literature de regimine principum. In the Basilikon Doron, for example, James combines his advice on choosing "men of knowne wisdome, honestie, and good conscience" as counsellors with an injunction that such men be "free of all factions and partialities: but speciallie free of that filthy vice of Flattery, the pest of all Princes, and wracke of Republickes" (Vol. I, 115). On the same theme, and using a common Elizabethan image that is also used by the servant in the Garden scene in Richard II, Chillester in his Prologue to his English translation of Chelidonius, which is entitled Institution of Christian Princes (1571), refers to the parasites and flatterers who endeavour to surround princes as "Caterpillars, which neuer cleaue but vnto the good fruites." Cf. Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, p. 194.

[18]James Cleland, The Institution of a young Noble-Man (1607), facsimile edition with introduction by Max Molyneux (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1948), p. 192. Among the most frequently cited historical exemplae of the ill-effects of bad counsel was the fate of Richard II. Even a pro-Yorkist portrait of Richard, such as that found in Thomas Trevelyon's "Commonplace Book," claims that "In bounty and liberalitie hee [Richard] farre surpassed all his progenitors," is forced to admit that the King was "most ruled by young councell, and regarded nothing the councell of the sage and wise men of the realme, which thing turned this land to great trouble, and himselfe to extreame misery." See Thomas Trevelyon's "Commonplace Book," Vol. II (1616), 222, as reproduced in SQ, Vol. XIV (1963), 386.

[19]Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, p. 245; Chillester, Institution of Christian Princes, pp. 129, 131.

[20]Basilikon Doron, Vol. I, 101.

[21]The Mirror for Magistrates, p. 272.

[22]The Education of a Christian Prince, p. 150.

[23]Three Prose Translations of the Secreta Secretorum, edited by Robert Steele, EETS ES 74 (London, 1898), pp. 12-13. On this same theme one might note the proverb "A Maid oft seen, a gowne oft worn, are disesteemed and held in scorn" (Tilley, M 20), and the manner in which Shakespeare in I Henry IV has Henry IV criticize Richard II on the grounds of over-familiarity with his subjects (III, ii, 1879-1903) [III, ii, 60-85].

[24]Cf. also the scene in Shakespeare's Henry V (1599), ?Thomas Farrant's The Wars of Cyrus (1587-94) in which the king is described as mingling incognito with his soldiers (sig. $B3^{v}$), and those scenes in Samuel Rowley's When You See Me You

Know Me (1603-5) in which Henry VIII, wearing a disguise, is arrested like an ordinary citizen for beating a rogue.

[25]In such plays as Shakespeare's Measure for Measure (1603-4), Marston's The Fawn (1604) and Middleton's The Phoenix (1603-4) one can perceive a common recognition by the authors of the difficulties that rulers face when they attempt to see through the veil of flattery and deceit with which their subjects are so commonly tempted to surround them. The use of disguise by the various men of authority in these plays provides them with a viable means of perceiving the truth and sorting out good men from bad from among those on whom they depend in affairs of state.

[26]John Skelton, "Speculum Principis" (1500-1), reprinted by F.M. Salter in Speculum, Vol. IX (1934), 25-37. The original of this passage reads: "Ante omnia gulam abhominare. Sobrietatem et temperanciam cole. Crapulam proscribe. Luxuriam detestare. Prostibulum scortorum fuge. Noli nuptias temerare. Virgines noli deflorare. Viduas noli violare" (p. 35).

[27]Basilikon Doron, Vol. I, 27. Using the same kind of argument, but applying it to the nobility rather than to kings, Owen Feltham in his Resolves, divine, morall, politicall (1623) said that "Earth hath not any thing more glorious than ancient Nobility, when 'tis found with vertue," but "A debauched sonne of a Noble Familie, is one of the intolerable burthens of the Earth, and as hatefull a thing as Hell" (edition of 1628, p. 86).

[28]Erasmus, Education of a Christian Prince, p. 148.

[29]The phrase is from More's speech to the rioters in Sir Thomas More (ca. 1595), edited by W.W. Greg in Malone Society Reprints (Oxford University Press, 1911), line 227, p. 77.

[30]Chillester, Institution of Christian Princes, p. 16.

[31]Baldwin's Preface to the Mirror for Magistrates, p. 64.

[32]In all the many passages in the literature de regimine principum on the subject of intemperance, there would not seem to be any common concern with the kind of riotously boistrous behaviour such as was associated with the historical Prince Hal. That responsible men were prone to it, however, is suggested in the anonymous The Institution of a Gentleman, mentioned earlier, in which there is a warning against "roistering," (OED defines a roister as "A swaggering or blustering bully, a riotous fellow, a rude or noisy reveller"). As the anonymous author of this piece of courtesy

literature explains, "Thus cannot an axe do the ded of a spade neyther a rake the work of an axe: no more can a Royster do the office of a Gentleman, so long (I meane) as in Roysterlye condicions he dothe continew." That a "roistering" prince would not be considered able to do the office of a prince surely goes without saying.

[33]Raphaell Holinshed in his Chronicles (edition of 1587), for example, accused Richard II of "the filthie sinne of leacherie and fornication, with abhominable adulterie" (II, 868), and described the king as "prodigall, ambitious, and much giuen to the pleasure of the bodie. He kept the greatest port, and mainteined the most plentifull house that euer any king in England did either before his time or since. For there resorted dailie to his court aboue ten thousand persons that had meat and drinke there allowed them . . . in gorgious and costlie apparell they exceeded all measure" (II, 868). Furthermore, according to Holinshed, Richard "made choise of such councellors as were not fauoured of the people, whereby he was the lesse fauoured himselfe" (II, 869). All quotations from Holinshed in this study are from the six volume reprint by Sir H. Ellis (London, 1807-8).

[34]John Dover Wilson, The Fortunes of Falstaff [1943] (Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 20.

[35]Cotton MS, Claudius A 8 (ca. 1430), leaf 11, quoted by Furnivall (ed.), in Hoccleve's The Regement of Princes, p. xiv.

[36]Robert Fabyan, Chronicles (edition of 1542), p. 353.

[37]Richard Grafton, Chronicles (1569), reprinted in 2 volumes by Sir H. Ellis (London, 1809), Vol. I, 507.

[38]Holinshed, Chronicles, Vol. III, 61.

[39]Fabyan, Chronicles, pp. 353-4.

[40]In John Stow's A Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles (edition of 1570), for example, there is recounted the "dagger" incident (fol. 260^{v}) which occurs in The Famous Victories. This encounter between father and son seems to have been the source for Act III, ii, of Shakespeare's 1 Henry IV. The incident is also recorded in Shakespeare's main source for the Henry IV plays, Holinshed's Chronicles (Vol. III, 54) as is the "crown on the pillow" incident (Vol. III, 57).

[41]The first extant edition of The Famous Victories is that of 1598. The date of composition is usually deduced from the fact that Tarlton of the Queen's Men, who died in 1588, is said to have doubled the parts of the judge and the clown on one occasion when the play was performed. On this

matter see Chambers' Elizabethan Stage, Vol. IV, 17.

[42]Stow in The Annales of England (1592) describes such "a tricke of youth" when he says that Prince Henry "with some of his yong lords & gentlemen, . . . would waite in disguised aray for his owne receiuers, and distresse them of their mony" (p. 547). In The Famous Victories, however, Henry promises to protect the receivers from his father's wrath by saying nothing about the robbery.

[43]The Famous Victories, edited by W.C. Hazlitt in Shakespeare's Library, 2nd edition (London: Ves and Turner, 1875), Vol. V, 324. All quotations will be from this edition.

[44]For the sixteenth and seventeenth century belief that, whereas religious music could turn the mind to God and martial music could prepare a soldier for battle, lascivious music could have a degrading effect, see F.W. Sternfield's "Music and Ballads," in Shakespeare Survey, Vol. XVII (1964), 217. Cf. Burton's elaboration on the theme that "a sweet voice and music are powerful enticers" (Anatomy of Melancholy, Vol. III, 107).

[45]According to Stow and Gregory the actual riot in 1410 in Eastcheap upon which this incident appears to be based did not involve Prince Henry at all (Stow, Annales, p. 550; Gregory's Chronicle, edited by J. Gairdner, Camden Society, N.S. No. 17, p. 106).

[46]On this matter, see the discussion by A.R. Humphreys in the New Arden edition of Henry IV: Part Two (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1967), p. xxxvi. In Elyot's account Hal does not box the Justice's ears. Instead he draws his weapon. The earliest known authority for the blow given by Hal to the Justice is Robert Redman's Vita Henrici V (written 1536-44), p. 11, according to W.G. Boswell-Stone in Shakespeare's Holinshed [2nd rev. ed. 1907] (New York: Dover Publications, 1968), p. 161n.

[47]The proper title of the book is A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man (1543). It was the result of a commission issued to Cranmer and others in 1540, according to Allen, Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, p. 128 n.

[48]Similar ideas on obedience are to be found in the Homilie Against Disobedience and Wilfull Rebellion in which it is explained that, in addition to the obedience owed to God, "in families and housholds, the wife should be obedient vnto her husband, the children vnto their parents, the seruants vnto their masters" and that God has ordained "in Cities and Countreys seuerall and speciall gouernours and also rulers, vnto whom the residue of his people should be obedient" (Homilies, p. 276).

[49]On the relationship between Elizabethan comedy and concepts of Misrule and Holiday, see C.L. Barber's Shakespeare's Festive Comedy (Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1963).

[50]Unfortunately the play has come down to us in a very poor text, which contains many errors, and which, according to Irving Ribner, probably only represents a version cut for road presentation. See The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 71. Cf. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, 6 Vols. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-), Vol. IV, 159, 167.

[51]It is interesting that, although, as we shall see, Shakespeare is very careful to prepare for Hal's conversion in advance, in Henry V Canterbury feels called upon to state explicitly that, appearances to the contrary, Hal's conversion is by means other than a miracle (I, 108) [I, i, 67]. There is, perhaps, a suggestion of the miraculous in the parable when the father says to the Elder Brother, "For this thy brother was dead, and is aliue againe: and he was lost, but he is founde."

[52]Consider, for example, the section in the enlarged 1574 edition of The Mirror for Magistrates in which Despair appears to Queen Cordila carrying, among other weapons of self-destruction, poisoned daggers beneath her outer garments (Parts Added to 'The Mirror for Magistrates,' edited by Lily B. Campbell, Cambridge University Press, 1946, p. 157). For an illuminating insight into the manner in which Despair should be depicted by artists, see the section on this subject by Cesare Ripa, in the Iconologia (Venice, 1669), p. 160.

[53]I have checked Hazlitt's version of the sentence in which the phrase occurs against the original text of 1598. His transcription of the passage is accurate except that the phrase "of your sonne" should read "of that your sonne" (sig. $C\,3^{r}$).

[54]Samuel Gardiner, Portraiture of the Prodigal Sonne (1599), p. 7.

[55]It is interesting to note that the corresponding scenes in Shakespeare are put in two different plays, a device which enables Shakespeare to make two Prodigal Son plays, each with its own reconciliation scene.

[56]The remainder of The Famous Victories is chiefly taken up with the military exploits of Henry V, as its title suggests, and is consequently of no relevance to this study.

[57]The Fortunes of Falstaff, pp. 17-25, et passim.

[58]For a summary of the various arguments and for suggestions as to solutions to the problems involved, see Harold Jenkins' The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1956), and A.R. Humphreys' discussion in his introduction to the New Arden edition of Henry IV: Part Two, pp. xxi-xxviii.

[59]According to the Chroniclers, Hal lost his place on the Council because of his physical assault on the Chief Justice, but Shakespeare is careful at this stage not to risk tarnishing Hal's reputation, and he carefully suppresses for the time being any explicit references to this famous incident.

[60]Shakespeare may here, however, be referring to the kind of support which the Hal of The Famous Victories gave to the arrested thief.

[61]Holinshed, Chronicles, Vol. III, 53-5.

[62]To make the contrast between the two youths more vivid, Shakespeare, like Daniel in Book III of The Civil Wars (1595), makes Hotspur (born 1364) "no more in debt to yeeres" (1 Henry IV, III, ii, 1923) [III, ii, 103], than Prince Hal (born 1387), although Hotspur was in fact even older than Hal's father, who was born in 1367.

[63]John Dover Wilson clearly recognizes this in The Fortunes of Falstaff where he says of the Henry IV plays that "the story of the prodigal, secularized and modernized as it might be, ran the same course as ever and contained the same three principal characters: the tempter, the younker [prodigal], and the father with property to bequeath and counsel to give" (p. 22).

[64]In this attempt to lessen Hal's guilt by making his reputation partly the product of false stories, Shakespeare has taken a hint from Holinshed, who significantly also uses the term "pickthanks" to refer to those who maliciously slandered Prince Hal (Vol. III, 54).

[65]One cannot, of course, prove that Shakespeare is here consciously alluding to the parable of the Prodigal Son, but it is significant, I believe, that there is later a definite allusion when Falstaff says, "I had a hundred and fiftie totter'd [sic] Prodigalls, lately come from Swine-keeping, from eating Draffe and Huskes" (IV, ii, 2408-10) [IV, ii, 36-8]. Cf. also Falstaff's remark about being made "a Younker" (III, iii, 2084) [III, iii, 91], and his allusion to "the Storie of the Prodigall" in 2 Henry IV, II, i, 741 [II, ii, 156]. Richmond Noble in his Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge (London: SPCK, 1935) lists nine references to the parable in Shakespeare (pp. 277-8) and claims that it is "the

most frequently mentioned Parable of the Gospels in the plays" (p. 277). In addition to these nine references, Susan Snyder in "King Lear and the Prodigal Son," SQ, Vol. XVII (1966), has identified two more, one in King Lear and one in The Merchant of Venice (pp. 361, 362 n.).

[66]These words are used by Lancaster in the early Quartos up to and including that of 1608. They are missing, however, from the Quarto of 1613 and from the First Folio. In Hardin Craig's edition they occur in Act V, v, 32.

[67]Richard J. Beck, Shakespeare's Henry IV (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1965), p. 25.

[68]Harold Jenkins, The Structural Problem in 'Henry IV,' p. 25, and Humphreys (ed.), Henry IV: Part Two, p. xxvi.

[69]Humphreys (ed.), Henry IV: Part Two, p. xxvi.

[70]For allusions to Falstaff's drunkenness, see 1 Henry IV, I, ii, 116-7, V, ii, 2947 [I, ii, 2-3, V, iii, 56-7]; for gluttony, see 1 HIV, I, ii, 121, II, iv, 1509 [I, ii, 7-8, II, iv, 591-2], 2 HIV, II, ii, 924-5, V, v, 3262, 3265 [II, ii, 160-1, V, v, 54, 57]; for lechery, see 1 HIV, I, ii, 122-3, III, iii, 2019-20, 2165 [I, ii, 8-12, III, iii, 19-20, 179], 2 HIV, II, iv, 1287 [II, iv, 285]; for prodigality, see 1 HIV, III, iii, 2083-4 [III, iii, 91-2], 2 HIV, I, iii, 485-7 [I, ii, 264-5]; for vanity in dress, see 2 HIV, I, iii, 303-4, 316-8 [I, ii, 32-4, 48-50]; for dicing, see 1 HIV, III, iii, 2018 [III, iii, 18]; for brawling, see 2 HIV, II, iv, 1222 [II, iv, 215].

[71]1 HIV, I, ii, 203-6; III, iii, 2007-8, 2027-8; V, iii, 3129-31 [I, ii, 106-7; III, iii, 5, 27-8; V, iv, 168-9]; 2 HIV, II, iv, 1258 [II, iv, 254-5].

[72]Humphreys (ed.) 2 Henry IV, pp. 1-li; Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery [1935] (Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 133.

[73]It is worth noting that the 1600 Quarto text has the word "win" rather than "ioyne" in this passage.

[74]This is also Wilson's view in The Fortunes of Falstaff, p. 122.

[75]Morris, Political Thought in England, p. 20.

[76]Ibid. p. 11.

[77]In the first scene of Henry V we hear more about Hal's apparent conversion. Canterbury speaks in praise of Hal's scholarship, his ability to "reason in Diuinitie"

(line 79) [I, i, 38], "debate of Common-wealth Affaires" (line 82) [line 41], "discourse of Warre" (line 84) [line 43], and unravel any "Cause of Pollicy" (line 86) [line 45]. Ely speaks of Hal as "a true louer of the holy Church" (line 63) [line 23] and talks of how Hal "obscur'd his Contemplation /Vnder the Veyle of Wildnesse" (lines 104-5) [lines 63-4], while Canterbury, describing Hal's apparent conversion in explicitly Christian terms, speaks of how "Consideration like an Angell came, /And whipt th'offending Adam out of him" (lines 68-9) [lines 28-9].

[78]The Governor, Book III, ch. V, p. 171.

[79]The Mirror for Magistrates, p. 145.

[80]Allarme to England (1578), sig. K 1^{v}. Cf. Thomas Proctor, Of the Knowledge and Conducte of Warres (1578), fol. 17^{r}; Thomas Rogers, The Anatomie of the Minde (1576), p. 22; Bernard De Loque, Discourses of Warre and Single Combat, transl. by J. Eliot (1591), p. 33.

[81]It should be noted, however, that the editor of the New Arden edition explicates these words as "who has the advantage of power and initiative" (John H. Walter, editor of Henry V, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1965), p. 82.

[82]Irving Ribner (ed.), The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe (New York: Odyssey Press, 1963). Cf. Thomas Heywood, 1 Edward IV in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood, edited by R.H. Shepherd (London: J. Pearson, 1874), Vol. I, 17. On Elizabethan attitudes to such behaviour see Paul A. Jorgensen's "The 'Dastardly Treachery' of Prince John of Lancaster," PMLA, Vol. LXXVI (1961), 488-92.

[83]In Holinshed the numbers of the enemy are stated to have been superior to the King's forces (Chronicles, Vol. III, 37), but in Shakespeare's play there is some doubt as to the actual numbers involved. On this matter, see Humphreys' note in his edition of 2 Henry IV, p. 239.

[84]Humphreys (ed.), 2 Henry IV, p. xlvi.

[85]Holinshed, Chronicles, Vol. III, 37.

[86]Alphonso's act may have had some topical significance. Some seven years before Dekker's play was published, James 1 had come close to being assassinated at the time of the Gunpowder Plot, while in France there had been a successful assassination of Henry IV only two years previously.

[87]On the subject of James I's prodigality, see David Harris Willson's King James VI and I [1956] (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), pp. 184, 286, and 343. Willson also notes

that James had an apparent dislike of soldiers (pp. 273-4), and this might lead one to consider the possibility that Alphonso's unpleasant treatment of the soldier in II, i, is, perhaps, a hostile allusion to James.

Chapter VI:

[1]The London Prodigal, edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke in The Shakespeare Apocrypha (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918), p. 191.

[2]Various theories have been put forward concerning the authorship of The London Prodigal, and it has been suggested that the play was written by one of the authors of Sir John Oldcastle (i.e. Munday, Drayton, Wilson, or Hathway), or perhaps by Marston or Dekker, but no form of positive proof exists (Brooke, Shakespeare Apocrypha, p. xxx).

[3]Flowerdale Senior's indulgent attitude towards his son is comparable, as will be seen, to that of Sir Thomas Gresham towards his prodigal nephew, John Gresham, in the second part of Thomas Heywood's If You Know Not Me.

[4]The father's disguise and the fact that he is taken on as his son's servant are paralleled in The Staple of News. It was this which, as has been pointed out in Chapter IV, led De Winter in his edition of Jonson's play to suggest that The London Prodigal was one of the sources for Jonson's play.

[5]Erasmus, Opera, Vol. VII, col. 406.

[6]The motif of the "Patient Wife" is common in bourgeois drama of the period, other examples occurring in Dekker's The Shoemakers' Holiday (1599), his Patient Grissil (1598), Dekker and Middleton's 2 Honest Whore (1605), and Thomas Heywood's How a Man May Choose a Good Wife From a Bad (1602). In Heywood's A Woman Killed With Kindness (1603) one finds an interesting variation of the motif, for in this tragic work it is the husband who shows forbearance when dealing with an unfaithful wife. In 1 Honest Whore (1604) the motif of the "Patient Husband" (Candido) is presented in comic form.

[7]As in The Staple of News the motif of the "Return from the Dead," which is usually associated with the return of the Prodigal Son, is here employed to refer to the apparently miraculous re-appearance of the father himself. Weathercock says, "Maister Flowerdale! /Welcome from death, good Maister Flowerdale" (V, i, 424-5).

[8]The play's title-page may have been just as misleading on this matter as it appears to have been concerning its

authorship. 2 If You Know Not Me was probably performed at the Curtain or the Boar's Head, the usual houses of the Queen Anne's Men between 1604 and 1609, and Greene's Tu Quoque was almost certainly performed at the Red Bull, one of the usual houses of the Queen Anne's Men according to a Royal Patent of April, 1609, confirmation deriving from the allusion to the Red Bull in the play itself (Dodsley, Vol. XI, 240). The English Traveller, according to its title-page, was performed at the Cockpit, but the play may have been written as much as twelve years earlier than its publication and could well have been performed originally at a public theatre.

[9]In his Preface to the Reader in the first edition of 1614, Heywood refers both to his "worthy friend the author" and to his "entirely beloved fellow the actor," Master Green, a player at the Red Bull who was famous for his role as Bubble in Cooke's play. Greene's Tu Quoque is reprinted in Dodsley, Vol. XI, 173-289. All quotations will be from this edition. Green died in August, 1612, from which it can be deduced that the play was written at least two years before its first publication.

[10]The Hole was, according to the OED, the name of one of the worst apartments in the Counter, a prison for debtors in Wood Street, London.

[11]Only occasionally do the prodigal and the other characters in Cooke's play express concern about his spiritual state, but even then this seems to be of secondary importance to the financial concern. On one occasion Spendall refers to his situation in the Counter as "lighting up the taper of my soul" (p.259), on another he refers to himself as "drown'd in sin" (p. 260), and elsewhere Widow Ragsby tells him to "Be thankful unto heaven" for his release from prison (p. 269).

[12]If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody: Part II, edited by Madeleine Doran, Malone Society Reprints (Oxford University Press, 1934). All quotations will be from this edition. On the question of dating see Doran's introduction, pp. v and x.

[13]Gresham founded the Royal Exchange in 1568. Dr. Parry was an M.P. who had been acting as a spy for the English government. He had Catholic encouragement for his plot in 1584. On the subject of Parry, see John E. Neale's Queen Elizabeth I [1934] (Penguin Books, 1960), p. 271, and Conyers Read's Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), Vol. II, 399-405.

[14]On the complex textual problem of the play, see Madeleine Doran's introduction, pp. viii-xix.

[15]The first edition of The English Traveller appeared in 1633, but the play was probably written some time earlier (Harbage, Annals, p. 120). The edition that will be referred to here is that by A. Wilson Verity in Thomas Heywood, Mermaid Series (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1888).

[16]This scene, according to Mowbray Velte in The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood [1924] (New York: Haskell House, 1966), p. 108, is probably based on John Molle's translation of Philip Camerarius' Operae Horarum Subscisivarum sine Meditationes Historiae (1621), ch. XCIV.

[17]On the influence of Plautus' Mostellaria on the subplot of The English Traveller, see A.H. Gilbert's "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," JEGP, Vol. XII (1913), 596-7, 600-02.

[18]Thomas Wilson, A Discourse Upon Usury (1572), edited by R.H. Tawney (London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1925), p. 203.

[19]Volume and page references are to R.H. Shepherd's edition of The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood, 6 vols. [1874] (New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1964). All references to Heywood's plays will be from this edition, except in the cases of 2 If You Know Not Me and The English Traveller. A number of the examples cited in this paragraph are pointed out by Wright in Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England, pp. 637-51.

[20]Thomas Dekker, Non-Dramatic Works, 5 vols., ed. A.B. Grosart (London, 1884-6), Vol. III, 334.

[21]The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, Vol. II, lines 918-24, p. 281.

[22]Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England, p. 186.

[23]Ibid. 170-200.

[24]Among the many works which warn that prodigals will come to a bad end are the following: the anonymous A New Ballad, Intituled, A Warning to Youth (temp. Eliz. or early James I) in Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. III, 36; Richard Climsell's The Forlorn Traveller in Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. III, 273; the anonymous Youth's Warning Piece (pr. 1636) in Roxburghe Ballads, Vol. III, 1; Francis Lenton's The Young Gallant's Whirligigg: Or Youthes Reakes (1629); and the anonymous A Caveat or Warning for all sortes of Men both young and olde, to avoid the Company of lewd and wicked Woemen (ca. 1620), ed. Hyder E. Rollins, The Pepys Ballads, Vol. I, 129.

[25] *The Pleasant History of Thomas of Reading* in *The Works of Thomas Deloney*, ed. Francis O. Mann (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), ch. XIV, lines 43-4, p. 268.

Chapter VII:

[1]On the question of revision and authorship, see Alvin Kernan's article, "John Marston's play, Histriomastix," MLQ, Vol. XIX (1958), 134-40. As for the problem of where the play was first performed, see Philip J. Finkelpearl's analysis in "John Marston's Histriomastix as an Inns of Court Play: A Hypothesis," HLQ, Vol. XXIX (1966), 223-34, and his discussion of the whole question in John Marston of the Middle Temple (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 119-24. Cf. also Samuel Schoenbaum's A Supplement to the Revised Edition of Annals of the English Drama (Evanston, Illinois: Dept. of English, Northwestern University, 1966), p. 6. References to Histriomastix will be to the Quarto text, printed by Thomas Thorpe in 1610.

[2]William A. Armstrong, "The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres," RES, n.s., Vol. X (1959), 237.

[3]Posthaste is generally considered to be a satiric portrait of Anthony Munday (Halliday, Shakespeare Companion, pp. 328-9). For the possibility that Posthaste is Shakespeare, see Appendix B.

[4]Manly (ed.), Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama, Vol. I, 415. Cf. Mary Magdalene, line 491, in The Digby Mysteries (London: N. Trübner, 1882); Robert Wilson's Three Ladies of London in Dodsley's Old English Plays, Vol. IV, 254; The Four Elements, edited by Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays, 1st Series, p. 16; Skelton's Magnyfycence, line 745.

[5]For a possible explanation of the penultimate line of this quotation see Appendix B.

[6]The word "passion" is used here in the sense of a "passage marked by deep or strong emotion" or "a passionate speech or outburst" (OED). Its use is comparable to that of the Duke in A Midsummer Night's Dream when he remarks of Thisby's final entrance, "Heere she comes, and her passion ends the play" (V, 2109)[V, i, 320]. On the possibility that there is an allusion to A Midsummer Night's Dream intended here by Marston, see Appendix B. Cf. Hamlet's statement that he dislikes "to see a robustious Pery-wig-pated Fellow, tear a Passion to tatters" (III, 1857-8) [III, ii, 9-10].

[7]For a discussion of the date of the play, see Herford and Simpson's Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 192.

[8]Wright, Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England, pp. 630-1.

[9]Ibid. p. 631.

[10]T.M. Parrott (ed.), The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies, 2 vols. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1914), Vol. II, 839.

[11]Ibid. Vol. II, 840.

[12]John Doebler would appear to be an exception. Writing of Touchstone and admitting that the latter lacks social grace and "is made slightly foolish," he nevertheless argues that the shopkeeper is "intended to be the stock figure of the prudent, honest, and admirable tradesman" ("Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle and the Prodigal Son Plays," 339).

[13]John Marston, Satirist (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961), p. 225.

[14]Endeavors of Art, p. 166.

[15]Muriel Bradbrook's opinion of Eastward Ho is to be found in her The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy, pp. 137, 149-51; and in her The Tragic Pageant of 'Timon of Athens' (Cambridge University Press, 1966), p. 16.

[16]Ben Jonson of Westminster, pp. 150-1.

[17]Ibid. p. 150.

[18]Other plays of this type performed at about the time of Eastward Ho or later are the lost Richard Whittington, entered on the Stationers' Register in 1605, Heywood's The Wise Woman of Hogsdon (ca. 1604), and Fortune by Land and Sea (ca. 1607-9), and William Rowley's A Shoemaker a Gentleman (1607-9) in which the dedicatory address by the printer in the 1638 quarto contains the significant statement that the work "is a Play that is often Acted; and when others fade and are out of date, yet this doth endure to the Last."

[19]That Eastward Ho later enjoyed a career in the public theatres is indeed ironic when one considers the fact that it was originally intended to parody the dramatic fare of the public theatres. For the records of performances in

1613, see W.W. Greg's edition of The Henslowe Papers (London: A.H. Bullen, 1907), pp. 71 and 78. See also Chambers' Elizabethan Stage, Vol. III, 372, and Vol. IV, 129.

[20]Unfortunately for the authors, those laughs in Eastward Ho which were engineered at the expense not of the London citizenry but of men like Sir James Murray and even the King himself had dire results. Sir James Murray, who apparently took the play as a personal insult, managed to arouse the King's anger, and this may have played a part in bringing about the imprisonment of the authors who were charged officially with failing to register the play prior to publication. For Jonson's own account of the Eastward Ho affair, see Conversations with Drummond, edited by Herford and Simpson in their Ben Jonson, Vol. I, 140.

[21]For a discussion of the problems of authorship in Eastward Ho, see Herford and Simpson's Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 636-46.

[22]One such book, Baldwin's A Treatise of Morall Philisophie (1547), has already been mentioned a number of times in this study. This was undoubtedly one of the most popular books of the age and went through at least eighteen editions by 1640 (Wright, Middle-Class Culture, p. 148). However, more directly aimed at the middle-classes, as Wright points out (p. 149), was Greene's The Royal Exchange. Contayning Sundry Aphorismes of Phylosophie, and Golden Principles of Morrall and Naturall Quadruplicities (1590). For the titles of other works of this kind, see Wright, pp. 147-53.

[23]The possibility that Jonson is alluding to Hamlet receives support from the presence in Eastward Ho of a footman named Hamlet.

[24]See the reference in Eastward Ho to the "wearing of Yellow" (V, v, 185). According to Frank Aydelotte in his Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds [1913] (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1967), "The Rogues caught were imprisoned in stocks and cages, had yellow V's stitched in their clothing, and were conducted out of the City with a basin ringing before them and a proclamation at the standard in Cheapside" (p. 61). As Herford and Simpson point out, yellow was also the color of jealousy (Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 677n).

[25]As Herford and Simpson point out (Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 669n), Gresham's deeds were acted on the stage during his lifetime in I. Rickets' Byrsa Basilica, seu Regale Excambium a Sereniss. Regina Elisabetha in Persona sua sic Insignitum (1570).

[26]A Handefull of Pleasant Delites, edited by Rollins, pp. 65-8. Herford and Simpson mention as typical of the genre Luke Hatton's Repentance, entered on the Stationers' Register on 3 November, 1595, and Luke Hutton's [sic] Lamentation, which he wrote the day before his Death, being condemned to be hang'd at York (1598), see Ben Jonson, Vol. IX, 677n.

[27]Rollins (ed.), A Handefull of Pleasant Delites, p. 118.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Works, Hunterian Club Edition [1880] (New York: Johnson Reprint Company, 1966), Vol. II, 37, and 8. (Works in this edition are paginated individually.)

[30]How a Man May Choose a Good Wife From a Bad, reprinted in Dodsley's Old English Plays, Vol. IX, 41; Match at Midnight, reprinted also in Old English Plays, Vol. XIII, 94.

[31]Although there may be no intended allusion to Eastward Ho, it is perhaps worth noting that it is said of the prodigal in Francis Lenton's Characterismi; or, Lentons Leasures (1631) that "he neuer lookes so low as hogs, till he eats huskes with them, and then the Trough proves his Touchstone" (sig. D9^{r}).

[32]There has been considerable argument about the date and auspices of the first production of the play, but recent opinion seems to favour a date of 1607, with a first performance at the Blackfriars. On this matter, see John Doebler's edition of The Knight of the Burning Pestle (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. xi-xiii (cf. Schoenbaum's Supplement to the Revised Edition of Annals of English Drama, p. 6). All references will be to Doebler's edition.

[33]Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (New York: Macmillan, 1952), pp. 106-8; Beaumont and Fletcher, A Critical Study (London: Allen and Unwin, 1956), pp. 13-16.

[34]John Doebler in "Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle and the Prodigal Son Plays," was the first to point out the parody (SEL, Vol. V, 339-44).

[35]The Grocer's reference to seven years provides evidence that the play was performed at the Blackfriars in 1607 which would be seven years after the reorganization of the Children of the Chapel Royal (afterwards known as the Queen's Revels). At the Whitefriars, the other possible

theatre where the play could have been first performed, there is no record of occupancy before that of the Children of the King's Revels in 1608 (Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, Vol. II, 516).

[36]Doebler, "Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle and the Prodigal Son Plays," 341.

[37]Ethics, Bk. IV, ch. I, p. 113.

[38]There is also an allusion here to the proverb "Cast no Pearls before Swine" (Tilley, P 165), and to Matthew 7: 6 ("do not feed your pearls to pigs").

[39]Chambers, Elizabethan Stage, Vol. III, 295-6.

[40]On the dates of these plays, see Charles Barber's edition of A Trick to Catch the Old One (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), p. 1, and Standish Henning's edition of A Mad World My Masters (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1965), pp. ix-x. All references to these plays will be to these editions.

[41]Cf. I, i, 28-9, 42, 102; I, iii, 26-7; II, i, 3-4, 156, 194; II, ii, 25, 31-5; III, i, 112, 148, 179; IV, iii, 4, 21-2; IV, iv, 281; V, ii, 182-3.

[42]Cf. I, i, 87-90; II, i, 188-9, 274-6; IV, ii, 49-50, 58-9.

[43]Cf. Featherstone's marriage to Doll in Northward Ho (see especially V, i, 430-1, 493).

[44]Philip Massinger, A New Way to Pay Old Debts, edited by T.W. Craik (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1964).

[45]Thomas Randolph, The Jealous Lovers, edited by W.C. Hazlitt in The Poetic and Dramatic Works of Thomas Randolph [1875], 2 vols. (New York: Benjamin Blom Inc., 1968), Vol. I, 51-171; William Cartwright, The Ordinary in Dodsley's Old English Plays, Vol. XII, 203-317.

Appendix B:

[1]The taunt occurs in the anonymous A Caueat to the reader touching A.M. his discouery, appended to A True Reporte of the Death of M. Campion (?Douai, 1581), a reply to Munday's own A Discouerie of Edmund Campion (see, A Caueat, sig. E1[r]).

[2]Ben Jonson, edited by Herford and Simpson, Vol. IX, 308n. Herford and Simpson point out that no City pageant by Munday is known prior to 1605, but that the set from 1592 to 1604 is missing.

[3]"Peaking," according to the OED, normally means "sneaking," "skulking," or "mean-spirited," but it can mean "prying." All of these meanings, but especially the last, are applicable to Munday, who in the 1570's and 1580's was in Italy and engaged in undercover work for the English government, searching out Catholics who were actively engaged in anti-English activities. Of relevance here are the references to Posthaste teaching his players to "play true Politicians" (sig. B1[r]) and the allusion to "politician Players" (sig. B1[r]). Such allusions to the possible involvement of Posthaste in politics, taken in conjunction with the statement that he is "not imploid in matters of State" could aptly apply to Shakespeare, who may have had political pretensions that went unrewarded. As will be seen in a moment, I favour the identification of Posthaste as Shakespeare rather than Munday.

[4]Ben Jonson, edited by Herford and Simpson, Vol. III, 103. Cf. Vol. III, 50.

[5]Celeste Turner, Anthony Mundy, An Elizabethan Man of Letters, University of California Publications in English, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928), p. 75.

[6]Simpson's early assumption that Posthaste was Shakespeare was unsupported in his book by any evidence and was based upon the flimsiest of arguments (The School of Shakespere, Vol. II, 14, 89). A far more fruitful approach was made by Henry Wood in "Shakespeare, Burlesqued By Two Fellow-Dramatists," American Journal of Philology, Vol. XVI (1895), 273-99. I am indebted to Wood for a number of the points made in this Appendix as will be noted.

[7]Jonson, Timber: or, Discoveries (1641), quoted by Chambers in William Shakespeare, Vol. II, 210; John Heminges and Henry Condell, "To the great Variety of Readers," on 4th preliminary leaf of First Folio, quoted in Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. II, 230.

[8]Charles Gildon, Remarks on the Plays of Shakespear (1710), quoted Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. II, 262. Significantly, Bentley in Shakespeare: A Biographical Handbook refers to the legend concerning the speed at which The Merry Wives was written as "one of the most probable of the many Shakespeare legends" (p. 12).

[9]Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. II, 27, 372.

[10]Ibid. Vol. I, 443.

[11]Flora Haines Loughead, Dictionary of Given Names with their Origins and Meanings (Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark, 1934), p. 170.

[12]Chambers, Shakespeare, Vol. I, 560; Vol. II, 289.

[13]Ibid. Vol. I, 76; Vol. II, 87-90.

[14]Ibid. Vol. I, 75; Vol. II, 99-101. The two possible allusions to Shakespeare discussed in this paragraph were pointed out to me by my thesis Supervisor, Dr. B.N. De Luna.

[15]Wood, "Shakespeare, Burlesqued," 285.

[16]Philip J. Finkelpearl, "John Marston's Histrio-Mastix as an Inns of Court Play: A Hypothesis," HLQ, Vol. XXIX (1966), 233. Cf. the same author's discussion of the matter in John Marston of the Middle Temple, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 119-24.

[17]Ben Jonson, edited by Herford and Simpson, Vol. I, 373, and Vol. IX, 449-50.

[18]Wood, "Shakespeare, Burlesqued," 283.

[19]Ibid. 278.

[20]Ibid. 287.

[21]On Marston's probable authorship of this scene in Eastward Ho, see Ben Jonson, edited by Herford and Simpson, Vol. IX, 643.

[22]The device is also used, of course, in Love's Labour's Lost.

[23]The play-within-a-play device was also employed, however, in Munday's John a Kent (ca. 1587-90) in which Turnop and a crew of rustics, somewhat resembling those in A Midsummer Night's Dream, put on a play.

[24]W.J. Lawrence first pointed out the similarities between these incidents in Histriomastix and A Midsummer Night's Dream in his "Act-Intervals in Early Shakespearean Performances," RES, Vol. IV (1928), 78-9.

[25]Ibid. 78.

[26]Halliday, Shakespeare Companion, pp. 375-6.

[27]Bentley, Shakespeare: A Biographical Handbook, p. 99.

[28]Wood, "Shakespeare, Burlesqued," 285-6.

[29]I.A. Shapiro, "Shakespeare and Mundy," ShS, Vol. XIV (1961), 25, 27.

[30]Chambers, William Shakespeare, Vol. II, 91.

[31]Ibid. Vol. II, 90.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations:

These follow those set out in the introduction to the current bibliography of The Modern Language Association of America (June, 1969). In addition, the following have been employed:

CUP	Cambridge University Press.
Dodsley	Dodsley, Robert, ed. A Select Collection of Old English Plays. Revised by W.C. Hazlitt. 15 vols. 4th edition. London: Reeves, 1874-6.
EETS ES	Early English Text Society. Early Series.
EETS OS	Early English Text Society. Original Series.
MSR	Malone Society Reprints. General Editors, Walter W. Greg (1906-39), F.P. Wilson (1948-61), Arthur Brown (1960-). Oxford University Press, 1906-.
OUP	Oxford University Press.
PLat	Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina. Edited by J.P. Migne. 221 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1844-1905.
Renaissance Drama	Regents Renaissance Drama Series. General Editors, Cyrus Hoy and Gerald E. Bentley. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963-.
Roxburghe	The Roxburghe Ballads. The Ballad Society [1869-1901]. 8 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1966.
STC	A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed

Abroad, 1475-1640. Edited by A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1926.

Wing — Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries 1641-1700. Compiled by Donald Wing. 3 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945-51.

Use of Microfilm and Microcard:

Early books seen on microfilm belong to the following series:

1. Early English Books, 1475-1640. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms.

2. Early English Books, 1641-1700. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms.

Works seen on microcard belong to the following series:

Three Centuries of English and American Drama. New York: Readex Microprint Corporation.

Dating of Titles:

In the section of the Primary Sources entitled "Books," dates following the titles are for the first printed editions or for the first extant manuscript. A date enclosed in square brackets means that the title page of an edition is undated. In attributing dates in such instances, I have made use of such sources as Harbage's Annals of English Drama and the editors of the texts concerned. Occasionally, I have had to rely on my own judgement in supplying a date. In making a decision of this kind I considered such available evidence as the dates at which the printer was operating and the dates at which the author was known to have been writing. In the list of Secondary Sources, dates enclosed in square brackets are those of the first edition whenever a later edition has been cited.

Works of Reference

Arber, Edward, ed. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554-1640. 5 vols. [1875-7] New York: P. Smith.

Adams, Joseph Quincy. The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917.

Bentley, Gerald E. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941-.

--------. Shakespeare: A Biographical Handbook. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Brewer, Ebenezer C. Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. Revised edition. London: Cassell, 1952.

The British Encyclopaedia of Medical Practice. Edited by Sir Humphrey Butterworth et al. 12 vols. London: Butterworth & Co., 1939.

Bryan, Michael. Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers. Revised edition by George C. Williamson. 5 vols. London: G. Bell and Sons Ltd., 1925-7.

Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1897-.

Chambers, Edmund K. The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

--------. The Mediaeval Stage. 2 vols. OUP, 1903.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. 13 vols. New York: Scribner, 1910.

Gaskell, George A. Dictionary of All Scriptures and Myths. New York: Julian Press, 1960.

Greg, Walter W. A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration. 4 vols. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1939-59.

Halliday, Frank E. A Shakespeare Companion 1564-1964. Revised edition. Penguin Books, 1964.

Harbage, Alfred B. Annals of English Drama, 975-1700. Revised by Samuel Schoenbaum. London: Methuen, 1964.

Herbert, Arthur S. Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible 1525-1961. Revised and expanded from the 1903 edition of T.H. Darlow and H.F. Moule. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1968.

Index Exegeticus: Parabolarum Novi Testamenti Praecipuarum in PLat, Vol. CCXIX, col. 266.

The Interpreters Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick et al. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-.

Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. A Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised edition by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Lievsay, John L. The Sixteenth Century: Skelton Through Hooker. Goldentree Bibliographies. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Loughead, Flora Haines. Dictionary of Given Names with their Origins and Meanings. Glendale, California: Arthur H. Clark, 1934.

The New Bible Dictionary. Edited by James D. Douglas. Revised edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans, 1965.

The New Catholic Encyclopaedia. 15 vols. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Compiled and edited by Sir Paul Harvey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.

The Oxford English Dictionary. 12 vols. Corrected Re-issue. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Petit de Julleville, L. Répertoire du théatre comique en France au moyen âge. Paris: Librairie Léopold Cerf, 1885.

Read, Conyers. Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485-1603. Revised 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Ribner, Irving. Tudor and Stuart Drama. Goldentree Bibliographies. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Rollins, Hyder E. An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1700) in the Register of the Company of Stationers of London. [1924] Hatboro, Pa: Tradition Press, 1967.

Schoenbaum, Samuel. A Supplement to the Revised Edition of Annals of the English Drama. Evanston, Illinois: Dept. of English, Northwestern University, 1966.

Smith, William G. The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs. 2nd edition. Revised by Paul Harvey. OUP, 1948.

Stephen, Leslie, and Sidney Lee, et al. The Dictionary of National Biography. 21 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1885-1909.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A., ed. Elizabethan Bibliographies. New York: S.A. Tannenbaum, 1937-50.

--------. Supplements to Elizabethan Bibliographies. London: Nether Press, 1967-.

Thieme, Ulrich. Algemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler. 37 vols. Leipzig: E.A. Seemann, 1907-50.

Tilley, Morris Palmer. A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.

Wickham, Glynne. Early English Stages 1300-1660. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959-63.

Primary Sources

Microfilm:

Anonymous. A True Reporte of the Death & Martyrdome of M. Campion. [Douai, 1581.] STC 4537. Reel 200.

--------. The Institution of a Christian Man. London, 1537. STC 5163. Reel 31.

--------. The Institucion of a Gentleman. [1555] London, 1568. STC 14105. Reel 250.

--------. A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Chrysten Man. London, 1543. STC 5168. Reel 31.

Acheley, Thomas. The Massacre of Money. London, 1602. STC 86. Reel 817.

Biblia. The Bible that is, the holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament. Translated by Miles Coverdale. London, 1535. STC 2063. Reel 20.

The Holie Bible. [The "Bishops' Bible"] 5 parts. London, 1568. STC 2099. Reel 1020.

Bullein, William. Dialogue both pleasaunt and pietifull, wherein is a godlie regiment against the Feuer Pestilence. [1564] London, 1573. STC 4037. Reel 412.

Carr, John. The Ruinous fal of Prodigalitie: with the notable examples of the best aprooued aucthours which hath bin written of the same. London, 1573. STC 4685. Reel 202.

Casa, Giovanni della. Galateo of Maister Iohn Della Casa, Archebishop of Beneuenta. Or rather, A treatise of the manners and behaviours, it behoueth a man to vse. Translated by Robert Peterson. London, 1576. STC 4738. Reel 188.

Ceriol, Furio. A very briefe and profitable Treatise declaring howe many counsells, and what maner of Counselers a Prince that will governe well ought to have. London, 1570. STC 11488. Reel 243.

Chillester, James. A most excellent Hystorie of the Institution and firste beginning of Christian Princes. [Translation of Chelidonius] London, 1571. STC 3165. Reel 176.

Comenius, Johann Amos. Orbis Sensualium Pictus. Translated by Charles Hoole. London, 1659. Wing C 5523. Reel 88.

Copley, Anthony. Wits, Fittes and Fancies. London, 1595. STC 5738. Reel 207.

Dekker, Thomas. Penny-Wise, Pound Foolish. London, 1631. STC 6516. Reel 831.

Dickenson, John. Greene in Conceipt. New raised from his graue to write the Tragique Historie of faire Valeria of London. London, 1598. STC 6819. Reel 217.

Fabyan, Robert. The Chronicle of Fabyan. [1516] London, 1542. STC 10661. Reel 40.

Farrant, Thomas. [attrib.] The Wars of Cyrus. London, 1594. STC 6160. Microcard.

Feltham, Owen. Resolves, a Duple Century. [1623] London, 1628. STC 10758. Reel 772.

Foxe, John. Christ Iesus Triumphant. [Translated from Latin by John Day, the printer]. London, 1579. STC 11231. Reel 638.

Fulwood, William. A New Ballad against unthrifts. London, 1562. STC 11484. Reel 1203.

Gardiner, Samuell. Portraiture of the Prodigal Sonne. London, 1599. STC 11579. Reel 243.

Gayton, Edmund. Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot. London, 1654. Wing G 415. Reel 145.

Gnapheus, Gulielmus. Acolastus. Edited by Johannes Bolte in Lateinische Litteraturdenkmaler des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts. Berlin, 1891.

H., I. This Worlds Folly. London, 1615. STC 12570. Reel 1103.

Humphrey, Laurence. The Nobles or of Nobilitye. London, 1563. STC 13964. Reel 249.

Hurault, Jacques. Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses Translated from French by Arthur Golding. London, 1595. STC 14000. Reel 249.

Leius, Matthias, and Iohannis Secundi. Reginae Pecuniae Regia. London, 1623. STC 15439. Reel 842.

Lenton, Francis. Characterismi; or, Lentons Leasures. London, 1631. STC 15463. Reel 842.

--------. The Young Gallants Whirligigg: or Youths Reakes. London, 1629. STC 15467. Reel 842.

Loque, Bernard de. Discourses of Warre and Single Combat. Translated by J. Eliot. London, 1591. STC 16810. Reel 476.

Lupton, Thomas. All for Money. London, 1578. Microcard. STC 16949.

Marston, John. Histriomastix: Or, the Player Whipt. London, 1610. STC 13529. Reel 962.

--------. Parasitaster, or The Fawne. London, 1606. STC 17484. Reel 895.

--------. What You Will. London, 1607. STC 17487. Reel 895.

Munday, Anthony. A Discouerie of Edmund Campion, and his Confederates. London, 1582. STC 18270. Reel 324.

N[icholson], S[amuel]. Acolastus his Afterwitte. London, 1600. STC 18546. Reel 549.

Plutarch. The Education or bringinge up of children. Translated by Sir Thomas Eliot. London, n.d. [?1535]. STC 20057. Reel 3 (Shipment 1).

Preston, John. A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Mr. Arthur Upton. London, 1619. STC 20268. Reel 933.

Procter, Thomas. Of the Knowledge and Conducte of Warres. London, 1578. STC 20403. Reel 391.

Randolph, Thomas. The Muses Looking Glass. Oxford, 1638. STC 20694. Microcard.

Riche, Barnabe. Allarme to England. London, 1578. STC 20978. Reel 858.

Rowley, Samuel. When You See Me, You Know Me. [1605] London, 1632. STC 21420. Reel 936.

Rowley, William. A Shoo-maker a Gentleman. London, 1638. STC 21422. Reel 936.

Stow, John. The Annales of England. London, 1592. STC 23334. Reel 356.

--------. A Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles. London, 1565. STC 23319. Reel 356.

Taylor, John. A Shilling or, The Trauailes of Twelue-pence. London, 1621. STC 23793. Reel 1036.

Textoris, J. Rauisii. Dialogi aliquot festiuissimi, studiosae iuuentuti cum primis vtiles. London, 1621. STC 23793. Reel 1036.

Terence. Floures for Latine Spekynge. Selected and gathered oute of Terence. Translated by Nicholas Udall. STC 23899. Reel 147.

Wapull, George. The Tyde Tarryeth No Man. London, 1576. STC 25018. Microcard.

Whetstone, George. The Rocke of Regard. London, 1576. STC 25348. Reel 553.

Whitney, Geffrey. A Choice of Emblemes, and other Devises. London, 1586. STC 25438. Reel 401.

Xenophon. The VIII. Bookes of Xenophon, Containinge the Institution, scole, and education of Cyrus. Translated by William Barker. [?1560] London, 1567. STC 26067. Reel 404.

--------. Cyrupaedia. The Institution and Life of Cyrus. Translated by Philemon Holland. London, 1632. STC 26068. Reel 1056.

Books:

Anonymous. The Babees Book. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall. EETS OS, Vol. 32. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1868.

--------. The Book of Vices and Virtues. [14th century English translation of Lorens d'Orleans' Somme Le Roi.] Edited by W. Nelson Francis. EETS OS, Vol. 217. London: OUP, 1942.

--------. The Castell of Perseveraunce [MS, ca. 1440]. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall and Alfred W. Pollard in The Macro Plays. EETS ES, Vol. 101. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1904, pp. 75-186.

--------. The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality (pr. 1602). Dodsley, Vol. VIII, 329-83.

--------. The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality. Edited by Walter W. Greg. MSR (1913).

--------. Early English Homilies. Edited by Rubi D.N. Warner. EETS OS, Vol. 152. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1917.

--------. English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum. Edited by Sidney J.H. Herrtage. EETS ES, Vol. 33. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1879.

--------. Everyman [pr. 1510-19?]. Edited by A.C. Cawley in Everyman and Medieval Miracle Plays. London: Dent, 1956, pp. 206-34.

--------. The Excellent Parable of the Prodigal Child. Roxburghe, Vol. II, 391-8.

--------. The Famous Victories (pr. 1598). Edited by William C. Hazlitt in Shakespeare's Library. 6 vols. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. London: Ves and Turner, 1875, Vol. V, 321-77.

--------. Hickscorner [pr. 1515-16]. Edited by John M. Manly in Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama. 2 vols. Boston: Ginn, 1897, Vol. I, 386-420.

--------. The London Prodigal (pr. 1605). Edited by Charles F. Tucker Brooke in The Shakespeare Apocrypha. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918, pp. 191-218.

Anonymous. Mankind [MS, 1450-1500]. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall and Alfred W. Pollard in The Macro Plays. EETS ES, Vol. 101. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd., 1904, pp. 1-34.

--------. The Marriage of Wit and Science [pr. ca. 1569]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Five Anonymous Plays. 4th Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1908, pp. 47-100.

--------. Mary Magdalene [MS, ca. 1480-1520]. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall in The Digby Mysteries. EETS ES, Vol. 70. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1896, pp. 53-136.

--------. Middle English Sermons. Edited by Woodburn O. Ross. EETS OS, Vol. 209. London: OUP, 1940.

--------. Money is my Master [pr. ca. 1620-30]. Roxburghe, Vol. III, 280-84.

--------. Mundus et Infans (pr. 1522). Edited by John M. Manly in Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama. 2 vols. Boston: Ginn, 1897, Vol. I, 353-85.

--------. Nice Wanton (pr. 1560). Edited by John S. Farmer in The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 93-115.

--------. Pater, Filius, Uxor, or The Prodigal Son [pr. 1530-34]. Edited by Walter W. Greg. MSR, Collections, Vol. I, i (1907), 27-30.

--------. The Prodigal Son (pr. 1620). Edited and translated from the German by Richard Simpson in The School of Shakespere. 2 vols. New York: J.W. Bouton, 1878, Vol. II, 91-123.

--------. The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune (pr. 1589). Dodsley, Vol. VI, 143-243.

--------. Respublica (MS, 1553). Edited by Leonard A. Magnus. EETS ES, Vol. 94. London: K. Paul, Trench, and Trübner, 1905.

--------. The Silver Age, or, The World Turned Backward (pr. 1621). Edited by Hyder E. Rollins in The Pepys Ballads. 8 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929-32, Vol. I.

--------. There's nothing to be had without money [?1606-ca. 40]. Roxburghe, Vol. II, 565-9.

Anonymous. A Warning to Youth [pr. temp. James I]. Roxburghe, Vol. III, 36-41.

--------. Wealth and Health [pr. ca. 1565?]. Edited by Walter W. Greg and Percy Simpson. MSR, 1907.

--------. Wisdom [MSS, 1450-1500]. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall and Alfred W. Pollard in The Macro Plays. EETS ES, Vol. 101. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1904. pp. 35-74.

--------. Youth [pr. 1530-5]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays. 2nd Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1906, pp. 91-116.

--------. Youth's Warning-Piece (pr. 1636). Roxburghe, Vol. III, 1-5.

Alighieri, Dante. "Hell," The Divine Comedy, Cantica I. Translated by Dorothy Sayers. Penguin Books, 1949.

--------. "Purgatory," The Divine Comedy, Cantica II. Translated by Dorothy Sayers. Penguin Books, 1955.

Ambrose. Expositionis in Lucam, Lib. VII. PLat, Vol. XV, col. 1848.

Aristophanes. The Complete Plays. Edited by Moses Hadas. Translated by Moses Hadas, et al. New York: Bantam Books, 1962.

Aristotle. The Ethics [Nichomachean Ethics]. Translated by James A.K. Thomson. Penguin Books, 1955.

--------. The Politics. Translated by J.A. Sinclair. Penguin Books, 1962.

Ascham, Roger. The Scholemaster (pr. 1570). Edited by R.J. Schoek. Don Mills, Ontario: Dent, 1966.

Augustine. Quaestionum Evangeliorum, Lib. II. PLat, Vol. XXXV, cols. 1344-8.

--------. "Sermon XLVI on New Testament Lessons," in The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Philip Schaff. 14 vols. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1888, Vol. VI, 408-11.

Baldwin, William. A Treatise of Morall Philosophie (pr. 1547). Facsimile of 1620 edition by Robert Hood Bowers. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967.

Barnfield, Richard. The Lady Pecunia (pr. 1598). Edited by John P. Collier in Illustrations of Old English Literature. 3 vols. [1866] New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966, Vol. I.

--------. "An Ode," from Poems: In Diuers Humors (pr. 1598). Edited by Edward Arber in Barnfield's Poems 1594-8. Birmingham: Arber, 1883, pp. 120-1.

Beaumont, Francis. The Knight of the Burning Pestle (pr. 1613). Edited by John Doebler. Renaissance Drama, 1967.

Becon, Thomas. A New Catechism, set forth dialogue-wise in familiar talk between the father and the son (pr. 1560-4). Edited by John Ayre in The Works of Thomas Becon. The Parker Society. CUP, 1844.

Bede. Opera, Part II. Edited by D. Hurst. Vols. CXVIII-CXXV in Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina. Turnholti: Brepols, 1960, Vol. CXX, 287-95.

Bernard, Richard. [attrib.] The Birthe of Hercules [MS, 1597-ca. 1610]. Edited by Malcolm W. Wallace. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1903.

Bernard, (de Clairvaux). Opera Omnia. Edited by Jacques P. Migne. 4 vols. Paris, 1860.

--------. Oeuvres. Translated by M.M. Davy. 3 vols. Paris: Aubier, 1945.

Bible. La Bible Moralisée Conservée à Oxford, Paris et Londres. Edited by Alexandre de Laborde. 4 vols. Paris: Societé française de réproductions de manuscripts à peintures, 1911-27.

--------. Biblia Pauperum [BM copy]. Edited by J. Ph. Berjeau. London: John Russell Smith, 1859.

--------. Biblia Pauperum nach dem Original in der Lyceumsbibliothek zu Constance. Edited by Pfarrer Laib and Decan Dr. Schwarz. Zurich, 1867.

--------. Die Urausgaben der holländischen Apokalypse und Biblia Pauperum. Edited by H. Th. Musper. Munchen: Prestel-Verlag, 1961.

--------. Biblia Pauperum. Edited by Elizabeth Soltész. Budapeste: Corvina Press, 1967.

--------. Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Clementium. 3rd edition. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1959.

Bible. The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition. Introduction by Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

--------. The Holy Bible: Authorized King James Version. Glasgow: Collins' Clear-Type Press, 1934.

--------. New English Bible: New Testament. CUP and OUP, 1961.

--------. Novum Testamentum Graece. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1873.

Breton, Nicholas. No Whipping, nor Tripping but a kinde friendly Snipping (pr. 1601). Reprinted in The Whipper Pamphlets. Edited by Arthur E. Davenport. Liverpool: University Press of Liverpool, 1951.

Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. Edited by Holbrook Jackson. 3 vols. London: Dent, 1932.

Calvin, John. Commentaries. Edited and translated by Joseph Haroutunian and Louise Pettibone Smith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958.

--------. Commentarius in Harmoniam Evangelicam in Opera quae supersunt omnia. Vols. 29-87 in Corpus Reformatorum. Brunsvigae: Schwetschke, 1891, Vol. LXXIII.

--------. The Institutes of the Christian Religion. Edited by John T. McNeill and translated by Ford Lewis Battles. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.

Cartwright, William. The Ordinary (pr. 1651). Dodsley, Vol. XII, 203-317.

Castiglione, Baldassare. The Book of the Courtier (pr. 1561). Translated by Sir Thomas Hoby. Introduction by William H.D. Rouse. London: Dent, 1928.

Certaine Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Chvrches, In the time of the late Queene Elizabeth of famous memory (pr. 1623). Facsimile edition with introduction by Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1968.

Chapman, George. The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: Comedies. Edited by Thomas Marc Parrott. 2 vols. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1914.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Complete Works. Edited by Walter W. Skeat [1912]. OUP, 1957.

Cleland, James. The Institution of a Young Noble Man (pr. Oxford, 1607). Facsimile edition with introduction by Max Molyneux. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1948.

Climsell, Richard. The Forlorne Traveller [pr. 1634]. Roxburghe, Vol. III, 274-9.

Comestor, Petrus. Historia Scholastica in PLat, Vol. CXCVIII, cols. 1053-1722.

Cooke, John. Greene's Tu Quoque, or The City Gallant (pr. 1614). Dodsley, Vol. XI, 173-289.

Cyril. Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa. Edited by William Telfer. London: SCM Press, 1955.

Daniel, Samuel. The Civil Wars (pr. 1595). Edited by Laurence Michel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

--------. Philotas (pr. 1605). Edited by Laurence Michel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949.

Davenport, Robert. A New Trick to Cheat the Devil (pr. 1639). Edited by Arthur H. Bullen in The Works of Robert Davenport, in A Collection of Old English Plays. 4 vols. New Series [1890]. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964, Vol. III, 187-299.

Day, John. The Parliament of Bees (pr. 1641). Edited by Arthur H. Bullen in The Works of John Day [1881]. London: Holland Press, 1963, pp. 527-605.

Debussy, Claude. L'Enfant Prodigue. Paris: A. Durand, 1908.

Dekker, Thomas. Dramatic Works. Edited by Fredson Bowers. 4 vols. CUP, 1953-61.

--------. Non-Dramatic Works. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart [1884-6]. 5 vols. New York: Russell, 1963.

Deloney, Thomas. The Novels. Edited by Merrit E. Lawlis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961.

--------. Works. Edited by Francis Oscar Mann. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

Dürer, Albrecht. Paintings, Drawings and Prints. London: The Folio Society, 1969.

Earle, John. Microcosmography (pr. 1628). Edited by Harold Osbourne. London: University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1933.

Early Plays from the Italian. Edited with introduction by R.W. Bond. OUP, 1911.

Early Protestant Educators. Edited by Frederick Eby. New York: McGraw Hill, 1931.

Edwards, Richard. Damon and Pithias (pr. 1571). Edited by Arthur Brown and Frank P. Wilson. MSR, 1957.

Elizabethan Critical Essays. Edited by Gregory Smith. 2 vols. OUP, 1907.

Elyot, Thomas. The Booke of the Gouvernor (pr. 1531). Edited by Foster Watson [1907]. London: Dent, 1937.

Erasmus, Desiderius. Ausgewählte Werke. Edited by Annemarie and H. Holborn. Munich: Beck, 1933.

--------. Desiderius Erasmus Concerning the Aim and Method of Education. Edited and translated by William Harrison Woodward [1904]. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1964.

--------. The first tome or volume of the paraphrases of Erasmus upon the Newe Testament (1551 edition). Translated by Nicholas Udall. [Copy in Cameron Library, University of Alberta].

--------. Institutio Principis Christiani (pr. 1516). Translated by Lester K. Born. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

--------. Operum Omnium [1706]. 10 vols. Reprinted London: The Gregg Press Ltd., 1962.

--------. The Praise of Folly. Translated by Hoyt Hopewell Hudson. New York: Modern Library, 1941.

--------. Discourse on free will. Edited and translated by Ernst F. Winter. New York: Ungar, 1961.

Faulkner, William. The Reivers, a Reminiscence. New York: Random House, 1962.

Fletcher, John. The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher. Edited by Arnold Glover and Alfred R. Waller. 10 vols. CUP, 1905-12.

Gascoigne, George. The Complete Works. Edited by John W. Cunliffe. 2 vols. CUP, 1907-10.

Gide, André. Le Retour de l'Enfant Prodigue. Paris: Gallimard, 1961.

Gildon, Charles. The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton (pr. 1710). Extracts reprinted in The Restoration Stage. Edited by John I. McCollum, Jr. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961, pp. 104-11.

Gnapheus, Gulielmus. Acolastus. Edited and translated by W.E.D. Atkinson. University of W. Ontario Studies in the Humanities No. 3. London, Ontario: University of W. Ontario, 1964.

--------. Acolastus. Translated by John Palsgrave [1540]. Edited by Patrick L. Carver. EETS OS, Vol. 202. London: OUP, 1937.

Grafton, Richard. A Chronicle at Large (pr. 1569). Edited by Sir Henry Ellis. 2 vols. London, 1809.

Greene, Robert. Life and Complete Works. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. 15 vols. [1881-6] New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.

Gregory, William. Chronicle of London. Edited by James Gairdner in The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the 15th Century. Camden Society, N.S., No. 17, 55-239.

Hall, Edward. Chronicle. Edited by Sir Henry Ellis. London, 1809.

Hankin, St. John Emile Clavering. The Return of the Prodigal, in Plays. 2 vols. London: Secker, 1923, Vol. I, 95-177.

Harvey, Gabriel. Foure Letters and Certeine Sonnets, Especially Touching Robert Greene (pr. 1592). Edited by George B. Harrison. The Bodley Head Quartos. London: John Lane. The Bodley Head Ltd., 1923.

Henslowe, Philip. Diary. Edited by Walter W. Greg. 2 vols. London: A.H. Bullen, 1904-8.

--------. Henslowe Papers. Edited by Walter W. Greg. London: A.H. Bullen, 1907.

Heywood, John. A Merry Play Between Johan Johan the husbande, Tyb his wyffe, & Syr Jhon the prest (pr. 1533). Edited by John S. Farmer in The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 65-89.

Heywood, Thomas. The Dramatic Works. Edited by Richard H. Shepherd. 6 vols. London: John Pearson, 1874.

--------. Thomas Heywood. Edited by A. Wilson Verity. Mermaid Series. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1888.

Heywood, Thomas. If You Know Not Me: Part II. Edited by Madeleine Doran. MSR, 1934.

Hilton, Walter. The Scale of Perfection. Edited by Evelyn Underhill. London: J.M. Watkins, 1923.

Historical MSS Commission Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle Preserved at Penshurst Place. London: HMSO, 1925.

Hoccleve, Thomas. The Regement of Princes. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall. EETS ES, Vol. 72. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1897.

Holinshed, Raphaell. Chronicles (edition of 1587). Edited by Sir Henry Ellis. 6 vols. London, 1807-8.

Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Edited by Christopher Morris. 2 vols. London: Dent, 1907.

Horatius Flaccus, Quintus. Horace: Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica. Latin text with English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough. London: Heinemann, 1932.

Hrotswitha. The Plays. Translated by Christopher St. John [1923]. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966.

Hugh of St. Victor. Allegoriae in Novum Testamentum, Lib. IV, Cap. XXII. PLat, Vol. CLXXV, cols. 820-1.

Ingelend, Thomas. The Disobedient Child [pr. ca. 1560?]. Edited by John S. Farmer in The Dramatic Writings of R. Wever and T. Ingelend. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 43-92.

Irving, Washington. Bracebridge Hall. London, 1823.

Isidorus. Sententiarum. PLat, Vol. LXXXIII, cols. 537-738.

James I. Basilikon Doron (edition of 1603). Edited by James Craigie. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons Ltd., 1944.

Jerome. Epistola XXI. PLat, Vol XXII, cols. 387-8.

--------. The Letters. Edited and translated by Charles Christopher Merow. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1963.

Johnson, L., and A. Rudd (?), T. Richards (?). Misogonus [MS, ca. 1560-77]. Edited by Richard W. Bond in Early Plays from the Italian. OUP, 1911, pp. 162-258.

Johnson, Richard. Looke on me London (pr. 1613). Edited by John P. Collier in Illustrations of Early English Popular Literature [1863]. 2 vols. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1966, Vol. II.

Jonson, Ben. Ben Jonson [Life and Complete Works]. Edited by Ch. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn M. Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52.

--------. Eastward Ho (pr. 1605). [Written in collaboration with Chapman and Marston]. Edited by Julia Hamlet Harris. Yale Studies in English, No. LXXIII. New Haven, 1926.

--------. The Staple of News. Edited by De Winter. Yale Studies in English, No. XXVIII. New Haven, 1905.

Joyce, James. Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man [1916]. New York: Viking Press, 1964.

Keble, Rev. John. Sermons for Lent to Passiontide. London: Walter Smith, 1885.

Kipling, Rudyard. "The Prodigal Son," in Rudyard Kipling's Verse 1885-1932. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1933.

Langland, William. Piers Plowman. Edited by Elizabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall. London: Edward Arnold, 1967.

Latimer, Hugh. Sermons. Edited by George E. Corrie. The Parker Society. 2 vols. CUP, 1844.

Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by William Keatinge. The Parker Society. CUP, 1847.

Lodge, Thomas. A Margarite of America (pr. 1596). Edited by Edmund W. Gosse in The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge [1883]. The Hunterian Club. 4 vols. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1966, Vol. III.

Lucian. Timon, or the Misanthrope. Greek text with translation by Austin M. Harmon in Lucian. 8 vols. London: Heinemann, 1919, Vol. II.

Luther, Martin. The Bondage of the Will. Edited and translated by Ernst F. Winter. New York: Ungar, 1961.

--------. A Compend of Luther's Theology. Edited and translated by Hugh Thomson Kerr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.

Luther, Martin. Luther's Meditations on the Gospels. Edited and translated by Roland H. Bainton. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

--------. Luther's Works. General Editor, Helmut T. Lehmann. 55 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958-68.

Lydgate, John. The Assembly of the Gods. Edited by Oscar Lovell Triggs. EETS ES, Vol. 69. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1896.

Lyly, John. Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit (pr. 1579). Edited by Edward Arber. London: Alex Murray & Son, 1868.

--------. Euphues and his England (pr. 1580). Edited by Edward Arber. London: Alex Murray & Son, 1868.

Marlowe, Christopher. The Complete Plays. Edited by Irving Ribner. New York: Odyssey Press, 1963.

Marmion, Shackerley. Holland's Leaguer (pr. 1632). Edited by James Maidment and William H. Logan in The Dramatic Works of Shackerley Marmion. London: H. Sotheran & Co., 1875, pp. 1-97.

Marston, John. Works. Edited by Arthur H. Bullen. 3 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1887.

Massinger, Philip. A New Way to Pay Old Debts (pr. 1633). Edited by Thomas W. Craik. New Mermaid Series. London: Benn, 1964.

The Medieval Records of a London City Church 1420-1559. Edited by Henry Littlehales. EETS OS, Vol. 128. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1905.

Medwall, Henry. Nature [pr. 1530-4?]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Lost Tudor Plays. London: Early English Drama Society, 1907, pp. 41-133.

Menot, Michel. Sermons Choisis: 1508-18. Edited by Joseph Nève. Paris: Champion, 1924.

Merbury, Francis. The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom [MS, 1579 or 1570]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Five Anonymous Plays. 4th Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1908, pp. 257-98.

Middleton, Thomas. Works. Edited by Arthur H. Bullen. 8 vols. London: Bullen, 1885-6.

--------. A Mad World My Masters. Edited by Standish Henning. Renaissance Drama, 1965.

Middleton, Thomas. A Trick to Catch the Old One. Edited by Charles L. Barber. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

Miller, Arthur. Death of a Salesman. New York: Viking Press, 1958.

The Mishnah. Edited by Herbert Danby. OUP, 1933.

More, Thomas. The English Works [Facsimile of 1557 edition]. Edited by William E. Campbell and Allen W. Reed. 2 vols. London and New York: Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., 1931.

The Mirrour for Magistrates (pr. 1559-78). Edited by Lily B. Campbell [1938]. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1960.

Parts Added to 'The Mirrour for Magistrates.' Edited by Lily B. Campbell. CUP, 1946.

Munday, Anthony. John a Kent [MS, ca. 1587-90]. Edited by Muriel St. Clare Byrne. MSR, 1923.

--------, and Thomas Dekker, Henry Chettle, Thomas Heywood [attrib.], William Shakespeare [attrib.]. Sir Thomas More [MS, ca. 1593-ca. 1601]. Edited by Walter W. Greg. MSR, 1911.

Murner, Thomas. Die Schelmenzunft. Edited by Moritz Spanier in Murners Deutsche Schriften. 8 vols. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Grunter & Co., 1925, Vol. III.

Myrc, John. Instructions for Parish Priests. Edited by Edward Peacock. London: Trübner & Co., 1868.

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Edited by Geoffrey Bullough. 6 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-.

Nashe, Thomas. Works. Edited by Ronald B. McKerrow [1904-10]. Reprinted with corrections and supplementary notes by Frank P. Wilson. 5 vols. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1958.

Needham, Richard J. "The Prodigal Son" in The Garden of Needham. Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1968, pp. 86-8.

Newman, John Henry. Parochial and Plain Sermons. 8 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908-18.

Norton, Thomas, and Thomas Sackville. Gorboduc (pr. 1565). Edited by John Gassner in Medieval and Tudor Drama. New York: Bantam Books, 1968, pp. 406-53.

Parker, Martin [attrib.]. The Usurer and the Spendthrift [?1606-ca. 1640]. Roxburghe, Vol. I, 129-36.

-------- [attrib.]. A Warning to All Lewd Livers [?1625-ca. 1640]. Roxburghe, Vol. III, 23-8.

Paton, Alan. Cry, the Beloved Country. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1948.

"Petition Against the Return of George Gasgoigne, The Poet, To Parliament." Reprinted in the Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. XXXVI (1851), pt. ii, 241-4.

Plato. The Republic. Translated by Henry D.P. Lee. Penguin Books, 1955.

Plautus, Titus Maccius. Plautus. Latin text with English translation by Paul Nixon. 5 vols. London: W. Heinemann, 1916-38.

Plomer, William. The Prodigal Son. [Libretto.] London: Faber Music Ltd., 1968.

Plutarch. Moralia. Edited and translated by Frank Cole Babbit. 15 vols. London: Heinemann, 1927.

Porter, Henry. The Two Angry Women of Abingdon (pr. 1599). Dodsley, Vol. VII, 267-383.

Preston, Thomas. Cambyses [pr. ca. 1569]. Dodsley, Vol. IV, 157-248.

Prudentius. Psychomachia. Edited and translated by H.J. Thomson, in Prudentius. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949, Vol. I, 274-343.

Quintilian. On Education. Selected and translated by William M. Smail. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.

Rabanus. Allegoriae in Sacram Scripturam. PLat, Vol. CXII, cols. 849-1088.

Randolph, Thomas. The Poetic and Dramatic Works. Edited by William C. Hazlitt [1875]. 2 vols. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

--------. The Drinking Academy, or The Cheaters' Holiday [MS, 1626-31]. Edited by Samuel A. Tannenbaum and Hyder E. Rollins. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Rastell, John. The Four Elements [pr. ca. 1526-30]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays. 1st Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 1-45.

Redford, John. Wit and Science [MS, 1531-47]. Edited by John M. Manly in Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama. 2 vols. Boston: Ginn, 1897, Vol. I, 421-56.

Ripa, Cesare. Iconologia [1613] (Venice, 1669). [Copy in Cameron Library of University of Alberta].

Rhodes, Hugh. The Boke of Nurture, or School of Good Manners for Men. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall in The Babees Book. EETS OS, Vol. 32. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1868, pp. 61-108.

Robertson, Frederick W. "The Prodigal and his Brother," in Sermons. 3 vols. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co., 1870, Vol. I, 314-31.

Robinson, Clement. A Handefull of Plesant Delites (pr. 1584). Edited by Hyder E. Rollins [1924]. New York: Dover Publications, 1965.

Rowlands, Samuel. Works. Hunterian Club Edition [1880]. 3 vols. New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1966.

Rowley, William (and Thomas Middleton [attrib.]). A Match at Midnight (pr. 1633). Dodsley, Vol. XIII, 1-98.

Saddharmapundarika, or Lotus of the True Law. Translated by Hendrik Kern in The Sacred Books of the East. Edited by F. Max Müller. 50 vols. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1879-1910, Vol. X, 1-442.

Scott, Walter. Kenilworth. Boston: n.d.

Scribe, Eugène. L'Enfant Prodigue in Oeuvres complètes. 17 vols. Paris: E. Lebigne-Duquesne, 1854, Vol. X, 21-37.

Shakespeare, William. The First Folio (pr. 1623). Norton Facsimile Edition. Prepared by Charlton Hinman. New York: Norton & Co., 1968.

--------. The Complete Works. Edited by Hardin Craig. New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1951.

--------. Henry IV: Part One. Edited by Arthur R. Humphreys. Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks. London: Methuen, 1966.

--------. Henry IV: Part Two. Edited by Arthur R. Humphreys. Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks. London: Methuen, 1967.

--------. Henry V. Edited by John H. Walter. Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks. London: Methuen, 1965.

Shakespeare, William. King Richard II. Edited by Peter Ure. Arden Shakespeare Paperbacks. London: Methuen, 1966.

Sidney, Philip. An Apologie for Poetrie (pr. 1595). Edited by Geoffrey Shepherd. London: Nelson & Sons, 1965.

Skelton, John. Magnyfycence [pr. 1530?]. Edited by Robert Lee Ramsay. EETS ES, Vol. 98. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1908.

--------. "Speculum Principis." Edited by Frederick M. Salter in Speculum, Vol. IX (1934), 25-37.

Spenser, Edmund. Works. Edited by E. Greenlaw, C.G. Osgood F.M. Padelford, et al. Variorum Edition. 10 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1932-49.

Stubbes, Philip. The Anatomy of Abuses (pr. 1583). Edited by W.B.D. Turnbull. London, 1836.

Taverner, Richard. Proverbs or Adages by Desiderius Erasmus Gathered out of the 'Chiliades' (edition of 1569). Facsimile text with introduction by De Witt T. Starnes. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1956.

Terence, Publius. Plays. Latin text with English translation by John Sargeaunt. 2 vols. London: Heinemann, 1931.

Textor, Ravisius. Thersites, and, Juvenis, Pater, et Uxor. Edited by Ferdinand Holthausen in Englischen Studien, Vol. XXXI (1902), 77-103.

Thoresby, Archbishop. The Lay Folk's Catechism. Edited by Thomas F. Simmons and Henry E. Nolloth. EETS OS, Vol. 118. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1901.

Thynne, Francis. Emblemes and Epigrammes (pr. 1600). Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall. EETS OS, Vol. 64. London: N. Trübner & Co., 1876.

Trevelyon, Thomas. "Commonplace Book." 2 vols. Certain pages of the manuscript reproduced in SQ, Vol. XIV (1963), 386, 418, 440, 444, 460, 488.

The Two Books of the Homilies to be Read in Churches. Edited By John Griffiths. OUP, 1859.

The Two Liturgies A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552. Edited by Joseph Ketley. Parker Society. CUP, 1844.

Tyndale, William. Doctrinal Treatises. Edited by Rev. Henry Walter. Parker Society. CUP, 1848.

Udall, Nicholas [attrib.], or W. Hunnis [attrib.]. Jacob and Esau (pr. 1568). Edited by John S. Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays. 2nd Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1906, pp. 1-90.

Udall, Nicholas [attrib.]. Thersites [pr. 1561-3]. Edited by John S. Farmer in Six Anonymous Plays. 1st Series. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 194-226.

Wager, Lewis. The Life and Repentaunce of Marie Magdelene (pr. 1566-7). Edited by Frederic Ives Carpenter. The Decennial Publications. 2nd Series. New and revised edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1904.

Wever, R. Lusty Juventus [pr. ca. 1565?]. Edited by John S. Farmer in The Dramatic Writings of R. Wever and T. Ingelend. London: Early English Drama Society, 1905, pp. 1-42.

Wilson, Robert. Three Ladies of London (pr. 1584). Dodsley, Vol. VI, 246-370.

--------. Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (pr. 1590). Dodsley, Vol. VI, 372-502.

Wilson, Thomas. A Discourse upon Usury (pr. 1572). Edited by R.H. Tawney. London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1925.

Wither, George. Abuses Stript and Whipt (pr. 1626) in Juvenalia [1871]. 3 Vols. New York: B. Franklin, 1967, Vol. I, 1-333.

Woodes, Nathaniel. The Conflict of Conscience (pr. 1581). Dodsley, Vol. VI, 29-142.

Wright, Louis B. ed. Advice to a Son: Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Yonge, James, transl. The Gouernaunce of Prynces. Edited by Robert Steele in Three Prose Versions of the Secreta Secretorum. EETS ES, Vol. 74. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1898.

Secondary Sources

Books:

Adams, Henry H. English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy 1575 to 1642. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Adams, Henry. Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres [1913]. New York: New American Library, 1961.

Akrigg, George P.V. Jacobean Pageant [1962]. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

Allen, John W. A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century [1928]. London: Methuen, 1960.

Appleton, William W. Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study. London: Allen and Unwin, 1956.

Ashley, Maurice. England in the 17th Century. Pelican Books, 1952.

Aydelotte, Frank. Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds [1913]. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Baldass, Ludwig von. Hieronymus Bosch. New York: Henry N. Abrams, 1960.

Baldwin, Thomas W. Shakspere's Five-Act Structure. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1947.

Barber, Charles L. Shakespeare's Festive Comedy. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Co., 1963.

Barker, Richard H. Thomas Middleton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Baskervill, Charles R. The Elizabethan Jig [1929]. New York: Dover Publications, 1965.

--------. English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. University of Texas Bulletin, No. 178 (1911).

Beck, Richard J. Shakespeare's Henry IV. London: Edward Arnold, 1965.

Berlin, Normand. The Base String. The Underworld in Elizabethan Drama. Rutherford, Madison, Teanech: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1968.

Bernbaum, Ernest. The Drama of Sensibility. Boston: Ginn, 1915.

Bethell, Samuel. Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1944.

Bethurum, Dorothy, ed. Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature. Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1958-9. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Bevington, David M. Tudor Drama and Politics. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Bindoff, Stanley T. Tudor England. Pelican Books, 1950.

Black, John B. The Reign of Elizabeth. 2nd edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Boas, Frederick S. Chapter on "Education Drama" in the Cambridge History of English Literature. Edited by Adolphus W. Ward and Alfred R. Waller. 15 vols. CUP, 1908-27, Vol. V, 100-13.

--------. An Introduction to Tudor Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

--------. University Drama in the Tudor Age. OUP, 1914.

--------. Thomas Heywood. London: Williams and Norgate, 1950.

Boswell-Stone, Walter G. Shakespeare's Holinshed. 2nd revised edition [1907]. New York: Dover Publications, 1968.

Bradbrook, Muriel C. The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy [1955]. Peregrine Books, 1963.

--------. The Tragic Pageant of 'Timon of Athens.' CUP, 1966.

Brandl, Alois. Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare. Strasburg: K. Trübner, 1898.

Brennecke, Ernest. Shakespeare in Germany. 1590-1700. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Brooke, Charles F.T. The Tudor Drama [1911]. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1939.

--------. Life of Marlowe. London: Methuen, 1930.

Brown, J.R., and Bernard Harris, eds. Jacobean Theatre. Stratford-Upon-Avon Studies. Revised edition. London: Edward Arnold. Vol. I (1965).

Bugge, Chr. A. Die Haupt-Parabeln Jesu. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1903.

Caiger-Smith, A. English Medieval Mural Paintings. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Campbell, Lily B. Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

--------. Shakespeare's Histories [1947]. London: Methuen, 1964.

Caputi, Anthony. John Marston, Satirist. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1961.

Chambers, Edmund K. William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Charlton, Kenneth. Education in Renaissance England. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Chew, Samuel C. The Pilgrimage of Life. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

--------. The Virtues Reconciled: An Iconographic Study. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1947.

Chute, Marchette. Ben Jonson of Westminster [1953]. New York: Dutton, 1960.

Clarke, W.K. Lowther. Concise Bible Commentary. London: SPCK, 1952.

Cooper, Charles H., and T. Cooper. Athenae Cantabrigienses. 3 vols. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1858-1913.

Coulton, George G. Ten Medieval Studies [1906]. Becon Hill, Boston: Becon Press, 1959.

Craig, Hardin. English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages. OUP, 1955.

Craik, Thomas W. The Tudor Interlude. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1958.

Creed, John M. The Gospel According to S. Luke [1930]. London: Macmillan, 1957.

Creizenach, Wilhelm. Geschichte des Neueren Dramas. 3 vols. Halle: Niemeyer, 1911-23.

--------. Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten. Berlin and Stuttgart: W. Spemann, n.d.

Croft-Murray, Edward. Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837. 2 vols. London: Country Life, Ltd., 1962.

Dodd, Charles H. The Parables of the Kingdom [1935]. Revised edition. London: Collins, 1961.

Doran, Madeleine. Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama [1954]. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

Durand, Georges. Description Abrégée de la Cathédrale d'Amiens. 3rd edition. Amiens: Yvert et Tellier, 1926.

Durand, M. Paul. Monographie de Notre-Dame de Chartres. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881.

Easton, Burton S. The Gospel According to St. Luke. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke, 1926.

Fairchild, Arthur H.R. Shakespeare and the Arts of Design. University of Missouri Studies. Vol. XII (Jan. 1937).

Finkelpearl, Philip J. John Marston of the Middle Temple. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Fonck, Leopold. The Parables of the Gospel. New York: Pustet & Co., 1914.

Frank, Grace. The Medieval French Drama. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Frye, Northrup. Anatomy of Criticism [1957]. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

--------. A Natural Perspective. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Glunz, Hans H. History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon. CUP, 1933.

Gore, Charles, H.L. Goudge, and A. Guillaume. A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. London: SPCK, 1929.

Gough, Richard. Sepulchral Monuments in Gt. Britain. 2 vols. London, 1786-96.

Greaves, Margaret. The Blazon of Honour: A Study in Renaissance Magnanimity. London: Methuen, 1964.

Gregg, Kate L. Thomas Dekker: A Study in Economic and Social Background. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1924.

Hanson, Richard P.C. Allegory and Event. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Audience [1941]. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Harris, William O. Skelton's 'Magnyfycence' and the Cardinal Virtue Tradition. Chapel Hill: University of N. Carolina Press, 1966.

Herford, Charles H. Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century. CUP, 1886.

Hill, Christopher. Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England [1964]. London: Mercury Books, 1966.

Hind, Arthur M. A History of Engraving and Etching [1923]. New York: Dover Publications, 1963.

--------. An Introduction to a History of Woodcut [1935]. 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications, 1963.

Hogrefe, Pearl. The Sir Thomas More Circle. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959.

Hollis, Christopher. Eton. London: Hollis and Carter, 1960.

Holstein, Hugo. Das Drama vom verlornen Sohn. Halle: Otto Hendel, 1880.

Holzknecht, Karl J. Outlines of Tudor and Stuart Plays 1497-1642. London: Methuen, 1963.

Hone, William. Ancient Mysteries Described, Especially the English Miracle Plays. London, 1823.

Hürlimann, Martin, and Jean Bony. French Cathedrals. New York: Viking, 1967.

Jameson, Mrs. Anna B., and Lady Elizabeth Eastlake. The History of Our Lord As Exemplified in Works of Art. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, & Co., 1892.

Jenkins, Harold. The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's 'Henry IV.' London: Methuen, 1956.

Jeremias, Joachim. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S.H. Hooke from the 6th edition (1962) of Die Gleichnisse Jesu. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Jones, Geraint Vaughan. The Art and Truth of the Parables. London: SPCK, 1964.

Jordan, John Clark. Robert Greene. New York: Columbia University Press, 1915.

Jülicher, Adolf. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Freiburg, Leipzig and Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1899.

Kallensee, Kurt. Die Liebe des Vaters; das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn in der christlichen Dichtung und bildenden Kunst. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstadt, 1960.

Katzenellenbogen, Adolf. Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Medieval Art. Studies of the Warburg Institute. Vol. X. London, 1939.

Kendon, Frank. Mural Paintings in English Churches During the Middle Ages. London: John Lane, 1923.

Keyser, Charles E. List of Buildings in Gt. Britain and Ireland Having Mural or Other Painted Decorations. 3rd edition. London: HMSO, 1883.

Knights, Lionel C. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson [1937]. Peregrine Books, 1962.

Künstle, Karl. Ikonographie der Christlichen Kunst. 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co., 1926.

Kurth, Betty. Die Deutschen Bildteppiche des Mittelalters. 3 vols. Vienna: A. Schroll & Co., 1926.

Lee, Anthony van der. Zum literarischen Motif der Vatersuche. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1957.

Lyte, H.C. Maxwell. A History of Eton College. London: Macmillan, 1875.

Mackenzie, W. Roy. The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1914.

Mâle, Émile. L'art Religieux du XIII^{e} Siècle en France. Paris: Armand Colin, 1919.

Manson, Thomas W. The Sayings of Jesus [1937]. London: SCM Press, 1949.

Martin, Arthur Marie, and Charles Cahier. Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges. Part One. Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand, 1841-4.

Martin, Hugh. The Parables of the Gospels. New York: SCM Press, 1937.

McClennen, Joshua. Allegory in the English Renaissance. University of Michigan Contributions in Philology, No. 6. University of Michigan Press, 1947.

McMahon, Clara P. Education in 15th Century England. The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Education, No. 35. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1947.

Merlet, René. La Cathédrale de Chartres. Petites Monographies des Grands Édifices de la France. Paris: H. Laurens, 1929.

Mill, Anna Jean. Mediaeval Plays in Scotland. St. Andrew's University Publication, No. XXIV. Edinburgh and London, 1927.

Millet, Gabriel. Recherches sur l'iconographie de l'Évangile aux XIV^{e}, XV^{e}, et XVI^{e} Siècles. Paris: Fontemoing, 1916.

Montefiore, Claude G. The Synoptic Gospels [1909]. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Morris, Christopher. Political Thought in England from Tyndale to Hooker. Oxford: Home University Library, 1953.

Motley, John Lothrop. The Rise of the Dutch Republic. 3 vols. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1906.

Motter, Thomas H. Vail. The School Drama in England. London: Longman's, 1929.

Neale, John E. Queen Elizabeth I [1934]. Pelican Books, 1965.

Nicoll, Allardyce. British Drama. 5th edition. London: Harrap, 1962.

Noble, Richmond. Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge. London: SPCK, 1935.

Oesterley, William O.E. The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background. London: SPCK, 1936.

Owst, Gerald R. Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. 2nd edition with new material. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

--------. Preaching in Medieval England. CUP, 1926.

Palmer, Henrietta R. List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics Printed before 1641. London: Blades, East and Blades for the Bibliographical Society, 1911.

Panofsky, Erwin. Studies in Iconology [1939]. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Pepin, Jean. Mythe et Allégorie. Aubier: Éditions Montaigne, 1958.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke, 1896.

Porée, Charles. La Cathédrale d'Auxerre. Petites Monographies des Grands Edifices de la France. Paris: Henri Laurens, 1926.

Poteat, Edwin McNeill. Parables of Crisis. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Prouty, Charles T. George Gascoigne, Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier and Poet. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Read, Conyers. Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Réau, Louis. Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien. 3 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1955-9.

Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Rosenfeld, Sybil. The Theatre of the London Fairs in the 18th Century. CUP, 1960.

Rossiter, Arthur P. English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans. London: Hutchinson University Library, 1950.

Rössler, Alice. "Die Parabel vom verlorenen Sohn des 16. Jahrhunderts als Spiegelbild der rechtlichen wirtshaftlichen und sozialen Verhältnisse jener Zeit." Unpublished dissertation. Jena, 1952.

Rostenberg, Leona. English Publishers in the Graphic Arts 1599-1700. Burt Franklin Bibliography and Reference Series, No. 42. New York: Burt Franklin, 1963.

Ryan, Lawrence V. Roger Ascham. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1963.

Schelling, Felix E. The Life and Writings of George Gascoigne. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1893.

Schmidt, Erich. Die Komödien vom Studentenleben. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1880.

Simon, Joan. Education and Society in Tudor England. CUP, 1966.

Sims, James H. Dramatic Uses of Biblical Allusions in Marlowe and Shakespeare. University of Florida Monographs: Humanities, No. 24. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press, 1966.

Smith, Bertram T.D. The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels. CUP, 1937.

Spengler, Franz. Der verlorene Sohn im Drama des 16. Jahrhunderts. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1888.

Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Spurgeon, Caroline. Shakespeare's Imagery [1935]. CUP, 1968.

Strong, Roy. The Elizabethan Image: Painting in England 1540-1620. London: Tate Gallery Publications Department, 1969.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A. Shaksperian Scraps. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.

Tawney, Richard H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism [1926]. Pelican Books, 1938.

Taylor, Henry O. The Mediaeval Mind. 2 vols. 4th edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Thompson, Elbert N.S. The English Moral Play. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts, Science and Letters, 1910.

--------. Literary By-Paths of the Renaissance. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924.

Thomson, William G. A History of Tapestry from the Earliest Times until the Present Day. Revised edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1930.

Tillyard, Eustace M.W. Shakespeare's History Plays [1944]. Peregrine Books, 1966.

Traversi, Derek. Shakespeare from 'Richard II' to 'Henry V.' Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. Notes on the Parables of Our Lord [1847]. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1948.

Turner, Alison Mary. "The Motif of the Prodigal Son in French and German Literature to 1910." Unpublished dissertation. University of N. Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1966.

Turner, Celeste. Anthony Mundy, an Elizabethan Man of Letters. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928.

Usher, Roland G. The Rise and Fall of the High Commission [1913]. Reprinted with a new introduction by Philip Tyler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Velte, Mowbray. The Bourgeois Elements in the Dramas of Thomas Heywood [1924]. New York: Haskell House, 1966.

Vetter, Ewald. Der verlorene Sohn. Lukas-Bucherei zur christlichen Ikonographie. Dusseldorf: Schwann, 1955.

Via, Dan O. The Parables. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Wais, Kurt. Das Vater-Sohn Motif in der Dichtung. 2 parts. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1931.

Warner, Sir George. The Library of King James VI, 1573-83. Scottish Historical Society, Miscellany, Vol. XV (1893).

Watson, Foster. The English Grammar Schools to 1660. CUP, 1908.

Weatherhead, Leslie D. In Quest of a Kingdom. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism [1904-5]. Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Wellhausen, Julius. Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien. 2nd edition. Berlin: George Reimer, 1911.

Willson, David Harris. King James VI and I [1956]. London: Jonathan Cape, 1963.

Wilson, Frank P. The English Drama 1485-1585. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Wilson, John Dover. The Fortunes of Falstaff [1943]. CUP, 1964.

Wood, Margaret. The English Mediaeval House. London: Readers Union, Phoenix House, 1966.

Woodforde, Christopher. English Stained and Painted Glass. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

Woodward, William H. Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600. CUP, 1906.

Wright, Louis B. Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1935.

Young, Karl. The Drama of the Mediaeval Church. 2 vols. OUP, 1933.

Articles, essays, etc.:

Armstrong, William A. "The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres," RES, n.s., Vol. X (1959), 234-49.

B., W.C. "Shakspeare and Droeshout," N&Q, 6th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1885), 325-6.

--------. "Shakspeare and the Prodigal Son," N&Q, 7th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1891), 305-6.

Barnard, Ettwell A.B., and Alan J.B. Wace. "The Sheldon Tapestry Weavers and their Works," Archaeologia, Vol. LXXVIII (1928), 255-314.

Bevington, David M. "Misogonus and Laurentius Bariona," ELN, Vol. II (1964), 9-10.

Bloomfield, Martin. "Symbolism in Medieval Literature," MP, Vol. LVI (1958), 73-81.

Bradner, Leicester. "A Check-List of Original Neo-Latin Dramas by Continental Writers before 1650," PMLA, Vol. LVIII (1943), 621-33.

--------. "The Latin Drama of the Renaissance," SRen, Vol. IV (1957), 31-70.

Craig, Hardin. "Morality Plays and Elizabethan Drama," SQ, Vol. I (1950), 64-72.

Doebler, John. "Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle and the Prodigal Son Plays," SEL, Vol. V (1965), 333-44.

["An Elizabethan Wallpainting"], The Times (August 29, 1935), pp. 13, 14.

Feldman, Abraham B. "Dutch Humanism and the Tudor Dramatic Tradition," N&Q, Vol. 197 (Jan.-Dec., 1952), 357-60.

Feldman, Abraham B. "English Playwrights in the Netherlands War," N&Q, Vol. 197 (Jan.-Dec., 1952), 530-3.

-------. "Gnapheus in England," MLN, Vol. LXVII (1952), 325-8

Finkelpearl, Philip J. "John Marston's Histrio-Mastix as an Inns of Court Play: A Hypothesis," HLQ, Vol. XXIX (1966), 223-34.

Frye, Northrup. "The Argument of Comedy" in English Institute Essays (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), pp. 58-73.

Gilbert, Allan H. "The Function of the Masques in Cynthia's Revels," PQ, Vol. XXII (1943), 211-30.

-------. "Thomas Heywood's Debt to Plautus," JEGP, Vol. XII (1913), 593-611.

Graves, Thomas S. "Some Allusions to Richard Tarleton," MP, Vol. XVIII (1920-1), 493-8.

Grivelet, Michel. "The Simplicity of Thomas Heywood," ShS, Vol. XIV (1961), 56-65.

Hallen, A.W. Cornelius. "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 9th Series, Vol. I (Jan.-June, 1898), 195-6.

Harbage, Alfred. "A Census of Anglo-Latin Plays," PMLA, Vol. LIII (1938), 624-8.

Harris, William O. "Despair and 'Patience as the Truest Fortitude' in Samson Agonistes," ELH, Vol. XXX (1963), 107-15.

James, Montague R. "The Wall Paintings in Brooke Church," in A Supplement to Blomefield's Norfolk, edited by Clement Ingleby (1929), pp. 14-25. [Published privately by Clement Ingleby].

Jorgensen, Paul A. "The 'Dastardly Treachery' of Prince John of Lancaster," PMLA, Vol. LXXVI (1961), 488-92.

Kernan, Alvin. "John Marston's play, Histriomastix," MLQ, Vol. XIX (1958), 134-40.

Kittredge, Geo. Lyman. "The Misogonus and Lawrence Johnson," JEGP, Vol. III (1901), 335-41.

Lawrence, Wm. J. "Act-Intervals in Early Shakespearean Performances," RES, Vol. IV (1928), 78-9.

Lawrence, Wm. J. [On The Sun's Darling], TLS, Dec. 20, 1923, p. 894.

Martin, David. "Is This Man Really the Country's Best Athlete?" Life, June 6, 1969, pp. 48-58.

Mitchell, Charles. "The Education of a True Prince," TSL, Vol. XII (1967), 13-21.

Moore-Smith, G.C. "Misogonus," TLS, July 10, 1930, p. 576.

Partridge, Edward B. "The Symbolism of Clothes in Jonson's Last Plays," JEGP, Vol. LVI (1957), 396-409.

Peacock, Edward. "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 8th Series, Vol. XII (July-Dec., 1897), 385.

R., R. "The Prodigal Son," N&Q, 9th Series, Vol. I (Jan.-June, 1898), 136-7.

Rainer, Pineas. "The English Morality Play as a Weapon of Religious Controversy," SEL, Vol. II (1962), 157-80.

Ribner, Irving. "Tamburlaine and The Wars of Cyrus," JEGP, Vol. LIII (1954), 569-73.

Shapiro, I.A. "Shakespeare and Mundy," ShS, Vol. XIV (1961), 25-33.

Snyder, Susan. "King Lear and the Prodigal Son," SQ, Vol. XVII (1966), 361-9.

--------. "The Left Hand of God; Despair in Medieval and Renaissance Tradition," SRen, Vol. XII (1965), 18-59.

Sternfield, Frederick W. "Music and Ballads," ShS, Vol. XVII (1964), 214-22.

Stonex, Arthur B. "The Sources of Jonson's The Staple of News," PMLA, Vol. XXX (1915), 821-30.

Talbot, Ernest W. "The Classical Mythology and the Structure of Cynthia's Revels," PQ, Vol. XXII (1943), 193-210.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A. "A Note on Misogonus," MLN, Vol. XLV (1930), 309.

Ustick, W. Lee. "Advice to a Son: A Type of Seventeenth-Century Conduct Book," SP, Vol. XXIX (1932), 409-41.

Whitehorn, Katharine. "Husks with Everything," The Observer Review (July 28, 1968), p. 19.

Wilson, John Dover. "Euphues and the Prodigal Son," Library, n.s., Vol. X (1909), 337-61.

Wood, Henry. "Shakespeare, Burlesqued by Two Fellow-Dramatists," American Journal of Philology, Vol. XVI (1895), 273-99.

Wright, Louis B. "Some Social Aspects of Some Belated Moralities," Anglia, Vol. LIV (1930), 107-48.