Publications
OF THE
University of Pennsylvania

SERIES IN
Philology, Literature and Archaeology

VOL. VII NO. 2

THE RISE OF FORMAL SATIRE IN ENGLAND
UNDER CLASSICAL INFLUENCE

BY

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN
Instructor in English, University of Pennsylvania

Published for the University
PHILADELPHIA
1899

GINN & Co., Selling Agents, Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

PREFATORY NOTE.

This monograph was presented to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in partial fulfillment of the requirements made of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It was the intention of the author to rewrite the dissertation for publication, bringing it into a somewhat less formal and more readable shape. On consideration, however, it seemed (since the contents are such as to be of interest only to serious students, and that largely by way of reference) that the material presented would be perhaps even more serviceable in its present state than if enlarged and made more pretentious of literary form. The monograph is printed, therefore, substantially as originally written, with certain trifling additions, the material for which came to light during the time of preparation for the press.

What was believed to be needed, first of all, was an orderly setting together and—to a certain extent—an analysis of the facts relating to the rise of formal satire in England. This, it is hoped, has been measurably accomplished. Hitherto there has been no accessible discussion of the subject, except in the fragmentary "Conversations" of Mr. Collier's *Poetical Decameron* (now almost obsolete), and in the rapid survey of Elizabethan satire in Warton's *History of English Poetry*. It may be well to state definitely in what ways it is hoped that the present work may be useful, aside from serving as a general index and introduction to the authors and works treated. It will, in the first place, perhaps throw some light on the development of satirical literature in England, particularly on the satirical drama of the Elizabethan period and on the regular verse satire of the seventeenth and

eighteenth centuries. In the second place, it will perhaps furnish aid in the making up of the full account, yet to be written, of English life in the period covered. For this reason the references of the various satirists to contemporary characteristics and customs have been arranged in regular lists of "objects satirized," so as to form a sort of running index to allusions more or less descriptive of Elizabethan life. Surely it is in its relations to *human life* that the fundamental interest of any study of literature, however technical, must be found.

The writer is under many obligations to those whose courtesy and scholarly help have been at his service: to Professors Kittredge and Baker, and Mr. J. B. Fletcher, of Harvard University, for a number of valuable suggestions; to Professors Gudeman, Cheyney and Learned, of the University of Pennsylvania, for guidance in matters pertaining to their several fields; to Mr. T. J. Kiernan, of the Harvard College Library; to Dr. Horace Howard Furness, for the generous accord of the use of his private library; to Mr. Edmond Gosse, for his kindness in offering the use of still unpublished notes; to Professor Brumbaugh, of the University of Pennsylvania, for the use of his manuscripts and library on matters relating to Donne; and to the late Dr. Small, of Brown University, who is most unfortunately beyond the reach of words of gratitude or friendship. Acknowledgment is due above all to my teacher, Professor Felix E. Schelling, whose stimulating and unceasingly friendly direction has alone made my work possible.

R. M. A.

PHILADELPHIA, 30 September, 1899.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE RISE OF FORMAL SATIRE IN ENGLAND UNDER CLASSICAL INFLUENCE.

There are two ways in which satire may be considered—as a mode, and as a form. Undoubtedly it is from the former point of view that it is most interesting. It may then be traced through all literary forms—lyrical verse, the drama, prose fiction, and the essay. Its varieties of expression and application, due to different historical conditions, are practically unlimited in number and scope. Its relations to wit and humor, to emotional expression, to the fine arts, and to the particular literary forms in which it may appear, are well worth study. But the very conditions which would make such study interesting, would demand an enormous accumulation of material, and the strongest possible basis of scholarship and intellectual insight.

The study of formal satire is a more modest task. Formal satire arose comparatively late in the history of literature, and has always taken one of a few easily distinguishable forms. Its identity is generally proved at once by its own professions; for while not always sincere, it is one of the most self-conscious of literary forms. Dealing usually only with the faults and follies of mankind, its subject-matter is not pleasant to dwell upon, for one who would preserve his optimism intact. The optimistic student, however, may do something toward clearing away the merely formal and traditional charges made against the defendant, and explaining the more just remainder by historical conditions. Satire, again, because of its large dependence on such temporary or local conditions, is of all forms of literature one of the most ephemeral. Its authors have very seldom been able to associate with it elements of beauty,

or even of permanent and universal truth. On the other hand, it is surprising to find how little the main elements of its subject-matter have changed from age to age. The procession of its characters, like that of the heroes of tragedy, is fairly uniform and never passes the given point. It is in this revelation of human life that its interest, like that of all literature, must be sought.

The greatest English satirist, John Dryden, quotes for a definition of satire (evidently meaning formal satire thereby) that of Heinsius in his *Dissertations on Horace:*

"Satire is a kind of poetry, without a series of action, invented for the purging of our minds; in which human vices, ignorance, and errors, and all things besides, which are produced from them in every man, are severely reprehended; partly dramatically, partly simply, and sometimes in both kinds of speaking; but, for the most part, figuratively, and occultly; consisting in a low familiar way, chiefly in a sharp and pungent manner of speech; but partly also, in a facetious and civil way of jesting; by which either hatred, or laughter, or indignation is moved."[1]

To this Dryden objects that the description "is wholly accommodated to the Horatian way," since it makes the fault of Horace, his "low familiar way of speech," "the virtue and standing rule" of this order of poetry. It is probable that most critics would agree rather with Heinsius than with Dryden, not only in easily pardoning Horace's "familiar" style, but also in recognizing such a style as one of the common characteristics of satire. Certainly there are passages in Dryden's own satire which are not to be defended according to the standard of a "majestic way" which he sets up. The definition of Heinsius, while cumbersome and now obsolete in phraseology, will in reality stand remarkably well the test of detailed examination and of comparison with the great number of examples of formal satire. I shall have occasion hereafter to call attention more particularly to its elementary distinctions.

[1] *Essay on Satire.* Scott-Saintsbury edition of Dryden, vol. xiii. p. 107.

Whatever may have been the relation of satire among the Romans to so-called satire among the Greeks (a matter disputed in Dryden's time, and still imperfectly understood), it is universally agreed that formal satire, in the sense already indicated, began in Latin literature. No less certainly, wherever it has appeared in modern literature it has been under Latin influence. As has already been said, it is a self-conscious form, and requires for its full development a self-conscious and self-critical age. The first age of this kind in England was that of Elizabeth, when the beginnings of all formal and conscious literary modes took shape.[1] When to this is joined the fact that it was an imitative age, and the further fact that it followed close upon the revival of classical learning, it is clear enough why formal satire should have arisen in England just when it did. We may conveniently look for its beginnings where we look for those of nearly all other exotic forms, in the middle of the sixteenth century; and we shall find that, like the other forms, it had passed through a period of development and decline by the time of the accession of Charles the First, and was ready for new development under the new influences of the seventeenth century. It is the purpose of the present study to trace its rise during the period thus defined.

Some preliminary clearing of the ground will be necessary. It will first be in order to consider rapidly the appearances of satire, in the broader sense of the word, in English literature previous to the period of classical influence, in order to be able to recognize new elements by comparison with the old. It must next be inquired just what the classical satirists did, and how they came to be imitated on the continent and in England. We shall then be in a position to reach some general conclusions as to the relations of native English and classical elements. The particular satirists of the period chiefly under consideration will then be taken up in detail.

[1] See Warton: *History of English Poetry*, Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 362.

Two principal questions will be kept in mind in the study of these: How far were they influenced by their classical models? and, What objects of satire, in the life and morals of their period, did they more or less faithfully represent? Finally, it may be possible to draw some general conclusions as to the relations of Elizabethan satire to that of the great period following—the age of Dryden.

Such, then, roughly outlined, will be the order of this discussion. There is a considerable mass of details to be gone over, many of them of an unlovely order; one must hope that the reward will be found in a better understanding of that age when Englishmen made the strongest attempt to realize the impact of antiquity upon their own life and thought.

I.

Mediæval satire was of a thoroughly informal kind. It arose, not from classical traditions, but from contemporary life. It usually took the form either of invective or burlesque. It was the comment or remonstrance of the witty scholar or indignant Christian, in the face of the inconsistencies, oppressions, and small knaveries that he saw all about him. From the first it was particularly severe upon the avarice and luxury of those who professed to be models of righteousness.[1] The various orders of ecclesiastics aimed at one another's weaknesses; the traveling scholars at the regular clergy; the unlettered against the foibles of scholastics and latinists; the townspeople at the stupidity of the rustics. Various classes and professions came to be recognized as types for satirical attack.

[1] See the account of religious satire in Schneegans: *Gesch. der Grotesken Satire.* See also the "Gospel According to Marks of Silver," described by Wright: *History of Caricature and Grotesque*, p. 172.

"Zum Mönch, zum Bauern und zur Frau gesellt sich als vierter im Bunde der Arzt, dessen Prahlen mit seinen Kenntnissen und seinen allmächtigen Heilmitteln auf wirkliche groteske Art karikiert wird. . . . . Wie hier der Stand der Ärzte, so wird in andern Satiren der Stand der niederen Spielleute angegriffen."[1]

The best known example of satire on the jovial clerks of the Middle Ages is the "Apocalypsis Goliae Episcopi" (in Wright's *Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes*, p. 1). One may find also in Wright's *History of Caricature and Grotesque* some account of the satire directed against various trades (p. 133) and against particular localities (p. 181). The list of satirical writings now known to students of mediæval literature, whose object was to rebuke the corruptions of the Church, would of itself fill many pages. Besides the paraphrases given by Schneegans one may see, for example, some of the poems in de Méril's *Poésies Populaires Latines du Moyen Age*,—two satires thought to be by Gautier de Châtillon, one by Pierre des Vignes ("sur les désordres du corps ecclésiastique"), and one ("contre les Symoniaques") attributed to Saint Thomas à Becket.

There was also, of course, satire of a political character. There were always some to protest against the aggressions of kings, courtiers, and judges, as well as to make use of satirical gifts in behalf of their patrons.

"Viel mehr als die kleinlichen Rivalitäten zwischen den Spielleuten mussten zur Satire die wichtigen politischen Ereignisse reizen. . . . Die politische Satire Frankreichs richtete aber ihre Pfeile nicht nur gegen ihre auswärtigen Feinde. Auch die innere Misstände werden, wo es Not thut, gegeisselt."[2]

The classical satirists had long ago dwelt on the identity of vice, imprudence, and madness; and this (whether derived from them or from immediate insight), came to be the central idea of mediæval satire.

"*Stultorum infinitus est numerus.*[3] These famous words sum up as well as any others the fundamental axiom of all satire, to which every generation of satirists

[1] Schneegans, pp. 81, 83.

[2] Schneegans, pp. 86, 89.

[3] See in Wright's *History of Caricature and Grotesque* (p. 212) a cut of a leaden medal, celebrating the "Pope of Fools," and containing this motto.

has given expression in every variety of accent and phrase. That the world is a kingdom of Fools is a conviction easily detected beneath the fine urbanities of Renan, the glittering irony of Pope. Uttered with more downright and brutal emphasis it is the commonplace in which the decaying Middle Age invested its whole capital of intellectual and moral scorn. The commonplace was piquant, however, and the extraordinary variety of expression and metaphor with which it was seasoned never permitted it to pall. The whole range of mediæval institutions, the church, the court, the civic guild, the monastic fraternity, were imported into the kingdom of Fools; the animal world swelled its numbers with 'asses' and 'cuckoos,' 'apes' and 'hares;' pagan mythology provided Venus and Bacchus for its divinities; Seneca and Solomon, Horace and Juvenal furnished a store of instances, and the treasury of vernacular proverb-lore an inexhaustible supply of illustration."[1]

It is to this order of satire that one of the very earliest of English satirists belongs,—Nigellus Wireker, whose *Speculum Stultorum* dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century, and who embodied in his work the idea of an Order of Fools,

[1] C. H. Herford: *Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 323. Compare the brilliant account of Lenient: "La satire est la plus complète manifestation de la pensée libre au moyen âge. Dans ce monde où le dogmatisme impitoyable au sein de l'église et de l'école frappe comme hérétique tout dissident, l'ésprit critique n'a pas trouvé de voie plus sûre, plus rapide, et plus populaire, que la parodie . . . . Cette contre-partie du monde féodal et religieux forme une vaste trilogie dont chaque siècle est un acte, et dont chaque acte a son héros principal: au XIII^e^ siècle, c'est Renart; au XIV^e^, le Diable; au XV^e^, la Mort. Le grand choeur satirique du moyen âge s'avance pêle-mêle, semblable au cortége de Bacchus, à cette foule lascive et désordonnée de Pans, de Faunes, de Silènes, de Bacchantes, tous hurlant, chantant, sonnant de la trompe ou battant des cymbales. Encore le dieu du Nysa, fils de l'imagination grecque, reste-t-il au milieu de cette armée grotesque, comme le type de l'adolescence et de la beauté. La vieille mascarade gothique est cent fois plus risible et plus fantasque. Toutes les classes de la société, tous les règnes de la nature viendront se confondre dans cette immense cohue: chevaliers, moines, abbés, marchands, paysans, bourgeoises, religieuses, hommes et bêtes, papes et rois. En tête, paraît d'abord Renart, avec sa mine futée, son regard oblique et fauve, son museau étroit et allongé, qui flaire la malice et le sarcasme; puis son compère et son successeur, le Diable, personnage pattu, velu, crochu, séducteur bénin et moqueur impitoyable; enfin, la Mort, long, sec et pâle squelette, avec ses yeux caves, ses joues dechiquettées, son ventre vide, ses côtes fendues, entr'ouvertes, et son horrible mâchoire dégarnie qui grimace en riant." (*La Satire en France au Moyen Age*, pp. 14, 15.)

"Novus Ordo Brunelli."[1] Three hundred years later the same idea became prominent again in English literature.

French influence made itself felt in English satire, as in all English literature, from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries. In France satirical poetry took on a variety of forms, but seems to have shown a decided preference for the narrative, particularly the allegory.[2] The two greatest examples of this are the cycle of Reynard the Fox,[3] which had a late echo in Spenser's *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, and the *Roman de la Rose*,[4] the satire in the latter part of which (the work of Jean de Meun) was, under the guise of allegory, of a sweeping character, and which shows its effect in the work of Chaucer and his followers. Johannes de Alta Villa (Jean de Hauteville) imitated in England the French allegorical satire, in his *Architrenius* (about 1184.)[5] Nearly a century later Rutebœuf, in France, gave an impetus to satire of the invective type.[6] There were also the usual popular attacks on classes, on political opponents, and on the corruptions of the Church.

"Viennent ensuite les satires dirigées contre les clercs, leurs vices, leur fainéantise, . . . contre les bourgeois, . . . contre les vilains . . . Enfin la satire politique ne fut pas inconnue à la poésie du moyen age. De bonne heure Anglais et Français, qui employaient la même langue, s'attaquèrent par la plume comme par les armes. . . . La cour de Rome fut dans toute la chrétienté, pour ses envahissements et surtout pour la cupidité qu'ou reprochait à ses représentants, l'objet de virulentes attaques."[7]

[1] Herford, p. 325.

[2] See Paris: *La Littérature Française au Moyen Age.* Sec. 2, chap. iii.

[3] See Wright: *Caricature and Grotesque*, p. 77; and Lenient: *La Satire en France au Moyen Age*, chap. viii. pp. 137 ff.

[4] See Lenient: chap. ix. pp. 155 ff.

[5] Wright, p. 160.

[6] See *Oeuvres de Rutebœuf*, ed. Jubinal. Preface, p. xx., etc.

[7] Paris, pp. 155 f. On the political satire of France Lenient remarks: "La Gaule ou la France, comme on voudra l'appeler, a toujours médit de ses maîtres. Esclave, elle tremble èt obéit, mais se venge par la satire de ceux qui lui font peur. Elle conserve ses rois pendant quatorze siècles, en se réservant le droit de les chansonner; et l'on a pu dire d'elle avec raison qu'elle était une monarchie tempérée par le vaudeville." (p. 13.)

But the most characteristic and considerable specimens of satire in England during the later Middle Ages are neither the satires of Fools nor the satirical allegories. They are the direct invective satire of the common people, expressing criticism on political affairs and resentment against oppression, or the protests of the truly religious against luxury and inconsistency among Christians of all orders. These productions, while often vivid and picturesque, are too serious and direct to make great use of allegory, caricature, or what Heinsius called "a facetious and civil way of jesting." They are often defective in humor, but seldom in vigor. As Schneegans says:

"Der direkte Satiriker erweist seinem Feinde nicht die Ehre, in seine Gedanken einzugehen, sie weiterzuführen, sie auszuschmücken, ja gegebenfalls sogar zu loben. Er packt seinen Feind an der Gurgel, schnürt ihm die Kehle zu, lässt ihn nicht zu Worte kommen, überschüttet ihn aber selbst mit einer Flut von Schimpfwörtern. Ganz anders der Groteske." [1]

One of the earliest of these direct popular satires is that on the vanity of women, found in Böddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen*, p. 106, and in Wright's *Political Songs of England*, p. 153.[2] This is thought to date from the end of the thirteenth century, and is a bitter arraignment, from a religious point of view, of the feminine love of finery.

"Such a joustynde gyn uch wrecche wol weren,
Al it cometh in declyn this gigelotes geren.
Upo lofte
The devel may sitte softe,
& holden his halymotes ofte."

"The objects of satire," says Ten Brink, "grew more manifold in the reign of Edward I. It became the advocate of the poor people, of the peasant class, whose position in the glorious and blessed reign of that great prince was perhaps not less precarious than later under the rule of 'Queen Bess.' The *Song of the Husbandman* is a lament of the husbandman who, in spite of bad harvests and dearth, must pay the king high taxes for his wars, and who is tormented and drained

[1] Schneegans: op. cit., p. 494.
[2] See Ten Brink: *Early English Literature*, p. 317.

to his life's blood by foresters, rangers, and bailiffs. They hunt him as the hound does the hare; he sees himself compelled to sell his grain while it is still as green as grass." [1]

"Another poem that must have originated about 1316–17, shows satire in a quite advanced stage as regards scope and matter. It is not content with attacks on the vices and abuses of single classes or ranks of men, or with general allusions to the degeneracy of society; it takes up the various classes in turn, and pitilessly lays bare their social blemishes. . . . Truth and right are down, deceit and treachery are almighty. The review is begun with the Church at Rome. . . . Covetousness and Simony rule the whole world. . . . The outlook is no better in the monasteries; pride and envy reign in all orders. . . . Next comes the turn of the knightly orders, the Hospitallers. . . . The chapters and consistories are then taken up. It is easy to attain an end with them by bribing judges and witnesses. Thereupon appears the physician who helps men to die. . . . Counts, barons, and knights are brought before us, who oppress the Church instead of defending it, stir up strife at home instead of going to the Holy Land, who behave in the hall like lions, and like hares in the field. . . . But we must be brief, and refer the reader to the poet himself, who tells how the royal justices, ministers, sheriffs, judges, bailiffs, and beadles, how advocates, assize-justices, how bakers, brewers, merchants, conduct themselves. Wrong and cheating are everywhere; in every walk of life the poor and honest are oppressed and plundered." [2]

This is a typical piece of English satire; typical in its vigorous pessimism, its emphasis of political injustice, and its thoroughly serious tone. Of the same period is the poem on the servants of the rich, thought to be the work of a gleeman (Böddeker, p. 135; Wright's *Political Songs*, p. 237). But here the tone is more rollicking and the description livelier; there is also some fine sarcasm in the verses:

"Whil god wes on erthe
& wondrede wyde,
whet wes the resoun
why he nolde ryde?
For he nolde no grom
to go by ys syde,
ne grucchyng of no gedelyng
to chaule ne to chyde."

[1] Ibid. See also Böddeker, p. 102: and Wright's *Political Songs*, p. 149.

[2] Ibid., p. 318 ff. This poem On the Evil Times of Edward II., may be found in Wright's *Political Songs*, p. 323. See also the *Song on the Times*, in a curious mixture of Anglo-Norman, Latin, and English, ibid., p. 251.

The *Vision of Piers the Plowman* is the great satirical work of the fourteenth century, and is, indeed, if Langland be the author, the first English satire of its kind whose author's name has come down to us. That it was largely satirical was recognized already in 1589, when Puttenham called it a "Satyre," adding that its author seemed to be a "malcontent." [1] In this work we have strong premonitions of the satire of the Reformation, in the attacks on pilgrims, priests, friars, papal corruptions, and the like, together with the usual rebukes of idleness and gluttony. The form is of course primarily allegorical.

From near the close of the century comes a satirical *Song against Friars*,[2] especially interesting from its sustained irony —a rare feature of English satire.

"Men may se by thair contynaunce
That thai are men of grete penaunce,
And also that thair sustynaunce
Simple is and wayke.
I have lyved now fourty yers,
And fatter men about the neres
Yit sawe I never than are these frers,
In contreys ther thai rayke."

The writer goes on to prove that "cursed Cayme" first founded the four orders, the letters of his name standing respectively for the Carmelites, Augustinians, Jacobins and Minorites. He soon passes, however, true to his nation, from wit and humor to serious reproach.

In this connection it will be convenient to mention other satirical attacks on the friars, belonging to the same general period. The so-called *Piers Ploughman's Crede* and the *Complaint of the Ploughman*[3] are closely connected in this respect.

[1] Puttenham: *Arte of English Poesie.* Arber ed., pp. 74, 76.

[2] Wright: *Political Poems*, vol. i. p. 263.

[3] The former was included in Wright's edition of *Piers Plowman*, 1842. The latter may be found in *Political Poems*, vol. i. p. 304.

The latter poem is a most interesting and vigorous attack on friars of all orders, then on the corruptions of the church and clergy in general, set in a loose narrative framework representing a dialogue between a griffin and a pelican. The Reformation sounds nearer and nearer in such passages as these:

"They saine that Peter had the key
Of heven and hel, to have and hold.
I trowe Peter tooke no money
For no sinnes that he sold.

. . . .

"Peter was never so great a fole
To leave his key with such a lorell,
Or take such cursed soch a tole,
He was advised no thing well."[1]

Still another satire of the same group is that called *Jacke Upland*,[2] which, like the *Complaint of the Ploughman*, was printed in some of the early editions of Chaucer. It is placed by Wright in the year 1401, and is a direct address to the friars, with the view of putting to them a number of ingenious and embarrassing questions. Thus:

"Whose ben all your rich courts that yee han,
And all your rich jewels,
Sith ye seyen that ye han nought
Ne in proper ne in common?
If ye saine they ben the popes,
Why gather yee then of poore men and lords
So much out of the kings hand
To make your pope rich,
And sith ye sain that it is great perfection
To have nought in proper ne in common,
Why bee ye so fast about to make
The pope, that is your father, rich,
And put on him imperfection?"[3]

Finally, while concerned with satire against the friars, we must not forget that of the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*,

[1] p. 314.
[2] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 16.
[3] p. 26.

and of other portions of the poetry of Chaucer, who, uniting the best elements in French, English and general mediæval satire, gives us the best examples of satire in its descriptive and narrative forms.

John Gower, Chaucer's most distinguished literary contemporary, was a satirist of the more common order. Almost destitute of humor, he naturally adopted the method of *direct rebuke*. It will be remember that in the Prologue to the *Confessio Amantis* he adverts to the strife and confusion that afflict the world, and the reign of avarice and ambition in the Church.[1] We have also from his pen some Latin poems entitled by Wright *The Corruptions of the Age* and the *The Vices of the Different Orders of Society*.[2] The first is called "Carmen super multiplici vitiorum pestilentia unde tempore Ricardi secundi partes nostrae specialius inficiebantur," and has for subdivisions "Contra dæmonis astutiam in causa Lollardiæ," "Contra mentis saevitiam in causa superbiæ," "Contra carnis lasciviam in causa concupiscentiæ," "Contra mundi fallaciam in causa perjurii et avaritiæ." The second poem was originally headed: "Incipit tractatus de lucis scrutinio, quam ad diu vitiorum tenebræ, proh dolor! suffocarunt, secundum illud in evangelio, Qui ambulat in tenebris nescit quo vadat;" it deals successively with the clergy, rulers and nobles, men of law, soldiers, merchants and the commons. The two poems are characteristic of two important methods of construction in vogue in early English satire, the influence of which was long-continued. The first method, that of classifying material by vices, goes back apparently to the mediæval sermon-books, and finds its most intolerable monument in the *Confessio* of Gower himself. The second method is that based on social classes, and, while doubtless also to be found in early mediæval religious literature, seems more than the first to be a product of the satirical spirit.

[1] See Morley's edition, *Carisbrooke Library*, pp. 35–40.

[2] *Political Poems and Songs*, vol. i. pp. 346, 356.

Probably also to the reign of Richard II. belongs a curious satirical poem *On the Times*[1] written in alternate English and Latin verses. It is a general condemnation of contemporary life, as contrasted with the better days of the past. Wars oppress the people; flatterers are supreme; the rich grind the poor; there is no relief in law; there are absurd fashions in dress; lechery abounds; the Church is corrupt. The sweep of the satire is here unusually wide; and despite the complications of the bi-lingual form, it is not only vigorous but witty and dramatic. Thus the writer points out the inconveniences of some fashions of the day:

"A strayth bende hath here hose,
laqueant ad corpora crura;
They may noght, I suppose,
curvare genu sine cura;
Qwen oder men knelys,
pia Christo vota ferentes,
Thei stond at here helys,
sua non curvare valentes.
For hortyng of here hosyn,
non inclinare laborant;
I trow, for here long toos,
dum stant ferialiter orant."[2]

Again, notice the dramatic concreteness of a passage on idle drinkers:

"Wyv sa belle," thei cry,
fragrantia vina bibentes,
Thei drynke tyl they be dry,
lingua sensuque carentes.
Thei cry, "Fyl the bowles!
bonus est liquor, hic maneamus;
For alle crystone sowllys,
dum durant vasa, bibamus!"[3]

In the fifteenth century satirical poetry, like all other literature, seems to have languished, if we except merely political

[1] *Political Poems and Songs*, vol. i. p. 270.
[2] p. 275.
[3] p. 277.

ballads and the like, such as were awakened by the civil wars. What we have in the way of popular satire does not differ from that of the previous period. Thus from the early part of the century is a brief poem *On the Corruption of Public Manners*, rebuking chiefly the love of finery among both women and clergy ;[1] and (according to Wright) from the days immediately preceding the outbreak of the civil wars, two poems *On the Corruptions of the Times*,[2] the one built on the refrain "For now the bysom ledys the blynde," the other on "Of al oure synnys God make a delyveraunce." They treat of the prevalence of deceit and robbery ; the disappearance of mirth ; corruption in the Church ; hatred between classes ; simony ; idleness ; lack of charity, and allied evils.

John Lydgate, living largely in the first half of the fifteenth century, wrote a satirical poem of the same class as those just considered. In the Percy Society edition of his minor poems it is called a *Satirical Ballad on the Times*.[3] Its chief interest is its ironical plan ; in each stanza everything is declared to be as it should be, but in each case there is the modification, "So as the crabbe gothe forwarde." In this way the author sketches by implication the evils of changing fortune, hypocrisy, unrighteous princes, unjust men of law, discontented poor, worldly religion, newfangled women, dishonest merchants, and the like. The times, like the crab, are clearly going the wrong way.

In *A Tale of Threescore Folys and Thre*,[4] commonly called *The Order of Fools*, by the same author, we turn back abruptly to the satire of fools, already spoken of in connection with Wireker. Here the order of fools is said to be of long standing, and to consist of sixty-three members. Many of them are enumerated in outline, always with the concluding

[1] Vol. ii. p. 251.

[2] Ibid., pp. 235, 238.

[3] *Minor Poems of Lydgate*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, in vol. ii. of Percy Society, p. 58.

[4] Ibid., p. 164.

warning that they "shall never thrive." While the range of the characters is wide, there is little satiric power in the description. As Herford well remarks:

"The description of the sixty-three Fools is quite without dramatic life. Though written within two generations of Chaucer's great Prologue, it is a mere catalogue of isolated traits nowhere elaborated into a portrait, a sort of index of dangerous persons, as it were calculated for practical utility rather than for æsthetic delight."[1]

He also says of Lydgate what is applicable to a very large proportion of English satire so-called, that "the inherent irony of his plan is dispelled at every moment by an unseasonable earnestness." Finally, he points out the emphasis laid by Lydgate upon the vice of hypocrisy or deceit.

"The deceitful fool, we are told, is the most heinous of all. . . . . The note thus struck almost at the outset is recurred to throughout the series. We hear of fools 'with two faces in one hood' (st. 2), simulating (st. 5), 'flattering and faining' (st. 10), 'promise-breaking' (st. 11), and faith-violating fools (st. 12)."[2]

This emphasis upon hypocrisy we shall have occasion to see remaining a noticeable element in English satire.

We turn now to the most important work in the history of English satire before the Elizabethan period—Barclay's translation of Sebastian Brandt's *Narrenschiff*. The original work was published at Basel in 1494. There were three unauthorized reprints in the same year; a Low German translation in 1497; Locher's Latin version (*Stultifera Navis*), also in 1497; a French translation of this, soon followed by others; and a second Latin translation, by Jodocus Badius Ascensius, in 1505. No further evidence is needed of its widespread influence.

[1] Op. cit., p. 326 f.

[2] Ibid., p. 339. See also a poem attributed to Lydgate, and quoted by Wright (*Caricature and Grotesque*, p. 137), on the cheating of millers and bakers.

"Trithemius calls it 'Divina Satira,' and doubts whether anything could have been written more suited to the spirit of the age; Locher compares Brandt with Dante, and Hutten styles him the new law-giver of German poetry. . . .

"Brandt's satire is a satire for all time. . . . The thoughtful, penetrating, conscious spirit of the Basle professor passing by, for the most part, local, temporary or indifferent points, seized upon the never-dying follies of human nature and impaled them on the printed page for the amusement, the edification, and the warning of contemporaries and posterity alike."[1]

Alexander Barclay, a chaplain in the College of St. Mary Ottery, in all probability a Scotchman, made his *Ship of Fools* in 1508, and published it in 1509. He himself says that he translated "out of Laten, Frenche, and Doche," but he seems to have chiefly used the two Latin versions of the *Narrenschiff*, especially Locher's. While his translation was fairly faithful, he did not hesitate to add or adapt. He gives his reasons for making additions, in his Dedication:

"Fateor equidem multo plura adiecisse quam ademisse: partim ad vicia que hac nostra in regione abundantius pullulant mordacius carpenda: partimque ob Rithmi difficultatem."[2]

"Barclay's additions," says Professor Ward, "are mostly of a personal or patriotic nature; but he also indulges in an outburst against French fashions in dress, . . . indites a prolonged lament, the refrain of which suggests a French origin, on the vanity of human greatness, . . . and makes a noteworthy onslaught upon the false religions. . . . Like Brant, he never forgets his character as a plain moral teacher. He is loyal and orthodox, and follows his original in lamenting both the decay of the holy faith catholic and the diminution of the empire, and in denouncing the Bohemian heretics, together with the Jews and the Turks."[3]

I quote again from Barclay's editor on the political element in his satire:

"Everywhere . . . the voice of the people is heard to rise and ring through the long exposure of abuse and injustice, and had the authorship been unknown it would most certainly have been ascribed to a Langlande of the period. Everywhere he takes what we would call the popular side, the side of the people as

[1] Introduction to Barclay's *Ship of Fools*, ed. T. H. Jamieson, pp. x., xi.
[2] Jamieson edition, p. cxv. f.
[3] Article on Barclay, A. W. Ward, in *Dictionary of National Biography*.

against those in office. Everywhere he stands up boldly in behalf of the oppressed, and spares not the oppressor." [1]

Yet like other satirists Barclay took pains to show that he was not directing his shafts against the powers to which he owed allegiance. Thus in the chapter on "the great myght and power of folys" he turns aside to congratulate England on the rule of King Henry—

"Harry clene of conscience,"—

from whom may be learned all meekness and "godly wysdome." [2]

There is a sense in which the *Ship of Fools* might be taken as the starting point of classical influence in English satire. Brandt was himself familiar with Juvenal, as well as (Zarncke tells us) with Persius, Catullus, Ovid, Seneca and Virgil.[3] Chapter 26 of the *Narrenschiff* ("von unnutzen wunschen") Zarncke speaks of as "fast gänzlich aus der 10 satire des Juvenal entlehnt." The same classical material naturally appears in Barclay's work. Yet it was of course not the general form of Latin satire which either Brandt or Barclay attempted to reproduce; they derived something of the pessimistic spirit of Juvenal, and illustrative details of either description or moralization. The pessimism of the *Ship of Fools* is as marked as in any satire we have met with. Thus we are told in the Prologue:

"Banysshed is doctryne, we wander in derknes
Throughe all the worlde: our selfe we wyll not knowe.
Wysdome is exyled, alas blynde folysshenes
Mysgydeth the myndes of people hye and lowe.
Grace is decayed, yll governaunce doth growe;
Both prudent Pallas and Minerva are slayne,
Or els to hevyn retourned are they agayne." [4]

[1] Jamieson ed., pp. xix–xx.

[2] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 16.

[3] See Zarncke's ed. of the *Narrenschiff;* Einleitung p. xlv. Zarncke pointed out that the whole poem was in fact "eine übersetzung und zusammenkittung von stellen aus verschiedenen alten, biblischen und classischen, schriftstellern."

[4] p. 11.

The prose Prologue ("A prologe in prose shewynge to what intent this Boke was firste made, and who were the first Auctours of it") is particularly interesting in its account of the relations of the *Ship* to classical literature.[1] It opens with a brief description of the rise of literature as a useful art, and then takes up the early satirists in particular. Having spoken of the satirical comedy of Aristophanes and other Greeks, the author proceeds:

"Of this auncient wrytinge of Comedyes our laten Poets devysed a maner of wrytinge nat inelegant. And fyrst Lucilius composed one Satyre in the whiche he wrote by name the vices of certayne princes and Citezyns of Rome And that with many bourdes so yt with his mery speche myxt with rebukes he correct al them of the cyte that disordredly lyved. . . . of hym all the Latyn poetes have takyn example, and begynnynge to wryte Satyrs whiche the grekes named Comedyes: As Fabius specifyeth in his X boke of institucions. After Lucilius succeded Horacius, moche more eloquent in wrytynge whiche in the same deservyd great laude: Persius also left to us onely one boke by the whiche he commyttyd his name and laude to perpetuall memory. The last and prynce of all was Juvenall whiche in his jocunde poemys comprehendyd al that was wryten most eloquent and pleasaunt of all the poetis of that sorte afore his tyme."[2]

It is then pointed out that all good poets have had the intention to reprove vice and commend virtue by their work, and that the author of the *Narrenschiff* is a late example of this kind. Of the present translator it is said:

"Sothely he hathe taken upon hym the translacion of this present Boke neyther for hope of rewarde nor lawde of man: but onely for the holsome instruccion commodyte and Doctryne of wysdome, and to clense the vanyte and madnes of folysshe people of whom over great nombre is in the Royalme of Englonde."[3]

Most interesting of all, however, for our present purposes, is the appearance of the word "satire" in this work—the first instance in the material thus far considered. In the author's argument to the translation it is said:

[1] This was a translation of Locher's Prologue to his Latin version.

[2] p. 7.

[3] p. 9 f.

"This present Boke myght have ben calliyd nat inconvenyently the Satyr (that is to say) the reprehencion of foulysshnes, but the neweltye of the name was more plesant unto the fyrst actour [prob. for *auctour*] to call it the Shyp of foles: For in lyke wyse as olde Poetes Satyriens in dyvers Poesyes conjoyned repreved the synnes and ylnes of the peple at that tyme lyvynge: so and in lyke wyse this our Boke representeth unto the iyen of the redars the states and condicions of men."[1]

And again, in the body of the poem, Barclay says:

> "Therefore in this satyre suche wyll I repreve
> And none that borowe nor lene on amyte."[2]

To "represent to the eyes of the readers the states and conditions of men" was clearly the purpose of the *Ship of Fools*, in both original and translation. Barclay expresses the same thing in his Epilogue:

> "The myrrour showys eche man lyke as they be:
> So doth my boke, for who that is in syn
> Shall of his lyfe the fygure in it se;"—

an idea later developed by Gascoigne in his *Steele Glas*. The number and variety of the figures included in the *Ship* is very great. One need hardly search in vain for any vice, or folly, whether peculiar to the fifteenth century or to human nature in every age. It is almost startling to find the satire dealing at the very outset with a superfluity of useless books. As the most convenient summary of the list of fools included, I quote from that of Herford:

"We may distinguish six different notions which Brandt at various times attaches to his cardinal term Folly, and under one or other of which all his Fools may be grouped. Some of them have always been recognised as marks of Folly; others reflect the curious idiosyncracy of Brandt's age, and of Brandt himself. The inclusion of a large number of more or less criminal offences, for instance, is perhaps the most original feature in an ethical system which for the modern mind is full of originalities. We have offences against religion,—blasphemy, contempt

[1] p. 17. The idea here seems to have been derived from Locher, who had said: "Cum vero Narragonia seu Navis fatuorum (quam non inepte Satyram appelare possumus)," etc.

[2] p. 134. There is at least one direct allusion to Juvenal in vol. ii. p. 180:

> "As Juvenall the noble Poete sayes."

for God,' or for another life, desecration of festivals; offences against the law and common morality,—oppression, crafty dealing of various kinds, forging and appropriation, dishonest borrowing and extortionate usury, slanderous falsehoods and hollow flattery, with lust and adultery. . . .

"The second class of Fools are also unpleasant to their neighbours rather than conspicuously or directly injurious to themselves; the insolent and quarrelsome people, who take offence at the slightest provocation or correction, and carry every petty squabble into the law-courts; or wantonly injure, and sneak away to avoid the consequences; petty tyrants like the civic officials; rough oppressors like the knights, insolent upstarts like the peasants.

"The third class are also far from innocuous to society, but they do themselves still worse harm. . . . Dancing, and gambling, heavy eating and drinking, disturbances and bad language in the streets, or in church, or at table, and above all on the occasion most notorious for both,—the Shrove-tide festivities; wantonness of idle students and workmen, butlers and cooks; . . . superfluity of wealth, of talk, of books, of benefices; outlay of precious hours in the saddle, or with the gun.

"The fourth class: . . . their fault is one of neglect rather than of commission. People who neglect their children, or do not provide for old age, or for death, or for the accidental mischances which to men of Brandt's cautious temperament appear to be always impending; or again, the merely lazy and indolent, the maid who slumbers at her wheel and the man who loiters at the mill. . .

"The Fools . . . who incur his most vehement and persistent criticism, to whom he returns again and again, and who, if any, may be said to touch the very heart of his satire, are those who neglect their own duty to meddle with another's, . . . the Fools of *presumption*. Brandt's fertility of illustration on this head is infinite. . . .

"Lastly, we have the class of mere simpletons whose title to belong to the order of Fools has always been recognised: the people who 'cut themselves with their own knife'—are trampled on, as Brandt says, by the ass, who disobey their doctor or make foolish exchanges, or who are fatuously credulous or fatuously communicative, or generally weak and unstable in character, incapable of breaking a bad habit or keeping a good resolution." [1]

One might judge from this that the *Ship of Fools* would give an early example of true character-satire, and some have emphasized its excellence in this direction. Thus Professor Ward observes:

"The English *Ship of Fools* exercised an important direct influence upon our literature, preeminently helping to bury mediæval allegory in the grave which had

[1] *Literary Relations of England and Germany*, pp. 333–338. For a somewhat more extended summary of the *Ship*, in the English version, see Morley: *English Writers*, vol. vii. pp. 95–103.

long yawned before it, and to direct English authorship into the drama, essay and novel of character."[1]

Herford quotes this approvingly and expresses a similar idea:

"It helped to bridge over the difficult transition from the literature of personified abstractions to that which deals with social types. It helped to substitute study of actual men and women at first hand for the mere accumulation of conventional traits about an abstract substantive; to turn allegory into narrative, moralities into dramas, and, in a narrower field, to prepare the way for the Character-sketches of the seventeenth century."[2]

Yet in another place he observes that it was to the comprehensive plan of the work, "rather than to its confused and feebly executed imagery, that the *Ship of Fools* owed its lasting influence."[3] This seems to me the safer view. It must be remembered that there are no individuals in the *Ship;* if they are not allegorical types, they are still types, selected (to quote Herford again) as illustrations of "what no doubt was primarily a classification by moral qualities." The type of Fool we have already seen was a familiar one of the period.

"Steht an der Schwelle des 16. Jahrhunderts eine andere Gestalt mit Schellenkappe und Eselsohren, lustige Fratzen schneidend und den Menschen zur Gefolgschaft auffordernd. Am Ufer steht das Narrenschiff zur Abfahrt bereit; wer mitfahren will, steige ein! . . . Ein Dichter wie Sebastian Brant denkt sich nicht: der Mensch ist so thöricht, dass er das Ideal der Thorheit, die Narrheit, erreicht; er sucht vielmehr ein sichtbares Zeichen für die Thorheit des Menschen und findet als bestes und untrüglichstes die Narrenkappe. . . . Im Tone des Verurtheilers und Verdammers geht er scharf und schonungslos ins Gericht mit den meisten weltlichen Freuden."[4]

The influence of Barclay's *Ship* in England was undoubtedly very great. One of the earliest results seems to have been the ballad of *Cocke Lorell's Bote*, of which a fragment survives as it was printed by Wynkyn de Worde.[5] It is a

[1] Article in *Dictionary of National Biography*.

[2] pp. 324 f.

[3] p. 333.

[4] Schneegans: op. cit., pp. 142 f.

[5] Ed. by E. F. Rimbault, for the Percy Society, vol. vi. On its relation to Barclay, etc., see Herford, p. 342.

rollicking production, quite without the serious tone of the *Ship*, and has for its most interesting element the great list of trades and professions represented in the "bote" of Cocke Lorell. Everyone seems to have been included except a company of hermits, monks, friars, canons, and the like, who were left out only because they arrived too late. Another ballad, even more closely connected with the original *Ship*, is that of the *XXV. orders of Fooles*, who were, as Herford remarks, "entirely recruited from Brandt's crew." Other imitations it is not necessary to mention here. As late as October 30, 1604, I have noted in the Stationers' Register the entry of "A Ballet called the *Ship of fooles*"; and Jamieson cites an allusion to Barclay as a satirist, in a poem by Sir Aston Cokayne, well on in the seventeenth century.

Most distinguished, however, among those who are thought to be inheritors of the satire of Brandt, was Erasmus, the humanist and reformer. It is by accident, one may say, that the *Moriæ Encomium* may claim any place in English satire. Its author was not an Englishman, and it was not written in English, but it was written in England, at the house of Sir Thomas More, in the same year that witnessed the publication of Barclay's *Ship of Fools*,—1509.

"Stultorum infinitus est numerus" was the motto of the *Praise of Folly*.

"Ecclesiastes doth somewhere confess that there are an infinite number of fools. Now when he speaks of an infinite number, what does he else but imply that herein is included the whole race of mankind, except some very few, which I know not whether ever anyone had yet the happiness to see? . . . This confirms that assertion of Tully, which is delivered in that noted passage we but just now mentioned, namely, that all places swarm with fools."[1]

Erasmus's method of treating this doctrine was, externally, that of mediæval personification, Folly being represented as discoursing on her attributes and servants. But in reality

[1] I quote from an anonymous and undated translation, published, with the illustrations of Holbein, by Reeves and Turner, of London, p. 170 f.

the satire was of a thoroughly concrete and self-conscious sort, marked by a keenness and a fine irony which were characteristic of the author rather than of the period. "I would not be thought," the author says slyly in one passage, "purposely to expose the weaknesses of popes and priests, lest I should seem to recede from my title, and make a satire instead of a panegyric." [1]

The actual subject-matter of Erasmus's satire is already familiar to us. The fools are those of the perennial procession. There is the same idea of the prevalence of hypocritical appearances and inverted judgments.

"It is certain that all things, like so many-Janus's, carry a double face, or rather bear a false aspect, most things being really in themselves far different from what they are in appearance to others; so as that which at first blush proves alive, is in truth dead; and that again which appears as dead, at a nearer review seems to be alive: beautiful seems ugly, wealthy poor, scandalous is thought creditable, prosperous passes for unlucky, friendly for what is most opposite, and innocent for what is hurtful and pernicious. In short, if we change the tables, all things are found placed in a quite different posture from what just before they appeared to stand in." [2]

There is the same representation of the follies of vanity; of old people who pretend to be young and who marry those much younger; of the madness of passion; of excess of hunting and building; of the wiles of alchemy and astrology, with other superstitions; of gambling; of the telling of big stories; of false pedigrees and pompous funerals; of flattery; of jealousy; of gluttony; of the many follies of money-making; of kings and courtiers, merchants and clergy. But with all this, there is something more, less familiar in the popular satire which we have been considering. The wit of the scholastic appears in the satire on formal logic; on grammarians and teachers; on the philologist who is carried away with ravishing pleasure when he "has found out who was the mother of Anchises, or has lighted upon some old unusual

[1] Ibid., p. 164.
[2] p. 50.

word, such as *bubsequa*, *bovinator*, *manticulator*, or other like obsolete cramp terms;" on the sophist who prayed chiefly that his life might be spared till he had learned rightly to distinguish between the eight parts of speech; on the everlasting scribbling of poets and rhetoricians; on those coxcombs who employ their pens in writing panegyrics on one another, and adopt classical names; on philosophers who "build castles in the air, and infinite worlds in a vacuum;" on theologians who discuss whether the godhead might be revealed in an inanimate substance, and what would have happened if St. Peter had celebrated the eucharist at the very hour of the crucifixion.[1] Towering above the scholastic, too, appears the reformer, who treats the corruptions of the Church with all the vigor of the early English satirists added to the keenness and spiritual breadth of Erasmus himself. The climax of this is the famous passage on the monks:

"It will be pretty to hear their pleas before the great tribunal: one will brag how he mortified his carnal appetite by feeding only upon fish: another will urge that he spent most of his time on earth in the divine exercise of singing psalms: a third will tell how many days he fasted, and what severe penance he imposed on himself for the bringing his body into subjection: another shall produce in his own behalf as many ceremonies as would load a fleet of merchantmen: a fifth shall plead, that in three-score years he never so much as touched a piece of money, except he fingered it through a thick pair of gloves: a sixth, to testify his former humility, shall bring along with him his sacred hood, so old and nasty, that any seaman had rather stand bareheaded on the deck, than put it on to defend his ears from the sharpest storms: the next that comes to answer for himself shall plead that for fifty years together he had lived like a sponge upon the same place, and was content never to change his holy habitation: another shall whisper softly, and tell the judge he has lost his voice by a continual singing of holy hymns and anthems: . . . . and the last shall intimate that he has forgot to speak, by always having kept silence, in obedience to the injunction of taking heed lest he should have offended with his tongue. But amidst all their fine excuses our Saviour shall interrupt them with this answer: Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites, verily I know you not; I left you but one precept, of loving one another, which I do not hear anyone plead he has faithfully discharged."[2]

[1] pp. 108–134.
[2] pp. 138 f.

In such passages as this, of course, the original scheme of the satire is wholly forgotten, and the type is that of direct rebuke, heightened by a mingling of wit and of religious earnestness which few satirists have equaled. We have, then, in the *Praise of Folly* neither an early popular satire nor a formal satire on classical models. Erasmus was too original to follow any form. From the classics he derived very much, and in his method of heaping up quotations from them and from the Scriptures he is thoroughly mediæval. One cannot doubt, either, that he must have derived not a little material from the classical satirists in particular, though I have no detailed evidence to offer for this. As a whole, his work combines many influences unified by the original spirit of the author. Its influence was of course widely felt.

One cannot fail to remember, at this point, the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, the first volume of which appeared six years after the *Praise of Folly* was written. The delightful irony of these letters must have done much to develop a taste for satire in all the countries where they were known. Like the work of Erasmus, the *Epistolæ* spared the dignity of no ecclesiastic or university scholar, but struck right and left at the ignorance of the arrogant and the littleness of those reputed great.[1]

Another contemporary of Brandt and Barclay, who was an inheritor, too, of the influence of the *Narrenschiff*, was Skelton, "the laureate." He is the first Englishman to win the name of being primarily a satirist. His relation to the *Narrenschiff* is signalized by his *Boke of Three Fooles*, a paraphrase of portions of the Latin version, which he gave to Cardinal Wolsey before his defection from his great patron. For this he selected the fool that marries for money, the envious fool, and the voluptuous fool.

[1] On the *Epistolæ*, see edition of Böcking, Leipzig, 1869; D. F. Strauss: *Ulrich von Hutten*, chap. 8; and Wright: *Caricature and Grotesque*, pp. 324 ff.

"It is not difficult to understand the motive for this choice. Few chapters in the *Narrenschiff* could have better expressed the characteristic bitterness with which Skelton incessantly assails the follies of worldly station and of those who struggle for it. Voluptuousness is for him in a special sense the vice of high rank. . . . In the same way Envy was the vice of those who sought high station, and *wedding those old wyddred women, whych have sackes full of nobles*, a means of attaining it hardly preferable to the extortionate devices of the conjurer which he was one day to lay bare."[1]

With Barclay, as is well known, Skelton's relations seem not to have been friendly. As Professor Ward remarks: "Neither jealousy nor partisanship, nor even professional feeling is needed in order to explain Barclay's abhorrence of the Bohemian vicar of Diss, with whose motley the sober hue of his own more sedate literary and satirical gifts had so little in common."[2] There is a trace of a book by Barclay, called *Contra Skeltonium*, and there is an unfriendly allusion to Skelton's "Philip Sparrow" at the very end of the *Ship of Fools:*

> "Wyse men love vertue, wylde people wantones;
> It longeth nat to my scyence nor cunnynge
> For Phylyp the Sparowe the Dirige to synge."

Of Skelton's satire there has always been one opinion, expressed as early as 1589 by Puttenham, who calls him "a sharpe Satirist, but with more rayling and scoffery then became a Poet Lawreat, such among the Greekes were called *Pantomimi*, with us Buffons, altogether applying their wits to Scurrilities and other ridiculous matters."[3] In the *Bowge of Courte* Skelton made use of the allegorical form of satire, after the French manner, introducing the characters of Sauncepere, Favore, Daunger, Drede, Favell, Dysdayne, and the like. His usual method was, of course, that of invective, in that peculiar style for which there is no name save "Skeltonicall." In the *Bowge of Courte* the object of satire is, of course,

[1] Herford; op. cit., p. 352.
[2] Article on Barclay in *Dictionary of National Biography*.
[3] *Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Arber, p. 76.

the life of the court. In *Colyn Cloute* it is the ignorance and sensuality of the clergy, with implications against all classes:

"For, as farre as I can se,
It is wronge with eche degre:
For the temporalte
Accuseth the spiritualte:
The spirituall agayne
Doth grudge and complayne
Upon the temporall men:
Thus eche of other blother
The tone agayng the tother:
Alas, they make me shoder!" [1]

We have, however, what is so frequent in the early English satire, marking its unconscious sincerity, a disclaimer of attacks upon good and bad indiscriminately:

"Of no good bysshop speke I,
Nor good preest I escrye,
Good frere, nor good chanon,
Good nonne, nor good canon,
Good monke, nor good clercke,
Nor yette of no good werke:
But my recountyng is
Of them that do amys." [2]

In *Why Come Ye Nat to Courte?* we have a personal object of satire, Cardinal Wolsey. Of personal satire we have found almost nothing hitherto, though it might have been noted in the purely political satire of the early periods, in such poems as those *On King Richard II.*, *On the Duke of Burgundy*, the *Verses Against the Duke of Suffolk*, and the like.[3] In all such cases the personal object was but a type of national evils; and this is true theoretically in Skelton's invective. Wolsey represents the corrupt, voluptuous Church, and the oppressors of England—those who assume much more

[1] ll. 59–68. Riverside ed., vol. ii. p. 127.
[2] ll. 1097 ff., p. 163.
[3] See Wright's *Political Poems and Songs*, vols. i. and ii.

ecclesiastical dignity than the Apostle Peter, and those who conduct affairs so

> "That the commune welth
> Shall never have good helth."

There is also to be noted the classical influence apparent in Skelton's work. He was a thorough Latinist, and from his disposition must have especially enjoyed the writings of Juvenal. Of considerable significance is a passage in *Why Come Ye Nat to Courte:*

> "Some men myght aske a question,
> By whose suggestyon
> I toke on hand this warke,
> Thus boldly for to barke?
> And men lyst to harke,
> And my wordes marke,
> I wyll answere lyke a clerke;
> For trewly and unfayned,
> I am forcebly constrayned,
> At Iuvynals request,
> To wryght of this glorious gest,
> Of this vayne glorious best,
> His fame to be encrest
> At every solempne feest;
> *Quia difficile est*
> *Satiram non scribere.*
> Now, mayster doctor, howe say ye,
> What soever your name be?
> What though ye be namelesse,
> Ye shall not escape blamelesse,
> Nor yet shall scape shamlesse:
> Mayster doctor in your degre,
> Yourselfe madly ye overse;
> Blame Iuvinall, and blame nat me:
> Maister doctor Diricum,
> *Omne animi vitium*, &c.
> As Iuvinall dothe recorde,
> A small defaute in a great lorde,
> A lytell cryme in a grate astate,
> Is moche more inordinate,
> And more horyble to beholde,
> Than any other a thousand folde."[1]

[1] ll. 1199–1230, vol. ii. p. 316 f.

We find here for the first time adopted in England, so far as I have noted, the saying of Juvenal's which one might say became the motto of Elizabethan satire: "Difficile est satiram non scribere." Besides these two citations from Juvenal there is one from Persius in *Speke Parrot*: "Quis expedivit psittaco suum *chaire?*"[1]

Like Brandt and Erasmus, however, Skelton of course made use of the classical satirists only in the matter of pessimistic tone and in details of illustration,—not in imitation of their form. For like Brandt and Erasmus, again, he was original in the general method of his satire, and had his eye first of all upon distinct objects which he desired to attack in his own time and among his own people. All these men set substance far above form.

We have already met many premonitions of the Reformation, in the satire of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. It was but a few years after the publication of the English *Ship of Fools* and the writing of the *Praise of Folly*, and about the time of Skelton's quarrel with the Cardinal, that Luther was entering upon his great career. The satire of the Reformation cannot here be taken up in any detail. So far as it was general and not purely personal or political, it did not materially differ from what we have already considered. Schneegans enumerates four classes of satire of the Reformation:[2]

"Neben der auch hier vorkommenden directen Satire, welche in Invectiven und Grobheiten schwelgt, und der dialogischen Satire, welche die lutherischen beziehungsweise christlichen Einrichtungen den päpstlichen gegenüberstellt, um das Abscheuliche der letzeren desto greller hervorleuchten zu lassen, neben den allegorischen Satiren, welche besonders häufig den Holzschnitt gebrauchen, um ihre Wahrheiten zu verbreiten, nehmen die grotesken einen besonders hervorragenden Platz ein."

Perhaps the most interesting English satire of this period, closely connected with that of Skelton by its personal attack

[1] l. 30, vol. ii. p. 247. The quotation is from the Prologue of Persius, l. 8.

[2] *Geschichte der Grotesken Satire*, pp. 158 ff.

upon Wolsey, is the *Rede me and be nott wrothe* of Roy and Barlow. This was the work of two English Franciscan friars, and was published in Strasburg, for circulation in England, in 1528. Its form is that of a dialogue, and its immediate occasion seems to have been the "Disputation of Berne," which declared for the abolition of the Mass. I quote Mr. Arber's concise account of the substance of the satire:

"The Mass is dead in Germany, where shall it be buried? At Rome? In France? In England? This is debated by two servants of a Strasburg priest, apparently, however, not hitherto very intimate with each other. Watkyn, evidently a citizen, is full of faith in the power of the gospel; Jeffray, a new-comer from England, who has been 'in religion a dozen years continually,' is full of the craft and subtilties of the clergy. Thus the sharpest contrast is kept up in the Dialogue. At last, they fix on a'Becket's shrine at Canterbury as the appropriate grave for the dead Mass. Who then shall be the buriers? The Cardinal? The Bishops? the Secular Clergy? the four orders of mendicant Friars? or the Observant Friars? In the discussion of their respective fitness for this purpose occurs the opportunity for exposing their misdeeds; and it is on this framework that the attack is made upon the hierarchy, priesthood, and monasticism of England. . . . It was written for circulation in England. A fearfully dangerous book to write or even to possess at that time. Intrinsically it is one of the worthiest Satires in our language. Its spirit is excellent. *I say no thinge but trothe* is its true motto. . . . The book is the embodiment of the resentment of its authors at the burning of Tyndale's New Testaments at Paul's Cross in 1526." [1]

The dialogue is preceded by a *Lamentacion* supposed to have been uttered by the ecclesiastics whose occupation was lost in the death of the Mass, an admirable piece of semi-dramatic irony; and in the midst of the dialogue is introduced a "balett" on the corruption of the times, and an "oracion" against the Cardinal,—both rendered by Jaffray. The "balett" is quite in the manner of the early songs "on the times," and might have been a century old when it was sung for the edification of Watkin. The pessimism is familiar:

> "The worlde is worsse than evyr it was.
> Never so depe in miserable decaye
> But it cannot thus endure all waye." [2]

[1] *Rede me and be not wrothe*, Arber's English Reprints, p. 6 f.
[2] p. 66.

But it is pessimism not unilluminated by hope, for the refrain is constant after every stanza of evils:

"It cannot thus endure all waye."

Before we take leave of this hasty survey of English satire preceding the Elizabethan Age, we have to notice a piece of Scottish satire which, while in dramatic form, announces its satirical character in its very name. This is *Ane Pleasant Satyre of the Threie Estaitis, in Commendatioun of Vertew and Vituperatioun of Vyce*, made by Sir David Lindsay.[1] This is in fact a late Morality play, and was acted before the King of Scotland, tradition says, in 1535, certainly (perhaps for a second time) at the Feast of Epiphany, 1540. The title "satire" is clearly used because of the purpose of "commendation of virtue and vituperation of vice," and the play is really another satire of the Reformation. The three estates of the realm are introduced, walking backward (as their custom is said to have been) and led by their vices. But it is the clergy upon whom the brunt of the blame falls; it is they who are oppressing the commons, opposing the free Bible, and clinging to Sensuality and Covetousness. In a satire of this order the prevalence of humor is very noticeable; and the abstract characters of the drama, as in the best of the late Moralities generally, are more than abstractions or even types: they are real *dramatis personæ*. Tradition has it that at the end of the performance of the Satire King James warned the spiritual lords who were present that they would do well to take heed to its admonition.[2]

[1] Printed by Robert Charteris, Edinburgh, 1602. Reprinted by Early English Text Society, 1869. For an abstract see Morley's *English Writers*, vol. vii. p. 256.

[2] It is interesting to note that at almost this same time John Bale was writing his satirical religious plays,—in 1538 *A Brefe Comedy or Enterlude of Johan Baptystes Preachynge in the Wyldernesse*, and the *Newe Comedy or Enterlude concerning the three lawes of Nature, Moises and Christe, corrupted by the Sodomytes, Pharyses and Papistes.*

We are now at the end of this preliminary survey of the years preceding the period of classical influence. It was but two years after the 1540 presentation of the *Satire of the Three Estates* that Sir Thomas Wyatt died, and it was perhaps in the year following the presentation that he wrote what have been frequently called the first true satires in English. Already the Reformation has triumphed in England; the king has broken with Rome; the monasteries and abbeys have been suppressed; the English Bible has been issued; and a new period has begun in literature and society. We have rapidly reviewed the progress of English satire up to the beginning of this new period, omitting only that of a purely personal or political nature, which is but slightly connected with the main line of our investigation. It will be well to reserve the summary of what has been thus considered until we can compare it with the satire of Rome.

II.

There were but three Latin satirists whose works came down to the modern world in sufficient completeness to exercise any specific influence: Horace, Persius and Juvenal. They were not among the authors who were forgotten during the Middle Ages, as manuscript editions and commentaries abundantly testify.[1] Juvenal's strictures upon women must have been especially dear to the long line of ascetics who accepted the gospel of Jerome "adversus Jovinianum." Chaucer knew Juvenal, and—indirectly, at least—parts of Horace. The classical satirists of course shared in the general revival of the classics, and as early as 1439 Gregory of Sanok was explaining Juvenal at the University of Cracow.[2] Ognibene

[1] See Friedländer's Juvenal: *Juvenal im späten Alterthum und Mittelalter*, vol. i. pp. 80 ff.

[2] See Voigt: *Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums*, vol. ii. pp. 329, 391.

da Lonigo made a commentary on Juvenal, too, for his fellow-humanists of Italy. We have already seen evidence of knowledge of the same author on the part of Brandt, Barclay, Skelton, and probably Erasmus. Editions of all three Latin satirists had been printed in 1470, among the first "editiones principes." Translations of course came considerably later. In England the first translation of Horace was that of Drant, who in 1566 printed *A medicinable Morall, that is, the two Bookes of Horace his Satyres, Englyshed according to the prescription of saint Hierome.*[1] An edition of the following year included the Epistles. I have not found that Persius was translated into English before 1616, while of Juvenal there were only fragmentary translations until much later. It is clear enough that, while the Latin satirists very naturally never became as popular as Ovid, Vergil or Cicero, the students of the sixteenth century, whose whole education was based on the classical curriculum, found them included and easily made their work their own.

The influence of the three Latin satirists must, however, be distinguished. Their work was of course by no means of the same order. For a discussion of their differences one may see Dryden's *Essay on Satire*, though it is probable that very few modern readers will agree in his main distinction that "the meat of Horace is more nourishing, but the cookery of Juvenal more exquisite."[2] Let us briefly consider just what was the satirical work of all three.

Horace wrote eighteen poems which are usually called Satires.

The first is on the folly of avarice, and the possible happy mean between miserliness and prodigality. The second is on opposing extremes of folly, and treats chiefly, in light fashion, of various tastes in amorous indulgence. The third is on the vice of censoriousness, and teaches that, wherever possible, favorable interpretations of conduct should be preferred. The fourth is on the writing of

[1] See p. 62, below.

[2] Scott-Saintsbury ed., vol. xiii. p. 90.

satires ; Lucilius is discussed, as founder of the form, and the excellence of satire is alleged to consist not in its poetic nature but in its success in teaching by example. The fifth is the humorous account of the journey to Brundisium. The sixth is on pride of birth ; Mæcenas, and Horace's freedman father, are treated in particular, and the disadvantages of responsible position are discussed. The seventh is merely a witty anecdote of "Rupilius Rex." The eighth is an attack on one Canidia, a sorceress. The ninth is the account of the author's meeting with a bore on the Via Sacra ; ways of obtaining favor at court are discussed. The tenth is a criticism of the satire of Lucilius, with some consideration of servile imitation of the Greeks, and of the true critical attitude. The eleventh (Satire One of Book Two) is in the form of a dialogue with Trebatius, discussing the author's satire and the complaints brought against it. The twelfth is on Ofellus the farmer, as exemplifying the advantages of plain living, and the dangers of gluttony and prodigality. The thirteenth is an exposition of the doctrine that everyone is mad who is not wise ; avarice, ambition, luxury, superstition and the like, are mockingly treated as symptoms of insanity. The fourteenth is on the precepts of an epicure ; cookery and service are ironically represented as being taught by a philosopher. The fifteenth is on legacy-hunting ; an imaginary dialogue between Ulysses and Tiresias is introduced, and false ways of making friends are discussed. The sixteenth is on the advantages of country life, illustrated by Horace's own Sabine farm, and by the fable of the town and the country mouse. The seventeenth is on moral slavery, considered in a dialogue between Davus the slave and his master. The eighteenth is the account of the supper given by Nasidienus, a vulgar and miserly rich man ; the menu, the conversation, the accidents that occurred.

Besides these eighteen satires, commonly so called, there are twenty-two epistles of a not dissimilar nature. It has recently been shown that these were originally considered, and should still be regarded, as an integral part of the collection of Satires.[1] The epistles are, however, obviously of a more personal nature than the "sermones," and are all (with the exception of those on literature at the end of the First Book, and the first of the Second Book, on the same subject) primarily reflective or philosophical rather than satirical. It will already have appeared that the satire of Horace is throughout characteristically *reflective*, above all things. It illustrates the saying of Dacier, quoted by Dryden, that "the word satire is

[1] *Are the Letters of Horace Satires ?* G. L. Hendrickson, in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xviii. p. 313.

of a more general signification in Latin than in French or English."

"For amongst the Romans it was not only used for those discourses which decried vice, or exposed folly, but for others also, where virtue was recommended. But in our modern languages we apply it only to invective poems, where the very name of satire is formidable to those persons who would appear to the world what they are not in themselves; for in English, to say satire is to mean reflection, as we use that word in the worst sense; or, as the French call it, more properly, *médisance*." [1]

The observation here as to the general English usage is very well founded, and makes clear one reason why Juvenal, not Horace, became the accepted representative of classical satire.

The satires of Juvenal are sixteen in number.

The first treats of the author's reasons for becoming a satirist, together with the wide province of satire, and the danger of making its applications personal and contemporary; the evils of the times are described,—loud women, rich barbers, affected nobles, fortune-hunters, treacherous guardians, gluttonous governors, adulterers, horse-racing, the forgery of wills, the poisoners of husbands, gambling, the deification of money, parasitism, and the seemingly universal prosperity of evil. The second attacks hypocrisy, the absurdities of professed virtue, the universal reign of lust, indecency of dress, the bacchanalian orgies of the city, the descent of nobles into gladiatorial contests, the effeminacy of soldiers, and the prevalence of religious unbelief. The third deals with the characteristic evils of the city, from the point of view of the citizen Umbritius, who is leaving Rome because he finds it no place for an honest man; the abundance and presumption of sneaking Greek immigrants, the estimating of all character on a basis of wealth, the bodily discomforts and dangers of city houses and streets, and the increase of crime over that of former days. The fourth is the mock-heroic tale of Domitian's turbot, presented to him by the trembling fisherman who caught it, and of the council of state called to consider how it should be cooked and served. The fifth describes the life of a parasite, and contrasts his discomfiture with the condescension of his patron, and with the honors that he himself would receive if he only had money. The sixth is the satire against women; their lust, their ill-temper, their vulgar tastes and passions, their debauchery, their talkativeness, their dressing and painting, their superstition, their treachery to their husbands. The seventh is on the neglect of learning, the ill condition of literature, and the laborious life of all kinds of scholars and men of letters. The eighth is on true and false nobility; the insignificance of mere pedigrees, illustrated by examples of noble men of lowly

[1] Dryden, Scott-Saintsbury ed., vol. xiii. p. 67.

birth; the true character of great men; the corruption of the outwardly great of the present age. The ninth introduces a horrid parasite of the lowest order; he relates his unhappy lot, and is warned that it is likely to grow worse rather than better. The tenth is on "the vanity of human wishes," of money, eloquence, fame, long life, beauty; with a description of the truly happy and trustful mind. The eleventh is on simplicity of living, illustrated by Juvenal's invitation to his friend Persicus, bidding him prepare for a frugal dinner, with literary entertainment in place of dancing girls. The twelfth is on legacy-hunting, describing the adulation offered to childless rich men. The thirteenth is on dishonesty, its prevalence and punishment; Calvinus, whose fortune has been made away with, must consider himself no worse off than most men, and must satisfy his desire for revenge by reflecting on the penalties of conscience and the judgments of the gods. The fourteenth is on the bad examples set by parents, in the matter of gambling, gluttony, cruelty, lust, superstition, extravagance, but above all of avarice. The fifteenth is an account of some of the superstitions of Egypt and of the animal savagery of man. The sixteenth (a mere fragment) is on the extraordinary advantages enjoyed by soldiers, no matter what their character, above those of other citizens.

Here we have a group of satires quite different from those of Horace. The immense difference in tone and style is not shown by any such summary of contents; but it is made clear that (admitting the use of many methods,—of irony, humor, dramatic presentation, and reflective or philosophical treatment) Juvenal's satire was in tone primarily that of a pessimist, and in method was primarily that of direct rebuke. These were the elements which chiefly caught the eye of his English imitators.

The satires of Persius I have reserved till the last because they are historically of the least importance. Persius was a young and fairly vigorous writer, who set himself the task of following in the steps of Horace, and achieved no very great success. Curiously enough, he succeeded in reaching a place as one of the three great Latin satirists not by the side of his master Horace, but by the side of Juvenal, and has been associated with the latter till this day. His satires are but six in number.

The first treats of the bad poetry of the times. The second attacks superstition, and unjustifiable requests made to the gods. The third deals with idleness,

gluttony, and other vices of the rich. The fourth treats of some of the vices of rulers, under the form of an address to Alcibiades—vanity, effeminacy, and the like. The fifth offers a tribute to Cornutus, the author's former teacher, attacks the idleness of young men, and discusses true freedom and sanity after the manner of Horace. The sixth is in the epistolary form, describing the author's retirement in his country-seat, and discussing the true use of riches and the folly of miserliness.

In effect, these satires are a combination of the methods of reflection and of direct rebuke, lacking both the urbanity of Horace and the vigor of Juvenal. The style, save for its difficulty, has no characteristic attractiveness like that of the other two satirists; and there would be less ease, as there would be less temptation, in attempting to imitate it. We shall see, therefore, very naturally, that while Persius was widely read and nearly always referred to in conjunction with Juvenal, his actual influence was in no proportion to his fame.

These were the men to whom the Englishmen of the sixteenth century turned, when they sought to write satire inspired by antiquity instead of by the needs of their own times. We have already seen that the Romans were the acknowledged monarchs of satire, even before the days of classical influence on form. It is quite possible that the introduction of the word *satire* into English is to be attributed directly to the Latin. The early history of the English word still seems to be obscure. The earliest use of it which I have found is, as has already been pointed out, in the preface to Barclay's *Ship of Fools*. This I take to be a transfer from the Latin. Brandt does not seem to have used any such word of his own poem, but Locher said: "Navis fatuorum, quam non inepte *Satyram* appelare possumus," and it was from this that Barclay probably drew the English word. It has been common to refer the word to a French origin, and there is no difficulty in supposing that the French *satire* exerted its share of influence; but as there was no formal French satire in the sixteenth century, and as the study of the Latin satirists did not come to England through France, there

appears to be no reason for giving that influence the earliest place. Littré quotes no instance of the word earlier than Régnier (1608), and it does not appear to have been in general use in mediæval French, though the diminutive *satirel* appears in Bénoit de S. Maure.[1] The spelling of the French word may eventually have aided in the establishment of the final *e* in English, as opposed to the favorite early spelling "*satyr*." Finally, we must not forget that the Italian form of the Latin word was in good use early in the sixteenth century, and may soon have been influential in England.

We have seen that when Barclay defined the nature of his work, he used the word *satire* as an equivalent for "the reprehension of foolishness." This was the sense of the word in English for a very long time. When Puttenham called the *Vision of Piers Plowman* a Satyr, and said that its author was a "malcontent" who "bent himselfe wholy to taxe the disorders of that age,"[2] he clearly had the same idea in mind. Neither he nor Barclay thought of the satire as a "satura"—a mixture of fruits, or, as Dryden has it, a "hotchpotch"—but rather as a "Satyrus," "that mixed kind of animal," who was imagined to bring the rude observations of his simple life to bear upon the faults of humanity. It is worthy of remark that on this point the modern philologists seem to be coming around to the position of the English and of Scaliger, as opposed to the doctrine of Casaubon expounded by Dryden and until lately widely accepted. On the other hand, the early English satirists clearly did not use the word with any connotation of a fixed form. Juvenal, Langland and David Lindsay were equally satirists, in their "reprehension of folly." Curiously enough, as late as 1600, when the idea of the formal satire had taken firm hold, *Every Man out of his Humour* was entered in the Stationers' Register as "a Comicall Satyre."[3]

[1] See Godefroy's *Dict. de l'ancienne Langue Française.*

[2] *Arte of English Poesie*, Arber ed., p. 76.

[3] Arber's Transcript, April 8, 1600.

The reference of the word *satire* to the mythological satyrs had two noteworthy effects on Elizabethan satire, apart from its connection with the idea of rebuke or invective. It served to furnish a semi-dramatic setting for the form, of a romantic or pastoral nature, carried out but slightly and usually having no connection with the body of the satire, but evidently adding to the contemporary interest. Thus in Guilpin we have a sort of stage-direction: "The Satyres flourish before his fencing;" in Wither we have a notable picture of a shaggy satyr with shepherd's pipe in one hand and scourge in the other; and in Brathwayt we have an illustrated title-page for "the Wilde-Mans Measures, Danced naked by twelve Satyres." In the second place, the connection of *satire* with *satyr* served to add emphasis to the idea that satire was characteristically uncouth and crabbed, if not rustic and obscene as well; and this we shall find to be an interesting element in the satire of the Elizabethan age.

As the renewed study of all the classics, and their consequent imitation, blossomed forth first in Italy, so it is there that we must look for the first satires written in the modern languages on classical models.[1] These appeared as early as the end of the fifteenth century. In 1495 Antonio Vinciguerra published his satire on marriage, and in 1527 appeared his other satires. They are of the type of general rebuke, full of figurative language, and, according to Ginguène, showing the influence of Dante. Their most interesting feature is the metre, the *terza rima*, in adopting which Vinciguerra set the example for all the succeeding formal satirists of Italy.

It was Ariosto who won chief glory in this form. His satires are seven in number, and are usually ranked in importance and interest with the *Orlando*.[2] In form they are epistolary, and in manner show chiefly the influence of Horace.

[1] On this subject see Ginguène: *Histoire Littéraire d' Italie*. Tome 9, chap. xxxvi.

[2] Published 1533, and again in 1534, 1537, 1538, 1546, 1548, 1550, etc. See list of editions in *Opere Minori di L. Ariosto*, ed. Polidori, vol. i. p. x.

With one exception, they are distinctly of a personal, if not autobiographical, nature.

"Il s'y proposa d'imiter Horace, ou plutôt il n'avait pas le choix entre les modèles que les Latins lui pouvaient offrir. La nature n'avait donné à son génie rien de commun avec le génie de Perse ni avec celui de Juvénal. La douce philosophie, la modération en toutes choses, l'enjouement qui émousse les traits de la malignité, l'art de se mettre sur la scène pour y amener les autres, la manière de voir, de peindre et de raconter, tout avait en lui un tel rapport avec Horace, qu'il fut comme invinciblement porté à donner à ses satires le même air de liberté, d'abandon, de censure sans fiel, et de malice sans aigreur, que le poéte romain avait mis dans les siennes. On peut croire qu'il étudia sa manière, qu'il apprit surtout de lui a mêler dans le discours des apologues et des récits; mais cela même lui paraît être si naturel, qu'il n'est pas sûr qu'il ne les y eut pas mêlés de même, quand Horace ne l'eut pas fait avant lui." [1]

It was doubtless the influence of Ariosto, as well as the general character of Italian genius, that turned the course of formal satire in Italy into the Horatian manner. On the other hand, the quarreling philologists and men of letters—in such exchanges of compliments, for example, as those of Pietro Aretino and Niccolo Franco—made vigorous use of the keener elements in classical satire. It is related that Aretino's attacks upon Antonio Broccardo were so ferocious that the victim died of chagrin upon reading them. But, as Ginguène remarks, "ces effets appartiennent à l'invective, a l'injure, a la calomnie, au libelle, mais non à la satire proprement dit.[2]

Next in importance to the satires of Ariosto are those of Luigi Alamanni. These were written while he was in exile in Provence, and were published in 1532. Thus in publication they antedate those of Ariosto, but they were written later than his and clearly show his influence. They are in general, like his, in the Horatian manner, but with somewhat more vigorous directness, especially in the treatment of political affairs.

[1] Ginguène: vol. ix. p. 92 f. On the satires of Ariosto, see also J. A. Symonds: *The Renaissance in Italy*, vol. iv. pp. 507-519.

[2] p. 196.

Other satirists after the classical manner followed these, but none with great distinction. Ercole Bentivoglio Ginguène calls a diminutive Ariosto, as Ariosto was a diminutive Horace. His satires were published in 1560, but were written some twenty-five years earlier. Lodovico Paterno is noteworthy as having abandoned the *terza rima* in part for other measures. Other names there is no need to mention here. Our purpose is to note that the Italian classicists followed Horace almost wholly, in their formal satire, and that they did so with some assiduity in the early sixteenth century, though with no supreme success. "Of satire in the strict sense of the term," says Mr. Symonds, meaning evidently the English—and later, the French—sense of the term, "the poets of the sixteenth century produced nothing that is worth consideration." [1] And again:

"The nation's life was not on so grand a scale as to evolve the elements of satire from the contrast between faculties and foibles. Nor again could a society, corrupt and satisfied with corruption, anxious to live and let live, apply the lash with earnestness to its own shoulders. *Facit indignatio versus*, was Juvenal's motto; and indignation tore the heart of Swift. But in Italy there was no indignation. All men were agreed to tolerate, condone, and compromise. When vices come to be laughingly admitted, when discords between practice and profession furnish themes for tales and epigrams, the moral conscience is extinct. But without an appeal to conscience the satirist has no *locus standi*. Therefore, in Italy there was no great satire, as in Italy there was no great comedy." [2]

It is a question how far these general statements will bear examination: one wonders just what sort of society would suit Mr. Symonds's conditions, having sufficient vice to furnish material for true satire, and at the same time sufficient conscience to furnish it a *locus standi*. But the application to Italy is sufficiently clear, and the comparison of what is said with Elizabethan conditions in England should be instructive.

It is not necessary to enter with any detail upon the consideration of the rise of formal satire in any other continental

[1] *Renaissance in Italy*, vol. v. p. 381.

[2] Ibid., p. 310 f.

country. In Germany its rise was comparatively late, and seems to have been due to French influence rather than to direct imitation of the classics. In France formal satire appeared but little later than in England. While Du Bellay seems to have made some effort to introduce the imitation of classical satire, he met with small success.[1] In 1605 were published the works of Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, including a number of satires in the epistolary manner. Godefroy calls this satirist "cet émule d'Horace," and says:

"Il a des traits énergiques contre les vices et les ridicules, mais peu de malice ni de fiel. Son indignation est toujours tempérée, aussi le plus grand nombre de ses satires ressemblent-elles assez à des épîtres." [2]

The first Frenchman, however, to write formal satire with distinguished success was Mathurin Régnier (1578-1613).

"Er war der Erste, der, mit satirischer Kraft begabt, die Pfade der römischen Dichter einschlug, und sich an Horaz und Juvenal bildete." [3]

Régnier's satires were written at intervals through his life, but none seem to have been published till 1608. They are the product of both Latin and Italian influences, and are in the epistolary form, in the manner of Horace but with some of the spice of Juvenal. In Satire 2 he observed that he would follow "la trace du libre Juvénal," (Horace being "trop discret . . . pour un homme picqué"); but, as Lotheissen remarks, "trotz dieser Kritik folgt er doch Horaz häufiger als Juvenal." It seems to me that Régnier's third satire, on "la vie de la Cour," shows the influence of the

[1] See Lotheissen: *Geschichte der Französ. Lit. im 17. Jahrhundert*, vol. i. p. 107; and Lenient: *La Satire en France au XVI^e Siècle*, pp. 117 ff.

[2] *Histoire de la Littérature Française. Poëtes*, Tome i. p. 234. See also Lenient, op. cit., pp. 130 ff.

[3] Lotheissen, op. cit., i. 107. Mlle. de Scudéry said also (in *Clélie*): "Il sera le premier qui fera des satires en français." See also the praise of Despreaux (in his tenth *Chant de l'Art Poëtique*):

> "De ces maîtres savans, disciple ingénieux,
> Régnier seul parmi nous forme sur leurs modèles."

ninth of Alamanni, which we shall presently find paraphrased by Wyatt in England.

If we assume that the writings of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye and Régnier could have been well known in England only after publication, the influence of French formal satire upon English poets was of course not earlier than the seventeenth century.

While we are considering French satire, it will be well to notice the *Satyre Menippée*, although this is apart from the line of classical imitation. The full title of this work was *Satyre Menippée de la Vertu du Catholicon d'Espagne, et de la tenue des Estats de Paris.* It was published in 1594, and was, as is well known, an attack on the meeting of the Estates General of 1593, convened in the interests of the Spanish party. The name was of course of classical origin, and was doubtless adopted from the fact that verse satire was introduced into the regular prose narrative of the book. Aside from the name, however, the *Satyre Menippée* was most unclassical, being a burlesque account of the meeting of the States, given with typical French wit and interspersed with popular political verse.[1] The book was enormously popular, four or five different editions appearing within a year after its production. In England, too, it seems to have been well known; in 1595 appeared a translation by P. Le Roy and others, called *A pleasant Satyre or Poesie: wherein is discovered the Catholicon of Spayne, and the chiefe leaders of the League.*[2] For our purposes the only interest of the book is the fact that its name may have exerted some influence in England in the growth of satire as a recognized literary form.

Two streams, then, meet in the England of the sixteenth century: familiarity with the classics, which had been in some measure a part of clerical education throughout the Middle

[1] See the editions of C. Labitte (Paris, 1841) and C. Read (Paris, 1876); also Wright: *History of Caricature and Grotesque*, pp. 343 ff.

[2] This was reissued, with a new title, in 1602. See British Museum Catalogue, under *Satyre Menippée*.

Ages, and which was now the centre of culture; and observation of the efforts made in Italy to translate contemporary life and thought into classical forms.

III.

Before entering upon a particular examination of the satire of the Elizabethan Age, it will be well to compare what we have seen of early English satire with the work of the Latin satirists, in order to be able to speak with some precision of the characteristic elements of each, and to determine in some measure just what elements the Elizabethans derived from the classical models. It is not possible to make this comparative analysis so accurate or complete as to serve the purpose of a formula; for individual genius constantly sets aside general laws, and periods of influence will not define themselves rigidly so as either to include or exclude distinctly all the literature concerned. It is believed, however, that enough can be said to present a standard of comparison which will be useful in the study of Elizabethan satire.

To consider first the matter of *form*, the chief contrast between classical and early English satire lies in the fact that the former was recognized as a more or less fixed literary form, while the latter was not. Many differences of detail are to be referred to this general fact. Thus the hexameter was accepted as the metrical form for classical satire, and wherever the latter has been consciously imitated some correspondingly fixed measure has been sought and adopted; while in early popular satire the verse might be the alliterative long line, the four-stress rhyming verse or the more exact octosyllabic couplet, some ballad measure, or the short outbursts of the Skeltonic rhythm.

The *type* of classical satire was also fairly well fixed, though with numerous minor variations. It was in general a subjective kind of poem, representative primarily of the point of view of the individual writer, carried on, as Heinsius said, "partly dramatically, partly simply," but never so distinctively dramatic or narrative as to have a unified "series of action" or plot. Its two characteristic sub-types we have seen to be that of reflective or philosophical satire, and that of the satire of direct rebuke. On the other hand, the early English satire had no such fixed type of subjective poem. It might be in distinctly lyrical or ballad form, it might be in dialogue or fully dramatic form, it might be in the form of elaborate allegorical narrative. Like the classical satire, it was largely of the type of direct rebuke; unlike the classical satire, and like all the literature of unsophisticated and more or less unconscious periods, it made slight use of elements which we should call reflective or philosophical. When the narrative element was introduced, it was likely to be of an allegorical, typical, or otherwise unreal sort; while the dramatic element in classical satire (excluding such forms as the apologue or fable) was of a distinctly realistic order. On the other hand, early popular satire of a descriptive nature was as realistic and as concrete as any of the classical school.

If we consider the *spirit* of the two groups of satire,—their attitude toward life,—it is in both cases of course characteristically pessimistic. The difference lies chiefly in the fact that the pessimism of the classical satirists is modified (if at all) by lightness of touch, a certain lack of seriousness, or the predominence of the reflective element, all of which are wanting to the early English satire; while the pessimism of the latter is modified (if at all) by a hopefulness due either to religious faith or to the spirit of reform. The spirit of the classical satire is on the whole conservative; that of the early English is on the whole distinctly progressive. Finally, the spirit of the former group is not only pagan as a matter of course,

but largely unreligious; while that of the latter is in large measure religious and distinctively Christian.

Turning to the *subject-matter* of the two groups, we find, as has already been intimated, a closer resemblance than might have been expected. In each case there is a wide variety in the objects satirized, and a large proportion of attack upon the perennial faults and follies of human nature. The chief differences are those of emphasis, and arise from the formal nature of the classical satire, and from its more individual point of view. While the occasion of all true satire lies in the existence of contemporary evils, the motives of literary effect and of the exercise of a reflective turn of mind exert a much larger influence where satire is a recognized literary form. Thus the satire of Horace and of Persius may be said to take its origin primarily in such a reflective turn of mind; and, while the sincerity of Juvenal is a less certain element, it may safely be said that his satire is too highly finished and at the same time too extreme in its charges to be taken as the spontaneous outpouring of outraged virtue. If we compare his satires with the letters of Pliny the younger, written at the same period, we may see how easy it is for one man to write cheerfully in the epistolary form, when he sets out to do so, and for another man at the same time to write satire of the most vitriolic character, when it is that that he has set out to do. Besides, we have Juvenal's own word for it that he takes up the writing of satire in revenge for the bad poetry that has been poured into his own ears; in other words, it is a literary performance consciously undertaken. Now the early English satire was not usually so sophisticated a performance, and it usually had its origin rather in the actual contemporary evils to be attacked than in the reflective temperament of the writer. It was frequently (as in the satire of the Reformation) the result of a distinct moral uprising, with a real and professed motive of reform. It was also, as has already been suggested, less individual than the classical satire, being often

obviously representative of the feeling of a social class, a political party, or a religious order. These things of course had their influence upon the subject-matter of the satire.

Said Juvenal:

> "Quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
> Gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est." [1]

And so far as the vicious side of these is concerned, he made good his word. He even did something of what Horace did much further, and expounded the good as well as the evil side of life,—virtues in contrast to vices. We have seen that the English satirists had a narrower idea of satire than their classical predecessors, and made it wholly, or nearly so, a form "in which human vices, ignorance and errors" are "severely reprehended." They dealt, as did the Romans, with morals, fashions, personal humors, classes, and individuals; they also dealt much more with politics and religion. The greatest single distinction is that in classical satire the emphasis was on private evils; in early English satire it was on public evils. When the latter attacked the vices of the king they did so primarily because he was king, just as they attacked the vices of the clergy because they were the clergy and were thought to be under special obligation to be righteous. On the other hand, when Juvenal attacks the vices of Domitian or Nero we do not feel that he is attacking the rulers as representatives of the people; their vices are indeed the greater for their exalted position ("Omne vitium," etc.), but they are distinctly treated as the vices of private aristocrats. This distinction runs through the whole line of division between the two groups of satire. In the classical satire the emphasis is on private morals, foolish fashions, and the like. In the early English satire the emphasis is on public morals, class morals, and religion. There is a marked tendency to group

[1] Sat. I. 85 f.

and typify, instead of to individualize. Thus we have the "social types" of the *Ship of Fools* and its successors. Again, when private vices and the follies of fashion were touched on in English satire, as they of course constantly were, it was their opposition to the public good and to the laws of religion which was emphasized, rather than their intrinsic folly or impropriety. Thus the permanent public spirit, the utilitarianism, and the moral and religious earnestness of the English race are as evident in this form of literature as in others. Religious and political satire we have seen were absolutely characteristic of the early English as distinguished from the classical satirists; on the other hand literary satire belongs to the latter, being one of the products of a more sophisticated age. Whenever the classical satire has begun to be imitated, its hints in this direction have been eagerly followed. Finally, of personal satire, except that of a representative nature, there was little, in comparison with generalities, in either group; but there was more in that of the classics than in the early popular satire, owing to the general tendency of the former toward greater individualization.

We come finally to distinctions of *style*. These are chiefly those natural to the difference between a recognized literary form and no such recognized form. Thus the style of the classical satirists is polished, compact, often indirect in its application (speaking, as Heinsius said, "for the most part figuratively and occultly"), and full of allusion. That of the early English satirists is for the most part fairly direct, simple (save for the use of allegory and occasional irony), loose in structure, and generally unliterary. In both groups there is a tendency toward a "low familiar" manner, but this is, of course, more marked in the popular satire. In both there is a suggestion of ruggedness and crabbedness, but this has been generally exaggerated, so far as it implies a contrast with other forms. There is more dramatic variety in the classical satire, particularly of a rapid, elliptical sort; while in the other

group descriptive elements play a more important part. The reflective or philosophical element in the classical style, and its absence in that of early popular satire, have already been implied. The tendency to dramatize and to individualize, displayed in the former group, has its most conspicuous result in the use of the *personal type-names* so widely introduced into the satires of Juvenal, based in varying degrees upon the true names of real persons.

Among matters of style the distinction between the humor of the two groups is perhaps the most difficult to define. To a considerable extent no distinction need be made; for that humor which is natural to the very essence of satire, and is based on the permanently ridiculous follies of humanity, belongs to all classes alike. But there is a marked diminution in the quantity of wit and humor when we leave the classical satire for the early English period; the latter exhibits a more serious tone, which may sometimes be called, as Herford calls it in Lydgate's *Order of Fools*, "an unseasonable earnestness." We have already seen this illustrated in the case of a satirist carefully pointing out the fact that he is attacking only the evil side of things, and does not wish to have the good confounded with his victims. This is a common statement in early English satire, and displays a deficiency in wit which may be best realized by considering how inconceivable such a stolidly conscientious performance would have been to Juvenal. It is of the very essence of the formally pessimistic satire to assume that everything is as bad as it can be. In general it may be said (though without forgetting a fair number of exceptions) that the humor of early English satire, when it appears, is of a more obvious and less subtle kind than that of the classical satirists,—a fact which is, of course, quite consistent with its less sophisticated nature. Those who philosophize on the subject of wit and humor are in the habit of saying that they depend for their existence upon some contrast strikingly, if not unexpectedly, presented.

Schneegans has it that the contrast must be between a pleasant and a disagreeable idea:

"Darin sind aber fast alle einig, dass das Lächerliche auf einen Kontrast zwischen einem Lust- und Ungelustgefühl beruhe."[1]

In the early English satire perhaps the most common sort of humor is that based upon the contrast between professions and performances,—the humor of inconsistency. This is, of course, the primary element in witty attacks upon the clergy of all orders. Another very common sort is what may be best called the humor of description, in which English writers have commonly been successful. The humor of the classical satirists, being, as has been said, of a subtler kind, is not so easy to define. Frequently it rests in the contrast between real and assumed importance, as in the story of Domitian's turbot. Frequently it lies in an ironical detail or comment, introduced unexpectedly and irrelevantly to the principal train of thought,—as when Juvenal declares that he could no more enumerate the diseases incident to old age than he could count up the number of Hippia's paramours. Frequently, again, it is merely the humor of exaggeration. But in general we must beware of expecting too much wit or humor of any kind in the region of formal satire, especially if we exclude that of the Horatian order. The satire of the grotesque or burlesque order has in fact so attracted the attention of the modern world that it has been assumed by many to be satire *par excellence*. But the old type of satire of direct rebuke or formal criticism was a more serious matter, and could not often turn aside to raise a laugh, even if it were one of scorn.

These, then, roughly outlined, are some of the points of contrast to be noted between the classical satire and that of the early English period, the enumeration of which, it is hoped, may throw light on the period of imitation. We should expect that those who turned to the classics as their models

[1] op. cit., p. 19.

in satire would, either insensibly or consciously, show a series of tendencies in the several directions indicated. They would adopt a more fixed literary form than the early popular satirists; they would show a disposition to use the reflective or philosophical method; their pessimism would be more sweeping and not so well founded; they would lessen the religious element, and be disposed to turn their emphasis from public to private vices; they would represent a more individual attitude; they would adopt a more sophisticated and self-conscious style; their humor would be more frequent and more subtle. Above all, the one element in Latin satire which they would be pretty certain to miss would be its originality; for in the act of imitation they would turn their eyes from their object to their model, and lose in spontaneity what they might gain in form.

IV.

We have now to examine in detail the English satirists of the period of classical influence. The principal difficulty to be met at the outset is to decide just what to admit and what to exclude. We must recur, however, to what was said at the very beginning of this study: that our task is to consider satire as a *form*, not as a *mode*, and to consider it primarily as affected by classical influence. It was pointed out that the form is a self-conscious one, and may usually be distinguished by its own professions. Poems of a satirical character, but without either the profession or the characteristics of formal satire, will be excluded. Thus mere "broadsides," popular ballads, and personal or political tracts, do not come within our range. Epigrams, if they are true epigrams (that is, limited to the expression of single witty or gnomic ideas), may also be omitted. The chief test will be the name *satire* (except, of course, for its occasional application to the drama or other separate literary forms), since the very idea of classical imitation

was naturally marked, in England as in Italy, by the adoption of the classical name.

Of each work thus examined practically the same questions are to be asked. Its date, author, publication, and general history are first to be considered. Its external form and its style will then be briefly noticed; then its contents; then the type of satire represented; then the detailed evidence of influence either of classical or earlier modern satire. There is then to be considered the relation of the work in hand to the general characteristics of classical and of early English satire, with the view of ascertaining which elements predominate; and, finally, its relations to contemporary life as represented by the objects satirized.

So far as may be practicable this will be the order followed throughout the period now before us.

1. Sir Thomas Wyatt.

"Wyat," said Warton, "may justly be deemed the first polished English satirist."[1] This opinion has widely prevailed. When we turn to the "satires" of Wyatt we find that the poems so called are three of those published in Tottel's *Miscellany*, 1557: *Of the meane and sure estate, written to John Poins; Of the courtiers life, written to John Poins;* and *How to use the court and him selfe therin, written to syr Fraunces Bryan.*[2] These poems are not, however, called satires in Tottel, and it appears that in the earliest manuscripts they were either without title (as in the partially autograph MS., Egerton 2711),[3] or with the titles printed in the *Miscellany*. I do not know but Warton was the first to apply the term *satire* to these poems; since his time it has been generally accepted,

[1] *History of English Poetry*. Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 47.

[2] Tottel, Arber ed., pp. 85–93.

[3] See Flügel's reprint, in *Anglia*, vol. xviii. p. 507.

by Dr. Nott in his edition, and very recently by Ten Brink and Flügel.

The publication of these "satires" was of course posthumous. They are thought by Mr. W. E. Simonds,[1] who is perhaps as competent as any to speak on the subject, to have been written in the period of Wyatt's retirement at Allington, July, 1541, to October, 1542, and hence to date from the very end of his life. The text varies slightly in the various manuscripts and in Tottel's version, chiefly in the way of bringing the later copies into closer correspondence with the more critical ideas of metrical regularity which were growing up in the period succeeding Wyatt's death. More interesting are some changes obviously made for reasons of policy. Thus in the original of the poem on the *Courtier's Life* we have:

> "Nor I ame not where Christe is geven in pray
> For mony poison and traison at Rome;"

—which was changed by Tottel, whose volume appeared in the reign of the un-Protestant Queen Mary, to—

> "Nor I am not, where truth is geven in pray,
> For money, poyson, and treason: of some
> A common practice," etc.

And again in the poem on *How to Use the Court* there is a similar omission of a sharp allusion to the "cloister," as well as of a reference by name to one Kitson, a sheriff of London. It is a common fate of satires to find their first editions acceptable only to the time for which they were immediately written.

These three poems take high rank among the work of their author. Warton considered that Wyatt "mistook his talents" in becoming chiefly a sonneteer instead of a satirist, and Nott commented interestingly on the disproportion between their merits and their reputation:

[1] *Sir Thomas Wyatt and his Poems*, p. 42. See also R. Alscher: *Sir Thomas Wyatt und seine Stellung*, etc., p. 34.

"The fate which has awaited Wyatt's Satires is somewhat remarkable, and deserves to be noticed. They are unquestionably his happiest and most finished productions. They may be ranked among the best satires in our language; and yet they never seem to have obtained either admirers or imitators; at least I do not recollect that any of our early writers have spoken of them in particular with commendation. This, I apprehend, may be easily accounted for. Wyatt had outstripped, as it were, his times. A taste for delicate satire cannot be general until refinement of manners is general likewise; and society is brought to that state which allows of the development of foibles in character, and encourages philosophical inquiry into the motives and principles of human actions. As long as society is in a state of incipient refinement only, satire ever will be, and ever has been, coarse, personal, and indiscriminating; for the beauty of general allusions cannot then be felt; and few will be enlightened enough to comprehend that the legitimate object of satiric poetry is not to humble an individual, but to improve the species."[1]

This explanation is not entirely satisfactory. There is a sense in which the age of Wyatt had just the elements of self-consciousness and of taste for "general allusions" which Nott is referring to; and its formal satire we shall not find to be largely personal. On the other hand, it is true that the satire of the urbane, Horatian type never took great hold in England.

The metre of Wyatt's satires is the *terza rima*, obviously an Italian element, which would of itself give the clue to the source of their inspiration. It shares the qualities of the other verse of the same author, showing good metrical taste, but needing adaptation (such as it received very promptly) to the requirements of rigidly accentual rhythm. The style is compact but smooth, and noticeably urbane. It is of the epistolary order, and of Horatian ease and naturalness. Where narrative is introduced it is handled with direct and idiomatic simplicity, and the reflective and ethical elements are noticeably vigorous.

The first satire opens with the fable of the town and the country mouse, and proceeds to discuss the miserable error of human desires, the fact that true pleasure

[1] Nott's ed. of Wyatt, Introduction, p. cxxxvii f. Compare also Alscher, p. 41: "Ja, Wyatt war so sehr der erste Satiriker, welcher einen edlen, classischen Stil in diese Dichtungsart einführte, dass er sogar von seinen Zeitgenossen gar nicht verstanden worden zu sein scheint."

is to be sought within rather than without, and the punishment of ambition in its own sense of the loss of virtue. The second explains why the author withdraws from the press of courts; he does not scorn rulers, but he cannot flatter, and give vices pretty names; so he hunts and reads, in peace and liberty, rejoicing that he is removed from the gluttony of France, the formalities of Spain, the deceitfulness of Flanders, and the corruption of Rome. The third, advising Sir Francis Bryan "how to use the court and himself therein," gives him ironical rules for living in ease; he has but to avoid truth, use virtue in word only, lend only where it will profit him, flatter wealthy old men, cajole their widows, and offer his female relatives for sale. In conclusion, Bryan is represented as refusing to part with his honest name for any riches, and is recommended to poverty.

It is already clear that these are satires of the reflective type; narrative is introduced only as incidental to philosophy. Direct rebuke appears but slightly. The attitude toward life is mildly pessimistic,—in a word, Horatian. There is no formal idea of satire presented, as the poems make no formal pretension to be satires.

We have now to consider the immediate sources of the satires. The fable of the two mice is of course originally from Horace (Book ii. sat. 6), and with this Wyatt was doubtless familiar; yet the Horatian story is not followed in detail. Dr. Nott suggested that Wyatt was indebted to Henryson's version for the "mode of telling" the fable, and this is adopted by Ten Brink. In Horace the mice are friends; in Henryson and in Wyatt they are sisters.[1] In Horace and Henryson the story begins with a visit of the town mouse to the country; in Wyatt it does not. In Horace there is little direct conversation recorded; in Henryson and in Wyatt there is considerable, and in each case the mice say "peep." In Horace the country mouse is frightened by dogs; in Henryson and Wyatt by the cat. In Horace the catastrophe is not recorded; in Henryson the mouse is caught, but escapes; in Wyatt it is caught, and there is no intimation of escape.—These comparisons of detail suggest how difficult it is to reach certain conclusions; as a matter of fact the fable must have been one

[1] See Henryson's *Poems and Fables*, ed. Laing, p. 108.

of such popularity that both Henryson and Wyatt could have choice of many versions for their own use.[1]

The moralization following the fable ("Alas my Poyns!") does not belong directly to Horace. Nott compares it with Chaucer's—

> "We seken faste after felicitee,
> But we goon wrong," etc.,
> (*Knight's Tale*, l. 408.)

—a passage of Boethian origin.

The passage also suggests Juvenal, Satire X.:

> "Pauci dignoscere possunt
> Vera bona," etc., (l. 2.)

and many references in Juvenal to the "vanity of human wishes." But the whole idea is so common that it cannot be exactly referred. In general, Wyatt's use of his sources is characterized by complete English paraphrase—the thought as well as the words being translated to suit his needs.

The conclusion of this satire, as has been repeatedly noticed, is from Persius, Satires I. and III. Thus,

> "Seke no more out of thy selfe to find," etc.,

is from

> "Ne te quæsiveris extra." (Pers. I. 7.)

And the fine passage,

> "But to the great God and to his dome,"

is from Satire III., 35 ff.:

> "Magne pater divum, sævos punire tyrannos," etc.

The second satire (*Of the Courtier's Life*), which was quite likely the first in order of composition, has a most interesting

[1] See also Alscher's comparison of Wyatt's and Henryson's versions, pp. 35–37.

source. It is from the Tenth of Alamann., which was addressed to Thommaso Sertini, and dealt with the petty hypocrisies of life at court.[1] The paraphrase of Wyatt is decidedly close, but with his usual freedom of adaptation; thus he follows Alamanni in his arraignment of life in France, Germany, Spain, and Rome, but for

> "Sono in Provenza, ove quantunque pieni," etc.,

he has

> "I am here in Kent and Christendome;"

and, better still, for

> "Dir non saprei Poeta alto et gentile
> Mevio, giurando poi che tal non vide
> Smirna, Manto, et Fiorenza ornato stile,"

Wyatt substitutes

> "Praise syr Topas for a noble tale,
> And scorne the story that the knight tolde."

Lines 53 f. remind one of Juvenal, if we compare "Grinne when he laughes," etc., with

> "Rides? majore cachinno," etc. (iii. 100.)

And line 61,

> "With nearest vertue ay to cloke the vice,"

suggests

> "Fallit enim vitium specie virtutis, et umbra."
> (Juvenal, xiv. 109.)

But these are perhaps sufficiently explained by the corresponding passages in Alamanni.

The third satire, addressed to Sir Francis Bryan, is derived (as was also pointed out by Nott) from Horace's fifth Satire of Book 2, on Legacy-hunting; but the source is not followed

[1] This is reproduced in Dr. Nott's edition of Wyatt, p. 458.

closely. In this satire, as in the others, the adaptation of the original is an interesting study (cf. l. 55), Lines 60 to 66 are not in Horace, and suggest the bitterer style of Juvenal; compare with them, for example:

> "Qui testamenta merentur
> Noctibus, in cœlum quos evehit optima summi," etc.
> (Juvenal, i. 37 ff.)

We find, then, distinct evidence of familiarity with the satires of Horace and Persius, and suggestions of familiarity with those of Juvenal. Most significant, however, is the connection with Alamanni. It is from the latter that Wyatt seems to have derived his metre, and it is safe to assume (especially when we remember his general connection with the Italian poets) that it was from Alamanni also that he derived the idea of adopting the form of epistolary satire, and of adapting the classical method to the conditions of his own time and place.

It remains to ask what general elements of classical satire appear in these first English imitations. In the first place, they are in an artificial form of verse. Most conspicuously, they are of the reflective type, and of a generally sophisticated tone. When narrative is introduced, it is of a realistic order; thus the fable of the two mice, while intended as a typical apologue, is really in the realistic method (for a different method compare the fable of the Belled Cat in *Piers Plowman*). Again, the pessimism of these satires is of the classical sort; it is calm and ironical, without modification, and without the element of reform. There is, however, a true moral earnestness, and the author seems to have been too serious and sincere to assume a pagan attitude, as in the passages dealing with the Roman Church. The emphasis laid on private morals is a classical element; so is the portrayal of virtue in connection with its opposite; so also is the distinctly individual point of view. The style is not an attempt at classical imitation, and we have seen that it

is well adapted to English subject-matter and local color; but yet it is that of an accepted literary form, polished and reflective, and the dramatic dialogue of the third satire is quite on classical lines. The humor, too, is of a subtle sort, and is in part at least based on classical *motifs*.

The objects of Wyatt's satire are chiefly the permanent vices of the conditions depicted, and come under the head of private morals. Thus ambition and covetousness, and, above all, flattery and deceit, form the leading themes. Legacy-hunting was taken up in detail, as appropriate to both classical and Elizabethan satire. Under Religion we have the passages in the second satire (l. 98) and in the third (l. 22). Under personal satire we have only the reference to the white-coated Ritson (who seems to have been Sheriff of London in 1533) in iii. 47. A kind of satire best noticed separately from any of the general heads is that upon the faults of continental countries (ii. 89–99)—a form of amusement always dear to Englishmen.

In conclusion, the satires of Wyatt are clearly after the Horatian model, and show direct influence of both the classics and the Italian imitators. They had their origin primarily in the reflective mood. Their great merit lay in the fact that they were not classicized in detail, but were adapted to contemporary purposes; they were also treated in a truly poetic and idealizing spirit. It is no undue anticipation to say that in all these matters Wyatt had no successor.

We have at this point to notice in passing a poem bearing the name of "satire," by Wyatt's friend and follower, the Earl of Surrey. It is called a *Satire Against the Citizens of London*, and appears to have been written in April, 1543,[1] when Surrey was a prisoner in the Fleet "for having—in company with Thomas Wyatt the younger, and young Pickering—caused disturbance to the citizens of London by shooting stones at their windows from a cross-bow." The poem is an arraignment of the morals of London citizens, from a religious point of view, entirely serious in tone and without interest of detail. Except for its title, it is of no interest for us. The metre—*terza rima*—suggests that the name "Satire" was

[1] See Ten Brink: *History of English Literature*, vol. ii. Part ii. p. 255.

derived from Italy. If so, there is an interesting contrast between Wyatt and Surrey—the former borrowing the spirit without the name, and the latter the name without the spirit.

Here also must be briefly considered a work called *One and thyrtye Epigrammes, wherein are bryefly touched so many Abuses, that maye and ought to be put away.*[1] This is the work of Robert Crowley, and was published at the author's own press in 1550. Crowley was an interesting controversialist of the period, who was at Oxford from 1534 to 1542, a printer for some time following 1548, and Archdeacon of Hereford in 1559. In the same year with his *Epigrams* he published the *editio princeps* of *Piers Plowman*, and the influence of Langland's work is evident in that of Crowley.

The Epigrams (which are really thirty-three in number) are longer than they should be to bear such a name, and would more properly be called satires—though not of the classical order. Some have therefore included Crowley among the earliest English satirists. The Epigrams are in short lines of two accents each, rhyming alternately; or, in other words, in resolved four-stress couplets. The style is vernacular English, with a Puritanical and scriptural flavor. The Epigrams deal with evils of the day, arranged alphabetically after the fashion of a mediæval book of *Exempla:* thus, Abbayes, Allayes, Almes houses, Balyarrantes, Baudes, Beggars, etc. Special emphasis is laid on the oppression of the poor, the peculiar ills of city life, and irreligion. Many of the criticisms of social conditions are of considerable interest. In the Epigram on Alleys, Crowley laments the number of unemployed for whom work should be provided by the city officials and by wealthy citizens. So also in the Epigram on Idle Persons, where it is said that

> "this realme hath thre commoditie,
> woule, tynne, and leade,
> which being wrought within the realme,
> eche man might get his bread."

It was the selfishness of society that distressed this reformer, as it does modern reformers. London seemed to him

> "An hell with out order, . . .
> Where everye man is for him selfe,
> And no manne for all."
>
> (ll. 201 ff.)

Like all satirists of the century, he attacked the holding of double benefices. Like most of them he gave special heed to flatterers. Like many of them, he satirized the "inventors of strange news"—comparing them, curiously enough, to the poets and orators whom Plato expelled from his commonwealth.[2] An inter-

[1] Ed. by J. M. Cowper, for Early English Text Society, 1872.
[2] ll. 1133 ff.

esting passage is that on "Forestallars," who would seem to be what we should call "dealers in options":

> "And some saye the woule
> is bought ere it do growe,
> And the corne long before
> it come in the mowe." (ll. 941 ff.)

The foolish fashions of women of course come in for a share of the rebuke:

> "If theyre heyre wyl not take colour,
> then must they by newe,
> And lay it oute in tussockis:
> this thynge is to true.
> At ech syde a tussock,
> as bygge as a ball,—
> A very fayre syght
> for a fornicator bestiall." (ll. 1301 ff.)

The only satire of a literary sort is the condemnation of "vayne wryters" together with "vaine talkers" and "vaine hearers."

The sources of this work are obviously only general. The apparent influence of Langland has already been noted. The only reference to the classics is that to Plato's Republic. The type of satire is as clearly that of pure rebuke. The attitude is pessimistic, but with a hopeful view of moral reform. All this is of the early English order. So are the progressive spirit, the religious tone, the emphasis on public morals, the slight amount of humor, and the general style. The occasion of this work was in Crowley's observations of men and things about him, and not at all in literary imitation.

From the same author and the same year we have another satirical work, valled the "Voyce of the laste trumpet, blowen by the seventh Angel, ... callying al estats of men to the ryght path of theyre vocation," etc. In this case the classification is by orders of men: the beggar, the servant, the yeoman, the unlearned priest, the scholar, the physician, the magistrate, the gentleman, etc.[1]

Here, for the sake of chronological completeness, may be mentioned a work which seems like an echo from a previous century. This is George Buchanan's *Franciscanus*, a satire on the Franciscan monks, written at the request of the king. It was in Latin, was begun in 1535 and finished in 1564. On this see Morley's *English Writers*, vol. viii, pp. 340 ff.

[1] See Corser's *Collectanea*, Part 4, pp. 539 ff.

In 1566 was published, as has already been noted, Drant's "Medicinable Morall, that is, the two Bookes of Horace his Satyres, Englyshed according to the prescription of saint Hierome: . . . Quod malum est, muta; quod bonum est, prode." It would appear from the reference to Jerome's motto that the original was altered for contemporary purposes, and Corser (from whom I copy the title-page)[1] says that there is included "a poetical definition of a Satire." This it would be interesting to examine, but I have not been able to see a copy of Drant's work. In 1567 it was reprinted, together with the Epistles and the *Ars Poetica*.

2. Edward Hake.

"Newes out of Powles Churchyarde, Now newly renued and amplifyed according to the accidents of the present time, 1579, and Otherwise entituled, syr Nummus. Written in English Satyrs. Wherein is reprooved excessive and unlawfull seeking after riches, and the evill spending of the same. Compyled by E. H. Gent."

The work of which this is the full title is by one Edward Hake, and has been edited by Mr. Edmonds as one of the "Isham Reprints." As appears from the title-page, it was published in 1579, but "newly renewed and amplified." It was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1567, but no copy of the first edition is known to be extant. There is an allusion to it as early as 1568, in Turberville's *Plaine Path to perfect Vertue:*

> "I neither write the Newes of Poules
> Of late set out to sale," etc.[2]

Hazlitt has it that the 1579 edition was the "third impression," but I know of no evidence to support this. Since the discovery that Hake's "Satyrs" preceded Gascoigne's *Steele Glas*, he has frequently been mentioned as one of the very earliest English satirists; he does not, however, belong among the classical imitators.

[1] *Collectanea*, Part 5, pp. 244 ff.
[2] See Collier's *Rarest Books*, vol. ii. p. 105.

Hake was a public man, a lawyer and the holder of several public offices. The *Newes out of Pauls* is his earliest known work, and was written while he was Mayor of New Windsor, and a protégé of the great Earl of Leicester. Some ten other works of his are enumerated by Mr. Edmonds. He himself declares (in the address "to the Gentle Reader") that he receives no money for his writing, and puts a modest estimate upon it.

The metre of these "Satyrs" is a kind of resolved Septenarius, rhyming (a), b, (c), b. The style is of a distinctly early order; rugged and sometimes violent, with abundant alliteration, sometimes rising to real vigor, usually fluent, monotonous, and full of the vernacular.

The satires are preceded by a dedication to the Earl of Leicester, whose coat-of-arms is reproduced. There are also several complimentary verses, and an address "To the Gentle Reader,"—explaining that the printer is pleased "after twelve yeeres silence, to hale again into the lighte this my little booke of englishe Satyrs." . . .

"Touching this my booke: I have not abridged it of any one Satyre that was in the first edytion thereof, neyther have I added unto it any other whole Satyr: But I have enlarged here and there one. . . . I confesse I coulde have beene wylling to have increased the number by ii. or iii. Satyrs at least: Namely of vnder-shreeves and Bayllifs one: And of Informers and Sompners or Apparitours other twoo. Which offycers (if they áll so be) how they abuse the Subjects and people of this Realme at this daye, by intollerable Extortions bryberies trecheries and deceyts, what whole Shier, and in everye Shier, what Cytie Towne or Village, is not hable haboundauntly to declare?"

Following is an outline of the contents of the satires:

Satire I. Walking in Pauls, the author heard one Paul address his friend Bertulph, and tell him of his distress over the wiles of a certain Nummus, who rules in country and city, over clergy, merchants and townsmen.

Satire II. Paul continues to tell how Nummus beguiles men of law, judges, attorneys, counsellors and the like.

Satire III. He proceeds to show how Physicians are in the "greedy traine;" their avarice, their cure-alls, their fatal effects.

Satire IV. Passing over apothecaries and surgeons, he tells of merchantmen; their travels, their cheating of foolish citizens, their sale of forbidden finery, and in general the luxury, selfishness, and oppressiveness of the rich.

Satire V. He inveighs against "Banckrowts" who fear no punishment for their avarice and luxury; their loud wives; fools and roysterers; the lives of spendthrifts; the inconsistency of those who profess religion; the utter wickedness of the age.

Satire VI. He takes up the abuse of Paul's Church itself: it has come to be filled with "chaos vyle." The avarice and pride of country gentlemen; the universal reign of fraud and vice. The Papists who walk in the south aisle of St. Paul's; their hypocrisy, treachery and cruelty. Good preachers are exempted from the general condemnation.

Satire VII. He prays for pardon if he slanders or exaggerates; recounts the deeds of bawds and brokers, unsuppressed by officers of the law.—Here Paul the speaker ends, promising hereafter to relate his own unfortunate dealings with Sir Nummus.

Satire VIII. The author's "quaking quill renewes the plaint" against all forms of avarice, especially the sins of usurers, who are warned of hell fire.

The Author upon the Booke points out that he quips "no private man for hate," and that he recognizes that "in the towne are divers sortes of men" of all the classes treated, still virtuous and on the way to joyful immortality.

The type of satire here is clearly the early English one of direct rebuke, though couched in a strained narrative form. The pessimism is of the most monotonous type. The "sottish sinfull brittle age" has overcome the writer with its panorama of wickedness.

> "Besides deceit and vile devise,
> dooth nothing now remaine
> Within the harts of English men." (S. 6.)

Yet in seemingly unconscious contradiction of this, Hake repeatedly points out that he distinguishes good from evil men, and does not wish his statements to be applied too sweepingly. His ideal of satire is explained in the Dedication, where he says that his book

"explaines the present state,
And sets to vew the vices of the time
In Novell Verse and Satyrs sharpe effect
Still drawne along and pend in playnest rime
For sole intent good living to erect:
And sinne rescinde which rifely raignes abroade
In peoples harts full fraught with sinfull loade."

Hake's predecessors in this sort of work were the many early English satirists of the type already seen in Crowley. It is not impossible that the *Epigrams* of 1550 may have fallen under his observation and given him hints. Except in the use of the term "satire," and what may be called the consciously rhetorical point of view of the author, there is no trace whatever of the influence of classical satire. The general type of satire we have seen to be that of the early English period. The allegorical figure of "Sir Nummus" is also to be noted. The treatment of public affairs (which receive a large proportion of emphasis) indicates the direct observation and interest of the author. The style and local color are thoroughly English. The religious element is noticeable. To illustrate all these matters of style one may quote two characteristically vigorous passages:

"O Labirinths of lothsome lust,
O hellish humane harts,
O beastly belching bely gods
that thus their store convarts:
O lumpishe Luskes, that lieffer had
to have of Viands store:
To winne the Rytchman, than to feede
the begger at their dore.
O stony harts, that more esteeme
A Monckey tyde with chaine
Then their poore brother, for whose sake
Christe Jesus sufferde paine." (S. 4.)

And again:

"O dreyrie dregges of dampishe cave,
O fowle infernall fiendes,
O tryple stinged Vipers broode,
O hagges of hellish mindes.

O Cyclops such as styll devoure
the sheepe of forreine foldes,
O brockish beastes with ravine gorgde:
that lurcke within their holdes.
Shall duskie drosse of Dytis cave
denie infecting death?
Shall Orcus spare with skalding skortch
to noye their vitall breath?
No sure, the pitchie burning pit,
and Limboes flaming Lake
Shall yolpe them up, except they yeelde
the goodes which they did take." (S. 5.)

The objects satirized all centre about the love of Sir Nummus, and are chiefly of interest as showing attention to problems of poverty and the social order. They may be classified—

Under Morals:

Avarice (throughout).
Cheating, S. 5, 6, 7.
Lust, S. 5, 7.
Usury, S. 5, 6, 7, 8 (where it appears that rates of interest ranged from 10 to 50 per cent).
Gossip and Slander, S. 6.
Hypocrisy, S. 2.
Gluttony, S. 4.
Bribery, S. 2.

Under Fashions:

Display of fine clothes, S. 3, 4, 5.
Bear-baiting (on Sunday), S. 5.
Feasting, S. 4.
(Here is given the complete menu of a rich merchant's feast, some fifty separate dishes being enumerated.)
Paul's Church as a rendezvous, S. 6.[1]

Under Public Affairs:

Encroachment of land, S. 2, 6.
"No poore man must have lande" seems to be the doctrine of the time. "That which was of land demeasne is holden now for rent."
Rent raising, S. 6.

[1] See Mr. Edmonds's notes on this passage.

Delayed and bribed justice, S. 2.
Treachery of Papists to the Queen, S. 6.
Fraudulent magistrates, S. 7.
Instability of wealth, and unnecessary poverty, S. 4, 5.
"The poore complaine and wanting, crye through hunger halfe forepinde."

Under Classes:

Loud women, S. 5.
Brokers, S. 7.
Lawyers, S. 2.
Physicians, S. 3.
Merchants, S. 4.

Under Religion:

Profanity, S. 1.
Avarice of clergy, S. 1.
Papists, S. 6.
Pluralities, S. 6.

It is not easy to say just how serious was the purpose of this satirist. His method suggests mingled reality and art. There is a lack of genuineness in the pessimism, and there is clearly an aim after rhetorical effect in the form; but the interest in social and public affairs seems genuine. The fact that the *Satyrs* were presented to the Earl of Leicester is of interest; there may have been an intention to drop hints on matters within his power to remedy, but the tone of the satire is too authoritative to have been intended as in any sense an address by a protégé to a patron.

3. George Gascoigne.

"The Steele Glas. A Satyre compiled by George Gascoigne, Esquire."

This was published, together with *The Complainte of Phylomene; an Elegie devised by the same Author*, in 1576, and republished in the Works of Gascoigne, 1587. It is well

known that Gascoigne is distinguished especially for his experiments in adaptations of literary forms, whether in the drama, criticism, or minor poetry; and he has been called by Mr. Arber, as well as by some others, "the first English satirist."[1] It is interesting to find that in 1575, addressing the Queen in the *Tale of Hemetes the Hermit*, he declares himself to be a "satirical writer, meditating the Muse that may express his reformation" from his former idle poetry.[2]

The *Steele Glas* seems to have been widely read and admired. It was dedicated to the Lord Gray of Wilton, and in the Dedication is called by the author a "Satyre written without rime, but I trust not without reason." It was also preceded by commendatory verses by "N. R.," by "Walter Rawely of the middle Temple,"[3] and by Nicholas Bowyer. N. R., after enumerating various forms of poetry as practiced by the ancients, concludes:

> "In Satyres sharpe (as men of mickle praise)
> Lucilius and Horace were esteemed.
> Thus divers men with divers vaines did write,
> But Gascoigne doth in every vaine indite." (p. 46.)

Raleigh writes in commendation of the mirror which

> "unpartially doth shewe
> Abuses all, to such as in it looke,
> From prince to poore, from high estate to lowe." (p. 47.)

While Bowyer comments on the fact that Gascoigne's Muse had changed from "layes of Love to Satyres sadde and sage." Finally, for words of commendation, we find in the correspondence of Harvey and Spenser that the latter "could very well abide Gascoigne's *Steele Glas*."[4]

[1] Arber ed. of the *Steele Glas*, etc., p. 11.
[2] See Morley's *English Writers*, vol. viii. p. 277.
[3] Apparently Raleigh's earliest published verses.
[4] Grosart's ed. of Harvey, vol. i. p. 180.

The blank verse of this satire has long been a matter of comment, in connection with the author's early use of the measure in the drama. Professor Morley observes that the *Glas* is "in English literature the first satire written in blank verse;" he might almost have added that it was the last. The effect of the measure is largely that of smoothness and monotony. In the author's address to the Reader he declares that he is about to lay siege to a sort of tower of fame, and that

> "rimes can seldom reach
> Unto the toppe of such a stately Towre."

He will therefore try reason instead of rhyme, and in "rhymeless verse" thunder "mighty threats" where "vice the wall decays." The verse is marked by a very persistent cesura after the fourth syllable, which is generally indicated by a comma whether the sense requires such punctuation or not. The style is, for the most part, like the verse, smooth, direct, and monotonous. There is a predominatingly serious, and sometimes a bookish, tone; but this is relieved by occasional gleams of mild humor and occasional passages of decided vigor. In general it must be said that the satire lacks the characteristic excellences of both the Horatian and the Juvenalian order.

The satire opens with an invocation to Phylomene, and proceeds to describe allegorically the pedigree and fortunes of *Satyra* (ll. 54–160). She is the twin-sister of Poesy, daughter of Playnedealing and Simplycitie. Vaine Delight, having ravished her, cut out her tongue; but with its stump she "may sometimes Reprovers deedes reprove." "The substance of the theame beginneth" with an account of the "weak and wretched world." The sins of various classes of society are rapidly enumerated, and attributed to the disuse of the ancient mirror of steel for glasses intended to flatter all who consult them. Lucilius, "a famous old satyrical Poete" (as a marginal note explains), is said to have bequeathed the steel glass to such as love to see themselves just as they are. The ideal commonwealth is then described, and the "common woe," where political corruption is dominant, is set forth in contrast. The evils of royal luxury, epicureanism, vulgar sports, the keeping of horses, fine clothing, display of jewelry and gold, avarice and ambition, are all adverted to; and English patriotism is

appealed to to maintain the pure and vigorous life of the country, and not to run to the city seeking advancement. Different classes are then taken up in detail,—soldiers, peasants (among whom Gascoigne includes all who labor for gain), officers, judges and advocates, merchants, and priests; in each case the ideal virtues of the class are described, and contrasted with its vices. In conclusion, the good priests are urged to pray for princes, nobility, the clergy, the universities and all manner of scholars, the commons, and for the author himself. These prayers may be given up, it is declared, only when all classes of men are at length honest and upright,—and in making this statement the author introduces a rapid, vigorous sketch of the faults of the various trades, enumerating them all by name (ll. 1075-1131).

An Epilogue of forty-nine lines gives a strongly drawn picture of "a stranger troope" of the affected and overdressed women of the period, who are treated with more bitterness than almost any of the more heinous sinners in the satire proper.

The type of satire in the *Steele Glas* is evidently not precisely the same that we have met with before. We find here neither an urbane, discursive, Horatian satire, nor a satire of the ultra-pessimistic type of rebuke—whether native English or classical. The work is really a kind of moral poem, satirical, no doubt, but not distinctly in satirical form. The attitude toward life is indeed theoretically pessimistic, the former (classical) age being always referred to as the time of loftier virtue (see 183 ff., 704 f., 729 ff., 779) and the present age as degenerate; but the reality of virtue is always before the author's mind, and its present existence not denied. The satirist's idea of his mission appears to be the common one, "to thunder mighty threats" against vice; and it is interesting to see that he recognizes that he has left, in a sense, the proper province of poetry. *Satyra* is only a sister of Poesy, and with her tongue cut out at that.

The sources of the *Glass* are not distinct or important. Like much of Gascoigne's work, it was not original in its primary idea or plan, but was carried out with some independence. As to the plan I quote from Professor Schelling:

"The age abounded in 'glasses' and 'mirrors,' from the non-extant *Speculum Principis* of Skelton to the various *Mirrors, for Magistrates*, for *Man*, of *Modesty*,

Monsters and *Mutability* to the *Lookin_ Glass for London* of a later date. *A Mirrroure of Gold* and a *Mirror of Glass for all Spiritual Ministers* had both appeared before Gascoigne's *Steele Glas*."[1]

Professor Morley has called attention to the apparent influence of Langland upon Gascoigne ("Peerce plowman" being introduced, near the close of the *Glass*, as a type of honesty that "shall clime to heaven before the shaven crownes"); one cannot tell how familiar he may have been with the Epigrams of Crowley or the Satyrs of Hake. Of distinctly classical sources I have noticed no evidence, though a brief passage (l. 945 f.) suggests a well-known saying of Juvenal:

> "The greater Birth, the greater glory sure,
> If deeds mainteine their auncestors degree."

It is noticeable that the only classical satirist alluded to by Gascoigne himself is Lucilius, of whom his knowledge was of course merely traditional.

While this satire, then, was not based on classical models primarily, it shows many classical elements mingled, under mediæval influence, with those native to England. The religious element, and the large interest in public affairs and official virtue, belong to the English type of satire; but on the other hand we find pseudo-pagan references to classical deities (see ll. 265, 324, 518), and many allusions to classical history and legend. Two traditional type-names of classical origin are introduced (*Laïs* and *Lucrece*: 208, 209, 1126). The pseudo-classical preference for antique virtue has already been noticed. The point of view in the satire is distinctly an individual one, and it of course finds its origin (like the typical formal satire) not in any uprising against external conditions, but in a reflective turn of mind. Finally we must notice certain non-classical elements, in the allegory of *Satyra* with which the satire opens, and in the hopefulness which triumphs over the formality of assumed pessimism. The style is formal,

[1] *Life and Writings of George Gascoigne*, p. 73.

but not in general imitative of the classics, and the local color is usually English. The total effect seems to be that of a moral poem, attempted under the influence of the idea of satire as a fixed literary form, but for the most part under the power of English influence and contemporary conditions.

The objects satirized are of no little interest in relation to contemporary life. They fall for the most part under Morals, Fashions, Classes, and Religion.

Under Morals:

Surcuydry,[1] 166.
Luxury, 306, 341, 380.
Avarice, 401.
Ambition, 410.
Usury, 792, 845.
Drunkenness, etc., 480 ff., 850.
Dishonesty in trade, 1075–1131.

Under Fashions:

Sports, etc., 358, 371, 859.
Clothes, etc., 382, 767, 389, 1150.

Under Religion:

Priests' morals, 810 ff.
Pluralities, 857.
Simony.

Satire on classes, such as we met with as early as the *Ship of Fools*, is found throughout. One should also note the satire on public affairs, in the passages on the commonwealth, rulers, and the like. Gascoigne adverts, like Wyatt, to the characteristic vices of continental countries (903–918, 956–961). Of literary or personal satire the *Steele Glas* contains none.

It has already been remarked that this satire, while not a classical imitation, is an artificial product. While not in a fixed literary form, it seems to be under the influence of the

[1] *i. e.*, presumption. Usually written *surquedry* or *surquidry*.

idea of such a form. A serious purpose has generally been assumed for it. Thus Mr. Arber says:

"It was a first experiment in English satire; and although it does not fang like Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, it is a vigorous effort in favour of truth, right, and justice." [1]

As Professor Schelling has pointed out, there was not the slightest reason why Gascoigne's satire should have "fanged" like Dryden's; but on the other hand, it did not reach the unconscious power of sincerity which its English predecessors display. It is charactistic of its attitude that, after describing the selfish pomp and luxury of kings, it disclaims all local allusion:

> "I speake not this by any english king,
> Nor by our Queene, whose high forsight provides
> That dyre debate is fledde to foraine Realmes,
> Whiles we enjoy the golden fleece of peace."
>
> (325 ff.)

Like many other satirists, Gascoigne preferred to deal gently with royalty, though when it came to the petty cheating of London merchants he could afford to speak without modifications.

Mr. Herford, after discussing the sources of Gascoigne's *Glass of Government*, remarks interestingly on the confusion of influences appearing in such a man.[2] He calls Gascoigne "a Calvinist by grace, but a true Elizabethan by nature." Mr. Courthope, evidently with a respectful view of the serious purpose of the *Steele Glas*, observes that it "reflects in the most vivid manner both the continuity of the reforming movement in religion, which had been supported by Wycliffe and Langland in the fourteenth century, and the active operation of the individual conscience in men, which was the great agent in the Reformation of the sixteenth century." [3]

[1] Introduction to Arber Reprint, p. 13.

[2] *Literary Relations of England and Germany*, pp. 163 f.

[3] *History of English Poetry*, vol. ii. p. 177.

Here must be mentioned the *Prosopopoia: or Mother Hubbard's Tale* of Edmund Spenser, which was published in 1591, and dedicated to the Lady Compton and Mountegle. It has frequently been called a satire, and is of course a satirical fable, after the manner of the mediæval *Reynard*. The satire is of classes. The fox and the ape, seeking to better their condition, become at first soldiers, "that now is thought a civile begging sect;" then shepherds; then clerks; then courtiers; then respectively prime minister and king. Their experiences in each capacity give room for some very keen description of the characteristics of the various professions. They are attracted to the clerical order by learning of the easy life of its members, but are warned that to secure advancement they must make friends at court.

> "These be the wayes by which without reward
> Livings in Court be gotten, though full hard;
> For nothing there is done without a fee:
> The Courtier needes must recompenced bee
> With a Benevolence, or have in gage
> The Primitias of your Parsonage:
> Scarce can a Bishoprick forpas them by
> But that it must be gelt in privitie."[1]
>
> (513 ff.)

The life of courtiers is described at length by the observing Mule. The boldest part of the satire, if we assume contemporary significance for it, is that describing the administration of the ape and the fox, when they had by deceit acquired control of the animal kingdom.

> "The Ape, thus seized of the Regall throne, . . .
> First to his Gate he pointed a strong gard,
> That none might enter but with issue hard:
> Then, for the safeguard of his personage,
> He did appoint a warlike equipage
> Of forreine beasts, not in the forest bred,
> But part by land and part by water fed;
> For tyrannie is with strange ayde supported.
> Then unto him all monstrous beasts resorted
> Bred of two kindes, as Griffons, Minotaures,
> Crocodiles, Dragons, Beavers, and Centaures:
> With those himselfe he strengthned mightelie,
> That feare he neede no force of enemie.
> Then gan he rule and tyrannize at will."
>
> (1111 ff.)

[1] "Gelded" vicarages or bishoprics were those of which a part of the revenues was reserved by the patron conferring them. See later, under Hall and others.

And of the Fox it is said:

> "He fed his cubs with fat of all the soyle,
> And with the sweete of others sweating toyle;
> He crammed them with the crumbs of Benefices, . . .
> He chaffred Chayres in which Churchmen were set,
> And breach of lawes to privie ferme did let. . . .
> Men of learning little he esteemed; . . .
> As for the rascall Commons least he cared." (1151 ff.)

At length Jove interferes in this mock kingdom, sends Mercury to the rescue, and the lion is restored to power. The Fox is skinned, and the Ape loses a part of his ears and all of his tail.

The satire here is chiefly courtly and political. The latter element would be an interesting subject for more study than has yet been devoted to it, though it does not concern our present purpose. Collier suggests that the fox may have been intended to represent Spenser's enemy, Lord Treasurer Burghley.[1]

If we call the *Mother Hubbard's Tale* a satire, it is the first satire of the period to appear in the decasyllabic couplet, the metrical form which was later almost universally adopted for satirical verse. This is a fact of no little interest, especially when it is considered that Spenser's couplet was unusually regular and compact, showing a very small proportion of run-on lines or couplets, and few metrical irregularities of any kind.[2] The poem is also connected with other satires of its age by the common view of a degenerate age as compared with a former prosperous period (see lines 141 ff.), and by the thought which has already become familiar in our study, of the contrast between what *is* and what *seems*. (See l. 649 f.) This latter idea is a constantly recurring one in the satire of the sixteenth century.

We cannot, however, call the *Tale* a formal satire on classical models. The frame-work of it, as has been observed, goes back to the mediæval beast-fables. There are few if any evidences of immediate classical inspiration; there is an ultimately classical allusion to the "golden age of Saturn old," but this was common property. There is no general assault upon contemporary vices; there is no classical local color, save that of mythology; and the style is not imitative. The essential satire upon the court, the clergy, and the politics of the period we should, however, be sorry to miss; and the work is interesting from the reappearance of satirical ability, and the interest in popular reforms, which Spenser had shown much earlier in some well-known passages of the *Shepherd's Calendar*.

4. John Donne.

In recent editions of the works of Donne appear seven "Satires." Five of them were included in the first edition of

[1] Collier's ed. of Spenser, vol. iv, p. 427.

[2] See metrical table in Appendix.

his poems, in 1633; a sixth was added in the edition of 1635, and a seventh in the edition of 1669. The actual date of writing of these satires is involved in some obscurity, and, owing to the disputed claims of priority among the various satirists of the last decade of the sixteenth century, is a matter of no little interest.

The satires are commonly referred to the year 1593. This is on the authority of Harleian MS. 5110, which contains the first three satires, and is inscribed "John Dunne His Satires. Anno Domini 1593." There is also in the Hawthornden MSS. a transcription of the fourth satire, by William Drummond, dated 1594; but we shall presently see that this is probably a mistake. The authenticity of the date on the Harleian MS. does not seem to have been seriously questioned.

There has been not a little talk of a printed volume of Donne's poetry, containing the satires, which is supposed to have appeared during the author's lifetime. The evidence for this consists in certain allusions by contemporaries. Thus one of Freeman's epigrams, in *Rubbe and a Great Cast* (1614), is addressed to Donne, in which, after referring to Donne's poems on the Storm and the Calm, the writer adds:

> "Thy Satyrs short too soone we them o'erlook,
> I prithee, Persius, write another booke!"

Dr. Grosart oddly enough mistook this as a reference to "two short satires;" [1] the main point, however, is not the number, but the question whether Freeman's allusion indicates a printed volume. Of the same character is the allusion of Jonson's 94th Epigram (dating before 1616), which was addressed to the Countess of Bedford with a gift of "M. Donne's Satires." There is also a reference to Donne's poems in William Drummond's private papers of 1613. Finally, in a letter of Donne's dated April 14, 1612, he speaks apologetically of having "descended to print anything in verse." The

[1] Grosart ed. of Donne, vol. ii. p. xxxii.

tendency of the best authority now, however, is to reject the idea of this hypothetical and much-regretted volume. As is observed in some manuscript notes to Grosart's edition of Donne,[1] there is nothing in the allusions of Freeman, Jonson, and Drummond which might not be explained by manuscript copies of the satires, circulated as so commonly in the Elizabethan period. Since the total number of Donne's satires is so few, we should not indeed expect that they would be separately referred to as in book form. Mr. Collier thought, however, that Freeman's desire for a "bigger book" indicated a printed volume.[2] So far as the passage in Donne's letter is concerned, it is sufficiently explained by the publication of the *Anatomy of the World* in 1611.

The question of a volume earlier than the edition of 1633 does not, however, bear significantly upon the matter of the original date of the satires; for they are admittedly of early date in a general sense. A frequently quoted passage in this connection is that from Izaak Walton's Elegy on Donne, printed together with the *Life* in 1640:

> "Did his youth scatter poetry, wherein
> Lay Love's philosophy? Was every sin
> Pictured in his sharp satires, made so foul,
> That some have fear'd sin's shapes, and kept their soul
> Safer by reading verse; did he give days,
> Past marble monuments, to those whose praise
> He would perpetuate? Did he—I fear
> Envy will doubt—these at his twentieth year?"[3]

There is a similar testimony in Jonson's conversations with Drummond, to the effect that Donne's satires were written before he was twenty. As he was born in 1573, this would place them near 1593, the date on the Harleian MS. I am indebted to Professor Martin G. Brumbaugh for another piece

[1] Probably by the late Dr. Brinsley Nicholson. The copy is now in the Philadelphia Library.

[2] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. p. 158.

[3] Muses' Library ed. (ed. Chambers), vol. i. p. xxxix.

of evidence, apparently proceeding directly from Izaak Walton. Professor Brumbaugh is the fortunate owner of a copy of the 1633 edition of Donne which was owned by Walton himself, and contains his autograph on the fly-leaf, and various marginal notes throughout the text. At the head of the Satires, in this volume, is written (apparently in Walton's hand) the words : "Writ in Q. Eliz-a's Days probably about 1590 odd." There was perhaps no man more able than Izaak Walton to give evidence in matters relating to Donne; but on the other hand it must be said that his zeal in showing that all Donne's secular verse was the work of his extreme youth (a zeal that led him to arrange for a youthful portrait of Donne to take the place of the late one that was published in the first edition), suggests a prejudicial disposition in connection with such statements.

Of internal evidence of date there is almost nothing definite in the first three satires. In the first there is a mysterious reference to "the infant of London, heir to an India,"[1] which, if anyone could explain it, might give a hint as to a contemporary date. In the second there is a reference to "tricesimo of the Queen," which would be appropriate at any time after 1588. In the third there is allusion to the giving of aid to "mutinous Dutch," which in like manner might belong to any date after 1580. In the fourth satire we are a little better off. This is the satire existing in the Hawthornden MS. with the date 1594. It contains a reference to "Gallo-Belgicus," a newspaper which, according to Grosart and Chambers, was started in 1598. This date, however, is a mistake, the *Mercurius Gallo-Belgicus* having in reality been started as early as 1588.[2] There is also in Donne's satire an allusion (l. 114) to

[1] l. 58. In the 1669 ed. it is given : "The infantry of London, hence to India." Mr. Gosse writes me : "My impression is that 'the Infant of London' was the name of a merchant-vessel, and that there is some obscure allusion here to this ship having been intended for the India trade, and having been competed for. The MSS. offer no help."

[2] The first editor, Michael von Isselt, died in 1597 ; and his successor took charge of the volume for 1598, a fact which perhaps may have given rise to the

the period from the time when

"The Spaniards came, to the loss of Amiens."

As Grosart observes, the earlier date should be that of the Armada, 1588, and the later 1597, when Amiens was surprised by the Spaniards. As the city was recovered within a few months, Dr. Grosart thinks the absence of an allusion to its recovery indicates that the satire was written in 1597, between the capture and the recovery, forgetting that he has just laid down 1598 as the earliest limit for the reference to "Gallo-Belgicus." Curiously enough, Mr. Chambers (in the Muses' Library edition) follows him in this inconsistency. As a matter of fact there was no reason why Donne should have referred to the recapture of Amiens; it appears, however, that there is no objection to placing the satire in 1597 or shortly afterward. A reference to "the Queen" fixes 1603 as the latest limit.

The fifth satire also contains a reference to Elizabeth, and is evidently of the same general period as the fourth. The most significant allusion it contains relates to "the great Carrick's pepper." I quote from Grosart's notes on this line (85):

"About 1596 or after, the price of pepper rose from 3*s.* to 8*s.* a pound, owing to the war with Spain and Portugal. . . . On the 31st December, 1600, a charter was granted to the Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading to the East Indies, and in the spring of 1601 they sent out four large ships under Captain James Lancaster. He . . . did not return till September, 1603. . . . But 'he had previously sent home the other two [vessels] with cargoes composed partly of pepper, cloves, and cinnamon, partly of calicoes and other Indian manufactures taken out of a *Portuguese carrack* that he had fallen in with and captured' (*Pictorial History of England*, b. vii. c. 4, On the National Industry). I have not been able to trace the exact date of the arrival of these vessels."

This explanation has been generally accepted as fixing the date of the fifth satire as 1601 or 1602. But there is a

error. On this matter see Prutz: *Geschichte des deutschen Journalismus*, p. 202, and Brockhaus's *Konversations-Lexikon*, vol. xvi. p. 938. Jonson's Epigram 97 contains an allusion to the same publication.

difficulty which Grosart and others do not seem to have noticed. In the same satire is a flattering allusion which has been generally assumed to be addressed to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, for some time Donne's employer:

> "You, sir, whose righteousness she loves, whom I,
> By having leave to serve, am most richly
> For service paid, authorized now begin
> To know and weed out this enormous sin."
>
> (31 ff.)

Now it was from 1596 to 1600 that Donne was secretary to Lord Ellesmere, and in 1600 that he was discharged as a result of his clandestine marriage. From 1600 to 1604 he lived in retirement, and—presumably—in some chagrin.[1] We should not therefore expect to find the satire containing the address to the Lord Chancellor dating from later than 1600. It is possible that there was a carrick of pepper known to local fame before the time of Captain Lancaster's expedition; and again it is possible that the reference to the carrick (which is almost at the end of the satire) was added to an early version written during the author's secretaryship.

The sixth satire (the shortest and least interesting), which was added in the 1635 edition, contains no internal evidence whatever of its date.

The seventh we have seen was not added till the 1669 edition. It has generally been accepted as authentic, but Professor Brumbaugh (in his dissertation, still in manuscript, on the Poetry of Donne, which I have had the fortunate opportunity of using) believes that it is by another hand than Donne's.

"The coloring," he says, "is entirely unlike the others, and the dignity, sincerity, and profundity of the others is wanting. Then, too, to accept it as Donne's introduces an element of insincerity and of hypocrisy into his life entirely unwarranted by the facts. The Satire is addressed to Sir Nicholas Smyth, and heaps personal abuse and obloquy upon Elizabeth and James I. Donne never refers to Elizabeth but in the most considerate manner, and to James he was indebted for the final and great triumph of his life—his career as a divine. It

[1] See Jessopp's article on Donne, in *Dictionary of National Biography*, and his *Life of Donne*.

seems utterly impossible that Donne should have given forth such an unusual product as this. The production belongs clearly to the time of James; but Donne after 1600 never entertained such unseemly thoughts as those that mark the unmanly and unworthy author of this foul-flavored satire."

The date of the satire is fixed in part by the reference to King James as "that Scot" who now rides with "sumpter-horse," but

> "at his coming up, had not
> A sumpter-dog." (131 ff.)

There are also allusions to the death of Essex and Cuff, in 1601, and to a certain Epps who died in the siege of Ostend, which began in the same year. The satire is dated 1602 in the Hazlewood MS., but the incorrectness of this is made certain by its reference to the death of Elizabeth.

I do not feel disposed to speak certainly as to Professor Brumbaugh's rejection of this satire. He has in person expressed the additional objection that as the satire seems to belong to 1603 or 1604, it must, if written by Donne, have been produced during his period of retirement and quasi-disgrace, when he would have been little likely to write satires. It is to be said, however, that there is some evidence indicating that he finished the fifth satire in this period; and that his unhappy experience with the authorities might have been just what would lead him to the bitterness shown in his allusions to Elizabeth and James. So far as James is concerned, if the satire was written immediately after his accession, Donne had as yet no cause for gratitude toward him. It may be admitted, however, that the references to these royal persons are not in keeping with what we should have expected of their supposed author. The more intangible evidence against the authenticity of the satire—its want of the coloring, dignity, and profundity characteristic of Donne—is of little value except in the hands of one who has made himself absolutely familiar with the style of the poet. This Professor Brumbaugh has done, and although the distinctions which he makes would

probably not be at once apparent even to the careful reader, I cannot here meet him on equal ground. In the absence of confirmatory evidence, and in consideration of the general acceptation of the seventh satire, I do not see that it can be positively rejected.

These satires, then, cover a possible period of something like ten years, from 1593 to 1603. There is no positive evidence to place the first three before 1595, when Lodge's Satires appeared, or even before 1597, when the first of Hall's were published. But in the absence of contradictory evidence, the MS. of date of 1593 may be tentatively accepted. The fourth satire dates from 1598 or thereabout; the fifth is probably to be placed near 1600; the sixth cannot be dated; and the seventh (whether it be Donne's or not) belongs apparently to 1603 or a little later. If these dates are correct Donne's satires cover just the decade when the form was in its greatest vigor in England.

The popularity and influence of these satires we have already seen reason to believe were considerable. Jonson and Drummond admired them; Freeman called the author a Persius, and demanded more. If these men knew Donne's satires in manuscript (or, indeed,—what is less probable—if they knew them in printed form) they must have been widely circulated in England, and—like the other poetry of their author—have exercised a notable influence upon the younger generation. In later times they were still admired. Dryden flattered his patron, the Earl of Dorset, by telling him:

"Donne alone, of all our countrymen, had your talent; but was not happy enough to arrive at your versification; and were he translated into numbers, and English, he would yet be wanting in the dignity of expression. . . . You equal Donne in the variety, multiplicity, and choice of thoughts; you excel him in the manner and the words. I read you both with the same admiration, but not with the same delight." [1]

Dryden's hint as to translation "into numbers and English" was taken by Parnell, who paraphrased Donne's third satire,

[1] Scott-Saintsbury ed., vol. xiii. p. 6.

and by Pope, who "versified" the second and fourth so as to suit the ear of his age. All true Donneians have judged them violently for doing so; but there was something more than whimsical in the opinion of these several poets that there is in the satires of Donne an element of permanent strength, which nevertheless fails of permanent appeal because of the idiosyncrasies of the author and the peculiarities of his period.

If the *Mother Hubbard's Tale* be not counted, we have here the first use of the decasyllabic couplet in formal satire—assuming Donne's satires to be earlier than 1595. The couplet as he used it is as far as possible from the compact, periodic measure of the later satirists. His usual contempt for form appears here to an exaggerated degree; and it seems probable that it is from the satires that there has spread widely the idea of Donne's poetry as being so metrically infelicitous. The measure is characterized by approximation to the common speech of conversation; it is this that throws both syllable-counting and observance of regular accent into the background.[1] Whether there was anything intentional in the ruggedness of the rhythm will be a matter for later inquiry.

The style is like the metre: rugged, free and conversational in construction, and yet extremely compact, almost always vigorous, occasionally obscure either through conciseness or Latinized construction. It is marked by the curiously concrete vocabulary, the intellectual mood, and the out-flashing insight (often cynical in tone) which mark the body of the early poetry of the author. Quite naturally, it shows the elements of cynicism, coarseness, and dramatic interpretation, to a greater degree than his other poems. Dr. Grosart praises the satires in terms which, as usual, must be taken *cum grano salis:*

"Our satirist is pungent, yet never in a fury. He is proportioned too in his noble rage. . . . Occasionally you catch the sound of musical, joyous laughter,

[1] See metrical table in Appendix.

and anon the awful tears consecrated too outrages too deep for words. . . . Bishop Hall's *Satires* placed beside them look thin and empty." [1]

I believe that the elements of both proportion and sincerity are here considerably exaggerated; yet it is true that in his satires, as elsewhere, Donne succeeds in producing by intellectual methods a sense of reality and depth of emotional experience.

An outline of the contents of the satires is as follows:

Satire I. opens with an account of the pleasures of the library. A young gallant of the period is introduced, who persuades the author to go with him for a walk; as they go abroad, he has his eyes ever on the rich or distinguished, bowing obsequiously, and making estimates of all passers-by according to their pocketbooks. At length he deserts his companion, in a mad rush after his mistress. Various affectations of the period, and incidentally lust, conceit, and flattery, are touched upon.

Satire II. deals with the sins of lawyers. Minor evils, such as vile poetasters who write for any reason except that they have talent,—together with drinkers, swearers and usurers,—the poet declares he can abide; but Coscus the lawyer, newly fledged, is too much for him. He now says everything, even to making love, in legal parlance; he lies to everyone, cheats his own clients most of all, and has volumes of worthless documents constantly transcribed.—Country-seats are described as running to ruin in these times of excess. Neither fasting nor riotous feasting is to be favored. Good works are still called good, but out of fashion.

Satire III. deals with religion, in a serious and sometimes lofty strain. We are in danger of appearing worse before God than our pagan ancestors. To love the world is to love a withered strumpet. A number of seekers of religion are described and compared with men's various opinions of their mistresses:—the Romanist, the Calvinist, the Established Churchman, the hater of all, the liberal. God only must be judge,—not human (delegated) authority.

Satire IV. is of the Horatian type. The poet declares that he has been in purgatory, having been seized, while on the street, by a strange creature who persisted in boring him with questions, and in gossiping of court and town. At length, having extorted a crown from his victim, the bore departs; and the poet reflects on the wretchedness of the court. Affectations of dress and speech are treated at random.

Satire V. treats of "officers' rage and suitors' misery." Suitors are the prey of officials. Injustice is now sold dearer than justice used to be. There is no help against corrupt courts; law has fair fingers but cruel nails.

[1] Ed. *Donne*, vol. ii. p. xxviii.

Satire VI.[1] is addressed to a foolish lover, desirous of marrying a widow younger than himself. He is warned of the results if he is successful.

Satire VII. is addressed to Sir Nicholas Smyth. Beginning with a eulogy of sleep, the poet exclaims that he should have been asleep when he first met Natta "the new knight." The foolish conversation and conduct of this youth are described at length. The satire concludes with a reference to the author's own unhappy experience at court, to the treason of Essex, to the old age of Elizabeth, and the succession of James the "Scot."

Here we have a variety of satirical types. The methods of satirical narrative, of reflection, and of direct rebuke, all are used. There are Horatian and Juvenalian elements. The attitude toward life is, however, uniformly pessimistic. (See especially V. 35 ff. and IV. 156–168.) The atmosphere is somewhat severe and unamiable; but there is no formal and artificial assumption of authority to castigate, as in so many of the imitative satirists. It is well known that Donne was least of all men imitative; and even in following a classical form he avoids obvious unoriginality. Standing by themselves, his satires bear no evidence of being in a sophisticated form.

When we come to detailed examination, there are not a few suggestions of the classical satirists. In Satire I. we may compare lines 29 ff.

("That when thou meet'st one, with enquiring eyes
Doth search, and like a needy broker prize
The silk and gold he wears, and to that rate,
So high or low, dost raise thy formal hat")

with Juvenal III. 140 ff.:

"De moribus ultima fiet
Quaestio: quot pascit servos? quot possidet agri
Jugera? quam multa, magnaque paropside coenat?" etc.

The ironical illustrations in 53 ff. of the same satire suggest the similar incidental irony in Juvenal X. 219 ff.:

"Quorum si nomina quaeras,
Promptius expediam, quot amaverit Hippia moechos,
Quot Themison aegros autumno occiderit uno;
Quot Basilus socios," etc.

[1] In the edition of 1669, in which the full number of seven satires first appeared, the order and numbering of what are here called VI. and VII. were reversed.

With the concisely stated doctrine, "Mean's blest"(II. 107) compare Horace, Satire 2 of Book II., ll. 88–125; Juvenal XI.; and Persius VI. The account of the bore in Satire IV. instantly suggests that of Horace, Book I. Satire 9. The gossip of the same character (ll. 98–108; 127 f.) reminds us of Juvenal VI. 402–412:

> "Haec eadem novit, quid toto fiat in orbe:
> Quid Seres, quid Thraces agant: secreta novercae,
> Et pueri: quis amet: quis decipiatur adulter," etc.

In V. 35 ff. the allusion to the "age of rusty iron," which deserves some worse name, is obviously derived from Juvenal XIII. 28 ff.:

> "Nunc aetas agitur, pejoraque saecula ferri
> Temporibus: quorum sceleri non invenit ipsa
> Nomen, et a nullo posuit natura metallo."

Line 109 of Satire VII.,

> "By their place more noted, if they err,"

suggests Juvenal VIII. 140 f.:

> "Omne animi vitium tanto conspectius in se
> Crimen habet, quanto major, qui peccat, habetur."

The prayers of Natta, in VII. 53 ff., are to be compared with Persius II. 10 ff., and it may be said also that the most serious of the satires (the third, on religion) suggests the second of Persius in general tone. The name *Natta*, used in the seventh Satire, is found in Horace, Bk. I., Sat. 6, l. 124; in Juvenal VIII. 95; and in Persius III. 31. The reference in Persius is most closely connected with Donne's character; but the name seems to be accepted as a mere satirical type.

These are the detailed suggestions of familiarity with classical satire which have fallen under my observation. Only two or three of them are sufficiently clear to be significant if taken separately; but together they indicate the influence of the Latin satirists, particularly Juvenal, with some clearness.

Whether Donne had any other models in mind is an interesting question. We have been obliged to assume that his first three satires antedated those of Lodge and Hall; and the later ones are so generally in the same manner as to preclude the probability of any new influence,—even if Donne were the man to be influenced by contemporary fashions. I am indebted to Mr. J. B. Fletcher, of Harvard University, for a suggestion that he may have had some French satires in mind in writing his own. Mr. Fletcher calls attention to a letter of Donne's (105 in the Alford edition [1]), unfortunately without date or name of the person addressed, which opens as follows:

"To Yourself. Sir: I make shift to think that I promised you this book of French Satires. If I did not, yet it may have the grace of acceptation, both as it is a very forward and early fruit, since it comes before it was looked for, and as it comes from a good root, which is an importune desire to serve you."

These expressions are interestingly ambiguous. Were it not for the word "French," as Mr. Fletcher observes, we should assume at once that the letter had reference to the writer's own compositions. That he should have written in French, however, is a supposition quite without support in what we know either of him or of the period. The suggestion that he may have had reference to paraphrases or translations made by himself from the French is of most interest, but it will have appeared from what was said of formal satire in France that he had slight chance of obtaining French satires before the publication of those of Vauquelin and Régnier. I am of the opinion that the letter must be regarded as of comparatively late date, like most of those of Donne's which have come down to us.[2]

[1] Vol. vi. p. 421.

[2] Mr. Edmond Gosse, who is engaged in the preparation of the Life and Letters of Donne, writes to me in regard to this: "The letter in question was written to George Gerrard, who, I am convinced by a long chain of evidence, is always the 'yourself' of Donne's correspondence. It was written in 1612, and I think after August. The book of satires is almost certainly the 'Satyres et autres œuvres folastres' of Régnier, published early in 1612 while Donne was in Paris. It is

There is little of the native English element in these satires of Donne's. The treatment of religion in Satire III. is highly theoretical, and does not attack the concrete abuses of organized religion. The attack in Satire V. on the oppressions practiced by legal officers is more like much of early English satire, but even here it is as an individual, and not as a representative of the people, that the satirist speaks. This note of individual pessimism is what most clearly connects Donne's satires with those of the Romans. In both cases the occasion of the satire is primarily in the reflective disposition; and in both cases the emphasis is on private morals, fashions and humors. The style, while not distinctly imitative, is more like that of classical satire than any we have yet met with. Its compactness, its indirect method, its allusiveness are all of the classical sort. We meet, too, for the first time, distinct use of the *personal type-names*, the Latin form of which is the only departure from English local color (see II. 40; III. 43, 62, 65; IV. 48, 219; VII. 22, 70). The use of dialogue (as in the semi-dramatic street conversations) is in the Latin manner. In general the style is that of a recognized literary form, although there was in England, at the time when Donne's first satires seem to have been written, no such recognized form. The humor is of the sharp and subtle sort, based largely on exaggeration. Finally, the selection of vices to be satirized (the flattery of heirs, various forms of lust,

interesting to notice that this was the first edition of Régnier containing the *Macette*, which must have greatly interested Donne, as the entirely successful execution of a scheme which he himself had unsuccessfully attempted nearly twenty years before."

In reference to the possible sources of Donne's satires, Mr. Fletcher also suggests the influence of the "Bernesque" satire of Italy, saying, "He would seem to show some characteristic traits of the *Poesia Bernesca*,—anti-Petrarchism, love of paradox, frank licentiousness, malicious 'point.'" Berni was a satirist—not of the formal type—of the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Boccalini compared him with Juvenal in an amusing fable of a proposed contest between the ancient and the modern satirist, which Juvenal declined on the ground that Berni could arm himself with all the new vices of modern times.

luxury and avarice, idleness and wantonness, personal vanity, and the like) reminds us of classical satire. Not infrequently we come upon a passage which suggests, without direct reminiscence, that it may be an adaptation from Juvenal. Yet in the use of classical material, as the separate passages already cited show, Donne was as usual untrammeled and original.

The objects satirized, roughly classified as formerly, are these :

Under Morals :

Flattery and obsequiousness, I. 29 ff.; IV. 38 ff.
Lust, I. 38 ff.; 108 ; VII. 35 ff.
Luxury, IV. 169–181.
Fortune-hunting, VII. 53 ff.

Fashions and Personal Humors :

I. 14 ff.; 61 ff.; 71 ff.
II. 45 ff.
IV. 20–154 ; 180–216.
VI. and VII., *passim.*

Public Affairs :

Official corruption, V. and surely in IV ?
Courts and kings, VII. 110–133.

Classes :

Lawyers, II.
Courtiers, IV., VII.
"Scarlet gowns," [2] IV. 192.

Literature :

Bad poetry ; plagiarism, II. 5–30.
Love-poetry ; Abraham Fraunce, VII. 82–89.

Religion :

III., *passim.*

Persons :

Fraunce (as above).
Elizabeth, James, etc., VII.
(Perhaps others, not identified.)

[2] Probably doctors of the Universities.

These satires, then, were the experiments of a young man, whose own genius was in some respects closely akin to that of the classical satirists, and who could adopt their material and make it his own. In so young a poet, and in such experimental work, we should not look for any great degree of emotional sincerity; yet Dr. Grosart finds Donne's satires "not so much a given number of printed lines and part of a book, as a man's living heart pulsating with the most tragical reality of emotion."[1] Few will be impressed in the same way, until they undertake an edition of Donne and are attacked by the editorial passion. We need not deny genuine indignation to the young satirist; but it is for the most part like that of Jonson's plays,—the indignation of formal rebuke of foolish fashions, not the passion of an aroused people or of a deeply stirred individual.

5. Thomas Lodge.

"A fig for Momus, Containing Pleasant varietie, included in Satyres, Eclogues, and Epistles, by T. L. of Lincolnes Inne Gent. Che pecora si fa, il lupo selo mangia. At London," etc. 1595.[2]

This work was licensed on March 26, 1595. Unlike most of the satires of the period, these were produced near the end, instead of near the beginning, of their author's literary career. Lodge's poetical work was nearly complete in 1595; five years later he became a physician and abandoned poetry. The *Fig for Momus* was an experiment in a different direction from his previous successes, and does not seem to have acquired much popularity. At any rate, Lodge seems never to have been led to print the "whole centon" of his satires which he tells us were in his possession. This comparatively slight success may be due in part to the absence of contemporary

[1] Ed. of Donne. Intro. Essay, vol. ii. p. xxviii.

[2] Reprinted in Hunterian Club ed. of Lodge, vol. iii.

allusion in the satires, and to the absence, too, of any considerable amount of humor. In all ages satire has depended in large part for its popularity upon either its narrative frame-work (particularly the frame-work of allegory, or the humor of its style; and when both these elements are lacking, one cannot expect much success. Lodge was included, however, in Meres's list of successful English satirists in the *Palladis Tamia* (1598). This passage in Meres it may be well to quote at this point, as it is of important bearing on our subject.

"As Horace, Lucilius, Juvenal, Persius, and Lucullus are the best for Satire among the Latines: so with us, in the same faculty, these are chief: Piers Plowman, Lodge, Hall of Emmanuel College in Cambridge; the Author of *Pygmalions Image and certain Satires*; the Author of *Skialetheia*." [1]

And again:

"As that ship is endangered where all lean to one side; but is in safety, one leaning one way and another another way: so the dissensions of Poets among themselves, doth make them, that they less infect their readers. And for this purpose, our Satirists Hall, the Author of *Pygmalion's Image and Certain Satires*, Rankins, and such others, are very profitable." [2]

Lodge, then, was next after Langland; the other names mentioned by Meres we are soon to meet. It may be noticed that the satires of Lodge were still known to at least one man as late as 1615; for, as Mr. Collier pointed out,[3] Anthony Nixon, who in that year published his *Scourge of Corruption*, plagiarized the opening of Lodge's first satire, printing the paraphrase in prose form as though to disguise the fact:

"Whence comes it (say you) that the world begins, when each hath cause another to reprehend, to winke at follies and to soothe up sinnes?" etc.

The metrical form of the satires of Lodge is the decasyllabic couplet, as in Donne. The verse is very much smoother, however, than Donne's, showing the practiced hand of one who for years had been writing not only good,

[1] Arber's *English Garner*, vol. ii. p. 100.

[2] p. 106.

[3] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. p. 302.

but admirable, verse; and the number of run-on lines and couplets is noticeably small. The use of this metre for the purpose of satire is of special interest in connection with the order and influence of the several satirists of this period. Mr. Gosse gives Lodge great credit for its introduction.

> "This was another case in which Lodge set a fashion which has been followed by every English writer of the same kind. The satire in heroic couplets has passed from Lodge through Hall, Donne, Dryden, Pope, Churchill, Crabbe and Byron, to such rare later efforts as have been essayed, without any change of outward form, and Lodge deserves the credit of his discovery." [1]

Mr. Gosse seems to select the order of publication for the enumeration of the satirists, neglecting the probably early date of Donne's first satires, in which the couplet was used (though it must be confessed it was by no means "heroic"). Whether Lodge had seen any of Donne's satires (assuming that they were in manuscript at least two years before the publication of the *Fig for Momus*) it is perhaps impossible to say; I should think it improbable. Granting, however, that his choice of the couplet for satire was independent, I do not think its use by succeeding satirists can be positively attributed to his influence. Donne's satires seem to have been more widely known than his, even while unpublished, and the influence of Donne at this time may already have begun to be felt. It was undoubtedly the satires of Hall, however, which had most influence on all his successors; and if we could but know whether he was familiar with those of Donne, of Lodge, or of both, or whence he derived the measure which he used so skillfully, we should know something of no little importance for the history of satirical verse.

If Lodge was the more successful in the verse of his satires, Donne was the more successful in style. Lodge misses both the Horatian urbanity and the Juvenalian vigor. Some passages are not without strength, but in general Mr. Gosse's observation that the style is monotonous and that "the thought

[1] Memoir of Lodge, in Hunterian Club ed., vol. i. p. 34.

is rarely bright enough, or the expression nervous enough to demand definite praise," may be sustained. "The best that can be said of them is that they are lucid and Horatian," he goes on;[1] to which it may be objected that while they are lucid they are certainly not Horatian. There is no active personality revealed, as in the work of Horace and Wyatt, or of Donne and Juvenal; the author strikes one as being a stolid, not unamiable person, decidedly English in tone though adopting an un-English form.

The satires are four in number, though there appear to be five, owing to a mistake in the numbering. The book opens with a dedication to Wm. Earle of Darbie, followed by an address "to the Gentlemen Readers whatsoever." Here the name is explained by the fact that the "detractor" (critic), "worthily deserving the name of Momus, shall rather at my hands have a figge to choake him, then hee, and his lewd tongue shall have a frumpe to check me."

"This cause (gentlemen) hath drawne me to use this title, and under this title I have thought good to include Satyres, Eclogues and Epistles: first by reason that I studie to delight with varietie, next because I would write in that forme, wherin no man might chalenge me with servile imitation, (wherewith heretofore I have been unjustlie taxed.) My Satyres (to speake truth) are by pleasures, rather placed here to prepare, and trie the care, then to feede it: because if they passe well, the whole Centon of them, alreadie in my hands, shall sodainly bee published.

"In them (under the names of certaine Romaines) where I reprehend vice, I purposely wrong no man, but observe the lawes of that kind of poeme: If any repine thereat, I am sure he is guiltie, because he bewrayeth himselfe."—(Dated 6 May, 1595.)

It is here to be noticed that Lodge makes no distinct claim to originality in using the form of satire (nor that of the eclogue), though of his Epistles he declares that "they are in that kind, wherein no Englishman of our time hath publiquely written." His classical imitation is frankly admitted for the Eclogues: "whose margents, though I fill not with quotations, yet their matter, and handling, will show my diligence."

[1] Ibid., p. 36.

There are seven epistles and four eclogues. The second satire is misnumbered 3, and the others follow the error.

Satire I. treats of the tendency of all the world to love flattery and reject reproof. Bribes, lechery, usury, ambition, the praise of bad poetry, luxury, flattery, and avarice are attacked in particular.

Satire II. treats of the examples of parents and the durability of early impressions, particularly in the matters of gambling, lust, profanity, and extravagance.

Satire III. is addressed to "a deere friend lately given over to covetousnesse." There is a picture of the miser's miserable lot: the real poverty of his home, life, and prospects.

Satire IV. treats of the commonly mistaken ideas of what is truly good, and of the striving for what is really weariness. Ambition, conquest, fraudulent dealing, are rebuked; and there is in conclusion an account of the happiness of a lowly life, free from fear of enemies or calamity.

The type of satire is clearly that of rebuke and admonition, with a touch of the reflective manner. The attitude toward life is less pessimistic than commonly,—certainly if the first satire is excepted, in which there are sweeping charges against "the world," but without Juvenalian bitterness. In the third satire the folly of avarice is represented as belonging simply to the individual addressed. This element of optimism may be assumed to be an at least partially individual point of view, as distinct from conformity to models.

Distinct suggestions of connection with classical satire are not hard to find. The picture of the lazy "Rollus, lusking in his bed" (p. 10)[1] suggests the opening of Persius Satire III. The reference to

> "tunning sin being clad in Vertues shape" (p. 11)

strikes a note familiar in all the satire of the period; we have already noticed it in Wyatt II. 61 and Juvenal XIV. 109. The account of the flattery of bad poetry—

> "'Tis rare, my Lord! 'twill passe the nicest eares,"—

suggests Horace Bk. II. Sat. 5. 95 ff., and other classical

[1] References are to the Hunterian Club edition, where the lines are not numbered.

passages on the same theme. The second satire is in large measure a paraphrase of Juvenal XIV. Thus compare "damned dice" with "damnosa alea;" "surfet" with "cana . . —gula"; the lines on "Lucillas daughter" with lines 25–30 in Juvenal; the lines on the possibility of escape from early training with 33–36; the allusion to the early food of animals with 83–85; and so on throughout. The picture of the miser in Satire III. may be compared with Juvenal XIV. 124–140; also with Horace II. 3. 122 ff. and with Persius VI. The fourth satire shows at the very outset, in the reference to "Gades" and "Ganges," that it is based on Juvenal X. The conclusion is suggested by lines 357 ff. of the latter, but also suggests Horace II. 6 and other familiar passages.

We find, then, ample evidence that Lodge was taking Juvenal as a model, with suggestions of the satires of Horace and (less definitely) of Persius. It appears, then, that in substance these satires, instead of following Horace closely, as Saintsbury says[1], —perhaps through careless following of Mr. Gosse—are to be referred primarily to Juvenal. One would naturally look for Italian influence in Lodge,—an idea suggested, too, by the quotation on the title-page of the *Fig for Momus*—and it is quite probable that he was familiar with the satires of Ariosto and Alamanni; but as he did not adopt, with them, the urbane, epistolary type of satire, he had slight use for their influence.

The native English element in Lodge's satire is chiefly that of the hopeful, earnest tone. The substance is predominatingly classical. The moral elements, while not obviously paganized as in later satirists, are not given a Christian coloring, as in Gascoigne and even in Donne. The occasion of the satire is clearly in a reflective turn of mind (cf. the opening lines of Satire I.); and the emphasis is more completely on private morals than we have found it hitherto. The point of view is individual. It is also to be noticed that artificial conditions (such as literary flattery) are conspicuously treated.

[1] *Elizabethan Literature*, p. 145.

In the style the imitation of classical models is not successful. The manner of Juvenal was too remote from that of Lodge. We have, however, a large use of the type-names in Latin forms (*Amphidius*, *Rollus*, *Sextus*, *Quintus*, *Diffilus*, *Lucilla*, *Volcatius*, *Tellus*, *Dacus*, *Shanus* (!), and the like). There is also an occasional attempt at classical scenery; as in Satire II., where one is represented as having in his hall a picture of Cæsar his monarch, and in IV.:

> "Nor leave the northern lands, and fruitful Gaul
> In royall Rome thine empire to enstall."

On the other hand there are slips into thoroughly English scenes, as in III.:

> "Scarce butter'd turneps upon Sundaies have;
> They say at New-yeares-tide men give thee cakes," etc.

There is no subtle humor after the classical manner, nor semi-dramatic dialogue; humor indeed of any kind is almost entirely wanting.

The relation of Lodge's satires to contemporary life is of the vaguest possible sort. There is but one trace of a distinct allusion to a contemporary personage or event, and that is at present beyond my power to explain:

> "Who builds on strength by policie is stript:
> Who trusts his wit, by wit is soonest tript.
> Example be thou Hepar, who profest
> A home-born infant of our English west
> Hast in that shamefull schene of treasons play
> Betray'd thy selfe to death, who would'st betray."
>
> —Satire IV. p. 49 f.

Of objects satirized, we have under

Morals:

Avarice, I., II.
Lechery, I., II.
Ambition, I., IV.
Flattery, I.
Luxury, I., II.
Gambling, II.
Dishonesty, I., IV.

This includes very nearly all. Neither fashions, classes, nor religious life are included, except as related to private morals. The only literary satire is that already noted, in regard to literary flattery; and (except for the passage concerning "Hepar" the traitor) there seems to be no satire of a personal or political sort.

The occasion of these satires is perhaps more purely artificial than in the case of any of those previously considered. Of this the introduction of the author is evidence; it should be noted how (p. 93 above) he professes to follow the laws of a certain "kind of poem," and to reprehend vice "under the names of certain Romans." He does not show contempt for the age in which he lives, nor appear to have been aroused by any concrete contemporary evils. The satires, then, are confessedly experimental,—the work of one who had tried almost every other literary form. Their chief interest to us is in their frank imitation of the classical satire.

6. Joseph Hall.

"Virgidemiarum Sixe Bookes. First three Bookes of Tooth-lesse Satyrs. 1. Poeticall. 2. Academicall. 3. Morall." London. 1597.
With "Three last Bookes Of byting Satyres," 1598.

The first group of these satires was entered on the Stationers' Register, March 31, 1597 (together with the "worthy manuscript poems" of *Sismond*, *The Northern Mother's Blessing*, and *The Way of Thrift*, which were afterward included in editions of Hall's poetry); the second group a year later, March 30, 1598. The later editions of the series were numerous, and have caused some confusion to bibliographers. According to Hazlitt, there were two issues of the *Toothless Satires* in 1597, and a revised edition in 1598, besides the additional publication of the *Biting Satires* in 1598, and another edition of both groups in 1599. According to Peter Hall,[1]

[1] In his edition of Joseph Hall, 1838.

the edition commonly called that of 1602 is in reality that of 1599, printed "with the surreptitious date of 1602 prefixed to the first part; . . . while the correct date of 1599 still remains to the second part." This "1602" edition seems to have been pirated; at the end is a printer's note to this effect:

"After this impression was finished, upon the Authors knowledge, I had the view of a more perfect Copy, wherein were these additions and corrections, which I thought good to place here, desiring the reader to referre them to their places."

Of some other differences between this edition (a copy of which is in the Library of Harvard University) and earlier ones, I shall have occasion to speak later.

In 1597 Joseph Hall was twenty-three years old. He had taken his M. A. at Cambridge in 1596, and seems still to have been a resident of Emmanuel College. So far as is definitely known, the satires were his first literary work, though it will appear later that there is some evidence of his having already written pastoral verse. Certainly the satires seem to have proved an immediate success. We have already seen that they were included among the satires enumerated by Meres, in 1598. In 1599 they were condemned in company with other satires, by an order of the ecclesiastical authorities,[1] but were presently exempted and the prohibition "stayed." Among the Epigrams of Davies of Hereford (No. 218) is one which praises Hall's satires. In 1641, when their author was interested in more important matters than satirical verse, or verse of any kind, these early productions of his pen were singled out for attack by no less a person than John Milton. It was Hall's *Defence of the Remonstrance* that brought forth the *Apology for Smectymnuus*, in which Milton, with his usual unhappy adherence to the controversial customs of the time, did not fail to introduce matter having no proper relation to the controversy.

[1] Stationers' Register, 1 June, 1599.

"I had said," he wrote, "that because the Remonstrant was so much offended with those who were tart against the prelates, sure he loved toothless satires, which I took were as improper as a toothed sleekstone. This champion from behind the arras cries out, that those toothless satires were of the Remonstrant's making; and arms himself here tooth and nail, and horn to boot, to supply the want of teeth, or rather of gums in the satires. . . . For this good hap I had from a careful education, to be inured and seasoned betimes with the best and elegantest authors of the learned tongues, and thereto brought an ear that could measure a just cadence, and scan without articulating: rather nice and humorous in what was tolerable, than patient to read every drawling versifier. Whence lighting upon this title of 'toothless satires,' I will not conceal ye what I thought, readers, that sure this must be some sucking satyr, who might have done better to have used his coral, and made an end of teething, ere he took upon him to wield a satire's whip. But when I heard him talk of 'scouring the rusty swords of elvish knights,' do not blame me if I changed my thought, and concluded him some desperate cutler. But why 'his scornful muse could never abide with tragic shoes her ancles for to hide,' the pace of the verse told me that her mawkin knuckles were never shapen to that royal buskin. And turning by chance to the sixth satire of his second book, I was confirmed; where having begun loftily 'in heaven's universal alphabet,' he falls down to that wretched poorness and frigidity, as to talk of 'Bridge-street in heaven, and the ostler of heaven,' and there wanting other matter to catch him a heat, (for certain he was in the frozen zone miserably benumbed,) with thoughts lower than any beadle betakes him to whip the signposts of Cambridge alehouses, the ordinary subject of freshmen's tales, and in a strain as pitiful. Which for him would be counted the first English Satire, to abase himself to, who might have learned better among the Latin and Italian satirists, and in our own tongue from the 'Vision and Creed of Pierce Plowman,' besides others before him, manifested a presumptuous undertaking with weak and unexamined shoulders. For a satire as it was born out of a tragedy, so ought to resemble his parentage, to strike high, and adventure dangerously at the most eminent vices among the greatest persons, and not to creep unto every blind tap-house, that fears a constable more than a satire. But that such a poem should be toothless, I still affirm it to be a bull, taking away the essence of that which it calls itself. For if it bite neither the persons nor the vices, how is it a satire? And if it bite either, how is it toothless? So that toothless satires are as much as if he had said toothless teeth.[1]

For its personalities this passage would not be worthy of such extended quotation; but it is quite worth while to get so full (if maliciously colored) a view of Milton's idea of satire. We may be sure that had he chosen to write verse satire it would have been far from "toothless." Two points are of

[1] *Apology for Smectymnuus.* Milton's Prose Works, Bohn ed., vol. iii. pp. 140 f.

special interest in his account of the true nature of satire: first, the familiar English idea that it is to be primarily a form of stinging rebuke (forgetting the urbane, Horatian type); and second, the seventeenth century idea (reminding us of Dryden's account of heroic poetry) that satire should "strike high," and confine itself to the vices of the great.

Peter Hall observed that, after Milton's attack upon Hall's satires, "for two whole centuries they were then almost forgotten." There was an edition at Oxford in 1753, "and Pope and Gray were both of them alive, and endeavored to enliven others to an appreciation of their merits. But it was not till the masterly analysis by Warton . . . that the *Virgidemiarum Libri Sex* of Bishop Hall took their place among the classical poetry of the land."[1] It is no doubt true that Warton's extended account of this work has had much to do with its familiarity to modern readers. But in this matter Warton was a representative of eighteenth century taste (to which Hall's work was singularly fitted), instead of being, as in some other things, a precursor of the taste of the nineteenth century. It was of all things most natural that men like Gifford should appreciate the *Virgidemiarum*,—as when he wrote in the *Baviad:*

> "Hall could lash with noble rage
> The purblind patron of a former age;" etc.

It was, however, Hall's versification which especially pleased the ear of the eighteenth century. Thus Warton remarks that "the fabric of the couplets approaches to the modern standard;"[2] and Anderson, in the introduction to Hall's satires, declares that "many of his lines would do honour to the most harmonious of our modern poets. The sense has generally such a pause, and will admit of such a punctuation at the close of the second line, as if it were calculated for a

[1] Notes on the Satires, vol. xii. of Hall's Works.

[2] *History English Poetry*, Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 367.

modern ear."[1] It has already been suggested that the form of Hall's satires exerted great influence upon his successors; it may be added that he was in fact one of the first to adopt the compact satirical couplet accepted by later satirists. The proportion of run-on lines and run-on couplets is almost the same as in Dryden.[2] The rhythm is generally smooth and even; there are two or three Alexandrines (whether introduced inadvertently or by intention), some half dozen short or half-lines, and a nearly equal number of triplets such as were familiar to the writers of later heroic verse. Altogether, Hall's versification, though it lacks the constant medial cæsura and the quality of line-antithesis, was well enough "calculated for a modern ear" of a century ago.

The style of Hall's satires combines the qualities of smoothness and vigor to a greater degree than that of any of the earlier satirists. While not often obviously Latinized, it represents with fair success the quality of the Juvenalian satire. The classical material is adapted with much more than merely imitative skill. There is a self-restraint, a "classical precision" (as Warton calls it), a coldness or hardness, if you please, in the style of Hall, which naturally associates itself with his compact versification, and which is more than equally unusual in the poetry of the Elizabethan Age. I quote further from Warton's somewhat enthusiastic account:

"The characters are delineated in strong and lively coloring, and their discriminations are touched with the masterly traces of genuine humour. . . . It is no inconsiderable proof of a genius predominating over the general taste of an age when every preacher was a punster, to have written verses, where laughter was to be raised, and the reader to be entertained with sallies of pleasantry, without quibbles and conceits. His chief fault is obscurity, arising from a remote phraseology, constrained combinations, unfamiliar allusions, elliptical apostrophes, and abruptness of expression. Perhaps some will think, that his manner betrays too much of the laborious exactness and pedantic anxiety of the scholar and the student."[3]

[1] *British Poets*, vol. ii. p. 726.

[2] See metrical table in Appendix.

[3] Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 367.

The matter of obscurity of style, in these and other Elizabethan satires, calls for more than passing remark. Saintsbury sums up the common modern opinion:

"It is now agreed by all the best authorities that it would be a mistake to consider this roughness unintentional or merely clumsy, and that it sprung, at any rate in great degree, from an idea that the ancients intended the *Satura* to be written in somewhat unpolished verse, as well as from a following of the style of Persius, the most deliberately obscure of all Latin if not of all classical poets." [1]

I quote also from a manuscript note thought to be by Dr. Brinsley Nicholson, on Hall's claim to be the first English satirist:

"As to Hall's assertion that he was the first English satirist, I would lay some but not much stress on his being the first to publish, believing he would rest his chief claim on this, that his were the first English which by being written in a rugged rustic and archaic style answered to the old Roman satires. Hall's own satires, Marston's, and those which may or may not be T. Middleton's, show that this was the idea of a true satire in 1598. Donne's are not smooth, but his style would [be] held to have a polish of its own & his language that of contemporary literature." [2]

There is a passage in Scott's Life of Dryden which is interesting in the same connection:

"Hall possessed a good ear for harmony; and, living in the reign of Elizabeth, might have studied it in Spenser, Fairfax, and other models. But from system, rather than ignorance or inability, he chose to be 'hard of conceit, and harsh of style,' in order that his poetry might correspond with the sharp, sour, and crabbed nature of his theme." [3] Scott proceeds to say that he infers the intentional want of harmony from a passage in Hall's Postscript, which will presently be quoted.

Perhaps the strongest statement of this view is that of Mr. Churton Collins, in his account of Tourneur's "Transformed Metamorphosis:"

"A school of writers had arisen, with Hall and Marston at their head, whose principal ambition would seem to have been to stand in the same relation to classical English as Callimachus and Lycophron stand to classical Greek, and as Persius stands to classical Latin; to corrupt, that is to say, their native language and

[1] *Elizabethan Literature*, p. 151.

[2] Note in copy of Grosart's Donne, Philadelphia Library.

[3] Scott-Saintsbury ed. of Dryden, vol. i. p. 230.

to create a detestable language of their own. This they managed to do by substituting for simple words hideous sesquipedalian compounds coined indiscriminately from Latin and Greek; by affecting the harshest classical phraseology and constructions; by loading their pages with obscure mythological allusions; by the systematic employment and abuse of ellipse; by adopting technical expressions borrowed sometimes from astrology, at other times from alchymy, and occasionally also from theology, casuistry, and scholasticism: and by torturing language and thought into every kind of fantastic absurdity. . . . Even Tourneur must have viewed with a sort of admiring despair the genius which could produce such gems as 'rough-hewn teretismes,' 'logogryphs,' 'acholithite,' 'semele-femorigena,' 'mastigophoros eyne,' 'vizarded-bifronted-Janian,' 'aphrogenias, ill-yoked,' 'the ophiogine of Hellespont,' 'mistagogus,' 'enagonian,' 'collybist,' etc. (These barbarisms have been culled indiscriminately from the satires of Hall and Marston, and are very far from exhausting the list.) . . . That these satirists should have agreed to express themselves in a jargon like this—for not even Lodge is altogether free from it—is inexplicable. It is not impossible that they imagined themselves imitating Persius, who has always been a favourite with the English satirists; though it is singular that while adopting it themselves, they never failed with the ludicrous inconsistency of their master to ridicule it in others." [1]

I quote finally from some further remarks of Professor Saintsbury on the same subject, in his Introduction to the poetry of Donne:

"It is now, I believe, pretty well admitted by all competent judges that the astonishing roughness of the Satirists of the late sixteenth century was not due to any general ignoring of the principles of melodious English verse, but to a deliberate intention arising from the same sort of imperfect erudition which had in other ways so much effect on the men of the Renaissance generally. Satiric verse among the ancients allowed itself, and even went out of its way to take, licences which no poet in other styles would have dreamt of taking. . . . It is not probable, it is certain, that Donne and the rest imitated these licences of malice prepense. . . . In Donne's time the very precisians took a good deal of licence. . . . If therefore you meant to show that you were *sans gêne*, you had to make demonstrations of the most unequivocal character." [2]

Nearly all these passages are instances of that dangerous habit of generalization into which even careful writers are apt to follow one another like sheep going over a stile. So many strong statements cannot, indeed, be without foundation, but it is safe to say that the true condition of things has

[1] Ed. Tourneur's *Plays and Poems*, vol. i. pp. xxi. ff.

[2] Muses' Library ed. of Donne, vol. i. pp. xx. ff.

been greatly exaggerated. Let us analyze the charges made. In regard to roughness of versification, we have seen that this is undoubtedly noticeable in the satires of Donne,—as it is to a less degree, and for the same reason, in all his verse. It seems quite possible that the popularity of his satires led some of his successors to imitate his roughness intentionally, but I consider it very far from being "certain" that it was imitative with him; and whoever may have imitated Donne, or set an example for others, in this respect, Hall did not. I have already said that the versification of Hall's satires is generally smooth and of unusually regular scansion, and I do not know (unless it was from imperfect understanding of the right pronunciation of obsolete words) why Scott should have complained of his verse in this respect.

The charge of obscurity has a somewhat better foundation. In this connection Warton's analysis of the obscurity of Hall is instructive. He says it arises "from a remote phraseology, constrained combinations, unfamiliar allusions, elliptical apostrophes, and abruptness of expression." The "remote phraseology" I take to be a reference to the archaisms which many have noticed in the *Virgidemiarum*. This does not seem to be referable to the classics so much as to Spenser, whose work Hall greatly admired. Nor could his archaic forms have produced any great impression of ruggedness or obscurity to a contemporary reader, since they do not even to a modern eye. They consist of occasional verb-endings in *-en*, participles in *y-*, and such words as *arede*, *rath*, *sib*, *sithes*, *thrave*, *unshent*, and the like (for a full list of these see the Notes of Peter Hall's edition). "Unfamiliar allusions" form a trait which any imitation of the classics will of course display. "Constrained combinations," "elliptical apostrophes," and "abruptness of expression" will be recognized as characteristics of classical satire by any reader of Juvenal or Persius, even of Horace; some of them have already been included in the account of satirical style among the Romans; and

they were characteristics which writers of a dramatic age would be able most easily to imitate. Obscurity of this sort would arise, then, in satire written on classical models, whether intentional or not.

Mr. Collins's account of the vocabulary of the Elizabethan satirists is particularly unreasonable. He devised it to explain Tourneur, whose *Transformed Metamorphosis*, as will appear later, he had no adequate reason for including in the group of satires. His list of "barbarisms culled indiscriminately from the satires of Hall and Marston" contains five words taken from Hall's satires: *teretismes*, *logogryphs*, *acholithite*, *semele-femorigena*, and *collybist*. Of these the second and last were not coined by Hall, and are probably familiar to a number of modern readers; it is likely that the meaning of the first and third was sufficiently obvious to the readers of his own time. As for "semele-femorigena," it is given by Hall as the absurd invention of "a great poet" who had the art

"In epithets to join two words in one;"[1]

and is no more properly an illustration of the satirist's vocabulary than his account of the reign of lust is an illustration of his own morals. It was more clever than ingenuous to make a list "indiscriminately" of these words and some of Marston's uncouth phrases; for the vocabulary of Marston has been understood to be *sui generis* from the time of *The Poetaster*, and has small connection with the fact that he was one of those who wrote satires. The idea, then, that these two men, who cordially disliked each other, should have formed a conspiracy "to corrupt their native language," is little less than ridiculous.

While these objections are to be urged against the expressions of Mr. Saintsbury, Mr. Collins, and others, it is not to be denied that there was a prevalent impression at this time that a satire was not to be so transparent and clearly flowing

[1] Grosart says that the reference is to the elder Scaliger.

a poem as verse of other sorts. Like the rough versification of some, this may have been in part due to the influence of the satires of Donne. It was also very likely, as has been suggested on all sides, due to impressions of Persius. That Persius was wilfully rugged and obscure is a view which has probably descended from the Elizabethans to Mr. Saintsbury;[1] I do not understand that it is the weight of the opinion of classical scholars to-day. Persius was wilfully concise, no doubt; and lacked the gift of Horace and Juvenal to be at once concise and clear. He has always lacked, too, such abundant commentaries as were transmitted through the Middle Ages in connection with the satires of Juvenal. The Elizabethans found him hard reading, though strangely attractive, and sometimes (as Marston, curiously enough, pointed out) mistook the right reason. Juvenal, too, while not so hard to understand, wrote with extraordinary compactness. It seemed, then, that a good satire must not be wholly open-hearted. This idea had no doubt been developed by the teachers of the classics, before there was any actual imitation of them in England.

Hall's relation to this view may be best understood by turning to what he says of his own work. In the Prologue to Book III. of the *Virgidemiarum* he refers to criticism directed against his satires for not being sufficiently "riddle-like,"—

> "Contrarie to the Roman ancients,
> Whose words were short, and darksome was their sense."

> "My Muse (he says) would follow them that have foregone,
> But cannot with an English pinion."

So, just as the satires of the ancients were milder than their earlier comedies, his satires shall be milder than theirs.

In Book IV. Satire 1 he recurs to the same subject:

[1] On the view of this held in the seventeenth century, see Dryden's *Essay on Satire*, Scott-Saintsbury edition, vol. xiii. p. 75.

"Who dares upbraid these open rhymes of mine
With blindfold Aquines, or dark Venusine? . . .
Which who reads thrice, and rubs his ragged brow, . . .
Should all in rage the curse-beat page out-rive,
And in each dust heap bury me alive."

In the Postscript he again refers to "the learned" who will think his work "too perspicuous, being named with Juvenal, Persius, and the other ancient satires;" while the unlearned will complain that it is too obscure, "because not under their reach;"—

"wherein perhaps too much stooping to the low reach of the vulgar, I shall be thought not to have any whit kindly raught my ancient Roman predecessors, whom, in the want of more late and familiar precedents, I am constrained thus far off to imitate; . . . first, therefore, I dare boldly avouch, that the English is not altogether so natural to a satire as the Latin; . . . which if any more confident adversary shall gainsay, I wish no better trial than the translation of one of Persius's satires into English, the difficulty and dissonance whereof shall make good my assertion. . . . Let my second ground be, the well-known dainties of the time; such that men rather choose carelessly to lose the sweet of the kernel, than to urge their teeth with breaking the shell wherein it was wrapped; and therefore sith that which is unseen is almost undone, and that is almost unseen which is unconceived, either I would say nothing to be untalked of, or speak with my mouth open, that I may be understood. Thirdly, the end of this pains was a satire, but the end of my satire a further good, which whether I attain or no, I know not; but let me be plain with the hope of profit, rather than purposely obscure only for a bare name's sake.

"Notwithstanding, in the expectation of this quarrel, I think my first satire doth somewhat resemble the sour and crabbed face of Juvenal's, which I, endeavouring in that, did determinately omit in the rest."

The reference to the "first satire" clearly is to the first one of the fourth book, for which the Postscript was more particularly written; and this first of the "Biting Satires" is in truth the most perfect imitation of Juvenal in the entire work, being also the most difficult to understand. It is curious that more attention has not hitherto been given to Hall's explicit statement that this satire is intentionally obscure, the others intentionally clear. The obscurity is largely due to compact and elliptical structure, and to what Warton called "constrained

combinations" of ideas. It must be said that some of the satires of the fifth book present similar difficulties.

It will perhaps be convenient at this point to anticipate our progress, in order to notice Marston's attitude toward this question of obscurity in satire. In his Satire II. he makes fun of the fashion:

> "I'll leave the white robe and the biting rhymes
> Unto our modern Satire's sharpest lines,
> Whose hungry fangs snarl at some secret sin,
> And in such pitchy clouds enwrapped been
> His Sphinxian riddles, that old Oedipus
> Would be amazed . . .
> Delphic Apollo, aid me to unrip
> These intricate deep oracles of wit—
> These dark enigmas, and strange riddling sense
> Which pass my dullard brain's intelligence."
>
> (13–34)

This might be mere personal attack upon Hall, but in his prose prologue to the *Scourge of Villainy* Marston makes his opinion still more clearly known:

> "Persius is crabby, because ancient, and his jerks (being particularly given to private customs of his time) dusky. Juvenal (upon the like occasion) seems to our judgment gloomy. Yet both of them go a good seemly pace, not stumbling, shuffling. Chaucer is hard even to our understandings: who knows not the reason? how much more those old satires which express themselves in terms that breathed not long even in their days. But had we then lived, the understanding of them had been nothing hard. . . . Let me have the substance rough, not the shadow."[1]

This is a really keen bit of historical criticism, and may well be pardoned if it exaggerates the historical character of classical obscurity. Unfortunately, Marston did not always make his satires consistent with his theory, unless modern judgment of them is also colored by historical conditions.

Returning to the *Virgidemiarum*, let us rapidly analyze its contents.

[1] "To those that seem judicial perusers," Marston's Works, ed. Bullen, vol. iii. p. 305.

The satires are preceded by *A Defiance to Envy*. Various kinds of poetry are alluded to, and compared with "ruder satire." In particular there is an extended reference to pastoral poetry, couched in such terms as to suggest that Hall had already tried his hand in that direction. In that field, however, he says:

"At Colin's feet I throw my yielding reed,"—

an expression which it is difficult to see how Mr. Bullen interprets so as to show that Hall "boasted that he could . . . hold his own with any of the poets,—even hinting that he was a match for Spenser."

Book I. opens with a Prologue in which occurs the author's famous pretension of being the first English satirist. The satires of this book, as the title-page indicates, relate to "poeticall" matters.

Satire I. is an introductory contrast of Satire with other forms of poetry, concluding with another compliment to Spenser.

Satire II. declares that the Muses have become dissolute harlots.

Satire III. relates to contemporary tragedies and theatrical critics.

Satire IV. treats of bad heroic poetry.

Satire V. of contemporary elegiac verse.

Satire VI. of pseudo-classical versification.

Satire VII. of extravagant amatory verse.

Satire VIII. of religious poetry in pseudo-classical style.

Satire IX. of licentious poetry of the passions.

Book II. is called "academicall." The first two satires included in it seem to belong with the previous group. The Prologue represents Satire as the scourging Nemesis of vice.

Satire I. treats of the abundance of bad poetry.

Satire II. shows the folly of writing for money.

Satire III. deals with the degeneracy and extortion of the law.

Satire IV. shows the follies connected with the practice of medicine.

Satire V. rebukes simony,—the buying of benefices.

Satire VI. is a mock advertisement of a country gentleman for a tutor-chaplain; the applicant must be prepared to be snubbed in all manner of ways.

Satire VII. deals with the practice of astrology.

—Many of the satires of this book are very brief, and, dealing with single matters, would more properly be called epigrams. The same thing is even more true of the following book. In general it is to be said that the satires of the first three books bear evidence of having been written separately, at odd moments, and collected as by after-thought; while those called "biting" are more consciously in the classical manner, and I think more consciously grouped together.

Book III. contains the "morall" satires. The Prologue is that already described, dealing with the author's alleged lack of obscurity.

Satire I. describes the ancient golden age, and contrasts it with modern luxury and greed.

Satire II. treats of the folly of desiring a great monument.

Satire III. describes an ostentatious but miserly host.

Satire IV. treats of the love of personal display.

Satire V. is a pure epigram of anecdote, on the loss of a courtier's wig.

Satire VI. is a similar epigram, on the extraordinary thirst of one Gullion.

Satire VII. describes Ruffio the gallant.

The "Conclusion" to this series predicts that the following satires will be much more severe.

Book IV. is preceded by "The Author's Charge to his Second Collection of Satires." It is here stated by implication that the author intends that the satires shall be published only after his death, and some have been led to consider this profession genuine; but since the "Charge" precedes the second collection, which was published apparently as a voluntary supplement to the "toothless satires," it may better be regarded as one of the common Elizabethan devices for professing unintentional publication.

Satire I. opens with an account of obscurity in satire (already referred to), and goes on to deal with various aspects of the reign of lust.

Satire II. describes a son made rich by his father's toil, and his professions of aristocracy.

Satire III. treats of the vanity of merely inherited greatness.

Satire IV. describes Gallio the young gallant.

Satire V. deals with the piratical gaining of wealth through the losses of others.

Satire VI. is on "the vanity of human wishes."

Satire VII. attacks the "Romish pageants" of the Papacy.

In *Book V.*

Satire I. treats of the oppressions of landlords.

Satire II. describes the decline of oldtime hospitality.

Satire III. opens with an account of the mission of satire, and concludes with an account of the origin and abuse of land-boundaries.

Satire IV. describes the spendthrift son of a thrifty farmer.

In *Book VI.*

Satire I. describes Labeo's reception of the author's satires. The world is mockingly described to be virtuous. Contemporary poetry is treated at length, especially that of Labeo. (This poet appeared previously in Satire I. of Book II. His identity will be discussed later.)[1]

[1] Occasional references will be found to a second satire in Book VI. Thus Hazlitt added to Warton's statement that the book consisted of one long satire only, the words "but was enlarged in the third [edition] to two." The correction was in fact a mistake. The edition referred to is evidently that of 1599 (dated 1602), in which the last satire of Book IV. (which Peter Hall says was added in the second edition) was omitted by mistake from its right place, and was added as Satire II. of Book VI. The error was corrected in the printer's note already described. It may be observed that in this edition there appear immedi-

The author's *Postscript*, which also seems to have been added in the 1599 edition, has already been in part described. It is professedly an attempt to anticipate the censures of various critics, though these had probably already been heard from. The *Postscript* is chiefly interesting as giving the author's views, already quoted, on the matter of obscurity in satire, as well as from a reference to previous satirists known to him (to be cited later). It also contains an interesting, but obscure, passage on the versification of Latin satire as distinguished from the verse of modern languages, and the usual claim that in his own satire he avoids all personal attack (defended by the familiar question-begging argument that if anyone is offended he must have been hit).

The type of satire here is generally that of direct rebuke. Except in what I have called epigrams, there is none of the purely narrative element; and there is little of the purely reflective. The amiable Horatian type is seldom noticeable; the Juvenalian everywhere predominates,—though with less impression of personal bitterness than in either Juvenal or Donne. The attitude toward life is the usual pessimistic one. There is an occasional intimation that the satires are intended as a wholesome corrective (compare the expression in the *Postscript:* "the end of my satire a further good," etc.). The mission of satire is indeed more consciously presented than we have hitherto found it, and it is serious and ethical. Thus:

> "Go daring Muse, . . .
> And do the ugly face of Vice unmask." (Prol. Bk. I., l. 20.)

> "The satire should be like the porcupine,
> That shoots sharp quills out in each angry line,
> And wounds the blushing cheeke, and fiery eye
> Of him that hears, and readeth guiltily." (Bk. V. S. 3.)

The "brittle mold" of modern ears is complained of:

> "Ye antique satires, how I bless your dayes,
> That brook'd your bolder stile." (Ibid.)

Quite worthy of note, too, is this affirmation of his serious intent:

ately before Satire I. of Book I. six Latin verses, playing on the word *Satyra*, called "De suis Satyris."

"Sufficeth me, the world may say
That I these vices loath'd, another day,
Which I have done with as devout a cheere
As he that rounds Paul's pillars in the eare,[1]
Or bends his ham down in the naked quire." (Ibid. 17 ff.)

Connected with this are the usual views of the degenerate character of the age, in part of classical origin. The age is called "smoothing;" all who loved abstinence are long since dead (IV. 5. 7); the world is degenerate (IV. 6. 1);

"Who can refrain . . .
Whiles yet he lives in such a cruel time?"[2] (V. 1, 21.)

We find in these satires of Hall, then, to an extent merely suggested by his predecessors, the source of the doctrine of a "degenerate age" which marked so many of his successors.

We have now to consider the sources of the *Virgidemiarum*. In the author's *Postscript* there are two or three important suggestions in this direction. I have already quoted that relating to "my ancient Roman predecessors, whom, in the want of more late and familiar precedents, I am constrained thus far off to imitate." Later there is a reference to "the satires of Ariosto (save which, and one base French satire, I could never attain the view of any for my direction)." Besides these we have distinct allusions to the satires of Persius, and "the sour and crabbed face of Juvenal's."

In Satire I. of Book V. occurs this similar passage:

"Renowned Aquine,[3] now I follow thee,
Far as I may, for feare of jeopardy;
And to thy hand yield up the ivy-mace
From crabbed Persius, and more smooth Horace;

[1] That is, *whispers to* the pillars in St. Paul's.

[2] And see especially Satire I. of Book III.

[3] That is, Juvenal. It is interesting to compare this passage with a similar one in Régnier:

"Il faut . . . recognoistre la trace
Du libre Juvenal: trop discret est Horace
Pour un homme picqué," etc. (Satire II.)

> Or from that shrew, the Roman poetesse,
> That taught her gossips learned bitternesse;
> Or Lucile's muse, whom thou didst imitate,
> Or Menips old, or Pasquillers of late." (ll. 7-14.)

It was the classical satirists, then, that Hall had chiefly in mind, and with whom he was thoroughly familiar. The "base French satire" it would be most interesting to identify, but we have already seen the difficulty of doing so at this period, and from the tone of Hall's allusion to it one would not judge that it exercised any considerable influence upon him.[1] Ariosto he doubtless knew very well, but as the type of satire which he chose was quite different from that of the Italian satirist, he could not follow him very closely. I am indebted to the late Dr. R. A. Small, who carefully examined Hall's satires in connection with those of Ariosto, for the statement that the *Virgidemiarum* shows only the slightest influence of the latter. There is a motto from Ariosto III. 237 prefixed to Hall's first satire of Book IV., and Dr. Small thought that a passage in the third satire of the same book

> "Was never fox but wily cubs begets," etc.,)

was suggested by Ariosto I. 100 ff. I think that we may also attribute to the influence of the Italian satirists the frequent proper names in Italian form which Hall introduces among those in Latin form. That he derived much material from contemporary continental sources, however, there seems little reason to believe.

The question of Hall's relation to his predecessors in England centers about the famous couplet in the Prologue:

> "I first adventure: follow me who list,
> And be the second English satirist."

One may be sure that had the author realized how many pages would have been written in comment on these lines, he

[1] Professor Schelling has suggested that it may have been the *Satyre Menippée*, which would certainly have been sufficiently different from Hall's ideal of satire to have been called "base."

would either have omitted them or have added a footnote. On their meaning and trustworthiness see, among others, Saintsbury, *Elizabethan Literature*, p. 144; Grosart, Introductions to editions of Donne and Hall; Edmonds, Introduction to Hake's *News out of Pauls;* Singer, Introduction to edition of *Virgidemiarum;* Collier, *Poetical Decameron*, i. 154, and *Rarest Books*, ii. 113; Cooper, Introduction to *Times Whistle;* and Corser, *Collectanea*, viii. 374.

In all these places it is pointed out that, whatever interpretation of the term "satirist" be accepted, Hall was not the first of that line in England. Milton seems to have been the first to make objection to the claim (see citation on p. 109, above). Collier at first suggests that Hall "was not aware of the existence of any predecessor in the language, for when he published his *Virgidemiarum* . . . he was a very young man, little acquainted with English writers, his knowledge being chiefly confined to the classics at college." He is obliged to retract this, however, admitting that the satires "are full of references to books and literary men."[1] So far as the various possible rivals are concerned, *Piers Plowman* may at once be ruled out as in no sense a formal satire in Hall's sense of the word. Neither need Wyatt be insisted upon, since his so-called satires were not called such by himself, and were epistolary in form. Hake's *News out of Pauls* may well have been forgotten by the time Hall was old enough to read it, and even had he seen it, he would probably not have considered its "Satyrs" as answering to the classical standard. In like manner, the *Steele Glas* was early enough to be out of the range of Hall's reading, and was, as we have seen, rather an ethical poem in satirical vein than a true satire.

All this admitted, there remain Donne and Lodge, both of whom wrote satires expressly so called, after the classical manner, and in the decasyllabic couplet. Donne has given

[1] See *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. pp. 154, 227.

little trouble to those who have assumed that he was Hall's successor, but we have seen reason to assume the contrary. It is true that in 1597 his satires were not yet printed, that at most but three of them were written, and that the evidence that those three were in existence so early is but slight. Clearly there is no reason to believe that they were widely known or read when the *Virgidemiarum* was being written. Dr. Grosart has a singular "suspicion that, inasmuch as the anonymous commendatory poems prefixed to the 'Anatomie' of Donne, and other authorities, reveal that Hall and Donne were personally acquainted, the former had heard, or read at least, the first four of Donne's satires in MS., and wrote his own in the recollection of them." He goes on to suggest that the line

"I first adventure: follow me who list"

"may have been Hall's challenge to his friend Donne to 'adventure' forth, and not to hold in MS. his satires."[1] It seems almost needless to say that there is no foundation for such a theory, which seems to have been constructed for the purpose of providing a personal allusion for the reference to plagiarism in Donne's Satire II., 25–30. If this satire was written in 1593, as Grosart and most others think, of course the *Virgidemiarum* was not yet published (nor is there any evidence that it was written); but Dr. Grosart thinks that Hall could have seen Donne's satires in MS., and then, when he had begun to imitate them, Donne could have learned of the fact and introduced his reference to plagiarism as an attack on their intended publication! This is too intricate a series of events to be seriously followed. As to the reputed friendship of the two satirists, the evidence is of course of later date, and does not relate to the period when Donne was in Spain with Essex or in London as secretary to the Lord Chancellor, and Hall

[1] Ed. Donne, Introduction, pp. xxx–xxxi.

was still at the University. There is no internal evidence, in Hall's satires, of the author's familiarity with those of Donne; and I see no necessity for believing that any existed.

Lodge's *Fig for Momus* was published only two years before Hall's satires, and contained such obvious imitation of classical satire that it is difficult to see how it could have been explained away. It is also a little difficult to believe that such a keen observer of contemporary literature as Hall should not have seen it. This seemed, however, the most probable explanation to Mr. Collier, who called attention to the fact that there seems to be no allusion to any of Lodge's works in the *Virgidemiarum*, as well as to the fact already noticed, that the *Fig for Momus* does not seem to have reached any great popularity.[1] It is possible that Hall, knowing of the few satires which Lodge had introduced among the Eclogues and Epistles of the *Fig for Momus*, still did not think they entitled their author to be called an "English satirist," in comparison with one who should issue a considerable series of satires in a volume by itself. There is danger in taking too seriously passing boasts of this kind, and making their accuracy a much more significant matter than the author would have thought of doing. The whole question is chiefly of interest in its connection with another question, viz., whether these three or four men hit upon the same sort of classical imitation at very nearly the same time, and adopted the same form of English verse for its expression, without either agreement or mutual influence? It will already have appeared that I am inclined to answer this question in the affirmative. There is not yet evidence to warrant us in denying the truth of Hall's statement that he "could never attain the view of any" for his direction. So far as the verse-form is concerned, the couplet had already been used sufficiently to indicate its convenience for satire, and in Spenser's *Mother Hubbard's Tale* had actually

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, i. 227

been applied to satirical material. In France it had long been familiar, though it was now yielding to the Alexandrine.[1] If we could be sure as to the nature of the French influence of which there has been some suggestion in connection with both Donne and Hall, it might throw light on their use of the couplet. It may also be suggested that decasyllabic rhymed verse in English corresponded naturally enough with the hendecasyllabic *terza rima* of the Italian satirists.

We have now to notice the detailed evidence of classical imitation in the *Virgidemiarum*.

Lines 19 ff. of I. 1, are from the Prologue of Persius:

> "Heliconidasque, pallidamque Pirenen
> Illis remitto, quorum imagines lambunt
> Hederæ sequaces." (4 ff.)

And the idea of "hunger-starven trencher poetrie," a few lines above (13) suggests a neighboring passage in the same Prologue:

> "Magister artis, ingenique largitor
> Venter." (10 f.)

A passage in I. 9,

> "Th' itching vulgar tickled with the song," etc.,

suggests Persius I. 20 f.:

> "Carmina lumbum
> Intrant, et tremulo scalpuntur ubi intima versu."

Lines 47 ff. of II. 2 are from Persius III. 78 ff.:

> "Non ego curo
> Esse quod Arcesilas, æruminosique Solones," etc.

The account of superstition in II. 7. 19 ff. suggests a passage in Juvenal VI. 552–590.

[1] The satires of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye are partly in decasyllabics, partly in Alexandrines; those of Régnier in Alexandrines.

The opening of the Prologue to Book III. suggests the opening of Horace, Satire I. of Book II.:

"Sunt quibus in satira videar nimis acer," etc.

The description of the golden age, at the opening of III. 1, is ultimately, of course, of classical origin; but it was so common not only in classical poetry but in modern paraphrases, that direct reference is impossible. One may compare with the passage in Hall: Juvenal III. 171 ff., VI. 1 ff., XI. 77 ff., XIII. 38 ff.; Horace Satire 3 of Book I.; together with well-known passages in Ovid and Lucretius.[1] The same thing appears in Boethius, *De Consolatione* II. m. 5, whence it was transferred to Chaucer's fine version in *The Former Age*.

With a couplet in III. 2

("Thy monument make thou thy living deeds," etc.,)

may be compared Juvenal VIII. 19–26.

The allusion to the blind snake of Epidaurus, in IV. 1. 24, has been referred to Horace, Satire 3 of Book I., l. 27; but in Horace the serpent is represented as of unusually acute vision.

The account of Titius wedding a dying widow for her money, in IV. 1. 61 ff., may be compared with Juvenal I. 37–41, and VI. 135 ff.

The idea that the vices of the world are more entertaining

"than a Paris-garden beare,
Or prating puppet in a theatre," (IV. 1. 74 ff.)

suggests Juvenal XIV. 255 ff.

The picture of the adulteress in IV. 1. 144 ff. is from Juvenal VI. 115–131, and is perhaps the best imitation of the Juvenalian manner in all Hall's satires.

[1] For all the classical passages of this kind, see the *Leipziger Studien*, VIII. 1–80.

Satire 3 of Book IV. is a free paraphrase of Juvenal VIII. Compare especially the description of the

> "figures half obliterate
> In rain-beat marble near to the church gate,
> Upon a cross-legged tomb," etc.,

with the corresponding description in the original; also the passage (l. 50 ff.) relating to estimations of the qualities of horses. The passage on the descent of vices from father to son (86 ff.) seems to have been suggested by Juvenal XIV.

The allusion in IV. 4. 72 to manners as soft as "the lambs of Tarentine" suggests the "Euganean Lamb" of Juvenal VIII. 14.

At the head of IV. 5 is a motto ("Stupet Albius ære") from Horace, Satire 4 of Book I., l. 28. Also from Horace is the heading of Satire VI.: "Quid placet ergo?"

The opening of IV. 6 is from the opening of Juvenal X.: "Omnibus in terris," etc.[1] The passage descriptive of the effeminacy of young men (5–14) may be compared with a similar one in Juvenal II. The conclusion of the satire is from the end of Juvenal X., but may be compared, as may the theme of the whole, with Horace I. 1. It is to be observed that Lodge paraphrased the tenth of Juvenal in a somewhat similar strain; if Hall was acquainted with the *Fig for Momus*, it may very well have suggested this satire (IV. 6).

Lines 15–20 of V. 1, declaring that though the author is a follower of Juvenal, he will attack not the dead but the living, are obviously a reference to the conclusion of Juvenal's first satire.

The passage in V. 2, descriptive of the contrast between the fare of the patron and his client at table (112–150) are from the similar passage in Juvenal V.

The account of the origin of land-boundaries, in V. 3.

[1] Also, it would seem, from the opening of Horace, Book I., Satire 1.

34 ff., is in part, at least, of classical origin. It may be compared with the passages in Juvenal already cited, on the golden age, and in particular with Lucretius V. 1240 ff.

The reference in VI. 1. 207 to

"Lucan stretched on his marble bed"

may have been suggested by Juvenal VII. 79.

The passage on contemporary poetry (VI. 1. 221 ff.), beginning—

'No man his threshold better knows, than I," etc.,

is in imitation of Juvenal I. 7 ff.:

"Nota magis nulli domus est sua," etc.

Dr. Small also noted interesting parallels between Hall I. 2. 17 ff. and Juvenal IV. 34 ff.; II. 2. 57 f. and Juvenal X. 171 ff.; IV. 1. 134 f. and Juvenal III. 62 f.; II. 6 and Juvenal VII. 186 ff.

The personal type-names in the *Virgidemiarum* are also in part derived from classical satire. Labeo, Hall's favorite type of a bad poet, is mentioned in Persius I. 4. Ponticus, in Satires 1, 3 and 4 of Book IV., is clearly the same sort of person as Juvenal's friend of the eighth satire. Trebius the parasite, and Virro the wealthy host, reappear from Juvenal V. and IX. in Hall IV. 1 and V. 2. Messaline, in IV. 1. 102, is Juvenal's heroine of the stews. Matho, Juvenal's fat lawyer, appears in Hall IV. 5, IV. 7 and V. 1. Curius, in IV. 5. 7, was directly suggested by Juvenal XI. 78; and Mutius and Tigellinus, in V. 1. 14, are from Juvenal I. 154. Other names, such as *Crispus*, *Titius*, *Caia*, *Scaurus*, *Virginius*, *Lycius*, *Gellia*, *Mæcenas*, *Calvus*, *Balbus*, *Clodius*, *Rufus*, are of obviously classical origin, though not so direct in allusion; and still another class, including *Matrona*, *Cynedo*, *Martius*, *Nummius*, *Moecha*, *Tattelius*, *Pansophus*, is that of names whose occasion suits their etymology.

Classical allusions and quotations from other than satirical sources it is not necessary to enumerate. Thus we have "Hence, ye profane!" from Horace; "Arcades ambo" and "Fuimus Troes" from Vergil; a passage in IV. 3. 68–79 apparently from Horace's Odes IV. 4; etc.

We have here, then, classical imitation to an extent unapproached in any of the earlier satires. The English elements are distinct, but not proportionately conspicuous; it is in the prelude, "Defiance to Envy," that they appear most noticeably. There is a serious attitude toward life which predicts something of the future churchman; and the considerable treatment of public affairs (the relations of landlords and tenants, the seizure of land, the purchasing of benefices, the prevalence of high prices, inconsistencies of priests, and the like) suggest the familiar English note. Occasionally, but rarely, we find the involved language and conceits of the Elizabethan period (see especially III. 7. 51–70), for the general absence of which Warton justly commends Hall's satires. English local-color is frequently interwoven with classical.[1] Among the prevailing classical and Italian names we find occasional English ones, as "Dennis," "Hodge," and the allegorical combination "Make-Fray."

The general type and tone of the satire, however, are classical. There is the familiar pessimistic and conservative attitude. For the most part the spirit is pagan, too, with the machinery of classical mythology. The occasion is clearly a view of contemporary evils from a reflective mood. The emphasis is chiefly on private morals and fashions; and especially noteworthy is the appearance of satire on contemporary literature, found in brief passages in the classical satirists, but enlarged by Hall and adapted to the needs of his time. The satires, further, are representative of the individual author, though they do not reveal his personality as clearly as Donne's. Of

[1] Thus see III. 4. 13 ff.; IV. 1. 134 ff.; IV. 2. 19–50, 69 f., 91–100; IV. 3. 4–17.

the relation of Hall's style to the classical models I have already spoken in part. It is full of allusion, is indirect in nature, and makes use of the sudden dramatic turns of classical satirists. The humor is not abundant, but what there is is chiefly of the classical sort, and is based on exaggeration and disproportion. Warton rightly calls attention [1] to Hall's use of purely *incidental* satire in his illustrations, after the manner of Juvenal; for examples see IV. 3. 78 f.; V. 2. 25 f.; V. 3. 46 f.

Most interesting, however, among Hall's classical elements are the type-names, many of which have already been enumerated. There are about fifty distinct names of this sort, some of which, as we have seen, are taken directly from Juvenal, and some of which are made to order; while most are in classical or Italo-classical form. Still another class, small but worthy of note, is that of *blank* names or initials, as

> "What else makes N—— when his lands are spent."
> (IV. 5. 23.)

(See also IV. 5. 35; V. 2. 21, 28.) Warton remarks that this is the earliest instance he has noted of the satirical use of these, and I have myself found none earlier; it is quite possible that the idea was derived from mere pamphlets and political ballads, in which full names were avoided for prudential reasons. Whether the initials in the *Virgidemiarum* stand for real persons it is perhaps impossible to say. The very fact of their use suggests that they do. It is pretty generally agreed that the great majority of Juvenal's proper names were those of real persons, who either from date or position were powerless to take revenge upon the satirist.[2] To an imitator of Juvenal there was, then, no little temptation to turn in like manner to personal attack. The earlier satirists in England did this but

[1] Hazlitt ed. vol. iv. p. 385.

[2] See Friedländer's Juvenal, Anhang 1: *Ueber die Personennamen bei Juvenal.* Vol. i. p. 99.

slightly, however (except in the case of literary quarrels), and always professed to be impersonal. When they became too obviously direct, they were in danger, whether under the rule of Elizabeth or James.—Finally, it is to be observed that all the classes of type-names appearing in Hall are of no little importance in the future development of satire in England.

Grouping the objects satirized by Hall under the usual heads, we find private morals distinctly predominant. Without exception (save in the case of alchemy and one or two others, excluded for obvious reasons) the vices and follies in these satires are those of classical satire. Lust is treated frankly and severely, but with unusual brevity, and with the distinct impression that the author is not fond of dwelling on it like Juvenal and like many of his English successors.

Under Morals we have:

Flattery, I. 1. 11 f.; VI. 1. 41 ff., 100 ff.
Superstition, II. 7.
Usury, IV. 5. 39 ff.
Lies of travelers, IV. 6. 59–77; VI. 1. 51.
Extravagance, V. 4.
Inhospitableness, V. 2.
Fortune-hunting, VI. 1. 89 ff; IV. 1. 61 ff.
Avarice and greed, II. 3; III. 1. 52 ff.; IV. 6. 30 ff.; V. 1. 79 ff.; IV. 5.
Bribery, IV. 5. 2 ff.
Forgery, V. 1. 37, 46.
Ambition, III. 2; III. 4.
Lust, IV. 1. 95–164; V. 3. 30 ff.
Gluttony, IV. 4. 18 ff.
Effeminacy, IV. 6. 4–13.
Drunkenness, VI. 1. 71 ff.

Under Fashions:

Clothes, etc., III. 1. 63 ff.; 4. 30; 7. 26 ff.; IV. 4. 42 ff.; 6 7–13; VI. 1. 115 ff.
Wigs, III. 5.
False teeth, VI. 1. 289.
Tobacco, IV. 4. 41; V. 2. 74.

Chariots, IV. 6. 19 ff.
Foreign languages, VI. 1. 137 ff.
Profession of aristocracy, IV. 2. 133 ff.
Practice of alchemy, IV. 3. 39 f.; 4. 15.

Under Public Affairs:

High prices, II. 1. 9 f.; IV. 6. 25.
Voyages to South America, IV. 3. 28 ff.
Exportation of poor to Virginia, V. 1. 113.
Landlords and tenants, V. 1. 23 ff., 60 ff.; IV. 2. 124 ff.; 5. 78.
Encroachment upon public land, IV. 2. 127; V. 3. 62 ff.
Famine, V. 2. 75–100.

Under Personal Humors:

Hypocritical hospitality, III. 3.
City etiquette, IV. 2. 85 ff.
A young gallant's occupations, IV. 4. 86.
Marriage of an old man, IV. 4. 114 ff.

Under Classes:

Lawyers, II. 3. 15 ff.
Physicians, II. 4.
Tutors, II. 6.

Under Literature:

This is treated at unusual length (see the analysis of Book I., on contemporary poetry). In I. 1, we have satirized the "trencher poetry" of those dependent on some great patron; and that dealing with "the pagan vaunt" of Mahound and Termagaunt. The reference to Termagant has been understood as an allusion to the *Fairy Queen* (B. vi. c. 7. st. 47); Singer, however, thinks the satire may be on Harington's translation of the *Orlando*. In Satire 2 the attack is upon the lustful character of contemporary verse; various attempts have been made to explain it as of individual significance. I quote from Singer's notes:

"Ovid's *Art of Love* had recently been rendered in a coarse manner, and Marlowe had translated Ovid's *Epistles*, and written his erotic romance of *Hero and Leander*. Shakspeare had also published his *Venus and Adonis*, which had given great offence to the graver readers of English verse. But it is in the epigrams of Davies and Harrington, and in the ephemeral publications of Greene and Nashe, that decency was most outraged. The poet had these most flagrant transgressions in mind. Though the first edition of Marston's *Pigmalion's Image* bears the date of 1598, I cannot but think that Hall particularly points at that poem."[1] Similar conjectures might be quoted in regard to Satire 9 of the same

[1] Singer's ed. *Virgidemiarum*, p. 7.

book, which deals with one particular poet of the amatory sort. Warton thought this was an allusion to Greene, and others have applied it to Marston's unpublished *Pigmalion*. Peter Hall pertinently questioned whether Hall would have attacked in such terms a man who, like Greene, had been dead for some five years when the satires were published. The probability of reference to Marston in these satires I shall discuss somewhat later. Certain identification of the poets referred to does not seem possible.

In Satire 3 the attention is turned to tragedies, with the scenes in the theatres at the time of their presentation, and the critics

> "Whispering their verdict in their fellows ear."

It is Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* which is selected for particular ridicule,—a play which had been on the stage for nine years, and a new edition of which came out in 1597.[1]

In Satire 4, dealing with heroic poetry, we hear of a tale

> "With strange enchantments, fetch'd from darksome vale
> Of some Melissa, that by magic doom
> To Tuscans soil transporteth Merlin's tomb."

This has been very reasonably conjectured to be a reference to contemporary imitations of Ariosto's *Orlando*, which had been translated in 1591. The exaggerations of romanticism seem to have been especially offensive to Hall. "If some painter," he asks,

> "Should paint the stars in centre of the earth,
> Could ye forbear some smiles, and taunting mirth?"

The satire concludes with another compliment to Spenser, whom "let no rebel satyr dare traduce."

Satire 5, on elegiac verse, ridicules

> "Rhyme of some dreary fates of luckless peers,"

—evidently referring to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Satire 6 deals with English hexameters, which were in considerable vogue at this time, and in particular with Stanyhurst's *Virgil*, which had been published in 1582, and which seems to have maintained itself for some time in popular interest. The reference is made certain by Hall's use of some of Stanyhurst's "new coin of words," as *thwick-thwack* and *riff-raff*.

Satire 7 ridicules the extravagant love poetry of the time. The allusions are too general for distinct reference, but Singer suggests that Hall was aiming at Henry Lok's *Love's Complaints*, then just published. Such reaction against the

[1] Grosart supposes, but I think with no sufficient reason, that in what follows regarding the mingling of tragedy and comedy Hall had special reference to Shakspere.

excesses of amorous praise is comparable to that appearing in other poets of the time—indeed in Shakspere himself.

Satire 8 ridicules the combination of classical and religious themes. "Parnassus is transformed to Sion hill." The reference to Saint Peter weeping "pure Helicon" is thought to be to Southwell's *Peter's Complaint* (1595), and the following line to the same author's *Mary Magdalene's Funeral Tears* (1594). Following this is a thrust at Markham's *Sion's Muse*.[1]

Book II. opens with a continuation of the satire on literature, dealing at first with the immoral poetry of "Labeo." In ll. 55 ff., as Warton observes, there seems to be allusion to translations or imitations of Poggio and Rabelais, as there is elsewhere to the work of Aretine. The second satire treats of those who spend "a thousand lamps, and thousand reames . . . of needless papers," in hope of winning wealth by poetizing.

In IV. 2. 83 f. is a passing allusion to a "plagiary sonnet-wright" visited by the ghost of Petrarch; and more specifically, in VI. 1. 251 ff., Labeo the bad poet is represented as being able to

> "filch whole pages at a clap for need,
> From honest Petrarch, clad in English weed."

In IV. 6. 50 ff. we have a vigorous attack on the wholesale balladry of the period,[2] and the youth who read the *Spanish Decades*,[3] or the "whet-stone leasings" of Mandeville.

In V. 2. 45 ff. there is a thrust at the bad poetry of one Mævio,—

> "Nail'd to an hundred postes for novelty,
> With his big title an Italian mot."

Finally, there is in VI. 1. 155–280 an extensive series of thrusts at contemporary poetry: elegies on dead birds and dogs; heroic poems on Brutus, George, Arthur, and the like; pastorals and amatory verse. The bulk of the satire here is directed apparently at the single poet called "Labeo," of whom mention has already been made. His identity has interested not a few readers of Hall. Warton suggested Chapman, but it does not seem possible to bring evidence in favor of such an identification. It appears from the passage in 245 ff. that "Labeo" is writing heroic poetry under the professed inspiration of Phœbus; that he invokes heathen deities for guidance; that he plagiarizes from Petrarch; that he is fond of beginning weak stanzas with "big *But oh's!*"; that he imitates the foreign fashions introduced by Sidney; that he is fond of double

[1] In these literary identifications I follow Warton, as all his successors have thankfully done. For a further possible explanation of references in Satire 5, see p. 142 below.

[2] The reference to "some drunken rhymer" is probably to Thomas Elderton, the balladist, a familiar figure of the period.

[3] *i. e.*, Eden's translation of *The Decades of the newe Worlde*, etc., 1555.

epithets or compound adjectives; that he "names the spirit of Astrophel"; that he wrote pastoral verse and love-poetry before undertaking that on heroic themes. I am indebted to Dr. Homer Smith for the suggestion that Drayton may have been the poet intended, though I have since noticed that the same idea had occurred to Singer. The suggestion is an interesting one, and deserves consideration. Drayton had begun his career with pastorals (in the Eclogues of 1593), he had published love-sonnets in 1594, and had then turned to his *Tragical Legends;* while at the time of the *Virgidemiarum* he was through with the *Mortimeriados* and was working at the *Heroical Epistles.* He was quite the sort of poet to inspire Hall with repugnance. I regret that I have not been able to identify with any satisfaction the details of Hall's description which seemed to suggest identification. In the *Mortimeriados* Drayton uses a number of stanzas beginning with the exclamation "O;" he has frequent references to Phœbus and other "heathen deities;" and his sonnets might easily have been accused of using Petrarchan material;[1] but beyond these quite general comparisons I have not yet been able to go.

It is clear that we have in all this literary satire the work of an unusually keen and well-read critic of contemporary literature. The material was no doubt in part suggested by occasional passages in Juvenal, Persius and Horace; but it is worked out with originality and with constant reference to contemporary conditions. It is also interesting as showing the revolt against romanticism which no doubt always appears at the very moment of romantic enthusiasm, and which unites with the metre and other elements in these satires to give them their curiously eighteenth-century effect.

Under Religion:

Lollards, II. 1. 17.
Benefices and simony, II. 5; VI. 1. 38 ff.
Romanism; inconsistencies of priests, etc., IV. 7.

Of personal satire (excluding the initial-names which it is now impossible to explain) there seems to be little in these satires apart from the literary allusions. This personal element we have seen increasing in the rise of formal satire, and unfortunately it continued to grow and prosper. In Hall's satires we have also to consider possible traces of his "quarrel" with Marston; but this may most conveniently be reserved for consideration under the satires of the latter. It is enough here to note that the idea of the nature of satire, as Marston described it, "under feigned private names to note general vices," is already being lost.

It has been necessary to take up the satires of Hall at considerable length and in much detail. They are the largest single collection of satires (with the exception of Wither's)

[1] For cases of compound adjectives, too, see Drayton's 53d Sonnet.

appearing in our period, and they are incomparably the most important. They were clearly the product of classical influence, and were frankly imitative and conventional, yet by no means destitute of originality. They bear a close relation to contemporary life, and seem to be the work of one really impressed by the vices and follies of the time, as we should expect the future bishop to have been. Their influence, as we have already seen, must have been considerable, and it is not too much to say that, when compared with other satirical literature of this period, that influence seems to have been in large measure for good.

William Rankins was one of the satirists mentioned by Meres in the *Palladis Tamia*. On May 3, 1598, there were entered in the Stationers' Register his "Seaven Satyres Applyed to the weeke, including the worlds ridiculous follyes. True faelicity described in the Phœnix. *Maulgre.* Whereunto is annexed the wandring Satyre." This is a rare work, and has not, so far as I am aware, been reprinted. I have therefore been unable to see it, but make use of the description given by Collier.[1]

The work was dedicated to John Salisbury of Llewenni. The satires are introduced by an "Induction," which illustrates the dramatic use made of the mythological idea of a Satyr, as already commented on:

> "Of Love, of Courtships and of fancies force
> Some gilded Braggadochio may discourse:
> My shaggy Satyres doe forsake the woods,
> Their beddes of mosse, their unfrequented floodes,
> Their marble cels, their quiet forrest life,
> To view the manner of this humane strife.
> Whose skin is toucht, and will in gall revert,
> My Satyres vow to gall them at the heart."

The seven satires are directed respectively Contra Lunatistam, Martialistam, Mercurialistam, Jovialistam, Venereum, Saturnistam, Sollistam. They are in seven-line stanzas. A serious piece, "Sola felicitas, Christus mihi Phœnix," is followed by the *Satyrus Peregrinus.* I quote (through Collier's transcription) from the account of an amorous gallant, and that of a pamphleteer:

[1] *Rarest Books*, vol. iii. pp. 278 ff.

"He is in love with every painted face
Saluting common truls with ribauld lines,
In songs and sonnets taking such a grace,
As if he delv'd for gold in Indian mines;
But see how fortune such great wit repines:
In this sweet trafique his bargaines are so ill
That he is made a jade by every Jill."

. . . "Another artlesse mone, bewitcht with praise,
Thrusts forth a patched pamphlet into print,
When fooles on it, as on a pide coat, gaze;
His copper words come out of coxcombs mint:
Fluent from arte as water from a flint.
Foure bookes he makes foure elbowes to present:
By his induction is his bawble meant."

It does not appear from this that much has been lost in the falling into obscurity of Rankins's satires, nor that—apart from the name—they are greatly indebted to classical models. The practice of dividing books of poetry into seven parts was not infrequent at this time, and we shall meet it again in connection with the writing of satires; it is attributed by some to the influence of the *Semaines* of Du Bartas, which were translated into English in 1597 or 1598.

Rankins published, besides the *Seven Satyrs*, an attack on theatres called *A Mirrour of Monsters* (1587); and there is also attributed to him a work called *The English Ape, the Italian imitation, the Foote-steppes of Fraunce* (1588), an attack on foreign fashions in dress and the like.[1]

7. John Marston.

"*The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Image. And Certaine Satyres.*" 1598.

"*The Scourge of Villanie.* Three bookes of Satyres. Perseus: 'Nec scombros metuentia carmina nec thus.'" 1598.

The first of these books was entered on the Stationers' Register on May 27, 1598; and the second on September 8 of the same year. A second edition, twice issued, appeared in 1599, "with the addition of Newe Satyres,"—in reality with the addition of one satire, the Tenth. The author's name did not appear in any of these, but the dedication was signed "W. K.," *i. e.*, "W. Kinsayder," Marston's pseudonym, which appears in full at the end of the prefatory address to

[1] See article on Rankins, *Dictionary of National Biography*.

"judicial perusers," in the *Scourge of Villainy*. In the third satire of the *Scourge* occurs a reference to the author's "concealed name" (l. 132), and Mr. Collier suggested[1] that the passage indicates apprehension of consequences as the cause of anonymity.

At this time Marston was probably about twenty-three years of age, and must have come lately from Oxford; perhaps he was trying to study law with his father, who in his will (1599) regretted that John should not have followed his own profession. *Pigmalion's Image* was undoubtedly popular when published, though this may in large part be attributed to the poem which gave the name to the volume. The *Scourge of Villainy* seems also to have attracted no little attention. We have seen that Marston was included in Meres's list of satirists, which appeared almost immediately after the *Pigmalion*. In 1599 his satires were included in the list of condemned publications, and ordered to be burned. Though they were not afterward exempted, like Hall's, we find them complimented in 1601 by Charles Fitzgeffrey, who viewed Marston as the successor and rival of Hall:

> "Gloria Marstoni satyrarum proxima primæ,
> Primaque, fas primas si numerare duas:
> Sin primam duplicare nefas, tu gloria saltem
> Marstoni primæ proxima semper eris."[2]

There is also an interesting passage relating to Marston, or "Monsier Kynsader," in *The Returne from Pernassus, or The Scourge of Simony* (about 1602):

> "Me thinks he is a Ruffian in his stile,
> Withouten bands or garters ornament,
> He quaffes a cup of Frenchmans Helicon.
> Then royster doyster in his oylie tearmes,
> Cutts, thrusts, and foines at whomesoever he meets,
> And strews about Ram-ally meditations . . .

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. p. 233.

[2] *Ad Johannem Marstonium*, Epigram in *Affaniæ*, quoted by Warton, Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 400, and by Bullen, ed. Marston, vol. i. p. xxiv.

Brings the great battering ram of tearmes to towns
And at first volly of his cannon shot,
Batters the walles of the old fustie world." [1]

The form of the satires in these two volumes is the now familiar one of decasyllabic couplets. They are much less regular and compact than Hall's, with fewer end-stopped couplets and more irregularities of accent; the result is to some degree a gain in freedom but a great loss in smoothness and epigrammatic effect. That Marston was intentionally careless of the niceties of poetics appears from his address "Ad rhythmum," before Book II. of the *Scourge*: "My liberty scorns rhyming laws," etc. See also the "Præmium in Librum Tertium:"

"I crave no sirens of our halcyon times,
To grace the accents of my rough-hew'd rhymes."
(l. 9 f.)

In some of the satires (notably the First of the *Scourge*) the rhythm is more impossible than anything in Donne's satires.

The style is crabbed and distorted. We have already seen Mr. Collins's account of that of the Elizabethan satirists in general, and have admitted that the account is more just in the case of Marston than in others. Most of the peculiarities are in fact familiar to readers of his tragedies. "The author deliberately adopted an uncouth and monstrous style of phraseology," says Mr. Bullen; but the succeeding charge of extreme obscurity is not so well founded. As a matter of fact Marston, while not always true to his theories of perspicuity (see p. 108 above), was on the whole no more obscure (if he was as much so) than Donne and Hall; and, like the latter, he confined his worst mysteries to a few satires. Examples of his "monstrous" style may be found in the openings

[1] *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, etc., ed. W. D. Macray, p. 86. See also the passage in *What You Will*, II. 1: "You Don Kinsayder! Thou canker-eaten rusty cur!" etc.

of Satires 4 and 5,[1] the Prœmium to Book I. of SV., in SV. 2. 70 f., and 6. 1–20, 61 ff. Some of this is of course intentional burlesque, as is indicated by the old marginal note on Satire 5. 5: "Huc usque Xylinum" ("Bombast up to this point," as Bullen renders it). Some of the strange expressions will be recognized as among those vomited up by the hero of *The Poetaster*. In general, Marston's satires are much less uniform in style, and much less distinctly satirical in form, than those of his most noteworthy contemporaries. Sometimes (as in SV. 4. 113–150) he leaves the satirical vein altogether. Generally he gives the impression of striking very much at random, with a dull blade; but occasionally (as in SV. 5. 56 ff.) he is keen and vigorous. On the whole we may accept Warton's well-phrased account of his work as compared with Hall's:

"There is a carelessness and laxity in Marston's versification, but there is a freedom and facility, which Hall has too frequently missed by labouring to confine the sense to the couplet. . . . Hall's meaning, among other reasons, is not always so soon apprehended, on account of his compression both in sentiment and diction. Marston is more perspicuous, as he thinks less and writes hastily. Hall is superior in penetration, accurate conception of character, acuteness of reflection, and the accumulation of thoughts and images. Hall has more humour, Marston more acrimony. Hall often draws his materials from books and the diligent perusal of other satirists, Marston from real life. Yet Hall has a larger variety of characters."[2]

The contents of the two collections of satires are as follows:

Following *Pigmalion's Image* we have "The Author in praise of his precedent poem," a satirical passage of 46 lines, giving mock commendation of the *Pigmalion*, and clearly declaring the author's intention to censure himself. From this he will proceed to "snarl at those which do the world beguile."

Satire I. is entitled "Quædam videntur, et non sunt," and attacks various kinds of hypocrites.

Satire II. is entitled "Quædam sunt, et non videntur." It opens with an account of the affectations of contemporary satire, and proceeds to attack Puritans, flatterers, lechers, travelers, and other hypocrites.

[1] References to satires by numerals only will be understood to be to those published with *Pigmalion*; those in the *Scourge* will be indicated by "SV."

[2] Hazlitt ed., vol. iv. p. 409.

Satire III. is entitled "Quædam et sunt, et videntur," and describes the follies of Duceus the lover.

Satire IV. is entitled "Reactio," and is a reply to certain satires of Hall.

Satire V. is entitled "Parva magna, magna nulla," and shows how vice has become virtue.

The *Scourge of Villainy* opens with some stanzas called "To Detraction I present my Poesy." There follows an address "in Lectores prorsus indignos," disdaining the opinions of the crowd, and concluding with some verses to "diviner wits." Next is the prose preface "To those that seem judicial Perusers," already quoted from.

The Prœmium to Book I. is an appeal to Melancholy as the author's Muse.

Satire I. is entitled "Fronti nulla fides," and is on the general deceitfulness of "this nasty age."

Satire II. is headed "Difficile est Satiram non scribere," and is a medley of abuse of "the snottery of our slimy time."

Satire III. is headed "Redde, age, quæ deinceps risisti," and especially lashes lust and luxury.

Satire IV. is entitled "Cras," and assumes procrastination as the key of numerous sorts of vice.

The Prœmium to Book II. is a declaration of the author's independence as a satirist. It is followed by the lines "ad Rhythmum" already referred to.

Satire V. is called "Totum in toto," and treats of the prosperity of all kinds of evil.

Satire VI., headed "Hem, nosti'n?" is first of all an attack on those who have misinterpreted the author's *Pigmalion* as being written in "sad seriousness." It was written only

> "to note the odious spot
> And blemish that deforms the lineaments
> Of modern poesy's habiliments."

Even the anachronism by which Pygmalion exclaimed "O Ovid!" is declared to have been a burlesque on those poets who make Homer cite Spenser.—This serves as introduction to a general tirade against the stupidity of both poets and critics of the day.

Satire VII. is called "A Cynic Satire." It opens with a parody of an already famous line in Shakspere's *Richard III.* The theme of the satire is the loss of manhood: instead of men we have devils, clothes, sponges, lamb's fur, eels, huge oaths, water-spaniels, apes, asses, muckhills, beavers, puppets, and the like.

The Prœmium to Book III. invokes Reproof as the author's Muse.

Satire VIII., entitled "Inamorato Curio," describes the follies of those who are slaves to love and lust.

Satire IX. is headed by the old saying, "Here's a Toy to mock an Ape indeed," and deals with various aping vanities and affectations.

Satire X. (the *Satira Nova* of the second edition) is called "Stultorum plena sunt omnia," and is dedicated to "his very friend, Master E. G." This friend is called "Ned" in the text, and has been thought by Hazlitt and Bullen to be the Edward Guilpin whose *Skialetheia* was published just after the *Scourge of Villainy*. The satire is an attack on the author of *Virgidemiarum*, and as such will receive later consideration.

Satire XI. is called "Humours," and treats of various personal follies and foibles.[1]

Then follows the address "to Everlasting Oblivion," and the prose conclusion, "To him that hath perused me," signed "Theriomastix."

The type of satire here is of course that of direct rebuke, with occasional admixture of the reflective method, but never of the Horatian kind. Marston's view of satire is the one now rapidly becoming conventional, that it is a serious scourge of vice. Of the title of satirist he exclaims:

> "O title, which my judgment doth adore!
> But I, dull-spirited fat Boeotian boor,
> Do far off honor that censorian seat."
>
> (Satire 2. 3 ff.)

Of his serious purpose he speaks in the prelude "In Lectores prorsus indignos" (67 f.), and earlier in the same prelude he summons all manner of fools—

> "Castilios, Cyprians, court-boys, Spanish blocks,
> Ribanded ears, Granado netherstocks,
> Fiddlers, scriveners, pedlars, tinkering knaves,
> Base blue-coats, tapsters, broad-cloth-minded slaves"—

that he may make their "galled hides to smart." In the opening of SV. 2, he makes an unusually feeble effort to imitate the conscious indignation of Juvenal:

> "Who'll cool my rage? who'll stay my itching fist?" etc.

[1] Gerald Massey (*Secret Drama of Shakspere's Sonnets Unfolded*) supposed that in this satire Marston satirized Shakspere under the name Drusus, in connection with the reference to *Romeo and Juliet*. Grosart's notes seem to me to furnish sufficient refutation of the theory.

This conventional fury had been suggested by Donne and formally introduced by Hall; it was now becoming an established feature of all English satire based on classical models.

To say that Marston's attitude is pessimistic is to put the facts mildly. Some of the epithets that he hurls at the age in which he was fortunate enough to live have already appeared in the analysis of the satires.[1] That he was inspired by any very serious desire of promoting reform, however, it is difficult to believe. He shows an unpleasant satisfaction in dwelling on unclean details; and, as Warton observes, "the satirist who too freely indulges himself in the display of that licentiousness which he means to proscribe, absolutely defeats his own design." The most curious illustration of Marston's method of doing just this, is the *Pigmalion's Image*,—the starting-point of his satire. It is one of the most frankly indelicate poems of the period, and there is in the text nothing whatever to indicate that it is not a sincere effort after success in its own line (if we except such lines as

> "Peace, idle poesy,
> Be not obscene though wanton in thy rhymes"—

which have the appearance of a bit of sly affectation). As Mr. Bullen remarks: "It would require keener observation than most readers possess to discover in *Pigmalion* any trace of that moral motive by which the poet claimed to have been inspired." Neither he nor others, however, have sufficiently recognized the fact that in the lines following the poem, and published at the same time, the author ironically points out that his Muse has been engaged in displaying "titillations which tickle up our lewd Priapians," and proceeds to ridicule the general composition of the poem. It cannot, then, be alleged that the protestations of its satirical intent, as they appear in the *Scourge*, were after-thoughts due to criticism or repentance. Evidently, however, the interest aroused in the

[1] See S. 5; SV. 2. 104 ff; SV. 5. 18, 96 ff.

poem at the time of its popularity was not due to its satirical nature; and in 1619 it was reprinted by itself as a serious poem of passion.

Marston's view of the propriety of obscurity in satire we have already noticed in connection with Hall. As in other respects, his theory here was not consistent with his practice. In his concluding words "To him that hath perused me" he makes the conventional disclaimer of personal allusion, and backs it up by the usual observation that anyone complaining of attack thereby confesses it to be just. Some, he complains, "not knowing the nature of a satire (which is, under feigned private names to note general vices), will needs wrest each feigned name to a private unfeigned person." Of course Marston was no more ingenuous in this than most of his contemporaries. Of apparently equal sincerity is the curious dedication of the satires "to everlasting oblivion." This is to be compared with Hall's similar expressions in the "Charge to his Satires," and it may have been intended (though this explanation does not seem to have occurred to any one) as a burlesque of the latter. We have already seen that it is sometimes hard to distinguish Marston's seriousness from his burlesque. Mr. Bullen oddly remarks that while "in much of Marston's satire there is an air of evident insincerity," this dedication "is of startling earnestness;" and he calls Marston "the rugged Timon of the Elizabethan drama, who sought to shroud himself 'in the uncomfortable night of nothing.'" Most persons, however, will see nothing in the facts connected with the publication of the various editions of these satires, to indicate that the author really craved oblivion. The fact always suggests itself to a simple-minded person that oblivion is too easily had ever to be loudly demanded. The truth is, the affectation of Timon-like cynicism was one of the numerous self-interesting affectations of this period.

The sources of Marston present few important problems. That Hall's satires served as a suggestion for him we cannot

doubt, though there is no close imitation. Doubtless Marston conceived that he might use some of Hall's material with added vigor of style and heat of apparent passion. It is very likely that he was also familiar with Lodge's *Fig for Momus*. The first satire in the *Pigmalion* series, and the first in the *Scourge*, remind one of Lodge's opening satire on hypocrisy. This, however, was the starting-point of much of the satire of the period (see Hall's Prologue to Book I.). Direct evidence of familiarity with Donne's satires I have not found in Marston. It is possible that he may have imitated their ruggedness of metre, but more probable that he was imitating in his couplets the structure of contemporary dramatic blank verse.

The classical sources are not numerous. While using classical conventions Marston was for the most part thoroughly English in atmosphere and subject-matter. We have seen him quoting from Juvenal and (on the title-page) from Persius (I. 43). Two adaptations from passages in Juvenal are noted by Bullen: in SV. 1. 5 ff. (cf. Juvenal X. 221), and SV. 1. 19 (cf. Juvenal II. 95). I have no doubt that the title and motif of SV. 4 ("Cras") were taken from the fifth satire of Persius:

> "'Cras hoc fiet.' Idem cras fiet. 'Quid! quasi magnum
> Nempe diem donas?' Sed cum lux altera venit,
> Jam cras hesternum consumpsimus: ecce aliud cras," etc. (66 ff.)

The title of SV. 1 ("Fronti nulla fides") is from Juvenal II. 8. In the first three satires—especially in their titles—we have a recurrence of the distinction between "being and seeming," which has been noticed from the satire of Wyatt to that of Marston. Other classical quotations might be identified; "Stultorum plena sunt omnia" is of course from Cicero (*ad Fam.* 9. 22. 4). The subject and *motif* of SV. 5 remind us of Juvenal I. 73 f.:

> "Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris, et carcere dignum,
> Si vis esse aliquis. Probitas laudatur, et alget."

In view of Marston's evident familiarity with Persius, it may seem strange that he should not have derived more from him; but the restrained, classical style of the latter was too distant from his furious temper. In Juvenal he found what most attracted him, unlimited and almost shameless pictures of shameless lust; and about these he centered his work, as had Juvenal, while missing the severe, compact style of the latter. It is possible that from the philosophizing of Persius he may have derived some suggestion which led him to the use of a curious philosophical jargon, in part obtained from mediæval scholasticism.[1]

The English elements in Marston's satires are most noticeable in the style. His moral purpose, as conspicuously professed, is of native type. The local color is generally English. The humor is rare at best, and is chiefly of the grotesque type, suggesting mediæval origin. The occasional element of direct raillery or invective is characteristic of modern popular satire. On the other hand, the classical elements appear in the general conventional type of rebuke, representative of a personal, individual standpoint. The emphasis, too, is distinctly on private morals, fashions, and contemporary literature. In the form of the satires the conventionalized classicisms appear, without successful classicism of style. Thus we have the pagan deities, instead of native religious tone. Marston has a curious habit of reviling the morals of these classical deities[2] in a manner for which I know no parallel outside of mediæval Christian literature; though it curiously suggests the passage in Juvenal's account of the Golden Age (XIII. 40 ff.) where the morals of the gods are shown to have degenerated. One of the very few attempts at classical local color in Marston is in SV. 5. 113 ff.:

> "I'll offer to thy shrine
> An hecatomb of many spotted kine."

[1] For examples of this, see Satire 4. 87 ff., the lines "to Detraction," SV. 4. 99 ff., SV. 7. 66 ff., 123 ff., 189 ff., SV. 8. 173 ff., SV. 11. 205 ff.

[2] See Satire 1. 55 ff.; SV. 2. 21 ff.; SV. 3. 101 ff.; SV. 8. 27 ff., 149 ff.

There is great abundance of familiar mythological allusions, and also of the personal type-names. Of the latter I have noted about seventy-five (a number being, as in Hall, in Italian rather than classical form). They are used with less individual characterization than in Hall, and are derived from all sorts of classical sources. A few are made to order, and a few (such as *Matho*, *Cossus*, *Codrus*, *Mutius*) are apparently from Juvenal, but are not used with express reference to his characters. The style exhibits the free dialogue form and dramatic suggestiveness of the classics (see especially SV. 7); and sometimes there appear the ironical exaggeration and purely incidental satire of Juvenal (see "Ad Rhythmum" 15–21, and SV. 11. 115). All these things, however, reached Marston through Hall as well as from the classical satirists directly; and the influence of the former was perhaps the stronger.

The objects satirized we have already seen to be chiefly those of personal morals and fashions. Classifying as usual, we have:

Morals:

Hypocrisy and cheating, S. 1; SV. 1; SV. 3. 151 ff.; SV. 9. 126 ff.; SV. 5.

Flattery and parasitism, S. 1. 11 ff.; S. 2. 89 ff.; SV. 4. 57 ff.; SV. 7. 143 ff.

Lust, S. 1. 64 ff., 96 ff.; SV 1. 39, 58, etc.; SV. 2. 20 ff., 104 ff.; SV. 3. 29 ff.; SV. 4. 33 ff.; SV. 7. 118 ff., 158 ff.; SV. 9. 119 ff.; SV. 11. 136 ff.

Usury, S. 2. 72; SV. 4. 73 ff.

Gambling, SV 3. 11 ff.

Fortune-hunting, SV 2. 122 ff.; SV. 3. 133 ff.

Gluttony, SV 7. 32 ff.

Abuse of guardianship, SV 2. 58 ff.; SV. 3. 157.

Foreign vices, S. 2. 143 ff.; SV. 3 55 ff.

Fashions:

Follies of gallants, S. 1. 28 ff., 125 ff.; S 3; SV. 7. 18 ff.; SV. 9. 82 ff.; SV. 11. 160 ff.

Clothes, etc., S. 3. 7 ff.; SV 7. 18 ff., 31; SV 11 157 ff., 187 ff.

Tobacco, "In Lectores," 11; SV. S. 77.

Decorations of women, SV. 7. 160.
Dancing, SV. 11. 15 ff.
Theatre-going, SV. 11. 37 ff.
Fencing, SV. 11. 52.
Horse-training, SV. 11. 98 ff.

Public Affairs :

Office-seeking, S. 1. 73 ff.
Monopolies, SV. 4. 83 ; SV. 7. 33.
Oppression of tenants, SV. 2. 134 ff.

Personal Humors :

Lovers, S. 3. 53 ff.; SV. 8.
(Miscellaneous), SV. 11.

Classes :

Soldiers, S. 1. 90 ff.; SV. 7. 100 ff.; SV. 8. 77 ff.
Travelers, S. 2. 127 ff.
Physicians, SV. 1. 6, 47.
Lawyers, SV. 7. 81 ff.

Literature :

Lustful poetry, SV. 6. 23 ff.
Plagiarism, S. 1. 41 ff.; S. 2. 41 ff.; SV. 3. 127 ff.; SV. 11. 75 ff.
Critics, S. 4. 83 ff.; SV. 6. 77–100 ; SV. 9. 16 ff.; SV. 11. 105 ff.; "To Detraction ;" "In Lectores."
Balladry, SV. 4. 12–20 ; SV. 6. 40.
Writing for money, *Præmium* SV. 11. 7–12.
Elegies on dead pets, SV. 8. 1 ff.
Barnes's *Parthenophil*, SV. 8. 126.
Affectation of style, SV. 9. 40 ff.
(The passages having relation to Hall's satires are reserved for consideration under Personal Satire.)

Religion :

Transubstantiation, SV. 2. 75 ff.
Simony, SV. 5. 64.
Puritans, S. 2. 55–86 ; SV. 3. 154 ; SV. 9. 109 ff.
"Gelded" vicarages, SV. 3. 173 ;[1] SV. 5. 65.

We have still to consider the "quarrel" of Marston and Hall, so far as it appears in the satires of both. Of this much

[1] See Bullen's notes on this passage, and the note to Spenser's *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, p. 74 above.

has been written, but with much vagueness. Tradition has it that Hall began the quarrel. It must be remembered, however, that when the *Virgidemiarum* (Books I.–III.) was published, Marston—so far as we know—had never been heard of in any public manner. The *Pigmalion* is his first known publication, and even this was not entered on the Stationers' Register till May 27, 1598, two months after the entry of the second series of Hall's satires. As a matter of fact, there is nothing applicable to Marston in the first three books of *Virgidemiarum*, unless it be the ninth satire of Book I., which we have already seen has been referred to Marston, or the second of the same book, concerning which Singer made a similar suggestion. *Pigmalion* was of course not yet printed, but is conceived to have been circulating in MS. and thus to have fallen under Hall's reprobation. I am not able to see any good reason for such an assumption. We have seen that there was plenty of poetry popular at this time which might have been the object of Hall's rebuke; and if *Pigmalion* was professed from the first (as it was in its published form) as a burlesque on amorous poetry, Hall would have been as dull as a modern editor to select its author as "a new laureat" of Cupid.

In the satires following the *Pigmalion* we begin to find signs of trouble. It is very possible, and has been more than once suggested, that the attack on the obscurity of contemporary satire, in S. 2. 14–36, was leveled at Hall. In Satire 4 there is no room for doubt. Here the author plunges very early into an attack upon a

> "Vain envious detractor from the good."

He complains of Hall's derision of Markham's *Sion's Muse* (l. 34), Southwell's *Peter's Complaint* and *Marie Magdalen* (l. 37), and accuses him of railing at

> "All translators that do strive to bring
> That stranger language to our vulgar tongue."

After a passage defending Biblical poetry, he proceeds:

> "But must thy envious hungry fangs needs light
> On Magistrates' Mirror"—

which we have seen Hall attacking in I. 5. Lines 81 f.

> ("What, shall not Rosamund or Gaveston
> Ope their sweet lips without detraction?")

are of special interest. They seem to refer to Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond*, and Drayton's *Legend of Pierce Gaveston*;[1] but Bullen observes: "I cannot discover any abuse of Daniel or Drayton in Hall's satires." My attempt to identify Labeo as Drayton suggests that to search for such "abuse" is not unreasonable, and it is possible that we can find the reference to *Gaveston* in close connection with that to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. In Hall I. 5 we have:

> "Then brings he up some branded whining ghost,
> To tell how old misfortunes had him tossed.
> Then must he ban the guiltless fates above,
> Or fortune frail, or unrewarded love.
> And when he had parbrak'd his grieved mind,
> He sends him down where erst he did him find,
> Without one penny to pay Charon's hire,
> That waiteth for the wand'ring ghosts retire."

Compare this with the opening and concluding lines of Drayton's *Gaveston:*

> "From gloomy shaddowes of eternall Night,
> Shut up in Darknesse, endlesly to dwell,
> O here behold Me miserable Wight,
> Awhile releas'd, my Tragedie to tell."
>
> . . . "My Life and Fortunes lively thus exprest,
> In the sad Tenor of my Tragique Tale,
> Let me returne to the faire fields of rest,
> Thither transported with a prosp'rous gale,
> And leave the World my Destinie to view,
> Bidding it thus eternally adiew."

[1] Dr. Grosart took the allusion to be to the character of Gaveston in Marlowe's *Edward II.*, but I think this is undoubtedly a mistake.

Pierce Gaveston had been published not long before the *Virgidemiarum*, and was quite the sort of poem to be included among Hall's aspersions on contemporary literature. The only objection to this identification is that the fifth satire seems obviously to be aimed throughout at the *Mirror for Magistrates*, or at least to the work of the same author.[1] I am inclined to think, however, that Marston may at least have understood *Gaveston* to be included.

Leaving literary matters, Marston next complains of Hall's detraction of "glorious action" (109 ff.), alluding to his remarks on voyages to Guiana (IV. 3. 28–33). This fact indicates that the second series of the *Virgidemiarum* was included in Marston's material. Finally he proceeds to a parody of Hall's "Defiance to Envy," adopting many of its phrases and lines bodily; thus—"plumy pinion," "the eagle from the stairs of friendly Jove," "lead sad Pluto captive," "scour the sword of elvish champion," "summon the nymphs and Dryades," "pines of Ida," etc., etc. There is also here a reference (147 f.) to Hall's "pastorals," which serves to strengthen the supposition that he had written such poems before he undertook satire.

The *Reactio* must have awakened not a little interest, with its fairly clever parodies of Hall. We shall see later how it was referred to in Guilpin's *Skialetheia*.

If we are to believe Marston's statement, Hall's revenge for these attacks took the form of an epigram which he "caused to be pasted to the latter page of every Pygmalion that came to the Stationers of Cambridge," where he was no doubt still in residence. The epigram is nothing brilliant; Marston quotes it in full in SV. 10, with a note on the word *kinsing*: "Mark

[1] The corresponding passage in the *Mirror* (1587 ed.) is as follows:

"Then straught hee foorth his servante Morpheus calde,
On Higins here thou muste (quoth hee) attende;
The Britayne Peeres to bring (whom Fortune thralde)
From Lethian lake, and th' auncient shapes them lende;
That they may shew why, howe, they tooke theire ende."

the witty allusion to my name." The *Scourge of Villainy* was not entered on the Stationers' Register till the eighth of September, 1598, more than three months after the *Pigmalion;* but the tenth satire of the *Scourge*, replying to Hall's alleged epigram, did not appear until the edition of 1599, so that the "pasting" may have occurred after the first edition was published. Already in SV. 3. 165 ff., Marston had returned to the charge, rebuking Hall's treatment of Lollio's son in IV. 2 of the *Virgidemiarum*, and apparently casting coarse slurs upon Hall's poverty while a student at Cambridge. Immediately afterward he refers to Hall's satire on Romanism (IV. 1, 7). In the Prœmium to SV. II., we have probably another compliment looking in the same direction:

> "I cannot quote a mott Italionate,
> Or brand my satires with some Spanish term;
> I cannot with swoll'n lines magnificate
> Mine own poor worth, or as immaculate
> Task others' rhymes, as if no blot did stain,
> No blemish soil, my young satiric vein."

Here there seem to be allusions to the "Defiance to Envy", to the satires of Book I., and to the Italian motto, "Che baiar vuol, bai."[1]

In Satire 10, added in the second edition of the *Scourge*, and perhaps addressed to Edward Guilpin, we find the account of the rhymes of that

> "stinking scavenger
> Which from his dunghill be bedaubed on
> The latter page of old Pygmalion."

It is here that the alleged epigram of Hall's is quoted in full, with comment. The admiration bestowed on the *Virgidemiarum* (perhaps also the recall of the Bishops' edict against it,

[1] Or perhaps a side allusion to the author referred to by Hall as Maevio, with his "Italian mot." See p. 126 above.

if that had already occurred) evidently rankled in Marston's mind.

> "Shame to Opinion," he cries, "that perfumes his dung
> And streweth flowers rotten bones among!"

And here he seems to have had the last word. It has become common to assert that the last satire (VI. 1.) of the *Virgidemiarum* contains Hall's final rejoinder to his opponent; but this view seems to disregard the fact that all six books of Hall's satires were published,— if we may judge from the Stationers' Register,—before the first of Marston's. We have seen Marston alluding to passages in the *Biting Satires*, in one of his first series. The only possible way to assume that Hall was making any return attack in VI. 1, would be on the basis that the controversy had been going on in manuscript, before any of the satires were published; and of this we have no evidence. There is, moreover, no internal reason for connecting anything in Hall's last satire with Marston. Labeo the bad poet we have already tried to identify; whoever it was, there is nothing to indicate a man still unknown as a poet. Some have thought that the Labeo at the opening of Book VI. is a different person, viz., Marston; but it is more reasonable to assume that the character is the same except for being more typical,—still the bad poet who is the natural enemy of the satirist. There is nothing to indicate that any of the Labeo's was himself a satirist.[1]

The so-called "quarrel" of Hall and Marston, then, resolves itself largely into the form of monologue. Hall's only part in it, so far as we have direct evidence, was the epigram pasted into the copies of *Pigmalion;* and the sole evidence of this is Marston's own statement. How accurate his account may be we shall probably never know. It would be equally

[1] See Grosart's Introduction to Hall for a discussion of the Labeo-Marston theory. His view of the matter is not different from mine, except that he believes that lines 175–184 of VI. 1. have reference to Marston. Certainly if any lines are to be so explained it should be these.

interesting to know the cause of his original outbreak against his predecessor in the writing of satire. Some have suggested that it was simply the fact that Hall was his predecessor. It appears from some lines in SV. 10 (27–30) that he wished it to be supposed that he was really the earlier satirist of the two, and that Hall had outwitted him by earlier publication; this was a common device of the time. One need not seek any serious cause for unkind feeling; for it would be sufficient that Marston, intending to write satires of a somewhat furious sort, should feel that their interest would be enhanced by opportunity for personal attack, and should select his rival satirist as the most convenient object. That two parties are necessary to a quarrel is not always a doctrine of satirists.

We have finally to consider the relation of Marston's satires to his quarrel with Jonson. I quote briefly from Dr. Penniman's statement of the case:

"There exists almost unanimity of opinion that Marston's Satires were in some way the cause of the quarrel. . . Two passages in Marston's *Scourge of Villanie* contain allusions to Torquatus, and it has been accepted traditionally that Jonson is the person intended. If this interpretation of the passages is correct, then *The Scourge of Villanie* (1598) is the earliest extant literary expression of the differences between Jonson and Marston."[1]

Dr. Penniman reached the conclusion that there is strong evidence for viewing the identification of Torquatus as Jonson as the correct one. The two significant passages in Marston are as follows:

". . . I wrote the first satire, in some places too obscure, in all places misliking me. Yet when by some scurvy chance it shall come into the late perfumed fist of judicial Torquatus (that, like some rotten stick in a troubled water, hath got a great deal of barmy froth to stick to his sides), I know he will vouchsafe it some of his new-minted epithets (as *real*, *intrinsecate*, *Delphic*), when in my conscience he understands not the least part of it."[2]

[1] *The War of the Theatres*, p. 2.

[2] "To those that seem Judiciall Perusers." Bullen ed. vol. iii. p. 305.

"Come aloft, Jack! room for a vaulting skip,
Room for Torquatus, that ne'er oped his lip
But in prate of *pommado reversa*,
Of the nimble, tumbling Angelica.
Now, on my soul, his very intellect
Is naught but a curvetting sommerset." [1]

It was doubtless Jonson's attack on the first of these passages (in *The Poetaster*), together with the supposed recognition of the "new-minted epithets" as peculiarly Jonsonese, that first led to the identification. I am of the opinion, however, that the evidence does not favor its correctness. The matter was recently re-examined by the late Dr. R. A. Small, and I am indebted to his courtesy for the following abstract of his conclusions:

"In view of Jonson's express declaration that the beginning of the quarrel between him and Marston was that Marston represented him on the stage, and that Marston's first dramatic effort was almost certainly his part of *Histriomastix*, Aug., 1599, I thought it extremely improbable that any satire on Jonson existed in *The Scourge of Villainy*. The study of the satires in question made the idea a firm conviction.

"It is absurd to suppose that Tubrio (S. 1, SV. 7. 102–138, S. 2. 118), the worse than worthless pseudo-soldier can be meant for Jonson, always depicted by Marston and Dekker as a scholar and poet, dressed in plain black, never accused of drunkenness or lust, and mentioned by them as a soldier only once, and then in a casual allusion (*Satiromastix.*)

"Jack of Paris Garden (SV. 9) is an actual ape, kept at Paris Garden on exhibition, as I can easily show.

"As for Torquatus, . . . if there were no arguments against the identification of Torquatus with Jonson, it would still be very improbable; for the simple interpretation of 'Torquatus' is 'the one adorned with a neck-chain or collar' (Harper's *Latin Dictionary*), 'the one richly adorned;' the plain interpretation of 'late perfumed fist' is that it refers to the dainty hand of some fop; and the words *real*, *intrinsecate*, and *Delphic*, as Dr. Penniman himself shows, are well-known affected words of the time.

"But we have convincing evidence against the identification. In the first place Jonson's duel occurred September 22, 1598, and his trial in October; but the *Scourge* was entered September 8, 1598. Secondly, Jonson is always represented by himself, Marston, and Dekker, as modestly clad in black, and smelling not of a pomander, but of lamp-oil. Thirdly—and this by itself is conclusive—Jonson expressly declared that Marston first attacked him *in a play*; and Marston's

[1] SV. 11. 98 ff.

first play (or rather part of a play) appeared nearly a year later than the *Scourge*. (Jonson's words in Apol. Dial. to *The Poetaster* about 'three years' refer to his quarrel with Monday). The whole tone of the Torquatus passage convinces me that the reference is either to some half-educated courtly critic now incapable of identification, or, more probably, to a type-character standing for the whole class of such critics.

"Finally, in SV. 11. 98 ff., Torquatus is again described in terms that make my explanation certain. In this last-mentioned passage, Dr. Penniman apparently adopts[1] Grosart's tentative explanation that 'sommerset' is 'meant for a hidden stroke at Torquatus, *i. e.*, Jonson's adulation of Somerset;' but Robert Carr was created first Earl of Somerset in 1613, fifteen years after the date of the *Scourge of Villainy*."

It is sufficient for us to notice the various probabilities of personal allusion in these passages. Other attempted identifications, as Dr. Penniman observes, are incapable of proof.

The satires of Marston, then, are in the direct line of classical imitation, though they begin to show signs of the conventionalized or secondary imitation which must characterize a form at once popular and artificial. Insincerity is a natural element in such work, and it is this quality which does most to injure the effect of Marston's satires. Yet it is in part redeemed by that strange strength of hand and deep-shadowed coloring of style which make his dramas fascinating in spite of their familiar faults

8.—Edward Guilpin.

"Skialetheia: or, a Shadowe of Truth in certaine Epigrams and Satyres." London, 1598.

This little book was entered on the Stationers' Register September 15, 1598, only a week later than the *Scourge of Villainy*. It was published anonymously, and the author's

[1] Dr. Small here did Dr. Penniman injustice, since the latter carefully avoided any expression of acquiescence in Grosart's suggestion. It will also be observed that some of Dr. Small's objections are met by Dr. Penniman's supposition that the *Scourge* was not published immediately on entry in the Stationers' Register.

name was first pointed out by Mr. Collier, from the fact that "long passages in *Skialethia* are assigned to him in *England's Parnassus* (1600)."[1] It was first reprinted in 1843, and again by Mr. Collier and by Dr. Grosart, but is still inaccessible to most readers. Of the author nothing whatever is known, and the only other works assigned to him are some brief commendatory poems in volumes dating from 1577 to 1597. It has already been noted that he has been suspected of being the "E. G." to whom Marston dedicated his SV. 10.[2] The *Skialethia*, like the other satires of the same time, was included by Meres in his *Palladis Tamia*, and was among the fated works condemned by the prelates in 1599.

The form and style show familiarity with the author's predecessors. The metre is the usual couplet, and is fairly free and vigorous. The style is less strong than Hall's and less violent than Marston's. It shows the influence of the various earlier satirists, but has a certain virility and independence of its own. It is compact and concrete, and frequently shows skill in the adaptation of the ideas of others.

The contents of the book are a Preludium and Six Satires, followed by seventy epigrams, the last of which is signed "S. A."; it is not necessary to suppose that all of these were the work of the author of *Skialethia*.

The Prelude is semi-dramatic in atmosphere. "Give me a Doricke touch, whole semphony!" the author prays; and at the end is the direction: "Explicit the Satyres flourish before his fencing." The prelude is a protest against the lustful and enervating poetry of the day, and an account of the mission of Satire as the "antidote of sinne, the healer of luxury, the cantharides of vanity, the rack of vice, the bone-ache to lechery, the Tamberlaine of vice, the Tyborn of impiety," etc.

Satire I. follows the example of Lodge and Marston, in opening with a general tirade against the deceitfulness of the time.

> "The world's so bad that vertue's over-awde,
> And forst, poore soule, to become vices bawde."

[1] See Collier's *Misc. Tracts, Temp. Eliz.* and *Jac. I.*, No. 4. 1868.

[2] See Bullen's note on SV. 10, and Warton, ed. Hazlitt, vol. iv., p. 401.

And again :

"All things are different from their outward show."

The lies of travelers are vigorously described :

"This makes the foisting travailer to sweare,
And face out many a lie within the yeere ;
And if he have beene an howre or two aboarde
To spew a little gall ; then, by the Lord,
He hath beene in both the Indias, East and West,
Talkes of Guiana, China and the rest ;
The Straights of Gibraltare, and Ænian
Are but hard by, no, nor the Magellane :
Mandevile, Candish, yea experienst Drake
Came never neere him, if he truly crake,
Nor ever durst come where he layd his head,
For, out of doubt, he hath discovered
Some halfe a dozen of th' infinity
Of Anaxarchus worlds."

Satire II. lashes the artificial beauty of women, and gives us a view inside the Elizabethan dressing-room :

"They know your spirits and your distillations
Which make your eies turn diamonds to charm passions :
Your cerusse now grown stale, your skaine of silke,
Your philterd waters and your asses milk.
They were plaine asses if they did not know
Quicksilver, juyce of lemmons, Boras too,
Allom, oyle Tartar, whites of egges and gaules,
Are made the bawds to morphew, scurffs and scauls."

Satire III. is on the assumption of superiority by those having no claim to it, especially the newly rich.

"Th' art quite turn'd Dutch, or some outlandish lowt :
Thou hast cleane forgot thine English tong, and then
Art in no state to salute Englishmen :
Or else th' hast had some great sicknes of late,
Whose tiranny doth so extenuate
Thy fraile remembrance, that thou canst not claime
Thine old acquaintance, mothers tong, nor name
Given thee in thy baptisme."

Satire IV. is on the foolish jealousy of husbands.

Satire V. is on the follies of the city, especially the young gallants of Paul's.

"Let me alone, I prethee, in thys Cell;
Entice me not into the Citties hell:
Tempt me not forth this Eden of content
To tast of that which I shall soone repent.
Prethy excuse me: I am not alone,
Accompanied with meditation,
And calm content, whose tast more pleaseth me
Than all the Citties lushious vanity.
I had rather be encoffin'd in this chest
Amongst these bookes and papers, I protest,
Than free-booting abroad purchase offence,
And scandale my calm thoughts with discontents.
Here I converse with those diviner spirits,
Whose knowledge and admire the world inherits:
Here doth the famous profound Stagarite
With Natures mistick harmony delight
My ravish'd contemplation: I here see
The now-old worlds youth in an history:
Here may I be grave Platos auditor. . . .
If my desire doth rather wish the fields,
Some speaking painter, some poet straitway yeelds
A flower bespangled walk, where I may heare
Some amorous swaine his passions declare
To his sun-burnt love. Thus my books little case,
My study, is mine all, mine every place.'

This is one of the few passages in all the satires of this period which stand out as quotable for their own sake. It is interesting too for another reason, which will appear presently.

Satire VI. is on slavery to Opinion, as opposed to reason; this theme is made the basis for an interesting excursion into criticism of contemporary literature.

"In these our times
Some of Opinions gulls carpe at the rimes
Of reverend Chaucer: other-some do praise them,
And unto heav'n with wonders wings do raise them.
Some say the mark is out of Gowers mouth;
Others he's better than a trick of youth.
Some blame deep Spencer for his grandam words;
Others protest that in them he records
His maister-peece of cunning, giving praise
And gravity to his profound-prickt layes.

Daniel (as some holds) might mount if he list,
But others say that he's a Lucanist.
Markham is censur'd for his want of plot,
Yet others thinke that no deep stayning blot :
As Homer writ his Frogs-fray learnedly,
And Virgil his Gnats unkind Tragedy,
So though his plot be poore, his subject's rich,
And his Muse soares a Falcons gallant pitch.
Drayton's condemn'd of some for imitation,
But others say 'twas the best poets fashion,
In spight of sicke Opinions crooked doome
Traytor to kingdome mind, true judgments toomb.
Like to a worthy Romaine he hath wonne
A three-fold name affixed to the Sunne,
When he is mounted in the glorious South,
And Drayton's justly sirnamed *Golden-mouth*.[1]
The double volum'd Satyre praised is,
And lik'd of divers for his rods in pisse ;
Yet other some, who would his credite crack
Have clap'd Reactios Action on his back.
Nay, even wits Cæsar, Sidney, for whose death
The Fates themselves lamented Englands scath,
And Muses wept, till of their teares did spring
Admiredly a second Castal spring,
Is not exempt from prophanation,
But censur'd for affectation."

The Satire concludes with a personal declaration of independence :

"Let others care,
Ile play the gallant, I, the cavaleire :
Once in my dayes Ile weene and over-wene,
And cry, a *fico* for the criticke spleene !
For let them praise them, or their praise deny,
My lines are still themselves, and so am I."

The Epigrams are true ones, distinct in form from the satires. Some of them are decidedly keen and amusing.

The type of satire here is the usual one of direct rebuke, with touches (as in V. and VI.) of the reflective. The attitude toward life is in theory the conventionally pessimistic one

[1] The epithet given by Fitzgeffrey, 1596 ; see also on Drayton in the *Palladis Tamia*.

(see especially the Preludium and Satire I.), but it is relieved by pleasant thoughts and by some appreciation of the better side of the picture. Thus in the last satire it is interesting to find that the attitude of the satirist is one of commendation for the great contemporary poets, and of rebuke only for their critics. His idea of the mission of satire is sufficiently obvious from the analysis of the Preludium.

Guilpin's relations with his immediate predecessors, as already hinted, are most striking. He was evidently familiar with the work of Hall and Marston, and for the first time also we find distinct evidence of familiarity with the satires of Donne. The fine opening of Satire V., already quoted, seems to be a paraphrase of the opening of Donne's first satire. The account of the fawning gallant in Satire V. also suggests Donne's similar character. The Preludium, in its account of contemporary amorous poetry, may be in imitation of the first book of the *Virgidemiarum;* see especially the lines on

> "their whimpring sonnets, puling elegies. . .
> . . elegiack pen patheticall. .
> Tickling her thoughts with masking bawdry," etc.

The references to Aretine and Rabelais also suggest similar allusions in Hall. Satire I., as already intimated, reminds us of Lodge and Marston in its theme of "Vice maskt in a vertuous robe;" and the account of the lies of travelers is not without suggestions of earlier passages. The opening of Satire II.,—

> "Heere coms a coach: my lads, let's make a stand,
> And take a view of blazing starres at hand.
> Who's here? who's here? now, trust me, passing faire!
> Thai're most sweet ladies: mary, and so they are,"—

seems to imitate a passage in Marston's SV. 7. 160 ff.:

> "Peace, Cynic; see, what yonder doth approach;
> A cart? a tumbrel? No, a badged coach.
> What's in't? Some man. No, nor yet womankind," etc.

And the end of Satire VI., quoted above, seems to be from Marston's

> "Spite of despite and rancour's villainy,
> I am myself, so is my poesy."
> ("To Detraction.")

One may also compare Guilpin's allusion to Epictetus with that of Marston.

Further comparisons with contemporaries might be made, but enough has been cited to show that Guilpin, while sometimes original in detail, made free use of suggestions closer at hand than the classics. Of classical lore, indeed, his satires give little suggestion, beyond what was everywhere current in his time. There are few if any direct borrowings from Juvenal. The objections to the city, in Satire V., remind one of those of Umbritius, in Juvenal III.; and the parasitic flatterer crying "Oh rare my lord!" suggests another classical passage,—but it is also like one in Lodge. The allusion to a chandler stopping a mustard-pot with the petticoat of the author's Muse (that is, with his poetry), may have been suggested by the line from Persius which appeared on Marston's title-page.

The English elements in Guilpin's satires are more noticeable than in the classicists proper. His style is distinctly the Elizabethan vernacular, and the humor is apt to be of native type. The local color, too, is generally English. The classical elements are those which had already become conventionalized,—such as the reflective passages, the conservative pessimism, and the portrayal of virtues as well as vices. The emphasis, as in Hall and Marston, is almost wholly on private morals, fashions, and literature; and the point of view is individual. From the classical imitators Guilpin derived also the semi-dramatic style, and the occasional use of the type-names (about twenty in all).

Under objects satirized we find :

Morals :

Lust, (Preludium).
Hypocrisy, S. I.
Arrogance, S. III.
Jealousy, S. IV.
Slavery to "Opinion," S. VI.

Fashions :

Painted beauty, S. II.
Gallants, S. IV., V.
Affectation of manner, S. III.
Foreign fashions, S. V.

Literature :

Contemporary poetry, Preludium ; S. VI.
Critics, S. VI.
Elderton the balladist, S. V.

In the analysis of Satire VI., already given, Guilpin's views on literature are set forth. The reference of most interest to us is that to the "Double-Volum'd Satyre,"—evidently the two books of *Virgidemiarum*—and Marston's "Reactios Action." The expression "rods in pisse" has been thought by many to be a distinct allusion to Marston's SV. 1. 44, where the same phrase is used ; but while Guilpin's use of the phrase may have been suggested by that of Marston, his application of it is clearly to Hall ; and on the other hand, there is no suggestion of any reference to Hall in the passage in Marston. The phrase seems to be an equivalent for "rods in pickle," that is, "punishment in preparation."

There is no personal satire now intelligible in the *Skialetheia* (as there is none on public affairs or religion), except in connection with literature. Mr. Collier thinks that one of the Epigrams (24) following the Satires, is directed at Marston under the name of Fuscus, who "had taught his Muse to scold ;" but he does not give evidence. In like manner he speaks of Guilpin as showing animosity toward both Marston and Hall,[1] but I am not able to see that such an expression is warranted. The author of *Skialetheia* seems, on the whole, to have been a fairly amiable satirist.

The occasion of this work is more clearly artificial than any we have met with, and it serves to represent the increased

[1] *Rarest Books*, vol. ii. p. 101.

conventionalization and imitativeness of the formal satire at this time. The original model is still in the classics, but it is not directly in sight. Guilpin's originality of detail, however, redeems his satires from the dullness of second-rate imitation.

9.—"T. M." (*Micro-cynicon.*)

"Micro-cynicon. Sixe Snarling Satyres. Insatiat Cron, Prodigall Zodon, Insolent Superbia, Cheating Droone, Ingling Pyander, Wise Innocent. Adsis pulcher homo canis hic tibi pulcher emendo." London, 1599.

This little book, which belongs in the group of satires published at the height of the satirical fashion and soon condemned to be burned, was evidently published in the early part of 1599. The introductory verses are signed "T. M. Gent.," and it has been common to attribute the work, on this basis, to Thomas Middleton. Mr. Bullen has followed the tradition, regretfully and perhaps unnecessarily, and has included the satires in his edition of Middleton. Mr. Collier long ago called attention to the fact that "T. M." calls himself "the author's mouth," and speaks of the author as defying the hatred of Envy *more* than he himself does,—expressions which suggest that the author of the satires was not T. M.[1] Another reason, Mr. Collier said, "for thinking that T. M. . . . was only the author's friend," is the fact that "his 'defiance to Envy' is followed by what bears the title expressly of 'the Author's Prologue;'" but this argument cannot be regarded as of any weight. Mr. Hazlitt also rejects the Middleton authorship of *Micro-cynicon*, and would assign it, on the basis of the "T. M.," to Thomas Moffatt.[2] There is no internal evidence which can be called satisfactory.

If this was the work of Middleton it was his earliest known publication, except perhaps *The Wisdom of Solomon Para-*

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. pp. 283 f.

[2] Ed. Warton, vol. iv. p. 411.

phrased, which is also of doubtful authorship. It was in 1599 that Middleton began his connection with the stage, and it would be quite after the manner of other young writers that he should turn to the satirical fashion of the day. Whoever wrote it, we have seen that the *Micro-cynicon* was condemned very soon after publication. Mr. Collier thought that a reference in the sixth satire to attempts to stop the author's career as satirist, was an allusion "to certain threats of punishment which had been held out to the satirists . . before the extreme measure of burning Marston's two books was resorted to."[1]

The form of these satires is the usual couplet, somewhat careless and irregular in structure. The style is in like manner somewhat careless, and of the vernacular order. Bullen says, following the usual theory, that the author "thought it necessary to adopt a rugged rhythm and barbarous phraseology;" but except in the introductory "Defiance to Envy" and "Prologue" there is little barbarous phraseology of the Marstonian order, and I know no evidence that the ruggedness of rhythm was intentional. Except in the last satire the style is generally free from obscurity, but for the most part it lacks skill, vigor, and point.

The contents are as follows:

His Defiance to Envy (signed T. M. Gent).

Author's Prologue (boasting of his satirical venom).

Satire I. "Insatiate Cron:" avarice, and the rule of gold.

Satire II. "Prodigal Zodon:" the son of Cron, who rose from low conditions; his lust and prodigality result in his fall.

Satire III. "Insolent Superbia:" proud women; their dress, fashionable life, envy of one another, and cruelty to servants.

Satire IV. "Cheating Droone:" the story of how Droone takes a stranger in London to a tavern, entertains him, and then steals his money.

Satire V. "Ingling Pyander:" who goes about town disguised as a beautiful girl, and deceives unwary lovers.

Satire VI. "Wise Innocent:" a piece of difficult and ingenious dialogue based on the words "innocent," "fool," and "ass," with an Epilogue stating the moral in equally obscure terms.

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. pp. 300 f.

The Prologue and Epilogue refer to these satires as "the First Book," but, as Mr. Bullen remarks, "happily no more than the first book has come down."

The author evidently started out with the idea of writing conventional "snarling satires" against the follies of the world. In Satire I. he gives the usual account of the age gone astray,

> "Ranging the briery deserts of black sin."

His discussion of avarice and greed leading him to give a picture of Cron the usurer, he is turned aside into a series of character sketches of London life—not unlike what Middleton shows a fondness for in his dramas—and we frequently lose the proper satirical form. In Satires III., IV. and V., the form is distinctly narrative, and not of the conventional type. See especially the passage in II.:

> "When welcome spring had clad the hills in green,
> And pretty whistling birds were heard and seen,
> Superbia abroad gan take her walk;"
>
> (29 ff.)

and the tavern scene in Satire IV. The attitude toward life, then, while frequently that of conventional pessimism, is by the author's preference one of easygoing observation, with such friendly moralization as—

> "The cheater had his prey:
> Be wise, young heads, care for an after-day!"
>
> (IV. 87 f.)

The writer of *Micro-cynicon* was evidently familiar with contemporary satire, though he did not borrow much from it, since he was really writing in a different manner. He started out with an imitation of Hall's "Defiance to Envy," and (in the Prologue) another imitation of Marston's artificial rage. There is in Satire V. 93 a reference to "doting Pygmalion," which suggests Marston again; and Zodon, in Satire II., reminds us of the character in IV. 2 of the *Virgidemiarum*. The sugges-

tions of classical satire are even fewer. At the head of Satire I. is a quotation from Horace's Satires (II. 2. 103): "Cur eget indignus quisquam, te divite?" The account of the cross mistress and her servants in III. 101 ff. reminds one of Juvenal VI. 456 ff., but not conclusively. At the end of the satires is a quotation from Ovid's *Metamorphoses;* the Latin on the title-page I can neither translate nor refer to a source. Clearly "T. M.," if he be the satirist, shows little classical inspiration.

It is the English elements, then, that are most noticeable in these satires. It is true that the emphasis is wholly on private morals and fashions, and that the satire is purely individual in its point of view; but these are by this time mere conventionalities. The style is English; the narrative element lacks the abrupt, rapid method of classical satire; the type-names are few and generally non-classical. The local color is distinctly English (see especially the account of the dinner in III., of Paul's Church in IV. 7, and the whole scene of the narrative in IV.). Humor is generally lacking, save in the descriptive details of Satire IV.

Under objects satirized we have:

Morals:

Avarice and greed, I.
Usury, I. 83.
Prodigality, II.
Lust, II. 58 ff.
Envy, III. 73 ff.
Pride, III.
Cheating, IV., V.

Fashions and Follies:

Clothes of a young gallant, II. 15 ff., IV. 1 ff.
Women's clothes and vanities, III. 1 ff., 67 ff.
A fashionable dinner, III. 37–72.
Youths disguised as girls, V.

No personal satire is now distinguishable. There may have been references obvious to contemporaries, but the effect is one of generalization.

In these satires we move still further from the satire of direct classical imitation. They were clearly experiments in a fashionable form unsuited to the author's taste or talent. Middleton was far from being a moralist, and the author of *Micro-cynicon* was like him in so far, if it was not he himself.

Soon after the publication of the *Micro-cynicon* came the great attack upon the satirists from the ecclesiastical authorities. It seems to have been determined that a censorship of the press in several directions must be carried on more strictly than heretofore. Whatever the cause, we find in the Stationers' Register for June 1, 1599, the following entry:

"Satyres tearmed Halles Satyres viz virgidemiarum or his toothles or bitinge Satyres

Pigmalion with certaine other Satyres

The scourge of villanye

The Shadowe of truthe in Epigrams and Satyres

Snarlinge Satyres

. . . [and others]

That noe Satyres or Epigrams be printed hereafter

That noe English historyes be printed excepte they bee allowed by some of her majesties privie Counsell

That noe playes be printed excepte they bee allowed by suche as have aucthorytie

That all Nasshes bookes and Doctor Harvyes bookes be taken wheresoever they maye be found and that none of theire bookes bee ever printed hereafter

That thoughe any booke of the nature of theise heretofore expressed shal be broughte unto yow under the hands of the Lord Archebisshop of Canterburye or the Lord Bishop of London yet the said booke shall not be printed untill the master or wardens have acquainted the said Lord Archbishop, or the Lord Bishop with the same to knowe whether it be theire hand or no

Jo Cantuar

Ric London

Suche bookes as can be found or are allready taken of the Argumentes aforesaid or any of the bookes above expressed lett them bee presently broughte to the Bishop of London to be burnte

Jo Cantuar

Ric London

Sic examinatur"

And two or three days later, under 4 June, is this entry:

"Theis bookes presently thereuppon were burnte in the hall viz

Pygmalion

The scourge of vilany

the shadowe of truthe

Snarling Satires
. . [etc.]
Theis staid
Caltha Poetarum
Halls Satires
Willobies Adviso to be Called in"[1]

In 1600 was published "*The Transformed Metamorphosis*, by Cyril Turner,"—his first acknowledged publication, so far as is known. It would not require consideration here were it not for the fact that it has been included by some in the category of the formal satires of this period, together with those of Marston, Hall, and the others. Mr. Saintsbury does this in his *Elizabethan Literature*, doubtless following Mr. Churton Collins in his edition of Tourneur. Mr. Collins says in his introduction to the poem: "The poem is in the first place a satire, as Tourneur has condescended to inform us himself (see the fourth sonnet prefixed to it)."[2] It appears from other allusions that by "the fourth sonnet"—which is not a sonnet—Mr. Collins means the latter half of the author's address "to the Reader," which runs:

> "Yet seeke I not to touch as he that seekes
> The publike defamation of some one;
> Nor have I spent my voide houres in three weekes
> To shew that I am unto hatred prone;
> For in particular I point at none:
> Nay I am forced my lines to limit in
> Within the pale of generalitie: . . .
> Who finds him touch't may blame himself not me
> And he will thanke me, doth himselfe know free."

This undoubtedly sounds much like the conventional introduction to the satires of the period, and very likely owes something to them; but I am not able to find the lines where the author is said "to inform us himself" that the poem is a satire. Its form suggests nothing of the kind, for it is in seven-line stanzas instead of couplets, and in the manner of a semi-allegorical narrative. It may be well to quote a part of Mr. Collins's own analysis:

"The first six stanzas represent the poet as looking on a miserable and corrupted world; . . . in the fourth stanza he identifies himself with that world which has been changed or metamorphosed from its pristine purity. He describes how there is a general conspiracy against the Reformed Church on the part of the great powers, *i. e.*, Spain and the Papacy. But Heaven is asleep, and sees not the danger in which its earthly concerns are standing. . . . The next three stanzas obviously describe the corrupt Church of Rome. . . . From

[1] Arber's *Transcript*, vol. iii. p. 677 f.
[2] Tourneur's Plays and Poems, vol. ii. p. 178.

stanza 43 to 50 describes the metamorphosis of the Church from its virgin purity to pollution and corruption. . . . From stanza 57 to stanza 71 is an allegorical sketch of Essex's Irish campaign." The conclusion Mr. Collins thinks deals with the coming of James as the defender of Protestantism.

It is evident that the only important element which the poem has in common with the formal satires of the period is its general picture of the corruptions of the times. There is no objection, indeed, to calling it a satire in some sense; but its method and contents are on the whole quite distinct from the form which was called by that name in 1600. From Marston Tourneur may, as Mr. Collins assumes, have derived suggestions for his extraordinary vocabulary, but for the general method of the poem he was chiefly indebted to Spenser (compare especially the account of Mavortio's encounter with the grisly beast Hyenna). The allusions to classical mythology are numerous, but there is little, if any, reminiscence of classical satire.

At this point we should also notice the series of satirical poems by Nicholas Breton, published in 1600. They were *Pasquil's Madcap* (entered on Stationers' Register March 20), *Pasquil's Foolscap* (May 10), *Pasquils Mistresse*, and *Pasquils Passe, and passeth not* (May 29).[1] Like the *Transformed Metamorphosis*, these poems are satirical in content (much more so, indeed, than Tourneur's poem) but are not formal satires. They are largely in the seven-line stanza, and show Breton's usual fluent, sententious style. Dr. Brinsley Nicholson suggests (in his marginal notes to Grosart's edition) that they were "incited by Hall's and Marston's satires," and they certainly cover much of the ground—in the objects satirized—which we have already been over. The opening division of the "Madcap" is called "An Invective against the Wicked of the Worlde," and deals with the dominion of wealth and greed—as shown among gentlemen, soldiers, clergy, lawyers, women, etc. The succeeding "Mes-

[1] The name "Pasquil" is a familiar one during the second half of the sixteenth century. It had now become a sort of personification, like *Momus* and similar expressions. I quote from Thomas Wright's brief account of its origin:

"A mutilated ancient statue was accidentally dug up in Rome, and it was erected on a pedestal not far from the Ursini Palace. Opposite it stood the shop of a shoemaker, named Pasquillo, or Pasquino. . . . This Pasquillo was notorious as a facetious fellow, and his shop was usually crowded by people who went there to tell tales and hear news; and as no other name had been invented for the statue, people agreed to give it the name of the shoemaker, and they called it Pasquillo. It became a custom, at certain seasons, to write on pieces of paper satirical epigrams, sonnets, and other short compositions, . . . and these were published by depositing them with the statue, whence they were taken and read. . . . The name of Pasquil was soon given to the papers which were deposited with the statue, and eventually a *pasquil*, or *pasquin*, was only another name for a lampoon or libel. . . . A collection of these pasquils was published in 1544 in two small volumes."—*History of Caricature and Grotesque*, pp. 312 f.

sage" to the author's Muse, directing her to "go abroad and beat the world about," takes up the vices of the time under all possible classes and professions, after the manner of the early satires of fools. In like manner *Pasquil's Fool-cap* is an exhaustive classification of follies. In *Pasquil's Passe* we have a "Precession" of all manner of undesirable persons, in the form of a Litany praying, "from each of these the Lord deliver me;" while the "Prognostication" shows how Doomsday may be predicted by the disappearance of various forms of vice and folly. There is nothing of the method of classical satire in all of this, but some very keen criticism of contemporary life. For the most part, as in all of Breton's work, the tone is milder and more amiable than is usual in formal satire. Breton's doctrines on this matter we shall see in a moment.

In 1601 was published a piece of satire primarily personal, called *The Whipping of the Satyre* (entered on the Stationers' Register, August 14, 1601). It has not been reprinted, and I have been unable to see a copy; I therefore avail myself of Mr. Collier's account of the book.[1] It opens with a prose address "To the vayne-glorious, the Satyrist, Epigrammatist, and Humorist," signed W. I. Mr. Collier thought the author might be John Weever (the initials being reversed, as frequently); Dr. Brinsley Nicholson believed it was William Ingram of Cambridge.[2] According to Mr. Collier, the satire is directed principally against Marston, Jonson and Breton. "None of the three poets . . . are mentioned by name, but they are sufficiently indicated by pointed allusions, and by the mention of their productions. Thus . . . we meet with these lines:

> 'But harke, I heare the Cynicke Satyre crie,
> A man, a man, a Kingdom for a man!'

This exclamation is from Marston's *Scourge of Villainy*. Again, . . . W. I. says:

> 'He scourgeth villanies in young and old,
> As boys scourge tops for sport on Lenten day.'

The allusions to Ben Jonson and Nicholas Breton are rendered even more distinct by marginal notes, and are contained in the division of W. I.'s work headed, '*In Epigrammatistam et Humoristam*,' where we meet with the following stanzas, a form of writing that is observed throughout:

> 'It seemes your brother *Satyre*, and ye twayne,
> Plotted three wayes to put the Divell downe:
> One should outrayle him by invective vaine:
> One all to flout him like a country clowne;
> And one in action on a stage out-face,
> And play upon him to his great disgrace.

[1] *Rarest Books*, vol. iv. pp. 253 ff.

[2] See Edmonds's Introduction to Breton's *No Whipping*, etc., p. ix.

> ' You Humorist, if it be true I heare,
> An action thus against the Divell brought,
> Sending your humours to each Theater,
> To serve the writ that ye had gotten out.
> That Mad-cap yet superiour praise doth win,
> Who, out of hope, even casts his cap at sin.'

At the bottom of the page, with marks of reference, are two notes 'Against the booke of Humours' and ' Pasquil's Mad-cap.' "[1]

Marston is generally thought to have undertaken to reply to this attack, and to have done so in a pamphlet called *The Whipper of the Satyre his pennance in a white Sheete: or, The Beadles Confutation.* This was entered on the Stationers' Register November 6, 1601. (See Collier, as above.)

The third member of this little group is called *No Whippinge, nor trippinge: but a kinde friendly Snippinge.* Like the two previous volumes, it was published in 1601, and has generally been thought (as Mr. Collier has it) to have been later than both the others; it was entered on the Register, however, on September 14, nearly two months before *The Whipper.* It is generally agreed to be the work of Nicholas Breton, and was reprinted as such in the Isham Reprints (No. 3). It is a protest, in Breton's usually gentle vein, against the bitternesses of personal satire.

"It was my happe of late," he says, "passing through Paules Church yarde, to looke upon certaine pieces of Poetrye, where I found (that it greeves me to speake of) one writer so strangely inveigh against another, that many shallow wits stoode and laught at their follies." He is therefore led to counsel more kindly methods. He refers to the satirical fashion of the time:

> "'Tis strange to see the humors of these daies:
> How first the Satyre bites at imperfections:
> The Epigrammist in his quips displaies
> A wicked course in shadowes of corrections:
> The Humorist hee strictly makes collections
> Of loth'd behaviours both in youthe and age:
> And makes them plaie their parts upon a stage."

Among these satires he includes his own *Madcap*, but later in the poem he declares:

> "And for poore Mad-cap, I dare sweare as much:
> In all the compasse of a little wit,
> It meant no one particular to touch."

[1] Dr. Grosart says of this production (in his ed. of Hall, Intro., p. xxvi.): "Whoever was its author (William Ingram, probably) Hall gave whatever of thin inspiration there was in it and to it." He gives no evidence, and no one else seems to have made the discovery.

Even *Madcap* was too severe :

> "Would to God it had ben so in deed,
> The Satyres teeth had never bitten so :
> The Epigrammist had not had a seede
> Of wicked weedes, among his herbes to sowe ;" etc.

It is not the business of poetry, he even maintains, to give itself to reproof :

> "The Preachers charge is but to chide for sinne,
> While Poets steppes are short of such a state."

He is no scholar ("My masters gowne deserves no face of Satine"), save in the school of life ("My Librarie is but experience"): yet he will venture to advise his fellow-writers in favor of more peaceable style.

> "Let all good wits, if any good there be,
> Leave trussing and untrussing of their points,
> And heare thus much (although not learne) of me,
> The spirits that the Oyle of Grace annoyntes,
> Will keep their senses in those sacred joynts,
> That each true-learned, Christian-harted brother
> Will be unwilling to offend another. . . .
>
> "Let us then leave our biting kinde of verses ;" etc.

It is a cause for congratulation that this little book should have been rediscovered and reprinted, as evidence of a hearty contemporary protest against the rancorous satire which was coming into fashion at the very end of the sixteenth century.

10.—Samuel Rowlands.

"The Letting of Humours Blood in the Head-Vaine. With a new Morisco, daunced by seaven Satyres, upon the bottome of Diogines Tubbe." London. 1600.

This book was the work of Samuel Rowlands, one of the most prolific of popular writers in London during the first decade of the seventeenth century. Of his life practically nothing is known. It would be of interest to know whether he was a university man ; as Mr. Gosse observes, the evidence

would indicate that he was not.[1] He had published but one volume earlier than the *Letting of Humours Blood*, viz.: *The Betraying of Christ; Poems on the Passion* (*1598*). The epigrams in the *Letting of Humours Blood* seem to have given offence through personal allusions, and there is a record in the Stationers' Register[2] of the fining of twenty-nine stationers (*2s. 6d.* each) for "their Disorders in buying of the bookes of *humours letting blood in the vayne* being new printed after yt was first forbydden and burnt."

The form of Rowlands's satires is that of the usual satirical verse, in this case decidedly smooth and vigorous. There is an unusual number of feminine endings for the couplet of the period. Mr. Gosse refers to the metre as being under the influence of Lodge, Hall, etc., and says further of Rowlands:

> "He is, however, in some respects the superior of these preceding writers. . . He was seduced by no desire of emulating Persius into those harsh and involved constructions which make the satires of Donne and Marston the wonder of grammarians.
>
> . . "There are lines in this passage (from *Humour's Looking Glasse*) which Pope would not have disdained to use. It might, indeed, be employed as against that old heresy, not even yet entirely discarded, that smoothness of heroic verse was the invention of Waller. As a matter of fact, this, as well as all other branches of the universal art of poetry, was understood by the great Elizabethan masters; and if they did not frequently employ it, it was because they left to such humbler writers as Rowlands an instrument incapable of those noble and audacious harmonies on which they chiefly prided themselves."[3]

Rowlands's style is best characterized as being unadulterated vernacular. It is noticeably concrete; the author always wrote with his eye on his object. (Thus see his description of the Usurer, and of "Contempt.") He always seems to have tried to give vivid pictures of real life, and is usually successful. Artificial elements of style—conceits, and the like—are lacking.

[1] Introduction to Hunterian Club ed. of Rowlands.

[2] Vol. ii. p. 832.

[3] Introduction to Rowlands, pp. 16 f.

The Letting of Humours Blood opens with thirty-seven epigrams, some of which might well pass for true satires. Following these is this dramatic transition :

> " Your Sceane is done, depart you Epigrammes :
> Enter Goate-footed Satyres, butt like Rammes :
> Come nimbly foorth, Why stand you on delay ?
> O-ho, the Musique-tuning makes you stay.
> Well, frisk it out nimbly : you slaves begin,
> For now me thinkes the Fidlers handes are in."

The satires are seven in number :

I. A Gull, dressed in fine clothes, is described as walking in Paul's Church, and telling all manner of lies.

II. The hypocrisy of those who cry " God save you sir " to their worst enemies. This, illustrated by the intercourse of usurers with their victims, leads to a description of a grasping, filthy money-lender.

III. The account of the serving-man of a gentlewoman ; his affectations of dress and manner, his card-tricks, superstition, and practice of alchemy.

IV. On " Eloquence," that is, the use of high-sounding words, skill in which has spread from city gallants to country youth. The speech of a country fellow trying to use legal language is burlesqued ;[1] also his love-letter to his " Honny-suckle."

V. " Contempt " is described,—always falsely professing virtue, slandering the innocent, and stirring up strife. His personal appearance is pictured.

VI. is an account of jolly William and his praises of drink.

> " As for nine Worthies on his Hostes wall
> He knowes three worthy drunkards passe them all :
> The first of them in many a Taverne tride,
> At last subdued by *Aquavitæ*, dide.
> His second Worthies date was brought to fine,
> Feasting with Oysters and brave Rennish wine.
> The third, whom divers Dutchmen held full deere,
> Was stabb'd by pickeld Hearinges and strong Beere."

VII. The triumph of Vice over Virtue. Dissimulation and Cozenage win the day.

> " The world is naught, and now upon the ending,
> Growes worse and worse, and fardest off from mending."

Seven grand devils rule the world : Pride, Covetousness, Lechery, Envy, Wrath, Gluttony, and Sloth.

[1] It is amusing to find here the counterpart of a joke which has lately gone the rounds of the newspapers : the young man asks to be appointed his father's " executioner," on the ground that the latter " died detestable."

Obviously the type of satire here, as in the *Micro-cynicon*, is not primarily that of severe rebuke (much less that of reflection), but of easy narrative. The conventional pessimism of contemporary satire is rare, and serves merely as an introduction to character sketches. Neither is the author formal enough to have any fixed ideal of satire. His "satyres" are "goat-footed," and will act only when the music pleases them.

One cannot doubt that Rowlands was familiar with contemporary satire. From this, rather than from the classics, he derived the idea and name of the form. But his genius was too unconventional to borrow more than general ideas. A couplet in Satire III.,—

> "His dinner he will not presume to take
> Ere he aske counsell of an Almanacke,"—

may have been suggested by II. 7. 19 ff. of the *Virgidemiarum*. And with the reference to him

> "That wrappes up Vices under Vertues gowne"

may be compared several similar expressions, already noticed, on the same theme. In general Hall, and even Marston, must have seemed too formal for Rowlands. With "T. M." he was perhaps more closely allied. Of classical suggestion there is almost nothing. There is none of the usual classical machinery. The local color is always that of London. The emphasis, to be sure, is on private morals and fashions, and the point of view is rather individual than public; but these are now conventions. When Rowlands touches religious matters (as at the end of Satires I. and VII.) he is orthodox and English. In the epigrams he sometimes follows the mode of type-names in classical form, but not familiarly or by preference; and in the satires there are no such names. "Kind-Heart," "Mistress What d'ye call," "Cobbin," "Ynkhorne," "Cloth breech," "Contempt," "Rashness," "Good-

man Trollopp," and the like, are the characters of the satires. The style, as has already been made clear, is never on the classical model. The humor is almost wholly of the descriptive order; when formal satire is attempted (as in VII.) there is no humor at all. The use of the Seven Deadly Sins, and of the allegorical names, is suggestive of very early literature.

The objects satirized are to be classified almost wholly under Morals and Fashions. The absence of literary satire is by this time noticeable. The subjects treated are frequently the conventional ones, which go back ultimately to Juvenal; but they are perfectly translated into modern terms. (See, for example, the treatment of astrology in Satire III.)

Under Morals we have:

Lying, I.
Hypocrisy, II., V., VII.
Usury, II.
Pride and arrogance, III.
Superstition, III.
Slander, V.
Drunkenness, VI.
Gluttony, VII.
Avarice, VII.
Lust, VII.
Envy, VII.
Quarrelsomeness, V., VII.

Fashions:

Alchemy and astrology, III.
Tobacco, VI.
Women's clothes, VII.

Classes:

Travelers, I.
Money-lenders, II.
Merchants, VII.

Rowlands, then, is chiefly interesting as showing how the formal satire was made use of, when it had become an accepted

fashion, by a man wholly removed from the classical spirit and desirous only of giving pictures of contemporary life. He was not by nature a satirist. As Mr. Gosse says:

"Rowlands is never immoral, he is rarely indecent; his attitude towards vice of all sorts is rather indifferent, and he assumes the judicial air of a satirist with small success. He has neither the integrity nor the savagery that is required to write satire; he neither indulges in the sensual rage of Donne, nor the clerical indignation of Hall; he is always too much amused at vice to be thoroughly angry with it."[1]

In conclusion, we should notice the other satirical works of Rowlands. None of them were formally called satires, but they all illustrate his satirical method.

In 1604 was published *Looke to It; for Ile Stabbe ye.* This is a series of "stabs" supposed to be promised by Death, against "Tyrant Kings, Wicked Magistrates, Curious Divines, Covetous Lawyers, Up-start Courtier, Wealthie Cittizens, Greedy Usurer, Cursed Swearers, Phisitions of the Quacksalvers crew, Gentlemen of base broode, Counterfayte Captaine, Dissembling Souldier," and the like.

In 1608 was published *Humors Looking Glasse.* It was declared to be

> "A mirrour of the mad conceited shapes
> Of this our ages giddy-headed apes."

It consists of some twenty pieces, most of the type of epigrams and anecdotes, dealing with various foibles and follies of the day.

Best known of Rowlands's works were those of the "Knave" series: *Knave of Clubbes* (1609), *Knave of Harts* (1612), *Knaves of Spades and Diamonds* (1613). The first of these is a series of rough but vigorous pictures of London life. The second is a more orderly description of a series of knaves, in regular satirical verse,—as, "a proud knave," "a lying knave," "a whoring knave," etc.; these being followed by a number of less formal pieces. The third book of Knaves is of a more dignified satirical character than either of the others. It includes reflections and illustrations of a number of wise saws; aspersions on tobacco, Machiavellianism, usury, gluttony, the seven deadly sins, etc.

Finally, in 1615, appeared *The Melancholie Knight*, a burlesque portrait of an impecunious young gentleman of the period, inspired by the romances of Sir Launcelot, Sir Guy, and King Arthur, and lamenting that he is not appreciated because of the sordid character of the prevalent demand for money. The sketch is an extremely clever one. It concludes with specimens of the Knight's romantic poetry, and is to be associated with the evidence we have already met showing that the qualities of romanticism were at this time subject to considerable ridicule.

[1] Introduction, p. 23.

Mr. Gosse observes that *The Melancholie Knight* shows the influence of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.*

At this point should be mentioned *The Owl* of Michael Drayton, a poem satirical in content, though not a formal satire on the classical model. It was published in 1604, and is frequently said to have been written as a result of Drayton's vexation at the reception of his poem in honor of James's accession ; but it appears on his own testimony that *The Owl* was written before the latter poem. It is after the manner of Spenser's *Mother Hubbard's Tale*, under the influence of which it must have been produced. Through the mouth of the owl the public and private vices of the bird kingdom are severely arraigned. There must have been included many contemporary allusions whose significance cannot now be appreciated, but it is to be noted that the character of the king (that is, the Eagle) is never attacked. It is he, indeed, who gives the final summary of admonitions against the evils which have beset his kingdom :

> "Let your wise Fathers an example give,
> And by their Rules learn thriftily to live.
> Let those weake Birds, that want wherewith to fight,
> Submit to those that are of grip and might.
> Let those of power the weaker still protect,
> So none shall neede his safety to suspect ;
> Suppressing those enormities that are,
> Whose cure belongs unto our Soveraigne care.
> For when wealth growes into a few Mens hands,
> And to the Great, the poore in many Bands ;
> The pride in Court doth make the Country leane,
> The abject rich hold ancient Honour meane.
> Mens wits employ'd to base and servile shifts,
> And Lay-men taught, by learn'd Mens subtill drifts,
> Ill with this State 't must incidently fare . . .
> Shun beastly Lust (you young well-feathered Fowle)
> That wounds the Body, and confounds the Soule ; . . .
> And you that sit as Judges of the Law,
> Let not vile Gayne your equall Ballance draw." [1]

The title-page of the 1619 edition of Drayton's poems is embellished by an engraving representing four figures of equal size and dignity,—one a plumed warrior-Minerva, one a player on a lyre, one a shaggy satyr, and one a shepherd with pipe and crook. These must have been intended to represent heroic, lyric, satiric,

[1] For a possible source of this poem, see p. 192 below.

and pastoral poetry. *The Owl* is the only poem in the volume which could properly be called a satire; but later (in 1627, together with *The Battle of Agincourt*, etc.), Drayton published *The Moon-calf*, which is generally mentioned as his second satirical effort. It is based on the old motto, "Stultorum plena sunt omnia," and represents the world as giving birth to twin monsters, in the description of which the usual follies and vices of contemporary life are introduced. The latter part of the satire consists of four fables whose morals are explained as relating to the great vices of the age.

In 1608 were published "*Epigrams and Satyres*: made by Richard Middleton of Yorke, Gentleman." Of this little book a single copy has survived in the Drummond collection at the University of Edinburgh; forty copies were reprinted in 1840. Nothing is known of the author; but Hazlitt supposed it was the same person as the Middleton who was Chaplain to Charles I. when he was Prince of Wales, and who published in 1609 a volume of sermons called *The Key of David*. I do not see that the identification is probable.

The verse is the usual decasyllabic couplet, employed with small skill; and the style is generally commonplace and lacking in both force and pointedness. The Dedication is addressed to "William Bellasses," and professes the usual satiric wrath:

> "If you deeme my stile too petulant,
> (Outstripping th' limits of chast modesty,)
> Or think mine elate verse too insolent,
> (Shrouding great men's crimes in dishonestie.)
> Thinke that the passion to describe the error
> Of such apparent mischief, sweld in time
> To a deformed Chaos, makes a terror
> In patienst breasts, much more in Satyre's Ryme."

The epigrams are fifty in number, and are in true epigrammatic form, addressed in Latin, "ad Lectorem," "in Ebrium," "in Mercatorem," etc. Many are extremely coarse. What the author evidently called satires are included under *Time's Metamorphosis*, with a separate title-page. They are without individual titles, and would more properly be called epigrams. They are in fact a series of brief character-sketches, generally in apostrophic form. The idea of the title is expressed by the motto:

> "Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis,"

with the comment:

> "Ovid, thy writ is true: times changed then,
> But much more now amongst this race of men."

The characters are—

1. Equestro, unworthy of his knighthood.
2. Cassius, the lustful.

3. "Sinstering" Sylvio.
4. Lustful Liberio.
5. Pulchrino, too proud to recognize his friends, but badly in debt.
6. Barbato, who thinks he can become a grave poet by wearing a beard.
7. Collegio, the young gallant.
8. Luscus, a proud fool.
9. Sapientio, whose excellence is wholly in his clothes and long hair.
10. Zano, the actor, whose wife chose him on the stage.
11. Centurio, a degenerate law-student.
12. Ridentius, a worthless playwright.
13. Graccius, a brawler.
14. Calphurnius, a fluent poet, who is urged to write on the rebellion in Ireland, but wisely declines.

15 is "a more generall criticke"—of Pandulphoe the proud attorney, Stadius the usurer, Tatius the thief, luxurious Pantalia, etc.

16 is the author's meditation on the various misconceptions and criticisms to be expected among his readers.

> "No, judicious spirits,
> I envy no man, or maligne their merits.
> Such bitter stinging gall was never mixt
> With purenesse of my stile, nor have I fixt
> My humble muse upon so high a pin,
> That it should scourge the world, publish all's sin.
> This I protest (and I will stand unto it)
> 'Twas no malignant fury made me do it:
> But 'twas the revolutions of these times,
> And men's retrogradians, made these Rimes."

These quasi-satires are of slight interest for our purpose. They deserve examination as coming after a considerable silence in formal satire (1600–1608); but they lead to nothing fresh, and do not belong with the later group of 1613–1621. They show only general familiarity with previous English satire, but mark the development toward more individual character-sketches, feebly suggesting the later epigrams of Jonson. The conventional type-names are freely used, as is evident from the summary, but not in the distinctly classical manner. If Middleton was a classical scholar, it was Martial rather than Juvenal who most interested him. The local color of his work is English, and (incidentally) that of York instead of London. The objects of satire include (under Morals) Lust, Pride, Usury, Hypocrisy; (under Fashions) Gallants, Clothes and Hair, Assumed Gentility; (under Literature) Bad Poets. The only obvious allusion to contemporary, or recent, literature is one to Robert Greene; who

> "did say and wisely scan
> A velvet slop makes not a Gentleman."

The occasion of the book must have been purely experimental,—the amusement of a gentleman of York, of no very refined taste, who was familiar with the popular literature of the previous decade.

In the same year with Middleton's satires (1608) were published "Ariosto's Satyres in seven famous Discourses, shewing the state, 1. Of the Court and Courtiers. 2. Of Libertie and the Clergie in generall. 3. Of the Romaine Clergie. 4. Of Marriage. 5. Of Soldiers Musitians and Lovers. 6. Of Schoolmasters and Scholers. 7. Of Honour and the happiest Life. In English by Gervis Markham."[1] In 1615 Robert Tofte laid claim to this translation,[2] and as Markham seems not to have disputed the claim, Tofte has generally been assumed to be the real author. The work "was reprinted anonymously in 1611" (I quote from Mr. Collier) "under the title of *Seven Planets governing Italy*, with the addition of three elegies. The edition of 1608 is ushered by an address from the stationer to the reader, followed by 'The Argument of the whole worke, and the reasons why Ludovico Ariosto writ these seaven Satyres.' The translation, which is not deficient in spirit or fidelity, is accompanied by explanatory marginal notes."

I regret that I have not been able to see a copy of this book. It is interesting to see how the satires of Ariosto were wrested from their original discursive, epistolary type, in accordance with the idea of the satire of rebuke. Tofte may have derived the idea of connecting the seven satires with the seven planets from the work of Rankins already described. (See p. 128 above.)

On the eighth of October, 1610, there was entered on the Stationers' Register[3] *The Scourge of Folly, consisting of Satyricall Epigramms, and others in honor of many noble and worthy Persons of our Land. Together with a pleasant (though discordant) Descant upon most English Proverbes: and others.* This was the work of John Davies of Hereford, writing-master, who was living in London at the time of its publication. It deserves brief consideration here; for although it does not come strictly within our series of formal satires, it illustrates the general progress of satirical verse. Opposite the title-page is a picture (to quote Grosart's description) of "Witt scourging Folly, who is elevated, with bared buttocks, on the back of Time." This clearly represents the idea now prevalent of the nature and mission of satire. In the "Passages before the Book" is one interesting in the same connection;

[1] The work was entered on the Stationers' Register on September 21, under the title: "A President for Satoristes or the Seven famous Satyres or Planettes written by Master Ludovico Ariosto."

[2] See Collier's *Rarest Books*, vol. iv. p. 167.

[3] Grosart, not knowing of this entry, was able only to fix the date roughly, from internal evidence, as between March, 1610, and January, 1612.

"Of Alchymists and Satirists

"As counterfet coyning is put upon Alchimists,
So Libelling lightly is set upon Satyrists:
But as the one makes Lead, Silver at least:
So the other would make a Man of a Beast.
By heat of strange Fires,
They seeke their desires."

The *Scourge of Folly* proper consists of 292 epigrams, on all manner of themes. They are true epigrams, in length, form, and content; many of the subjects treated (as gallants, tobacco, lust, superstition, usury, bad poetry, benefices, etc.) are those familiar to us in the satires.

Following these comes

"Papers Complaint, compiled in ruthfull Rimes
Against the Paper-spoylers of these Times."

This is in decasyllabic couplets, and approaches the character of a regular satire. It purports to be a remonstrance voiced by Paper against the innumerable scribblers of the period. There are particular allusions to Ballad-mongers; Churchyard's *Chips:* the same author's *Rehearsal of Wars:* Harrington's *Ajax:* *Venus and Adonis:* Nash's *Pierce Pennilesse:* the pamphlets in the quarrel between Nash and Harvey; Greene; romances of Sir Gawain, Guy of Warwick, Arthur, and the like; the *Mirror of Knighthood:* Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour:* Dekker's *Satiromastix:* pettifogging chroniclers of contemporary history; religious polemics; flattering dedications, etc.[1] The poem concludes with an appeal to scribblers to stop "writing everlastingly," and to devote themselves to Reason and Contemplation; they may then be able to write "eternal lines."

As a piece of literary satire this is not without interest. In its metrical form and general style it shows the influence of the more formal satirists of the period, with whose work Davies was evidently familiar. (See his Epigram on Hall, already referred to.) In general, however, he followed the epigrammatists rather than the satirists proper. His attitude toward life is therefore lighter and less pessimistic than that belonging to pure satire; in his epigrams he is frequently complimentary rather than critical, and he never adopts the tone of one soured against a degenerate age. In the epigrams we find numbers of the classical type-names,—now of course a mere convention; and in the emphasis laid on fashions and personal follies, in the literary satire, and occasionally in the humor, we see the influence of the classical school. Davies's work is that of a schoolmaster, ingeniously adopting (without either classical or moral inspiration) familiar literary forms.

In 1612, John Taylor, the "Water Poet," began his long career as a writer with the publication of *The Scullers Travels, from Tyber to Thames: with his*

[1] See Grosart's notes, in his edition of Davies.

Boat laden with a Hotch-potch; or *Gallimawfry of Sonnets, Satyres, and Epigrams,* etc.[1] This work contained a number of epigrams on the Romish Church and other subjects, and two "satyres," the first showing the evil that befalls all manner of sinners, and the second dealing with the various evil-doers

> "Who on this earthly stage together keepe,
> Like Maggots in a Putrified sheepe."

Two years later, in 1614, Taylor published *The Nipping or Snipping of Abuses: or, The Wooll-gathering of Wit.* This, as the title indicates, was in imitation of Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613), which we are presently to consider. The style and versification are distinctly in the manner of Wither, and in *The Authours description of a Poet and Poesie* occurs an interesting passage relating to Taylor's predecessor and model:

> "A Poets ire sometimes may be inflam'd:
> To make foule Vices brazen face asham'd.
> And then his Epigrams and Satyres whip,
> Will make base gald unruly Jades to skip.
> In frost they say 'tis good, bad blood be nipt,
> And I have seene *Abuses* whipt and stript,
> In such rare fashion, that the wincing age,
> Hath kick'd and flung, with uncontrouled rage.
> Oh worthy *Withers*, I shall love thee ever,
> And often maist thou doe thy best indever,
> That still thy workes and thee may live together,
> Contending with thy name and never wither."

The Anagrams and Sonnets in this volume are followed by "A Cataplasmicall Satyre, composed and compacted of sundry simples, as salt, vineger, wormwood, and a little gall, very profitable to cure the impostumes of vice." This attacks various vices, such as bribery, miserliness, the use of tobacco, and drunkenness.

It is curious to notice that in 1651, nearly forty years later, Taylor again published a book of Epigrams, with "two new made Satyres that attend them," the first satire being on the hypocrisy of Puritans, the second "against swearing, equivocation, mentall reservation, and detestable dissimulation."

There is, of course, little or nothing of the classical type in these "satires" of Taylor. They belong to the class represented in part by Gascoigne and chiefly by Wither,—moral poems of a descriptive and generally serious character.

II.—George Wither.

"Abuses Stript and Whipt: or Satyricall Essayes. By George Wither." London, 1613.

This volume was entered in the Stationers' Register, January 16, 1613. The author was but twenty-five years old at

[1] I quote from the title-page as it reappeared in the folio of 1630.

the time, and had previously published only a poem on the death of Prince Henry. According to Collier, there were other editions of the *Abuses* in 1614, 1615, 1617, 1622, 1626, and 1633, "and no one of these reimpressions was exactly like any other that preceded it."[1] Although the work seems to have been so popular, it brought its author into trouble, and he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea as a result. Tradition has it that he was released as the outcome of his "Satire dedicated to the Kings Majestie" (Stationers' Register, 8 August, 1614).

The metrical form of Wither's satires is the usual one, and his couplets already exhibit his marvelous and dangerous fluency. Feminine endings are numerous (as in so much verse of this period), and the whole effect is that of a free conversational style. These verse characteristics, fluency and freedom, mark also the general style of the satires. There is absolutely no obscurity; it would have been foreign to the author's purpose.

"Some no doubt," he says, "will mistake my plainenes, in that I have so bluntly spoken what I have observed, without any Poeticall additions or fained Allegories: . . . for I know if I had wrapt up my meaning in darke riddles, I should have been more applauded, and less understood, which I nothing desire." . . . "It cost me more (I protest) labour to observe this plainenesse, than if I had more Poetically trim'd it."

Besides the qualities of fluency and conversational directness, Wither's satire is noticeable for its abstractness. This must be attributed rather to his ideal of satire than to limited ability, for he can be concrete enough when he wishes; thus see the brief description of the jealous husband (I. 7), of the swaggering gallant (I. 8), the quite full account of the gallants in the tavern (II. 1), the discussion about the farmer's son who went to college (II. 2), and the sketch of the tavern in the *Scourge*. These are almost the only cases in the long stretch of the satires, where Wither tries to give concrete

[1] *Rarest Books*, vol. iv. p. 274.

images of particular persons and places. It is almost always the vague general type which he professedly treats; yet even so, he does not always fail of vigor and directness.

The contents of the collection are as follows:[1]

1. To him-selfe, G. W. wisheth all Happinesse.

2. To the Reader, warning him not to "looke for Spencers or Daniels well-composed numbers; or the deepe conceits of now-flourishing Johnson. Say, 'Tis honest plaine matter, and there's as much as I expect."

3. Four Epigrams, the last being addressed "to the Satyro-mastix," and admonishing the "Scourge of Satyrs" to stand back and withhold his whip from the author.

4. To the gald Reader (another Epigram), warning him not to mistake the pricking of his conscience for personality in the satire.

5. Commendatory verses, signed "Th. C."

6. The Occasion of this Worke. It is here related how the author, having been interrupted in his pursuit of education as begun at Oxford, came to London. There he was amazed by the new fashions and strange creatures that he found—coxcombs, gulls, gallants, sirens, anthropophagi. At length he decided to remain and investigate:

> "The actions of the present time I ey'd,
> And all her secret villanies discry'd:
> I stript Abuse from all her colours quite,
> And laid her ugly face to open sight.
> I labour'd to observe her wayes, and then
> In generall the state and tricks of men."

The results he now purposes to relate.

7. An Introduction, calling on Invention, Judgment, Knowledge and Reason to call his Muse from "epigrams, love-sonets, roundelayes" to more serious matter. It is not nature, but Man, that he is to treat—the most diverse and inconstant of creatures. This difficult task he may be fitted for, though young, because not yet blinded by long experience among men.

8. Of Man. His fall from a state of innocence is described as the cause of the evil state of the world.

Satire I. Of the Passion of Love; its follies.
Satire II. Of Desire, or Lust.
Satire III. Of Hate.
Satire IV. Of Envy.
Satire V. Of Revenge.
Satire VI. Of Choller.
Satire VII. Of Jealousie (of husbands and wives).

[1] This analysis is from the 1622 edition (in the *Juvenilia*) as reprinted by the Spenser Society; and from this all quotations not otherwise referred are made.

Satire VIII. Of Covetousness.
Satire IX. Of Ambition (with a political digression).
Satire X. Of Feare.
Satire XI. Of Despaire.
Satire XII. Of Hope, the most estimable "passion."
Satire XIII. Of Compassion; its abuse.
Satire XIV. Of Crueltie; its many forms.
Satire XV. Of Joy, *i. e.*, true content.
Satire XVI. Of Sorrow (*i. e.*, discontent).

The Conclusion, describing the two-fold nature of passions: one sort derived from God, the other from our corrupted nature; the latter to be overcome by Reason.

The Second Booke: of the Vanitie, Inconstancie, Weakenes and presumption of Men.

Precatio (a prayer for inspiration).

Satire I. Of Vanitie (about 1700 lines in length). The vanities of young men, princes, great men, courtiers, divines, lawyers, magistrates, universities, etc.

Satire II. Of Inconstancie.

Satire III. Of Weakness (physical and moral).

Satire IV. Of Presumption.

Epilogus. Religion as a cure for all these.

Following the two books of satires appeared, in the 1617 edition and thereafter, *The Scourge*. In the 1617 edition this was introduced by a notable picture of a Satyr, shaggy and naked, bearing a scourge in his right hand and a shepherd's pipe in his left. The descriptive verses accompanying the picture are so difficult of access to most persons, and of such interest as showing the use made of the mythological idea of the satyr, that I quote them in full.[1]

"Though in shape I seeme a Man
Yet a Satyr wilde I am;
Bred in Woods and Desert places,
Where men seldome shew their faces;
Rough and hayrie like a Goate,
Clothed with Dame Natures coate;
Eagle-sighted, quick of hearing,
Spying Vice at first appearing;
Barefoot like a silly Fry'r
Such a shaveling was my Sy'r;
Chaste and holy as was that Nun,
Of whom the Pope begat a Son;
Ape-like-fac't, Spaniell tayl'd,
Fawning till I have prevayl'd;

[1] They are entitled, "Vices Executioner: or The Satyr's selfe-description of himselfe."

My pleasing left hand hath a pipe,
On which I play till Folly's ripe;
To carelesse Fooles in a Trance,
I doe pipe and they doe Dance;
Like mirth-full Syrens that doe charme,
Delighting those they meane to harme;
Teaching men to hold their way,
Not from their right course to stray:
The other hand a whip doth beare,
With which (provok't) I surely teare
Skin from flesh, and flesh from bone
Of such as I hap upon:
I'me sent abroad the World, to purge
Mans vile Abuses with my scourge;
Oft I make my Master sport,
When man sinne to lash them for't.
An Execut'oner am I,
Of Lust, and wanton Venery.
Thus are vices scourg'd by me,
Yet my selfe from vice not free;
Like to Sumners that cite others,
When themselves defile their mothers.
They have warning had before,
Yet they'l not amend; therefore,
Such-ones as take delight in sin,
The bloud Ile drawe from out their skin:
Great and small are one to mee,
None shall bribe me with a Fee;
But if the Greatest dare offend,
Ile lash them still, till they amend.

Thus having shew'd my selfe at large,
I'le now attend my Masters charge."

The Scourge which follows declares the necessity for a less gentle warning than that given by the previous Satyrs. The author then enumerates all the classes to be scourged, exempting the honest among all, and warning his Satyr not to strike "in speciall." If this does not suffice, he promises a Satyr still more severe.

The type of Wither's satire is primarily that of direct rebuke. There is also the reflective method, but not in the classical manner. Both rebuke and reflection are in the vein of the preacher. Satire is viewed distinctly as the servant of

morals and religion. The religious tone appears constantly.[1] Frequently the satirical type is for the time being entirely neglected, and general moral discourse takes its place.

The attitude toward the world is pessimistic. Thus—

> "I weigh'd it well, and found it was the Scaene
> Of Villanie, of Lust, and all uncleane
> And loath'd Corruption." ("Of Man.")

Again:

> "Whereas Poets now are counted base,
> And in this worthlesse Age in much disgrace;
> I of the cause cannot refraine to speake;
> And this it is. Mens judgements are grown weake."
> (II. 3. p. 287.)

Some of this is inherited from classical satire, but it is for the most part the pessimism of Puritanism, explained theologically; and salvation is not only believed possible but is distinctly urged (see conclusion to Book I. and Epilogus to II.).

As usual, Wither professes to avoid personalities, and condemns those who

> "apply that in particular
> Which doth extend to all in generall."

The purpose of his satire is to "taxe iniquitie" (Epigram 4). His natural tone is mild—

> "I'me none of those
> That write in Anger or malicious spleene;
> I have not taken Pepper in the Nose;"— (Ibid.)

but he makes some use of the tradition of satiric fury:

> "New bloud hath fild up all my Love-dride veines,
> A sacred Fury hath possest my braines."
> (Intro.)

[1] See especially the end of I. 4 and II. 4; and I. 11, 12, 15, 16, throughout.

"Here I will teach my rough Satyricke Rimes
To be as madde and idle as the times.
Freely I will discover what I spy.
And in despight of curiositie,

Maske in a homely phrase as simply plaine,
As other men are mystically vaine;
He breake the Closset of mans private sin,
Search out the villanies conceald therein;
And if their sight may not infectious be,
Draw them to view in spight of secrecie." (Ibid.)

That Wither was familiar with the satires of his predecessors one need not doubt; but he set himself a new type, though following the conventional models afar off, and imitated the satirists of 1590–1600 very little. For a dozen years or more there had been no noteworthy satires written; the convention had begun to fall away. Wither had little in common with the concrete, easy-going satire of Rowlands and "T. M." (though he reminds us of them in the account of the tavern loafers in II. 1); and equally distasteful to him must have been the blustering style of Marston. A passage in II. 1,

"Dost thou suppose by a few carved stones . . .
To be immortall?" etc.,

suggests a similar one in one of Hall's satires, where he attacks ambition for great monuments. A passage in the *Scourge* (p. 339)—

"Here approaches
A troope with Torches, hurried in their Coaches,"—

was perhaps suggested by Marston's SV. 7. 160 ff., or the imitation of it in Guilpin S. 2.

Distinct suggestions of classical satire are quite infrequent. In the *Satire to King James* occurs an allusion to Juvenal's famous line:

"'Tis a hard thing not to write Satyres now."

A passage on the worship of gold (I. 8. p. 122) suggests Juvenal I. 112–114; and one on pride of pedigree (II. 2. p. 266) may have been indebted to Juvenal VIII. In general, however, like his more recent predecessors, Wither derived only the general form and idea of satire from the classical tradition, and turned it to distinctly individual form.

> "With examples of old ages past
> And wise mens sayings, I might more have grac't.
> But that I am resolv'd to tie my Rimes
> As much as may be to the present times."
> (Concl. to Bk. I.)

And this he does. It is always England that he has in mind. From the classics he inherited his general type of satire against corrupt manners and morals, but his classification of material under ethical and psychological headings was a mediæval inheritance. His religious tone is of course furthest removed from classical imitation. There is never any pagan coloring, and the seriousness is almost unvarying. While he shows something of the native type of satire of reform, the occasion of his work is clearly in the reflective spirit. Conventional literary or social satire is wanting. The style is fairly original; it generally lacks concreteness and avoids dramatic elements. The absence of the classical type-names is very noticeable.[1] In the great expanse of his satires I have observed but four individual characters introduced by names, —"Dick" and "Dunce" in II. 2, and "Nick" and "Froth" in the tavern scene in the *Scourge*. Altogether there are something more than a half dozen stories or anecdotes, generally told in a manner as abstract as possible, without names or dialogue. The notable exceptions to this are the tavern story in II. 1, and the farmers' discussion of the folly of education, in II. 2; in this last we have not only real persons, but dialogue in country dialect. In general, Book II. is more pictorial and concrete than Book I. The local color is always

[1] The only possible exception is "Thraso" (in I. 8 and II. 1), and this is not a type-name in the usual sense.

English. Humor is extremely rare, and when it occurs is usually incidental to description. There is occasionally, however, a suggestion of the antithetical wit which marked the satire of the latter part of the century.

The objects satirized by Wither are of extraordinary range, and indicate (though under a false system of classification) not a little keen and wholesome observation of life. Classifying them as usual, and excluding some mere abstract conceptions, we have

Under Morals :

Pride, I. 1, 8 ; II. 1, 2.
Lust, I. 2 ; II. 3 ; *Scourge.*
Hate, I. 3.
Envy, I. 4.
Slander, I. 4, 14.
Quarrelsomeness, I. 5, 6.
Profanity, I. 5.
Avarice, I. 8.
Parasitism and flattery, I. 8 ; II. 3.
Usury, I. 8, 14 ; II. 1.
Prodigality, I. 8.
Ambition, I. 9 ; II. 1.
Superstition, I. 10 ; II. 1.
Cowardice, I. 10, 11.
Cruelty, I. 14.
Gluttony, II. 1.
Hypocrisy, II. 1.
Lying, II. 1.
Effeminacy, II. 4.
Inhospitableness. *Scourge.*

Fashions :

Lawless pilgrimages, I. 5.
Foreign clothes, I. 8 ; II. 1.
Marrying old women, I. 8.
Foreign foods, drugs, etc., II. 1.
Tobacco, II. 1.
Vain feasts, II. 1.
Early marriages, II. 3.
Astrology, II. 4.
Foolish imitation, II. 1.

"The Sun lights not a Nation
That more addicteth Apish imitation
Than doe we English. Should we some man see
To weare his doublet where his hose should be,
Pluck gloves on's feet, and put his hands in's shoes,
Or weare his Rings and Jewels on his toes, . . .
Some of our Courtiers would make much adoo,
But they would get into that fashion too." (p. 223

Public Affairs:

Passionate rulers and magistrates, I. 7.
Monopolies, I. 8.
National dependence on the census, I. 10.
Abuse of pity at court, I. 13.
Beggars' orders, I. 13.
Bribery, I. 13, 14; *Scourge.*
Lords, court-barons, and over-tenants, I. 14; *Scourge.*
Embezzlement of public property, I. 14.
Abuse of the law, II. 1.
Unreasonable rise in price of wheat, II. 1.
Corrupt sheriffs, justices, etc. *Scourge.*
Mismanagement of Universities, II. 1.

Under this head Wither gives us some interesting views on the abuse of scholarships and fellowships, the unworthy obtaining of degrees, and the like.

"See, the Student poore
For whom it was ordain'd, stands at the doore
And may not enter; whilst the golden Asse
Is quietly admitted in to passe." (p. 207

Nor does he altogether approve the sort of scholar that is commonly turned out:

"What is't to heape up a great multitude
Of words and sayings, like a Chaos rude?
To say a Latine Disticke out of Cato,
Cite Aristotle, or some peece of Plato,
And diverse more; yet like a blockish Elfe,
Be able to say nought at all himself?" (p. 209

Neglect of martial discipline, II. 4.

On this subject Wither shows some decidedly vigorous patriotism. He feels that there is danger ahead of England, "a tempest brewing in the South," for which preparation must be made:

"Let's trim our rusty Armes, and scoure
Those long-unused well-steel'd-blades of our ;
(We shall not doe the Spyders any wrong,
For they have rent-free held their house-room long
In Morains, Helmets, Gauntlets, Bandileres :
Displace them thence, they have had all their yeeres)
And give them such a lustre, that the light
May dimme the Moone-shine in a Winters night." (p. 316)

Fashions and Follies :

Follies of lovers, I. 1.
Swaggering ruffians, I. 8.
Vanities of young men, II. 1.

Classes :

Lawyers, I. 14 ; II. 1 ; *Scourge.*
Courtiers, II. 1 ; *Scourge.*
University men, II. 1, 3.
"Roaring boys," II. 1.
Physicians, *Scourge.*
Brokers, "
Tailors, "
Workmen, "
Merchants, "
Tavern-keepers, "
Soldiers, "

It is noteworthy that he expressly declines to satirize women.

Literature :

Amorous and complimentary poems, I. 1.
Critics, I. 4 ; *Scourge.*
Bad poets and dramatists, II. 3.
Foolish abuse of poetry and theatres, II. 3.

In this connection occurs a most interesting defence of poetry, which goes back for its main arguments to Sidney. It concludes with an equally noteworthy passage on contemporary poets :

"But what need any man therein speake more
Than Divine Sidney hath already done?
For whom (though he deceas'd ere I begun)
I have oft sighed, and bewailed my Fate,
That brought me forth so many yeeres too late

To view that Worthy; and now thinke not you
Oh Daniel, Drayton, Johnson, Chapman, how
I long to see you with your fellow Peeres,
Sylvester matchlesse, glory of these yeeres:
I hitherto have onely heard your fames,
And know you yet, but by your Workes and Names. . . .
I am in hope you'l not disdaine my Youth:
For know you Muses Darlings, Ile not crave
A fellowship amongst you for to have,
Oh no; for though my ever-willing-hart
Have vow'd to love and praise You and your Art,
And though that I your stile doe now assume,
I doe not, nor I will not so presume;
I claime not that too-worthy name of Poet;
It is not yet deserv'd by me, I know it:
Grant me I may but on your Muses tend,
And be enroul'd their Servant, or their Friend;
And if desert hereafter worthy make me,
Then for a Fellow (if it please you) take me." (pp. 292 ff.)

It must surely have been a hard-hearted company of Worthies that could reject the advances of an aspirant who could reel off as many lines as are contained in the *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, and who at the same time presented his claims so modestly.

Religion:

Clerical abuses, I. 2.
Ambition for vicarages, etc., I. 9; II. 4.
The Roman Church, I. 9, 12; II. 4.
Pettifogging divines, II. 1.
Folly of monastic life, II. 3.
Puritans, II. 4.

"The busie-headed sect,
The hollow crew, the counterfeit Elect.

Simony, II. 4.
Jests on sacred things, II. 4.
Church-wardens and chancellors, *Scourge*.

Of Personal Satire there is (according to the author's profession) very little that is obvious in the later editions of the *Abuses*. The fact that Wither was imprisoned as a result of the publication of the Satires suggests that in the first edition there may have been passages afterward omitted or modified; but I have not been able to see a copy of the edition of 1613. In later ones the king and the

Archbishop are flattered, and the satirist declares, in reference to the virtues of the sovereign, that

> "I from these had matter
> To make a Panegyrick of a Satyr." (I. 9; p. 134.)

But Mr. Collier, quoting the lines on the follies and vices of kings (in II. 1), says: "Throughout Wither speaks with the utmost plainness, and gives more than glimpses of the part he was afterwards to take as a supporter of a republican government."[1]

Wither enjoys the distinction of being the most voluminous English satirist. If he had condensed into compact form the really good material so expanded by his fluency, his satires would no doubt have been much more widely read up to the present time; but their size discourages any but the most intrepid reader on first approach. As it was, however, they seem to have been widely read in the time for which they were written, and they stand at the head of what may be called the second period of formal satire in England, extending from 1613 to the death of James. They are of considerable interest as a new departure; for as Rowlands had taken the formal satire of classical tradition and turned it into popular descriptive poetry of low London life, so Wither took it and turned it into ethical and religious poetry such as suited his taste and genius. He was at least able to produce an unusual effect of sincerity; and (understanding, of course, that the *Abuses* must be regarded as his first great effort to win his way into the poetical aristocracy) I am inclined to accept his own statement of the origin of his satire,—that it was the result of his observation of London life, after a comparatively retired and unworldly youth.

I have already referred to *A Satyre, Written to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie, by George Wither, when hee was Prisoner in the Marshallsey, for his first Booke*. This was entered on the Stationers' Register August 8, 1614. I use, as formerly, the reprint in *Juvenilia* (1622). The appeal to the king is a most curious and ingenious *argumentum ad hominem*. It begins very boldly:

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. ii. p. 42.

"I am he, that entred once the list,
Gainst all the world to play the Satyrist . . .
All my griefe is, that I was so sparing,
And had no more in't worth the name of daring.
He that will tax these times must be more bitter."

Someone, Wither says, has entirely misconstrued his descriptions.

"I have not sought to scandalize the State,
Nor sowne sedition, nor made publike hate:
I have not aym'd at any good man's fame,
Nor taxt (directly) any one by name.
I am not he that am growne discontent
With the Religion or the Governement.
I meant no Ceremonies to protect,
Nor doe I favour any new-sprung Sect;
But to my Satyres gave this onely warrant,
To apprehend and punish Vice apparant."

He attacks his accusers boldly, and reiterates his condemnation of the age. He goes on to show that he is forced by the vigor of his mind to write when not otherwise employed.

"My body's subject unto many Powers:
But my soule's as free as is the Emperours."

He might have written songs or foolish ballads, but he did something more useful. He cites the examples of Seneca, Horace, Persius, Juvenal, and asks:

"Why did not that Age
In which they lived, put them in a Cage?"

He does not, however, condemn the authorities for his imprisonment, since he had as yet no means to show his innocence. Nor does he claim to have been wholly free from error; but his error was due to youth and ignorance. He appeals for pity on his youth and misery; refers to the favor of the Princess Elizabeth, for whom he had written an Epithalamion, and promises another and immortal song, if he is set free. It is not for himself, however, that he wishes freedom, as he can be content in any state, but for the king's sake, "my countries, and my friends," above all for the sake of his mistress, Virtue. If he is left to suffer, none will dare again lift up voice in her behalf.

Either this appeal, or circumstances of which we know nothing, we have seen had the desired effect of procuring the poet's release. It seems quite likely that the authorities thought the best way to abate the vigor of Wither's poetry was, as he himself suggested, to restore him to active life. From the fact that the satires

were so soon and so frequently reprinted, it would appear that either all objection to them was withdrawn or the objectionable passages were omitted.

"The Mastive, or Young Whelpe of the Olde-Dogge. Epigrams and Satyrs. Horat. Verba decent iratum plena minarum." London, 1615.

This was without doubt the work of Henry Parrot, a prolific epigrammatist of this time. In 1606 he published *A Book of Epigrams called The Mouse-Trap;* in 1608 *Epigrams or Humors Lottery;* in 1612 or 1613 *Laqueí Ridiculosi, or Springes to catch Woodcocks* (containing 216 epigrams). Of *The Mastive* Mr. Seacombe says: "A large cut of a mastiff upon the title-page . . . seems to have been modeled upon that of the *Mastif-Whelp* of William Goddard. The epigrams, which are often smart and generally coarse, are surmounted by clever Latin mottoes, and are followed by three satires and a paradox upon war." [1] Corser quotes at some length a fairly vigorous passage from the second satire,[2] which I reproduce from his transcription:

"Howle on yee Satyrs, whilst I sit and marke
How wolvish Envie at my Muse doth barke,
Backbite, detract, rayle, slander and revile,
With words of hatred, and uncivill stile.
First comes a Statesman to the Stationer
And many better Bookes hee passing over
By chaunce finde; this, whereon he reades a while
Then bytes the lippe, then frownes, then gives a smile,
And to the Seller sayes such fiery braines
Should warme the prison to reward their paines.
Becomes it any man of his profession
Reprove us of our manners, or transgression
Away goes hee: Next comes my gallant Dycer
His ordinarie stomache is more nicer
Who asks for new books; this the stationer showes him
Streight sweares 'tis naught unles the Poet knowes him.
Nor will hee read a Line: this Fortunes Mynion
Likes forsooth nothing but his owne opinion.
The mending Poet takes it next in hand
Who having oft the Verses over-sean'd,
O filching streight, doth to the Stationer say
Here's foure lines stolne from forth my last new play.
And that hee'l sweare, even by the Printers stall
Although hee knowes 'tis false hee speakes in all.
Then comes my Innes-of-Court-Man, in his Gowne,
Cries Mew, what Hackney brought this wit to towne.

[1] Article on Parrot, *Dictionary of National Biography*.
[2] *Collectanea*, Part 9, pp. 121 ff.

But soone again my gallant Youth is gon,
Minding the Kitchin more than Littleton,
Tut, what cares hee for Law, shall have inough
When's Father dyes, that Cankar'd Miser-Chuffe.
Put him a case in Ploydon then who will
That being his, plod you on Law-Bookes still.
Next comes by my Familiar, yet no Spirit,
Who forceth me his Friendship to inherit.
He sees my Booke in Print, and streight hee knowes it.
Then asketh for the Booke, and the boy showes it.
Then reades a while, and sayes, I must commend it,
But sure, Some Friend of his for him hath pen'd it.
He cannot write a Booke in such a fashion,
For well I wot 'twas nere his Occupation. . . .
Next after him, your Countrey-Farmer viewes it,
It may be good (saith hee) for those can use it,
Shewe mee King Arthur, Bevis, or Sir Guye,
These are the Bookes he onely loves to buye.
Well, that he likes and walkes: Then comes a Divell
With sober countenance, and Garments civill.
A Puritane, or pure one, choose you whether,
(For both as one makes self-same sense together)
Hee lookes on some, and finding this the next
With very sight thereof his minde is vext.
Fye on't (saith he) that any man should buye
Such bookes prophane of fained Poetrie,
That teacheth vice, worse than your Playes on Stages,
And is a shame to olde and future Ages." . . .

The heading of this satire is in Latin "Trahit sua quemque voluptas", but it is evident that it is not of the classical school.

The work of William Goddard's which was mentioned as perhaps the source of the title-page of Parrot's *Mastix*, is *A Mastif Whelp, with other vnfil Islandish Curres fetcht from amongst the Antipodes, Which bite and barke at the fantastical humorist and others of the time . . . . Imprinted amongst the Antipodes, and are to be sould where they are to be bought.* This is of uncertain date. Hazlitt leaves Warton's date "about 1615," but Mr. Collier thought that certain allusions in it pointed to the order for the burning of the satires in 1599, and that it therefore must have been written about 1600. The book is thought to have been printed in Holland, where Goddard seems to have been living in the early part of the century. His *Net of Wasps* was printed in Dort in 1615. Of doubtful date is *A Satyricall Dialogue, or a sharpe invective conference, betweene Alexander the Great and that truly woman-hater Diogenes. Imprinted in the Lowe countryes for all such gentlewomen as are not altogether Idle nor yet well occupyed.*" Here again Collier thought there was a reference to the 1599 order of

the prelates, in the account "of certain men who have been galled by the writings of satirists, and have endeavoured to revenge themselves upon their productions."

> "Badd are these men, such is their perverse kind,
> They burne all books wherein their faults they find;
> And therefore (earthlie aungells) my desire
> Is you'l protect this from consuming fire."

"At the close of the Satirical Dialogue is appended what is expressly called a *satire*, and is, in truth, a satirical apologue or fable: the precise title is this, *A morrall Satire Intituled the Owles araygnement*. . . . This 'moral Satire' is a bitter attack upon the great, under a figures aiming, perhaps, at royalty itself. . . . The Bat and Thrush summon the Owl before the throne of the Eagle (who represents the sovereign), for killing small birds, and disturbing the kingdom at night by her vociferations. The Owl defends herself from the first charge by recriminating upon the Hawk, and other favoured nobles of the court, who, she asserts, are doubly guilty of shedding innocent blood. The Eagle, sitting in judgment, struck with the justice of the accusation, calls upon the Hawk and nobles to reply to it, which they do, by charging the Eagle herself with murder, tyranny, and cruelty to such as are inferior in strength. This retort so enrages the Eagle, that she immediately makes war upon her subjects indiscriminately, and the Owl, during the civil strife, contrives to escape."[1]

The most interesting thing about this "satire" is its resemblance to Drayton's *Owl*, which need not be pointed out in detail. If Goddard's work was, as appears quite possible, published at the very beginning of the century, it would seem that Drayton may have derived some fruitful suggestions from it.

12.—Ben Jonson.

Ben Johnson his Epigrams were entered on the Stationers' Register on May 15, 1612, but do not seem to have been published until the folio volume of 1616, in which they were called "Book I." and dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke. They are 133 in number, and embrace many kinds of short poems, a large number being in size and character what I have hitherto called true epigrams. Gifford observed that Jonson's idea of an Epigram was "a short poem chiefly restricted to one idea, and equally adapted to the delineation and expression of every passion incident to human life." He

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. pp. 316 f.

objected, however, as appears from one or two passages in the Conversations with Drummond, to epigrams of a purely narrative character. Some of those in his collection are of such length and character as to have been called satires had they been published separately, and owing to the importance of the author's influence they deserve special consideration. The metre is the usual decasyllabic couplet, and is of course used with marked skill and satirical effect.[1]

Epigram 12 describes Lieutenant Shift, who gets rid of all debts by crying "God pays."

No. 21 (eight lines only) describes "Gamester," made meek by the bastinado.

No. 25 (same length) is on Sir Voluptuous Beast and his sensual life.

No. 28 is an admirable portrait of Don Surly, who makes himself great in his own eyes by haughtiness, arrogance, lust, profanity and cruelty.

No. 73 is addressed to "Fine Grand," who has borrowed all his jests, poems and other social ornaments from the author.

No. 88 is on "English Monsieur," whose "whole body" speaks French, through the aid of the "new French tailor."[2]

No. 92 is called "The New Cry," and is of unusual length. It describes the "ripe statesmen" who crowd London streets, and discourse wisely of the relations of all the States of Christendom.

No. 101 is "Inviting a Friend to Supper," and is distinctly a classical imitation. It suggests particularly the latter part of Juvenal XI., in one place borrowing the very phrasing ("My man shall read a piece of Virgil"). But Gifford points out that it also makes use of Horace's invitation to Vergil, and of Martial X. 48.

No. 112 is addressed "To a Weak Gamester in Poetry," imploring him to be less venturesome in trying his unskilled hand. Interesting for our purpose is the enumeration of the poetic modes of the day, in which satires are included among plays, odes, elegies, and epigrams.

No. 115, "On the Town's Honest Man," describes one of the swaggering gallants of the city, of whom we have already met so many.

No. 133 is a long and filthy account of a boat-ride on the Thames among the smells of a London summer. It is an instance of the type of satire imitative of Horace's *Iter Brundusianum*,—that of the burlesque itinerary.

[1] See Professor Schelling's paper, in the Publications of the Modern Language Association, vol. xiii. No. 2 (pp. 221 ff.), for some account of Jonson's influence on the satirical couplet of later times.

[2] This is an interesting testimony to the arrival of French fashions in England; in the satires of 1598 and thereabout all such references are of course to Italy.

These brief descriptions illustrate the contents of the longer epigrams, and make it clear that the characters in them are the same that we have met with in the satires, save that they are more individualized, and are drawn more rapidly and by a more masterly hand. The type-names are particularly interesting. Although Jonson was above all things a classicist, and enjoyed the introduction into his work of the minutiæ of classical learning, his characters have English names, made to order as many of the Latin names were made to order, to indicate the appropriate characters. In other words, he was clever enough to transfer the method instead of the actual words of the classical satirists. In others of the epigrams we find other familiar characters,—the Courtier, the Doctor, the Usurer, the Lawyer, the Plagiarist, etc.

In *Underwoods* also are some poems which might well be called Satires.

No. 30, "An Epistle to Sir Edward Sackville," is of the reflective type, and treats of true and false gratitude, of fortitude and self-development.

No. 32 ("An Epistle to a Friend, to persuade him to the Wars") is one of the very best of Jonson's epistolary poems, and at times represents a close approach to the manner of Juvenal. The account of the lust of the times, and of vain fashions and follies, bears out what we have heard from other satirists; and the pessimistic tone is most severe.

> "No part or corner man can look upon,
> But there are objects bid him to be gone
> As far as he can fly, or follow day,
> Rather than here so bogged in vices stay.
> The whole world here leavened with madness swells;
> And being a thing blown out of nought, rebels
> Against his Maker." . . .
> "Our delicacies are grown capital,
> And even our sports are dangers! what we call
> Friendship, is now masked hatred! justice fled,
> And shamefastness together! all laws dead
> That kept man living! pleasures only sought!
> Honour and honesty, as poor things thought
> As they are made! pride and stiff clownage mixed
> To make up greatness! and man's whole good fixed
> In bravery, or gluttony, or coin."

No. 37 (a "Satirical Shrub") is a brief aspersion, severe as Juvenal, upon false women, one in particular. The omission (indicated by stars, and a note in the folio that something is wanting) may have been of some length, and of more frankness and personal bitterness than what is given.

No. 62, "An Execration upon Vulcan," is an amusing satirical poem of the Horatian order, belaboring the god of fire for the burning of Jonson's house. Incidental satire of contemporary conditions is introduced, and in particular Vulcan is given leave to burn certain kinds of literature,—such as legendary compilations from "the learned library of Don Quixote," Logographs, Anagrams, and all manner of ingenuities in verse, "the whole sum of errant knighthood," etc.

> "With Nicolas' Pasquils, meddle with your match,
> And the strong lines that do the times so catch;
> Or Captain Pamphlet's horse and foot, that sally
> Upon the Exchange still, out of Pope's-head alley;
> The weekly Courants, with Pauls seal; and all
> The admired discourses of the prophet Ball."

No. 63, "A Speech, according to Horace," presents the contrast between the sturdy plebeian soldiery and the "lordlings" and "grandlings" of traditional nobility. At the close the author takes occasion to advert to the overdressed gallants of the period—

> "These carcases of honour; tailors' blocks
> Covered with tissue, whose prosperity mocks
> The fate of things."

No. 64 ("An Epistle to Master Arthur Squib") is another Horatian poem, on the testing of friendship.

> "Men have masks and nets;
> But these with wearing will themselves unfold,
> They cannot last. No lie grew ever old."

No. 66 ("An Epistle, answering to one that asked to be sealed of the tribe of Ben") is an admirable Horatian epistle, adverting satirically to drunkards, lechers, slanderers, newsmongers, and the like, and protesting the poet's individual purpose to

> "Live to that point . . . for which I am man,
> And dwell as in my centre, as I can,
> Still looking to, and ever loving heaven."

No. 68 ("An Epigram on the Court Pucell") is a bitter sketch of the lowest order of female courtier—her hypocrisy, lust, vanity, and short career of worthlessness.

Other poems of Jonson's might no doubt be included in this list; but I believe this is a fairly adequate enumeration of what might have been called Satires as the word was commonly used in his own day. We must not forget, too, the well-known translation of Horace's "bore" satire, in *The Poetaster*, III. 1. It is curious that Jonson should never have used the title of Satire, and that he should not have done more writing in the mode so popular at the time when he was beginning his career. Born in the same year with Donne, and only the year before Hall, he was undoubtedly familiar with the Satires of both, and certainly an admirer of those of the former (see *Epigrams* 94 and 96), whose rugged virility must have appealed to him strongly. We have evidence in the pieces just examined that he could have equaled, and probably outstripped, all other satirists of his time. He was able to appreciate the classical satirists as fully as any, and more able than any other to translate their spirit without slavish imitation. His local color is English, and his pictures are real and lifelike. Above all, he had the faculty (like Juvenal, but unlike most English satirists) of illuminating his satire with sudden, eloquent, close-packed sayings, worthy of remembrance apart from their context;—as in the last line of *Underwoods* 32:

> "Who falls for love of God, shall rise a star."

Although undoubtedly familiar, then, with the preceding English satirists, Jonson made little use of them, but used instead his knowledge of the classics and (chiefly) his knowledge of men. Somewhat curiously we have found him in the short poems more frequently following Horace than Juvenal, and preferring the epistolary and reflective types of satire. His pessimism was almost always of a rational rather than a conventional sort, though this is not to say that it was never exaggerated. The proof of its genuineness is in the whole mass of his work. In the subject-matter of his satire (the emphasis on private morals, etc.), in his individual tone, in his

humor, and in his self-conscious method and style, Jonson followed classical satire. But he did not imitate classical details, and in his directness and sincerity, in his practical ethical quality, and in the occasional optimism of his satire, he was thoroughly English.

Briefly analyzing, as usual, the objects of satire in the poems already examined, we find:

Morals:

- Lust.
- Drunkenness.
- Gluttony.
- Gambling.
- Arrogance.
- Hypocrisy.
- Slander.

Fashions:

- Foreign clothes.
- Curls, prinking, etc.
- Newsmongers.

Personal Humors:

- Debtors.
- Plagiarizing jokers, etc.
- Swaggering gallants.

Classes:

- Women.

Literature:

- Romances, pamphlets, etc. (See under *Underwoods* 62.)
- Bad poetry.

Readers of Jonson's plays think at once of better illustrations of all these matters than are found in the short satirical poems. It is to the plays, indeed,—to their success, and the

completeness with which they represented the author's complaints against tendencies of the time,—that we must look for the explanation of Jonson's failure to write more formal satire. We have already seen that he was recognized as a satirist: that *Every Man out of his Humour* was entered in the Stationers' Register as "a comical Satire," and that both the author of *The Whipping of the Satire* and Breton in his reply[1] referred to the "Humorist" as one who was really pursuing the work of the satirist in a slightly different fashion. This was precisely the case; and while the matter is one that cannot be adequately discussed here, it is worth while to notice that Jonson, while doing much less than others in the way of formal satire, did his full share in the general development of English satire. In his treatment of *humours;* in his unfailing ridicule of the absurdities of the time; in his character-sketches (from the "characters" in the list of *dramatis personæ* at the opening of some of the plays to his most elaborate attempts at characterization); and, not least of all, in his use of sharp personal satire in the conduct of his quarrels—he led the way to much of the satire of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

13.—"R. C." (*Time's Whistle*).

"Epigrammi Satiron. 'Septem compacta cicutis fistula.' The Times Whistle: or a new Daunce of seven Satires; whereunto are annexed divers other Poems comprising Things naturall, morall, & theological. Compiled by R. C. Gent.

"Parturit, assiduo si non renovetur aratro
Non nisi cum spinis, gramina mundus ager."

This collection, from a manuscript in the library of Canterbury Cathedral, was printed for the first time in 1871, edited for the English Text Society by Mr. J. M. Cowper. Mr. Cowper showed the date to be 1614–1616. The earliest limit is fixed by a reference to the death of Dr. Carrier (in

[1] See above, pp. 163, 164.

Satire 4), which occurred in 1614. Mr. Cowper thinks also that there is an allusion to the visit of James I. to Cambridge in 1615. His view of the final limit of date is not so convincing. Jonson's Epigrams were published in 1616, and there is an epigram on them in the *Times Whistle*. Mr. Cowper thinks, however, that R. C. had seen them in manuscript, and that in Jonson's 49th Epigram there is an allusion to the satirist's criticism :

> "Playwright me reades, and still my verses dammes :
> He sayes, I want the tone of epigrammes."

What R. C. had said was :

> "Peruse his book, thou shalt not find a dram
> Of witt befitting a true Epigram."

There is nothing conclusive in the similarity, especially in view of the fact that "Playwright" was a not infrequent object of Jonson's attack (see others of his Epigrams); and if there were it would prove nothing as to the date of publication of the *Times Whistle*, for if R. C. had read Jonson's Epigrams in manuscript (which is of course quite possible) Jonson might also have read his in manuscript, and we are still unable to say which were published earlier. Clearly, however, we may date R. C.'s satires not far from 1616.

The author's full name has never been discovered. Mr. Cowper thinks it may be Bishop Corbet, who in 1616 "was recommended by Convocation as a proper person to be elected to Chelsea College." The title "Gent." is against this, but Cowper suggests that Corbet would scarcely have wished these poems to appear as the work of an ecclesiastic, and further calls attention to the fact that Corbet was present at the occasion of the king's visit to Cambridge which seems to be alluded to in the *Whistle*. The manuscript is admittedly not in Corbet's hand; and I am not disposed to agree with the view that the satires suggest his style. Corbet's authentic

poems are of a decidedly rollicking sort, suited to his fame for conviviality; while the satires of the *Times Whistle*, although they furnish ample opportunity for such a manner, are in a quite different vein. Mr. Sidney Lee thinks that "the description of the author and the date of the collection destroy" Cowper's theory that R. C. was Corbet.[1]

The outward form of these satires is the usually satiric couplet, exhibiting the characteristic freedom of the verse of the period, with an abundance of run-on lines, inverted accents, and feminine endings. The style is rudely vigorous, professedly didactic, free and conversational, conventionally religious in tone, and concrete and direct in its description. The opening of the manuscript (what was intended to serve as title-page) gives us the first part of the author's profession as to his style—the conclusion being unfortunately lost:

"Reader, if thou expect to find in this booke either affectation of poeticall stile, or roughnesse of unhewen invention, which amongst many is of moste estimation, being" . . .

The body of the manuscript consists of seven satires, followed by the "certaine poems," thirty-two in all. Of the satires proper,

Satira 1 treats of Atheism (with an argument for the existence of God), of sects (Puritanism, Papistry, etc.), of corruption in the church, of Sabbath breaking and like sins, and of the vanity of the unrepentant life.

Satira 2, by a series of classical and mediæval illustrations of the deceitfulness of things, opens the subject of man's Hypocrisy. Various types of hypocrites are described in detail.

Satira 3 describes Pride, beginning with the fall of Lucifer, as infecting all classes of men.

Satira 4 treats of the reign of avarice among all classes and conditions.

Satira 5 reproves Gluttony and Drunkenness; the latter is said to have been introduced by the Dutch. Various kinds of drunkards are described; tobacco is attacked; and finally there is a warning of the judgment and of eternal punishment.

[1] Article on Corbet, *Dictionary of National Biography.*

Satira 6 treats of Lust, its wide sway and manifold forms.

Satira 7 represents man's reason as enthralled by Passion. The passions of love, hatred, joy, fear, desire, rashness, anger, hope, despair, are discussed; foolish loves are dwelt upon in detail. The fears and follies incident to passion are described.

The type of satire here is the late one first conspicuously illustrated by Wither, though it may be regarded as a return to mediæval or native English types, with the addition of certain conventional details of classical origin. It is primarily, of course, satire of direct rebuke. The attitude is pessimistic and yet religiously hopeful. There is the conventional idea of satire as a whip of sinners, and the usual picture of the "unrelenting age," "hardened in ungodly sin."

Says Mr. Cowper: "Our Poet, whoever he was, was well read in and made good use of the literature of his time, as well as of ancient classic authors. Shakespeare, Marston, Marlowe, Jonson, Hall, and others, appear to have been consulted to some purpose, but not to an extent to render the author liable to any grave charge of plagiarism."[1] He then compares lines 19 and 20 of the introductory verses of the *Times Whistle*,

> "Let ulcerd limbes and gowtie humours quake,
> Whilst with my pen I doe incision make,"

with a couplet in Marston:

> "Infectious blood, ye gouty humours, quake,
> Whilst my sharp razor doth incision make."

At the very beginning of the book, indeed, there is a suggestion of Marston in the line:

> "From the Rhamnusian goddesse am I sent."

Compare also the introduction of verses called *Ad Rhythmum*, as in Marston. Mr. Cowper notes further that T. W. 2762 ff.

[1] Introduction, p. xix.

(an account of the viands provocative of lust) suggests Marston's—

> "A crab's baked guts, a lobster's butter'd thigh,
> I hear them swear is blood of venery."

"R. C.'s" indebtedness to Wither will already have appeared from the analysis of the seventh satire, where he treats of the passions of love, hatred, joy, fear, desire, and the like, as Wither does in Book I. in a slightly different order. The general religious tone of the *Whistle* also indicates Wither's influence. Mr. Cowper points out allusions to Jonson,[1] with whom "R. C." was evidently very familiar. There are also general suggestions of familiarity with the satirical method of Hall.

That the author of the *Times Whistle* was a classical scholar there is ample evidence. He used Latin freely, and introduced into his Latin "argumenta" (at the beginnings of the satires) such quotations as "Fronti nulla fides" (Juvenal II. 8), and "Decipimur specie recti" (Horace); while "Omnia usnt auro nostræ vænalia Romæ" seems to be a paraphrase of "Omnia Romæ cum pretio" (Juvenal III. 183). A reference to "this worse than iron age" seems to have been suggested by Juvenal XIII. 28 ff. The account of Galla, "that insatiate city dame which loves a player," etc. (6. 2581 ff.), reminds us of Juvenal VI. 82 ff. It is to be observed also that we have the familiar theme of "vice in virtue's habit" (2. 850),—avarice counted as thrift, excessive spending as liberality, etc.

The classical and non-classical elements are curiously mixed. The general method of the satire is native, and may be compared with early satirical religious verse of the fifteenth century. But while the tone is religious, the emphasis (as in all conventional satire of the time) is on private morals.

[1] Ibid., p. xxii.

"Jove" stands either for the Christian God or the classical deity.[1]

In like manner the classical hell is treated as the true one, and we hear of the fall of angels to Acheron (890), and the probable descent of the Pope "to the Stygian lake" (1036). Characters of classical history are also treated much as personal types; thus "Poppaea" is rebuked for bathing in goats' milk. The true type-names in the *Times Whistle* are of more interest than in any satirist we have met since Hall; I have noted more than seventy-five of them,—most of them classical in origin and form. Some are types already familiar or obviously made to order (as *Pandarus*, *Bacchanall*, *Votarius*, *Fumoso*, *Mechanico*, *Sodomee*, *Temerus*, *Stolido*); some are constructed from Greek words (as *Philogonous*, *Amaidus*, and *Polupragma* or "Tittle-tattle"). In the midst of these appears an occasional Anglicism such as "Sir John Lacklattin," "Signior Necessity," or "Monsieur Graybeard;" and a typical person by the name of Cervisius we are surprised to find living companionably with "George" and "Rafe." The only name which suggests direct derivation from Juvenal is Codrus the poor cottager (4. 1481; cf. Juvenal III.). Local color is everywhere English; see, for example, the account of warring sects in Satire 1, the description of the drunkards in 5. 1813 ff., and the anecdotes of 5. 1977 ff. and 6. 2599 ff. One of the latter is much like one of Wither's. But "R. C." is more concrete than Wither, as appears from the great number of his named characters; his description of the miser Sordido (2. 749 ff.) is as pictorial as one of Rowlands's sketches.

Humor is rare, as commonly in these later satires. The tone is solemn and lacking in self-consciousness. Suggestions

[1] Thus a reference in Satire 6 to Jove "playing with Ganymede" is closely followed by:

> "Dost thou not fear that just Jove, in his ire,
> Will raine downe brimstone and consuming fire?"

of mediæval literature are noticeable. Thus of the list of great authors in 2. 813 ff. every one, with the exception of Comines and Montaigne, might have been enumerated by Chaucer: Vergil, Horace, St. Austin, Bernard, Aristotle, Avicenna, Galen, Ptolemy, Plato, Cato, etc. "Exempla," like those of Apitius, Cleopatra, Sardanapalus, etc., are used in the fashion of mediæval sermon-books. Of similar tone is the pseudo-philosophical jargon (perhaps suggested by Marston) about "essence and substance" (1. 85 ff.) and the like (5. 2078, 2127).

Objects of satire include:

Morals:

Alehouses, 549 ff.
Hypocrisy, S. 2; 2956 ff.
Boasting, 673 ff.
Cowardice, 708 ff.; 2983 ff.
Lust, 738 ff.; 1064 ff.; 1331 ff.; 1529 ff.; 2135 ff.; 2250 ff.; S. 6; 3105 ff.
Miserliness and avarice, 749 ff.; S. 4; 3129 ff.
Luxurious building, 937 ff.
Ambition, 995 ff.; 3279 ff.
Fortune-hunting, 1143 ff.; 3398 ff.
Usury, 1283.
Slander, 1465 ff.
Gluttony and drunkenness, S. 5.
Superstition, 3255 ff.
Quarrelsomeness, 3352 ff.

Fashions:

Painting of women, 661 ff.; 960 ff.
Curled hair, etc., 968 ff.
Foreign foods, 1679 ff.
Tobacco, 2191 ff.
A fine luncheon, 2765.
Assumed gentility, 767 ff.

Public Affairs:

Canonization of Ravaillac, 283.
Guy Fawkes, 291.

Justice for sale, 1231 ff.; 1343 ff.; 1449 ff.; 2538 ff.
Honors and offices for sale, 1311 f.; 1379 ff.
Bribery of voters, 1387 ff.
University honors for sale, 1405 ff.
Encroachment of land, 1481 ff.

Personal Humors:

A "fashion-imitating ape," 1077 ff.
Assumed learning, 798 ff.
Extravagant lovers, 2927 ff.
Mourning for the death of puppies, 3187 ff.

Classes:

Lying travelers, 721 ff.
Lawyers, 1237 ff.
Tradesmen, 1279 ff.
Physicians, 2149 ff.
Courtiers, 2821 ff.
Merchants, 3410 ff.

Religion:

Atheism, S. 1.
Schism, S. 1.
Puritanism, Brownism, etc., S. 1; 2. 733 ff.
Papistry, S. 1; 3. 1013 ff.
Anabaptists and Separatists, S. 1.
Sabbath-breaking, S. 1.
Transubstantiation, S. 1.
Benefices, simony, etc., 1351 ff.
Sale of meat in Lent, 1433 ff.
Apostasy to false religions, 1549 ff.
Incontinence of clergy, 2371 ff.

There is no proper literary satire, and none of an obviously personal sort, save a reference to the apostasy of Dr. Carrier, who, being already dead, should have claimed the exemption of "nil nisi bonum."

These satires show a number of mingled influences. They use conventions dating back to classicism, are written in a manner that dates back to mediævalism, and deal with matter of contemporary interest. The religious and moral aims of

the author seem undoubtedly sincere. His satire is of the type already said to be chiefly exemplified by Wither, and later condemned by Abraham Holland, as dealing with "the seven deadly sins in general."

"The Philosophers Satyrs: Written by M. Robert Anton, of Magdalen Colledge in Cambridge. Gaude, quod spectant oculi te mille loquentem: Quicquid sub terra est, in apricum proferet aetas." London, 1616.

This book was reissued in 1617, under the title *Vices Anatomie Scourged or Corrected in New Satires.* It has not been republished, and has not been accessible to me; but I make use of Mr. Bullen's[1] and Mr. Corser's[2] accounts. The satires are seven in number, each being named from one of the seven planets,—a plan which we have seen used by Rankins,[3] and again by Tofte.[4] The author refers to the device in his dedication, saying: "A satire is musicke worthie of Pithagoras his opinion, especially, when the planets dance a heavenly lavolto."

Mr. Corser says that the "satires are written in an inflated and pedantic style, with occasional vigorous and happy lines and expressions." The author declared his intention to be "to present Art and Nature without their ugly periwigs of obsceane and shallow Poetry." I transcribe from Mr. Corser's excerpts a passage on the lying travelers whom we have already met so many times:

> "Their travels well do understand
> Sweete Sion: and the blessed holy-land:
> Judeas ruines, and the raced Towers
> Of great Jerusalem, by Titus powers:
> The sacred relickes of that tombe, they made,
> Wherein our Saviours body Joseph laide:
> The worlds seven wonders, whom all times prefer
> To be Mausolus stately sepulcher.
> Egypts Pyramides the second is: . . .
>
> [and so on through the seven.]
>
> All which because they can with points relate
> They boldly challenge eminence in state,
> And walke with mumbling, and a grim neglect,
> As if each stone were bound to give respect,
> With notice of their travells, that have runne,
> Their progresse through the world from sunne to sun:
> As if the state (like Gray-hounds) thought men fit
> For footmanship, and not for searching wit."

[1] Article on Anton, *Dictionary of National Biography.*
[2] *Collectanea*, Part 1, pp. 48 ff.
[3] See p. 128, above.
[4] See p. 173 f., above.

There is also an interesting group of literary allusions :

> "I admire
> The most judicious Beaumont, and his fire :
> The ever Colum-builder of his fame,
> Sound searching Spencer with his Faierie-frame,
> The labor'd Muse of Johnson, in whose boome
> His silk-worme stile shall build an honor'd toombe
> In his own worke : through his long curious twins
> Hang in the roofe of time with daintie lines :
> Greeke-thundring Chapman beaten to the age
> With a deepe furie and a sollid rage :
> And Morrall Daniell with his pleasing phrase
> Filing the rockie methode of these daies."

There also seems to be an allusion to Wither's satires in the line—

> "When we whip others we our selves are whipt."

14.—Henry Fitzgeffrey.

"Certain elegies, done by sundri excellent wits : with satyrs and epigrams."

This little book was published in 1617, again in 1618 and 1620, and a fourth time without date. The elegies are by Beaumont, Drayton, and N. H. (Nathaniel Hookes?); the Epigrams and Satyres by Henry Fitzgeffrey. This Fitzgeffrey has been commonly thought to be the son of Charles Fitzgeffrey, publisher of *Affania*; but there seems to be no evidence for the theory.

The form of the satires is the usual one of couplets ; the style is fairly vigorous, vernacular, sometimes suggesting imitation of Marston's crudeness, frequently epigrammatic and witty.

The first satire is on the superabundance of contemporary poetry.

The second is called *A Morall Satyre*. This rebukes the spirit of censure and inquisitorial criticism,—the

> "strong scent villainy
> Of those close foxes, who (in milder skins)
> Invey, and guesse invectively at Sinnes."

The author complains that he cannot "wink at a window," "usher a lady," "cringe to a scrivener," or "turne oft in Pauls," without being the subject of remark by the lynx-eyed critic. He describes gluttons who rebuke excess; vain doctors who blame the present age; and those who are suspicious of red noses or bald heads, judging wholly by outward appearances—

> "As if a Frounced, pounced Pate coo'd not
> As much Braine cover, as a Stoike cut.
> Or practicke Vertue might not lodge as soone
> Under a Silken as a Cynicke gowne."

The satire concludes with a profession of faith in the "well tempred minde,"—independent, fearless of opinion, and free in conduct.

> "Know I can Frolique be with Fregio,
> Court it in comptest phrase with Curio,
> Come deepe the Caster: and Carouce it free,
> As farre as Vertues limites Licence mee;
> In as rich Grogans, Sattins, Tissues, goe
> As Florence, Carles, Tartary can showe; . . . .
> Confer with Crop-eared knights oth' post; heare tell
> Of Stangate prizes, and of Shooters Hill,
> Of Brothels, Stewes of vilest villainies,
> And learn out Vertue by her contraries."

Following this are some commendatory verses by J. Stephens, who complains of the Satires of the times:

> "There hath bin
> So much deceit in Satyres, tis a Sin
> (Almost) to hope for good ones: They who best
> Have done, have onely Dar'd: and more exprest
> Their Passions, then a Poem. Nay even all
> Doe but convert their little Braines to gall:
> And bee it bitter once, they care not then
> How venomous it be."

The Second Booke consists of Satyricall Epigrams,—true epigrams, some sixty in number, addressed to various typical personages: In Thrasonem, In Medicum, etc.

The Third Booke is of Humours "intituled Notes from Black-Fryers," and gives a vivacious, semi-dramatic account of the various sorts of persons to be seen in the theatre: Captain Martio the swaggerer, Sir Iliad Hunt the traveler of many tales, a Cheapside dame, a "world of fashions" in the clothes of many

nations, a "woman of the masculine gender," a "plumed Dandebrat," "Musk-ball Milke-sop," "Gilded Marchpane," "Tissue Slop" the prodigal, a coxcomb who diets himself that he may fit his clothes, Fantastick the singer, crabbed Websterio the playwright and critic, etc. John Stephens was so well pleased (and not without some reason) by all this that he declares in his final verses that

> "Lesse may be gleand from Puritanes than you
> Have gathered from the Play house."

The author adds an epilogue on contemporary poetry, ironically declaring that he cannot be a poet, since he cannot write for patronage or flatter the great,

> "Conferre with Fountaines: or converse with trees,
> Admit in my discourse Hyperbolyes . . .
> . . . sing my Mistris shee is Faire:
> Tell of her Lilly Hand, her golden Haire," etc.

Finally there is a Postscript to the Book-binder, describing the company and the purchasers desired for the work.

> "Ye, ye, Brave Gallants: Patrons of lively mirth:
> Ye, the young hopefull Land-lords of the earth:
> The youth of youth! That read most liberally,
> More out of Pastime than necessity:
> Yee worthy Worthyes! None else (might I chuse)
> Doe I desire my Poesie peruse."

There is a mingling here of the types of rebuke and reflection. The chief point of interest is the unfamiliar attitude toward satire and toward the usual objects of satire,—the opposition to lynx-eyed criticism, and the declaration of independence in conduct. One scarcely knows how seriously to take the author's sayings on these matters, or to be sure that he is not smiling ironically as he presents them. By far the best of his satire, however, is that in the *Notes from Blackfryers;* this belongs to what might almost be called a new type, which we have seen coming in with Jonson (though of course often suggested by earlier satirists),—viz., the type of character-study.

Fitzgeffrey was evidently a man of classical education, and he was also familiar with earlier English satire. I have already

intimated that he was following Marston in some of the peculiarities of his style. To him (and very likely to others also) he seems to refer in the opening of the "Morall Satyre:"

> "I Taxe no Times, I beare no Furyes scourge:
> I bring no powerfull Fountaine Springes to purge
> This Vicefull Lerna, this Augean stye,
> From long neglected noysome filthery."

In the first Satire is an allusion to Parrot's *Mastive*

> ("Then out comes Whelps of the olde Dog," etc.);

and it is possible that in the "grizely Tartarian curres" of the "Morall Satyre" there may be an allusion to Goddard's "ruff-island-like Currs." A passage in the *Notes from Blackfryers*, describing a gallant scolding his tailor, may be in imitation of a similar description in Wither II. 1. That Fitzgeffrey knew the work of Davies of Hereford, and of Rowlands, is evident from a passage presently to be noticed. Granting all this, however, it is to be observed that his vein of satire was fairly original.

In one passage the satirist refers to Homer, Vergil, Ovid and Juvenal as typical classics. The opening of Satire 1 suggests Juvenal I.:

> "Who'd not at venture Write? So many waies
> A man may prove a Poet now a daies!" etc.

And the end of the same satire is certainly in imitation of the Prologue of Persius:

> "It was nere my hap
> On high Pernassus Top, to take a nap," etc.

Satire 2 is preceded by the mottoes already noticed at the head of some of Marston's satires: "Videntur et non sunt," and "Sunt et non videntur." The description of the independent spirit, in the "Morale Satyre," suggests the conclusion of

Juvenal X., and similar passages in Horace. Finally, there is to be noticed a reference to obscurity in classical satire:

> "Takes he but so much Paine
> To write obscurely: adding so much Braine,
> As end his crabbed sencelesse verse in Rime:
> This might a Poet beene in Perseus time."

Fitzgeffrey seems, then, to have used various materials. His style is genuinely native, with small attempt at classical imitation. In general, however, he uses the methods of classical satire. He is severe, but not over-earnest. His emphasis is exclusively on private affairs, and his point of view personal. He uses allusion and other classical figures, together with the semi-dramatic method. He is self-conscious and keen. His type-names are of all sorts,—classical, Italian and English. The local color is entirely English. The humor is decidedly subtle, and sometimes ironical. Probably not all these things were obtained through English imitators of the classics.

Of objects satirized we have:

Morals:

Hypocrisy.
Slander.
Gluttony.
Boasting.
Prodigality.
Lust.

Fashions:

Foreign clothes.
Overdressed gallants.

Personal Humors:

(See analysis of *Notes from Blackfryers.*)

Classes:

Soldiers.
Travelers.
Loud women.

Literature:

In literary satire Fitzgeffrey shows special interest, his manner suggesting Persius. He attacks

Contemporary satire.
Verses on current events.
Pamphlets, Ballads, Plays, etc.
Critics.
Plagiarism.
Poetry on "Penny-Patrons."
Romantic and amorous poetry.

There is a single passage (in Satire 1) closely packed with hits at contemporary authors—among them being:

Breton's *Post with a Packet*, etc. (1603).
Nixon's *Strange Foot-Post*, etc. (1613).
Dekker's *English Villanies*, etc. (1616).
Jacke of Dover his Quest, etc. (1604).
Scoggin's Jests.
Parrot's *Laquei Ridiculosi* (1613).
Rowlands's *Doctor Merry-man* (1616) and *Knaves*.[1]
Freeman's *Rub and a Great Cast* (1614).
Taylor the Water-Poet.
William Fennor and his *Defence* (1615).
Davies, "the unreasonable Epigrammatist of Hereford."

There is also a favorable reference to Daniel and Spenser. Websterio ("the Play-Wright, Cart-wright: whether? either!") seems to be John Webster, whose *Duchess of Malfi* had been produced the year previous.

These satires, intrinsically slight, are interesting as giving us the last specimen, in this period, of satires showing the direct influence of classical satire, and also from their spirit of reaction against prevalent satirical methods.

[1] Here I follow Corser, *Collectanea*, Part 6, pp. 357 f.

15.—Henry Hutton.

"Follie's Anatomie: or Satyres and Satyricall Epigrams (with a Compendious History of Ixion's Wheele). Compiled by Henry Hutton, Dunelmensis." London, 1619.

This production is of slight interest, but requires brief consideration. Of the author nothing is known. Mr. Rimbault, who edited the book for the Percy Society, believed he might be Henry Hutton, A. M., who was curate of Witton Gilbert and who died in 1671. There seems to be no reason to regret the fact that no other of his works have survived. Collier refers briefly to the *Follie's Anatomie*[1] as being by one who was not "quite so great a plagiary as Parrot."

The satires are in the usual couplets, generally end-stopped and of monotonous effect. The style too is dull and unilluminated: it is the vernacular, and indicates chiefly the imitation of satirists of the English type.

The contents of the satires are as follows:

1. The author declares he cannot lash vices at his best, for lack of patronage.
2. The stern and lynx-eyed critic is attacked, (after Fitzgeffrey).
3. Various hypocrites; the lying servant; the overdressed gallant and his lust.
4. "Tom Tospot," the drunken traveler; his vices, his ragged poverty, his probable fate at Tyburn.
5. Mounsier Bravado is ironically instructed in the arts of gallantry: dressing, sonnet and madrigal writing, courting, theatre going, use of jewelry and perfumes, getting into debt,—finally how to sing when in jail.
6. A poetaster is at first ironically urged to write the madrigals, sonnets, panegyrics, etc., that he has promised; then the fate of his previous ballads (in pies, ovens, and worse places) is described, and he is frankly told that he will attain most praise in being mute.
7. A glutton is described and censured. The author professes that he would be more severe were it safe to be so.
8. "A woman creature most insatiate:" her outward graces, her inward lust and hypocrisy.

[Following these are fifty-six epigrams with separate title-page.]

The type of satire here is again the late one of brief scat-

[1] *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. p. 276.

tering hits at character types. The "depraved age" is the conventional one, and it is alleged that true satire is silenced by the "taxing times;" yet the author prints his name boldly on the title-page, with no fear of molestation.

I have already noted that Collier calls Hutton a plagiarist. A passage in the dedicatory verses,

> "My lame-legd muse nere clome Pernassus mount,"

might be from the Prologue of Persius directly, but it is more probably a variation on Fitzgeffrey; while in the second satire there is almost literal transcription from the "Moral Satyre" of the latter. In Fitzgeffrey the passage begins:

> "Beshrow mee, Sirs, if I dare strout in street:
> Winke at a Window: A God-dam-me greet:
> Usher a Lady: but salute her Glove:" etc.

In Hutton:

> "Beshrew me, sirs, I durst not stretch the street,
> Gaze thus on conduits scrowls, base vintners beat,
> Salute a mad-dame with a french cringe grace,
> Greete with God-dam-me a confronting face," etc.

Like most of his contemporaries, too, Hutton shows acquaintance with Wither's satires:

> "I urge no time, with whipt, stript satyrs lines,
> With furies scourge, whipping depraved times."

In his use of the type-names *Gnatho* and *Thraso* he probably borrows from previous satirists. Indeed the name *Gnatho* seems to have become so familiar a type that he is able to use the verb "Gnathonize" in the sense of *to play the hypocrite.* Of direct use of the classics there is no evidence. To classical satire the work goes back only traditionally. The local color is distinctly English, and the style for the most part attempts no classicism, except in the way of allusions

to Venus, Hymen, Vesta, Philomel, Meander's streams, etc. Type-names are sparingly used, and are of various forms. In a passage like the following description of a glutton we see Hutton's method of attempting vigorous satire :

> "His belly is a cisterne of receit,
> A grand confounder of demulcing meate.
> A sabariticke sea, a depthless gulfe,
> A sencelessé vulture, a corroding wolfe . . .
> Cramming his stomack with uncessant loade,
> Like a stuft bladder, hate's big swelling toade ;
> And rammes his panch, that bottomlesse abysse,
> As if to glut were legall, promised bliss." (S. 7.)

Humor is crude and rare ; in the Epigrams the author's idea of wit is seen to centre about atrocious puns.

Objects of satire include :

Morals :

Hypocrisy.
Slander.
Gluttony.
Lust.

Fashions :

Fashionable gallants.
Tobacco.
Women's artificial beauty.

Classes :

Travelers (of the tramp order)

Personal Humors :

The love-sick gallant.

Literature :

Sonnets, madrigals, etc.
Bad poets.

Besides the allusion to Wither already noted there is apparently in the sixth satire a hit at Harrington's *Ajax*. With this as a clue one might suppose that Harrington was the "poetaster"—the object of attack in the whole satire; yet Harrington had been dead seven years, and would not seem to have been a suitable object.

Hutton's satires show no original qualities, and may be attributed to mere motives of local imitation.

In 1621 Joseph Martyn published *New Epigrams, and a Satyre.* The book was licensed in 1619, under the title, *New Epigrams, having in their Companie a mad satyre,* and there may have been an edition in that year. I have neither seen the satire nor found any useful account of its contents.

16.—Richard Brathwaite.

"Natures Embassie: or the Wilde-Mans Measures: Danced naked by twelve Satyres, with sundry others continued in the next Section."—London. 1621.

Brathwaite is the last regular satirist of our list, and one hesitates to use the word "regular" in such a connection. He began to publish poems in 1611, and had already published works of a satirical character in 1615 and 1617.[1] The form of the "satires" in *Natures Embassie* is hardly to be called satirical; they are in six-line stanzas, rhyming *a, b, a, b, c, c.* The style may best be called mediæval: there is a great abundance of classical allusion, but nothing of the rapid satirical manner; the verse lacks both satirical strength and poetic sweetness; the tone is serious and dull.

The work opens with a Dedicatory Epistle to Sir T. H. the Elder, in which the author says:

"When the natures of men are cleere perverted, then it is high time for the Satyrist, to pen something which may divert them from their impietie, and direct

[1] For an account of the author's life, and a complete bibliography of his works, see Hazlitt's reissue of Haslewood's edition of *Barnabee's Journal.*

them in the course and progresse of Vertue . . . I have penned this short Discourse, interwoven with history as well as poesie, for two things summarily, . . . The first is the iniquitie of this present time wherein we live: so that Nature had either time now to send an Ambassage or never. . . . The second reason is the motion of a private friend of mine."

The Satyres are each preceded by a prose "Argument," that is, a brief discourse on the subject of the satire, and an account of the typical character by which the particular abstraction is personated. The list is:

1. Degeneration (personated in Nature).
2. Pleasure (in Pandora).
3. Ambition (in the Giants).
4. Vaine-glory (in Crœsus).
5. Crueltie (in Astiages).
6. Adulterie (in Clytemnestra).
7. Incest (in Tereus).
8. Blasphemie (in Caligula).
9. Beggarie (in Hippias).
10. Miserie (in Taurus).
11. Hypocrisie (in Claudius).
12. Excesse (in Philoxenus).

Following the first section of satires are "some Epycedes or funerall Elegies." The "Second Section of divine and morall Satyres" has a separate title-page, and was evidently published later in the same year, being bound up with copies of the first section. The Satyres are preceded by Arguments, as before:

1. Sloth (personated in Elpenor).
2. Corruption (in Cornelia).
3. Atheisme (in Lucian).
4. Singularitie (in Stesichorus).
5. Dotage (in Pigmalion).
6. Partialitie (in Pytheas).
7. Ingratitude (in Periander).
8. Flatterie (in Terpnus).
9. Epicurisme (in Epicurus).
10. Briberie (in Diagoras).
11. Invention (in Triptolemus).
12. Disdaine (in Melonomus).
13. Idolatrie (in Protagoras).

Here are interpolated three other Satyres "treating of these three distinct subjects":

1. Tyrannie (personated in Eurystheus).
2. Securitie (in Alcibiades).
3. Revenge (in Perillus).
   With an Embleme of Mortalitie (in Agathocles).
14. A short Satyre of a corrupt Lawyer.

Two short moderne Satyres :
In Ambulantem Hypocritam (Pseudophilia).
In Drusum meretricium Adjutorum (Poligonia).
Finally comes An Admonition to the Reader upon the precedent Satyres, signed *Musophilus.*

Brathwaite's type of satire may fairly be called original, if nothing else. In general he was a follower of Wither, and so dealt in the satire of abstract qualities. It is not evident that he made use of any other English satirist. He appears in *Natures Embassie* as a solemn, well-disposed person, with professedly ethical motives :

"To examplifie a mans writings in these daies, is but to beate the aire, unlesse invection or a bitter Satyre move it." (Argument to N. E. 4.)

"Satyres though rough, are plaine and must revile
Vice with a Cynicke bluntnesse, as long since
Those grave judicious Satyrists did use,
Who did not taxe the time, but times abuse.[1]
And yet I wish my pen were made of steele,
And every lefe, a leafe of lasting brasse, . . .
Yet well I know, I shall Characterd be,
In living letters, proving what I write
To be authenticke to posteritie,
To whom this Ages vices I recite
Which, much I doubt, as they're successive still
By course of yeares, so they'le succeed in ill." (N. E. 9.)

There is the usual characterization of the degeneracy of the age :

"That was the golden age, but this is lead,
Where vice doth flourish, vertue lieth dead."

With the classics and the mediæval fathers Brathwaite seems to have had extraordinary familiarity. The following is a partial list of the authors cited in the marginal notes : Homer, Plutarch, Hesiod, Pliny, Tacitus, Vergil, Livy, Ovid, Martial,

[1] A marginal note here explains that the satirists meant are "Eupolis, Aristobulus, Aristeas, &c."

Seneca, Suetonius, Horace, Cicero, Varro, Lucan, Catullus, Sallust, Valerius Maximus, Appian Alexander, "Dictys Cretensium," Laertius, Lampridius, Gregory, Augustine, Bede, Avicenna, Pico Mirandola. The Latin satirists, however, are but sparingly used, their method being quite remote from Brathwaite's; yet in one place we have a note "Vid. Persi. in Satyr," and in another "Vid. Juvenal Saty." In S. 4 (Argument) the author says:

> "With Juvenall I may well conclude:
> Spite of our teeth when vice appeares in sight,
> We must the Satyres play, and tartly write."

(Note the characteristically unclassical rendering.) There is also a quotation from Horace's Epistles (I. 1. 53): "Virtus post nummos."

Brathwaite used the classics, then, as the mediæval writers did, only as a storehouse of allegorical and ethical material. For him the Renaissance had never come. His general idea of satire as a rebuke of the vices of a degenerate age he of course derived from the imitators of classical satire, as he did the name Satyre; but his method was not consistent with the traditional satire. He shows a curious lack of logic and order; all sorts of material are put together, the moral is frequently much strained or hard to find, and the style shows a similar use of strained figures. The very title of the book is an instance in point: the idea which it expresses (and which is illustrated on the title-page by a vivid group of naked satyrs) is recurred to but once throughout the work, when it is said:

> "Longer I will not dilate on this subject, but recollect my spirits, to adde more spirit to my over-tyred Satyre, who hath bene so long employed in the Embassie of Nature, and wearied in dancing the Wilde mans measure, that after Perillus censure she must repose ere she proceede any further; and take some breath ere I dance any longer." (Arg. S. S. on Revenge.)

Brathwaite had slight conception of the satire as a distinct literary form, as is shown by the introduction of elegies, etc.

In one case (S. S. 12) he introduces the pastoral element conspicuously. There are some traces of the familiar type-names (as Naso the lawyer in S. S. 14); but generally the names used—as will already have become evident—are those of traditional heroes, viewed as real examples of the sins they represent. Local color of any distinct sort is generally lacking, though occasionally there is an English localization. In a marginal note to S. S. 9 is an allusion to Elderton the drunken balladist. In S. S. 11 "Britannie" is compared to the blessed isles described by Hesiod, "the two universities" to the streams of Helicon, and the Thames to the Euphrates.

It is quite impossible to group the objects of Brathwaite's satire in the usual way. They are generally the vague sorts of unrighteousness indicated by the titles of the poems. Particular objects are the vanity of women, epicures, beggars, lust, and the vanities of pastoral and amorous verse.

In *Natures Embassie*, then, we have a late use of the traditional form "satire," preserving the mythological connection of the form with the "satyrs" of pastoral myth, and its ethical connection with the aim of rebuking vice. The method, however, is irregular and inconsistent; the artificial character of the moral purpose is evident from the way in which it is carried out; and the form has become so merely traditional that the author uses it as a name for anything he wishes to include.

In 1615, as already noted, Brathwaite had begun his satirical writing, and his *Strappado for the Divell: Epigrams and Satyres alluding to the time*, etc., seems to have been a closer imitation of the popular satire of the time than the *Natures Embassie*. Collier describes it, however, as "a strange, undigested, and ill-arranged collection of poems of various kinds.[1] *The Epistle Dedicatorie* opens:[2] "To all Usurers, Broakers, and Promoters, Sergeants, Catchpoles, and Regraters, Ushers, Panders, Suburbes Traders, Cockneies that have manie fathers. Ladies, Monkies, Parachitoes, Marmosites, and Catamitoes, Falls, high tires, and rebatoes,

[1] *Rarest Books*, vol. i. p. 94.

[2] I have not seen the book, but quote from the bibliography in Haslewood's ed. *Barnabee's Journal*, already cited.

false-haires, periwigges, monchatoes: grave Gregorians, and Shee painters. Send I my greeting at adventures, and to all such as be evill, my strappado for the Divell." Mr. Gosse refers to the book as "a volume founded directly on *The Abuses Stript and Whipt* of George Wither."[1]

In 1617 Brathwaite published a satirical work called *The Smoaking Age, or the man in the mist: with the life and death of Tobacco.*

In 1621 (the same year as *Natures Embassie*) appeared *Times Curtaine drawne or the Anatomie of Vanitie with other choice Poems entituled Health from Helicon: by Richard Brathwayte Oxonian.*[2] Here again the author indicates his familiarity with Wither, and refers to the imprisonment of the latter in the lines—

> "Tutch not Abuses but with modest lipp
> For some I know were whipt that thought to whip,"

adding in the margin: "One whom I admire, being no lesse happie for his native invention than excellent for his proper and elegant dimension." These satires are in the usual couplet form. The first is on Riches. In the second there is a passage on the poverty of poets, quite in the manner of Wither. I quote from Collier's transcription:

> "Yet in the gifts of nature we shall finde
> A ragged coate oft have a Royall minde:
> For to descend to each distinct degree
> By due experience we the same shall see.
> If to Parnassus where the Muses are,
> There shall we finde their Dyet very bare;
> Their houses ruined and their well-springs dry,
> Admir'd for nought so much as Povertie.
> Here shall we see poore Æschylus maintaine
> His nighterne studies with his daily paine,
> Pulling up Buckets but twas never knowne
> That filling others he could fill his owne.
> Here many more discerne we may of these,
> As Lamachus, and poore Antisthenes,
> Both which the sweetes of Poesie did sipp
> Yet were rewarded with a staff and scripp;
> For I nere knew nor (much I feare) shall know it,
> Any die rich that liv'd to die a Poet."

[1] Article on Brathwaite, *Dictionary of National Biography.*

[2] See Collier: *Poetical Decameron*, vol. ii. pp. 54 ff.

In 1623 *Natures Embassie* was reissued under the title of *Shepherds Tales*, etc., the pastoral elegies evidently being thought to be its most attractive contents.

In 1624 or 1625 appeared a second edition of the *Scourge of Follie* of Davies of Hereford, and to this was added *A Continued Inquisition against Paper-Persecutors*, by "A. H." The author has been generally thought to be Abraham Holland. The poem is in 156 lines, in the usual couplets, and continues the attack on contemporary poetry which had been begun in Davies's *Paper's Complaint*. The author was not enamored of the satire as used by his contemporaries:

> "Others that ne'er searched new borne Vice at all,
> But the seven deadly Sinnes in generall,
> Drawne from the Tractate of some cloyster'd Frier,
> Will needs write Satyrs, and in raging fire
> Exasperate their sharpe Poeticke straine,
> And thinke they have toucht it, if they raile at Spaine,
> The Pope and Devill; and while thus they urge
> Their stinglesse gall, there's none deserve the scourge
> More than themselves, whose weaknesse might suffice
> To furnish Satyrs and poore Elegies." (ll. 42–52.)

This passage is worth more than a passing notice. It indicates the growing belief on the part of clever men that a good satire must have distinct contemporary allusions, and deal with "new born vices;" and on the other hand it rebukes the growing habit (justly, as we have seen) of writing vaguely on the "seven deadly sins," in the manner of mediæval sermonizers.

Further on Holland declares that the scribblers may yet force him to turn satirist himself:

> "Who if they doe not soone these matters mend,
> I'le shortly into th' world a Satyre send,
> Who shall them lash with fiery rods of Steele." (153 ff.)

And in l. 128 the author seems already to regard himself as a satirist:

> "Touching the State, Ambassadors or Kings,
> My Satyre shall not touch such sacred things."

The particular enumeration of the work of scribblers includes: the pamphleteers of Paul's Church; epigrams of "undigested mish-mash;" rhyming versions of the Bible; popular pamphlets and ballads (of Chevy Chase, etc.); elegies on nobility "in lamentable lachrymental rimes"; news pamphlets, etc. Dubartas and his translators are exempted from condemnation (35 ff.), and Jonson and Drayton are alluded to as unworthily neglected for cheap balladists, such as the "Wherrie Bookes" (perhaps of Taylor the "Water Poet"?).

Altogether this quasi-satire furnishes some very interesting comments on the literature popular in London at the end of the first quarter of the century. We

have now reached the time when the formal satire, instead of being a fresh criticism of contemporary publications, was decadent in vigor and was itself satirized among the other forms at which every cheap poet tried his hand.

V.

We have now only to summarize, as briefly as may be, the matters brought to light by the preceding study.

Early in the discussion it was remarked that in the classical imitations of the Elizabethans two streams of influence met: familiarity with the classical writers, such as had lately become a part of the education of all cultivated persons, and familiarity with Italian efforts to imitate the classics and adapt them to the expression of contemporary life. These influences have to do alike with many forms of literature; in the case of formal satire they are very clear. Wyatt, first of the formal satirists, derived his inspiration from Italy, though showing direct familiarity with classical satire. Others, while no doubt frequently finding in Italy the suggestion of satire as a literary form, did not—like Wyatt—follow the Italian method of adaptation. In France the imitation of classical and Italian satire followed close upon that in England, though there does not appear to have been any considerable connection between the two countries in this respect, until well on in the seventeenth century. In 1605 Casaubon published his great work *De Satyrica Græca Poesi et Romanorum Satira*, as well as his edition of Persius; the former work became the centre of interest in the classical satirists for a long time to come.[1]

[1] Mr. Gosse writes me: "I believe the personal work of Casaubon in his lecture-room to have started the whole thing, in France where it succeeded, as in England where it failed." However true this may be for France, I am not able to see what influence Casaubon could have had on the origin of the satirical imitations in England, fifteen years and more before the publication of his work on satire. When Donne and Lodge were making their experiments, Casaubon was still professor of Greek at Geneva, and he was not himself in England till 1610.

We have seen that, while in Italy and France it was the Horatian type of satire which was chiefly imitated, in England Wyatt, and occasionally Jonson, were the only ones to follow this form with success. In varying degrees, most of Wyatt's successors who drew from the classics accepted Juvenal as their model. Gradually, however, as must necessarily have been the case, the form became one not of direct imitation but of local convention, and the original models were followed further and further off. By the beginning of the seventeenth century the writing of satires was recognized as a fashion of the times. In *The Return from Parnassus: or The Scourge of Simony* (about 1601), Ingenioso appears as a violent critic of the times, bearing "Juvenal in his hand," and crying:

> "*Difficile est, Satyram non scribere, nam quis iniquæ*
> *Tam patiens urbis, tam ferreus ut teneat se?*
> I, Juvenall: thy jerking hand is good,
> Not gently laying on, but fetching bloud,
> So surgean-like thou dost with cutting heale,
> Where nought but lanching can the wound avayle.
> O suffer me, among so many men,
> To tread aright the traces of thy pen.
> And light my linke at thy eternall flame,
> Till with it I brand everlasting shame
> On the worlds forhead, and with thine owne spirit,
> Pay home the world according to his merit."

His friend Judicio greets him with the remark:

> "What, Ingenioso, carrying a Vinegar bottle about thee, like a great schole boy giving the world a bloudy nose?"[1]

And later in the same play Sir Raderick observes:

> "I hope at length England will be wise enough, I hope so, I faith, then an old knight may have his wench in a corner without any Satyres or Epigrams."[2]

[1] Macray's ed., pp. 80, 81.

[2] Ibid., p. 120. Compare Benedick, in *Much Ado*, v. 4: "Dost thou think I care for a satire or an epigram?" Other allusions in Shakspere to the satire as a literary form are in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, v. 1, where it is proposed to present a dramatic satire on the death of learning; and *Timon* v. 1, where the Poet proposes to present Timon with "a satire against the softness of prosperity."

In Chapman's *All Fools* (1605), the young gallant who describes his manifold arts with the ladies, concludes:

> "I could have written as good prose or verse
> As the most beggarly poet of 'em all,
> Either acrostic, or exordion,
> Epithalamions, Satyrs, Epigrams,
> Sonnets in Dozens, or your Quatorzains
> In any rhyme, Masculine, Feminine,
> Or Sdruciolla, or couplets, or Blank Verse."[1]

And in the dedicatory verses to Rowlands's *Guy of Warwick* (1607) there is a reference to

> "this same Poet-plenty-age,
> When Epigrams and Satyrs biting, rage."

In like manner Jonson, in his Epigram "To a Weak Gamester in Poetry," refers to satires in connection with epics, odes, elegies, and epigrams. In nearly all these passages the connection between satires and epigrams is particularly close, and so it was in fact. The two forms arose under similar influences, were usually published together, and are often difficult to distinguish if one is critical as to terms. Martial had begun to be translated into English even earlier than Juvenal, and found many imitators.[2] For a list of the most important epigrammatists, one may see Hazlitt's edition of Warton's *History of English Poetry*, vol. iv., pp. 414–427.

Very early in the development of the English satire its metrical form became fairly well fixed, as had been the case in other languages. The decasyllabic couplet may probably be regarded as at least the equal, for satiric effect, of the Latin hexameter or the Italian *terza rima*. We have seen that, chosen first by Spenser for satire, it was adopted almost simultaneously by Donne, Lodge, and Hall, and that it is

[1] Act ii. scene 1.

[2] See Warton's *History of English Poetry*, Hazlitt ed., vol. iv., p. 300.

quite as likely that this happened by coincidence as that any one of them definitely set the example for the others. Thereafter the measure may almost be made a test of the intentionally satiric character of a poem. The most interesting matter to be noticed in this connection is the fact that the couplet of the Elizabethan satirists is by no means lacking in the incisive, epigrammatic qualities that mark the satiric verse of a century later.[1]

Since the strong moral sense of the English people had always made good use of the informal satire of the type of direct rebuke, it was natural that the type of Juvenal rather than of Horace should predominate when the classical satirists came to be followed. Rapidly this type developed into a convention, so that we have found satirists with little individual taste for moral invective or ethical instruction, who really followed a free narrative method, still assuming for form's sake the attitude of scourgers of vice and preachers of righteousness. Those who kept nearest to the classics avoided the practical tone of the reformer, and contented themselves with the pessimistic representation of contemporary conditions; those who reverted most to the type of early English satire dwelt most frankly on the moral abstractions which were only suggested by the concrete objects of everyday experience; while some (like Rowlands and the author of *Micro-cynicon*) contented themselves with making the satire a mere instrument for such good-natured comment on the follies of the world as had pleased the ancient founders of the Order of Fools. Always, however, there was the assumption of an evil world and a degenerate age. This was taught too clearly alike by Juvenal, by the Bible of the reformers, and by personal experience, not to be easily accepted as general truth. Yet in the exuberant life of the Elizabethan period this conventional pessimism was out

[1] See the remark of Mr. Gosse (somewhat inconsistent, to be sure, with his more generally familiar doctrine of Waller and the heroic couplet), quoted above, p. 166; and the metrical table in the Appendix.

of place. In some cases it was doubtless mere affectation; in some it was the reaction from the overflowing gayety upon which the men of the Renaissance had entered; in some it was the outcome of the gloomy side of religion. In the formal satires it was perhaps rarely altogether sincere and independent of convention.

The detailed examination of the relations of the various English satires to their classical models, has made it evident that Juvenal was the principal source for the imitators, not only for type and tone, but for illustrative details. Horace was of course always a favorite, but was used chiefly for decorative purposes. Persius was much admired, and frequently cited in a general way; but his work was so difficult to grasp, and so limited in details of material, that it was not very useful in helping to build up the stuff of concrete satire. His chief influence seems to have been in the promotion of the idea that formal satire must tend toward harshness and obscurity, as well as toward keenness and vigor. We have seen the earlier imitators taking a large amount of material from these Latin sources, and the later ones taking material rather from the former imitators, or using the forms and shapes of what had been borrowed as a conventional framework for whatever of contemporary life they wished to include. The greatest variation in point of skill has appeared in the different degrees to which the English satirists were able to adapt their borrowings to local conditions, and to give them the color of real life. Few escaped altogether from the traditional trappings which every form of literature, no less than satire, had acquired in the effort to be classical. Few seized the idea that to follow Juvenal in calling a character "Calvus" was to call him, not Calvus, but "Bald-head," and that to give the effect that Juvenal produced in addressing Ponticus, one must address not Ponticus, but Digby or John. In actual faithfulness to local color the later satirists naturally improved over the earlier, and it finally becomes rare to meet with bits of

Roman scenery to any greater extent than in the type-names. In like manner it was only the earlier imitators who succeeded in the effort to classicize their style. We have thus followed the progress of the formal satire to the days when it was little more than a name for any sort of satirical material that a poet wished to put together.

Of all questions raised by a study of Elizabethan satire, those connected with the objects of its attack are perhaps the most interesting. It is these which bring us into closest touch with the real life of the time, even when set in imitative framework. To what extent do the pictures of the time as given by the satirists really represent the truth? This is not altogether easy to answer. In the first place, it may be said that the satirists undoubtedly exaggerated. When one has set out to write satire based on a pessimistic assumption, he must of course look at the world through colored glasses. Juvenal had done this, giving his picture of Roman society at the same time that Pliny was giving his very different one. "Le grand mérite de la satire," Lenient observes, "aux yeux de la postérité du moins, c'est qu'elle est indiscrète. Elle n'a point de ces ménagements calculés dont les partis s'enveloppent pour dissimuler leurs fautes : elle ose tout, dit tout, et même quelquefois plus que la vérité."[1] Vague statements, then, as to the corruption and degeneracy of the age, must not be taken too seriously. When we come to particular objects of satire, it is harder to distinguish truth from conventionality. Some objects are evidently given a Juvenalian coloring, if not altogether introduced from the classical pictures of degeneracy; while others are as clearly drawn directly from contemporary sources.

When we look through the list of moral vices attacked in the satires we have examined, a large proportion of them are seen to be those inherent in human nature and society, and

[1] *La Satire en France au Moyen Age*, p. 12.

equally the property of any age. The extremes of avarice and prodigality have always been peculiarly susceptible of literary treatment, and one need never go far for illustrations. The same thing is true of ambition, of superstition, and—to a lesser degree—of vices like gluttony and drunkenness. All these things the Elizabethan satirists found in their classical models, and they found them at the same time so easily in the life about them that to bring them down to date was nothing libellous or unfair. The emphasis on lustful passions and their reckless sway is a little harder to understand. So far as the mere emphasis is concerned, and the method of presentation as well, the source was undoubtedly the satires of Juvenal. Particular charges of horrible frankness and severity may often be traced to Rome, and one may doubt whether there was adequate ground for them in Elizabethan society. On the other hand it must be admitted that there is abundant evidence in Elizabethan literature, particularly in the drama, of laxity of morals such as one associates unwillingly with a period of such splendor. This is of course to be attributed not, as in the Rome of Juvenal, to the rottenness of decadent society, but to the lusty exuberance of life at the end of the sixteenth century. The treasures of antiquity had been spread open before the western world; the treasures of new and unconquered worlds further west had been added to these; and the restrictions of a paternalistic religion had been removed by the throwing off of the yoke of Rome. It was inevitable that there should come a new sense of fullness of life and liberty of action which, in spite of its blessings, should show between its rising waves dark abysses into which one does not like to look too long. Independence and intensity of life mark Elizabethan England in both her virtues and her vices. To pessimists all this seemed a decay of the foundations of morality. The prose pamphlets echo the charges of the verse satires. Thus Barnaby Rich, whose *Honestie of*

this Age was in fact a prose satire in the Elizabethan manner (1614), declared :

"A general corruption hath overgrowne the vertues of this latter times, and the world is become a Brothell house of sinne. It is enough for us now if we seeke but for the resemblance of vertue, for the soveraigntie of the thing it selfe we never trouble our selves about it. . . Whether will you tend your steppes, which way will you turne your eyes, or to whom will you lend your listening eares, but you shall meete with vice, looke upon vanitie, and heare those speeches that doe not onely tend to folly but sometimes to ribauldry, other whiles to blasphemy, and many times to the great dishonor of God."[1]

What has been said of moral matters applies equally to those elements in the satires relating to what I have called fashions and follies. Here also there was a great stir after intensity and independence. The increase of luxury and decay of seriousness, in the social life of London, may be compared with the absurdities of a not too wise youth who has unexpectedly come into a fortune. Mr. Hubert Hall says of the period as early as the time of Latimer :

"It was, in truth, a frivolous age in the light of a bygone earnestness and religiousness of life. The gains of industry and science, diminished by no regard for the interests or neeessities of others, were spent on their possessor's personal pleasures ; in eating, dress, gambling, and lewdness."[2]

The central figure of Elizabethan satire is the gorgeous young gallant ; his clothes representing as many countries as may be, the wonder of everyone he meets ; his short sword giving warning that he must be allowed the favorite side of the street ; his head surrounded with a constant halo of tobacco-smoke,—the weed being a foreign one, and its pleasures new and strange ; his eyes searching every window for

[1] *Honestie of this Age*, Percy Society Reprint, p. 17.
[2] *Society in the Elizabethan Age*, p. 40.

those of an admirer or a promising victim. This is the Gullio of *The Return from Parnassus* (Part I.), who declares :

"I am never seene at the courte twise in one sute of apparell; that's base! as for boots, I never wore one paire above two hours; as for bands, stockings, and handkerchiefs, myne hostes, where my trunkes lye, nere the courte, hath inoughe to make her sheets for her housholde."

And again :

"I cannot abide to be tide to Cleopatra, if shee were alive. It's enough for me to crop virginitie, and to take heed that noe laides dye vestalls and leade aps in hell. . . . It is my nature to be debonaire with faire ladies, and vouchsake to employ this happie hande in anie service ether domesticall or private."[1]

It is the same character whose daily life is described in one of Davies's epigrams :

"First, he doth rise at ten; and at eleven
He goes to 'Gyls,' where he doth eat till one;
Then sees a play till six, and sups at seven;
And after supper straight to bed is gone;
And there till ten next day he doth remain,
And then he dines and sees a Comedy,
And then he sups and goes to bed again;
Thus round he runs without variety."[2]

[1] Macray's ed., p. 54.

[2] On the frequenting of St. Paul's Cathedral by the fashionable young gentlemen one may see Mr. Edmonds's notes on *News out of Pauls*, and Mr. Bateson in *Social England*, vol. iii. p. 574. Rowlands's Epigrams in *The Letting of Humour's Blood* contain numerous references to the follies of young gallants of the period. Dekker's *Gull's Horn's Book* is of course a notable place to seek for illustrations of the same sort. On the follies in the dress of the other sex, one may see—besides the numerous passages in the satires that we have examined—Gosson's *Glasse to viewe the pride of vaineglorious women. A plesant invective against the fantastical foreigne toyes dayly used in womens apparel* (reprinted by the Percy Society, 1841). See also Stubbes's *Anatomie of Abuses* (1693).

On tobacco in particular, among the fashions of the period, our satires have been full of attacks. All the literature of the time is pervaded by similar allusions, and the Stationers' Register hands down the names of numerous pamphlets written either in defence or objurgation of the imported practice of smoking (three of them, for example, in 1602). For a collection of passages relating to this subject one may see Mr. Arber's notes "On the Early use of Tobacco in England,"

Closely akin to the gorgeous young gallant is the professedly traveled gentleman, who has been just far enough to know the fascinations of the outer world, and who finds at every corner those eager to hear of the wonders of the Indies or the Spanish Main. Here, again, contemporary literature of all forms takes up the same theme, and deals, in varying degrees of good-nature and bitterness, with the lies of travelers.

The satirist, being essentially a conscious, critical observer, notes the weakness and unreality of all this, oblivious to its fascinating and even beneficent side. He is impressed most of all by the fact that men are trying to be what they are not, and to make other people believe more than they should. Sir Lawrence Lack-land wears a cloak lined with velvet, and gilded spurs; Sir Henry Have-Little is tricked up like "Proteus the God of Shapes."[1] So we have the dominant note of hypocrisy, of *seeming* as contrasted with *being*, of inverted moral judgments, through all the Elizabethan satire. This Sir John Harington confessed with perhaps as much frankness and vigor as any other:

"Wee goe brave in apparell that wee may be taken for better men than wee bee; wee use much bumbastings and quiltings to seeme better formed, better showlderd, smaller wasted, and fuller thyght, then wee are; wee barbe and shave ofte, to seeme yownger than wee are; we use perfumes both inward and outward, to seeme sweeter than wee be; corkt shooes to seeme taller then wee be; we use cowrtuows salutations to seem kinder than wee bee; lowly obaysances to seeme humbler than we bee; and somtyme grave and godly communication, to seem wyser or devowter then wee be."[2]

It was perhaps in the treatment of public affairs that the satires were freest from classical influence and borrowed forms. We have seen that public satire was characteristic of early England, but not of Rome. The condition of the poor,

accompanying his reprint of King James's *Counterblast*. Rowland's works contain many such passages; see, for example, the address "To Smoky Noses, and Stinking Nostrils," in the *Knave of Spades*.

[1] Rich: *Honestie of this Age*, p. 18.

[2] *Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. i. p. 209.

the conflict of both government and populace with economic laws, the corruptions of secular and ecclesiastical officials, were subjects which the Elizabethan satirist inherited from a noble ancestry of protestants, and which he was not likely to forget. The further one inquires into the conduct of government officials during the splendid reign of Queen Elizabeth, the more clear it becomes that political corruption is not, as some have thought, an invention of modern times and democratic constitutions.[1] Of this the passages in our satires relating to official corruption, particularly to bribery, are sufficient evidence. More conspicuous, however, than these political evils, are those relating to such matters as the hardships of tenants, the scarcity of land, and the rise of prices. The depopulation of villages, and the "enclosure" of common lands, evils which had their rise before the age of Elizabeth, extended their baleful results to the latter part of the century, and we find the complaint against them echoing in our satires.[2] The rise in the price of commodities, which was felt most keenly by the lower classes of society, is also a frequent ground of complaint in the literature of the period.[3] Some of the formal satirists no doubt had genuine interest in the sufferings of the common people; but to most of them these matters were doubtless simply common talk which served to furnish convenient material and philanthropic tone to their satires.

[1] See the chapter on "The Official," in Mr. Hall's *Society in the Elizabethan Age*.

[2] On these matters see Cheyney's *Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century*, Part I, pp. 25–37; and *Social England*, vol. iii. pp. 533 ff. On the evil practices of landlords, one may see a citation by Mr. Collier, from a tract called "Maroccus Extaticus," in the *Poetical Decameron*, vol. i. p. 165.

[3] See *Social England*, vol. iii. pp. 545 ff. The Stationers' Register for December 28, 1594, contains the name of a pamphlet evidently relating to this subject, called "Newes from Jack Begger under the Bushe, with the advise of Gregory Gaddesman his fellow begger touchinge the deare prizes of corne and hardnes of this present yere."

Corruption in the church seems to have furnished even more material for satire than corruption in the state. This, indeed, had always been the case. It seems but a step from the remonstrances of Chaucer and Gower against a mercenary priesthood, to the constant talk of salable benefices, "gelded" vicarages, and the like, which we have met with among the Elizabethan satirists. That there was ample ground for dissatisfaction with the church at this time, one cannot for a moment doubt. As an extreme statement of sixteenth century conditions I quote again from Mr. Hubert Hall, whose words give evidence of needing the grain of salt which we have learned to apply to the charges of earlier satirists than he:

"Where once on the monastery lands garden-patches of grain and pulse and pot-herbs filled in the landscape, tracts of bare down supported thousands of murrain-wasted sheep. The agricultural population had disappeared in these districts. They had flocked to the towns to become fullers, workers, or dyers of the fleeces grown upon the land where they had before guided the plough. Others had gone to the wars, or to play at a yet more desperate game. Many had perished from want, and more still on the scaffold. Then a new class of society was formed out of those who had benefited by these changes, courtiers who plundered the people, landlords who evicted their tenants, officials who cheated the government, merchants, usurers, and pandars, who preyed upon the vices of the great or the woes of the unfortunate. . . . The towns were flooded with tippling-houses, bowling-alleys, tabling-dens, and each haunt of vicious dissipation. Murder, rapine, and every form of lawless violence were practised with comparative impunity. The state of society was the worst that had ever before been in the land. And where, all this time, was the influence of the Church at work? There was no pretence even of such an influence. The bishops were mostly starveling pedants, creatures of a court faction, whose fingers itched after filthy lucre; or else good, plodding, domesticated men, with quiverfuls to provide for; graziers or land-jobbers who had mistaken their vocation. Narrow, harsh, grasping, servile, unjust, they were despised as much by their masters as they were hated by their flocks. The inferior clergy, the typical parson or parish priest, scarcely existed at all. Half the parishes in many dioceses had no proper cure. Many more were provided for with a trembling conformist, or a lewd and insolent bigot. In the best of cases the curate was at the mercy either of the Crown or the amateur theologians, his parishioners."[1]

Truly, if it were half as bad as this, one could not blame an

[1] *Society in the Elizabethan Age*, pp. 104, 105. The "Marprelate" tracts, also give abundant evidence of ecclesiastical corruption.

Elizabethan for quoting Juvenal: "*Difficile est satiram non scribere!*" Nor can one wonder that "simony" is one of the most frequent themes of our satirists. The same theme was the subject of one of the best of the satiric dramas of the period, *The Return from Parnassus* (about 1601), whose subtitle was "The Scourge of Simony."[1]

Dissatisfaction with the established church found expression not only in literature, but also in the rise of dissenting sects of various sorts; and these became objects of attack for critics quite as much as the evils which gave rise to them. So we find in the satires, side by side with the complaints against the corruptions of the regular clergy and the machinations of Papal emissaries, vigorous thrusts at Separatists, Puritans, "Brownists," and the like. These grow more and more numerous as we enter the seventeenth century, until at length the Puritan—the living protest against the objects of earlier satire—himself becomes the central object of the satirist's wrath.

If the satire of public affairs was least under the influence of the classical models, literary satire, on the other hand, was the characteristic undertaking of the formal, imitative satirist. This demands a somewhat highly organized society, and a vigorous critical spirit; and there was present in England, in the last decade of the sixteenth century, quite enough of these to respond eagerly to the literary satire of Rome. In this

[1] On the general interest of this play as illustrative of some of the satires we have been studying, I quote from Mr. Macray's Preface to his edition of the *Parnassus Plays* (p. x.): "A comparison with Bishop Hall's *Satires* brings to view a great similarity alike in subjects and language. The second book of the *Satires* deals, in fact, with many of the abuses of which our unknown author treats. The second satire in that book is a complaint of the poverty of scholars; the third deals with lawyers; the fourth with doctors; the fifth with the growing sin of simony; . . . the sixth is respecting the engagement of a tutor, in which the conditions are very nearly identical, and the payment wholly so, 'five marks and winter livery.' The *Satires* were first printed in 1597; and the coincidences are so many and striking that it is plain that the writer of the plays had them at least freshly in remembrance, and may even have been consciously borrowing ideas from them."

respect as in others, the satirist was first of all an observant critic of the exuberant fashions of the time, refusing to be carried away with the popular rush after novelty, extravagance, and unreason. The prevalent fondness for Italian and Spanish romances, the desire to acquire the reputation of a literary critic by standing at the book-stalls and making wise remarks,[1] the attempt of young poets to follow every new fashion in verse and to plagiarize their betters,—all these things we have found to be frequent objects of attack. Of this critical spirit Jonson was the most noteworthy representative, standing as he did—with his fellow-satirists—for its ever-present reaction against the excesses of the romantic spirit.

It was in connection with literary satire that the element of personal satire most commonly appeared in the Elizabethan period. We have not found the satirists of our list giving any large proportion of strength to personalities. Perhaps it was because they failed to grasp the personality of Juvenal's characters (thinking of them rather as types than as individuals) that they did not derive more suggestions from that source. The formal satire, too, was first of all a literary exercise, and if it was to have personal application it was natural that it should be in the literary sphere. At periods both earlier and later than this, satires were primarily political productions, and aimed their shafts at objects in the political sphere; and political controversy, as everyone knows, is likely to be closely connected with personal attack. According to Dryden, there are but two cases in which personal satire is justifiable: "the first is revenge, when we have been affronted in the same nature, or have been any ways notoriously abused, and can make ourselves no other reparation;" the second is when

[1] For example, Amoretto, in *The Return from Parnassus*, who will "come to a booke binders shop, and with a big Italian looke and a spanish face aske for these bookes in spanish and Italian, then turning, through his ignorance, the wrong end of the booke upward, . . . first looke on the title and wrinkle his browe, next make as though he red the first page," etc. Compare with this the passage from Parrot, quoted p. 190 above.

the particular person "is become a public nuisance."[1] Satires of the former class (or "lampoons"), Dryden admits to be questionable from the standpoint of Christian charity; he expresses the opinion that all those of Horace, Persius, and Juvenal are of the second class—"an action of virtue to make examples of vicious men." Few satirists have been consistent with their own theories; and we have seen that the Elizabethans, even those who most indulged in personalities, always disclaimed any reference to individuals. It is true that when they introduced individuals they usually made them examples of professedly general principles; and it is also true that it is not in the formal satires, but in the pamphlets and prose tracts of the time (as well as in the dramas of quarrelsome playwrights), that we must look for the exchange of personal bitterness in its most conspicuous forms. The very artificiality of the formal satire hindered its expression of personal feeling; and in some cases (as in the "quarrel" of Marston and Hall) we have seen reason to believe that the satirical form was the cause rather than the instrument of belligerency.

This artificial element in the formal satire of the Elizabethans will probably give us a clue to its real nature and occasion. It was the work of experimentalists. It is more than curious to see how many of our authors were young men. In a number of cases the satires we have examined were the first publications of their writers, who never attempted the form again. It was just the sort of task to interest young men fresh from the universities and classical lore. The expression of later life was likely to be more serious and less artificial. The formal satire was introduced most successfully at a time when other exotic fashions—the pastoral, the sonnet, the Senecan tragedy—had been fairly tried and had lost freshness. Having tried every other classical form, why not undertake this? The Italians have satires: it is intolerable that they

[1] Essay on Satire, Scott-Saintsbury ed., pp. 82 f.

should have any fashions that we cannot adopt. This was the spirit of the imitators. But one need not lose interest in them too quickly on that account. The satire was no more imitative than the sonnet, the pastoral, or certain early forms of lyric and dramatic verse. It was no more spontaneous; it was no less spontaneous. It was, however, less suited to the prevailing spirit of Elizabethan England, being a merely reactionary movement against the main literary forces of the day. Moreover, it filled no want that could not be supplied better in some other way. The element of invective was capable of better treatment in prose pamphlets. The element of characterization found its best place in the drama. We have seen evidence in the case of Jonson, and of dramas like the "Parnassus plays," that the subject-matter of Elizabethan satire was easily dramatized, and that such treatment was preferred by the skillful. The story of the satiric drama of the period is yet to be written, but it may be that the matters considered in the present study will contribute to a better understanding of it. Finally, the satire, as a poetic form, was almost wholly unfitted for anything like idealization or what we call *poetic* treatment. Great poets therefore left it to small ones, and small ones were apt to leave it early for other forms.

When we look at the list of Elizabethan satirists, they are seen to fall into three chronological groups. The first is not, indeed, a true group, but consists of those sporadic attempts at formal satire which appeared in the half-century between Wyatt and Donne. The second group is that of the last decade of the sixteenth century, when the formal satire came to be distinctly in fashion, reaching its height in the years 1597–1600. In the first decade of the seventeenth century there is a noticeable blank, doubtless due in part to the strenuous efforts of the authorities to suppress satirical literature, as represented in the order of June 1, 1599, and perhaps due also to the rise of the satirical drama at just this time. The

third group extends from 1613 for a decade, and is marked on the one hand by the influence of Wither in turning the satire into a moral or religious poem, and on the other hand by the lapse of the form into a mere framework for any use to which small versifiers chose to put it. To the work of these small versifiers, so far as it has come down to us, we have given due attention for the sake of completeness; but there is some danger that in doing so we may lose a right sense of proportion. One sometimes wonders whether future historians may set themselves seriously to the classification of specimens of art and poetry from our daily newspapers, assuming that they are representative of artistic and literary movements of the time. Remembering the absurdities suggested by such a thought, we must not assume that all the satires we have examined were viewed with equal seriousness by their authors or their readers. The Elizabethans no doubt distinguished quite as well as we can do, between the characteristically rigorous yet passionate satires of Donne, or the severely classical satires of Hall, and the numerous small imitations which hung about the book-shops of Paul's Churchyard and met with the ridicule of strolling buyers.

The list of satires comes to an almost sudden break at about the time of the accession of Charles I. Like other literary forms of the Elizabethan age, this one had passed through a period of rapid decline, to be made ready for revival under new influences, and for new purposes, in the succeeding period. For a considerable space the Stationers' Register shows no entries of works called satires. This, of course, was only a part of a general decline in literary production at just this time. As Mr. Gosse remarks:

"For some reason or other the publication of verse in the third decade of the seventeenth century was extremely slack, though preceded and followed by periods of great publishing activity. The new King, Charles I., was averse to the writing of poems. . . . It was, in fact, a moment of exhaustion and transition in the book-trade. The day of the romance-writers and pamphlet-mongers was over; sixpenny plays and novels and verse-romances were no more sold over the

counter. . . Books were more expensive, more cumbrous in form; education was spreading, the taste for knowledge was taking the place of that innocent curiosity and romantic simplicity which had made the fortune of the Elizabethan booksellers. Already the shadow of the great political crisis was beginning to darken the horizon, and men were troubled in their minds, seeking for exact information, interested in travels, in philosophy, above all in theology. The great vogue of the Puritan divines was beginning, and almost the only verse which succeeded was put into the form of plays, cheaply printed, and hawked about in little dingy quartos." [1]

With the rise of the wars of the Commonwealth and the power of the Puritans, satire found again its ancient field of political strife, and took on new vigor. It would be interesting to inquire what elements it carried forward of what it had gained from the classical imitations of Elizabethan days; but that must be left to the story of seventeenth century satire. Meantime, the interest in Latin satire had not fallen away. In 1605, as we have seen, Casaubon's great work on classical satire had been published. In 1612 editions of Juvenal and Persius were issued in London. Persius was translated into English as early as 1616, with a late edition (the third or fourth) in 1635. Juvenal's tenth satire was published in translation by "W. B." in 1617, by Chapman in 1629, and by Henry Vaughan in 1646. The first two satires were similarly published in 1634 by John Biddle; and others by Stapleton in 1644, 1647, etc. In the troubled times of the mid-century appear a few formal imitators of these Romans. In 1639 were published *Two Bookes of Epigrammes and Epitaphs* by Thomas Bancroft,[2] whom Sir Aston Cokayne praised as a preserver of the ancient tradition; saying:

> "So old Petronius Arbiter applied
> Corsives unto the age he did deride:
> So Horace, Persius, Juvenal (among
> Those ancient Romans) scourg'd the impious throng;
> So Ariosto (in these later times)
> Reprov'd his Italy for many crimes;
> So learned Barclay let his lashes fall
> Heavy on some to bring a cure on all."

[1] *From Shakespeare to Pope*, pp. 19–21.

[2] See Corser's *Collectanea*, sub. nom.

Meantime, John Taylor, the "Water Poet," was still producing his pamphlets, adapting them to changed conditions and audiences. In 1644 he issued an attack on Wither, under the title, "*Aqua-Musæ: or Cacafogo, Cacodæmon, Captain George Wither Wrung in the Withers.* Being a short lashing Satyre, wherein the Juggling Rebell is Compendiously finely Firked and Jerked, for his late railing Pamphlet against the King and State, called *Campo-Musæ.*"

In the forties and fifties John Cleveland (1613–1658) was writing his vigorous attacks on the Puritans and the Commonwealth. These are chiefly in the manner of burlesque or invective, are full of odd conceits and sparkling witticisms, and frankly personal in their allusions and attacks. Among these characteristically seventeenth-century satires are two of an earlier type—*The London Lady*, called a "satyr" in Cleveland's collected works, and *The Times*, a satire of general rebuke and reflection. Andrew Marvell (1621–1678) may be regarded as the Commonwealth antitype of Cleveland. His satires, on the opposite side of the controversy, are as witty and as coarse as Cleveland's, and—like the latter's—full of conceits and of personalities. The most noteworthy, *Last Instructions to a Painter about the Dutch Wars* (1667), is full of character-sketches drawn with Juvenalian vigor and bitterness. On the other hand, *Flecnoe* shows the influence of Horace.

In 1662 we seem to have an echo of Elizabethan times in a Satyre published by the younger Donne, containing "A Short Map of Mundane Vanity," "A Cabinet of Many Conceits," and the like, and preceded—according to Corser—by a frontispiece representing a dancing satyr.

In 1665 were first published some of the satires of Boileau, and their influence was not long in reaching England. This influence meant a revival of classicism. Not so clever a man as Régnier, Boileau was yet able to absorb the essence of classical satire and adapt it to the taste of his time. As Professor Ward observes, he "revived the popularity of the

device" (which was of course familiar enough to the Elizabethans) "of paraphrasing Latin satirical poetry while applying to modern instances its references and allusions."[1] One of the most interesting of Boileau's followers in England was John Oldham (1653–1683), whose reputation has hardly done justice to his satirical force and keenness. His *Satires upon the Jesuits* (1679), his best known work, are partly in the ironical mood, partly in that of savage invective; and in his small use of humor, as compared with men like Cleveland and Marvell, he is typical of the classical spirit. The sources of his material he very frankly confesses. Thus in the Advertisement to the *Satires on the Jesuits* he says:

> "What he calls the Prologue, is in imitation of Persius, who has prefix'd somewhat by that Name before his Book of Satyrs, and may serve for a pretty good Authority. The First Satyr he drew by Sylla's Ghost in the great Johnson. . . . In the Second, he only followed the Swing of his own Genius, the Design, and some passages of the Franciscan of Buchanan.[2] . . . Whence he had the hint of the Fourth, is obvious to all that are any thing acquainted with Horace."

His so-called *Satyr against Virtue*, which was originally entitled an Ode, was based on Juvenal's saying:

> "Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris et carcere dignum,
> Si vis aliquis,"

which Oldham had himself translated, in the second Satire on the Jesuits:

> "Dare something worthy Newgate or the Tower,
> If you'll be canonized, and Heaven insure."

This couplet well illustrates Oldham's method of adaptation,

[1] Article on Oldham, in *Dictionary of National Biography*. Lotheissen says: "Boileau ahmte seine lateinischen Vorbilder nach; Horaz, Persius und Juvenal waren seine Lehrer. . . . Von allen französischen Satirikern war ihm nur Mathurin Régnier bekannt, weil sich dieser zuerst in der Nachbildung der lateinischen Satire versucht hatte." *Gesch. der franz. Lit. im siebzehnten Jahrh.* vol. ii. p. 99.

[2] See p. 61 above.

which he clearly stated in the Preface to his translation of Horace's *Ars Poetica*, saying that he had decided upon the plan of

"putting Horace into a more modern Dress than hitherto he has appeared in, that is, by making him speak as if he were living and writing now. I therefore resolved to alter the Scene from Rome to London, and to make Use of English Names of Men, Places, and Customs, where the Parallel would decently permit, which I conceived would give a kind of new Air to the Poem, and render it more agreeable to the Relish of the present Age."

Oldham also paraphrased the third and the thirteenth satires of Juvenal, and two satires of Boileau.[1]

Satire was by this time again a highly respectable literary form,—rather more so, indeed, than it had been in the Elizabethan period. Noblemen amused their leisure in its production. The Earl of Mulgrave's *Essay on Satire* (often attributed to Dryden) appeared in 1675. The satires of the Earl of Rochester gained wide repute, though those which have been handed down over his name are few and slight. They include a specimen of social satire (called "A Letter from Artemisa in the Town, to Chloe in the Country"), some literary and philosophical satires in the manner of Horace and Boileau, and a brilliant attack on Sir Car Scrope, who had ventured to defend the nobility of satire, and of whom Rochester declared:

> "In thy person we more clearly see
> That satire's of divine authority,
> For God made one on man when He made thee."[2]

The Earl of Dorset[3] is another name handed down with an

[1] Oldham deserves more thorough study than he has yet received; and I am glad to learn that this is being undertaken by Mr. Frederick Lindsey, of the University of Chicago, the results of whose work it is to be hoped may soon be accessible.

[2] Some political satires attributed to Rochester are included in *Political Satires of the 17th Century*, Edinburgh, 1885, together with others by Marvell, John Denham, etc.

[3] That is, the sixth Earl of the name; also Earl of Middlesex. The collection of seventeenth-century political satires cited in the preceding note contains one attributed to Dorset: "A Faithful Catalogue of our Most Eminent Ninnies" (1688).

undeservedly brilliant reputation for satire. This is largely due to Dryden's fulsome praise of his patron, in dedicating to him the Essay on Satire, in which he assigned the Earl a place beside Juvenal and Donne. Of Dorset's achievements in this direction there have been preserved but a few specimens,—two or three attacks on contemporary authors being the chief, together with "A Satire on a Lady of Ireland." The chief significance of efforts like these, the work of clever but over-praised noblemen, lies in the mere fact of their existence.

When we look thus hastily at this later period, two or three different impulses seem to be uniting to form the new order of satire. On the one hand, there was a mass of political satire, rising directly from the hot strife of men and parties, full of personalities, and marked by the fondness for ingenuity and wit which was characteristic of the early seventeenth century. The extreme sort of this satire was the burlesque, represented at its best in *Hudibras*. On the other hand, there was a great development of *character* satire, finding expression in numbers of amusing satirical essays descriptive of human types.[1] These seem to have had their rise in some of the character-sketches of Ben Jonson, such as were included in the list of *dramatis personæ* preceding *Every Man out of his Humour*. The most noteworthy collections that followed were the *Characters of Virtues and Vices*, by our old friend Joseph Hall (1608), the *Characters* of Sir Thomas Overbury (1614), and the *Micro-cosmographie; or, a Peece*

[1] In 1615 appeared John Stephens's *Satirical Essayes, Characters, and others*, the second edition of which, in 1631, was called *New Essayes and Characters, with a new Satyre in defence of the Common Law*, etc. Such titles, as well as the fact that men like Hall and Butler wrote in this form, indicate its close connection with verse satire. For further notes on these "characters," see Dr. Bliss's edition of Earle's *Micro-cosmographie*, 1811, Arber's Reprint of the same work, and Morley's *Character Writings of the Seventeenth Century*, in the "Carisbrooke Library."

of the World Discovered; in Essays and Characters of John Earle (1628). Butler, the author of *Hudibras*, also wrote a large number of "characters," which were published posthumously. The whole list of such writings for the century would be very large.

Now these two elements, the witty treatment of contemporary events, and the analytic treatment of human character, while we have not found them altogether lacking in Elizabethan satire, and while the Elizabethans no doubt paved the way for their later development, were just what the formal, classical satirists chiefly missed. They were, in fact, the strong elements of mediæval satire revived,—the elements of the satire of the Reformation and the early satire of Fools. If the new classicists of the seventeenth century, under the leadership of Boileau, could embrace these elements and at the same time imitate the dignity, the conciseness, the critical and reflective temper of the Latin satirists, the result would outrank—as literature—any satire that had preceded. This was just what happened. In *Absalom and Achitophel* were united a witty criticism of contemporary events, a keen analysis of character, and classical dignity and compactness of style. By this time, too, the limitations to the success of satire as a literary form, which had been felt in the Elizabethan Age, had largely disappeared. The drama was no longer a representation of real life, but itself a convention. The spirit of the age was primarily critical, and no longer demanded the imitation of its own spontaneity. Above all, the incapabilities of satire for poetic idealization were no longer felt to be grievous, for poetry had become the vehicle of subject-matter which in other periods has been chiefly reserved for prose. This was the time when the greatest poet of England could show his strength in satire. It was the Age of Dryden.

APPENDIX.

I.

The following is a list of the principal editions of satires and works of reference which have been cited in the foregoing pages:

R. Alscher: *Sir Thomas Wyatt und seine Stellung in der Entwickelungsgeschichte der Englischen Literatur und Verskunst.* Wien. 1886.

R. Anderson: *British Poets.* London. 1795.

Ariosto: *Opere Minori di L. Ariosto*, edited by Polidori. Firenze. 1857.

A. Barclay: *The Ship of Fools*, edited by T. H. Jamieson. Edinburgh. 1874.

K. Böddeker: *Altenglische Dichtungen des MS. Harl. 2253.* Berlin. 1878.

S. Brandt: *Das Narrenschiff*, edited by F. Zarncke. Leipzig. 1854.

R. Brathwaite: *Nature's Embassy*, reprinted at Boston, England, 1877. A copy of this reprint is in the Public Library of Boston, Mass.
Barnabee's Journal, edited by Haslewood, re-edited by Hazlitt. 1876.

N. Breton: *Works*, edited by A. B. Grosart. 1879.
No Whipping, etc., edited by C. Edmonds. Isham Reprints, No. 3. 1895.

B. Ten Brink: *Early English Literature*, translated by H. M. Kennedy. (Holt edition.) 1889. *English Literature*, translated by W. C. Robinson (Holt edition.) 1893.

"R. C.": *The Time's Whistle*, edited by J. M. Cowper. Early English Text Society. 1871.

E. P. Cheyney: *Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century.* Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. 1895.

J. P. Collier: *The Poetical Decameron, or Ten Conversations on English Poets and Poetry.* Edinburgh. 1820.
Rarest Books in the English Language. N. Y. 1866.

T. Corser: *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica.* 1860, etc.

R. Crowley: *One and Thirty Epigrams*, edited by J. M. Cowper. Early English Text Society. 1872.

J. Davies of Hereford: *Works*, edited by A. B. Grosart. 1878.

J. Donne: *Poems*, edited by A. B. Grosart. 1872.
Poems, edited by E. K. Chambers, with Introduction by G. Saintsbury. Muses' Library edition. 1896.

J. Dryden: *Essay on Satire.* Scott-Saintsbury edition of Dryden, vol. xiii. Edinburgh. 1887.

D. Erasmus: *The Praise of Folly.* Translation published by Reeves and Turner. London.

H. Fitzgeffrey: *Certain Elegies*, etc. Edition of 1620 reprinted at the Beldornie Press, 1843. A copy of this reprint is in the Library of Columbia University.

L. Friedländer: *Juvenal; mit Erklärenden Anmerkungen*, etc. Leipzig. 1895.

G. Gascoigne: *The Steel Glass*, edited by E. Arber. Arber's Reprints, No. 11.

P. L. Ginguène: *Histoire Littéraire d' Italie.* Milan. 1820.

F. Godefroy: *Histoire de la Littérature Française.* Paris. 1859.

E. Guilpin: *Skialetheia.* Reprinted in Collier's Miscellaneous Tracts, Temp. Eliz. & Jac. I. No. 4. 1868.

E. Hake: *News out of Paul's Churchyard*, edited by C. Edmonds. Isham Reprints, No. 2.

H. Hall: *Society in the Elizabethan Age.* London. 1888.

J. Hall: *Virgidemiarum Six Books.* Edited by S. W. Singer, Chiswick. 1824. In volume xii. of Hall's Works, edited by Peter Hall. London. 1837–39. Edited by A. B. Grosart. 1879.
In Anderson's *British Poets* (q. v.), vol. ii.
A copy of the edition of 1599 ("1602") is in the library of Harvard University.

J. Harington: *Nugae Antiquae*, edited by T. Park. London. 1804.

C. H. Herford: *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century.* Cambridge. 1886.

H. Hutton: *Folly's Anatomy*, edited by E. F. Rimbault. Percy Society, vol. vi. 1842.

A. Jessopp: *Life of Donne.* London. 1897.

B. Jonson: *Epigrams*, etc., in *Works*, Gifford-Cunningham edition, vols. viii. and ix. 1875.

C. Lenient: *La Satire en France au Moyen Age.* Paris. 1859.
La Satire en France ou la Littérature Militante au XVIe Siècle. Paris. 1866.

D. Lindsay: *Ane Pleasant Satyre of the Three Estates.* Early English Text Society. 1869.

T. Lodge: *Works*, Hunterian Club edition. With Introduction by E. Gosse. 1878.

F. Lotheissen: *Geschichte der Französischen Literatur im XVIIn Jahrhundert.* Wien. 1897.

J. Lydgate: *Minor Poems*, edited by J. O. Halliwell. Percy Society, vol. ii.

"T. M.": *Micro-cynicon*, in Middleton's Works, edited by A. H. Bullen, vol. viii. 1886.

W. D. Macray (editor): *Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, etc. Oxford. 1886.

J. Marston: *Works*, edited by A. H. Bullen. 1887.

R. Middleton: *Epigrams and Satires.* Edition of 1608, reprinted at the Beldornie Press, 1840. A copy of this reprint is in the Public Library of Boston, Mass.

G. Paris: *La Littérature Française au Moyen Age.* Paris. 1888.

J. H. Penniman: *The War of the Theatres.* Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. 1897.

B. Rich: *Honesty of this Age.* Percy Society, vol. xi. 1844.

S. Rowlands: *Works*, Hunterian Club edition. With Introduction by E. Gosse. 1874–1880.

W. Roy: *Rede Me and be not Wroth*, edited by E. Arber. Arber's Reprints, No. 28.

G. Saintsbury: *History of Elizabethan Literature.* London. 1887.

F. E. Schelling: *Life and Writings of George Gascoigne.* Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.

H. Schneegans: *Geschichte der Grotesken Satire.* Strassburg. 1894.

W. E. Simonds: *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Poems.* Boston. 1889.

J. Skelton: Poems, edited by A. B. Dyce. Riverside edition. Boston.

R. A. Small: *The Stage Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters.* Breslau. 1898.[1]

E. Spenser: Poems, edited by J. P. Collier. London. 1862.

J. A. Symonds: *The Renaissance in Italy.* 1875, etc.

J. Taylor: *Works*, Spenser Society Edition. 1870.

C. Tourneur: *Plays and Poems*, edited by J. Churton Collins. 1878.

T. Warton: *History of English Poetry*, edited by W. C. Hazlitt. London. 1871.

G. Wither: *Works*, Spenser Society edition. 1871, etc.
Abuses Stript and Whipt, 1617. A copy of this edition is in the library of Harvard University.

T. Wright: *History of Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art.* London. 1875.
Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History. London. 1859.
Political Songs of England. London. 1839.

T. Wyatt: Poems, edited by G. F. Nott (with those of Surrey). London. 1816. Satires in Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets*, edited by E. Arber. Arber's Reprints, No. 24.

Reference should also be made to Arber's *English Garner*, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Morley's *English Writers*, and Hazlitt's Bibliographical Collections. In the last mentioned work are to be found the titles and lists of editions of most of the Elizabethan satires (see the Index to the collections).

[1] Published since the foregoing monograph was written. Reference was made, however, to manuscript notes furnished by the author.

II.

Due attention has already been paid to the versification of the various satirists included in our list. The matter is of interest not only in its relation to the development of the English verse-satire, but also as illustrating in large measure the development of the heroic couplet in England—a subject still imperfectly understood. With a view to setting forth more clearly, especially for purposes of comparison, the treatment of the couplet by the different satirists, the following table is appended.

Concerning this table a few words of caution must be said. It is based on passages of one hundred lines each, believed to be fairly representative of the verse of the respective satirists. No passage of such length, however, can be known to be perfectly typical. The most that can be said is that the table bears out, as a whole, the statements based on a general examination of the verse represented.

Even more serious than the difficulty of fixing upon representative passages, is the difficulty presented by the subjective element in the reading of verse. A large proportion of such decasyllabic lines as depart from the perfectly normal iambic pentameter, may be read in more than one way. It is probable, therefore, that no two persons would agree in the figures to be chosen for such a table as is here presented. But so long as all the figures in the same table are determined by the same standard of judgment, the table ought to be useful for purposes of comparison, though admittedly not for purposes of accurate description.

It remains to explain more particularly the details of the table. The general principle adopted was to read each line *according to the natural rhetorical emphasis*, and to compare this reading with that of the purely metrical scheme. The typical verse, of course, is composed of five dissyllabic feet, each foot consisting of an unaccented syllable followed by an accented. From the standpoint of accent, there are four sorts of feet found in heroic verse which deviate from the normal iambic foot. First, the accent may be inverted and thrown upon the *first* syllable in the foot; secondly, there may be a distinct accent on *both* syllables in the foot; thirdly, there may be *no* distinct accent on either syllable in the foot; or, fourthly, there may be an *additional* unaccented syllable

inserted at the beginning of the foot. The terms *trochee*, *spondee*, *pyrrhic*, and *anapest* are used to describe these four variations. I have no hesitation in recognizing a much larger number of "pyrrhics,"—that is, feet with no distinct accent,—that it is common to enumerate in English verse. If a syllable stands in the metrical place where accent is expected, and if it is possible to give it a definite accent without destroying the rhetorical effect, I do so: but in at least one-third of all ordinary decasyllabic lines there will be one foot containing no syllable on which the reader will put any stress of either the first or second degree. Very commonly such a foot will be either preceded or followed by a spondee,—that is, two syllables each bearing a distinct accent. There are constantly, of course, all shades of compromises between the typical metrical scheme and the natural rhetorical stress; but these cannot be represented in figures.

Pauses, whether in the middle or at the end of the line, have usually been recognized only when they are distinctly appreciable from the rhetorical point of view. In other words, the punctuation—if it conforms to modern usage—has usually been taken as the test. This results in the setting down of a large number of lines as "without pause," in which most metrists would recognize a cesura without difficulty. There may be room for question as to which method is more serviceable in affording fair description of verse; but I believe the smooth, rapid sort of verse—represented, for example, in Spenser and Drayton,—with no marked rhetorical pause at any point within it, has a sufficiently distinct character to be described and counted. The very slight phrase-pauses which are commonly counted as "cæsural" do very little, in a natural method of reading, to break up verses into two halves. A well-known line may serve to make these matters more clear. Pope's

"Vice is a monster of so fearful mien"

will serve the purpose as well as any. In the natural reading of this verse *vice* is accented, and *is*, *a*, *of*, and *so* are practically unaccented. There is a very slight pause after *monster*, serving both to separate the noun from the modifying phrase and to compensate for the lack of quantity in the successive syllables "—ter of"; but it is not sufficient, naturally read, to break the verse into

halves. I should therefore describe the verse by saying that the first foot is a spondee and the third a pyrrhic; that there is a pause at the end of the verse, but none inside it. This is one of the lines which one hesitates whether to call "end-stopped" or "run-on;" but it seems to be a case where there is a rhetorical pause unrecognized by the punctuation.

What general idea, then, may we get of the character of the verse of any given poet by a glance at such a table as this? The first two columns indicate the freedom with which he has made use of *enjambement* at the end of lines and couplets respectively. The third column indicates the extent of his fondness for breaking the lines into two fairly equal halves.[1] The fourth column indicates his use of rapidly moving lines with no appreciable pauses within them. By adding the figures in the third and fourth columns, and subtracting the sum from 100, we learn the proportion of lines in which there are marked pauses at *other points* than near the middle. The sixth column indicates the use of inverted accents; the seventh, suppressed accents; the eighth, added accents; the ninth, hypermetrical syllables. If it could be shown at a glance in which feet inversion or excess of accent is found, the description would be still more accurate. Thus the jerky, irregular character of Donne's verse is indicated, in the table, by the large proportion of trochees and spondees appearing in it; and the same thing would be made yet clearer by a statement of the unusual places in the verse where his trochees and spondees occur. It has seemed impossible, however, to include these details in the table without making it too complicated to be serviceable.

[1] A word of caution is needed here. It must be observed that the equally-broken line requires a pause at the end as well as in the middle. Hence, when we find, as in Donne, a large proportion of medial cæsuras but an almost equally large proportion of run-on lines, the effect of the medial cæsura is entirely lost. The same phenomenon is easily noticed in the blank verse of Milton.

A similar caution may be applied to the seventh column, in which pyrrhics, or feet defective in accent, are enumerated. Where these are found in connection with a considerable number of spondees, it simply means that the accents in the verse have exchanged places, the general average being approximately maintained; but where, as in Dryden, there is a large number of pyrrhics with almost no spondees, a different sort of verse is indicated,—one where the lines gain a certain lightness and rapidity from the lack of the whole number of fully accented syllables.

It is to be regretted that it has seemed necessary to make this explanation of the table so much more extensive than the table itself; but I see no other way to avoid misunderstanding. It is not desired to lay any stress upon the metrical methods by which the figures here given have been gathered and put together; in the present state of English metric each student must work out his own methods for himself. It is possible that the only certain use of such a table as this will be to *prevent* us from making hasty statements as to versification which are not borne out by the statistics. If any one method, however, is followed consistently, and if the range of material included is sufficiently large, then columns of figures—however dry and forbidding in themselves—may enable us to see the phenomena of our verse more clearly, and compare them more understandingly, than would otherwise be possible.

METRICAL TABLE OF SATIRISTS.

	Run-on Lines.	Run-on Couplets.	Medial Pause.*	No Pause.	Feminine Endings.	Lines with Trochee.†	Lines with Pyrrhic.†	Lines with Spondee.†	Lines with Anapest.†
Spenser	14	4	31	64	6	13	29	13	0
Donne	19	15	50	28	0	48	34	41	8
Lodge	14	0	31	58	2	12	37	12	0
Hall	10	1	37	58	0	18	24	14	0
Marston	17	5	46	48	0	31	20	16	1
Guilpin	23	7	43	45	8	21	30	26	5
"T. M."	12	3	25	67	4	21	25	15	1
Rowlands	1	1	40	51	12	19	27	11	0
Drayton	9	3	26	70	0	22	30	10	0
Wither	18	4	31	56	18	16	27	7	0
Jonson	26	8	48	29	6	22	35	18	6
"R. C."	33	14	37	48	8	32	29	17	2
Marvel	14	1	31	53	0	32	33	18	0
Oldham	15	4	44	43	0	18	28	10	0
Dryden	11	1	52	40	0	15	46	1	0

* That is, a pause occurring at the beginning, middle, or end of the third foot.

† No account is taken of instances where *more than one* substitution of the same kind occurs in the same line.

INDEX.

Publications
OF THE
University of Pennsylvania

Group I.—Annual Publications.

University Catalogue (published in December).

Fasciculi of the Departments of Philosophy (Graduate School), Law, Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine; also Circulars of Information concerning courses offered in the College, as follows: Illustrated Descriptive Circular; **A**, Admission to College; **B**, Arts and Science; **C**, Finance and Economy (Wharton School); **D**, Biology; **E**, Music; **F**, Teachers' Courses; **G**, Architecture; **H**, Mechanical Engineering; **I**, Electrical Engineering; **K**, Civil Engineering; **L**, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering; **M**, Social Work; **N**, Commerce, Diplomacy and International Law; **O**, Business Practice and Banking.

Report of the Provost (published in January).

Group II.—Serial Publications.

Series in Philology, Literature and Archæology.
Series in Philosophy.
Series in Political Economy and Public Law.
Series in Botany.
Series in Zoölogy.
Series in Mathematics.
Series in Hygiene.
Series in Astronomy.
University Bulletin (an official record, published monthly).

Group III.—Occasional Publications.

Reports of the Museums of Archæology and Paleontology.
Certain Theses presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

**Group IV. Affiliated Publications.*

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.
Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History (occasional).
Americana Germanica (quarterly).
American Law Register (monthly).
University Medical Magazine (monthly).

EXPLANATORY.

Group I consists of publications issued annually under the direct auspices of the Provost and Trustees.

The University Catalogue is a volume of about 500 pp. It contains detailed information concerning all departments, lists of officers and students, with addresses, etc. Applications for copies should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. The Catalogue is sold at twenty-five cents a copy (paper cover), or at thirty-five cents if sent by mail.

* For exchange purposes only.

The Fasciculus of each department contains information concerning that department *only;* while the lettered Circulars of Information, covering the several courses offered in the College, are in like manner restricted as to their contents. The Fasciculi and College Circulars are published separately after the University Catalogue. Single copies are mailed free upon request.

The Report of the Provost, made by him annually to the Corporation, constitutes a general review of University activities during the year, and contains *inter alia* reports from the Treasurer and the several Deans. Single copies are mailed free upon request.

Group II consists of a number of serial publications in the several fields of literature, science and philology. They are issued in separate series at irregular intervals (for the most part), and represent the results of original research by, or under the direction of, members of the staff of instruction of the University. A complete list of these publications to date, *with prices attached*, is printed at length following. They are published under the supervision of the University Publication Committee.

Group III consists of occasional publications, such as reports of the various University departments (where printed separately), and certain theses presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.

Group IV consists of affiliated publications, not under the direct control of the Corporation, but edited in part by members of the University of Pennsylvania. Free copies are obtainable only through the medium of exchange (see below).

EXCHANGE BUREAU.

The University of Pennsylvania desires to extend its system of exchanging publications with other similar institutions and learned societies, both at home and abroad.

For convenience in correspondence, the following statement is made:

To those educational institutions and learned societies which issue only annual catalogues, reports, or similar publications, the University of Pennsylvania offers in exchange all those of its own publications classed under **Group I** and **III,** or as many of them as may be specified.

To those educational institutions and learned societies publishing *also* results of original investigations, the University of Pennsylvania offers in exchange any one of its equivalent series in **Groups II** and **IV,** or as many of them as may be mutually agreed upon in order to maintain a proportionate ratio of exchange.

In establishing a system of exchanges with any other institution, the University of Pennsylvania binds itself to the following regulations:

All publications agreed upon to be forwarded from Philadelphia to address furnished, immediately upon issue, free of expense to correspondents.

In return the University requests compliance with the following:

All publications to be forwarded to "Library of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.," marked "Exchange Bureau" in lower left-hand corner, immediately upon issue, free of expense to the University.

☞Orders for single numbers, or sets of Serial Publications under **Group II** (excepting the UNIVERSITY BULLETIN), should be sent to GINN & CO., *Selling Agents*, Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

General correspondence relating to the publications should be addressed to

J. HARTLEY MERRICK, *Assistant Secretary*,
Station B, Philadelphia, Pa.

Philology, Literature, and Archæology

Volume I.

1. **Poetic and Verse Criticism of the Reign of Elizabeth.** By FELIX E. SCHELLING, Professor of English Literature. $1.00.
2. **A Fragment of the Babylonian "Dibbarra" Epic.** By MORRIS JASTROW, JR., Professor of Semitic Languages. 60 cents.
3. *a.* Ἔμπης **with the Accusative.** *b.* **Note on a Passage in the Antigone.** By WILLIAM A. LAMBERTON, Professor of the Greek Language and Literature. 50 cents.
4. **The Gambling Games of the Chinese in America: Fán t'án and Pak kóp piu.** By STEWART CULIN, Curator of the Museum of Archæology and Paleontology. 40 cents.

Volume II.

1. **Recent Archæological Explorations in the Valley of the Delaware River.** By CHARLES C. ABBOTT, Sometime Curator of the Museum of American Archæology. 75 cents.
2. **Observations on the Platform at Persepolis.** By MORTON W. EASTON, Professor of English and Comparative Philology. 25 cents.
3. **The Articular Infinitive in Demosthenes.** By WILLIAM A. LAMBERTON, Professor of the Greek Language and Literature. (*In preparation.*)
4. **The Life and Writings of George Gascoigne.** By FELIX E. SCHELLING, Professor of English Literature. $1.00.

Volume III.

1. **Assyriaca.** By HERMANN V. HILPRECHT, Professor of Assyrian and Comparative Semitic Philology, and Curator of Babylonian Antiquities. $1 50.
2. **A Primer of Mayan Hieroglyphics.** By DANIEL G. BRINTON, Professor of American Archæology and Linguistics. $1.20.

Volume IV.

1. **Readings in Gower.** By MORTON W. EASTON, Professor of English and Comparative Philology. 60 cents.

2. **Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century as Reflected in Contemporary English Literature.** By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, Assistant Professor of History. $1.00.
3. **The War of the Theatres.** By JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, Instructor in English. $1.00.

Volume V. $2.00.

Two Plays of Miguel Sanchez (surnamed "El Divino"). By HUGO A. RENNERT, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures.

Volume VI. $2.00.

a. **The Antiquity of Man in the Delaware Valley.**

b. **Exploration of an Indian Ossuary on the Choptank River, Dorchester Co., Md.** With a description of the crania discovered by E. D. Cope; and an examination of traces of disease in the bones, by Dr. R. H. Harte.

c. **Exploration of Aboriginal Shell Heaps on York River, Maine.** By HENRY C. MERCER, Curator of the Museum of American Archæology.

Volume VII.

1. **La Ingratitud Por Amor (Comedia de Don Guillen de Castro).** By HUGO A. RENNERT, Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures. $1.00.
2. **The Rise of Formal Satire in England under Classical Influence.** By RAYMOND M. ALDEN, Instructor in English. $1.00.

Philosophy

1. **Sameness and Identity.** By GEORGE STUART FULLERTON. $1.00.
2. * **On the Perception of Small Differences.** With special reference to the Extent, Force, and Time of Movement. By JAMES MCKEEN CATTELL and GEORGE STUART FULLERTON.
3. **Spinozistic Immortality.** By GEORGE STUART FULLERTON. $1.00.

Political Economy and Public Law

1. ***The Wharton School Annals of Political Science.** March, 1885.
2. **The Anti-Rent Agitation in the State of New York.** 1839–1846. By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY. 50 cents.
3. **Ground Rents in Philadelphia.** By EDWARD P. ALLINSON and B. PENROSE. 25 cents.
4. **The Consumption of Wealth.** By SIMON N. PATTEN. 50 cents.
5. ***Prison Statistics of the United States for 1888.** By ROLAND P. FALKNER.
6. ***The Principles of Rational Taxation.** (Read at a meeting of the Association, November 21, 1889.) By SIMON N. PATTEN.
7. **The Federal Constitution of Germany.** With an Historical Introduction. Translated by EDMUND J. JAMES. (Second edition) 50 cents.

* Out of print.

8. **The Federal Constitution of Switzerland.** Translated by EDMUND J. JAMES. 50 cents.
9. **Our Sheep and the Tariff.** By WILLIAM DRAPER LEWIS.
10. **The German Bundesrath.** A Study in Comparative Constituti nal Law. By JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON. 75 cents.
11. **The Theory of Dynamic Economics.** By SIMON N. PATTEN. $1.00.
12. **The Referendum in America.** A Discussion of Law-Making by Popular Vote. By ELLIS P. OBERHOLTZER. $1.50.
13. **Currency Reform.** By JOSEPH FRENCH JOHNSON. 25 cents.
14. **The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study.** By WILLIAM E. BURGHARDT DUBOIS (Sometime Assistant in Sociology). Paper, $2.00. Cloth, $2.50.
15. **Railway Co-Operation in the United States; Its Evolution and Its Needs.** By CHARLES S. LANGSTROTH and WILSON STILZ. (Double monograph.) Paper, $1.00. Boards, $1.50.

Botany

Volume I—No. 1. $2.00.

(Plates I-XIII.)

1. **A Monstrous Specimen of Rudbeckia hirta, L.** By J. T. ROTHROCK.
2. **Contributions to the History of Dionæa Muscipula, Ellis.** By J. M. MACFARLANE.
3. **An Abnormal Development of the Inflorescence of Dionæa.** By JOHN W. HARSHBERGER.
4. **Mangrove Tannin.** By H. TRIMBLE.
5. **Observations on Epigæa repens, L.** By W. P. WILSON.
6. **A Nascent Variety of Brunella vulgaris, L.** By J. T. ROTHROCK.
7. **Preliminary Observations on the Movements of the Leaves of Melilotus alba, L., and other plants.** By W. P. WILSON, and J. M. GREENMAN.

**Volume I No. 2.*

(Plates XIV-XVII.)

Maize: A Botanical and Economic Study. By JOHN W. HARSHBERGER.

Volume I—No. 3. $2.00.

(Plates XVIII-XXXVI.)

1. **A Chemico-Physiological Study of Spirogyra nitida.** By MARY E. PENNINGTON.
2. **On the Structure and Pollination of the Flowers of Eupatorium ageratoides and E. coelestinum.** By LAURA B. CROSS.
3. **Contributions to the Life-History of Amphicarpæa monoica.** By ADELINE F. SCHIVELY.

---

* Out of print.

Vol. II—No. 1. $2.00.

(Plates I-XII.)

1. **Observations on Conopholis Americana.** By LUCY L. W. WILSON. (With Plates I–VI.)
2. **Recent Observations on Amphicarpæa monoica.** By ADELINE F. SCHIVELY.
3. **Water Storage and Conduction in Senecio Præcox, D. C., from Mexico.** By JOHN W. HARSHBERGER.
4. **Structure of the Cork Tissues in Roots of some Rosaceous Genera.** (With Plates.) By MARTHA BUNTING.
5. **Structure and Development of Internal Phloem in Gelsemium Sempervirens, Ait.** By CAROLINE B. THOMPSON.
6. **Comparative Studies on the Rate of Circumnutation of some Flowering Plants.** By ELIZABETH A. SIMONS.
7. **Observations on the Development of some Embryo-sacs.** By RANDOLPH E. B. MCKENNEY.
8. **The Occurrence and Structure of Hybrids between Drosera filiformis and D. intermedia.** By JOHN M. MACFARLANE.
9. **Statistical Information on the Production of Fruits and Seeds in Certain Plants.** By JOHN W. HARSHBERGER.

Zoölogy

Volume I—No. 1. $2.00.

1. **The Correlations of the Volumes and Surfaces of Organisms.** By JOHN A. RYDER. (Plate I.)
2. **The Growth of Euglena Viridis when Constrained Principally to Two Dimensions of Space.** By JOHN A. RYDER. (Plate II.)
3. **Descriptions of Three New Polychæta from the New Jersey Coast.** By J. PERCY MOORE. (Plates III-IV.)

****Volume I—No. 2.***

On the Embryos of Bats. By HARRISON ALLEN. (Plates V-VIII.)

Volume II.

(Paper, $1.00; cloth, $1.25.)

Syllabus of Lectures on the Vertebrata. By EDWARD D. COPE, with an Introduction by Henry Fairfield Osborn.

****Volume III***

Some Collected Scientific Papers of the late John A. Ryder.

---

* Out of print.

Mathematics

No. 1. 40 cents.

a. **Contributions to the Geometry of the Triangle.** By R. J. Aley.

b. **Properties of the Locus r Constant, in space of *n* Dimensions.** By Paul R. Heyl.

Hygiene

Nos. 1–2. 40 cents.

The Biological Relation between Bacteria and the More Highly Organized Flora of Running Streams. By David H. Bergey.

Comparative Studies upon the Pseudo-diphtheria, or Hofmann Bacillus, the Xerosis Bacillus, and the Löffler Bacillus. By David H. Bergey.

Astronomy

Volume I.

1. (In Preparation. See Announcements following.)

2. **Results of Observations with the Zenith Telescope, from October 1, 1896, to August 16, 1898.** By Charles L. Doolittle. $1.50.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The Publication Committee of the University of Pennsylvania announces the future issue of the following monographs in the several University Series. When published, they will be placed on sale through the agency of Messrs. Ginn & Co., Tremont Place, Boston, Mass.

Philology, Literature, and Archæology

Palatalization in the Old English Dialects. By CLARENCE G. CHILD. (In preparation.)

Hindu Logic as Preserved in China and Japan. By SADAJIRA SUGIURA. (In preparation.)

Astronomy

Description and Determination of the Longitude of the Flower Astronomical Observatory. By CHARLES L. DOOLITTLE. (In preparation.)

Political Economy and Public Law.

16. **Railway Passenger Traffic: With an Appendix on Statistics of the Railways of the World.** By WALTER E. WEYL. (In preparation.)