THE ROGUE-ARTISTS OF JONSONIAN COMEDY: PUBLIC PERFORMANCE AND PRIVATE DESIGN IN EARLY MODERN CULTURE

SONIA SAHOO

2016

Thesis Submitted for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Arts),

Jadavpur University

<u>**Certified that the Thesis entitled**</u>

'**The Rogue-Artists of Jonsonian Comedy: Public Performance and Private Design in Early Modern Culture**' re-submitted by me for award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Arts at Jadavpur University is based upon my work carried out under the supervision of Professor Swapan Kr. Chakravorty, formerly of the Department of English, Jadavpur University and that this thesis is a **revised version** of the one submitted on 21 August 2014.

It is certified further that neither this thesis nor any part of it has been submitted for any degree or diploma elsewhere.

Countersigned by the   Candidate

Supervisor

Dated: Dated:

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the emergence of interiorised subjectivity and autonomous selfhood in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England through a study of the figure of the 'rogue-artist' in three of Ben Jonson's selected plays. While the trickster-playwright's ability to negotiate between public role performance and private design offers a representation of the split-subjectivity associated with modernity, the rogue's imaginative license and Machiavellian intrigue also reveal the changing facets and dichotomous trajectory of the privacy discourse.

Early modern scholarship has generally been receptive to the relevance of the Renaissance and the Reformation as significant watersheds in the development of isolated contemplation, intimate friendships, familial closeness, and self-interested commercial relations. However privacy's emerging affirmative value as the guarantor of an invisible, inner space of freedom and authenticity was more than offset by the surveillance concerns surrounding it that saw privacy negatively as an object of unease, of competing priorities, hypocrisies, and treacheries.

Although privacy's ability to create a physical and psychological schism between individual and society was seen desirable for fostering intimate relationships and thoughtful withdrawal, yet it was also perceived as a threat not only to the interests of the community but to the moral and civic virtue of the individual as well. Grounded in secrecy and seclusion, privacy created space for volitional agency and self-reflection that was considered especially dangerous for an age socio-politically and psychologically inclined to cogency, integrity, and transparency as a requirement for social order and stability. Signifying absence or deprivation from the privileges fundamental to the public realm, privacy (derived etymologically from the Latin *privatio*) served to mark the limits of collective action and the suspension of state power.

Given the difficulty of studying the unstructured, fluid quality of private experience of an era separated by time and space, this dissertation adopts a deliberately bipartite and interdisciplinary methodology. The first three chapters use evidential material drawn from diverse areas of early modern culture such as baroque visual arts, popular and canonical literary narratives, scientific discourse, spatial practice, sensory experience, socio-political discourse, body theory, material culture, print history, and theological specificities that focus intrinsically on the anxieties generated by the emerging gap between 'public performance and private design' in the late sixteenth

and early seventeenth centuries to constitute the context for the argument pursued in the latter three chapters. These initial chapters also provide a brief overview of how the messy early modern demarcation, violation, and surveillance of public-private boundaries continue to determine the socio-economic and political parameters of the late modern living condition.

The concluding three chapters focus on Ben Jonson's metaphorical deployment of the liminal figure of the underclass rogue-servant – through the conning schemers Mosca in *Volpone* (1606), Face in *The Alchemist* (1610), and the sub-cultural fairground community in *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) with observations on other Jonsonian texts when relevant – to chart the changing trajectory of early modern subjectivity, especially of the emergence of the so-called private self. The chapters interrogate Jonson's ethical anxieties regarding privacy as well as the creative use he made of inwardness in three of his representative (in the sense of being most evocative of the tendencies and line of argument that I wish to pursue in the thesis) 'middle phase' plays. The selection of these three plays is directed less by the convenience of their chronological contiguity, than by the logic of the marginalised subjectivity (which leaves out characters such as the eponymous trickster-villain in *Volpone* or Francis Quicksilver in *Eastward Ho!,* 1605) and the remarkable psychological density (in contrast to classical servant-charlatans such as Brainworm in *Every Man in His Humour,* 1598; or Prudence and Compass (though technically not rogues) in *The New Inn,* 1629; and *The Magnetic Lady,* 1632; respectively) shared by their scheming impostors.

The thesis contends that the imaginative freedom and the societal unease associated with privacy in its transitional phase facilitated Jonson's appropriation of the rogue-artist as a metaphorical trope to articulate new identity positions in a still acutely hierarchical era. It argues that the fictional rogue's elastic manipulation between public role-playing and concealed intent can be used to conjecture Jonson's own manoeuvring of roles as court poet and professional playwright in a rapidly changing urban and literary milieu. Jonson's expedient turn towards the uncertainties of the commercial stage in response to the exigencies of a waning patronage system, resembled the state of radical dispossession and uncertainty of his rogues. Their public performance of obsequiousness to their client-masters while harbouring private intentions of profit offers a heuristic handle for understanding the possible ways in which Jonson may have used his professional persona as a mask to manipulate the audience for his own personal benefit.

Such negotiations reached their culmination in the 1616 folio which represented Jonson's ultimate arbitration between the private realm of inspiration and the public sphere of a burgeoning capitalist economy. Even as the text was published into the wider world, he was cautious of retaining his hold upon it as personal property by appealing to a select audience with judicious taste. The title *Workes* historicises the nascence of authorial subjectivity, articulating a new autonomous aesthetic, and emphasising on a critical rationality where the sense of material manufacture implicit in theatrical craft is reinterpreted as the scholarly labour associated with the liberal art of dramatic writing. The folio is Jonson's final attempt at achieving a happy mean between isolated artistic introspection and the camaraderie of a 'good life' shared by an imagined community of like-minded readers, through a careful eliding of the self-centred mercenary concerns that had contributed towards creating that space in the first place.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Michel Montaigne, *Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, trans. Charles Cotton, ed. William Carew Hazlitt (London: Reeves and Turner, 1877). Stable URL: http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/3600 (No page numbers were specified)

ABBREVIATIONS

The following contractions have been used:

CA	California
Circa	*ca.*
Conn. /CT	Connecticut
EMLS	Early Modern Literary Studies
EcHR	Economic History Review
edn.	Edition
ed.	Edited
ELH	English Literary History
fol.	Folio
IL	Illinois
MA/ Mass.	Massachusetts
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MSS	Manuscripts
MO	Missouri
N. J.	New Jersey
N. Y.	New York
NC	North Carolina
n.s.	New Series
NSW	New South Wales
no.	Number
OH	Ohio
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

r	Recto
RenD	Renaissance Drama
SEL	Studies in English Literature 1500-1900
SUNY	State University of New York, Buffalo
STC	*A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (ed.) (2nd edn.; London: The Bibliographical Society, 1976).
Wing STC	*A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700*, comp. Donald Wing (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945).
VA	Virginia
trans.	Translated
vol.	Volume

CANON OF BEN JONSON

Excluding *The Sad Shepherd* (unfinished at the time of Jonson's death) and *Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion* (which was planned but unperformed) the dates for performance have been given for plays and masques. In the case of poems, with the exception of 'To Penshurst' the dates refer to the year of publishing. All dates are new-style.

1597:   *The Case is Altered*

1597:   *The Isle of Dogs*

1598:   *Every Man in His Humour*

1599:   *Every Man Out of His Humour*

1600:   *Cynthia's Revels*

1601:   *Poetaster, or The Arraignment*

1603:   *A Particular Entertainment at Althorp*

1603:   *Sejanus*

1605:   *The Masque of Blackness*

1605:   *Eastward Ho!*

1606:   *Hymenaei*

1606:   *Volpone*

1607:   *An Entertainment at Theobalds*

1608:   *The Masque of Beauty*

1608:   *The Haddington Masque*

1609:   *The Masque of Queens*

1609:   *The Entertainment at Britain's Burse*

1609:   *Epicoene, or The Silent Woman*

1610:   *The Alchemist*

1611:   *Oberon, The Fairy Prince*

1611:   *Love Freed From Ignorance and Folly*

1611:   *Catiline*

1633:   *The King's Entertainment at Welbeck*

1634:   *Love's Welcome at Bolsover*

1637:   *The Sad Shepherd*

1640-1: *The Underwood*

1640-1: *Timber, or Discoveries*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Six

Conclusion

Works Cited

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: PRUDENCE AND DISSIMULATION
IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Frons tibi aperta, lingua parca, mens clausa.
An open face, few words, an inaccessible mind.[1]

(A) society in which all truths were bluntly exposed would be
more like a hell than a paradise.[2]

I

Surveillance and the Late Modern Decline of Privacy

In a major privacy policy shift that came into effect from 1 March 2012 search giant Google announced that it would begin tracking users universally across all its services – Gmail, Google+, Search, YouTube, Android cell phones, Google Maps, Google Street View – and linking and sharing data on user activity across all of them. While Google's de-anonymising cyber policy aimed at promoting transparency under the guise of providing 'a simpler, more intuitive Google experience' can be read as an index of the late modern era's conflicting ideas about the limits of surveillance and the nature of disobedience, yet it also furnishes evidence on how despite the liberal democratic valuation of privacy as a means of achieving psychological or moral autonomy and self-governance, its ambiguous collation with dissimulation, concealment, secrecy, social hypocrisy, or political threat can serve as a dark subtext to the intellectual history of private life. Equating privacy with both questionable activity and a devious mind, Google CEO Eric Schmidt was quoted as saying in a CNBC documentary ('Inside the Mind of Google') aired on 3 December 2009 that:

> I think judgment matters. If you have something that you don't want anyone to
> *know*, maybe you shouldn't be *doing* it in the first place. But if you really need that
> kind of privacy, the reality is that search engines, including Google, retain this
> information for some time and it's important, for example, that we are all subject

---

[1] Justus Lipsius, *Epistolarum selectarum* 35, letter 22, quoted in Jon R. Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), p. 7.
[2] Marcel Eck, *Lies and Truth*, trans. Bernard Murchland (London: Macmillan, 1970), p. 91.

in the United States to the Patriot Act and it is possible that all that information could be made available to the authorities.[3] (Emphasis mine.)

Google's new cyber surveillance policy joins ranks with a series of other subtly sophisticated though disquieting technological and bio-policing mediations that breach spatial or 'locational' boundaries, interfere with decisions on matters of a moral nature, procure personal data, abstracting and visualising the private domain in a dystopian prognostication of privacy's decline. They may work through seemingly innocuous social practices such as online shopping zones, Internet banking, social networking sites, blogs, reality television shows, celebrity-tracking paparazzi,[4] biometrically enabled ID cards,[5] RFID (radio frequency identification) and GPS (global positioning system) chips, installation of CCTVs in public places such as libraries, airports, supermarkets, or car parks all guaranteeing easier (voyeuristic) intrusions into private life in the name of comfort, security, or entertainment.[6]

Sometimes such panoptic[7] surveillance of private spaces maybe ethically, legally, or politically contentious such as the injection of deadly toxins under the surface of aging skin to smoothen out wrinkles, artificial conception of a human baby to provide replacement organs for an ill sibling, reproductive issues such as the use of contraception, forced pregnancies or abortions, mercy-killing or euthanasia, the right to read or view obscene material or pornography, freedom of the press overriding interests of a rape

---

[3] The interview ('Google CEO Eric Schmidt on Privacy') conducted by Maria Bartiromo, can be viewed at http://video.cnbc.com/gallery/?video=1348339933
[4] Photographs of the wedding of Michael Douglas and Catherine Zeta-Jones that took place in December, 2000 were secretly taken despite explicit notice having been given to all the guests forbidding 'photography or video devices at the ceremony or reception'. The couple had entered into an exclusive and expensive publication contract (for $1.6 million) with *OK!* magazine, but its rival *Hello!* sought to publish the pictures. The celebrity couple fought a privacy suit against *Hello!* and won. In 2004 supermodel Naomi Campbell won a similar privacy suit against *The Daily Mirror* for revealing that she had a drug addiction and was attending Narcotics Anonymous meetings.
[5] Biometrics refers to identification of humans by their personal attributes such as physical appearance (height, weight, colour of skin, gender, race, facial hair, wearing of glasses), natural physiography (e.g. skull measurements, teeth and skeletal injuries, thumbprint, iris and retinal scans, or earlobe capillary patterns), biodynamics (e.g. the manner in which one's signature is written, statistical analyses of voice characteristics, keystroke dynamics), social behavior (e.g. general voice characteristics, style of speech, visible handicaps) or imposed physical characteristics (e.g. dog-tags, bracelets and anklets, bar-codes, embedded microchips, and transponders).
[6] The possibilities of such intrusions are endless and can range from jackets that recharge mobile phones to fabrics that can monitor vital signs. Textronic's 'textro-polymer' is a revolutionary electronic textile made of fibres that change their resistance as they are deformed or stretched and thus can detect pressure. It can very conveniently detect and broadcast the number of people lying on it. Source: Kieron O' Hara and Nigel Shadbolt, *The Spy in the Coffee Machine: The End of Privacy as We Know it* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008), p. 9.
[7] The English Utilitarian Jeremy Bentham designed a high-surveillance prison (Panopticon<Greek *panoptos* 'seen by all'/*panoptēs* 'all-seeing') that facilitated the surreptitious observation of inmates. Today the term 'panopticon' is used metaphorically in a pejorative sense to describe the monitoring of personal data that is gradually spreading not only through society, but also being globally disseminated through the information highway of the Internet.

victim to remain anonymous, subjecting pregnant women to genetic screening technologies[8] to aid in family planning decisions or even collection of DNA as plausible criminal evidence. The inevitable 'Orwellian' slide towards pervasive surveillance undermines psychological agency and emotional autonomy, encourages selective stigmatisation of certain social undesirables (such as black males, illegal immigrants, sex offenders, or prisoners), erodes liberty and reduces anonymity, generating a climate of mutual suspicion and distrust.

In his classic work *Privacy and Freedom* (1967) Alan Westin conceives privacy as 'the claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated to others.'[9] Yet he also underscores a notion of privacy as a form of mental 'security' that lies in 'the voluntary and temporary withdrawal of a person from the general society through physical or psychological means, either in a state of solitude or small-group intimacy or, when among larger groups, in a condition of anonymity or reserve.'[10] Thus even more alarmingly such technological intrusions move beyond tangible physical barriers of property lines, borders, or the body and threaten ultimately to breach the innermost secret core of one's introspective solitude, silence, and inner reflection.[11] Hence modern micromarketing is

---

[8] In defiance of the ethical spirit of the Hippocratic Oath the collection and distribution of confidential medical information has become a multimillion-dollar industry with employers, government agencies, credit bureaus, insurers, educational institutions, and the media having free access to it. The circulation of personal medical information could have an enormous impact on people's lives by affecting decisions regarding employment, procurement of business license or life insurance policies, permission to drive cars, nominations for or elections to political office, or even risk being labelled as 'security threats'.

[9] Alan F. Westin, *Privacy and Freedom* (New York: Athenaeum, 1967), p. 7. Westin delineates four basic reasons for desiring privacy (personal autonomy, emotional release, self-evaluation, and limited/protected communication) and the four basic states of individual privacy to be: anonymity (freedom from being identified in public settings), reserve (the freedom to withdraw from communication), solitude (freedom from observation), and intimacy (closeness among a small group of people). He was Professor of Public Law and Government at Columbia University (he passed away on February 18, 2013) and was deeply concerned about new technologies in the hands of government and commercial agencies and their potential for invading individual privacy. He put forward proposals for changes in the U.S. law for according greater protection to the ordinary citizen. He pointed out that the tradition of limiting the surveillance powers of the authorities over the private activities of individuals and groups went back to ancient Greece.

[10] Westin, *Privacy and Freedom*, p. 7.

[11] An article (entitled 'The Right to Privacy' with the subtitle 'The implicit made explicit') published in the *Harvard Law Review* (1890) by lawyers Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis (later to be the US Supreme Court Justice) gave legal recognition to privacy as the 'right to be left alone'. Brandeis was insistent that the American Constitution be reinterpreted in order to extend privacy beyond the physical frontiers of body and property to encompass thoughts, emotions, and sensations. Reacting to an unfavourable ruling in *Olmstead v U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438 (1927) Brandeis stated that:

> The makers of our Constitution...knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things...They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone-the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men. To protect that right, every unjustifiable intrusion by the Government upon the privacy of the individual, whatever the means employed, must be deemed a violation of the Fourth Amendment. And the use of evidence in a criminal proceeding, of facts ascertained by such intrusion must be deemed a

based on the commoditised use of personal data (sold by credit information, telephone or credit card companies) to build 'psychographic profiles' of the minds of potential customers, analysing their weak points in terms of availability to consumer temptation. Telemarketing calls and junk mails are catered to respond to egotistical appetites, lifestyles, or ideological orientations of prospective buyers.

Undoubtedly the greatest impact on public and private spaces and their surveillance in recent times has come in the aftermath of the 9/11 panic. Instances of 'mind-invasion' are taking place in progressively more airports across the UK and the USA (under the Behaviour Detection program) as they resort to observing body language, pulse rate, facial expressions, or mood in order to gain an almost transcendental access to current or future hidden intent, concealed risk, deception, and prior knowledge, prioritizing criminal will over criminal act. Multimodal biometric technologies such as Video Early Warning (VEW), Biometrics Automated Toolset (BAT), and Human Identification at a Distance (HID) financed by the US Department of Defence's Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) focus on a suspect's behavioural features such as the modality of his gait to 'detect whether a stranger walking into a facility is a frightened woman or a terrorist with hidden explosives.'[12] The 'radar detects small frequency shifts in the reflected signal off legs, arms and the torso in a combination of different speeds and directions'[13] which are in turn fed into the Pentagon's Total Information Awareness (TIA) database.

In the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (1 January 2003) Linda Rothstein predicts how gait signature technology will enable the detection of criminals or terrorists well in advance of their having committed any offence.[14] Other FAST (Future Attribute Screening Technology) techniques such as Brain Fingerprinting, No Lie MRI, MALINTENT, SPOT (Screening of Passengers by Observational Training), and PHI (Project Hostile Intent) claim to objectively disclose the private truth, expose agency, and predict intention by making a radical split between the subject's mind and his or her body through a process in which the scanned and imaged body of the subject writes its own

---

violation of the Fifth. (Quoted by Debbie V. S. Kasper in 'The Evolution or (Devolution) of Privacy', *Sociological Forum*, vol. 20, no. 1, March 2005)

The U.S. Supreme Court declared privacy as a constitutionally protected act in 1965 through its judgement on the *Griswold vs. Connecticut* case which involved a Connecticut statute making it a crime to use, or prescribe the use of, contraceptive devices or drugs. The court fashioned a 'right of marital privacy' in order to strike down the Connecticut statute. The right to privacy was extended to single people too as also to protect an individual's access to abortion as well as to birth control (*Eisenstadt v. Baird* 1971; *Roe v. Wade* 1973).

[12] Joseph Pugliese, 'Biotypologies of Terrorism', *Cultural Studies Review*, vol. 14, no. 2, September 2008, pp. 49-66: 56.

[13] Pugliese, 'Biotypologies of Terrorism', p. 57.

[14] Ibid.

confessional script betraying the unspoken secrets of his political, ideological, and religious beliefs. Visible corporeal indices such as one's way of walking, measured against presupposed normative standards, disclose an internal (im)moral morphology: an incipiently criminal mind.[15] Despite their proclaimed non-invasiveness, non-violence, and passivity such cutting-edge digital technology encodes and transcribes the materiality of the body into bytes and pixels of information, claiming to visualise an act that has not taken place but is predetermined to unfold in the future.

Premised upon closing the gap between technology and the body such discursive practices assure of the enduring cultural fantasy of an unmediated, perfectly readable, and transparent body, piercing through the coverings of clothing, status, or feigned identity, in the effort to integrate action with intention, praxis with cognition, private with public. Such intrusive violations of bodily integrity (implying an inability to control access to and use of bodies or inability to take personal decisions) or disclosures of private statistics (implying a relinquishing of control over personal information) alter the nature of the relationship between subject and state, radically redefining the limits of state admittance into a person's invisible and discrete private space, in the name of public or state interest. They likewise destroy the process of dialectical interplay between an individual's decisions regarding their interactions with others (visibility) and the claim of personal control over self-disclosure (concealment).

> The individual's desire for privacy is never absolute, since participation in society is an equally powerful desire. Thus each individual is continually engaged in a personal adjustment process in which he balances the desire for privacy with the desire for disclosure and communication of himself to others, in light of the environmental conditions and social norms set by the society in which he lives.[16]

As personal information[17] gets increasingly disseminated in an uncontested public realm of knowledge and intervention, such negotiations underscore the problem of establishing stable distinctions between individual and community or between private responsibility and state allegiance.

---

[15] As the materially accessible sign of individuality and a person's most visible manifestation, the body is both inherently private and the site of connection to the public world. In a world that is wary of the marginalised body, corporeal experiences are often mapped onto perceptions of inwardness, with the former perceived to be an accurate gauge of the latter.

[16] Westin, *Privacy and Freedom*, p. 7.

[17] Article 2 (a) of the European Union Directive employs the following formulation as a definition of personal data: [A]ny information relating to an identified or identifiable individual natural person ('data subject'); an identifiable individual is one who can be identified directly or indirectly, in particular by a reference to an identification number or to one or more factors specific to his physical, physiological, mental, economic, cultural or social identity.
Source: http://www.dataprotection.ie/docs/EU-Directive-95-46-EC-Chapter-1

The German social theorist Ulrich Beck classifies late modern societies as 'risk societies'[18] grappling with the dark after-effects of unsurpassed industrial success, global capital, economic growth, and technological progress. Beck believes that industrial or 'first' modernity has reached its limit and is undergoing a process of transformation, moving irreversibly into a new historical epoch he labels as 'reflexive (second) modernity'.[19] Faced with economic recession, growing unemployment, outsourcing, offshore production, mistrust in the democratic welfare state, and threats of terrorism such societies are characterised by their lack of stability and security, where the focus is on risk, fear, and safety rather than on welfare issues of class and social justice.[20] Within this emergent social space the idea of uniform nation-states, national languages, coherent communities, consistent subjectivities, dominant centres, and distant peripheries no longer seem to be tenable.[21] With nations, spaces, and cultures no longer remaining isomorphic, cross-border mobilities of people, commodities, capital, and information give rise to a new crisis in forms of cognitive mapping.

Google CEO Schmidt's comment[22] in the CNBC interview similarly validates a milieu characterised by diminishing control over risk; dearth of security, and psychological assistance in a world that has lost its relational and communal bonds.[23] Confirming the complexities of maintaining security and social control in a risk-ridden environment Schmidt offers an implicitly pointed chastisement of private activity that has the threatening potential to undermine the integrity of the state or the community. As a corollary he also presupposes that the withholding of information, having knowledge about a certain state of affairs and refusing access to it is an ethically or patriotically culpable act. He does make an overt reference to the USA PATRIOT Act (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act) that was passed by the American Congress and signed into law by President George W. Bush within six weeks of the attacks of 11 September 2001.[24]

---

[18] Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).

[19] Beck, *World Risk Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).

[20] Beck, *Risk Society*, p. 49.

[21] Roger Rouse, 'Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism', *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, Spring 1991, pp. 8-23: 8.

[22] See footnote no. 3.

[23] Steven L. Nock in *The Costs of Privacy: Surveillance and Reputation in America* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1998) addresses the necessity of surrendering privacy in a world in which trust is difficult to come by. He argues that in a large and complex contemporary society, individuals have no criteria by which to judge trustworthiness other than the official credentials that one must carry to get along in modern life, even though they might betray personal information.

[24] On 26 May 2011 President Barack Obama signed a four-year extension of three key provisions in the USA PATRIOT Act: roving wiretaps, searches of business records, and surveillance of 'lone wolves'-that is

This is merely one of a spate of anti-terrorist measures[25] that have been introduced to authorise the surveillance of a wide range of activities, including telephone calls, e-mails, and Internet communications by law-enforcement officials.

One disturbing feature of the legislation is that it reduces judicial overseeing of electronic surveillance by subjecting private Internet communications to a minimal standard of review. The Act permits law-enforcement authorities to obtain a 'blank warrant' and impose indefinite detention or deportation in an infringement of civil liberties. The statute also provides the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) the power to use its intelligence authority (such as its Internet surveillance software entitled 'Carnivore') to evade judicial review of the 'probable cause'[26] requirement of the Fourth Amendment (relating to search and seizure) while authorising wiretap orders that do not specify the place to be searched or require that only the target's conversations be listened to.[27] The focus of the PATRIOT Act is not on securing justice for individual delinquents but rather a 'targeted governance' of dangerous groups ranked by risk (ultimately attributable to their race, ethnicity, national origin, or religion) to produce a spanking new threat-free society; that classifies, compiles, and analyses information to single out 'questionable' behaviour.

In November 2006 six Muslim imams were removed from an American commercial flight that was flying from Minnesota to Phoenix after being accused of 'suspicious activity' that they said amounted to no more than saying an evening prayer.[28] A survey revealed that nearly 220 US universities had turned over private information regarding Arab-American students to the FBI, the PATRIOT Act allowing students' private records to be searched for 'suspicious' information in an act of pre-emptive policing. This has serious implications for privacy in not only inhibiting the freedom of ideas and beliefs but also in its acceptance of a naively essentialist connection between inner self and outer behaviour. Thus behaviour, companions, hobbies, interests, reading habits, hangouts,

---

non-US individuals suspected of terrorist related activities although not linked to recognised terrorist groups.

[25] These include FISA (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, 1978), TIA (Total Information Awareness), and TIPS (Terrorism Information and Prevention Systems) among others.

[26] The Fourth Amendment to the US Constitution states: The right of the people to be secure on their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
Source: http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/fourth_amendment

[27] The PATRIOT Act also interferes into and challenges the provisions of the First (freedom of association and speech), Fifth (due process and grand jury), Sixth (right to counsel), Eighth (cruel and unusual punishment) and Fourteenth (due process, privacy, and equal punishment) Amendment guarantees provided in the US Constitution.

[28] Pugliese, 'Biotypologies of Terrorism', p. 52.

monetary transactions, or e-mail communications may suddenly become a 'reliable' means of inferring the hidden truth. People could be implicated even when they do not know what their friends might be doing, discussing politics in a social setting, being apolitical, refusing to vote, using linguistic terms that may have multiple translations, refusing to applaud, being inconspicuous, or feigning conformity to family, religious, or party values as the price for survival.

These incidents are also a stark reminder of how contemporary security and surveillance discourses use the rhetoric of difference, hazard, fear, uncertainty, and social exclusion to project ontological insecurity and epistemological anxieties of late modern identity onto the despicable and dubious figure of the marginalised other. 'High-risk' target groups such as immigrants, specific coloured communities comprised of South Asians, blacks, Arabs, Muslims, migrant workers, criminals, refugees, asylum-seekers, or terror suspects (*jihadis*) are constructed to represent the dark repercussions of liberal-utilitarian individualist identity. Rootless, unpredictable, and asocial 'no-gooders' these socially dislocated agents with opaque motives have come to symbolise a risky personhood premised on a sinister 'inward-looking' privacy. Posited as multivalent sites of somatic signification which do not reveal their meaning transparently, their unruly corporeal surfaces resist efforts to be 'read' and textualised. Such metamorphic bodies and inscrutable minds invite and justify the use of state intrusions as a means of 'capture' and incorporation into the Western system of self-imposed normative signification. The late modern subaltern has emerged as a semi-independent discursive site of cultural meaning, helping to mediate and displace the jarring ideals of a society at risk from acquisitive individualism, egoistic self-inventive identities, global mobility, and the perverse dangers of private camaraderie or intimate fraternity.

Schmidt's laconic observations in the CNBC documentary[29] and his latent depreciation of privacy as an autonomous defensive right, that safeguards against public intrusions, rehearses though unconsciously and in a different context both the abolitionist and egalitarian (and more recently feminist)[30] viewpoints that construe publicity as essential for a desirable civic life. The moral idealism of the former position perceives privacy as a 'fall' from an ideal primal condition of equality, social communion or personal wholeness that is associated with unpleasant feelings such as repression,

---

[29] See footnote no. 3.
[30] Feminists claim that a significant cause of women's subjugation is their relegation to the intimate private realm of the home and the family. In its predisposition to control the (masculine) public sphere the state is often reluctant to encroach into the (feminine) private realm which is frequently the site of domestic oppression, marital rape, exploitation of and violence against women.

violence, and guilt. Privacy is perceived to be the unfortunate consequence of ethnocentrism, racism, affluence, gender, or capitalistic class exploitation that breeds alienation between self and others, producing a split between private self and social mask. The radical perspective believes that the unnatural condition of privacy with its basic negation of communitarian values such as trust and the common good would disappear with the discontinuance of ethnic or class distinctions. Privacy may offer an escape from manipulation, conflict, and censure albeit through an acceptance of loneliness and alienation. The second position interprets privacy as an immoral condition of anonymity that allows a person to rationalise his escape from social responsibilities. The absence of efficient socialisation permits indulgence in narcissistic self-interest and provides the license to behave in a socially irresponsible manner.

Schmidt's comment[31] is also implicated in the contradictions and paradoxes afflicting late modern liberal-utilitarian thinking on privacy. First, the utilitarian (Benthamite) reduction of privacy to the principle of ruthless individual 'possessivism' conflates privacy with the narrow asocial world of materialistic goods and sensual hedonism, relegating privacy to an economic category, to a particular aspect of an all-encompassing legalistic natural right of property, and more specifically the right of possession over personal information.[32] Second, the liberalist (Lockean) identification of privacy with the spatially enclosed site of the body and its autonomous personal actions and idiosyncratic enjoyments (such as aesthetic choices, consumptive tastes, emotional, and familial needs) tends to conceive privacy in atomistic ethically deontologised terms that protects both the saint and the scoundrel. The problem with contemporary liberalism lies in its tendency to substitute 'privatism' for privacy (with its protection of private sovereignty) in its upholding of a private sphere inside which individuals are free to do whatever they want, even that which is unethical and socially or self-destructive as long as their communally irresponsible actions do not harm the equally arbitrary liberty of others.[33]

Third, the communitarian (Aristotelian-Thomistic) equation of privacy as the locus of an interiority characterised by ethical and spiritual values, tends to conceive it as an inferior reality whose true meaning and value can only be derived from a participatory

---

[31] See footnote no. 3.
[32] See Stefano Scoglio, *Transforming Privacy: A Transpersonal Philosophy of Rights* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998), pp. 27 ff.
[33] Scoglio sees global capitalistic society as sustained by the unity of the liberal will to satisfy idiosyncratic desires and the utilitarian focus on wealth-maximising processes that are guided by an individual and collective psyche made up of two reciprocally reinforcing types of soul: the self-preserving and acquisitive soul on one hand and the emotional soul of liberalism on the other. From a legal point of view this produces a deployment of 'rights language' to discuss issues regarding personal inwardness and a dependence of personality rights on the more fundamental right of property.

engagement with some kind of public realm, whether political, social, or religious. It is the dimension in which human beings can acknowledge and play out their lower acquisitive, sensual, and sexual natures. Tainted by its fall[34] into matter and interdependence, spiritual-intellectual privacy has to be mediated by the pure universality and ethical standards of an external source whether religious (Church) and/or political (State) community.[35] As an insecure and necessarily limited space privacy has to be subordinated to the rules and traditions of the Church on one hand and by some academic/scientific/political community or authority on the other. The communitarian lack of understanding of the importance of privacy as independent of any public pattern or function helps to sustain the current global attack on privacy.

Conversely privacy as an inner condition of individual interiority or withdrawal of being from family, town, and nation opens up the prospect of transcendental (Platonic) cosmic unity at the cost of privation from the socio-political community. In lacking a perception of inner universality, the possibility of an enlightened spiritual interiority has faded away from contemporary life. Taken together these three paradigms correspond to the three basic modalities of existential reality and levels of self-consciousness: material possessions (property), corporeal entity (personality), and psychical interiority (privacy). They correspond to Plato's fundamental triad referring to the three different types of souls: the instinctual-acquisitive soul, the spirited-aesthetic soul, and finally the ethical-spiritual soul. The last is the true soul with the first two being its mortal offsprings necessary to give sustenance to the two earthly realities of body and property. The first two aspects of the soul are not necessarily evil; however problems arise when the hierarchy is reversed with the two lower dimensions claiming primacy and power over ethical-spiritual growth.[36] What plagues contemporary conceptions of privacy is precisely the inability to recognise and value personal interiority and spiritual privacy as a state of

---

[34] Evil is thus located in the very depths of human interiority as a consequence of the irreversibly fallen materialistic nature of human beings. Matter is evil because of its finitude and particularity.

[35] The radical dualism of private and public is expressed by the American philosopher A. C. MacIntyre: 'For the Catholic Christian, as earlier for the Aristotelian, the body and soul are not two linked substances. I am my body and my body is social, born to those parents in this community with a specific social identity...[then] am *also* held to be a member of a heavenly, eternal community in which I also have a role, a community represented on earth by the church.' See Alasdair C. MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (1981; London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), p. 201. Hannah Arendt, the Aristotelian political thinker follows a similar line of thinking. To witness her enthusiasm for the public culture of Athens and her celebration of *vita activa* see her book, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958). For Arendt the privacy of the family has the positive function of enclosing and hiding matters of birth and death which would have a destructive effect on the visibility and determinacy of public life. The theoretical 'life of the mind' is enclosed in its own abstractness and is thus politically irrelevant. The privacy of mental life is reduced to an arena in which the public discourses and writings of the academic and political community are reflected upon.

[36] See Plato, *Republic*, trans. Benjamin Jowett (New York: Modern Library, 1982).

pure subjective experience for its own sake rather than as the means to an end.[37] With genetic, technological, and neuro-scientific innovations offering opportunities for surveillance and invasiveness of a kind never imagined before, there is a danger that privacy will soon become a luxury only to be purchased by those who are affluent or part of a socially favoured group.

The ambiguities of contemporary privacy discourses and the difficulty of determining public-private distinctions is closely related to the rise of an aggressive identity politics whether in the guise of multiculturalism, politically oriented religious fundamentalism, feminism, LGBT liberation movements or racial, ethnic, and nationalist politics. Again powerfully virulent forms of nationalism, racism, xenophobia, ethnocentrism, and fanatical group particularism also often expose the dark side of identity politics confirming the difficulty of conceptualising neutral boundaries between personal privacy and legal or political regulation. Using the marginalised to project the anxieties of late modern privacy is not a novel strategy, for in the consolidation and expansion of state power the marginalised have always served as a ground of representation for men's private iniquities, becoming a liminal site of abjection for recasting power relations as knowledge. The rhetoric of privacy also plays a key role in ideologies justifying the marginal's denigration and oppressive domination, legitimising his ultimate exclusion from full membership in the socio-political community and a denial of equality of opportunity in economic life.

Acting as the representational context through which the vexed relation between the epistemically impenetrable subject and the late modern state can be articulated, such figures are ironically 'othered' (in a bid to impose an illusory homogeneity and pseudo-neutrality on the rest of the society) in a process that concedes privacy rights, freedom, civil liberties, dignity, and authority to those in command. Subjected to unwarranted searches, seizures, preventive arrests, involuntary tests, 'routine' information gathering, deportations, and numerous other intrusions the marginalised are constructed as surveillant objects of discovery, harbouring unspoken intentions, and unacted desires whose disclosures vindicate the state's visualisation of its subjects in the name of national security or crime detection. Divested of political, legal rights, privileges or personal

---

[37] While it may be difficult to imagine religious devotion as a form of intimacy or relationship in a modern secular society this understanding could be vital for a faith-based community. Thus questions regarding faith and practice of religion may provoke discomfort. A prohibition on non-Muslims entering a mosque during prayer time may have something to do with protecting the private space needed to have solitary or communal subjective experiences.

freedom the 'de-agentified' marginal body is circulated as bits and bytes of disembodied information along networks of exchange and knowledge production.

In its implicit almost self-righteous commendation of self-disclosure, Google's digital policy represents the affective backlash of a society that has learnt to prioritise individual subjectivity over social or spiritual discipline through its emphasis on freedom of voluntary (arbitrary) choice and action. Google entertains the idea that spatial/'locational' or mental privacy may contain the seeds of danger, for those who claim the right to be alone, or even keep things to themselves, might deliberate bad deeds or entertain evil thoughts, implying a latent selfishness and irresponsibility. This cultural anxiety is worked out through the proscribed and unassimilated sub-cultural dregs of the Western social commune, their ontologically contingent bodies offering a corporeal model for an 'inward' subjective structure: tied to the belief that the 'truth' of one's identity does not simply exist on the material plane of the body but within a scopic regime of interiorised (mental) certitudes. As a nightmare essence of late modernity, his imputed social hypocrisy, proclivity for deception, and falsity disturbs the nostalgic (and plausibly deceptive) discursive coherence of nation-states and communities, representing the radical contingency of the bond that joins the social and the individual.

II

Old Regime Prudence, Dissimulation, and Interiority

As freedom of thought and opinion, value of dissidence, debates about virtue, and questions about authenticity and interpretation increasingly come under siege today, they recall the socio-politically and culturally turbulent last years of Elizabeth I's reign and the first few years of James I's reign. The extended engagement in sub-section 1 with the siege of late modern privacy and of life under surveillance aids in initiating a re-think on how after nearly two hundred years of privileging the rhetoric of sincerity, candour, and transparency contingent circumstances may have forced the late modern era to come closer than it may have imagined to the socio-cultural protocols and circumstances that once dominated the (Jonsonian) era caught in the uneasy transition from medieval religious collectivism through the absolutist politics of the Old Regime[38] to the 'open' secularising cultural ideals of the Enlightenment during the Seicento.

---

[38] The term 'Old Regime' (French *ancién regime* meaning 'old order') dates from the Enlightenment and was originally pejorative in nature. It referred to the European aristocratic socio-political system between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries. The term was used by the French Revolutionaries to promote their

In a 1594 diatribe against the dissembling politics of the French Bourbon King Henri IV (1589-1610) the essayist Louis D'Orléans complained that:

> (B)eing a secret and hidden animal, man withdraws within himself like an oyster, and only opens up when and to whom it pleases him to do so. His thoughts cannot be made transparent by the brightest light or the sun's most blazing rays, and this is why it is as difficult to judge them as it is difficult to judge a false or genuine diamond in the darkness of night, or a beautiful or ugly painting amidst dark shadows.[39]

In comparing the human mind to the familiar iconographic emblem of the oyster,[40] D'Orléans was critiquing a model of Renaissance 'split' personhood that had increasingly become the legitimising and often disturbing norm in early modern culture, politics, and society. He pays grudging deference to a type of secret self-centred identity premised on concealment, withdrawal, and invisibility that is protected by taciturnity and mental reservation, signifying an isolated world where inscrutable thoughts and passions seem to take on the representational qualities of speech and writing. The mind offered a covert inner space for discovering and examining the mental and emotional components of individual interior experience shielded by a chiaroscuro play of light and shadow, barring any access from the world outside. The private mind is constructed as an autonomous and inviolable personal realm sufficient unto itself, encompassing both sign and signified that categorically excluded any necessity for social intercourse.

Conversely the implied reference to the presence of an audience[41] hinted in the imperative to 'open up' and reveal the impenetrable and shadowy workings of heart and mind and the corresponding necessity to 'judge them' indicates that privacy is also a public construct: a 'transactive' site of socio-political and legal relationships involving self-display and self-withholding, preoccupied with roles and decorum. Such shifting and socially contingent self-representations and social negotiations made strategic use of secrecy and political discretion marking a radical split between inner life and outward

---

cause, in an attempt to impose a moral disapproval on pre-revolutionary society and an implying approval of a 'New Order'. See Alexis de Tocqueville's *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution* ('The Old Regime and the Revolution') (New York : Harper & Brothers, 1856).

[39] Louis D'Orléans, *Le Banquet et après dinée du Conte d'Arete, où il se traicte de la dissimulation du Roy de Navarre, & des mœurs de ses partisans* (Paris: Gillaume Bichon, 1594), as quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. xiv.

[40] The oyster was a common symbol for *eros*; it also suggested matter with little commercial and symbolic value. More importantly (for the purpose of my work) it was associated with the early modern virtues of secrecy and silence.

[41] The emphasis lies on visual spectatorship rather than an auditory one, underscoring the move from aural to ocular proof. This is further corroborated through the examples of the false versus genuine diamond and the beautiful versus ugly painting, underscoring the difficulty of reaching a judgement.

appearance, interior conscience and public conformity. Privacy offered the vanishing point of subjectivity, an absolute limit or threshold beyond which everything remained invisible, an interiority that stayed inviolate even during intersubjective arbitrations. These 'discursively' constituted private identities passed undetected into and through the public domain of the court and society, subverting the natural and immutable signification of signs in the public sphere, representing an acute awareness of meaning as a function of individual discretion or as an ever-changing product of cultural interactions.

Writing during a time of political restructuring (republican city-state to monarchical absolutist state) in the last decade of the sixteenth century, D'Orléans is aware of the underlying transition to new forms of power, represented by the centralised authority of the emergent European political state[42] centred on a closed courtly culture based on display and vigilance. He appears particularly perturbed by the perversity of secret identities to establish inviolable security zones around themselves, represented in the inscrutable and protean figure of the monarch. Composed in the aftermath of Henri's conversion from Calvinism to Catholicism in 1593 with its attendant doubts and anxieties about the plausibility of his motives for doing so, D'Orléans valorises transparency of identity and expresses cynicism about man's animal like appetite for secrecy.

Further by commenting on the perceived difference between an unexpressed interior and a manipulable theatricalised exterior he underscores the constant need for conjectural practices in social life in order to restore public legibility, encouraging the tenuous possibility that thoughts and passions concealed inside a man's heart might well be 'false' and 'ugly'. Destabilising any conviction about direct access to the internal working of other minds, it insists instead upon their visual remoteness and inaccessibility to a fallible human judgement. Renaissance social comprehension thus involved an acceptance of the fundamental opacity of all human relationships that conceived the space of human interiority as both privileged and elusive, an absent presence interpretable through an ambiguous semiotic system.

The French essayist's scepticism about the imperviousness of the perceived other, whose mysterious interior can never be fully displayed, also locates the subject within an epistemic crux. D'Orléans' harangue is also novel for the way in which it constructs people as a private cache of secrets or truths inviting inductive discovery, signalling a change in the terms by which the early modern subject engaged with the world in

---

[42] The term 'state' in its strictest sense should be limited to the modern age, since the concept as it is used now did not exist in the classical, ancient, or medieval times when the terms 'polis', 'civitas', or 'regnum' held sway. 'State' appears only with the advent of organised and institutionalised modern society.

dominant political, religious, and intellectual discourses. Although the intractable unknowability of the subject's hidden motives and loyalties, secret iniquities, or vicious desires cause concern yet it also posits him as an individual who is not fully subordinated to the traditional, hierarchical, authoritarian structures but rather as the transitive origin of cognition and experience, possessing an autonomy that is also the reason for its suspicion. Ongoing tactical negotiations with an expanding royalist administration, religious schisms, or the uncertainty of new proto-capitalistic economic arrangements offered many opportunities for individual action and decision-making that often jostled for space with conservative, socially regulated modes of determining identity: one controlled largely by social or geographical location, and in which there was relatively little or no tension between a shared social experience (derived from families, neighbourhoods, patronage systems, confraternities) and one's inner convictions, attitudes, or religious faith.

Despite D'Orléans' disparagement of the new behavioural model, the logic of a privileged inside and an unreadable outside constituted one of the most prevalent and contested modes of socialisation and subjectivity formation in the last years of the sixteenth century. For many it was an antidotal means of accommodating to the legal, administrative, and religious pressures of the Old Regime, by splitting off a private, interior, autonomous conscience from outward appearances of conformity or institutional oversight. It may not be purely coincidental that the word 'secret' which first came into use in the fifteenth century, drew from the Latin *secretus*, the past participle of *secerno* meaning 'to separate, to divide, to set apart'. The word may have originated with the sifting of grain, whose purpose was the separation of the edible from the inedible, the good from the bad. The separation was effected by a hole, the function of which was to allow something to pass or not to pass depending upon the relation between the object's shape and the size of the hole. The word 'secret' thus internalised a sense of discernment: the ability to make decisions and the capacity to sort out and draw distinctions. It also implied knowledge and a relation with others based on the dissimulation of that knowledge.

More generally D'Orléans seems to be reacting against the growing implication of sovereignty within a dark and uncertain public terrain of courtly observation, secrecy, negotiation, calculation, and diplomatic intelligence: his essays are the product of an era in which individuality was not yet fully formed but inscribed within a primitive machinery of political surveillance, power relations, and information networks. Henri's outward

conformity to the religion of the Catholic majority may have smacked of the insincerity of political expediency and though his private religious conscience remained unknown, yet his prudent act of religious amnesia may have been largely instrumental (especially in the wake of the Edict of Nantes[43] in 1598) in establishing the institutional framework of a centralised government and the foundations for civility, social life, and civic community in an expanding political nation. It marked the coming of peace and political stability after nearly thirty years of civil unrest: setting the pace for the centralisation of monarchy, the rise of the fourth estate (the bureaucrats or *commisaires* who served at the king's pleasure), mobilisation of a national army, and the end of French dependence on other centres of capital. Thus Henri's abjuration of faith or his partial rehabilitation of the Jesuits in 1603 were forms of royal decision-making based on an inscrutable personal judgement that lay beyond the competent scrutiny and comprehension of his subjects.

Nearly four decades later the mystique of royal authority is also the subject of a poem written by John Cleveland entitled *The King's Disguise* (1646). Describing the flight of the disguised Charles I from his parliamentary antagonists, Cleveland compares the dethroned king to a 'Text Royall' which is not legible to the untrained eye. Resisting any unlicensed exploration of Charles' private thoughts, Cleveland asserts: 'Keys for this coffer you can never get;/None but St. Peter's opes this Cabinet.'[44] The cabinet symbolises Charles' inscrutable self whose interiority is rendered permanently inaccessible to his adversaries, the 'Cabinet-untrussers' who try to decipher the king's innermost thoughts and identity. Cleveland's description of the king's motives and psychology as a coded encryption rehearses the language of absolutist statecraft which accorded the king the power to read the hearts of his subjects but denied any reciprocal attempt on the part of his subordinates. All royal manipulations and dissembling practices were deemed legitimate in the interests of justice and defensive governance. Likewise in his first appearance before the Star Chamber in 1616, James I was reputed to have maintained that 'the mystery of the King's power, is not lawful to be disputed, for that is to wade into the weakness of Princes, and to take away the mystical reverence that belongs unto them that sit in the throne of God', articulating that sovereignty was a mystery, to be piously accepted with awe rather than be explained to his subjects.[45]

---

[43] The Edict of Nantes granted many concessions to the Calvinist Protestants in France such as freedom of conscience, amnesty, and civil rights including the right to work in any field or for the state in a bid to promote civic unity. It was later revoked by Louis XIV in 1685.
[44] *The Poems of John Cleveland*, ed. John M. Berdan (New York: Grafton Press, 1993).
[45] See *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, A.D. 1603-1625*, ed. Joseph R. Tanner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 19.

In Henri's case the use of prudent dissimulation whether in matters of faith or politics was an indispensable political asset because it rendered his motives incomprehensible to the enemy and constituted part of a new political practice of reason of state[46] (*raison d'état, ragion di stato, ius dominationis*) that was gaining predominance in the late sixteenth century. It marked the increasing inaccessibility of the monarch from public life,[47] with the state's hostility to public engagement and participation by strictly controlling access to the *arcana imperii* (secrets of empire)[48] justified in the interests of state security and dynastic stability.[49] The idea that knowledge was power and should be restricted to those in authority was a key tenet of early modern absolutism that helped to sustain its ideology about the aura of government. Only the monarch was capable of understanding the mysteries of the state unlike his subjects who were unable to see beyond their narrow class or local interests. Absolutism conducted its politics in secrecy even while making conspicuous displays of its status and authority in public places. No longer were royal actions direct manifestations of divine will nor was the monarch obliged to consult his vassals before reaching a decision. The publicising of what formed the privileged

---

[46] The Florentine historian and political thinker (and Machiavelli's contemporary) Francesco Guicciardini apparently first introduced the term 'reason of states' into early modern discourse in his *Dialogo del Reggimento di Firenze*, 1521-25.

[47] Francis Bacon in a work (1622) dedicated to Prince Charles after he fell out of favour with King James I, called Henry VII a 'Wise Prince' for 'He was of an high mind, and loved his own will, and his own way; as one that revered himself, and would reign indeed. Had he been a private man, he would have been termed proud. But in a wise Prince, it was but keeping of distance, which indeed he did towards all; not admitting any near or full approach, either to his power, or to his secrets, for he was governed by none.' See Francis Bacon, 'The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh' in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, vol. 5(London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1826), p. 186. In the essay 'Of Empire' Bacon similarly observes: 'And this is one reason also of that effect which the Scripture speaketh of, *That the king's heart is inscrutable...*' See *Essays* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 77.

[48] *Arcanum* is another word for 'secret' derived from the Indo-European root *arek*, meaning to hold, contain, or guard. The sense of mystique associated with the term also derived from the sacredness of the *arcana ecclesiae*, which transferred this aura from the Church and religious figures to the state and its officials. 'Secretary' and 'state' meant a repository of 'secrets': the King, the Queen, and the Prince were 'secretaries' in this regard. In this connection see Swapan Chakravorty, 'Vulgar Pasquin and Lordly Players: A Game at Chess', in *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 166-192.

[49] The growing desire for privacy and secrecy can be witnessed in the growth of the Privy Chamber in the Tudor dynasty, which was a space of privileged access open only to the monarch's closest advisors and staffed by trustworthy servants, and the further retreat into the Bedchamber during the Stuart regime. The Bedchamber became a closed political elite space whose members allied with court factions and strongly influenced James' decisions. It was the primary recipient of the monarch's extraordinary munificence, and quickly became an alternative power centre to the Secretary and the Privy Council. In Bedchamber politics the polity is modelled on the family, one in which the gentry could rightly claim membership. See Neil Cuddy, 'The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603-1625', in *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. David Starkey, D. A. L. Morgan, John Murphy, Pam Wright, Neil Cuddy, and Kevin Sharpe(London and New York: Longmans, 1987), pp. 173-225: 173. In the *Basilikon Doron* James advised his son Henry, 'Let them that haue the credite to serue in your Chalmer, be trustie and secret; for a King will haue need to vse secrecie in many things.' See 'Basilicon Doron' in *James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1-61: 51. Likewise monarch and courtier alike dined in secret corners and places rather the communal setting of the Hall. See David Loades, *The Tudor Court* (Totowa: Barnes & Noble Books, 1987), p. 63.

knowledge of a politically elite group would only come about during the 1640s when the state lost control over published information. Informed by the study of the Roman historian Tacitus[50] on the lives of the emperors Nero and Tiberius the doctrine of reason of state implied an empirical collection and prudent management of knowledge as the basis of all politics. The Italian Tacitist Carlo Pasquale wrote in 1581 that 'not only Tiberius, but many other princes count dissimulation among those special virtues which it is necessary for them to have; and so they care for none of the other virtues as much.'[51] The success of Venice in thwarting its enemies on the European mainland was often attributed by contemporaries to its secret services and organs of government that operated in secrecy.[52]

In an important work written in 1589 – *Della Ragion di Stato* (The Reason of State) – the Venetian Jesuit Giovanni Botero justified honest dissimulation as a requisite tool for the preservation of the state and the social order in his promotion of the image of the absolutist ruler who governs with justice and liberality for all, and without recourse to fraud or tyranny. He defined reason of state as information (*notitia*) concerning the ways to found, preserve, and expand an intensified social disciplining over people during a time of radical mutability. As state secrets, *arcana imperii* were also instruments and practices used for justifying subjection by an authority that was unwilling to accept any private space apart from its own as a limitation on its power. According to Marx and Weber reason of state constitutes one of the principal mechanisms of political administration through which the state organises civil society.[53] In appropriating it within a ritualistic enactment of state power, the state refuses to allow groups within the civil society to have secrets of their own, viewing all challenges to it as merely private. In taking the first steps towards a formal separation between public power and civil life the doctrine of reason of state demanded that any group or individual aiming to retain some sense of secrecy or knowledge, would be placed under surveillance and infiltrated by the state.

---

[50] See his *Annals*, where Tacitus exposed the political methods of Augustus and his immediate successors, of which dissimulation was a key feature. His work became widely popular in the late sixteenth century and made a strong impression for its penetrating understanding of the nature of autocratic government.

[51] *C. C. Tacitus ab excess divi Augusti Annalium libri quatuor priores, et in hoc observations* (Paris: Roberto Colombel, 1581), trans. Richard Tuck, quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 107.

[52] Ibid.

[53] In an article written in 1843 for his newspaper *Rheinische Zeitung* Marx had stated that: 'The universal spirit of the bureaucracy is *secrecy*, it is mystery preserved within itself by the hierarchical structure and appearing to the outside world as a self-contained corporation. Openly avowed political spirit, even patriotic sentiment, appears to the bureaucracy as a *betrayal* of its mystery...As for the individual bureaucrat, the purpose of the state becomes his private purpose, *a hunt for promotion, careerism*.' Quoted in Doug Lorimer, *The Collapse of Communism in the USSR: Its Causes and Significance* (Chippendale, Australia: Resistance Books, 1997), p. 6.

Such ideas were controversial and in *Il Principe* (The Prince, 1531-32) Niccolò Machiavelli drew an implicit line between the use of dissimulative tactics by the prince and its use by any other member of the body politic. He maintained that only the prince had the lawful right to employ such amoral techniques in the greater interests of state maintenance and defense. In one of the most notorious passages of the text (Chapter XVIII: 'The Way Princes Should Keep Their Word') Machiavelli endorsed prudent and secretive image-management by the prince in order to sustain his political strength and legitimacy through the performative use of cunning (*astuzia*) subterfuge. Teaching the fine art of being a liar and hypocrite he advised the creation of a princely public persona that appeared to adhere to moral and ethical standards, seem to possess necessary qualities of piety and charity without actually having them.

In learning to play both the fox and the lion the prince needed to exercise self-control over speech and gesture, mask his thoughts and passions as he deciphered other's intentions in order to deflect and control them. Yet it was imperative that the prince disguise his real motives for 'Men in general judge more by the sense of sight than by the sense of touch, because everyone can see but only a few can test by feeling. Everyone sees what you seem to be, few know what you really are.'[54] Traditional virtue and prescribed social roles dissolved into a dizzying array of possible poses and manufactured identities concealing a secret space of thought: 'Betweene the brest, and lips'.[55] Machiavelli's reference to the faculty of vision (over touch) is an implicit reminder of the growing significance of the perceived discrepancy between outward appearance and inward disposition; the epistemological anxieties generated by such a gap and the social practices that were devised to manage it.

It is remarkable, even paradoxical that privacy should have made its first appearance in the act(s) of political policy-making within the inner sanctum of elite culture, from where the vast majority of people would have been excluded. However privacy in the modern sense of the term would only emerge outside the sphere of the government. Nevertheless Machiavelli had not probably foreseen that the political imperatives of dissimulation and the problematics of princely self-representation had a latent susceptibility of becoming an appealing component of the moral, ethical, and civil comportment of the ordinary individual in private and personal affairs as well. Such a possibility is worked out in a text such as *Apologie pour Machiavel* (Apology for Machiavelli, 1643, 1668) by the French

---

[54] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince,* trans. and ed. Robert M. Adams (2nd edn.; New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992), p. 49.
[55] Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, III.i.96-7.

ecclesiastic Louis Machon who was an obscure member of Cardinal Richelieu's Parisian circle in the 1640s. Citing Tacitus as his authority Machon acknowledged political dissimulation to be both natural and necessary for public security yet he was unable to sustain a coherent distinction between the prince's use of political dissimulation and the civil or moral dissimulation of his subjects. 'Let us confess that grace and dissimulation are so necessary, not only to princes and their ministers, but to all sorts of men, both in general and in particular, that without [them] it is entirely impossible to be able to act securely among men, and to ward off their malice.'[56] For Machon dissimulation had become the universal law of human intercourse, charting an extension of 'reason of state' from statecraft to domestic affairs:

> Holding nothing more certain than that dissimulation is the mainstay of kings, states, goods, families and the seasoning of all human action, and its practice is so necessary in all things, that I dare to put forward to you that, in order never to forget it in my petty intrigues and in looking after my own particular interests, I had written in very large letters above the upholstery in the *ruelle* alongside my bed-'Dissimulation is the mainstay of affairs'-so that, in going to bed and in rising I would not forget it in my undertakings, as the salt of prudence, the basis of all our designs, and the consolation for things that are not granted to us.[57]

Contextualising dissimulation within the intimacy of the bedroom, Machon demarcated it as the private space where he has to begin the daily task of (re)producing himself according to the imperatives of a world of intrigues and social conventions. In his famous treatise on education, marriage, money, and household management entitled *I libri della famiglia* (The Family in Renaissance Florence, 1441), the Florentine humanist Leon Battista Alberti similarly confirmed the change that had taken place a long time before Machon wrote his work:

> How can anyone dream that mere simplicity and goodness will get him friends?...The world is amply supplied with fraudulent, false, perfidious, bold, audacious, and rapacious men. Everything in the world is profoundly unsure. One has to be far-seeing in the face of frauds, traps and betrayals.[58]

---

[56] Louis Machon, *Apologie pour Machiavel* (Paris, 1643), p. 659, quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 145.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Leon Battista Alberti, *I libri della famiglia*, ed. Ruggiero Romano and Alberto Teneti (Turin: Einaudi, 1969), p. 350, quoted in John Jeffries Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 33.

Such an impasse was likewise reflected in a late work such as the *Breviarum politicorum* (The Politicians' Breviary) usually attributed to Cardinal Mazarin (1602-1661) and published for the first time in 1684 at Cologne.[59] The treatise offered a pragmatic portrait of early modern men and women (re)creating themselves on a daily basis, creating an impenetrable wall of seclusion, and sealing off oneself from the prying gaze of others during a time when privacy was a rare and sought-after commodity. This defensive gesture served to protect the secret inner cabinet of the self from any unauthorised entry. While the treatise advocated practical means of investigating others' private affairs without revealing one's own, yet it also reflected the anxiety of a society where the heart's secrets were hidden from public scrutiny.[60] Such texts underscore the nascent beginnings and growing feasibility of a new (modernist) mode of privacy interpreted as a form of civil liberty and its defense that opposed the government's power over the people, their work, leisure, property, and even their bodies.

This was inevitable for with the emergence of nascent authoritarian political states; political dissimulation underwent a shift in locale from the prince's exclusive privy chamber into the wider world of the nobility, gentry, wealthy merchants, and the urban bourgeoisie in general:[61] paralleling the transition from medieval household government to modern bureaucratic administration centred symbiotically on the monarch and his court.[62] The court was the locus for the display of royal authority and the formation of

---

[59] The work was reprinted more than ten times in various cities in France during the reign of Louis XIV but was never translated into French. It appeared in Italian in 1695, although the only surviving copy of the Latin manuscript (dated 1683) disappeared in 1950 from Bologna's Biblioteca Comunale dell'Archiginnasio. It is highly likely that the work was not composed by Cardinal Mazarin, however whoever wrote the work was intimate with the culture of secrecy to which the Cardinal subscribed.

[60] Similar ideas are presented in Pietro Andrea Canonieri's (d. 1639) treatise *Il Perfetto Cortegiano et dell'Ufizio del Prencipe verso 'L Cortegiano* (The Perfect Courtier and the Duty of the Prince to the Courtier) which recognised dissimulation to be an art necessary for everyone (Rome: Zannetti, 1609). Cited in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, pp. 39-42.

[61] Dilemmas of self-presentation may also have percolated even lower down the social scale. Sixteenth-century France was shaken by the infamous case of the peasant impostor Arnaud du Tilh alias Pansette, who arrived into the provincial south-western French village of Artigat at the foothill of the Pyrenees and assumed the identity, property, and family of the absentee soldier-adventurer Martin Guerre, charmed his way into the affections of Guerre's attractive wife Bertrande de Rols, and even fathered a child with her. Arnaud was finally beheaded at Toulouse in 1560 when the impotent and acerbic Guerre returned after spending many years abroad. See Natalie Zemon Davis' seminal micro-historiographical representation of the incident in *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).

[62] A very significant debate in this regard was started by G. R. Elton in the 1950s when he proposed that revolutionary changes (which were unparalleled till the overhauling that took place in the mid nineteenth century) took place in the way England was governed during the reign of Henry VII. He posits that the change from a medieval household government whose efficiency and effectiveness was dependent on the personal energy and ability of the monarch to a more 'professional' and 'modern' national bureaucracy which could function without the close supervision of the monarch, was made in accordance with the plans of Thomas Cromwell between the years 1532-1540. Although this thesis has been questioned in later years yet few have been able to distance themselves from the controversy that centred on the work. See G. R.

power networks. Statecraft became intimately connected to a courtly regime of anxious and studied reciprocal observation, competition for social status and distinction under the controlling gaze of the monarch and his coterie of aristocrats. The German-Jewish sociologist Norbert Elias[63] argues how the political centralisation of early modern Western Europe was partially fostered by a new revolution in behavioural sophistication: through the development of new practices of self-control and complex codes of etiquette that became a characteristic of court society and was eventually adopted by the middle classes as good manners. The internalised self-restraint imposed by increasing thresholds of shame, fear, and repugnance fostered a split between the intimate and the public sphere.

Social pressures required courtiers to speak and act in stereotyped ways, suppressing not only their innate instincts for revenge (the sword no longer served a pragmatic function but a symbolic one standing for gentility and a well-groomed appearance in general) but also lower bodily functions. They were meant to possess the martial accomplishments of an earlier feudal era (though without the exhibitions of strength and aggression that had usually accompanied it) along with the ornamental qualities of men of courteous breeding and leisure. Changes in affective life and manners (relating to violence, sexual behaviour, bodily functions, table manners, and forms of speech) helped in the growth of the super-ego and the creation of subjective depth by screening man's personal drives and imposing restraints on public expression.[64]

In a process that would in the long run lead to a gradual internalisation of the external surveillance systems within the individual psyche, the court became akin to a proto-panopticon where intrigue and diplomacy were governed by opacity, silence, decorum, secrecy, prudence, and improvisation. The self-conscious theatricality of courtly life as the 'glass of fashion and the mould of form/Th'observ'd of all observers,'[65] would have warranted the application of the commonplace baroque metaphor of the theatre of the world ('theatrum mundi') where social intercourse involved actors as well as spectators and where any evidence of imprudence might have had social ramifications beyond the

Elton, *Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958).

[63] Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*, vol. 1, trans. Edmund Jephcott (rev. edn.; Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

[64] Such myriad changes included injunctions to say grace and sit in one's place quietly, taboos on nudity, resorting to personal revenge, snorting, blowing one's nose on the tablecloth, using forks instead of hands, cleaning of teeth with the knife, and spitting among others. It became unfashionable to display emotions in public such that crying which would have earlier testified to the finer sensibilities of the aristocracy was transformed into a private act.

[65] William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, III.i.155-6.

immediate court circle. Hence the prevalence of encomiastic works[66] upholding the virtues of the ideal courtier's image were often undercut by anxieties relating to mendacity, flattery, sycophancy, lack of integrity, and dissimulation. The border separating the graceful spontaneity of *sprezzatura* from self-aggrandisement and self-interest was at best a porous one.

More specifically Elias' historical perspective on the civilising process relates the growth of modern manners to the needs of the landed nobility (erstwhile warriors turned courtiers) who lost much of their power, revenue, and prestige with the emergence of the political state. Although the extent of the attenuation of such social privileges is highly debatable, yet new codes of politeness allowed them to distinguish themselves intellectually and militarily from the upwardly mobile and status-conscious members of the bourgeoisie or professional classes and advance their own interests as the only worthy political counsellors and consorts of the monarch. It enabled the courtly elites to channelise their ambitions and envy into highly controlled forms of polite ritual competition. However these emerging norms of civility which were formerly only relevant to classes at the top of the social ladder soon came to be internalised as moral imperatives for a far broader range of social classes. Thus the more the bourgeoisie resembled the aristocracy, the more the latter had to refine its code of conduct in order to distinguish itself and maintain prominent positions at court. This struggle to control the most cherished symbols of English culture was propelled by the desire to be master of one's own autonomous sphere.

This aggressive class antagonism and precarious regimen of fine distinctions parallels in part the larger transition taking place from personal regal government towards an abstract depersonalised modern civil service and the way in which this burgeoning centralised administration came into conflict with older consecrated forms of authority. The centralisation and functional differentiation of power created an immense web of dependence and interdependence and brought about crucial changes in social interactions and relationships. The anxieties associated with such a change were felt most intimately in

---

[66] Baldassar Castiglione (*Il Libro del Cortegiano*, or 'The Book of the Courtier' 1528), Giovanni Della Casa (*Il Galateo*,or 'Galateo' 1558), and Stephano Guazzo (*La Civil Conversazione*, or 'Civil conversation' 1574) were prominent writers on the virtues and accomplishments of the Renaissance courtier. In Castiglione's book one of the interlocutors, the humanist Pietro Bembo, states that one should never trust anyone, not even a dear friend, to the extent of 'communicating without reservation all of one's thoughts to him' while the diplomat Federico Fregoso explicitly recommended the use of studied dissimulation in one's conversation. Yet courtly demands for flexible role playing or artful performance were scarcely distinguishable from falsehood and duplicity. One of the inaugural texts in this genre was Desiderius Erasmus' *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium* (On the Civility of Children, 1530): evidence of a thicket of prohibitions and regulations that served to condition 'modern' behaviour that proved especially harsh for younger generations.

turn of the century Tudor England. Here the growth of the administrative state apparatus encouraged civic participation which resulted in the influx of commoners into positions of power. This class of literate but non-aristocratic elite comprised of councillors, secretaries, clerks, Justices of the Peace,[67] sheriffs, and spies functioned as agents of a centralising but absent power represented by the monarch working through a chain of command and accountability. Constructed through a delegated chain of representational displacements, bureaucratic identity in such a political world became the product of an indecisive play of differentiation and identification between hierarchically related men.[68] Within the new system of proto-bureaucratic administration the distribution of intellectual resources and power among a minority of the male population and the conferral of governmental authority to a segment of that minority, helped to produce a professional masculine culture organised around the interplay of ambition and knowledge.

Political power was on its way to being incarnated in an apparatus rather than being embodied in persons, abstracted from individual subjectivities to being enshrined in an objective machine. The ostensible division between private and public spheres came with the separation of the sovereign's natural body from the body politic,[69] rapid conversion of public lands into semi-private property ('enclosures'), and the movement of public authority away from the hands of private citizens attested by the increase in cases of public litigation. The creation of a monopoly of power in the private person of the individual ruler was increasingly displaced by its investment and dispersal in the public institution of the state. As the state developed it broke down earlier medieval corporations, estates, guilds, and civic councils so that (atomised) individuals emerged from formerly cohesive social solidarities, only to be overwhelmed by this new political

---

[67] 'The backbone of the Elizabethan local government was the commission of the peace, and its individual members, the justices of the peace. Commissions of the peace tended to grow in both size and importance in this period. At the beginning of the Tudor period there were about ten justices per shire, by the middle of Elizabeth's reign about forty or fifty and by the end of the sixteenth century commissions were larger still.' See Michael J. Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 30-1.

[68] See Elizabeth Hanson, *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 20.

[69] The conception of the 'body politic' or *corpus mysticum* (which originally referred to the metaphorical extension of the body of the King) provided a bridge from the older to the newer system. Ernst Kantorowicz shows how Tudor jurists reinterpreted John Fortescue's medieval treatise *De laudibus legem angliae* (*ca.* 1470) to develop their theory that the sovereign's physical body was conjoined with a corporate one that was perfect, ageless, invisible, and ubiquitous (*character aeternitatis*). Thus the longstanding process of the gradual disassociation of the individual within the body politic, and the disambiguation between private individual and public citizen can be traced to the early modern court of the double-bodied sovereign. See Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957).

entity which Leviathan-like coiled itself around those whom it ruled. The centralised sovereign state came to possess growing powers to impose taxes, exercise a monopoly on the use of coercive violence through the army and the police, expand its territories in Europe and overseas, and impose discipline upon a disorderly populace at a time marked by foreign invasions, religious conflicts, and popular revolts. The establishment and consolidation of the state's power and authority was cumulatively aided by intelligence gathering techniques working through patronage systems, secret communicative protocols, espionage, aristocratic codes of mutual scrutiny, vigilance of territorial magnates, and a rising bourgeoisie: all geared at controlling the behaviour of subjects as well as the expression of political passions and ideas.

The contours of private life were ultimately determined by the state, exemplified in the rising validation of absolutist state intrusions into private lives and spaces, in a blatant disregard for and suspicion of privacy. The government made its presence felt in the affairs of the outlying shires through the presence of musters, county courts, quarter and petty sessions, manorial and leet courts, constables, and royal foresters. The *ad hoc* commissions through which much of Tudor administration was managed gradually became permanent fixtures in the localities. Penry Williams further comments on the increase both in number and scope of the commissions under Elizabeth:

> Commissions for sewers had originally been appointed in the reign of Henry VI to maintain defences against flooding and to keep open inland waterways. Their authority was extended by a statute of 1532 and they became still more important towards the end of the century when projects were mooted for the drainage of the fens. The Elizabethan Privy Council set up commissions in 1580 for improving the breed of horses and in 1586 for the relief of imprisoned debtors. A statute of 1601 authorized the appointment of charity-commissioners in each county to supervise the administration of charitable bequests. Taken together, these commissions show the steady growth of state intervention in national life.[70]

The change from a traditional political domination centred on a still potent monarch to a legal one centred largely on the bureaucracy produced confusion of authority. Who should be entrusted by the state to act on its behalf? To what extent should they be allowed to act autonomously? When agents of the state acted, who legitimised their actions? The crisis involved in the representation and renegotiation of authority often resulted in the state's lingering fears about the unknowability of those in its service or of

---

[70] Penry Williams, *The Tudor Regime* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 418.

subordinates manipulating official position to exact profit and convenience. Mediated systems of governance were plagued by the lurking fear of bureaucratic autonomy and the potential plurality of the individual representatives of the crown.[71] It was possible for such representatives to prudentially fashion public selves that could be worn loosely over private identities.

The extension of the crown's reach into the everyday lives of its subjects in a bid to ensure religious and political uniformity, simultaneously underscored the contingency of royal power on those who executed it. At a practical level political power was joined with faulty human knowledge for though it was imperative that the king have knowledge about [his subjects'] natures which they do not know themselves, yet 'the arts of his statecraft [were] arcane even to him.'[72] Consequently the state's panoptic desire to see and control the public world of knowledge and opinion, its inability to trust in the observations of others in the fulfilment of that desire, often surfaced in the spectre of the resistant, unreadable subject whose claims to inscrutable interiority served to align him with other targets of disciplinary surveillance. Both bureaucratic and civil subjects afforded implicit connections between private inwardness and self-interested agency, representing a subversive will behind potential action.[73]

If the practical and defensive advantages of secrecy in matters of politics was only too evident to Henri IV,[74] prudence in matters of faith was also not lost on him or on moral theologians and canonists either in an age prone to religious dissent, heterodoxy (such as the Waldensians/Vaudois, Lollards, Anabaptists, anti-trinitarians, millenarians), persecution of religious minorities, and when concealment of heretical beliefs was often a matter of survival.[75] The Reformation's shattering of the unity of belief exacerbated the growth of scepticism lending urgency to the 'problem of other minds'.[76] New beliefs

---

[71] Critics of Henry VIII, especially the leaders of the Pilgrimage of Grace often complained that he was surrounded by flatterers of base birth and vicious reputation who subverted the church and pillaged the realm for their own 'private' advantage.

[72] J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), p. 354.

[73] More recently scholars have begun to acknowledge the proto-bureaucratic nature of the early modern English state and its consequences for subject formation. See, for instance Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) and Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

[74] Not least of the reasons being that the infamous doctrine of mental reservation was given its fullest treatment in the sixteenth century by the Catholic Spaniard Dr. Martin de Azpilcueta, also called Dr. Navarrus because of his attachment to his homeland Navarre, which happened to be Henri's native place as well.

[75]Although religious dissimulation had a long history reaching back into the Middle Ages, however it acquired an urgency in the present era that became synonymous with unprecedented religious coercion.

[76] See Richard Popkin, *History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes* (rev. edn.; New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964). Distinctions between a socially visible exterior and an invisible personal interior have

represented by the radical thought of Martin Luther, Juan de Valdés, and Huldreich Zwingli had increased the number of religious possibilities and made choice of religious identity increasingly problematic. Targeting the 'crafty dissimulation' of crypto-Protestants in France, Italy, and the Netherlands John Calvin castigated them for denying the truth by their false participation in corrupt and idolatrous Catholic services 'to avoyde daunger' or 'to keepe themselves in the favour of the world'.[77]

The hegemony of organised religion over conscience had been weakened by schisms in the Church and bloody religious wars. The post-Tridentine[78] emphasis on the doctrine of confession gave rising validity to the secret space of religious scruples that was detached from the realm of social relations. The Catholic Church's recognition of the heart's secrets through its emphasis on confession gave rising credibility to the idea of a private, interior, autonomous secular conscience that was withdrawn from institutional spiritual oversight. For many, the pressures of outward allegiance to the state religion had made faith a personal and inward concern by insisting upon a traditional distinction between the (public) secular and (private) ecclesiastical domains. Yet Calvin refuted any distinction between inner intention and outer conformity by insisting that God be worshipped not only in the spirit but also in the body, since both were God's and the body should not be polluted through its worship of idols. Criticising any attempts at 'lawful justification' of religious dissimulation through the rationale of examples culled from the life of Naaman the Syrian who accompanied his king to the temple of Rimmon despite his conversion to Christianity;[79] Jeremiah's letter to the captive Israelites in the Book of Baruch,[80] advising them to glorify God when they saw the Babylonians worshipping their idols; and the apostle Paul who conformed to Jewish ceremonies,

had a long history in the Western philosophical tradition. Walter Raleigh in *Skeptic, or Speculation* (1651) closely adapted material from the first book of a late classical work entitled *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, by Sextus Empiricus, which had only been rediscovered in the sixteenth century. Renaissance thinking on scepticism was influenced by the Aristotelian and scholastic distinction between appearance and essence, the Stoic and neo-Stoic separation of true inward goods from inessential externals, and the Christian patristic tradition which emphasised the importance of the inner over the outer man.

[77] *A Little Treatise Showing What a Faithful Man Instructed in The Truth of The Gospel Ought To Do When Living Among Papists* (1543), quoted in Perez Zagorin, 'The Historical Significance of Lying and Dissimulation', *Social Research*, vol. 63, no. 3, Fall 1996, pp. 863-912: 890.

[78] An interiorised notion of confession (in a shift away from auricular confession) was promulgated at the Council of Trent in 1551. By the turn of the seventeenth century penitents made use of the new penitential technology of the confessional box which served to further buttress their sense of self-enclosure.

[79] The second book of Kings (2 Kings 5: 17-19) related that the prophet Elisha cured Naaman of his leprosy, and in gratitude he became a convert to the God of Israel. Although he vowed never to make sacrifices to pagan gods, Naaman begged for Elisha's pardon when he was forced to accompany his king (who used to lean on Naaman's arm) to the temple and pay his obeisance to the idol. Elisha however forgave Naaman's transgression.

[80] Baruch was an apocryphal book not part of the Hebrew canon of the Bible but was included in the Septuagint and later incorporated in the Vulgate among the books of the prophets.

Calvin alleged that pretensions to honouring God in the heart and betraying the truth before men amounted to religious mockery and sinful duplicity.

Henri's apparent spiritual conversion would have labelled him a 'Nicodemite' for in a second work entitled *The Excuse of John Calvin Against The Complaints of Messieurs The Nicodemites of His Too Great Severity* (1544), Calvin used the epithet to refer to those dissemblers who justified themselves with the example of the Pharisee Nicodemus. The Gospel of St. John (3: 1-2) mentions Nicodemus to have been a believer in Christ, yet he concealed his faith because of fear and visited Jesus secretly by night.[81] Calvin censured all rationalisations of religious subterfuge (the practice itself was called *Nicodemismo*) based on an appeal to human prudence as sheer hypocrisy. In England Catholics were forced to attend the national church on pain of fine, burdened by oaths, and subjected to tortures, and heresy trials. The anti-Catholic paranoia that gripped England in the wake of the Counter-Reformation, aggravated by Pope Pius V's excommunication and deposition of Queen Elizabeth in 1570 through the Papal bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, and the demonised image of Spain as a major Catholic power, cumulatively led to all Catholics being suspected as traitors.

In such trying circumstances feigning outward political obedience to the queen while privately following religious conscience would have seemed the most prudent way out.[82] Such Catholics were usually labelled church papists though Catholic authorities were vociferous in their condemnation of such duplicitous conduct and schismatic beliefs. The Jesuit priest Robert Parsons[83] for instance, in *A Brief Discours Contayning Certayne Reasons*

---

[81] Following Calvin's precedent Reformation historians have used the term 'Nicodemism' to denote a religiously motivated theory and practice of dissimulation in the sixteenth century, although the Nicodemites were not the only targets of Calvin's wrath. The case of Nicodemus also was much less frequently cited by defenders of dissimulation than other biblical precedents.

[82] The counterpart to early modern Christian dissimulation was offered by the doctrine of *Ketman* (an Arabic word meaning disguise), better known as *taqiyya* founded in the authority of the Koran, ('Whether ye hide what is in your breasts, or whether ye publish it abroad, God knoweth it', Sura 3, verse 27) which permits concealment and dissimulation of one's religious beliefs if confronted with the danger of death or injury from persecutors. Offering a sanction for religious lying, *Taqiyya* or the Islamic principle of holy deception was particularly identified with minority Shi'ite Muslims who underwent frequent persecution by the dominant Sunnis. See also Sura 16, verse 106: 'Whoso, after he hath believed in God denieth him, if he were forced to it and if his heart remain steadfast in the faith, *shall be guiltless*.'

[83] Following the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church tried to reclaim Catholic souls from heresy by training Englishmen as priests in seminaries on the continent in preparation for mission work in England. The English government which was worried about Catholic plots against the Queen's life, did its best to catch these priests, who were compelled to go about in disguise and conceal themselves, officiate in secret, and carry on their work at all times while in danger of death as traitors. Notable English Jesuits apart from Parsons included Henry Garnet (executed as a traitor for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot of 1606), John Gerard, and the 'poet-priest' and Robert Southwell, reputed to be the first to use mental reservation in escaping detection. The range of accommodations to enforced Anglicanism is evident in Gerard's memoirs where he makes a distinction between recusants (who had to pay punitive fines for refusing to attend Anglican services) and schismatics (who secretly aided priests and fellow-believers, but who attended

Why Catholiques Refuse To Goe To Church (1580) warned that dissemblance of faith might be mistaken as a denial of faith.[84] Even Jews found self-conscious acting an effective strategy to escape detection, making it expedient to assume a Christian identity in one place and a Jewish identity in another, living their lives like a 'ship with two rudders', as Enriques Nuñes, the Portuguese Jew living in Venice, put it in his inquisitorial interrogation in 1580.[85]

The difference between the truth of 'inward disposition' and the visible but less-real 'outward appearance' reached controversial proportions in the doctrine of mental reservation and equivocation. Both were devices of language designed to conceal and misrepresent the truth to an auditor without incurring the sin of lying. Equivocation involved the use of words or expressions with a double meaning which had different implications for the speaker and the hearer.[86] Mental reservation signified the utterance of riddling, evasive, and false statements which was completed by an unexpressed further statement in the mind of the speaker that made it true. They were based on the implication that thoughts and mental propositions are not signifiers but stood for things in themselves. The doctrine of mental reservation or *mentalis restrictio* was predicated on the difference between different kinds of speech which could be purely mental, purely vocal, or mixed. Mixed speech (amphibology) could only be judged true or false through an examination of all its parts, both expressed and tacit. Thus the vocal part of a statement which seemed false and heretical might become true and orthodox when the mental part was added.[87] By making the mind the site of reserved meaning it was possible to avoid perjury before God. Such dissimulative acts were permitted for the sake of safety

established worship with their neighbours). See *John Gerard: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan*, trans. Philip Caraman (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871).

[84] This tract was written to implement a 1563 papal declaration that explicitly forbade Catholics from mixing with heretics. It was printed under a pseudonym and from a secret press to avoid state censorship.

[85] See Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, p. 35.

[86] See Henry Garnet (also dubbed as the Doctor of Dissimulation and Destruction), *A Treatise of Equivocation*, ed. David Jardine (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851). For a discussion on the uses of equivocation by Catholics and other religious minorities, see Lowell Gallagher, *Medusa's Gaze: Casuistry and Conscience in the Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991). See also Camille W. Slights, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert and Milton* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1981).

[87] For instance on being asked if one had money to lend, one could answer, 'I do not have it' and escape sin by mentally understanding, 'so that I am obliged to lend it'. A well-known instance of casuistry was often attributed to St. Francis of Assisi. According to this story Francis saw a man fleeing from a murderer, who came upon the saint and asked him about the whereabouts of his quarry. Francis answered, 'He did not pass this way' pointing towards the sleeve of his cassock, thus deluding the murderer and saving an innocent life.

to the soul and body, for honour, virtuous acts, or just causes rather than for the purpose of evil deceit and vulpine cunning.[88]

Evidently moral and theological debates regarding the licitness of lying or dissimulation was influenced by the contrasting positions set by biblical precedents and commentaries of the early Church fathers. The Bible combined prohibitions against dissembling along with examples of those who had done so only for a moral purpose. Thus Job's lament to God (3: 26) makes passing reference to his practice of 'honest deceit': 'Did I not dissimulate? Did I not keep silent? Did I not keep calm? And yet I was overcome by the wrath of God.' Between 387 and 405 A.D. Jerome, Church father and the great biblical translator engaged in a controversial correspondence with Augustine regarding the interpretation of one particular passage in the New Testament (Epistle to the Galatians 2: 11-14) where Paul accused Peter for having dissembled his faith in Antioch. Jerome expounded the passage by saying that Paul had merely pretended to rebuke his fellow apostle, and contended that '(dis)simulation may sometimes be accepted as useful', as in facilitating Jewish conversions to Christianity.[89] Jerome's position was corroborated by other Church fathers such as Origen, Cassian, Gregory the Great,[90] Clement of Alexandria, Didymus of Alexandria, and St. John Chrysostom who all held that the withholding of truth might be permissible under certain conditions.

Undoubtedly however the greatest effect on future deliberations on dissimulation was made by Augustine whose rigorous doctrinal position became the reigning orthodoxy for years. He condemned Jerome's exegesis insisting that the scriptures contained no endorsements of falsehood, for that would destroy the sanctity of the Sacred Books and make them a precedent for liars. His views were mainly laid out in two short works, *De Mendacio* (On lying, ca. 395) and *Contra Mendacium* (Against lying, ca. 420) which flatly rejected all justifications of deception, including religious dissimulation in the face of persecution. The liar according to Augustine was a person who by speech or other action expressed what was *contra mentem*: that is speaking contrary to the mind. The separation

---

[88] See Zagorin, 'Historical Significance of Lying and Dissimulation', pp. 897-8.

[89] Jerome defended his position by referring to some other notable instances of dissimulation in the Bible. For instance David feigning madness (1 Samuel 22: 12-13), Jehu's pretended worship of the idol Baal so that he could kill his priests (2 Kings 10: 18-28), Paul's engagement in dissimulation on the occasions when he observed Jewish rites (Acts 16:3, 18:8). Christ too dissembled when he took on sinful human flesh to redeem mankind.

[90] Gregory's *Moralia* (beginning of the sixth century AD) was an influential commentary on the book of Job which was to be used by Catholics in their defense of dissimulation in the sixteenth century. It is famous for the statement also called '*Humanae aures*' (which gets its name from its opening Latin words)-'The ears of men judge our words as they sound outwardly, but the divine judgement hears them as they are uttered from within. Among men the heart is judged by the words; with God the words are judged by the heart.' Its significance was greatly enhanced by its inclusion into Gratian's *Decretum*, a twelfth-century compilation of canon law. As quoted in Zagorin, 'Historical Significance of Lying and Dissimulation', p. 873.

between heart and tongue was not a justification for lying and believers were under compulsion to profess their faith at all times. Answering Jerome's defence of biblical deception, Augustine maintained that concealment of truth was not the same as lying.[91] In striking contrast to Jerome, he envisioned the ideal Christian as a *homo fenestratus*, whose face ought to be an open book and whose heart should be as transparent as glass.[92]

The early modern shift in attitude towards dissimulation came with the scholastic philosopher Thomas Aquinas whose vast theological synthesis *Summa Theologiae* (Summary of theology, 1265-1274) treated lying and deceit negatively, but accepted that it might be licit to feign (Latin *fingere*) a truth one had no obligation to admit, through the use of prudence. Aquinas' use of the word 'prudence' is significant, for it referred to a principle of order that held the passions and appetites in check when they threatened the ability to obtain happiness or salvation. Prudence (*phronesis*) was an ancient virtue with classical roots, for Aristotle in book six of the *Nicomachean Ethics* viewed it as a matter of practical conduct and reason that aided in the process of ethical decision-making. Cicero in *De Inventione* (On invention, Book II. 53, c. 84 BCE) identified prudence as the exercise of *versatilitas* that involved the use of foresight, preparation, judgement, patience, quickness, perspicacity, maturity, and caution.[93] With secular humanist (by Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, Giovanni Pontano, and Lorenzo Valla among others) re-interpretations of Aristotle in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries prudence was equated with an ethical strategy that placed new emphasis upon the will and agency of the human subject. In the *Trattato Della Prudenza* (1537-38) the Sienese nobleman and evangelical Bartolomeo Carli Piccolomini stressed on the need for the individual 'to project an impressive image of himself, training himself to be all things to all men, while at the same time preserving his own inner freedom and remaining detached from the world in spite of his dealings with it.'[94]

Yet by the sixteenth century with its (Machiavellian) absorption into the doctrine of reason of state, prudence's practical divorce from ethics and its similarity to dissimulation

---

[91] Augustine applied this principle with reference to the life of Christ who never lied although he withheld many truths. He also used the example of Jacob's pretence to be the first-born brother Esau in the presence of his father Isaac that metaphorically signified the coming of Christ and the church.

[92] This ideal is similar to the classical virtue of *parrhesia* (pan 'all' + *rhema* 'that which is said') which is based on a continuity between thinking and saying. It implies the duty to tell the truth no matter what the cost may be.

[93] Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 8.

[94] Quoted by John Jeffries Martin, 'Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 102, no. 5, December 1997, pp. 1309-1342: 1324.

would be complete.[95] Under the influence of absolutism, the concept of secrecy had become morally ambivalent if not downright neutral, its significance determined by the use to which it was put. Attempts to reconcile secrecy with Christian virtue even led theorists to imagine three categories of deception starting with slight deceit (*fraus levis*) which involved a cautious mistrust of others' intentions and a degree of dissimulation to conceal one's own thoughts not through lies and ambiguous words but through silence; moderate deceit (*fraus media*) which included persuasion (*conciliatio*), bribery (*corruptio*), and deception (*deceptio*) that could be condoned provided they served a good cause; and finally grave deceit (*fraus gravis*)that involved violations of treatises (*perfidia*) and the disregard of laws and rights (*injustitia*) which might be acceptable in conditions of grave emergency.[96]

Notwithstanding such concessions, the cultural extension of the baroque concept of prudence beyond the privileged world of monarchs into contemporary everyday discourse was accompanied by the fear of how good manners and a pleasing facade might hide the truth of (apparently wicked) thoughts and intentions. Anxieties about the hypocrisy of obscure and ineffable private identities, such as their elusiveness and susceptibility to camouflage, their dialectical implication in self-display and self-withholding, the hermeneutic challenges they presented to the established church or state, problems of the relation between divine omniscience and a fallible human vision, or hierarchised distinctions between private-public, individual-community, were not exclusively confined to the surveillance fraught domains of religion or statecraft (as will be evident from Jonson's treatment of much the same themes in the three plays selected for discussion in this dissertation). The new prudential ideal reached across class lines and became an increasingly important dimension of daily life furtively glimpsed through the rapid growth of new 'psychogenetic' literary genres such as secular diaries, memoirs and journals, erotic lyrics, religious autobiographies, and philosophical introspections and new architectural developments such as the closet, private dining room, bedroom, and the study. Equally the dangers of privacy and anxieties about covert spaces and cultural practices were reflected through interrogatory tortures, heresy trials, state treason, witchcraft inquiries, and defamation cases.

Possibly the unstable character of social relations in this period led to an idealisation of secrecy as a guarantor of cultural and psychological security. However in possessing an isolating and withdrawing quality, secrecy implied a radical breach in intersubjective

---

[95] See Victoria Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

[96] See Peter Wilson, *Absolutism in Central Europe* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 51.

relations that went against the very spirit of the state. Prudence as an ethics of compromise between public appearance and private intention, rightful caution and plausible deceit, and as the skill of hiding private interest behind a public facade was an indispensable requirement in an Europe where as the late humanist Dutch scholar Justus Lipsius, the founder of Neostoicism and the first editor of Tacitus, argued in his political treatise *Politicorum Sive Civilis Doctrinae Libri Sex* (Six Books of Politics or Civil Doctrine, 1589):

> For what kind of men are we living among? Cunning men, bad men: who seem to consist entirely of fraud, deceit, and lies. The princes themselves, with who we have to do, are often of this category: and however much they play the lion, *they hide a cunning fox under their evil hearts.*[97]

III
Self and the New Ethic of Sincerity

Jon R. Snyder in his book *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* observes that dissimulation proved useful for coping with and overcoming the anxieties of defining identity in an age of absolutism.[98] By shattering the conformity between inside and outside, deception sought to negotiate the pressures of estrangement in a rapidly changing urban milieu creating a kind of psychological refuge and allowing freedom of thought and emotion. The last decades of the sixteenth century saw the emergence of huge and overcrowded cities that helped to create the disorienting conditions in which dissimulation took root, facilitating the movement towards particularisation and detachment in the development of the self.

Despite trade slumps, disappearing jobs, failed harvests, high mortality rates, lower-than-average birth rates, erupting riots, soaring inflation, rock bottom wages, internal strife, and intermittent civil and religious wars, turn of the century Europe burgeoned. Whereas the medieval subject had been a product of generic and rigid roles, part of a small community of village kinsmen and neighbours, the city-dweller had to interact with a wide spectrum of people: ranging from anonymous interactions with unknown persons for business purposes, casual attachments with acquaintances, to intimate

---

[97] Quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 125.
[98] Ibid., p. 25.

relationships among family members and close friends.[99] In a world beset by court intrigues, clandestine sectarian politics, religious uncertainty, and deceitful credit raising raising dissimulation gained relevance as a secularised practice of self-management and self-presentation that assured of success and protection in a chancy and unstable world. world.

As states and societies grew in size and complexity, the production, circulation, and reception of information came to be seen as involving vexing problems for rulers and subjects alike. The classification and corralling of knowledge proceeded with an awareness of its potential as political capital. This appetite for knowledge began to compete with status, as the new basis of socio-political authority. The Spanish Jesuit moralist Baltasar Gracián y Morales (1601-1658) warned that:

> (M)uch of our lives is spent gathering information. We see very few things for ourselves, and live by trusting others. The ears are the back door of truth and the front door of deceit. Truth is more often seen than heard. Seldom does it reach us unalloyed, even less so when it comes from afar. It always bears something mixed in by the minds through which it has passed.[100]

He added that in the teeming and complex urban centres of Europe 'you need more resources to deal with a single person these days than an entire nation in times past.'[101] Gracián's comment is especially relevant in the context of the development of the political state 'whose gaze looked inwards, over a firmly demarcated national territory to be described, anatomized and controlled.'[102] Since familiar systems of identification and policing based on kinship, status, occupation, clientage, and neighbourhoods broke down, early modern culture was faced with the fundamental opacity of all human relationships. The relentless effort to manage the outflow of personal information compelled an exercise of self-censorship not only of the state of one's heart and mind but also of words and gestures. The practice of self-vigilance abandoned any pretence to spontaneous self-expression, and the possibility of sincerity and frankness in

---

[99] Katherine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 24.

[100] *The Art of Worldly Wisdom: A Pocket Oracle*, trans. Christopher Maurer (New York: Doubleday, 1992), p. 45, quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 4.

[101] Gracian, *Art of Worldly Wisdom* I, quoted in Snyder, p. 45.

[102] Swen Voekel, '"Upon the Suddaine View": State, Civil Society and Surveillance in Early Modern England', *EMLS*, vol. 4, no. 2/ Special Issue 3, September 1998, pp. 1-27: 1. Stable URL: http://purl.oclc.org/emls/04-2/voekupon.htm

conversation with others. In such opaque encounters trust was neither to be given nor expected.[103]

Consequently state efforts at description, recording, and surveillance designed to render the unfailing identification of individuals were haunted by the spectre of inauthenticity. Thus diverse discourses whether on dissimulation and nation-formation, cultural practices of equivocation, self-fashioning, mental reservation, or representations of devious machiavels, duplicitous Jesuits, paranoid Inquisitors, crafty beggars, secret passageways and concealed priest-holes, cryptic messages, or poison rings often intersected uneasily with the making of early modern identity and the history bureaucratic identification. Nor was it unusual to find early modern discourses on privacy ensconced in ideas of secrecy since they referred to allied ideas in contemporary thinking. Where the Latin form of secrecy was *secretus* (to separate from, to divide from), the Latin form of privacy was *privatus* (to free from). Historically the notions were so close that Dr. Samuel Johnson saw the two words as interchangeable, defining privacy as a 'state of being secret; secrecy'[104] and 'secretness' (secrecy) as 'state of being hidden; privacy'.[105] At some later point the two words were drawn so far apart that they came to be viewed separately, with privacy being seen as good and secrecy as bad. The once obsolete association of privacy and secrecy however seems poised for a comeback in the late modern era.

Early modern unease about the dissimulative potential of private (secret) identities most certainly played a key role in the processes by which authority and subjectivity were constructed during this era. In shattering the reliability of a mimetic connection between words or gestures and the truth of the mind, dissimulation pointed to the symptoms of a growing epistemic disengagement[106] that grew particularly intense in these years that were marked by Elizabeth I and James I's reign, whereby the nature of the subject's relation to the world underwent a profound change. Timothy Reiss in *Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe* (2003) argues that 'Many years' work on the European seventeenth and earlier centuries had convinced me that this sense [of personhood] and its matching experiences differed radically from those dominant in the modern West, and that between the waning of the European sixteenth century and that

---

[103] Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. 45.
[104] Dr. Samuel Johnson, *Johnson's English Dictionary as Improved by Todd and Abridged by Chalmers* (Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1830), p. 724.
[105] Ibid., p. 818.
[106] The epistemic shift that Foucault locates in the early seventeenth century was a dissolution of knowledge based on the recognition of similitude within the Creation and the emergence of a new knowledge based on the accurate description of the discrete identities of things and their relation to each other. See Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1973).

of the seventeenth some (non-monolithic) change solidified.'[107] This process culminated in Descartes who made detachment a primary requisite of subjectivity, but pre-Cartesian cultural discourses conceived identity as essentially relational: located in the interstices between psyche-body or inner self-outward show.

Further, dissimulation is inconceivable without an idea of the subject as a private site of truth, which in the early modern times was often equated with vicious desires, secret iniquity, dissenting opinion, and insidious activity. The stress of cultural duress had not only made the negotiation of identity complicatedly treacherous for many, but had also made firm the link between evil and inwardness. Specifically what might have plagued early modern authorities was the ideologically negative alliance between privacy and self-interested agency, the capacity to act upon one's circumstances. The practice of dissimulation offered the tenuous possibility of being the master within the secure confines of one's own mental and emotional sphere, though at the cost of a sincere exchange with others. Advertising one's possession of information or knowledge that was inaccessible to the state was cause enough to be targeted as an outlaw. For most Elizabethans and early Jacobeans this mysterious inner realm was likely to represent a subversive or demonic quality, the ability to operate secretly beyond the constraints of constituted authority. The subject became a site of conceptual and discursive crisis embodying the potential not only to subvert the existing order but also to establish a parallel regime of knowledge.

Administrative structures of power and knowledge often conceived the subject as the possessor of hidden knowledge that the state had to struggle to extract and interpret. It is possible that the state's desire for totalising knowledge and its endoscopic efforts to 'see within' were implicitly influenced by the new revitalised discipline of visualisation such as anatomy, where bodily knowledge metonymically became a powerful form of epistemological mastery that could reach far beyond the self.[108] The discursive construction of the body as corporeal proof or as a storehouse of visceral knowledge and ultimate truth was spurred by the efforts of English and European Renaissance

---

[107] Timothy J. Reiss, *Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), p. 1.
[108] Compare Lear's wish to 'anatomise' Regan to see what makes her heart so hard: 'Let them anatomize Regan; see what breeds about her heart. Is there any cause in nature that makes these hard hearts?' (III.vi.70-2). In John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, Cariola defends herself against the accusation that she is responsible for Ferdinand's entrance into the Duchess's bedchamber, by locating the proof of her innocence in the interior of her heart-'when/That you have cleft my heart, you shall read there/Mine innocence' (III.ii.147-9).

anatomists[109] who contributed to a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of the human body than had been achieved in the anatomical works of Galen, Aristotle, Mondino, and Johannes de Ketham. Although these older anatomical models remained in vogue in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries yet the 'Vesalian revolution' in anatomy was soon to become the legitimising norm in the theory and praxis of seventeenth-century scientific enquiries in its novel grounding of knowledge acquisition in the act of 'seeing'. In trying to link the early modern fascination with the cultural institutions of dissection to a new interiority of personality, Jonathan Sawday writes:

> Vesalius and his contemporaries…in their urge to overturn Galenic authority, stressed the primacy of 'ocular evidence' in their explorations of the body. The important difference between their undertakings and those of classical authority, they continually claimed, was that, unlike Galen and those who followed Galen, they had *seen* the body with their own eyes.[110] (Emphasis in original.)

The fantasy of unmediated ocular and tactile access to physiological and thus psychological interiority, the ability to ground individual and collective nature in something empirically verifiable in a world of secret identities and performative selves is a legacy that has stayed with us till today. With its ability to testify physically, the body became the focal site of state investigation when it found its access to information blocked. The revelation of the body was seen as the most ready way to expose cognition, even intellection, subjectivity, moral belief, and identity. Thus the state reaffirmed its authority through metaphorical 'dissections' (visual and verbal unveiling) that broke down individual subjectivity and sense of selfhood, forcibly imposing social conformity upon it.

Early modern surveillance utopias, cultures of secrecy, and dissimulation were symptoms of a growing awareness of a notion of the person as having an explicitly layered quality that presented a skewed version of inwardness in its supposed link with evil. This is to neglect however a rich tradition of mainly devotional/metaphysical writing that made the transparency of the 'heart' a subject of contemplative study in the late Renaissance. While a concern with the notion of interiority had been a prime issue in spiritual writings of the twelfth century especially in the wake of the cultural and monastic

---

[109] Prominent amongst them were Andreas Vesalius (1514-1564), Andreanus Spigelius (1578-1625), Juan Valverde (c.1525-1587), Charles Estienne (1504-1564), Jacopo Berengario da Carpi (c.1465-1530), John Banister (1533-1610), William Harvey (1578-1657) and Baldasar Heseler (ca.1508-1567).
[110] See Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 26.

revivals of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries,[111] its Renaissance manifestation came through Petrarch whose writings especially the *Secretum*, were Augustinian examinations of the depth and shortcomings of the soul. In a similar vein, two centuries later, Michel Montaigne went on to observe, 'I, who profess nothing else, therein find so infinite a depth and variety, that all the fruit I have reaped from my learning serves only to make me sensible how much I have to learn.'[112] In the early sixteenth century the Venetian reformer Gasparo Contarini expressed similar views in a celebrated letter addressed to Tommaso Giustiniani: 'if you were to know me from within, as I really am (but even I do not know myself well), you would not make such a judgment about me.'[113] Even beyond the realm of humanist letters represented by Erasmus, Thomas More, or Shakespeare who made issues of interiority central to their discussion of human affairs, particularly poignant inward ruminations also marked Catholic and Protestant martyrologies, Puritan sermons, spiritual diaries, neo-Stoic writings, confessional letters, and inquisitorial[114] archives.

Writing in the last decade of the sixteenth century the French essayist Louis D'Orléans seems responsive to the shift taking place in European culture and morality even as he expressed displeasure at Henri's dissimulative nature: a movement towards the ideal of the proffered heart or the value of expressing one's thoughts, feelings, and convictions in a frank and candid manner. Sincerity expressed the wish for transparency and connectedness in a courtly and urban world that had lost its socio-cultural moorings. Stephano Guazzo's *La Civil Conversazione* (Civil Conversation, 1574)[115] expresses a tension between the contemplative and active life represented by the two characters of Cavaliere Guglielmo (Guazzo's younger brother) and Annibale Magnacavallo the physician respectively. The former makes it plain that the very falsity and artificiality of courtly life had made him melancholic and desirous of a solitary and contemplative life. He calls attention to the belief that it was only possible to achieve salvation and preserve the

---

[111] Medieval theologians noted for their celebrations of interiority included writers and theologians such as Bernard of Clairvaux, Aelred of Rievaulx, and Peter Abelard.

[112] Michel Montaigne, 'Of Experience' (Book III, Chapter XIII). This and all subsequent quotations have been taken from *Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, ed. William Carew Hazlitt, trans. Charles Cotton (London: Reeves and Turner, 1877). Stable URL: http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/360

[113] Contarini to Tommaso Giustiniani, 24 April 1511, in *Contarini und Camaldoli*, ed. Hubert Jedin (Rome, 1953), p. 13, quoted in Martin, 'Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence', p. 1321.

[114] A famous case was that of the Italian lawyer Francesco Spiera who struggled with the question of whether or not to dissimulate his beliefs before the Venetian tribunal. He abjured his convictions before the Inquisitor and later regretted it so deeply that he starved himself to death.

[115] Guazzo's text was based on Marc Antonio Vida's *De rei publicae dignitate* (1545) a radical humanist text known for its critique of human society. It was composed on the eve of the Council of Trent.

heart's purity through a life of social segregation. Magnacavallo on the other hand tries to cure the young man's disenchantment by urging greater participation in civic affairs.

Drawing on the Aristotelian concept of man as a dynamic social animal Magnacavallo emphasises on the new ideal of sincerity as a virtue essential for the practice of *vita activa*. In its ability to establish direct connections between internal affect and speech, sincerity ensured the realisation of the ideal of the pure heart even within society and not necessarily away from it. The new ideal of sincerity supplies the last piece in the chequered history of early modern identity and helps to thicken an understanding of the cultural contexts within which the subject was represented and constructed. Before the sixteenth century the word 'sincere' generally referred to something (usually a material substance such as a liquid or metal) that was pure or unadulterated. Lionel Trilling has argued that in the sixteenth century the word acquired moral connotations, referring 'to a congruence between avowal and actual feeling': 'I propose the idea that at a certain point in its history the moral life of Europe added to itself a new element, the state or quality of the self which we call sincerity.'[116]

There is evidence that from the twelfth century medieval authors were aware of the necessity to establish a correlation between the internal self (*homo interior*) and one's words and actions. They never used the word 'sincerity' however, expressing a complex though harmonious agreement between interior and exterior through words such as *concordia*, *consonantia*, *harmonia*, *concors*, *concordare*, and *accordare* which were traceable to early medieval monasticism.[117] As a medieval, essentially Catholic ethic, *concordia* or harmony was based upon the principle of likeness (*similitudo*) – the agreement of one person with another in relation to the worship of God. Medieval writers strove to model themselves on Christ, convinced that the human person was fundamentally similar to God. But in the late medieval ages nominalist theologians such as William of Occam had already begun the task of eroding the representative anthropology upon which the idea of *concordia* was based.

Thus Lutheran and Calvinist anthropology was based on a principle of dissimilarity – the human person was fundamentally sinful and depraved in contrast to the majesty of

---

[116] Lionel Trilling, *Sincerity and Authenticity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).

[117] A seminal text in this regard was the *Rule of St. Benedict*, in which the interior self was to be fashioned to correspond to the language of the *Psalms* that punctuated the monk's daily life. Benedict counselled monks to pray in such a manner that 'our mind be in agreement with our voice'. Concordia was also the central thread of the universe in Bernard of Sylvester's neo-Platonic *Cosmographia*. In the early thirteenth century St. Francis of Assisi advocated a form of praying in which 'one's voice was in agreement with one's mind'. In the late fifteenth century the concept percolated into the Platonic writings of Marsilio Ficino. He made it clear that the concord between heart and tongue was only one aspect of a larger divine plan. See Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, p. 111.

God, neither was he in a harmonious relationship with God and the cosmos. Sincerity was an ideal radically opposed to the practice of dissimulation. Commenting on the value of sincerity as an ideal diametrically opposed to dissimulation Calvin affirmed in his remarks on *Psalm XII* that:

> For as those that purpose to deal faithfully with their neighbours, set open their whole heart as it is; so the false and deceitful persons keep back a part of their meaning to themselves, and cover it with the varnish of dissimulation, so that no certainty can be gathered from their talk. Therefore must our talk be sincere (*simplex*), that it may be the very image of an upright mind.[118]

Francesco Guicciardini spoke in much the same vein about the conflict between prudence and sincerity in his *Ricordi*, a collection of maxims composed in the years 1528-1530. He agreed that 'frank sincerity' had a lot to commend it being 'a quality much extolled among men and pleasing to everyone, while simulation...on the contrary, is detested and condemned.' Yet he affirmed that 'for a man's self, simulation is of the two by far the more useful; sincerity...tending rather to the interest of others.'[119]

Once the idea of similarity between man and God had been ruptured it was very difficult to express a common Christian ideal since in changed circumstances words and gestures became merely an expression of the internal and particularised self. Sincerity was an ethic of difference, it precluded the possibility of establishing public consensus or a sense of community. However what was new was the premium placed upon the expressive subjectivity of individual feelings, passions, and emotions.[120] Protestant reformers such as Philip Melanchthon privileged the heart instead of the will (*voluntas*), equating any control over affections as amounting to insincerity. Yet no matter how sincere one was it was not possible to appeal to any truth that was greater than one's emotions, feelings, passions, or affections. Cut off from any sense of divine empathy based on similitude or an implicit anthropological identity with other fellow Christians,

---

[118] As quoted in Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, p. 115.

[119] Francesco Gucciardini, *Ricordi*, Series 2, No. 104, quoted in Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, p. 117.

[120] Luther praised the new ideal of sincerity in his 'Preface to the Psalms' which he published in his German Bible of 1528. He argued that the *Psalter* surpassed the lives of saints and other moral tales because it preserved 'their deepest and noblest utterances, those which they used when speaking in full earnest and all urgency to God. It not only tells us what they say about their work and conduct, but also lays bare their hearts … it enables us to see into their hearts and understand the nature of their thoughts.' Likewise Calvin in his *Commentaries on the Psalms* (1557) upheld the *Psalter* because 'here are prophets themselves talking with God, because they lay bare all their inmost thoughts...invite or hale every one of us to examine himself in particular, lest any of the many infirmities to which we are liable, or of the many vices with which we are beset should remain hidden. A rare and surpassing benefit, when, every lurking-place having been explored, the heart is brought into the light cleansed from hypocrisy, that most noisome pest.' Quoted in Martin, *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*, pp. 113-14.

man was faced with the fragility and tenuousness of inter-personal communications. There was every possibility of a deceitful hiatus between internal sentiment and external gesture. Noting the difficulties and limitations involved in determining the veracity of any claims to sincerity Augustine in Book X of the *Confessions* affirmed: 'And when they hear me confessing of myself, how do they know whether I speak the truth, since *no man knows the things of a man but the spirit of a man that is in him*? Whereas if they hear from You something about themselves, they cannot say, "The Lord is lying".'[121]

Montaigne lashed out at dissimulation 'which is now in so great credit', vouching that he knows no vice 'that evidences so much baseness and meanness of spirit. 'Tis a cowardly and servile humour to hide and disguise a man's self under a visor, and not to dare to show himself what he is; 'tis by this our servants are trained up to treachery; being brought up to speak what is not true, they make no conscience of a lie. A generous heart ought not to belie its own thoughts; it will make itself seen within; all there is good, or at least human.'[122] Yet he was only too aware of how the pressure to dissemble could often conflict with the ideal of sincerity. In practical life early modern identity was a tortuous space negotiated between conflicting ideals of social conformity, prudent dissimulation, and frank sincerity. What was new in such ideals was the idea of the self as an individual agent and expressive subject who had the power to choose the role most fitted to a particular situation – opting to reveal or conceal his convictions.

It is possible to see that sincerity with its expression of the individual self and prudence with its concomitant ability to conceal and reveal were important markers of changing subjective structures. For both rhetorical postures placed greater stress on the internal self as agent or subject of personal words and deeds. Charles Taylor claims that with 'the expressivist idea of articulating our inner nature, do we see the grounds for construing this inner domain as having depth, that is, a domain which reaches beyond our furthest point of clear expression.'[123] Calvin substantially enlarged the topography of interiority when he encouraged his readers to look more deeply inside themselves: '[t]he human heart has so many crannies where vanity hides, so many holes where falsehood lurks, is so decked out with deceiving hypocrisy, that it often dupes itself.'[124] Such

---

[121] Augustine, The *Confessions of Saint Augustine, Books I-X*, trans. F. J. Sheed (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942), p. 190.
[122] Montaigne, 'Of Presumption' (Book II, Chapter XVII).
[123] Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 389.
[124] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), Bk. 3, Chapter 2, Section 10, quoted in Martin, 'Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence', p. 1321.

contemporary observations help to increase an awareness of the Renaissance self as highly textured, encrusted, and even divided; one constantly aware of the tensions between interior beliefs, thoughts, and feelings and the particular ways through which one related to the external world. These features help to enhance the sense of inwardness and impart a sense of psychological depth and mystery to interior mental landscapes.

More importantly, such dialectical cross-currents between the epistemological-cultural practices of dissimulation, prudence, and sincerity traced in this and earlier sub-sections help to situate similar concerns in the later chapters of this work. Like Lipsius Ben Jonson believed that without 'honesty' and 'truth', 'Wisdome' and 'all the Actions of mankind' are mere 'craft', 'coosinage', and 'malice' (*Timber, or Discoveries*, ll. 89, 534-6). Yet living under the constant anxiety of sedition, insurrection, and the surveillance of late Renaissance politics, Jonson would have known that the rules of life were not reducible to simple black and white. The uncertainties of his religious transformation, his privileged access into (and exclusion from) the competitive politics of courtly privilege, and his precarious position as commercial playwright (intent on creating himself as a distinct literary 'brand') within an emergent print marketplace would have added to the urgency of this realisation in Jonson.

It also enables us to read his marginalised trickster antagonists as fictionalised projections of the slipperiness of the negotiation between performativity and intentionality that constituted early modern subjectivity in general. Their techniques of power are hands-on applications of prudence and dissimulation in daily life and there is every possibility that Jonson remained fascinated by their street-smart strategies of representation and survival. Yet as a responsible playwright he was always careful to distinguish between (morally neutral) means and (virtuous) ends. Thus the insidious authority of his rogues which is exercised behind closed doors suffers from the perpetual anxiety of public power policing and invasion of private spaces. The peculiar moral complexity of Jonsonian plays arises from this conflict between their publicly proclaimed didactic framework that is determined by Jonson the master-playwright and their farcical and deceitful plotlines privately directed by the manipulative impersonating rogue-artist thus serving to play out in miniature the larger conflicts that determined the early modern epistemological milieu. Privacy helps to put this moral *psychomachia* in perspective, helping to bind together the disparate elements that constituted the discourse of early modern individuation and identity.

IV

Poststructuralist Theories of the Self

However it is essential to remember at the outset that the question of early modern identity has been subject to scholarly debate for a very long time. Any analysis of the Renaissance self and its representation runs into stormy terrain on many counts, not least because of its alleged association with an outdated mode of criticism. The structuralist de-emphasis of the individual coupled with Jacques Derrida's poststructuralist attempts at deconstructing 'presence', psychoanalytic notions of the instinctual self, or Michel Foucault's claim that man did not exist before the invention of the human sciences[125] have attacked and destabilised any hegemonic notion of the positivist self. Again within the ambit of early modern scholarship cultural materialists have made a strong case for rejecting any idea of subjectivity in the Renaissance as a humanistic illusion.

It is represented by scholars such as Francis Barker[126] who have argued that contemporary 'bourgeois' readings of Hamlet that impute a modern sense of secret interiority on him are anachronistically misplaced for it was not until the late seventeenth century (roughly the time of the English Civil War) that the concept actually took hold, as evinced in Samuel Pepys' diary entries. Barker focuses on an emergent subject-object divide during this period linking it to the evolution of an interiorised subjectivity and connects it to the gradual subjection of the body by the mind. He however concentrates only on one brief passage from *Hamlet* to bolster his argument that interiority in Hamlet is purely 'gestural' since Hamlet is unable to adequately express his interiority except to inform others that it exists. Following Barker, Catherine Belsey, and Jonathan Dollimore have also produced denunciative readings of Hamlet as a proto-modern subject, arguing that the very concept of an autonomous subjectivity during the Renaissance is false.[127]

---

[125] 'One thing in any case is certain: man is neither the oldest nor the most constant problem that has been posed for human knowledge. Taking a relatively short chronological sample within a restricted geographical area- European culture since the sixteenth century one can be certain that man is a recent invention within it.' See Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, trans. Alan Sheridan Smith (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), p. 422 and Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997).

[126] Francis Barker, *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays in Subjection* (New York: Methuen, 1984).

[127] Belsey maintains that any search for an 'imaginary interiority' in Renaissance plays is misplaced for such an interiority is an imposition of the modern reader rather than a feature of the Renaissance text. See Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama* (London: Methuen, 1985), Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Sussex: Harvester, 1984).

Materialist claims regarding the absence of subjectivity in pre-bourgeois, pre-capitalist societies[128] has led medievalists such as David Aers to locate forms of subjectivity in medieval devotional writings.[129] Drawing on the work of Charles Taylor, Aers argues that religious writers such as St. Augustine 'introduced the inwardness of radical reflexivity' that Taylor characterises as one of the hallmarks of modern subjectivity.[130] Recent studies of medieval culture have supported Aers' contention and of the great Harvard historian Charles Homer Haskins,[131] showing how medieval practices of religious dissent and theatricalised punishment, or styles of self-presentation show a great deal of continuity with early modern forms. More recently, scholars such as Katherine Eisaman Maus have demonstrated that a significant degree of an autonomous personal interiority was present in cultural forms and modes before the capitalist explosion in the mid-seventeenth century. She examines the epistemological gap between a growing cultural sense of interiorised subjectivity and the potential of language to express such interiority. Challenging the recent tendency to see early modern selfhood solely as a function of external matrices, she isolates the two very public institutions of the courtroom and the theatre to show their implication in the difficulties of manifesting aspects of the inner life.

Postmodernist interrogations on the nature of the self are very often reactions to a liberal-essentialist myth of autonomous identity. But there is probably no need to assert the extreme position that all identities and actions are determined by external discourses.

---

[128] Similarly cultural anthropology has 'proved' that non-Western societies are less egocentric in comparison to Western ones. Clifford Geertz's attempts to study culture through symbolic systems, has contributed to a cultural relativism that asserts, for instance, that the Balinese have no sense of self during ritualistic possessions. See Clifford Geertz, 'The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man', in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 33-54. A relativist stance about notions of the self has to be tempered by the understanding that all cultures do have cognitive abilities and degrees of self-awareness.

[129] Aers is reacting against the famous Burckhardtian myth of medieval culture as a time of dreaming corporatism and collectivism when:

> (B)oth sides of human consciousness-that which was turned within as that which was turned without-lay dreaming or half awake beneath a common veil. The veil was woven of faith, illusion and childish prepossession, through which the world and history are seen clad in strange hues. Man was conscious of himself as member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation-only through some general category.

See David Aers, 'A Whisper in the Ear of Early Modernists', in *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*, ed. David Aers (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1992), pp. 177-202 and Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (New York: Harper and Rowe, 1958), vol. I: 143.

[130] However Elizabeth Hanson notes that Taylor makes a distinction between Augustinian interiority and Cartesian subjectivity: 'For Augustine is behind the eye as well as the One whose Ideas the eye strives to discern clearly before it.' For Descartes, the mind can only ever construct representations of the world, because it is profoundly different from the objective domain it struggles to know. Taylor connects Cartesian dualism to a radical shift in Western consciousness which he calls 'the loss of "ontic logos," the disappearance of a sense that the truths of the soul, language, and world are one...' See Hanson, *Discovering the Early Modern Subject*, p. 152, n. 25.

[131] Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927).

The latter position is upheld by New Historicist critics such as Stephen Greenblatt, Jonathan Goldberg, Patricia Fumerton, Ann Jones, and Peter Stallybrass who while acknowledging that the rhetoric of inwardness was highly developed in the Renaissance, maintain that it was invariably dependent upon outward, political, and public factors.[132] One only hopes that reductive and deterministic theories of agency and mentalité whether inspired by Foucault or of Marx are literary trends that will pass away with time. Rather it is important to move beyond a rigid conception of selfhood as a highly individualistic, autonomous, rationalistic, walled Cartesian ego possessing finite borders and conceive it as a decentred and fluid identity. Possibly a Cartesian heritage may seem less than credible today when private worlds are no longer as private as they are imagined to be.

This dissertation makes no claim to establish possible continuities between the sixteenth and twenty-first centuries apart from suggesting that the anxieties of identity in both periods have often been displaced onto the figure of the marginalised other. Since the thrust of this work is on Jonson's mediation of the concerns and elations associated with the newly privatised self through the trickster-artist, I have deliberately tried to translate such ideas into contemporary surveillance worries regarding the hyper-privatised or individualised social (illegal migrant), economic (welfare cheat), and religious (the Muslim *jihadist*) other. I proceed with the understanding that Elizabethan and Jacobean models of interiorised subjectivity may not be exactly identical to currently available paradigms. It may be too dangerous to presuppose a perfect fit between early modern notions of inwardness with late modern ideas about personal uniqueness, with its conviction that the self is a unified, pre-social entity, possessing a distinct right to privacy; its exaltation of the domestic sphere, and commitment to competitive individualism.

---

[132] Undoubtedly the greatest influence has come from Greenblatt who tends to view the formation of the Renaissance self within a synchronic play of social forces and ideological currents in a process that has come to be known as 'Renaissance self-fashioning' to demonstrate '[t]hat there is no layer deeper, more authentic, than theatrical self-representation.' Goldberg argues that 'the individual derived a sense of self largely from external matrices', Jones and Stallybrass that the 'private sphere' could only be imagined through its 'similarities and dissimilarities to the public world'. Fumerton maintains that 'the private could be sensed only through the public', and that 'the 'self' was void'. See Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 'Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture', in *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (rpt. 1990; New York: Routledge, 2007), pp. 176-95: 192; Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983); Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*', *SEL*, vol. 24, 1984, pp. 53-68; Patricia Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

The present work has tried to steer away from both a traditional idealistic concept of the autonomous, self-expressing subject[133] and of the subject as a radical 'postmodern' seemingly illusory artefact constituted by external socio-political matrices. It is more likely that the Renaissance experience of the self was essentially a collaborative one, deriving its power from the tense manipulations between inwardness and social identity at a time when new epistemic possibilities were beginning to mature and solidify in and around the fractures produced between the individual and the material conditions (economic, institutional, and social) of life. Therefore new ways of knowing were often profoundly at odds with the consciously held commitments of the people, emerging not as unifying principles but rather as makeshift strategies to negotiate myriad local crises, or as untheorised contradictions in discourse and social practice.

Circumventing the chronological and conceptual awkwardness of tracing a narrative of the early modern subject's emergence, I want to argue rather how during a time associated with the gradual distancing of the subject from his world, the recognition of a new sense of privacy was associated with fear and anxiety. Orthodoxy's resistance to political or conceptual innovation and the desire to recuperate a lost social legibility joined to produce the paranoid recognition that privacy could afford the individual a significant agency to fashion his own self in a denial of socially constituted identity. Inwardness encouraged an opportunistic disruption of kinship networks and social hierarchy. The strategic use of self-interested privacy could upset fundamental social and familial relationships-between subject and ruler, between father and son, or between husband and wife as I will go on to show in my discussion of Jonson's plays in later chapters.

The French historian Jean-Pierre Cavaillé[134] in his study of five seventeenth-century heterodox thinkers – Giulio Cesare Vanini, François La Mothe Le Vayer, Gabriel Naude, Louis Machon, and Torquato Accetto – went on to coin the neologism 'dis/simulation' to indicate that a coherent distinction between simulation and dissimulation cannot be sustained for long, though lying and keeping secrets may not always be identical. But

---

[133] The Burckhardtians see inwardness as a new feature of the Renaissance that grew out of Petrarch's example and the revival of Augustinian thought about the inner self. It stresses a conception of the 'person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgement, and action, organized into a distinctive whole.' See Clifford Geertz, '"From the Native's Point of View": On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding', in *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, ed. Richard A. Shweder and Robert A. Levine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 123-36: 126.

[134] Jean-Pierre Cavaillé, *Dis/simulations : Jules-César Vanini, François La Mothe Le Vayer, Gabriel Naudé, Louis Machon et Torquato Acetto; religion, moraleet politique au XVIIe siècle* (Paris : Champion, 2002).

drawing from Cavaillé's insights it is possible to infer that the early modern fear of interiority can be located in the shifting and morally overlapping space between simulation and dissimulation. The demonisation of privacy often led to concerns about an enemy whose inward truth was hidden and whose motives were suspect: witches, Jews, Jesuits, con men, stage machiavels and malcontents, Catholic friars, vagrants, moors, or New World natives. I contend that they represent the dark inverse of the Augustinian *homo interior*, dystopic figments of an evolving bureaucratic state, doppelgängers of the world of the Old Regime.

The introductory first chapter of my thesis 'Prudence and Dissimulation in Early Modern Europe' commences with an observation on the decline of privacy in contemporary times, noting the extent to which the nature of public-private spaces have been radically redefined in an increasingly surveillant post-9/11 world. I further stated that the new anxieties about privacy and secret deviant identities have found cultural expression through their displacement onto the figure of the non-Western other – the migrant worker, the asylum-seeker, or the terror suspect – who represent the unassimilated dregs of the Western social commune, standing metonymically for social hypocrisy, a penchant for deception, and falsity. Disturbing the discursive coherence of nation-states and communities, they represent the radical contingency of the bond that ties the private individual with the community.

This served as an entry point into my primary study on the rise of privacy in the early modern period, and how in its earliest stages of development its negative connotations usually derived from its association with the Old Regime practice of dissimulation. The practice of prudence, despite the anxieties associated with it, played a formative role in the appropriation of a secularised and psychologised interiority, which could hold the secrets of the early modern individual, who had to be aware when to disclose his secrets and when to keep silent. The concern about privacy as a privative state marked by social withdrawal and psychological (mal)agency were often displaced and reallocated onto early modern *sans papiers* such as the vagabond, the Jew, the beggar or the witch. Later sections of the chapter are concerned primarily in examining the background of early modern privacy, especially the unravelling of the cultural and ideological links between interiority and the legitimisation of new protocols for conduct revolving around the discourses of prudence and secrecy in Old Regime Europe. It also looks at current debates regarding the cultural valence of theories regarding inwardness, especially the tendency of

47

contemporary scholarship to see early modern selfhood wholly in terms of public parameters.

The second chapter 'Brewing Place of Poisons: Privacy and Solitude in Early Modern Culture' addresses the rhetoric of inwardness and human depth through an examination of selected Montaignian *Essays*. This choice is justified on the assumption that Montaigne provides a rich insight into late sixteenth-century habits of thinking and writing about the self. They are also a noteworthy reminder of how early modern subjectivity was implicated in a dialectical interplay between concealment and self-revelation, autonomy and plurality. Montaigne's poignantly 'modern' dilemma is prefigured by the way in which the self's desire for an authentic, unmediated, emancipated selfhood that is free from artifice and distortion is undercut by its irrational dependence upon the judgement of others and its imprisonment in socially governed actions. Later sections of this chapter are devoted to the cultural and material implications of being 'private' in the early modern era, observing how privacy was more often an object of misgivings and competing priorities, closely associated with deviance. It finally looks at the early modern epistemological anxiety regarding sequestered spatialities and enclosed subjectivities through three particular categories of space (that are prefigured by the Montaignian *arrière boutique*)that act as the material template of a secret psychological life: poison rings, Catholic priest holes, and cryptography.

The third chapter 'Underworld Heterotopias: Reading the Early Modern City through Rogue Narratives' is an examination of the illicit heterotopias that frame both the late modern and early modern social imaginary. It begins by looking at how contemporary spaces such as army barracks, prisons, and detention centres which are often used for housing illegal immigrants and apparently stateless people represent geographies of itinerant mobility, belonging, and citizenship that find their parallel in early modern 'non-spaces' such as liberties and bastard sanctuaries: demonised enclaves where the monarch's writ held no authority and which had acquired the squalid reputation as hideaways for the criminal riff-raff such as masterless men, prostitutes, vagabonds, radical Puritans or theatrical players. It analyses the socio-historical conditions that led to the creation of such ambivalent spaces looking at how they manifested themselves in literary discourses in the form of an imaginary heterotopic geography peopled by early modern subalterns such as witches and Jews.

The chapter takes up the case of Thomas Harman's cony-catching narrative *A Caveat for Common Cursitors* (1566) to look at his representation of the so-called Elizabethan

Underworld as an illicit and grotesque inverse of the pleasant domesticities and intimate relationships centred on the home. The *Caveat* advertises itself as an exposé of hitherto hidden worlds, covert practices, and arcane languages supposedly used by rogues, selling prurient secrets to an eager reading public. However by collapsing the moral polarities between his public authority as a Kentish gentleman and his private role as budding entrepreneur taking advantage of the burgeoning lucrative print market, Harman too offers a prototype of the privatised (secretive) subject caught in his own authorial strategies of self-display and self-concealment. Harman's authorial anxiety *vis-à-vis* his (criminalised) subject matter resuscitates many of the problems that would drive Jonson's more sophisticated authorial self-creation nearly four decades later.

The fourth chapter 'Half Lights and Full Shadows: Discovery and Concealment of the Early Modern Self' starts by looking at the visual tableau of the resurrected Christ being examined by a sceptical Thomas in Caravaggio's baroque masterpiece. I contend that Thomas' hermeneutic quest for truth participates in an anti-ocularcentric discourse, helping to create a cognitively dense model (in Christ) that structures itself around the dichotomy between a fallible human vision and an inscrutable divine mystery. Such a contradiction also marks the theatre and its protagonists, both marked by incompletion, absence, contingent knowledge, and ontological groundlessness: a form of visual display that also flaunts the limits of its display, where visible markers fade and dissolve into interior essence.

The chapter proceeds to consider how Jonson's negotiation with emerging subjective impulses and codes of privacy shifted uneasily between the affirmative and the negative. He presents grotesque perversions of the private disengaged subject (reminiscent of the classical *idioteis*) in the figure of the secretive rogue-artist or critiques emerging codes of monogamous sexual intimacy or idealised closeness centred on the nuclear family through the abnormal or less-than-happy domestic settings in his plays. On the other hand, his growing appreciation for the solitary intellectual pleasures and friendly camaraderie of private life for his own creative purposes become especially apparent in his Roman plays and non-dramatic works. The dialectic constituted by the growing disjunction between private and public was to determine not only the printed format and thematic content of Jonson's work but also his own complex authorial self-fashioning.

The fifth chapter 'Creative Labour and Imaginative Deceit: The Rogue-Artists of Jonsonian Comedy' studies three of Jonson's mature plays – *Volpone* (1606), *The Alchemist* (1610), and *Bartholomew Fair* (1614) – from the perspective of the socially unstable and

phenomenologically cryptic marginalised characters or community presented in them. I posit that such individuals offer a representational ground through which the early modern other (or author) may be seen and deciphered. As dark upshots of a transitional era both were thrust into cruel and aggressive proto-capitalist worlds where they had to use their creative intellects and linguistic dexterity to survive or fall prey to superior intriguers. Survival through wits on urban streets could be strikingly similar to managing one's professional career by exploiting the politics of courtly privilege or manipulating a set of cut-throat relationships with potential clients/fellow playwrights. The chapter also looks at the clever machinations of the Plautine slave and examines the qualitative changes that Jonson introduced even as he appropriated the character for his own plays. It undertakes a detailed analysis of rogue characters such as Mosca and Face to examine the nuances of their private designs and their consummate public performances of identity. It also observes how the fairground community of *Bartholomew Fair* is the closest that Jonson got towards defining a proto-civil (intimate public) society as the founding locus of the 'good life'.

Jonson is probably exceptional in taking the first formative steps towards the decentralisation of writing from external control by basing it in the enclosed worlds and authorities of independent-minded individuals. His move to enunciate a new form of 'authorial' labour veered dangerously close to the mental acuity, spontaneous creativity, rhetorical versatility, and resourcefulness of the rogues 'craft' despite his attempt to distinguish his 'higher' art by stressing its didactic valence and moral industry. His surreptitious overwriting of a subversive private script by a publicly conservative one can be deciphered only through an adjustment in interpretive perspective. His literary appropriation of the trope of the servant-artist helped him to envisage authorship as a mimetic practice that enabled new subject positions in a still deeply traditional era. I end this chapter by looking at the way Jonson's penchant for testing the moral sympathies of his audience veers towards the trangressive, constructing a distinct authorial identity on the sophisticated ability to obfuscate information and produce partial representations.

The sixth and final chapter 'Marginal Retreats: Staging Privacy on the Printed Page' starts out through a consideration of the case of Henry Cuffe, secretary and amanuensis to the Earl of Essex who was put to death, as I would like to believe, through the performance of treachery in the enclosed privacy of textual spaces and scholarly exegesis. It attempts to map Cuffe's unfortunate fate in terms of the larger technological shifts between a declining orality and an incipient literacy, especially the dissociation of speech

from the human subject and the engendering of 'presence' in the written rather than the spoken word, as new trends were emerging in the ways of transmitting knowledge and modes of perceiving the world. It uses this as a premise to gain entry into Jonson's canny authorial/editorial negotiation with the abstract commodity world of print, especially through an examination of paratexts in the quarto and folio editions of the three plays under consideration.

While this chapter does not involve fictional rogue characters *per se*, the dissertation justifies its insertion on the grounds that here on the *mise en scène* of the printed page, Jonson the author himself enacts the role of the roguish protagonist *vis-à-vis* his readers (as masters turned confidants) by making diligent use of marginal textual spaces and typographical devices (such as dedicatory epistles, prefaces, commendatory verses, Latin mottoes, arguments, addresses to the reader) for authorial self-display and self-concealment and to construct a sense of shared intimacy with the morally and intellectually cognizant reader: creating a version of the coterie audience of manuscript culture. It interprets such interlinear or extra-textual recesses on the material page of the printed text as dynamic sites of creative becoming where authorial agency was exercised, hermeneutic sites where a new kind of privatised subjectivity developed extending outwards to include the reader. The *Workes* (1616) thus represents not only his most blatant piece of self-representation, but also his idealistic conception of a transactive literary space shared between reader and author. Yet as I go on to show such 'peritextual'[135] materials and spaces establish a dynamic tension between exclusiveness and accessibility, silent reticence and conversational engagement so that Jonson's readerly concessions and friendly overtures are simultaneously marked by the gradual receding of the author into a self-constituted interiority, thereby constructing authorship as a condition marked by abstraction where the author's writings embody his self on paper.

---

[135] Gerard Genette uses the term 'peritextual' to refer physical features of the books such as the material (whether parchment or paper), the size (quarto, folio, octavo, duodecimo etc.), and the condition of the pages which may suggest something about book ownership and use. See Gérard Genette, *Paratext: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 1.

CHAPTER TWO
BREWING PLACE OF POISONS: PRIVACY AND SOLITUDE IN EARLY MODERN CULTURE

> The garment or the cover of the minde
>
> The humane soule is; of the soul, the spirit
>
> The proper robe is; of the spirit, the bloud;
>
> And of the bloud, the body is the shrowd.[1]

A whole history remains to be written of spaces—which would at the same time be the history of powers (both of these terms in the plural)—from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat.[2]

I
Montaigne's Discovery of the Inner Self

In a famous passage from the *Essays*, Montaigne likened the discovery of self-inspection to a topographical event:

> No one since has followed the track: 'tis a rugged road, more so than it seems, to follow a pace so rambling and uncertain, as that of the soul; to penetrate the dark profundities of its intricate internal windings; to choose and lay hold of so many little nimble motions; 'tis a new and extraordinary undertaking, and that withdraws us from the common and most recommended employments of the world. 'Tis now many years since that my thoughts have had no other aim and level than myself, and that I have only pried into and studied myself: or, if I study any other thing, 'tis to apply it to or rather in myself.[3]

Montaigne's errant travelling eye/I (in Plato's Allegory of the Cave the soul/self is an eye that has escaped the lower darkness to gaze upwards towards the sun to achieve intellectual vision) wanders and touches a strange ambient world of unforeseen layered expanse, moving forward and backward, inward and outward, alert yet withdrawn, attending to surface detail, recording images, mingling wonder and contemplation, now

---

[1] George Chapman, *The Revenge of Bussy d' Ambois*, ed. F. S. Boas (Boston and London: D. C. Heath & Co., 1905), V.v.170-3.

[2] Michel Foucault, 'The Eye of Power', in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings,* ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980), pp. 146-65: 149.

[3] Montaigne, 'Use Makes Perfect' (Book II, Chapter VI).

blurring and then clarifying its perspective, precipitating a moment of 'haptic-visuality'[4] in which perception and sensation, intimacy and distance, depth and form blend into each other. Montaigne uses the visual[5] to articulate a condition of tactile and sensuous intimacy, a sense of moving and lived space, his meandering eye looking and literally touching the surface in order to discern texture if not form: 'more inclined to move than to focus, more inclined to graze than to gaze.'[6] Likewise he uses the haptic[7] to probe and plumb the 'opaque depths' of the soul's subjective topography, apprehending, and discerning surfaces in an empathic process of continuous folding, refolding, and unfolding. The experiential discontinuity results from the narrator's immersion into multiple levels or layers of representational realities, moments of darkness and sudden lucidity that recalls the contemporary neo-baroque trend.

The literal closeness and tangibility of the image of the mental landscape bespeaks a psychological intimacy where the boundaries between subject and object get blurred, evoking a sense of touch, revealing the inadequacy of the visual as a mode of apprehension. The ego's self-examination and search for self-knowledge proceeds through a tactile 'proprioceptive' awareness of its own progress. Montaigne's quasi-simultaneous tactile and visual conception of experiential inner spaces seems to undermine even as it recognises the imminent primacy of visual cognition. This dynamic interplay between space, vision, and the senses where clarity plunges into obscurity and vice-versa locates him at the very brink of a cultural process that would eventually culminate in the Cartesian *res cogitans* with its privileging of the cognitive and the visual

---

[4] In haptic-visuality the eyes function as an organ of touch, whereas optic-visuality requires a distance between subject and object in order to perceive depth and to see objects as distinct forms in space. Haptic-visuality allows the viewer to incorporate other senses of experience, provoking a visceral and emotional consideration of the object under scrutiny.

[5] The discovery of the *camera obscura* (from the Latin for dark box) during this period was a desire to extend the eye's reach to every corner of the cosmos.

[6] Laura U. Marks, *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), p. 153.

[7] The word 'haptic' derives from the Greek *haptein* ('to touch' or 'to hold') and originated at the turn of the twentieth century with the Viennese art historian Aloïs Riegl who saw touch to be essential for experiencing the 'true quality, the depth and delimitation of objects in nature and works of art.' See Aloïs Riegl, 'Late Roman or Oriental?' in *German Essays on Art and History: Winckelmann, Burckhardt, Panofsky, and Others*, trans. Peter Wortsman, ed. Gert Schiff (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 1988), pp. 173-91: 181. It also recalls the tactile nature of Walter Benjamin's concept that involves feeling and grasping, the literal and the metaphorical: 'For the tasks which face the human apparatus of perception at the turning points of history cannot be solved by optical means, that is, by contemplation alone. They are mastered gradually by habit, under the guidance of tactile appropriation.' Deleuze and Guattari refer to the same idea when they characterise the close-in, a-centric mobilisation of vectors in space as haptic, in contrast to the more fixed arrangement of bodies in an abstract 'striated' Cartesian space. See Walter Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility', in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 4: 1938-40*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings (Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), pp. 251-83 and Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

over the corporeal and the haptic as the ultimate source of knowledge and control. For Montaigne, place becomes a fluid, malleable medium that he evokes in order to capture the essence of his inward self, reflecting a profound dislocation of traditional habits of mind and registering the transformations attendant upon this new and unknown journey.

Through its relational engagement with the cultural tropes of surface and depth, opticality and tactility, proximity and distance, the Montaignian *moi* acts as the liminal locus for two intersecting and competing paradigms of identity and epistemological inquiry: one that moves horizontally along seemingly porous surfaces and one that cuts, breaks or pierces vertically through impenetrable shells to reach an elusive and unknown interior below. One model presumes that the subject knows transitively taking the world as the object of his thinking, the second model posits that the subject can only know self-reflexively, recognising his place in the hierarchical order. The Montaignian self offers a unique template for studying Jonson's portrayal of the self which as I will be arguing in the later chapters engage with similar cognitive models in his rogue and gull characters.

Montaigne reveals, albeit through his own doubtful self-examination of the complex layers of his interiority, how in the discovery of another's secrets, truth lies outside the mind that would know it, masked by distances or surfaces which the discoverer labours to penetrate. Charged with the precarious task of holding both these metaphors of self in tension: being all surface while protecting a hidden depth, Montaigne is caught in a subjective no-man's-land where he could only tenuously oscillate between an older tradition premised on unbridled self-reflexivity and a yet to be articulated Cartesian dispensation.[8] Hence Montaigne engages simultaneously with an embodied and phenomenological account of identity and knowledge gained through the act and experience of containing, protecting, and feeling the limits of the body, thus achieving a counterpoint between visuality and tactility.[9]

Similarly Montaigne's topographic encoding of the complexities of self-introspection through the trope of a circuitous and vertiginous journey on 'a rugged road' enabled him to organise and visualise the boundless imagined terrain of the mind, establishing tenuous

---

[8] The long term consequences of this shift included the rise of Renaissance perspective, which reinforced the visual mastery of an individual viewer. Tactile modes of representation have generally been deemed subordinate in Western art history (exemplified by say, southern European painting) relegated to inferior arts and traditions such as Egyptian and Islamic painting, domestic and women's arts such as weaving or embroidery. However it also included high-art traditions such as illuminated medieval manuscripts, baroque art, and Flemish oil painting from fifteenth- to seventeenth-centuries. See Laura U. Marks, *Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), p. 6.

[9] Aloïs Riegl traces a similar revolution in visual styles in Roman art to a transformation in religious thought. 'The barbarian invasion of the Roman Empire precipitated a clash between the southern belief that the body could be the vehicle for grace and the northern belief that spirituality required transcending of the physical body.' As quoted in Marks, *Touch*, p. 5.

connections and interrelationships between being and location, moral reconnaissance and physical progression.[10] The dynamics of movement and the penchant for vigilant detail in his account of self-observation locates Montaigne within the interpellating force of a new spatial consciousness, the essence of which was mobility. His microscopic reflections yield a sense of an ontological self that is defined both spatially and locally, mapping him in an ambient locale that is at once enthralling, unsettling, and perilous; implying a larger space beyond the immediate scene: offering a point of negotiation between individual interiority and the exterior world. The observing subject learns through error and traces the lines of its identity through the passage it encounters: an uncertain terrain where paths are indirect, precipitous, and often dangerous. The repetitions, contradictions, and unlikely twists and turns of his diverse interiorised travels and wanderings cause the mind to acquire a graduated topographical form, a layered and slippery landscape through which the project of self-study is worked out.

By imposing a sense of spatial organisation on the mental landscape Montaigne tries to lend certainty and knowability to the unseen, yet any awareness of the inherent mappability of the mind is offset by his sceptical realisation of the uncertainty, intricacy, and inadequacy of the quest at hand, implicating him in an act of Derridean *différance*: both a differentiation of meaning and its deferral. Thus any sense of spatial coherence can be called vague at best, the mind's terrain suggesting a figurative and semiotic place for wayward actions and 'wandering' experiences without any direction or spatial specificity. The energy of the exploring and performing ego comes exclusively from the physical movement that penetrates it. The spatial landscape exists only as an ideational function of psychic discovery and development rather than as an accurate depiction of distance and reality. He questions the possibility of knowing and sees the self as marked by inconstancy and uncertainty: 'a marvellous vain, fickle, and unstable subject.'[11] The deeply felt experience of itinerancy, displacement, and fragmentariness that characterises self-examination is a reminder of the (vagrant) culture of geographical mobility and 'unsettled subjectivity'[12] that I will be examining in the third chapter. Montaigne's disconcerted reference to his sense of physical dislocation and mental disorientation

---

[10] Augustine had pictured the self as a spacious inner palace with large courtyards. Montaigne's doubtful quest is similar in spirit to Locke's picture of the self as a dark room where nothing but images are projected within, through windows out of which the self cannot see.

[11] Montaigne, 'That Men by Various Ways Arrive at the Same End' (Book I, Chapter I). The French title of his *Essays* were called *Essais* or 'Attempts' which implies a project of trial and error and of tentative exploration. It indicates continuous assessment and an ongoing intellectual attitude of questioning.

[12] This phrase has been taken from Patricia Fumerton's ambitious book entitled *Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), where she deals with 'low' subjectivity through the cultural history of early modern vagrancy.

works out in miniature the destabilisation of early modern orthodoxies relating to geographical and social displacement that opened up national space to the creative and commercial imagination of the subject.

In his lectures at the *Collège de France* between 1981 and 1982 and in his later work generally, Michel Foucault interpreted this fundamental dichotomy between the phenomenological self and its inherent performativity in terms of two radically different 'technologies' of disciplining and normalising the self that has dominated the Western world: one that conceives the self as something pre-existing, that people strive to interpret, the site of a hermeneutic act undertaken in the conviction 'that there is something hidden in ourselves and that we are always in a self-illusion which hides the secret.'[13] For Foucault this hermeneutic imperative of self-knowledge was preceded by a Stoic model of the self (most notably practiced by Marcus Aurelius and Seneca) that he traces to Plato's *Alcibiades* (where Socrates explains to Alcibiades that the soul is the part of the self that one must care for, in order to govern the city properly) and which characterised most of the ancient world: specifically care of the self corresponding to the ancient Greek (Hellenistic) precept of the *heautou epimeleisthai*, which is to engage in a daily ascetic regimen of self-regulation.[14]

Instead of discovering an extra-discursive truth buried deep in the subject, the ethic of self-care took the form of a vigilant attitude or way of life. It involved an assimilation of truth, instanced in the memorisation of laws of conduct so complete that they led to desired actions (fearlessness in the face of death, or indifference to pain or pleasure) becoming involuntary by nature. Opposed to a merely passive, contemplative life it included care of body and mind: physical exercise, study, conversation, and the pursuit of tranquillity. As a social practice it constituted one of the main rules for socio-personal conduct in ancient cities and aided in the collective functioning of the citizenry and state affairs. According to this view there could be no discrepancy between being and appearance, for the subject was a blank slate ready for inscription. The Stoic doctrine privileged the surface over depth and event over essence, representing the logical inverse

---

[13] Michel Foucault, *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, ed. L. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. H. Hutton (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988). See also Foucault's *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1978).

[14] They included Stoic techniques of epistolary examinations of conscience, the reviewing of one's actions, and dream interpretation designed to develop mindfulness, whereby individuals could 'effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, wisdom, perfection, or immortality.' See Foucault, *Technologies of the Self*, p. 18.

of Platonic metaphysics. In Stoic logic the ideal was always only an effect of the body's surface rather than the ultimate guarantor of an essential identity.[15]

Applying a similar Foucauldian dichotomy[16] to the *Essays*, it is possible to see that the most inward[17] turns of Montaigne's self-introspective subjectivity are haunted by a self-fashioning ethic of the protean, malleable self.[18] Thus the French sceptic's reference to the *arrière boutique* – a metaphorical private room behind the shop where no public business is allowed to enter or take over, or his injunction to retire into oneself are undercut by the possibility of interpreting all self-reflective turns as nothing more than as an engagement in the practice of self-government which prepares oneself for life's vicissitudes. The self, from this perspective, owes its existence to the process of writing; therefore the *Essays* are not really 'expressive' of the author's subjectivity so much as an auto-performance, a representation of an endlessly reiterated self-reflexivity: 'I have no more made my book than my book has made me.'[19] Notwithstanding such arguments that weigh against situating Montaigne within the advent of modern subjectivity as grossly anachronistic,[20] it is easy to see that the most engaging moments of the *Essays* are

---

[15] As a form of self-constitution and cultivation Foucault considered the notion of *epimeleisthai sautou* to have been gradually superseded by the first principle of Western Socratic/Platonic rationalist tradition, *gnothi sauton*, to 'know yourself', that was in turn further influenced by the Christian model of confession and self-renunciation.

[16] Although his untimely death left his project incomplete, Foucault did briefly speculate on Montaigne's contribution to the antique ethics and aesthetics of self-care.

[17] My arguments in the preceding section have been influenced by Nicholas Paige's study of interiority in seventeenth-century French literature. However in what follows, I categorically distance myself from his conclusion that the whole enterprise of introspection in Montaigne's *Essays* is nothing but an illusion. He maintains that 'the modern tendency to privilege autobiographical readings can and should be understood not as something totally foreign to the texts themselves, but rather as part of a diachronic process in which these important works have *become*, bit by bit, autobiographies.' See Nicholas D. Paige, *Being Interior: Autobiography and the Contradictions of Modernity in Seventeenth-Century France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), p. 60. The question of Montaigne's interiority has come under close scrutiny by scholars who wish to situate him within the evolution of a subjective (autobiographical) space while maintaining his historical specificity. See Richard L. Regosin, *The Matter of My Book: Montaigne's 'Essais' as the Book of the Self* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), p. 200 and Taylor, *Sources of the Self*, pp. 177-84. However the metaphor of interiority does not organise all of Montaigne's self-reflections, rather it is a concept upon which he hits upon from time to time.

[18] The insistence on Montaigne's modernity is a source of irritation for those who are interested in the self's inherent (pre- or postmodern) performativity or non-subjectivity (exemplified through passages such as: 'I have no more made my book than my book has made me: 'tis a book consubstantial with the author') seeing the *Essays* as 'neither memoirs nor autobiography, but rather a surrogate self, an auto-performance which cannot but displace the "real" Montaigne.' See Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 273.

[19] Montaigne, 'Of Giving the Lie' (Book II, Chapter XVIII).

[20] Although he denies any possibility of seeing Montaigne as 'modern', Anthony Cascardi also maintains that his strange and somewhat unhinged use of the first person is indicative of a crisis to which the modern subject would be a response. See Anthony J. Cascardi, *The Subject of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 65. For a similar reading see also Timothy J. Reiss, 'Montaigne and the Subject of Polity', in *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986), pp. 115-49: 134. 'I am tempted indeed to suggest that in the *Essays*, the "subject" is glimpsed only by these signs of its *absence*. In Descartes, the subject is *there* by the certainty of its *presence*.'

those where Montaigne stops short of revealing an experiential subjective space or where he withdraws uneasily from an ethic of self-care to a more interiorising vocabulary:

> The world looks always opposite; I turn my sight inwards, and there fix and employ it. I have no other business but myself, I am eternally meditating upon myself, considering and tasting myself. Other men's thoughts are ever wandering abroad, if they will but see it; they are still going forward:
>
> '*Nemo in sese tentat descendere';*
>
> ['No one thinks of descending into himself.'
>
> —Persius, iv. 23.]
>
> for my part, I circulate in myself.[21]

The detachment between self and world is balanced by a centripetalised scopic movement towards a vague mental interior, enhanced further by the citation from Persius' *Fourth Satire*.[22] Although Montaigne's lexical turn inwards is mired within a tautological proliferation of reflexive verbs and pronouns yet he comes close to occupying a hermeneutic posture: 'this capacity of trying the truth, whatever it be, in myself, and this free humour of not over easily subjecting my belief, I owe principally to myself.'[23] The first quotation at the commencement of this chapter (from the essay 'Use Makes Perfect') makes innovative use of the symbol of the fold ('dark profundities', 'intricate internal windings') juxtaposed between two metaphors of movement. Movement threatens to disengage the notion of a static unified truth; while the fold[24] suggests that something lurks inside, marking a fissure between exterior and interior, the observing eye and the observed object. Once again this passage becomes a bipartite metaphor for a selfhood that is disengaged from the labyrinthine profundities that hide truth, yet whose internal subjective folds also present the most explicit references to the subject's inward depth.

Montaigne's modernity lay precisely in his hesitant deployment of the tropes of interiority in a first-person text (and in an age) that was still dedicated to the older pre-modern self-fashioning ideal. His significance lay in the ability to anticipate seventeenth-century forms of introspective writing and for his highly nuanced approach to the

---

[21] Montaigne, 'Of Presumption' (Book II, Chapter XVII).

[22] Persius's *Satire 4* is a disorienting poem by itself because it presents a challenge to the author and reader to undertake a descent into the darkness of the unknown sinful self. It also comments on the terrifying loneliness of such an undertaking and expresses the discomfort of self-interrogation: suggesting not the luminous self-knowledge of the *gnothi seauton* but the terror of discovering disorientation. Montaigne's self-examination mirrors a similar perplexity.

[23] Montaigne, 'Of Presumption' (Book II, Chapter XVII).

[24] On the baroque fold as that which harmonises the interior and exterior, see Gilles Deleuze, 'The Fold', *Yale French Studies,* vol. 80, 1991, pp. 227-47.

problem of personal freedom (interpreted as a state of measured engagement and disengagement) in a threatening and corrupt courtly regime. More significantly I believe, Montaigne's ambivalence helps to establish the early modern self's ubiquity in a state of dialectical passage between the performative and the hermeneutic, acting and being, touch and vision, presence and absence. It is true that his practice of withdrawal and reflection is not essentially a means toward realising what by late modern standards would be his individual and truthful being, yet it is a necessary (and possibly the only) precondition for freeing oneself from the prejudicial and distorting vision of the world thereby allowing reclamation of ownership over oneself.

The *Essays* also coincide with the development of new empirical and scientific systems of inquiry which led to an abstract and disembodied form of knowledge production in its ability to divide the body into its disintegrated constituent parts. These new technologies served to regularise and discipline the way in which bodies were seen and ordered in space. They located the body in a predetermined visual lexicon and framed the context within which knowledge of the body was constructed and received, forming part of a broader obsession with the surveillance and control of the body. More pertinently, Montaigne's problematisation of surface and depth brings to the fore the two dominant and competing modes of medical inquiry directed at the body: humoural theory and anatomical dissection. Humour theory which was the principal mode of holistic medical inquiry in the classical and medieval eras was based on the idea that a careful (tactile) reading and interpretation of the surface of the body revealed its inner workings through external indices such as colour, temperature, or secretion of fluids. Contemporary ideas of interior selfhood were based upon humoural equilibrium, so that the microcosmic inner self was never hermetically sealed off from its macrocosmic surroundings.

Anatomy as the new science of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries stressed a notion of the body as a private entity. Lacking the close relationships between inner-outer which had sustained humoural medicine, anatomy opened up the individual and decontextualised body for investigation and instilled the belief that corporeal knowledge amounted to opening up its interior and exposing it to vision. In vernacular speech and writing the whole interior of the body – heart, liver, womb, bowels, kidneys, gall, blood, lymph – involved itself in the production of the mental interior, of the individual's private experience. Thus Edward Coke presiding at the trial of the Gunpowder Plot conspirators explained the rationale behind the punishment awaiting them: the traitor's 'bowels and

inlaid parts [are] taken out and burnt, who inwardly had conceived and harboured in his heart such horrible treason.'[25]

> The greatest and most grievous punishment used in England for such as offend against the State is drawing from the prison to the place of execution upon an hurdle or sled, where they are hanged till they be half dead, and then taken down, and quartered alive; after that, their members and bowels are cut from their bodies, and thrown into a fire, provided near hand and within their own sight, even for the same purpose.[26]

The scaffold was the stage where the convict literally spilt his guts and had his heart plucked out to reveal the mysteriousness and inscrutability of human desires and motivations. This spectacle intersected with a broader paradigm of examining the body as a proxy for examining the soul which formed the basis of the Delphic motto of knowing oneself. Yet even the interior of the body was conceived as a public space, for everything that could be visually identified was deemed to be 'public'. 'Private' was used to designate only those parts that were genuinely invisible to the physician's gaze or fell below the threshold of the linguistically articulable.

Given the general lack of clear distinctions between bodily and mental processes in the Renaissance, the presence of the anatomical or corporeal metaphor in Montaigne's advertisement of the essays as (psychosomatic) confession may therefore not be entirely coincidental: 'They who do not rightly know themselves, may feed themselves with false approbations; not I, who see myself, and who examine myself even to my very bowels',[27] or in his correspondence between writing and the anatomical uncovering of internal body organs: 'I expose myself entire; 'tis a body where, at one view, the veins, muscles, and tendons are apparent, every of them in its proper place; here the effects of a cold; there of the heart beating, very dubiously. I do not write my own acts, but myself and my essence.'[28] Montaigne's self is thus assimilated into the visceral interior of his body. Similarly the metaphor of the human mind as opaque fold (first quotation in this chapter) draws prominently on the anatomical description of the brain.[29] It calls to mind Andreas

---

[25] John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. George Townsend (London, 1839), quoted in Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 195.

[26] William Harrison, *The Description of England,* ed. Georges Edelen, Chapter XI (Ithaca, N. Y.: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell University Press, 1968), p. 187.

[27] Montaigne, 'Upon Some Verses of Virgil' (Book III, Chapter V).

[28] Ibid., 'Use Makes Perfect' (Book II, Chapter VI).

[29] In the succeeding age Rousseau was to conceive his autobiographical project under the rubric of anatomy, though by the eighteenth century the ubiquity of the medical gaze would become an accepted given.

Vesalius's seminal text of modern anatomy, *De Humani Corporis Fabrica* (On the Fabric of the Human Body, 1543) which contained a number of visual plates depicting the cranial folds of the brain thus serving to contextualise the *Essays* on the same epistemic ground as the Renaissance science of anatomy. Montaigne's insistence that the act of writing enabled penetration into the secrets that lay under the metaphoric opacity of the fold served to vindicate a model of haptic knowledge: 'seeing is believing, but touching is the truth.' However his uncertainty in making the mind speak and discerning its parameters parallels similar difficulties that confronted Renaissance anatomists as well.

> That difficulty was taxonomic...It was as if, having penetrated the interior, the explorer wandered through the new topography of the human world, bereft of reliable maps, and with guides who were proving increasingly untrustworthy.[30]

The mind then was conceived as a private space of thoughts yet unuttered, or of actions yet unexecuted. It was concealed deep inside the human body, imperceptible and uncontrolled from the outside. The safe possession of an unreadable space provided protection from public scrutiny and control. Such an association may have been especially pertinent to Montaigne for whom the *Essays* reiterated the value of the private sphere after his much publicised retirement in 1571 from active government service at the age of 38 to devote his leisure to self-study. Discontented with the artifices of court culture and the influence of Protestant and evangelical ideas privileging inward conscience over outward performance, he uses the celebrated architectural metaphor of the *arrière boutique* to describe a protected and enclosed inner space that we should carry within ourselves and be able to retire to all times and in all places.

> Wives, children, and goods must be had, and especially health, by him that can get it; but we are not so to set our hearts upon them that our happiness must have its dependence upon them; we must reserve a backshop, wholly our own and entirely free, wherein to settle our true liberty, our principal solitude and retreat. And in this we must for the most part entertain ourselves with ourselves, and so privately that no exotic knowledge or communication be admitted there; there to laugh and to talk, as if without wife, children, goods, train, or attendance, to the end that when it shall so fall out that we must lose any or all of these, it may be no new thing to be without them. We have a mind pliable in itself, that will be company; that has wherewithal to attack and to defend, to receive and to

---

[30] Jonathan Sawday, *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 129.

give: let us not then fear in this solitude to languish under an uncomfortable vacuity.

'*In solis sis tibi turba locis.*'

['In solitude, be company for thyself.'—Tibullus, vi. 13. 12.]

Virtue is satisfied with herself, without discipline, without words,   without effects.[31]

Montaigne effectively distinguishes the two main variants of early modern privacy – domestic and solitary – but the *Essays* also give a touching expression to the need to find spaces (in one's room or library, through friendships or writing) that permit the utterance of a comparatively honest and sincere account of oneself and one's feelings. The metaphorical back shop may have been intrinsically connected in Montaigne's mind to the enclosed circular space of his library tucked into the topmost third floor of the tower overlooking the front gate and courtyard of his sprawling chateau. After the death of his friend Etienne la Boetie, he converted it from a storage chamber to provide space for his friend's legacy of books. As the place where he wrote (his essays constituting yet another place of secession) his library constituted a space of both worldly mastery[32] and retreat to where he could withdraw from the pressing needs and obligations of the world. In her survey of sixteenth-century expressions of inwardness, Anne Ferry points out that accounts of self-examination 'were most commonly based on metaphorical comparisons to entering a room in a house: a chamber, closet, or cabinet.'[33] While the growing compartmentalisation and specialisation of spaces gave Montaigne access to the contemplative pleasures of an interior landscape, enclosed spaces also incarnated in risky and compelling ways some of the particular privileges and paradoxes of Renaissance subjectivity that will be explored in the later sections of this chapter.

Thus if such spaces offered the possibility of limited freedom and self-agency yet the very unreadability of such enclosures may have seemed sinister and anarchic, for the interior could enclose experiences that were incomprehensible to an observer such as adultery, conspiracy, hypocrisy, treason, unsanctioned desires, or orgasm. These bounded

---

[31] Montaigne, 'Of Solitude' (Book I, Chapter XXXVIII).

[32] The terms used by Montaigne to describe his library suggest a position of worldly control and empowerment: 'When at home, I a little more frequent my library, whence I overlook at once all the concerns of my family. 'Tis situated at the entrance into my house, and I thence see under me my garden, court, and base-court, and almost all parts of the building... 'Tis there that I am in my kingdom, and there I endeavour to make myself an absolute monarch, and to sequester this one corner from all society, conjugal, filial, and civil.' Montaigne, 'Of Three Commerces' (Book III, Chapter III). Yet the library was also constructed as a response to worldly disappointments, thus showing the interplay between private and public life.

[33] Anne Ferry, *The 'Inward' Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), p. 46.

and sequestered spaces whether material or conceptual thus invited and justified penetration, through a disclosure of their secret interiors. Montaigne himself may have been all too aware that the logic of interiority required a resistance to transparency,[34] the presence of something hidden that could only be pointed to and not expressed, lending dramatic illusion to a complex inner life. Disturbed by the potential alienation of outer from inner, of appearance from truth, his tentative foray into the concealed depths of his interiority is offset by his condemnation of needless dissembling and hypocrisy:

> For as to this new virtue of feigning and dissimulation, which is now in so great credit, I mortally hate it; and of all vices find none that evidences so much baseness and meanness of spirit. 'Tis a cowardly and servile humour to hide and disguise a man's self under a visor, and not to dare to show himself what he is; 'tis by this our servants are trained up to treachery; being brought up to speak what is not true, they make no conscience of a lie. A generous heart ought not to belie its own thoughts; it will make itself seen within; all there is good, or at least human...[35]

It may not be pure coincidence that Randle Cotgrave's gloss on *arrière boutique* in the *Dictionairie of the French and English Tongues* (1632) also included the idea of feigning and cunning ('dodging; diſſembling, or double-dealing').[36] Hence despite the need to find spaces that guaranteed freedom from the claustrophobic life at court, the centrifugal pull of a public life is unmistakable. Martha Hollander in her book on space and meaning in seventeenth-century Dutch art sees the concept of the *arrière boutique* as a metaphor for the writer's emerging self-consciousness, defined in a space that was separate from the larger community but fixed in the home.[37] The *arrière boutique* emerges as a cognitive map for exploring the pleasures and risks of the intimacies, secrets, and desires of his private life. Yet the image of Montaigne as an intellectual recluse can be qualified by placing him in the commercial context of a 'noisy shop' where he conducted his business with constant interruptions from the outside world.[38] Instead of the solitary humanist

---

[34] The distinguishing feature of the hermeneutic self was its concealment and the difficulty that the subject and the observer had in extracting its truths. It was the labour involved in accessing the truth that guaranteed its truth-value and the depth of the subject.

[35] Montaigne, 'Of Presumption' (Book II, Chapter XVII).

[36] Randle Cotgrave, *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611).

[37] Martha Hollander, *An Entrance for the Eyes: Space and Meaning in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2002).

[38] The high incidence of a 'commercial' vocabulary in the *Essays* has led eminent Montaigne scholars such as Philippe Desan to read these works within the ascendance of a modern capitalist society, driven by trade and contractual exchange among equals. Desan stops short of calling Montaigne bourgeois and is cautious of counterbalancing the 'economic discourse' of the *Essays* against traditional ideals of nobility and honour. See Philippe Desan's *Les commerces de Montaigne: Le discours économique des Essais* (Paris: A. G. Nizet, 1992). As

philosopher he can be reconstructed as an industrious merchant, multitasking, and actively engaging with all around him. Similarly his writing is only too aware of the conflict between the demands of prudent artifice and dissimulation and the new ethical ideal of sincerity – the need to be true to one's nature and temperament.

For Montaigne never completely retreated into the backroom, his book was written for the benefit of a public audience of readers and not a private coterie.[39] Humanist learning was intimately tied to the idea of praxis: an applied political or ethical action and not mere knowing for its own sake. Although the library may have symbolised retreat from the frustrations of public action, but its confines were also filled with nervous, undirected, and frenetic activity, revealing how the parameters of privacy were ultimately articulated through the rhetoric of public life: 'There I turn over now one book, and then another, on various subjects, without method or design. One while I meditate, another I record and dictate, as I walk to and fro, such whimsies as these I present to you here.'[40] This uneasy dialectic between withdrawal and its deferment, agency and passivity that embodies the impossibility of acting and knowing together was (as I will be tracing in the final chapter) to afflict Jonson's authorial stance in the printed versions of his plays. The very 'public-privacy' of the *arrière boutique* thus helps to implicate Montaigne in the epistemological anxieties generated by the perceived ethical gap between an unspoken (deceptive) interior and a 'theatricalised' exterior. Likewise it serves to emphasise the increasing sequestration of the body within private spaces and the shifting parameters of public-private spheres that would reach its culmination at the end of the seventeenth century.

Montaigne's growing awareness of consciousness as something inward and contained within a semi-permeable body, autonomous and thus vulnerable to secrecy and disguise was one that gained increasing relevance in the Renaissance. The emerging idea of man's autonomy was mediated by anxieties about inwardness as a state that was hidden not only from society but also from oneself. A perception of the subjective interior as a condition discrete from the exterior was only made possible through an acceptance of man as a thinking, feeling creature dictated by his will, intention, conscience, or intellect despite

discussed by Felicity Green, *Montaigne and the Life of Freedom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 78.

[39] Montaigne's withdrawal was not akin to the isolation and emotional self-effusiveness of the Romantics, for the essays may have partly been dictated to secretaries and he had a steady stream of private and public visitors. Despite his retirement he returned intermittently to perform administrative duties: twice as mayor and briefly in 1588 as a diplomatic negotiator between the King and Henri of Navarre (future Henri IV) in the course of the French religious wars.

[40] Montaigne, 'Of Three Commerces' (Book III, Chapter III).

what external power structures tell him he should think, feel, or believe. The interior-exterior cognitive schema and the idea of containment was the site of discursive contention where the efforts of the state to homogenise its subjects and police their thoughts were worked out. For many however the indulgence in material or imaginative spatial tropes may have allowed a means of surviving and coping with a changing world: giving rise to a new sense of identity that was in part defined by the relationship between space and self.

It is no coincidence that Montaigne's English translator John Florio happened to be a good friend of Jonson (to whom the latter referred to as 'loving Father and worthy Friend'). While Montaigne is undoubtedly one of the major figures to trace the developing trajectory of the early modern self, his contrasting of introspective privacy with the inevitability of public masking in his *Essays* touches upon the emerging discourses of prudence, dissimulation, and sincerity that has been traced in the preceding chapter. This Montaignian dialectic between public responsibility and private desire raises quite a few valid points that acquire significance for understanding not only Jonson's ethically oriented 'epistemologism' but also the general argument pursued in this work. First, Jonson's works express an analogous tension between the social reflexivity of shifting identities and unfettered subjectivities and the moral vigilance of the centred (Jonsonian) self albeit without the delicately amusing tone that pervades Montaigne. The plays also give a more sinister turn to the discrepancy between outward and inner self through his representation of the mercurially transforming trickster-characters.

Second, Jonson's writings in the printed format play upon the Montaignian idea of the metaphorical backshop or *arrière boutique* – a protected and enclosed inner space that is outside the purview of commerce – that comes to symbolise the nascent space of authorial consciousness or subjectivity. My discussion in the final chapter will engage with the folio and quarto version of *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholomew Fair* to show how Jonson envisaged the printed page as a private space of shared intimacy with the morally and intellectually aware reader through a careful eliding of the self-centred economic concerns (for gain) that had contributed towards creating that space in the first place.

Further, while Jonson would doubtless have appreciated the creative dimensions of Montaigne's solipsistic inward turn yet like Montaigne he would also have understood the risks associated with such enclosed spaces or subjectivities and the attendant dangers that lay in the physical and psychic alienation of inner from outer self. Jonson thus explored

and developed the disturbing and anarchic elements of privacy in the representation of his devious rogue-artists just as he was able to use privacy as an imaginative mode of authorial self-expression.

II
The Anxieties of Private Life

Notwithstanding the luxury of Montaigne's inward retreats into his metaphorical back shop or his well-endowed library, privacy[41] in the modern sense of personal interiority or solitude was a rarity in the Renaissance: it was more often experienced as a function of (non-)public transactive relationship between two or more people. His literary engagements thus demonstrate that the early modern history of privacy and publicity has to be considered together, as part of the continuing relationship of social experience and the creative imagination. The early modern period envisaged privacy[42] as a form of relative freedom from state surveillance or observation but also to indicate a shared freedom of familiarity within public spheres. The latter meaning in the sense of a privileged confidentiality (privy < French adjective *privé*) with another person is no longer much in use,[43] as is the nominative usage of 'private' for the person with whom the confidence is shared.[44] Moreover the plural form 'privacies' once designated intimate spaces or places of retreat that implied a contrast with a realm of public exposure, revealing that privacy was predominantly a relational term used with respect to individual ownership.

Privacy's association with the personal as regards property, bodily territory, or secrecy however derives from the Greek *idios* (meaning separate, self-centred, and selfish) which designated a particular person as opposed to *koinos*, meaning what was common to many. The oldest sense of 'private' thus related to the nature of an undistinguished individual person (*idioteis*) who was not a public office-holder. The classical idiot's politically suspect

---

[41] Raymond Williams characterises 'private' as 'still a complex word', noting that 'its extraordinary historical revaluation is for the most part long completed': he dates the development of the 'favourable sense' of *privilege* -etymological kin to 'private'- to the sixteenth century. See his *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 203.

[42] The English word 'private' shares a common Latin origin (*privatus* via French verb *priver*) with 'deprive', 'privation', and 'deprivation', all carrying negative connotations of stripping away that resulted in the loss of something. In Roman times 'privilege' denoted a law applying to an individual rather than to the population in general. For an interesting study on the etymological connotations of privacy, see John Hollander, 'The Language of Privacy', *Social Research*, vol. 68, no. 1, Privacy, Spring 2001, pp. 5-28. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40971434

[43] Lingering connotations of the older word can still be found in expressions such as 'privy chamber', 'privy council', 'Privy Purse', and 'Privy Seal'.

[44] In military language 'private' designates the absence of any particular rank in the hierarchy.

myopic isolation exemplified not only a negation of civic life (*demios*) but also a denial of the primary relationships of the family with its commitment to the household gods. Privacy was a domain beneath the threshold of social visibility, marked with the stigma of social privation. Likewise another pair of terms corresponding to the public-private distinction in classical times was *polis* and family. The *polis*/city referred to the completed or self-sufficient community or partnership – a community that could not be improved by addition.

All cities were greater communities but not all lesser communities – such as the family (*oikos*), phratry, tribe, or the village – were cities. However given the firm integration between the familial and the civic in classical times, neat divisions/oppositions between the 'private' family and the 'public' city were hard to maintain.[45] Privacies often overlapped in the family's satisfaction of daily and bodily needs and the city's provision of private property as a means towards living well.[46] The classical distinction between three categories of human life: solitary, domestic, and public sheds light on the ambiguity and variability of the word 'private' during the early modern period as well. 'Private' is opposed to 'public', but 'private' doubles as a signifier of both the inner life and the domestic sphere. In contrast to the spectacle of public life, private life may be situated in the chambers of the heart as well as in the physical chambers of a household. More often it was the context of privacy rather than the word itself that determined whether an act was solitary or shared, individual or communal.[47]

In turn of the century London, people lived in cramped alleys, winding nooks and crannies with small spaces to get into yards or hang clothes out to dry.[48] Overcrowded houses leaned over narrow streets towards each other, they had thin (cracked) walls (Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* includes a mechanical aptly named 'Wall' who literally plays the role of a wall with a hole for facilitating illicit communication between Pyramus and Thisbe in the play-within-a-play) and windows set so close that there was

---

[45] In her analysis of the ancients Arendt in *Human Condition* equates the private realm with that of the family and the public realm with the *polis* which was the realm of public affairs and politics. Judith Swanson in *The Public and the Private in Aristotle's Political Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) however perceives any attempt of equating the 'classical' private with the household as misdirected.

[46] At the end of the first book of the *Politics*, Aristotle states that primary relationships within the family such as between husband-wife and parents-children cannot be understood without placing them in relation to the *polis* which is the home of the family and the *politiea* or the regime that gives form to both the city and the family. Thus the family continues to be penetrated by the political association and its laws regarding marriage and divorce, abortion, taxes, schooling, and various other aspects of child-rearing.

[47] Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England*, p. 37.

[48] In the most crowded parishes within city walls as many as ninety-five houses were packed into a single acre.

plenty to see and hear as well.[49] Discussing the intervention of neighbours in a family's private affairs, Catherine Richardson maintains: 'When a wrongdoing has been identified, neighbours are legitimately allowed to look in, to use windows and doors intended for egress as a point of access, in order to make the domestic public.'[50] Gossip travelled fast in the crowded fabric of early modern cities and towns: 'Rumour with his thousand tongues and then thousand feet was not long in travel before he had delivered his distasted message.'[51] Close-knit village communities were characterised by a high degree of policing and surveillance by neighbours so that the adulterous Alice Arden (in *Arden of Faversham*, Act 1) worries that her 'narrow-prying neighbours blab' (l. 135) and 'the biting speech of men' (l. 139) would make it difficult for her to meet her lover.

It was this extensive permeability between public and private life that characterised the early modern domestic social world. Yet by the beginning of the seventeenth century if not earlier the longstanding cohesion between public and private was beginning to fragment as domestic or bodily spaces were beginning to close off to the external world. The privatisation of the family led to it being conceived as a cluster of spatially fixed and individuated identities, none of whom could be replaced by another. The body in general was being increasingly enclosed in a bounded sequestered space, sealing it off from all forms of social contamination. A significantly new and shifting delineation of public-private boundaries and elaborate levels of spatial differentiation was occurring though in a highly non-linear and disunified manner. Rather than a society organised around courts and manor houses, it slowly legitimated a society composed of individuated and privatised family units: a moral economy dedicated to the family as a self-sustaining community.

Socio-economic changes, developments in warfare technology, and more effective defense strategies were making medieval fortifications increasingly obsolete. 'The new

---

[49] It is possible to draw a connection between such material conditions of living to the vast number of eavesdropping episodes in Renaissance drama. The cranny's function as an illicit conduit for vision recalls various scenes that grant characters a view of intimate spaces. *Hamlet* easily comes to mind, so does *Cymbeline* where Iachimo uses a trunk to gain access to Imogen's chamber that enabled unimpeded access to private information. More disturbingly it calls to mind Jack Wilton's helpless witnessing of the rape of Heraclides by Esdras through a chink in the wall in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* and Shakespeare's use of the cranny to augment Lucrece's shame in *The Rape of Lucrece*. The cranny is a site of great anxiety foregrounding the possibility that the outside world may become a witness to private thoughts and behaviours. In Spanish drama there was a rich tradition centring on the *mirón* (busybody) attesting to the new interest in other people's secrets.

[50] Catherine Richardson, *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), p. 40.

[51] Extract from the pamphlet entitled *Two Unnatural Murders* (1605), quoted by Russell West-Pavlov in 'Divide and Rule: the Early Modern Gender System and Private Space', in *Bodies and their Spaces: System, Crisis and Transformation in Early Modern Theatre* (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 20-51: 27.

architecture was domestic. Mansions and great houses sprang up all over England.'[52] Architectural innovations ushered in new degrees of comfort, privacy, and individualism. In this transitional period even though the household was witness to gradual transformations of 'cordoned-off' interior spaces in the form of cabinets,[53] closets,[54] carrels, withdrawing chambers, private dining rooms, privies, and sleeping areas, their attendant activities such as prayer, reading, introspective self-examination, or account-keeping were still carried out with the explicit intention of attracting public notice. The inner and outer graces of servants reflected and magnified their masters' privacy to the wider public, confirming the master's claims to status as a great householder. Assertions of privacy were highly conscious of an observing audience, and embedded in an intricate network of formal conventions and rituals governed by the new ideals of courtesy and decorum. Alan Stewart quotes Mark Girouard to question the nature of privacy associated with the closet.

> 'Closet' was also used to designate private chapels...particularly in the early
> sixteenth-century...Significantly, the experience of a worshipper in this closet is
> not solitary (the lord being accompanied by his entourage) and the closet works
> in a complex relationship with wider society: it is placed 'like a gallery at one end
> of, and looking down into, a two-storey chapel. The family and important guests
> attended services up in the closet, and everyone else down in the body of the
> chapel', the lord's family taking part in the social event, while remaining aloof
> from it. To describe this as 'private devotion', when the devotion takes

---

[52] Arthur H. R. Fairchild, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Design*, University of Missouri Studies (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 1937). p. 1. Quoted in Geraldo U. De Sousa, *At Home in Shakespeare's Tragedies* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010), p. 27. W. G. Hoskins has identified this as the 'Great Rebuilding' -a boom in residential remodelling from the 1570s to the 1640s- understood as the effect of a new desire for privacy that filtered down from aristocrats to yeomen farmers. See W. G. Hoskins, 'The Rebuilding of Rural England, 1570-1640', *Past and Present*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1953, pp. 44-59.

[53] Cabinets may have been private rooms allocated to women and reserved by them for meetings with intimate companions, both male and female. See Orest Ranum, 'The Refuges of Intimacy', in *A History of Private Life: Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. Roger Chartier (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1989), pp. 207-63: 246-8. Alternatively in his discussion of the Shakespearean sonnet Bruce Smith sees cabinets as pieces of furniture used for storing and locking up personal treasures. See Bruce Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 234.

[54] Even a closet could only afford minimal privacy because it was often a space shared with one's secretary. See Richard Rambuss, 'The Secretary's Study: The Secret Design of *The Shepheardes Calender*', *ELH*, vol. 59, no. 2, 1992, pp. 313-35 and Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997). It was possible that servants overheard such 'private' conversations, probably also marking the time of entry into the closet. Lena Cowen Orlin notes that early modern houses were riddled with holes, both accidentally and intentionally placed through which illicit activity was often observed. See *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 177-92.

place apart from general society but still and deliberately in public view, begs the question: what is being constituted as 'private' here?[55]

Dwellings at nearly all social levels (whether palaces, castles, country manors, huts, or town houses) were still predominantly characterised by multipurpose fluid living spaces without mediating elements such as antechambers or separate sleeping spaces. Although class and wealth were important factors determining privacy yet if the poor were rarely alone with five or six people sharing a bed;[56] the relatively wealthy were seldom on their own either, with a household of servants in full view (who often slept on trundle/truckle beds in the same bedchamber).[57] Early modern household spaces were hardly ever occupied by a single person, more often they were inhabited by the husband and wife,[58] or by the larger extended family. But at the same time houses were being restructured by organising individual rooms along the central axis of a long corridor, which allowed the separation of private functions from the main routes of circulation through the house. Henry VIII's 1526 ordinances for the Eltham household were accordingly geared towards establishing a level of 'public privacy' befitting the king's unique status as the cynosure of attention.

> Considering that right mean persons, as well for their more commodity do retire and withdraw themselves sometimes apart...it is convenient, that the King's Highness have his privy chamber and inward lodgings reserved secret, at the pleasure of his grace, without repair of any great multitude thereunto; it is therefore ordained, that no person, of what estate, degree, or condition soever he be, from henceforth presume, attempt, or be in any wise suffered or admitted to come or repair into the King's privy chamber; other then such only as his grace shall from time to time call for or command; except only the ministers now

---

[55] Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 56 quoted in Stewart, *Close Readers*, p. 167.

[56] Poorer people often lived in a large open space shared by the whole family and sometimes animals. Celia Fiennes, travelling in Northumberland in the late seventeenth century described the ordeals of staying in 'a poor cottage which was open to the thatch and no partitions but hurdles plaister'd, they burning turf and their chimneys are sort of flews or open tunnills that the smoake does annoy the rooms.' See G. E. Mingay, *A Social History of the English Countryside* (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 110.

[57] The bedchamber was not necessarily a solitary space, friends or family might have visited or dined there as well. Even the celebrated early modern closet was a liminal space between the public and the private: a private space where the master and his secretary could work in unison to conduct personal and pecuniary business. David Hume notes in his *History of England to the Revolution* (1806) that by the time of James II in the late seventeenth-century private conferences were called 'closetings'. Quoted in Alan Stewart, 'The Early Modern Closet Discovered', *Representations*, no. 50, Spring 1995, pp. 76-100: 90.

[58] Compare Margaret Cavendish's equation of the communion of a blissful married life to a hermit's exiled existence: 'though I desire to appear at the best advantage whilst I live in the view of the public world, yet I could most willingly exclude myself so as never to see the face of any creature but my lord, as long as I live, enclosing myself like an anchorite.' See 'A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life', in *Select Poems of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle*, ed. Sir Egerton Brydges (Kent: Johnson and Warwick, 1813).

deputed...being in all the number of fifteen persons, whom the King's grace, for

their good behaviour and qualities hath elected for that purpose.[59]

Such a publicly performed privacy demonstrated Henry VIII's status as the focal point of the royal household's social space. In both foreign and domestic relations Queen Elizabeth played on the interface between her public and private self, handling threats from foreign princes by dangling the possibility of a marriage with her. Her privy chamber was a place of politic concealment and she often used her private life to alleviate pressures in her public and political life. Her public portrayal as the virgin queen (with courtiers such as Francis Walsingham, Walter Raleigh, and the Earl of Leicester participating in intimate rivalry for her affection), a private self in a public space – leading to what Patricia Fumerton calls the 'paradox of being locked away (in full view)'[60] – may have mirrored the efforts of her subjects who were similarly struggling to demarcate spaces and ideals of public and private life. Although she fiercely guarded her privacy, Elizabeth presented to the court a divided self as she engaged in private, intimate behaviour in public suggesting not only a contradiction within the self but also a violation of firm public-private boundaries. Privacy, royal or otherwise, was inherently paradoxical: it was not achieved in isolation but through a careful balance between proximity and distance, seclusion and access. For those who could afford it privacy was not only a means of differentiating a family/kin group from a larger social entity or from the alien other but also a commodified and performative index of power, privilege, taste, and greater personalised comfort.

Commenting on the nature of the aristocratic house and household Henri Lefebvre writes: 'Within...the lord is amidst his dependents – wife, children, relations at various removes; and these in turn are surrounded by their servants. There is no privacy here: the word has no meaning. Both privacy and facade will only come with the advent of the bourgeoisie and bourgeoisification of the nobility.'[61] Jürgen Habermas however locates a nascent early modern distinction between public and private engendered by the

---

[59] *A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns, Etc.* (London: John Nichols, 1790), p. 154. This particular genre of domestic writing was essentially a list of do's-and-dont's addressed by the master to his servants, but they are a good reminder of the changing nature of household governance, and of how the family was perceived to be an extension of the public sphere. They were kept in a central office to be consulted during procedural disputes and read aloud periodically to remind the family of shared values and draw them together as a community.

[60] Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics*, p. 69.

[61] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991), p. 314. Lefebvre's study suggests that privacy (he uses the term *intimate*) originated in the lifestyle of the 'higher' bourgeoisie which was a 'parody' of aristocratic social mores that was subsequently (re)appropriated by the aristocracy and spread simultaneously to the lower bourgeoisie and beyond.

movement from feudalism to centralised monarchy.[62] An upcoming mercantilist economy led to a rising standard of living and disposable income that caused a surge in the production and purchase of household commodities. As the domestic space accrued more and more private property it became a domain to be closely guarded from outsiders (based on the fantasy that property could constitute an autonomous sphere free from state intervention): by extension a refuge from the chaos of public life. The development of bodily codes of conduct such as eating, spitting, or nose-blowing were increasingly subject to rules of etiquette.[63] Other moments of bodily functioning such as sleep, vomiting, belching, or the visibility of the naked body were steadily being banished to the intimate space of the bedroom. Strictly regulated cultural codes worked to close down bodily orifices and restrict the circulation of body waste.

A theoretical distinction did therefore exist between private and public (that was to solidify only in the late seventeenth century) yet in practical reality there was a dynamic interrelationship between the two with potential consequences for individuals during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Domestic privacy (though scholars have argued against the proclivity of equating domesticity with privacy in this era)[64] was a layered concept that encompassed business needs, hospitality, and accommodation for daily living: constituting a continuum from public to intimate. It made no clear cut demarcation between the 'domestic' values of private life, personal choice, and the secular sphere and its 'institutional' association with communal life, depersonalisation, and religious life.[65] More often the desire for privacy was counterbalanced by a strong(er) impetus towards surveillance as the guarantor of socio-political order. For instance the underlying microcosmic analogy between the family or household and the state or church (enshrined for example in the expression that the household was a 'little commonwealth') occluded the possibility of any distinct private[66] sphere which was free of public

[62] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989).
[63] See Elias, *Civilizing Process*.
[64] The 'mutually constitutive' relationship between public and private domains in the early modern era has been corroborated by scholars such as Michael McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2005).
[65] See Sandra Cavallo and Silvia Evangelisti, 'Introduction', in *Domestic Institutional Interiors in Early Modern Europe* , ed. Sandra Cavallo and Silvia Evangelisti (Aldershot: Ashagte, 2009), pp. 1-23: 6.
[66] Lena Cowen Orlin prefers to use the term 'oeconomic' rather than private to describe the hegemonic implication of the early modern household within contemporary discourses on order and hierarchy. She sees domestic privacy during this period describing both the autonomy of the householder within his own domain and the need for neighbourly surveillance of every household to ensure the maintenance of order. See *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

interference,[67] structures of domestic housing also made it the locus of intensive control and surveillance.[68] The new cartographic imagination encouraged the possibility of imagining the entire country as a knowable, even intimate and familiar space, and it allowed the whole nation (including the family) to be spatially imagined and organised.[69] As an affective community bonded by love and nurturing (manly) virtue, the desire of dependents' for privacy[70] within the household often incurred intense scrutiny and humiliation.[71]

Education was supposed to inculcate the values of public living among the young. Thus Richard Mulcaster (1531/2-1611), the well-known headmaster of the Merchant Taylors' School argued in Chapter III of *Positions* (1581)[72] that pedagogical instruction by private tutors lacked the virtues of public schooling for education was meant to train individuals 'not to live alone, but amongst others [...] whereby he shall be best able to execute those doings in life, which the state of his calling shall employ him unto others, whether publike abrode, or private at home, according unto the direction of his countrie,

---

[67] David Cressy claims that '[e]ven within the recesses of domestic routine, every action, every opinion, was susceptible to external interest, monitoring, or control.' See his 'Response: Private Lives, Public Performance, and Rites of Passage', in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, ed. Betty S. Travitsky and Adele F. Seeff (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994), pp. 187-97: 187. Domestic space provided a more intense and immediate form of patriarchal pressure, serving as a region where women and children were most vulnerable to men. According to Louis Montrose the domestic was 'not a place apart from the public sphere so much as it is the nucleus of the social order, the primary site of subjectification.' Similarly Elizabeth's privy chamber offered a model of privacy that replicated rather than opposed the official public and political world, a forceful reminder that the private sphere is created and ordered by a 'logic of power'. See Louis Montrose, 'Spenser's Domestic Domain: Poetry, Property, and the Early Modern Subject', in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 83-130: 96.

[68] For the lack of privacy in early modern architecture see in addition to Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* and Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

[69] Donald. K. Smith, *The Cartographic Imagination in Early Modern England: Re-Writing the World in Marlowe, Spenser, Raleigh and Marvell* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 62.

[70] In this context I use privacy to designate three categories: household or kinship group privacy, intimate affective privacy (between lovers, husband and wife, or between lord or a lady and a particularly trusted companion or servant), and finally the personal, reflective privacy of the individual. The first category of privacy is usually engendered in the relationship dependent on social proximity or service between an alpha individual and the people in that person's household or kin group -maybe trusted servants or companions who offer advice. It may also imply a broadly defined group which is private in contrast to those who are alien or unknown outsiders. This is privacy in the sense of private property where there is a significant overlap between privacy and the notion of dominion, as in the lands or domains belonging to a feudal lord.

[71] The paradoxical status of the household in post-Reformation England is articulated by Orlin in *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England*, p. 8. The state relied on the private household but also distrusted its internal activities; it authorised the householder and also deployed the larger community to monitor domestic conduct. Thus in *The English Secretary* (1625) Angel Day notes: 'whereas into each other place of the house it is ordinary for euery neare attendant about vs to haue accesse: in this place we doe solitarily and alone shut vp our selues...The Closet in euery house, as it is a reposement of Secrets, so is it onely...at the owners, and no others commaundement.' Quoted in Andrew Hiscock, *The Uses of this World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2004), p. 152.

[72] This was Mulcaster's first work on education that advocated for reform of the educational system in order to conform it to the changed circumstances. In true humanist fashion it identified a sound educational policy as the basis for social harmony.

whereunto he is borne.'[73] Domestic[74] ideology was firmly linked to nationhood for the Latin roots of the word 'nation' signifies 'to be born', (Latin *nation* – 'birth, race'<*nat-*, past participle of *nasci* 'be born') a mindset that is still to be found in contemporary thinking when 'home' refers not only to a dwelling-place, a house, or abode but also to one's own country or native land.

Although the home had ceased to refer solely to the 'village' or 'estate' in the Middle Ages, it continued to narrow its emphasis from the full economic household to the nuclear family. As the role of kinship bonds and extended family decreased as a determinant of identity, 'home' seems to have shifted its meaning from a village cluster of related families to signify both smaller (individual household) and larger (national) units (which reminds how the rhetoric of family values was incorporating both home and state or domestic and civil order within a unified discourse).[75] The prospect of the private household as a competing and monopolising site of information, knowledge, and truth led the state to co-opt the home for its own uses, implying that any destabilisation within the home would flow over into the public sphere and destabilise the state:

> The state designated the individual household...as the primary unit of social
> control...And it reinforced the pre-existent patriarchal hierarchy to further
> empower the father politically and also to ensure his accountability...Political
> patriarchalism...in the late sixteenth century first analogized the household's
> structures of authority with those of the state...The political branch cannibalized
> domestic ideology in order to advance the doctrine of royal absolutism.[76]

Political authority was enshrined in the heads of respectable households that played an important role in the long term establishment of middle-class hegemony. It was only in the latter half of the seventeenth century that the home and domestic economies ceased to be the crux for debates on nation and governance. Stripped of political connotations the family was isolated from all social discourses and relocated firmly within the private realm so that Lockean political theory was able to define the family as safely private in nature.

---

[73] Richard Mulcaster, *Positions: Wherein Those Primitive Circumstances be Examined, which are Necessarie for the Training Up of Children* (1581; London: Longmans, 1888), pp. 184-5.

[74] 'Domestic' operated as a powerful metaphor for any privileged position of knowledge and intimacy. To be 'domestic with' someone was to have the most privileged level of access to them and the greatest right to familiarity.

[75] Mary Thomas Crane, *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 45.

[76] Orlin, *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England*, pp. 3-11.

The earliest occurring instance of the word 'private' in English literature is in a mid-fifteenth-century text called *The Life of St. Cuthbert in English Verse* though Chaucer curiously made no use of it. Instead the words 'privity' (derives from Old/Middle French priveté/privité)[77] and 'privy' were comparatively more common in the Chaucerian corpus especially in the sense of secrecy, familiarity, intimacy, and surreptitious behaviour.[78] Drawing on medieval usage the early modern discourse on privacy was often allied to secrecy and disguise. It referred not only to the thing concealed but also to the place of concealment. In the early Renaissance 'private' was more often an insinuation or allegation:[79] to be tucked away in a room in private or in some secluded corner was often enough evidence to land people in court. Privacy and private behaviour was often connected to grave social problems, and to tears in the social fabric. The evolution of the private sphere under a centralised monarchy coincided with the development of an information state in England.[80]

Deriding the distance between the private self and society, the administrative state's desire to document, socialise, (and sequester) identities and its controlled regulation of spatial dislocations (socio-civic locales and liminal borders such as inns, taverns, Catholic houses, brothels, alehouses, theatres, seminaries) subtly underscored the subversiveness of concealed bodies, things, confidential relationships, information, secret forms of behaviour[81] or the dangers of unsanctioned or covert material sites. The scarcity and

---

[77] Privacy's etymological articulation in English is based on French. The closest term in Old English was *ánlíepig/anlipe*, possibly a compound of *án* ('one') and *hleáp* ('a running leap'). In an Anglo-Saxon Dictionary the compiler gives the meanings, 'Going alone, solitary, private, alone, singular, one, each one' under the relevant entry.

[78] In *The Miller's Tale* when Alisoun decides that she will have an affair with her lodger Nicholas, she tells him that circumspection and preparation are essential for their plan to succeed:

> My husband is so full of jealousy,
> Unless you watch your step and hold your breath,
> I know for certain it will be my death.

See *Canterbury Tales*, trans. Nevill Coghill (1951; London: Penguin Books, 1958), p. 107.

[79] Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516) saw privacy as threatening to the welfare of the utopian commonwealth. Raphael Hythloday anticipates Marx and Engels in making it clear that private property was strictly inadmissible amongst the Utopians. 'So you see there is no chance to loaf or kill time, no pretext for evading work; no taverns, or alehouses, or brothels; no chances for corruption; no hiding places, no spots for secret meetings. Because they live in the full view of all, they are bound to be either working at their usual trades, or enjoying their leisure in a respectable way.' Even sex is not principally a private interaction between consenting adults, and becomes the subject of responsible public planning. See Thomas More, *Utopia,* Bk II, trans. and ed. Robert M. Adams (2nd edn; New York: W. W. Norton, 1992), p. 45.

[80] For the growth of the information state in England see Edward Higgs, *The Information State in England: The Central Collection of Information on Citizens since 1500* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[81] The need for secure communications during a period of religious and political conflicts led to the revival of the classical and medieval traditions of the secret art of letter-writing. The development of cryptography and encrypted correspondence helps to expand an understanding of early modern diplomatic, personal, amatory, and religious privacy. See James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

virtual impossibility of achieving privacy in early modern Europe may have contributed to its ambivalent association with suspicion, treachery, economic acquisitiveness, deviance, wilful isolation, negation of obligations associated with the public persona, manipulation, and unlawful activities whether illicit sexual dalliances[82] (incest, bigamy, homosexuality), gossip, or treasonous plotting.[83]

Because of the impracticality of acquiring privacy within homes, sometimes private rooms in inns and public houses may have been used as venues for conspiracies. Plans for the Gunpowder Plot were possibly developed in hired private rooms in alehouses and ordinaries owned by fellow Catholics in order to prevent discovery and betrayal by servants. Dian O'Hara has noted that alehouses were often commonly associated with illicit 'sexual liaisons and clandestine unions'.[84] Samuel Pepys carried out much of his illicit sexual activity in inns. Some of the most intricately 'dangerous' spaces in early modern houses were 'priest holes', hiding places constructed specifically to conceal illegal resident Jesuits and paraphernalia for performing Mass.

The growing awareness of the deviousness of privacy led to corresponding efforts to reconcile and collapse the distinction between private and public and to explore their plausible interdependence. Plagued by the inner conviction of inscrutable subjects the government's urgency to penetrate bodily, mental, personal, and material spaces with the imperative to know and gain visual access was part of a drive to secure uniformity and transparency of practice and allegiance amidst the heterogeneous complexity and anonymity of urban life.[85] Transparency as the unmediated (and sincere) expression of the heart denoted a perfect fit between the private and the public; it implied a body that told no lies and kept no secrets[86] and one who could exist in the public space in the same way

---

[82] Neighbourly chitchat, backbiting, and gossip accounted for numerous cases relating to sex and slander. It may be useful to remember that privacy's link with secrecy can be seen to be encoded in the phrase 'private parts'. In the early modern era the words 'private' and 'privacy' gave English speakers a fairly acceptable way of alluding to the female organs in particular, while leaving their secrecy intact.

[83] Privacy did sustain religious devotion, private prayer, or the growth of new literary genres such as the diary. Yet I have deliberately emphasised on the subversive aspects of privacy in keeping with the major thrust of my dissertation.

[84] Dian O'Hara, *Courtship and Constraint: Rethinking the Making of Marriage in Tudor England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

[85] Spatial control translated into an equally justified control of those subjects who occupied that space. James I addressed this issue explicitly in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1616): 'And as ye see it manifest, that the King is over-Lord of the whole land: so is he Master over every person that inhabiteth the same, having power over the life and death of every one of them.' Quoted by James J. Condon, 'Setting the Stage for Revenge: Space, Performance, and Power in Early Modern Revenge Tragedy', in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 25, 2012, pp. 62-82: 65.

[86] Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 96-7.

as in private space. Thus John Baxter ruminating on the difficulty of decoding the private intentions of Catholics imagined a fanciful solution to the problem:

> If a window were framed in the brests of these discontented catholikes, that her Majestie and the state-guiding counsel and all true friends to the kingdom might know their secret intentions…many false hearts would be found lurking under painted hoods, and cakes of foule cancred malice under meale mouthed protestations.[87]

Within the new 'informatised' regime privacy aroused anxiety because it implied freedom from regulation and a violation of the codes of civility. Habermas notes that 'interiorised human closeness…challenged the established authority of the monarch.'[88] It is probable that the fear of men and women in private may have been one of the reasons behind the dissolution of monasteries and convents for anxiety about people in secret places (as for instance Carthusian[89] anchorites and recluses confined in private cells[90] and partitioned dormitories in Cistercian monasteries) remained a part of what constituted popery in Tudor and Stuart England. In 1529 Simon Fish requested Henry VIII to remove monks from monasteries and 'Tye these holy idell theues to the cartes to be whipped naked about euery market towne', thus publicly exposing them.[91] In a 1635 sermon Thomas Turner (a former chaplain of Archbishop Laud), likewise, mocks the 'Monks and Friars' who '[sequester] themselves from all Company, and (as it were) [bury] themselves alive in their cloister'; unlike 'These speculative men…the Practical man hath more opportunities of doing good.'[92] In religious terms there was an inescapable affinity between the private and the heretical which involved scriptural interpretation according

---

[87] John Baxter, *A Toile for Two-legged Foxes* (London, 1600), quoted in Julian Yates, *Error, Misuse, Failure: Object Lessons from the English Renaissance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), p. 156.

[88] Habermas, *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p. 52. In this context one recalls Elizabeth's *Rainbow* portrait (c. 1600-3, attributed to Isaac Oliver and now housed at Hatfield House, England) that depicted eyes, ears, and tongues on the royal mantle to indicate an intricate system of state intelligence.

[89] Incidentally the first Catholic martyr under Henry VIII was John Houghton of the Carthusian order.

[90] The word 'cell' entered the English language in the twelfth century from Latin *cella* 'small room or hut' which is also related to the Latin *celare* 'to conceal'. Its earliest usage was related to monastic cells and therefore had associations of intense prayer and self-reflection. By the sixteenth century it could also mean a prison cell, probably a furtive comment on the demonised status of monks and friars during this era. Early modern brothels ('stews') also had cells which were housed in secret rooms and compartments within taverns, often in backrooms and beneath false floorboards.

[91] Simon Fish, *A Supplication for the Beggars* (1529), ed. Edward Arber (London, 1878), p. 13.

[92] Thomas Turner, *A Sermon Preached before the King* (London, 1635), p. 29, pp. 30-1 (p. 245). Andrew Willet's *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1592), likewise expressed bitterness against 'the solitary life of Eremites in flying the comfortable society of men' since they are not 'exhorting one another and provoking to good works' (p. 258). The singular suspicion of women in private was even more conspicuous. Jo Ann Kay McNamara observes the parallels between women being driven out of convents, out of brothels and, by association, out of covens. See *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns through Two Millennia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 435 (n. 46). All the above instances are quoted (relevant page numbers have been given in brackets) in Gary Schneider, 'The Public, the Private, and the Shaming of the Shrew', *SEL*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2002, pp. 235-52.

to 'owne liking and privat judgement'.[93] Such early modern appraisals sensed danger in the private sphere and entailed some sort of public exposure of their secret evils; the term 'private' in these commentaries appears to have been synonymous with socio-political threat.

The most common assumption today is to see early modern privacy as a function of the single-family home characterised by architectural amenities such as separate sleeping chambers, back stairs for servants, interior hallway, studies, and sitting rooms, (that first appeared in aristocratic and later in bourgeois settings) specific pieces of furniture such as wardrobes, chests, and curiosity cabinets, material objects such as letters along with technological innovations such as the chimney and the invention of the wall fireplace which permitted the heating of small, individual spaces. It presupposes that there could be no conceptualisation of privacy prior to the appearance of certain architectural elements or designs. Yet any approach to the history of privacy primarily through material[94] evidence might be too constricting given that privacy was not simply a commodity, a state of cloistered physical solitude dependent on concrete structures but an inviolable, unstructured, and fluid mental dimension that valued freedom of choice and emotional intimacy over hierarchical order and discipline. As my discussion on poison rings, priest holes or cryptography later in this chapter will show, such material innovations made concrete, if not possible, the manifestation of a cultural space of freedom for people to occupy when they were not at work or under state supervision in any way.

Interiority is a metaphor that likens the enclosure of the body within a private space to the relationship between the self and the body. Privacy can hence also be understood as a *mentalité* or a state of consciousness associated with certain material sites (which may be

---

[93] Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith* (1565), quoted in Huebert, 'Privacy: The Early History of a Word', *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 105, no. 1, Winter 1997, pp. 21-38: 30. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27548290
[94] According to Lawrence Stone in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) privacy was a luxury product of eighteenth-century elite architecture and enlightened thinking. In contrast the aristocratic household of the Renaissance was characterised 'by its lack of well-defined boundaries'. Patricia Fumerton concurs with Stone in stating that 'The Elizabethan aristocracy'...'never really arrived at an inner, private center in passing through the long corridor of outer, public "rooms".' See her '"Secret" Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets', *Representations*, vol. 15, 1996, pp. 57-97: 65. John Bold however pushes back Stone's starting date, stating that 'the seventeenth century was one of the most crucial periods of innovation and evolution in English domestic architecture and an understanding of the development of the concept of privacy, and the ways in which architecture sought to accommodate it, is fundamental to its assessment and to the charting of its development over the next two hundred years.' See his 'Privacy and the Plan', in *English Architecture Public and Private*, ed. John Bold and Edward Chaney (London: The Hambledon Press, 1993), pp. 107-19: 108.

private such as nunneries or even public such as outdoor fields, forests, gardens, [95]royal progresses) and practices (communal reading in bedchambers, book closets, churches, or private devotion) in an alternative social environment that conferred the right to be left alone either physically or mentally. In their introduction to *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England*, Elizabeth Mazzola and Corinne Abate similarly stress how privacy is associated with sociologically defined 'spheres' rather than spaces and structures. Criticising Lawrence Stone for relying too heavily on the evolution of concrete structures in dating and defining privacy, they write that:

> Well before the material apparatus Stone deems necessary for privacy there exist ideological as well as economic supports for a division of labor and a split between cultural spheres. The result was that across class lines, marriage and family became the primary contexts for and rewards of most women's lives.[96]

Thus the poet-persona Eliza speaks of her poems as if they are her children: 'my babes...were obtained by virtue, borne with ease and pleasure.' Creativity in this case is seen as a product of the inner self, though it is ultimately destined for the outside world: 'my desires were not given me, to be kept in private to my self, but for the good of others.'[97] Self-withdrawal could also be a symptom of melancholy as Montague suspects might be the reason for the strange behaviour of his son Romeo, who steals home at sunrise, 'shuts up his window, lock[ing] fair daylight out' and 'private in his chamber pens himself'.[98]

In the interests of the argument pursued in this dissertation I will be more interested in this latter kind of privacy, which is not necessarily dependent upon material structures, but rather a symptom of the mind's agency. The contents of the private sphere were political or civil liabilities in a society where the individual's thoughts and familial intimacies began to fall under the purview of the emerging

---

[95] Many large houses had 'privie gardens' close to the house and containing enclosed spaces such as bowers, labyrinths, arbors, grottoes, groves, and covered walks. Derived from the mediaeval tradition of the *hortus conclusus*, or a small garden enclosed to keep out destructive animals, they seem to have functioned as a kind of outdoor extension of the house and offered opportunity for privacy and solitude. In the seventeenth century public 'pleasure gardens' like Vauxhall and royal parks such as Hyde Park and St. James Park contained arbors that provided a public version of privacy.

[96] 'According to Stone, privacy...is really a development of the eighteenth century, afforded by elite architecture and enlightened thinking...Stone describes the eighteenth-century country house, for example, as increasingly "closed off from prying neighbour", "with rooms themselves more specialised in function and more numerous, with more bedrooms, studies, closets, and withdrawing chambers...where members of the family could get away from each other"'. See Elizabeth Mazzola and Corinne S. Abate, 'Introduction: Indistinguished Space', in *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England*, ed. Corinne Abate (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 1-17: 3.

[97] *Eliza's Babes: Or the Virgins-Offering* (1652), quoted in Huebert, 'Privacy', p. 34.

[98] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, I.i.131-2.

surveillance state. My reading of Jonson's plays in the later chapters will have to be situated against this wider cultural context traced in this sub-section to appreciate how his his plots are informed by an anxious awareness of the cultural ambivalence of intricate material and psychological interiors. First, the plays are structured around (and corroborate) the early modern disquiet regarding enclosed physical spaces (such as the bedroom/closet in *Volpone*, the alchemical laboratory in *The Alchemist*, the marginalised space of Smithfield Fair or Ursula's booth in *Bartholomew Fair*). Thus while private spaces spaces offered a quiet refuge from the turmoil of the hostile public world, Jonson shows shows how its very invisibility fostered treacherous possibilities. Second, the rogue's dissimulative power grew from his ability to feign and thus exercise control over his words, gestures, and actions enabling him to scrutinise others' motives and take advantage of their credulity. Moreover in an ironic reversal of contemporary state scrutinising measures these marginal characters are able to exploit the seclusion provided by the enclosed sanctuary of the mind (that recall the 'dark profundities' and 'intricate internal windings' of the Montaignian self mentioned at the beginning of this chapter) to prey on others' thoughts (that uncannily recalls the cutting-edge twenty-first century surveillance techniques discussed in Chapter I). Third, Jonson's tentative forays into the world of print to create the aura of the so-called Jonsonian brand reveals how he used privacy as a mode of creative exploration and aesthetic corralling to fashion an intimate-public world of shared intellectual interests.

<div align="center">

III

Early Modern Secret Spaces

</div>

Architectural innovations (as discussed in the earlier section) made early modern domestic interiors into multi-layered, fluid, and contingent environments. Bounded and hemmed in private spaces can be seen as an organising cognitive schema of early modern culture (to be touched upon in Chapter III as well), playing upon the ideas of inside and outside, capturing the very essence of being. The point at which early modern theories of state (section 2 of Chapter I), Montaigne's *arrière boutique* (section 1 of Chapter II), paranoia about a sub-cultural rogue underworld (section 2 of Chapter III), emerging notions of the body interior (section 1 of Chapter IV in relation to Caravaggio's representation of Christ), Jonson's rogue-artists (Chapter IV and V) or the paratextual spaces of his printed play-texts (Chapter VI) intersect is through their underlying

metaphorical use of the 'container' image schema as a conceptual metaphor of embodied cognition and knowledge structures. The thesis makes use of the elements (mentioned above) drawn from diverse fields to provide a structural framework for representing abstract and complex ideas relating to privacy and subjectivity. Such spaces are emotionally charged loci of crisis, contained by boundaries (limn as the space just before containment is the zone that is most characterised by indeterminacy) that threaten to rupture and spill out that which is contained. Closed physical spaces present a powerful psychological lure because their meaning is crucially proleptic, promising a revelation of possibly mortifying and chaotic secrets. They suggest both wonder and horror at what lies inside the bounded space. They further suggest that the material environment (in addition to the physical body) is not a passive thing but the means and mode of becoming conscious and forming language.

Attracting attention and simultaneously obscuring its deadly inner freight they mobilise the interpretive faculties and offer the possibility of a connection with the Greek myth of Pandora: the first woman on Earth. This particular iconography of a woman with a mysterious box evokes both dangerous content and a deceptively beautiful surface: the box standing both for the woman Pandora and her invisible but mortifying sexuality. The myth conjugates danger and death with any form of interiority linked to the Woman's body while rendering phallocentric (voyeuristic) curiosity about feminine sexual interiority and subjectivity a deadly mistake. The box[99] veils that which remains menacingly hidden, displacing and yet intensifying the threat of what is concealed beneath the surface. Analysing the container-objects of poetic narrative, Gaston Bachelard declares:

> Chests, especially small caskets, over which we have more complete mastery, are objects that may be opened. When a casket is closed, it is returned to the general community of object; it takes its place in exterior space. But it opens! For this reason, a philosopher-mathematician would say that it is the first differential of discovery. From the moment the casket is opened the dialectics of inside and

---

[99] In classical mythology, taken from Hesiod's *Works and Days*, Pandora had a large (storage) jar (*pithos*) instead of a box that contained all the evils of the world. In *Pandora's Box: The Changing Aspects of a Mythical Symbol* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965) Dora and Erwin Panofsky have shown how during the Renaissance the jar shrank into a small box that Pandora carried in her hands. Both jars and boxes are storage containers that carried a forbidden secret locked away and both are subject to 'the dialectics of inside and outside'. The motif of the secret box easily allows a metaphoric relationship with the female genitalia. The Renaissance mistranslation of Latin *pithos* to Greek *pyxis* 'box' is attributed to Erasmus's translation (in *Adages*, 1. i. 31) of Hesiod's tale into Latin. The Panofskys explain the slip as a confusion between the Greek Pandora and Apuleius' Psyche, setting up an interesting cathexis (resemblance binding together two different figures) between concealed interiors and the mind.

outside no longer exist. The outside is effaced with one stroke, an atmosphere of novelty and surprise reigns. And quite paradoxically, even cubic dimensions have no more meaning, for the reason that a new dimension just opened up.[100]

Pandora is engendered by deception, the dislocation between her attractive appearance and true meaning revealing her dual status as a lure and a trap.[101] Such closed spaces create a web of signifiers that try to map the 'other' in terms of a treacherous surface and a deadly, death-dealing interiorised topography continually oscillating between openness and depth, private and public, concealment and revelation. The 'inside' space may connote maternal femininity in the form of a womb or a home, but also links up with the enclosed, concealed space of subjective secrecy. These associations' one feminine, the other secret, splits femininity into an inside-outside polarisation. Hence the spatialisation that characterises Pandora is also extended to the box. Two topographies make up the mystery and danger inherent in the myth – that of the woman and that of the box which are patterned around an inside and an outside: 'a dialectic of division'.[102] Further, Pandora's gaze and her desire to look into enclosed and mysterious space becomes a figure for the yearning to see and know more. Although she had been forbidden from opening the box she gave way to her curiosity and released all the evils into the world. Only the spirit of hope (*Elpis*) remained at the bottom of the box.

As a surface that also conceals, Pandora and her box recall the alienation of surface from depth, suggesting that thoughts and passions imagined as properties of a hidden interior are not immediately accessible to other people. It likewise brings into play the vexed relationship between physical and conceptual enclosures and the way in which material sites, objects, and practices were deemed to be a manifestation of an indiscernible and ambiguous truth. Her investigative gaze furthermore rehearses the early modern epistemological anxiety about sequestered spaces and their enclosed subjectivities. In this section I look at three particular cultural sites and objects: poison rings, Catholic priest holes, and cryptography that were inflected by hermeneutic anxieties about private identity and dissimulation.

Taken together they make their appearance at that particular moment of crisis in English culture when the containment (and exposure) of physical, cognitive or spiritual

---

[100] Gaston Bachelard, *Poetics of Space* (New York: Orion, 1964).
[101] Pandora was a prototypical *femme fatale* created by Hephaestus and was taken to earth on Zeus' orders by Hermes as a snare and plague to men. Zeus, the father of the gods wanted to take revenge on Prometheus for having stolen fire from the heavens.
[102] The space of secrets is organised around the logic of binary opposition, the antinomy of inside and outside. See Bachelard, *Poetics of Space*, p. 211.

secrets was woven into the very fabric of existence. All such spaces carry out a critique of instrumental sight and seem to express a cultural anxiety arising from the contrast between visual flatness and tactile depth. Like the topographical depths and profundities of Montaigne's mind these spaces frustrate optical knowledge and invite haptic speculation, encouraging an embodied perception since vision can only move/glance over surfaces. Moreover they serve to project the anxieties about the split nature of human identity: inner subject as the source of (wicked) consciousness and (false yet superficially attractive) outer self/selves represented by social role, specific object, location, body or emotion. These spaces thus serve to establish the thematic concerns of the later chapters concerning the ontological surface and dark epistemological abyss of the Jonsonian rogue.

All three kinds of spaces discussed in this sub-section encode secrecy as a subtle form of power and resistance to the status quo. Further they provide a visual analogue to show how material/somatic and psychological space was conceived imaginatively and executed physically, suggesting that there were encapsulated insides to every outside. These new spaces of alterity also give life to the dark lands of unconscious and subterranean thought, representing the frightful expanses of the unknown and unknowable other (as the introductory sub-section on Montaigne has served to show). Created through a careful folding and refolding of space they represent liminal and indeterminate areas located on the slippery threshold between enclosure and display, interiority and public ceremony. The Renaissance imagination conceived of reality as a graduated, layered space: a series of nested, discrete yet linked concentric circles (reminiscent of the Great Chain of Being).

Thus spaces, objects, and people folded into each other and became sites of private identity and seclusion. In early modern Europe a well-ordered and scripted material space (whether library, audience chamber, or gallery) was a reflection of the human mind that gave order to the state, household, or life itself.[103] Thus (as I will be elaborating in later chapters) the grounding of Jonsonian rogues in specific locales shows that such spaces offered physical form and evidence of the trickster's imperceptible agency; substantiating the prevalent materialist interpretations of interiority. Similarly this also forms the basis of my argument in Chapter VI which looks at the materiality of paratextual/marginal spaces as an expressive realisation of the author's invisible subjectivity. These spaces presented the freedom and power to range across a whole range of topological possibilities and

---

[103] William N. West, 'Reading Rooms: Architecture and Agency in the Houses of Michel de Montaigne and Nicholas Bacon', *Comparative Literature*, volume 56, no. 2, Spring 2004, pp. 111-29.

offered material shape to what had been confined in the realms of thought. Architectural renderings of mental spaces were an expression of the subject's individuation in a form that was available to public gaze. Likewise Neoplatonic theories imagined the body as a building, a temporary house for the immortal soul. The destabilising nature of poison rings, priest holes, encrypted writing lay in their ability to nullify any simplistic relation between cognition and praxis and conformed to the general paranoia regarding secret spaces.

Poison or Borgia rings generally referred to rings with concealed compartments inside them, featuring a hollow bezel or space beneath the stone that was used most traditionally to store poison, but was also utilised as a space for secret messages, perfume, or personal or religious relics. Perhaps the earliest reliable use of the poison ring is that by the Carthaginian general Hannibal, who is reputed to have used one to commit suicide after a defeat at the hands of the Romans in 183 BCE. They were not uncommon in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe either, for they offered an easy escape from torture, humiliating slavery, or capture. Later they were used as instruments of murder. The Borgia family which gained immense power in Italy and Venice during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries are known to have used poison rings against their enemies.[104] Rings (such as the *anello della morte* or ring of death) made of gold were elaborately ornamented and concealed a sharp needle point at the back of the bezel. When the murderer shook hands with his victim, he pressed a certain part of his ring, which operated a spring connecting the needle with a cavity behind. The needle point scratched the skin of the victim slightly and injected a dose of poison,[105] but all this was done so secretly that the victim hardly knew what had happened.[106] Lucrezia Borgia herself has gone down in history as one who wore a hollow ring filled with poison to send her enemies to an agonizing death.

Regardless of the Borgia connection it is likely that women were the most common users, especially for those who had access to food. Some rings are said to have had sliding

---

[104] Rebecca Ross Russell, *Gender and Jewelry: A Feminist Analysis* (Medford, Mass.: Tufts University Press, 2010), p. 74.

[105] The Borgias might have used poisonous substances such as curare (first brought to England from the forests of Guiana by Sir Walter Raleigh) and deadly venom of the West Indian *manchineel* tree found in Brazil and the Spanish Indies. Curare poison lasts for many years but the efficacy of the venom obtained from *manchineel* can last even up to 150 years. See Harold T. Wilkins, *Secret Cities of Old South America* (rpt. 1952; New York: Cosimo, Inc., 2008), p. 350.

[106] The poison ring is structurally similar to the 'poison cabinet'. One such cabinet which went up for sale in London in 1935 was a gift from Cardinal Cesare Borgia to his sister Lucrezia. 'The cabinet was of ivory decorated with bronze, crowned with a handsome clock which ticked away the victim's numbered hours. Hidden in the lock of this rare period piece was a poison receptacle.' See Wilkins, *Secret Cities of Old South America*, pp. 350-1.

compartments that would allow powdered poison to be surreptitiously added to a meal. However a great majority of rings were innocent providing primarily a personal space to store private keepsakes, messages, and even strands of hair. By the seventeenth century jewellers were creating locket rings in the shape of caskets which served as mementos for mourners. Privacy of this sort was often unthinkable for women in earlier times. Rings with hidden compartments may have had romantic, political, memorial,[107] or hygienic[108] functions yet they also represented a desire for intimacy and private individuality imparting agency, autonomy, and power to the wearer. Jewellery has been traditionally associated with feminine passivity, submission, or a performance of masculinity and a projection of male status displayed on the body of 'their' women. On the other hand its value as portable capital and wealth allowing women to lead independent lives or provide for their families can hardly be overstated.

Poison rings however have the capacity to combine hidden intrigue and horror with a degree of privacy and emotional independence in a constrictive social environment: representing the dark side of bounded spaces and concealed privacies. It resisted and subverted the beholder's gaze and sent different messages to different viewers depending on the level of controlled access permitted by the wearer. As a material extension of physical selves they emphasised the boundary between a limited public and a privileged private knowledge, playing with concepts of privacy and ownership of spaces around the body. It underscored the management and allocation of private space and the capacity for such space to operate as an external marker of private subjectivity. The decorative outer surface of the ring encases an elusive and cunning inner life beneath layers of ornamental metal and stone. The ring offered a symbolic device to unhinge the link between interiority and social behaviour, seeking invisibility and anonymity in layers of self-revealing, self-concealing ornamentation. However it also reflected the early modern obsession with hiding and keeping secrets, mingling shock and wonder and recreating the dangers of perverse agency that cross the bounds of acceptability. The physical space concealed inside the ring paralleled the unplumbed cognitive space of the wearer, sustaining the illusion that there might still be more of the hidden to be revealed.

Richard Wilson considers secrecy to be the essence of early modern subjectivity. In his description of secret rooms, hidden cabinets, and labyrinths within Shakespearean drama he remarks on the significance of the playwright's growing up 'in the labyrinth of priest

---

[107] Mourning rings usually shaped as coffins, skeletons, or skulls were given to mourners to commemorate the death of a loved one.
[108] Hollow rings may have been used as miniature pomanders used to protect against foul smells and infections in an era that had not yet developed modern standards of sanitation and cleanliness.

holes, attic chapels, and underground passages that honey-combed houses of the Warwickshire gentry, as the material determinants of an entire lifestyle of self-concealment.'[109] Wilson notes how architectural innovations (crevasses, vaults under stairwells) were raised to a new level of sophisticated ingenuity during the Jesuit Counter-Reformation.

> The most complicated were those inserted by Jesuit engineers into the mansions of Catholic neighbours and relations of the Shakespeares, such as the maze of tunnels at Hindlip, the home of the Habintons; the Mass chamber behind panels at Huddington, the base of the Winters; the stack of hides in the Tower at Coughton, the Thorckmorton seat; or the roof chapel at Clopton, the house, in the 1600s of the Rookwoods.[110]

Endorsing John Kerrigan's stand on secrecy and the 'cubiculo' in *Twelfth Night*, Wilson explores the way in which material settings shaped Elizabethan identity:

> And it is in this analysis of the material foundation of secrecy, and the way in which Renaissance culture instituted novel ideas about privacy 'by building and exploring secluded chambers and closets,' that Kerrigan finds clues to the emergent mentality he traces in Shakespeare's ambivalent staging of 'exhibitionistic secrecy', and...'appeal to privy space.' For while identity, according to historians, was shaped by the new 'refuges of intimacy' in early modern Europe, and by all those alcoves and *kunstkammers*, by the carrels, commodes, and cubicles that made social separation and professional discretion for the first time physical possibilities, it is within an interplay of secrecy and disclosure, the transparent and occluded, that Shakespeare's drama in fact unfolds.[111]

Early modern architecture[112] was riddled with false chimneys, secret passageways, hollow staircases, cubicles, and trap-doors, many of which were designed specifically to hide both the regalia of Catholic Mass and the priests who faced execution if they were found

---

[109] Richard Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 23.

[110] Wilson, Secret Shakespeare, p. 23.

[111] Ibid, p. 25.

[112] Arguably one of the greatest revolutionaries in Counter-Reformation architectural design was Nicholas (alias John) Owen, famed for 'constructing hiding-places, and the innumerable quantity of these dark holes which he had schemed for hiding priests all through England.' See Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. 4 (London: Burns and Oates, 1878), p. 256. He helped John Gerard escape from the Tower of London in 1597 but was himself captured in 1605 when he came out of a hiding place to avoid starvation. Owen can also be credited with a new mode of architectural imagination that was three-dimensional, splintering the Renaissance personality into spatial figuration. He also devised hiding places within hiding places and usually contrived some sort of escape route.

out. In his autobiography (Chapter VII) the Jesuit John Gerard affirms the tension and emotional endowment that came with the architecture of secrecy in a tone that is vaguely reminiscent of Montaigne's topographical visualisation of the private space of his mind:

> My hiding-place was in a thick wall of the chimney behind a finely inlaid and carved mantelpiece. They could not well take the carving down without risk of breaking it. Broken, however, it would have been, and that into a thousand pieces, had they any conception that I could be concealed behind it. But knowing that there were two flues, they did not think that there could be room enough there for a man.
>
> Nay, before this, on the second day of the search, they had gone into the room above, and tried the fireplace through which I had got into my hole. They then got into the chimney by a ladder to sound with their hammers. One said to another in my hearing, 'Might there not be a place here for a person to get down into the wall of the chimney below by lifting up this hearth?' 'No', answered one of the pursuivants, whose voice I knew, 'you could not get down that way into the chimney underneath, but there might easily be an entrance at the back of this chimney.' So saying he gave the place a knock. I was afraid that he would hear the hollow sound of the hole where I was.[113]

Sometimes hunted papists died from suffocation in tight quarters which did not ventilate properly.[114] Like the poison ring the priest hole was also symbolic of the early modern mental and physical landscape. It is unlikely that Jonson would have missed the psychic import of the priest hole given the ambivalence of his religious affiliation. It may not also be too implausible to claim that the secret spaces of his plays that lie hidden behind/within apparently respectable public veneers owe their basis to the architectural particulars of the priest hole. Referred to as *loca secretoria* in Latin and later as *latibula* ('hole'), the priest hole (generally measuring about 8 feet by 3 feet by 5 feet and ingeniously contrived into the country houses of the Catholic gentry) set the stage for the high-stakes drama played out between hunted Catholic priests and an ever vigilant state. In deliberately withholding the self from state-sponsored social and religious rituals, recusants were perceived to be 'private' people whose hearts harboured secret, possibly treasonous desires. Recusancy was not simply an act of negation but a positive assertion of the desire to stay away, testifying to the presence of places that were outside the state

---

[113] John Gerard, *John Gerard: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan*, ed. John Morris (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1871), p. 56.

[114] On certain occasions it was essential to light a fire in the fireplace in order to deter immediate discovery, which may have led to the priest, hidden above in the chimney, dying of immediate asphyxiation.

purview. Spiritual and sacramental connotations blended with the corporeal threat of death and torture within priest holes. Julian Yates cites the archivist Michael Hodgetts who describes priest holes to have been an architecturally obscure and inconvenient space which was so small that one could hardly stand but was forced to sit or lie down beside a few days provision.[115] Most were dark, cramped, and airless, a veritable hell in days without canned food and modern sanitation.

As an indispensable element of the 'recusant architecture' of Catholic culture, priest holes were recessed mnemonic spaces: inextricably linked with performance and loss of memory.[116] The priest hole was identified through its flooring and entrance usually situated in dark and 'forgotten' corners of the house: behind a blank stretch of wall/wainscotting, inside a converted garderobe, privy or disused sewer, in the space between the gables and the vertical partitions of the attic, the dead end of a corridor, beneath floorboards, or a partially blocked-off chimney.[117] The very structure of the priest hole implied the presence of concealment which led to an expectation of discovery. The Catholic Mass and its sacramental rites had been built upon an act of remembrance of Christ's life ('as often as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in memory of me')[118] through the Eucharist, which was disrupted by the Reformation.

Old ways were criminalised and new ones were imposed which destroyed the hermeneutics of continuity for the Catholic faithful. The Tudor regime's unprecedented politics of espionage and spiritual surveillance sealed England's Catholic history in a metaphorical tomb. It is impossible not to miss the way in which priest holes recuperated the memory of a lost collective past: an act of remembrance of the Old Faith. The profound anticipation of discovery whether of objects, bodies, and practices may well

---

[115] Michael Hodgetts, *Secret Hiding-Places* (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1985), p. 2, quoted in Julian Yates, *Error, Misuse, Failure,* p. 145.

[116] The early modern architectural realisation of imaginary, contemplative spaces of memory goes back to Roman antiquity when the mind was conceived as a space holding various objects of thought. In the first century Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria*, volume 4) formulated his landmark understanding of how memory works architecturally. Later Augustine in his *Confessions* (Book X) described memory to be 'the fields and vast palaces…where are stored the innumerable images of material things brought to it by the senses.' See *The Confessions of St. Augustine, Books I-X*, trans. F. J. Sheed (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942), p. 178. Memory was imagined as a space that could be defined and then filled with objects as well as ethical and political precepts that helped one to lead a good life. To create a memory, one would imagine a building, and peripatetically populate each room and part of the space with an image, to recall the memory one had to mentally traverse the building, moving around and through space, revisiting in turn all the rooms that had been 'decorated' with imaginings. See also Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (1990; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[117] Yates, *Error, Misuse, Failure*, p. 145.

[118] The doctrine of transubstantiation was altered in the Common Prayer Book and Thomas Cranmer's rewriting of the Mass removed all ideas related to sacrifice. The Calvinist doctrine of transubstantiation was based on the remembrance of a body that was no longer there: on the idea of absence rather than presence.

have contained the spectre of a ruptured and forgotten English past.[119] Yates sees the priest hole as a mechanism 'for ensuring that, in all registers (domestic, national, textual) there will remain moments beyond the reach of the searcher, hidden to view. It is an investment in the future, a device that maintains the possibility of secrets even after their finding.'[120]

The last example I look at is cryptography[121] using it to demonstrate an idea of the textual interior but also to initiate the concerns of the final chapter which examines Jonson's printed output. The Renaissance interest in secret writing was not new, for it bore the weight of a venerable tradition preceding it. Historical evidence points to the existence of secret writing in Mesopotamia and Egypt. According to the Roman historian Suetonius, Julius Caesar supposedly used it in messages of military significance to fool his barbarian enemies. Medieval higher learning was saturated with the idea of codes, as monks studied Biblical and Hebrew ciphers.[122] The medieval Patristic four-fold mode of Biblical exegesis (literal, allegorical, typological, and moral) endured into the Renaissance. It resulted in a perception of the text as a polyvalent object that was intended to deliver multiple meanings and the reader/receiver was intended to decode the many layers of sense contained within it. The early modern mind understood code as a device of the almighty who had encoded meaning or truth in the design of all things, including his divinely inspired texts.[123]

Yet in the fraught and bifurcated religio-political environment of the Renaissance, the use of codes and ciphers, in particular cryptography could also be perceived as a perilous apparatus of sedition. Not least of the reasons for this being the peculiarly 'papist' colouring accorded to it in the wake of the condemnation of Mary Queen of Scots. During her imprisonment Mary had used a method called 'frequency analysis' (which analysed the incidence of letters in written languages to crack codes) to communicate

---

[119] The idea of memory living within the self and defining it goes back to the ancients. Plato first noted that memory was akin to a bird in a cage, which subsequently influenced the Renaissance conception of memory as something contained. If memory is associated with exposure its conceptual antonym-forgetting-is associated with concealment. See West, 'Reading Rooms', pp. 111-29.

[120] Ibid., p. 180.

[121] An authoritative tome on the subject is David Kahn's *The Codebreakers: The Comprehensive History of Secret Communication from Ancient Times to the Internet* (2nd edn.; New York: Scribner, 1996).

[122] Monks were particularly interested in the Atbash: the traditional substitution cipher for the Hebrew alphabet found in the Old Testament which constituted of replacing the *aleph* or first letter with the *tav* or last letter, and so on reversing the entire alphabetical series; and the *gematria*: a method of Jewish Torah analysis that assigned number values to words or phrases, added them up, and interpreted the results. See Stephen Pincock, *Codebreaker: The History of Codes and Ciphers, from the Ancient Pharaohs to Quantum Cryptography* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2006).

[123] This is closely aligned to the Platonic understanding of Alethia (truth) who insists on veiling herself, shunning public spaces and preferring to remain concealed in recessed areas.

with her allies, prominent among whom was Anthony Babington. Babington secured the services of one Gilbert Gifford, a former seminarian who being a double agent conveyed the encrypted communications to Sir Francis Walsingham. They were in turn delivered to Thomas Phelippes, England's genius code breaker of the times. Phelippes cracked the codes used between Mary and Babington which led ultimately to Mary's conviction and execution in 1587.[124]

The Catholic-humanist ideal of *poesis* as an encryption of the image of the divine came under attack in a post-Reformation culture which insisted on a return to *sola scriptura*, decrying all forms of literary and visual image-making as mere idolatry. Secret codes characterised by linguistic indeterminacy imparted an illusion of textual depth and provided a space for hiding dissident discourses on the contemporary socio-political scenario. These bounded discursive spaces became a means for smuggling forbidden political and spiritual matter into mediums such as print or the infinitely more hazardous popular theatre. For many nonconformist writers cryptography or layered writing and polysemic *jouissance* may have been an ambiguous and indeterminate means of survival, providing a concealed space within which his identity and point of view could be both concealed and covertly expressed. Sometimes they may simply have offered a private space of release in an intensely public culture. Philip Sidney believed shadowed language to be the essence of good writing (as explained in his influential *Apology for Poetry*, 1595), using them to act as a cover for deeper philosophical and spiritual truths. Discussing the use of ciphers in *The Advancement of Learning* (1605) Francis Bacon wrote:

> For ciphers, they are commonly in letters, or alphabets, but may be in words. The kinds of ciphers ... are many ... But the virtues of them, whereby they are to be preferred, are three; that they be not laborious to write and read; that they be impossible to decipher; and, in some cases, that they be without suspicion. The highest degree whereof is to write *omnia per omnia*; which is undoubtedly possible, with a proportion quintuple at most of the writing infolding to the writing infolded, and no other restraint whatsoever.[125]

---

[124] Leon Battista Alberti developed the Alberti (polyalphabetic) cipher (1466/67) on the European mainland which only exacerbated its links with Catholicism and papist subversion, not only literally in action but also in theology. This in turn was improved upon by the German Benedictine abbot Johann Trimethius's substitution algorithm (hiding a message and providing a clue to aid in locating and deciphering the message) as laid out in *Steganographia* (written in 1499 and printed in 1606) and *Polygraphia* (published posthumously in 1518). Two other well-known Renaissance figures who showed interest in this method were Giambattista Della Porta and Girolamo Cardano.
[125] Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning and New Atlantis* (London: Oxford University Press, 1906), pp. 148-9.

The last type of cipher, in which the 'infolded' writing must be one fifth of the length of the 'infolding' writing, still referred to as 'Biliteral Cipher' was Bacon's own contribution to cryptography. In *De Augmentis Scientiarium* (1623 Latin edition and expansion of *The Advancement of Learning*), Bacon was more specific about the nature of his invented cipher. Essentially it consisted of the use of two different typefaces or scripts to create a series of five-digit 'binary numbers' with the main typeface or script being represented by 'a' and the alternate typeface by 'b'. Each of the binary numbers represented a letter of the alphabet. Thus any message could be encoded into any piece of writing, so long as the original piece of writing was at least as five times long as the hidden message.[126] Its chief benefit was that a piece of writing would outwardly appear relatively innocuous and seemingly impenetrable. In its recourse to the idea of 'folding', discourses of secrecy and encryption were implicated in questions relating to the acknowledgement of a 'true' identity hidden beneath an obscuring exterior.

The Renaissance interest in cryptography also drew on and critiqued a specific discourse that envisaged a characterisation of subjectivity (and objects) as a text to be read and interpreted. Such a discourse envisaged the self as a site of limitation and oppression rather than of emancipatory individuality: the writing subject whose words and self are an extension of state power and the written subject or abject self whose life is turned into text as a means of social control. Cryptography functioned as a covert strategy of resistance and disorientation against those governing matrices that tried to implicate the subject within proliferating documents characterising the rise of the bureaucratic state. By concealing the very fact of its existence cryptography sought to undermine the bureaucratic desire to 'know' and document its subjects through surveillance. In its deliberate self-conscious performance of acquiescence it engendered a conception of the self as an encrypted message that defeated state attempts to translate the self into text through policing and documentation. Any conjecture about a stable and uncomplicated connection between visible and invisible proved ultimately to be elusive. Cryptography challenged the very nature of the customary relationship between writing, documentation, and subjectivity by refusing any attempt to render spaces and bodies legible. As I will explain in the last chapter, Jonson may not surely have used cryptography in his writings, but he did use its basic underlying principle to envisage and stage his own private subjectivity and construct places of personal intimacy ('the intimate-

---

[126] Brandon Whiting Christopher, "'Officious Men of State": Early Modern Drama and Early English Bureaucratic Identity', Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University, 2007), p. 149.

public') on the public space of the page that could only be comprehended by the discerning few.

In 'Secret Subjects, Open Secrets', D. A. Miller writes that secrecy is 'the subjective practice in which the oppositions of public-private, inside-outside, subject-object are formed.'[127] The essence of such covert intermediate zones and thresholds lies not simply in their ability to express the epistemological anxieties rising out of the difference between an unexpressed interior and a theatricalised exterior but also in their enactment of the very structure and meaning of cognition. Both concealment and exposure are dependent on the potential to manipulate space: distorting, multiplying, reshaping, and folding or doubling it through false turns or sounding and measuring hollow spaces, unfolding and eviscerating unknown regions, annotating unexplained volumes into a coherent geometric plan. The power of such transgressive spaces came from their ability to conceal information in an era where the status quo maintained itself through the management and circulation of data. While such spaces fostered the search for knowledge, they simultaneously frustrated any attempt to satisfy that need. All private phenomena were implicated in the hermeneutically circular problems inherent in any process of interpretation. To display privacy/inwardness was to imply that it had ceased to exist: inaccessibility and invisibility lost their authenticity as soon as they were advertised to or noted by another.[128] In their perpetual elusiveness and susceptibility to camouflage, secret spaces clarified and complicated Renaissance paradigms of inward truth.

IV

Touching and Seeing the Self

Engendered in literal and metaphorical darkness (whether physical or linguistic) spaces such as priest holes or secret writing also draw attention to the contemporary crisis of representation and the dissociation of modes of perception, challenging any complacent equation of seeing with knowing and probing the viability of non-visual perceptual experiences, in particular the value of tactility[129] as a guarantor of revelatory truth and

---

[127] D. A. Miller, *The Novel and the Police* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), p. 207.
[128] Maus, *Inwardness and Theater*, p. 33.
[129] In his book *The Life of Forms in Art*, trans. Charles B. Hogan and George Kubler (New York: Zone Books, Inc., 1989), p. 170 Henri Focillon stated: 'Knowledge of the world demands a kind of tactile flair. Sight slips over the surface of the universe. The hand knows that an object has bulk, that it is smooth or rough, that it is not soldered to heaven or earth from which it spears to be inseparable. Surface, volume,

belief in its ability to harmonise inside and outside. Through metaphorical extension such ideas enable the early modern self to be experienced in terms of two intersecting modalities, those of touch and vision. The deeper (or more private) the self the tougher it is to 'know' it, thus requiring the visual modality to guide the tactile and kinaesthetic to grasp the essence of its being.

If vision required distance between subject and object, touch[130] functioned as an intuitive reminder of a lost sense of immediacy, conveying the values of organic unity and intimacy found in reality. The older Catholic dispensation had been based on a sacramentalisation of touch (through baptism, anointing of the sick, veneration of relics, confirmation, ordaining, or flagellation) and corporeal presence (in the Eucharist) as a part of the articulation and fulfilment of faith. Late medieval Christians[131] expected to find the sacred manifest itself in material objects that could be seen, touched, smelled, tasted, and ingested. Catholic 'multisensory' doctrine demanded the presence of human and divine bodies to work its wonders. Mystic accounts stressed the deeply sensual nature of experiencing God: tasting the sweetness of Christ's flesh, kissing him deeply, entering his heart or entrails, or experiencing the sensation of being covered by his blood. This tradition of mysticism and affective piety was destroyed by the reformist emphasis on immaterial faith and word.[132]

---

density and weight are not optical phenomena. Man first learned about them between fingers and in the hollow of his palm.'

[130] The Western conception of 'vision' as the noblest of all the senses and the irrational sense of 'touch' as the lowest (also the least intellectual and the least aesthetic of all senses) is rooted in Aristotle's theory of perception and was continued in Neoplatonic thought. Descartes believed human rationality literally derived from the organ of the eye that led him to praise it (in *The Discourse on Method, Optics, Geometry, and Meteorology*) as the most comprehensive and noblest of the senses. At the beginning of *Metaphysics*, Aristotle stated that sight (as contemplation possessed only by humans) had a direct relationship with intellectual and artistic faculties, in being the corporeal basis of all metaphysical thinking. In *De Anima* he defined touch to be a condition of the body possessed alike by all animate beings which is essential for gaining nourishment and surviving and whose deprivation leads to death. The tactile sense primarily plays the role of mediating physical sensations for in the final chapter of *De Anima* (his treatise on the soul) Aristotle asserts: 'For without touch it cannot have any other sense-perception; for every ensouled body is capable of touch, as we have said. Now the other elements, except for earth, could become sense-organs, but all the latter produce sense-perception by perceiving through something else and through media. But touch occurs by directly touching objects; that too is why it has its name. Indeed even the other sense-organs perceive by touch, but through something else; touch alone seems to perceive through itself.' The sense of touch is 'immediate' since it directly unites subject with object unlike other senses which are mediated by specific bodily organs. See *De Anima*, trans. D. W. Hamlyn (1968; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 75. The early modern ambivalence regarding touch and its gradual fall into disrepute can be traced to this fundamental dichotomy in Aristotle's opinion regarding the tactile. The Arab scholar Avicenna was followed by Aquinas in according more or less equal merit to both the senses. Aquinas further argued for the precedence of touch over vision in the process of gathering knowledge.

[131] In the late Middle Ages theologians (such as Bernard of Clairvaux and William of Auxerre) increasingly turned toward to the putatively 'lower' senses of taste and touch to come to terms with profoundly spiritual matters especially the relation of self to God.

[132] Martin Luther constructed an entire metaphysics of hearing, for the Word was not something to be seen or touched but heard.

Analogous developments took place in medicine and science as the instruments of knowing shifted from humoural theory[133] that read the body through all its senses to an epistemology that granted increasing primacy to the ocular. Ideas of touch became increasingly visual during the Renaissance giving rise to what the American medical and cultural historian Sander Gillman calls the 'fantasy of "seeing" the sense of touch'.[134] So while the prevailing culture often used the tactile (subsumed within an escalating tradition of ocular hegemony) to know, mark, show possession, and subordinate[135] in continuation of the belief that touch aided better access into subjective interiors (as discussed in the first sub-section of this chapter), in a curious transfer of the *eidectic* (i.e. grasping of essences) power attributed conventionally to sight, there was a parallel tendency to discredit it as well. The haptic sense allowed the subject to be caressed with the eye/mind's fingers enabling the physical to mime cognitive touch: creating a closeness and immediacy as a response to increasing distances between selves. The eyes saw and felt texture and surface as they simultaneously groped for depth and volume.

The gradual disavowal of (secular) touch as primordial and animalistic within the ocular-centric structure of Western European thought and culture nonetheless had a long tradition before the Renaissance.[136] It was believed that surrendering to the pleasures of touch led to the further danger of succumbing to other vices (most probably based on later understandings of Aristotle's likening of taste with the disorderly pleasures of love in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, Book III), the most deadly among them being the treacherous sin of *Luxuria*. However alongside the familiar association of touch with the carnal vices of lechery, wantonness, and lust[137] there existed other traditions linking the sense of touch

---

[133] Touch evoked agency and receptivity, authority and reciprocity, sensual indulgence and epistemological certainty. See Elizabeth D. Harvey, *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), p. 2.

[134] Sander L. Gillman, *Inscribing the Other* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991), p. 40.

[135] The continuing primacy of touch could be felt in consolidation of new beliefs regarding the body's relation to knowledge, sexuality and reproduction, artistic creativity, and contact with new worlds (divine and geographic) gaining a new edge.

[136] According to D. H. Lawrence the origin of the loss of physical contact in Western culture derives from the absolute imperative of *noli me tangere* (derived from the Greek *mē mou haptou*) in Christian discourse. In the Bible the resurrected Jesus tells Mary Magdalene: 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father.' (Gospel of St. John 20: 17) Lawrence traces his culture's imbalance with the lack of touch in his poem 'Noli me tangere' (from *Pansies*, 1929): 'Great is my need to be chaste/and apart, in this cerebral age./Great is my need to be untouched,/and untouched.' Tactile contact is also evident in doubting Thomas's touching of Christ's wounds. This is a distinctively uncharacteristic moment in the Gospels given Jesus' ability to perform miracles through touch and generous allowance towards the untouchables: lepers, Samaritans, prostitutes, and the poor. However the Old Testament Bible is filled with other prohibitions regarding touch, notably God's interdiction against Adam and Eve's touching of the Tree of Knowledge, or the Levitical restrictions against touching the holy (e.g. Mount Sinai) or the unclean (e.g. menstruating women).

[137] The sense of touch evoked the erotic and the seductive. Early modern depictions of the 'Five Senses' sometimes portrayed Touch through lascivious or pornographic scenes. The earliest serial treatment of the

with pain, love, and virtue.[138] Thus while touch aroused hatred and fear it also evoked positive associations of intimacy and kindness. Gillman locates the incursion of sight into tactility in the syphilis epidemic that struck Europe in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, when sexualised touch became a sign of death (similar to the symbolic potential of AIDS in modern times).[139] Yielding to a life of senses implied the loss of moderation and the virtues (of sobriety, restraint, prudence, business, and labour) that ensured man's private role within the family and authorised his public position within the civic community. Touch thus occupied a shifting ground between materiality and transcendence, or physical/spiritual contamination and its cure. Where hearing, sight, and smell extended the body beyond its boundaries, touch insisted on the corporeal because it relied on contiguity or proximity for its operations.

In his book entitled *The Skin Ego* Didier Anzieu asserts that human subjectivity was shaped through touch.[140] Conversely it may be possible to presume that early modern identity and agency was precipitated in the physical and conceptual chiasm[141] between the metaphysics of sight and the materialism of touch. The recognition of sensory hierarchies draws attention to the body as the fragile site of engagement with the world and the

---

five senses in the graphic arts began in 1500 with the didactic treatise *Stultiferae naves* by the northern humanist Jodicus Badius Ascensius and the serial engravings (*The Five Senses*) by the Nuremberg *kleinmeister* Georg Pencz in 1544. Their verbal and visual depictions drew attention to the power of the hand as the organ of touch that could used in the pursuit of vice or virtue. Louise Vinge in her study of the literary tradition of the five senses traces the relation of touch with sensual pleasure to Xenophon's fable of Hercules at the crossroads, where he recounts in *Memorabilia* (drawing upon Prodicus' *Horae*) the female temptress' attempt to entice Hercules to choose the pleasant rather than the virtuous path of life. See Louise Vinge, The *Five Senses: Studies in a Literary Tradition* (Lund: Royal Society of Letters, 1975). Early Christian theologians also associated touch with the dangers of sexual pleasure. In the *Confessions* Augustine assigned to touch the dangerous power of sexual temptation. See also Marsilio Ficino's commentary on the *Symposium* where he sees touch to be the source of lust or madness. The interpretation of the tactile sense with pain and other unpleasant physical experiences was predominantly influenced by Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia* (1593). Touch was usually represented as a woman bitten or pierced by a wild animal. I am indebted to Sharon Assaf's learned discussion of the above-mentioned literary examples in her essay, 'The Ambivalence of the Sense of Touch in Early Modern Prints', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2005, pp. 75-98.

[138] See for example Michael Drayton's Sonnet XXIX 'To the Senses', Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queen*, or Andrew Marvell's 'Dialogue Between the Resolved Soul, and Created Pleasure'.

[139] 'The great syphilis epidemic of the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-centuries made the sexualized touch also the sign of death. What had been in Christian iconography an association between the sense of touch, the materiality of Christ and the act of crucifixion (and eventual resurrection), was secularized as the association between images of touch, images of disease and images of polluting sexuality...Over and over again, the hand, which is the icon of touch, comes to stand for the potentially deadly touch, just as the erotic touch has hidden within it the potential for pain.' See Sander L. Gillman, 'Touch, Sexuality and Disease', in *Medicine and the Five Senses*, ed. William F. Bynum and Roy Porter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 198-224: 202, 224.

[140] Didier Anzieu, *The Skin Ego*, trans. Chris Turner (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). Anzieu's ideas were prefigured by Helkiah Crooke in *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man* (London: W. Laggard, 1615).

[141] See Maurice Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (New York: Routledge, 1962) and *The Visible and the Invisible*, trans. Alphonso Lingis, ed. Claude Lefort (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988).

senses as powerful mediators for understanding that engagement. Touch provided a mode of cognition that involved sensuous and somatic forms of perception; a non-coercive engagement with the other (reminiscent of common human bonds) and a concomitant loss of self that possessed the powerful compulsion to become and behave like something else. The tactile was thus a powerfully destabilising factor in a rational world of hegemonic vision, producing a troubling metaphor for intersubjective relations. Early modern society thus had to negotiate constantly between two distinct and conflicting cognitive spaces and possessed a bifurcated consciousness experienced locally or materially through the body and abstractly or conceptually through the mind.

The intellectual history of privacy and domesticity is also implicated within this ambivalent dialectic. Early modern domestic guides and treatises often made use of the popular metaphor of the embodied home, that is the trope of the godly household as a body whose wise and prudent master or husband was akin to the head, the wife to the fleshly body, heart or womb, and servants to the labouring hands and feet (the materiality of the home or body thus centring on the gendered/class outsider in contrast to the abstract rationality of patriarchal power). Somatic domesticity stressed the importance of the (male) body to the emerging ideal of the balanced Protestant English home. In *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* Jonson draws on related ideas of domestic hierarchy of head and body to show how masterly influence can be rendered physically and symbolically vulnerable by internal (scheming servants) or external threats (the pseudo-alchemist Subtle). The Jonsonian home becomes a contested space that stages a power play between the symbolic configurations of command represented by the master and the tangible though short-lived control of the domestic dependent.

There is a strong affinity between the sensation that constitutes home and the naked skin. Its varied activities such as cooking, eating, socialising, sleeping, reading or sexual behaviour draw attention to surface textures and details, inviting the sense of touch to create an atmosphere of intimacy and warmth. Yet as a cultural backlash to the threat of privacy, society sought to control its citizens by promoting physical detachment in favour of intimate individuality. The positive values associated with touch either emerged in a dematerialised form in the new valorisation of the domestic hearth[142] or its negative physical associations (dirt, promiscuity, contagion, trickery) were transferred to the marginalised domestic in/outsider. The most apt instance of this lies in the way the Reformation altered the meaning of intimacy from a sensual or material to a metaphorical

---

[142] As an usage dating back to 1542, the adverb 'home' signified a movement toward 'the very heart or root of a matter, into close and effective contact, so as to touch, reach, or affect immediately.' (*OED*).

one as evinced in the reinterpretation of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and in the gradual legal devaluation of physical 'consummation' in favour of the abstract 'solemnisation' of marriage bonds. Jonson played on the perils of domestic touch through the dangerous intimacies and friendships established by Mosca and Face in *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* respectively. Conversely, in *Bartholomew Fair* he was to critique the emerging abstraction of emotions through a blatant emphasis on grotesque excess and corporeal desires.

Early modern society was formed through a process of differentiation which took the proximate and reconstructed it at a distance as spectacle for visual consumption or rational contemplation, thereby intensifying the distance between self and world. Sight is the sense of the solitary (voyeuristic) observer implying separation and exteriority whereas touch creates a sense of lived time and solidarity with space, creating a sensation of caressing interiority. Anxieties associated with privacy were also understood in tactile terms: the symbolic and epistemological links between touch and contamination were linked to conditions of physical and spiritual vulnerability. If touch has played a positive role in furthering the civic values of familial or conjugal life, in its negative sense it has played a formative role in the conceptualisation of class, (caste), race, and gender and has been used as a radical marker of 'coarse and diseased' otherness. The early modern appraisal of a segregated private life of self-restraint and circumscribed social and bodily relations is also likewise a history of the occlusion and subordination of touch as one of the most private and corporeal of the senses.

In the privileging of the supremacy of sight, touch (and smell) finally went underground surfacing occasionally as the dark[143] affective, sometimes erotic truth of an invisible inner life (as it did in the invocation of bodily experience in the late seventeenth-century revival of the anti-Cartesian Epicurean-Lucretian tradition): producing a split between the public (civilised) outer and the secret (demonised) inner. The instilment of social and bodily decorum curbed the instincts and rationalised the controlling of physical desires, valorising those senses that supported a greater tactile distance between bodies as a mark of 'civilisation'. Yet it is precisely the mobilisation of these irrational (sensory) elements that secures the smooth functioning of the rationalist world of distance and objectivity.

---

[143] Starting from Plotinus to neo-Platonism in the Renaissance, the metaphysics of sight was frequently couched in the 'metaphysics of light', by implication the metaphysics of touch was closely allied to metaphorical darkness.

Thus as I have pointed out in my discussion on modern age surveillance techniques in the first sub-section of Chapter I, the intense visualisation of empirical-idealist-rationalist traditions that valorise passivity, detachment, distance, and objectivity covertly depend upon connection, proximity, and material participation for their legitimation: sight often usurping the immediacy and implicit agency of the tactile.[144] In fact the greatest threat to privacy then as now comes from the invasion of personal space or restricting access to one's possessions, body or mind through the senses or through devices that are capable of sensory enhancement (for instance the binocular, the tape-recorder or X-ray in earlier times and modern bio-surveillance devices). Jonson's plots similarly reveal the conflict of privacy interests as the rogues use their sensory arts (whether visual, aural, tactile, olfactory or gustatory) to encroach on the person, disposition, personal information, and private property of the gulls. Conversely the rogues are able to circumvent efforts by others to access their bodies, beliefs, desires or personality by erecting physical barriers or metaphysical obstructions in the form of intentional concealment, deception, incomprehensibility or inscrutability. The surveillant 'watchful' gaze of characters such as the Avocatori in *Volpone*, Surly in *The Alchemist*, and Overdo in *Bartholomew Fair* who try to reveal the concealed crimes of the tricksters are shown to fail because of the disembodied abstraction of their techniques.

Early modern private spaces present the vanishing point of the materially haptic and disembodied optic trajectories, a fold or fissure in time and space that existed tenuously at the boundary of cultural and hermeneutic inquiry. In my next chapter I will focus upon the heterotopic space of the early modern underworld as the shadowy other of the restructured patriarchal family unit with its distinct notions of domesticity, hospitality, hygiene, and civility (in an anticipation of the way in which such ideas are ironically reversed as the Jonsonian home becomes a sanctuary for the rogue). Defying any clear spatial or temporal demarcation they were separated and simultaneously connected to

---

[144] The dominant hierarchies of the senses may well be loosening in the late modern world, where new interactive technologies such as smart phones and computers enable a private exploration of the sensorium in unprecedented ways; hypertext makes the practice of reading into a tactile three-dimensional experience. More recently the American design laboratory, Sensoree, has developed a 'mood sweater' that interprets the wearer's mood and communicates this via a series of multicolour LEDs that are embedded in the fabric of the curvaceous collar. Bluetooth enabled shoes have been developed by the Indian company LECHAL which possess the ability to steer blind people around navigational obstacles. However it is still too early to radically restructure human knowledge in favour of the tactile and an emerging order in which vision does not predominate. More fundamentally than new sensory hierarchies, we need new models to characterise man's relation to the world; where vision approximates touch and touch approximates vision: to feel at a distance and to see clearly even in proximity.

mainstream society by porous boundaries: such physical and conceptual commonalities helped to redefine intersubjective relations and the anxieties associated with it.

It is paradoxical that the emergence of domestic ideologies and the growth of the home (as a sphere commensurate in importance with church and state) should have occurred in an era that had the greatest incidence of homelessness and embargoes upon specific social groups from making houses in certain regions of the city. The home's cosy domesticities and benevolent connectedness throw into relief the dark griminess, estranged anonymities, and isolated privacies of London's vagrant underbelly that was associated with crime and dubious morality. Further, the othered figure at the margins of urban collective life reveals a spectre whose material and by implication inward life escapes discursive control. The anxious breach between discovery and concealment often surfaced in the form of fears about the underworld's strategic opacity or propensity for dissimulation. In the next chapter I look at Renaissance rogue literature as a cultural site where such concerns become apparent in their acutest form.

CHAPTER THREE

UNDERWORLD HETEROTOPIAS: READING THE
EARLY MODERN CITY THROUGH ROGUE NARRATIVES

Every day, we must operate with the knowledge that our enemies are changing based on how we change. And as we shore up one vulnerability, they're likely to look to uncover another. That is why science and technology is key to winning this new kind of war.[1]

(T)here are cozeners abroad, therefore it behoves men to be wary.[2]

They have intelligence of all things intended against them, for there be of them that will be present at every assize, sessions, and assembly of justices, and will so clothe themselves for that time as any should deem him to be an honest husbandman; so nothing is spoken, done, or intended to be done but they know it.[3]

I
Heterotopic Enclaves in Late Modern Cities

The hyper-vigilant defence of transnational nation-state boundaries in the name of increased post-9/11 security has led to a rather disturbing trend of events in the present years that include: the mass expulsion of Roma and state-sanctioned destruction of their settlements in Europe; routine deportation of illegal migrants along the US-Mexico border, potentially aggravated by Arizona's new immigration law SB1070 (Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighbourhoods Act);[4] accounts of human rights abuse in

---

[1] Tom Ridge, US Secretary of Homeland Security, Address to the National Press Club in Washington, September 7, 2004. Stable URL: http://findbiometrics.com

[2] William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, IV.iv.245-6.

[3] Letter by Edward Hext, a Somerset Justice of the Peace, addressed to Lord Burghley (25 September 1596) quoted in Linda Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), p. 199. One is struck by the reciprocal sympathies between Hext and Ridge's comments, despite the four hundred years that separate them: an ironic case of *aemulatio* or the idea that patterns of resemblance can occur between things despite the spatial distance separating them.

[4] SB 1070 mandates the carrying of proper documentation for any alien in Arizona, and it levies a misdemeanour on any person who is found to be without such documentation. It also requires state law enforcement officials to determine an individual's immigration status during any routine stop, detention or arrest when the official has a reasonable suspicion that an individual might be in Arizona illegally. Additionally, SB 1070 strengthens penalties for hiring, sheltering, and transporting illegal immigrants. Opponents of the bill worry that law enforcement officials will use race, colour, or national origin as their basis for determining whether or not they have a reasonable doubt about a person's immigration status.

camps and prisons like Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib; hundreds of centres (set up in former army barracks, hangars, camps, deserted warehouses, and buildings) for illegally staying 'third country nationals' (mostly from Maghreb countries, Kosovo, Bosnia, Slovakia, Afghanistan, and Iraq) in the twenty-six countries constituting the European Union;[5] state neglect of millions of people living in slums and inner city housing mostly in the global south; or deplorable conditions for stateless people who are housed in refugee camps around the world.[6] Such incarcerated, enslaved, neglected, illegally resident individuals are 'spectral humans' 'contained within the polis as its interiorized outside.'[7]

The panoptical aim to submit identities and restrict the movements of apparently 'suspicious' individuals to the surveillant knowledge of a centralised all-seeing power (whether of law enforcement authorities or military institutions) has become significant in the context of the late modern security state which is increasingly being grounded on the idea of a homogeneous ethno-cultural and linguistic identity, exclusivity, group difference, and upon a pragmatic political logic of access and exclusion. Assigning and attributing identity are not (and never have been) dispassionate, neutral processes, but charged sites of contention where opportunities for social role-playing and self-representation are dependent on status and thus far from being equal. It is coupled with strictly defined and particularly exclusionary prohibitive legal instruments.

Modern legal citizenship and spatiality are defined *ex negativo* – in the control and segregation of certain proscribed, non-integratable, high 'risk' target groups such as immigrants, specific coloured communities comprised of Asians and Blacks, Arabs, Muslims, migrant workers, criminals, refugees, asylum seekers, welfare cheats, or terror suspects. As notions of autonomous power, governance, and territory are radically reformulated in response to perceived risks and anomalies, such recalcitrant and ambivalent bodies become a metaphor for imagining contemporary order, community,

---

[5] Living conditions are grim and dehumanising in most centres, there have been reports of cages and containers being used in Italy to house migrants. Material and hygienic conditions are generally inadequate, sometimes even inhuman and degrading, with overcrowding leading to lack of privacy and scarcity of basic hygiene products. A prison regime is followed with no access to health care, legal aid or social support systems.

[6] 'When people flee violence in its different forms...seeking to escape famine, poverty or war, they often find that they are trapped in new spaces of exclusion...a quieter, geographically more distant and dispersed war against refugees is taking place...affluent states now routinely fortify their borders against the threat of unwanted peoples, often the surplus residue of their own neo-liberal and military adventures, and the physical adventures that are involved - walls, fences, detention centers and the like - depend on a dense armature of spatial-legal strategies.' See 'Introduction', *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror and Political Violence*, ed. Derek Gregory and Allan Pred (New York, London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 1-6: 4.

[7] Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak, *Who Sings the Nation-State? Language, Politics, Belonging* (London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2007), pp. 15-16.

and sovereignty. Emerging as the inverse logic to late modern societies these segregated inhabitants constitute a separate and parallel world: the dark antithesis of the contemporary triumph of the neo-liberal moment.

Confined to the interstices of socio-political history their existence is barely legible or even illegible within dominant discourses: neither here nor there they subsist precariously beyond the confines of identity registers or bureaucratic documents, in temporary abodes of transit such as airports, railway stations, detention and hosting centres, custom check points, toll booths, or the immigration and social service office before they are refused or allowed access to mainstream legalised society. Such non-identifieds are set within the constraints of society at large that use liminal cultural spaces to construct, contain, and control otherness. These spaces of a 'super modern' era are comparable to what the French anthropologist Marc Augé calls 'non-places' which are ahistorical, atemporal, and non-relational loci characterised by stasis, anonymity, entrapment, exploitation, and solitary individuality; divested of emotion and memory.[8]

> Place and non-place are rather like opposed polarities: the first is never completely erased, the second never totally completed...But non-places are the real measure of our time...A person entering the space of non-place is relieved of his usual determinants. He becomes no more than what he does or experiences in the role of passenger, customer, or driver...The space of non-place creates neither singular identity nor relations; only solitude, and similitude. There is no room for history unless it has been transformed into an element of spectacle.[9]

For Augé non-places are a response to a 'contemporary crisis in social relations' and the 'construction of individual identities through such relations.'[10] Due to the effects of globalisation local urban communities with their normative social grammars disappeared only to be replaced by 'sociospheres'[11] which exist without mutual interference, making neighbourhoods and communities obsolete as a source of identification.

---

[8] A non-place is a place without a particular identity, which inculcate a new sense of thin or abstract identity. They are places 'formed in relation to certain ends (transport, transit, commerce, leisure).' As examples Augé names supermarkets, airports, and railway stations where identity is shared by all customers or passengers alike. See Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthroplogy of Supermodernity* (London: Verso, 1995), pp. 75-115. This was a translation of his earlier work *Non-Lieux, Introduction à une anthropologie de la sur modernité* (1992).

[9] Augé, *Non-Places*, p. 79, 103.

[10] Emer O' Beirne, 'Mapping the Non-lieu in Marc Augé's writings', in *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2006, pp. 38-50.

[11] The British sociologist Martin Albrow defines sociosphere as the living environment and network of a person, maintained both by face-to-face communication on a local level and by electronic communication on a global level. The advance of technology has however made face-to-face communication somewhat

Augé's definition builds on Foucault's notion of heterotopia[12] which are 'sites with no real place... [with] a directed or inverted analogy with the real space of society.' Although Foucault never admitted as much, the literal translation of the Latin *heterotopias* (from the Greek roots *hetero* meaning 'other' and *topos* meaning 'place') as 'place of otherness' derives from the field of anatomy 'to refer to parts of the body that are either out of place, missing, extra, or, like tumours, alien.'[13] These parts are identified as segments of the body, yet are also 'other'. In modern medicine heterotopia refers to the exceptional condition of a cell or groups of cells living in a benign state within a distinct host cell or tissue. Although there is no definite consensus but the common assumption is that heterotopia usually occurs in 'organs adjacent to each other, or having a close spatial relationship in their evolution'. Essentially Foucauldian heterotopias[14] are existent physical and mental spaces of contradiction and uncertainty within a socio-cultural milieu (unlike non-existent and perfectionist utopias) embodying both sameness and otherness: they are the same as the real sites surrounding them in that they represent the social and spatial relations governing those sites, and yet different in the way they contest and invert

---

obsolete. Albrow holds that 'individuals with very different lifestyles and social networks can live in close proximity without untoward interference with each other.' He uses the example of the London suburb of Tooting to explain that the emotional significance of a place may differ depending on the range of the respective sociosphere inhabited by say the powerful business elite and locally bound citizens of an area. See Martin Albrow, 'Travelling beyond Local Cultures: Socioscapes in a Global City', in *Living the Global City: Globalization as Local Process*, ed. John Eade (London: Routledge, 1997), pp 35-69: 51. Anthony Giddens similarly talks about the 'time-space distanciation' that involves the radius of human action being enlarged from the local sphere to a network encompassing the whole globe. See *The Giddens Reader*, ed. Philip Cassell (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993).

[12] Foucault referred to the idea of the heterotopia in a lecture on urban geography that he delivered to a group of architects in March 1967 at the Cercle d'études architecturales in Paris. The manuscript of the lecture was released and published unedited in a French journal under the title 'Des Espaces Autres' shortly before his death in 1984 and was subsequently translated into English as the essay 'Of Other Spaces' in 1986. It was not really the first iteration of an idea which had already been developed earlier in the preface to *The Order of Things* (1966) where he discussed Juan Luis Borges' famous Chinese encyclopaedia. In this latter context Foucault implied that heterotopia is in reality related more to language and representation than to actual physical, concrete, and localisable places.

[13] Kevin Hetherington, *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 42.

[14] Foucault broadly defined heterotopias in terms of crisis and deviation: with the former type referring to 'privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis.' Foucault includes instances of the nineteenth-century boarding school or the 'honeymoon trip' where identities underwent radical transformation through activities like pubertal coming of age or deflowering of the young bride in the train or the hotel room. Heterotopias of deviation vary from those of crisis only in degree, they are spaces 'in which individuals whose behavior is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed.' They include institutions used to house undesirable bodies and people whose behavior is outside the societal standards (hospitals, asylums, prisons, retirement homes, cemeteries). He mentions the garden, movie theatre or the stage as a third kind of heterotopia (of illusion?) although he does not give it a name. These spaces represent real life through films and staged productions, and yet often contest and unsettle the audience's conceptions of reality, either through escape or through 'juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces.' See Michel Foucault, 'Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias', trans. Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics,* vol. 16, 1986, pp. 22-7.

those relations.[15] These alternate modes of anomalous social ordering are distinguished from surrounding spaces by the three 'M's': mirror function, multiple pockets, and miniaturisation. The mirror function reverses the codes of the dominant urban model, multiple pockets refers to the ability to house various conflicting norms within its multi-cellular spaces facilitating mixture and change, and the site reflects in miniature the surrounding dominant model with its codes reversed.

Heterotopias reflect a system of biases and exclusions against certain objects, processes, relationships or people by the dominant society who have segregated them into separate spaces. In a changing and increasingly uncertain society however, heterotopias have catalysed new and alternative modes of public ordering, social relations, and new forms of social cognition through an engagement with difference, uncertainty, or otherness. Their flexible codes of operation and ability to accommodate and acclimatise to exceptional activities and persons (who might be ineradicable or necessary for the existence and consistency of the urban social system) ultimately aid in the culture's capacity to 'handle flows and manage change for the large-scale urban networks in which they are embedded.'[16] Always in the process of becoming they contain change (in relation to hygiene, security, privacy or discipline) within an enclosed and highly restricted space, helping to keep the dominant culture 'pure' and untouched by the ravages wrought by change. Heterotopias help to define the marginal and the deviant through identification, classification, and containment implying that all that is left outside was by definition ordinary, normal, and healthy.

The advent of modernity has been inextricably linked to the utopian reordering of social space and its war against ambivalence.[17] With the modernising of metropolitan environments, place dissolved in the open, infinite, and non-hierarchical spaces of a new world order where everything was measured in terms of flows and movements. The spirit

---

[15] Foucault's history of space corresponds to Kevin Lynch's three normative city models: the 'City of Faith', the 'City as a Machine', and 'Organic City'. See Kevin Lynch, *Good City Form* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981), pp. 71-98. The three sorts of heterotopias Foucault distinguishes can be tied to Lynch's three spatial systems or stages: the medieval hierarchic 'Space of Emplacement' where the 'heterotopia of crisis' is concealed, the modern 'Space of Extension' where new urban actors create the 'heterotopia of deviance' outside the city initiating an urban network, and lastly the network as the 'System of Relations' where actors enjoy 'heterotopias of illusion' that display shifting, mobile relationships within the network. These urban and informational systems are called the pre-industrial, the industrial, and the post-industrial. See in this regard, David Grahame Shane, 'Heterotopias of Illusion: From Beaubourg to Bilbao and Beyond', in *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, ed. Michael Dehaene and Lieven De Cauter (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 259-71: 259.

[16] David Grahame Shane, *Recombinant Urbanism: Conceptual Modeling in Architecture, Urban Design, and City Theory* (London: John Wiley, 2005), p. 75.

[17] See Zygmunt Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1987).

of reform that impelled the modern city shifted spaces of deviant behaviour from within the city to its peripheral limits so that urban space could be logically sorted and shifted into strict enclaves or districts based on their function. This rigid spatialisation reinforced societal power structures by means of a sorting based on categorical systems and mono-functional subdivisions. Yet heterotopia opens up pathways for the deconstruction of sameness and its subversion, providing an exception to the logic of spatial uniformity and social homogeneity.

Heterotopia becomes the antidote against the erasure of difference implicit in the progression of the cultural logic of late capitalism and the advancement of sordid non-places that conform to the postmodern landscape, unlocking another topos where the other and the occasional may encounter alternatives to emerge and strive.[18] They reverse socio-spatial rigidities by providing routes of escape from hegemonic structures representing an emancipatory potential for change and recombination. Heterotopias challenge structures of regulation and control, dissolving, destabilising, and interrupting power. These displaced zones of marginalisation and abjection sometimes become places of semi-belonging and transformative agency in their ability to transcend social and affiliative ties and create new ones. Indeed postmodern perspectives tend to regard heterotopic spaces as alternative urban formations characterised by their inclusiveness, 'radical openness', and unlimited connectivity, something that renders them as sites of radical political resistance and social relevance for the empowerment of minor groups and marginal subgroups through their use of (third) space.[19]

Within a world of fragmentation, socio-cultural and economic polarisation, unequal distribution of opportunities and development, heterotopias appear as the only realisable space of material and social possibility, of the unexplored, the exceptional, and the exotic. This particular tendency of considering the other as an agent capable of radical transformation represents the eagerness of discovering a solution to homogeneity of identity and spatial homotopia. However to read such urban ghettos and human groups that deviate from established order either as potentially subversive or as presenting a

---

[18] See Heidi Sohn, 'Heterotopia: Anamnesis of a Medical Term', in *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society,* ed. Michiel Dehaene and Lieven De Cauter (New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 41-50: 47.
[19] The postmodern geographer Edward Soja expands on Henri Lefebvre's conceptual 'spatial triad' ('spatial practice', 'representations of space', and 'representational spaces') combining it with Foucault's heterotopias, to form the idea of 'thirdspace': 'an-Other form of spatial awareness…a product of the "thirding" of the spatial imagination', which expands traditional dual or 'real' and 'imagined' spaces to include 'real-and-imagined places'. See Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), p. 11.

utopian challenge to resistant hegemonic formations is to overlook the socio-spatial vulnerability of such marginalised spaces and excluded groups, trapped between areas of development, devoid of any real powers, defying clarity, logic, and order. The true import of such 'othered spaces and identities' ultimately lies in their uneasy dialectic between threat-fantasy, representation-reality.

Discourses celebrating multiculturalism, ethnic pluralism, non-racialism or colour blindness continue to be complicit with the dominant logic of multinational capitalism, all too often they are employed in the service of neo-liberal aims and are expressive of the simultaneous fear and containment of otherness. In the United Kingdom the body of the asylum-seeker or refugee becomes the (un)-marked body of strange(r)ness marking a shift from the older biological racism to xeno-racism and asylophobia that parallels Britain's appropriation of forms of economic and political otherness[20] in the rebranding of its multicultural identity. Although advertised as a war against terror the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan was also a geopolitical mission to exorcise the innate anxiety about the other as the fearsome and unpredictably dark side of the white, Western self. In Italy the racialised subject (Muslims or colonial immigrants) is excluded from the national identity project whose legal and symbolic entrance into the Italian national imaginary is met with strong resistance.

The position of the excluded and the non-identified (present in the myth of clandestine fraternal orders or secretive individuals) is forever inherent in the history of identification. The absent presence of the unshaped other frames identification and the space within which it occurs except that the cast changes from period to period. Cultural stereotypes and racialised presuppositions (associated with violence, vice, covert practices) have combined to make the 'excluded' both graphically atypical in the context of normative culture and yet paradoxically indiscernible. Tropes of ubiquity and invisibility blend into each other in descriptions of the non-identified. The locus of anxiety and cultural panic, their uncanny, undetectable ability to pass off as exemplary civilian subjects, or even law-enforcers makes them present 'everywhere and nowhere', be 'anyone and no one' at the same time.[21] Their persistent ambivalence helps to define the chauvinistic contours of Western individualistic, masculine, and capitalistic identity through a negotiation with subconscious colonial legacies, ethnic, class hierarchies or new

---

[20] Smaro Kamboureli calls multiculturalism a 'sedative politics' that 'attempts to recognize ethnic differences, but only in a contained fashion in order to manage them.' See Smaro Kamboureli, *Scandalous Bodies: Diasporic Literatures in English Canada* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 82.
[21] Pugliese, 'Biotypologies of Terrorism', p. 55.

forms of xenophobia and racism based on economic and religious paradigms (often insidiously grouped under the banner of Islamophobia).[22]

Western conspiracy theories (although this is not limited to the West only, infecting countries such as India, China, Japan, partitioned Sudan, and Jewish Yemen) portray Islamic youth groups as highly organised terrorist organisations; prospective migrants as politically seditious and economically radical, their private lives a secretive threat to the stability of the state; welfare-seekers as scam-artists or fiendishly clever masters of disguise, preferring to live off the labours of others, unemployed by choice or siphoning jobs and wealth from natives; coloured communities as sexually promiscuous and religiously archaic, linguistically and sartorially alien – symbolised through ill-fitting clothing or apparel out of sync with environment such as heavy coats/jackets in warm weather, culturally inscribed sartorial markers like turbans, sarees, steel bands or balaclavas,[23] the faux white of a fresh shave that sets off the swarthy tone of the upper face, strange hair colouring, and the use of excessive perfumes/deodorants.

And yet this motley crew of late modern *sans papiers* who fail to exist *de jure* – migrant labourers, refugees, cleaners, waiters, maids, nannies, prostitutes, welfare cheats, fruit-pickers, lavatory cleaners, asylum-seekers who inhabit late modern heterotopic non-places recall a similar demonised and outcast group – comprised of Jews, Catholics, vagrants, witch-suspects, Moors, beggars, sodomites, or the crippled – that also threatened the visual and ideological stability of the notion of a hermetically sealed Europe in particular and of the Occident in general. Contemporary attempts to fix the incorrigible non-conformity of (deviant) identity through diversified forms of body surveillance and patrolling techniques especially of othered populations, is a displaced response of control over and knowledge of a seemingly uncontrollable, socially contingent world of risk intensification and multiplication.

It relives, I argue, the critical moment of early modern Europe's transition towards the Enlightenment especially at a time when the demarcation between centre-margin, moral-

---

[22] Edward Said built on Benedict Anderson's influential notion of 'imagined communities' to suggest that (racialised) national identity acquires 'narrative coherence' through the 'hegemony of imperial ideology'. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (rev. edn.; London and New York: Verso, 1991) and Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994).
[23] The Sarkozy government in France has recently (2010) approved a controversial ban on the wearing of face-covering headgear in public places based on the argument that it prevents clear identification of a person which is not only a social risk but also a social hindrance within a society that relies on facial recognition. In Canada jurists are debating on the issue of allowing sexual abuse victims to testify while wearing a Niqab (veil) on the ground that it does not conform to 'constitutional values of openness and religious neutrality in contemporary democratic, but diverse Canada.'

immoral, public-private was just beginning to congeal. Both periods have not only witnessed the emergence, consolidation or reordering of state structures and symbols but also a concomitant globalisation of information/capital flows that revalues place and space. In no two eras have outsiders been more demonised than on account of their ability to devalue space and transgress the ideological and geographical meaning of place. In fact the interaction between marginalised groups and the institutions and practices constituting modernity have been fought over competing claims to the control and management of space. More importantly as spaces of the other and othered spaces late modern heterotopias help to map similar marginal spaces and individuals that plagued Jonson's era. It also assists in introducing the figure of the Jonsonian 'rogue-artist' and his ambivalent relation to the private interstitial sites of the early modern metropolis as alternative spaces of creative economy and resistance.

<div align="center">

II

A Socio-Historical Background to Early Modern Vagrancy

</div>

In a process that started from the latter half of the fifteenth century the nature of urban metropolitan space (both concrete and abstract) underwent a radical shift as early modern Europe grappled with the confluence of strains produced by a transition from medieval manorial to a capitalistic mode of production: sudden shift from home to foreign markets, the introduction of piece-work manufacture, un(der)employment, conversion from copyhold to leasehold tenure, a sharp increase in subsistence migration from provincial towns and villages,[24] harvest failures,[25] diseases (such as plague, dropsy, and sweating sickness), inflation, rising grain prices, falling/stagnant wages, fluid labour market, credit networks, and debased money.[26] The long standing consistency between labour and kinship, ownership and utility, trade and social place underwent a crucial

---

[24] Beier shows how 'between the mid-fourteenth and the mid-seventeenth centuries England experienced major shifts in migration patterns: from mainly local to more long distance moves, the latter rising significantly between 1580 and 1640, including frightening increase in the numbers of transient poor.' See A. L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England* (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 31.

[25] There was a succession of poor harvests between 1520 and 1535 and in the 1590s. A series of depressions in the textile industry, the backbone of the English economy, also shook the economy with poverty among textile workers being a major social problem.

[26] In his landmark study of the city Lewis Mumford stressed that from the late Middle Ages 'liquid capital proved to be a chemical solvent'...'capitalism, by its very nature...introduced an element of instability, indeed of active corrosion into existing cities.' See *The City in History: Its Origins, its Transformations, and its Prospects* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1963), p. 413 and p. 416. Quoted in Arpad Szakolczai, *Reflexive Historical Sociology* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), p. 172.

shift.[27] Varied other contrary elements and forces such as farm enclosures that expropriated common agricultural land (especially in the Midlands)[28] for sheep farming to produce wool, England's most valuable export, or for raising cattle for meat and dairy products; dissolution of monasteries, loss of religious charity; disbanding of soldiers and sailors; the arrival of gypsies and religious refugees (especially around 1567 and the late 1580s) from the Continent, coalesced together to present a topography of ambiguity, incontinence, and proximities that unsettled crude binary oppositions.

Such changes were more than offset by the rapid escalation in population which grew from seventy thousand to two hundred thousand between 1550 and 1600 and doubled again in the next half-century.[29]All such factors contributed to increasing mobility especially towards larger towns, so that Norwich, Bristol and York doubled or trebled in size whereas in London the population increased six fold. Not everyone who sought a better life in these cities was successful, failure to find work or accommodation resulted in vagabondage.[30] Torn between the time-honoured accretions of memory and localised mythologies of an older Tudor ideology[31] on one hand and the abstract homogeneity of the modern proto-capitalist city on the other a specifically new (fractured) urban consciousness emerged from the confusion of traditional spatial, cultural, linguistic, and social parameters. In his address to London, Thomas Dekker expressed this latent ambivalent apprehension underlying the first 'World City' of the Renaissance:

> Thou art the goodlieft of thy neighbours, but the prowdeft; the welthieft, but the moftwanton. Thou haft all things in thee to make thee faireft, and all things in

---

[27] Traditional units of production (guilds or family) were supplanted, land capitalised and larger districts of occupation were dispersed, and there was a steady growth in the investment of property.

[28] These would include the counties of Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and Oxfordshire. Enclosures allowed the landowner to use his land more profitably but this unfortunate practice caused many farmers to become jobless and lose their lands due to rackrenting, i.e. the practice of charging unreasonably high rents.

[29] For population estimates see Roger Finlay, *Population and Metropolis: The Demography of London 1580-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). To cap it Finlay suggests that the number of aliens in the capital rose as a percentage of the total population through the late 1500s, reaching a peak of 5.3% in 1573.

[30] It was not only the poor who flocked cities for 'advancement', gentry and noble youths industriously flocked to universities and Inns of Court in the hope of getting respectable positions in the Church or the government. In both cases supply exceeded demand. The European Renaissance we recall was largely an urban phenomenon.

[31] Nostalgia is the leading note in John Stow's *Survey of London* (1598) where the antiquarian mourns for lost spatialities, lost origins, before the city was beset by builders, inmates, and vagrants. See Ian Archer, 'The Nostalgia of John Stow', in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 17-34. The Renaissance ideal of the city was presented in terms of fixed spatial relationships embodying an ideal cosmic order. See Burton Pike, *The Image of the City in Modern Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 139.

thee to make thee fouleft: for thou art attir'd like a Bride, drawing all that looke vpon thee to be in louewith thee, but there is much harlot in thine eyes.[32]

Dekker may have had in mind the two biblical models of the city (*civitas dei* represented by Jerusalem and *terrena civitas* by Babylon, Sodom or Gomorrah) that had emerged from Augustine onwards: the city as a visionary embodiment of the ideal community as against 'the city as a predatory trap, founded in fratricide and shadowed by conflict.'[33] Yet Dekker's comment is also symbolic of the city's protean guises and multiple identities: the best and the worst of the urban worlds where the fabulously wealthy elite lived cheek by jowl with a thoroughly destitute majority.[34] Early modern London could be envisioned as a 'tale of two cities' where an upcoming bourgeois metropolis that desired freedom and mobility lived in uneasy contiguity with a bedraggled city requiring surveillance and control. Given the reality of a congested urban existence complete insulation on the lines of Venice would have been impossible in London.[35]

The city was instead a mosaic of little proximate and heterotopic worlds that touched but did not completely interpenetrate, social or topographical stratification being no guarantee for foolproof seclusion. The unsettling commingling of diverse pluralistic worlds could be felt most acutely at the margins or in the interstices: St. Paul's was the hub of commercial enterprises, a thoroughfare, marketplace, social meeting point, and a criminal haunt rolled into one; inns, taverns, ordinaries, dicing dens, and bawdy houses were frequented both by gentlemen,[36] as well as by apprentices, prostitutes, or actors. Cheapside as the city's principal marketplace provided a convenient urban space where large property-owners, small dealers, peddlers, and artisans mingled together. Similarly

---

[32] Thomas Dekker, 'The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London' (1606) in *The Non-Dramatic Works*, vol. 2. ed. Alexander B. Grosart (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), pp. 10-1.

[33] Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985), pp. 2-3.

[34] Steve Rappaport, *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth Century London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 3.

[35] 'In Venice, the physical character of the city made it possible finally to realize the rule prescribed by the Lateran Council-Venice a city built on water, water the city's roads which separated clusters of buildings into a vast archipelago of islands…In the making of the Jewish Ghetto, the city fathers put the water to use to create segregation: the Ghetto was a group of islands around which the canals became like a moat.' See Richard Sennett, *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization* (London: Faber and Faber, 1994), pp. 215-16, p. 218. In Amsterdam city gates were locked every night and iron barriers were lowered into canals to control illicit urban mobility. See Florike Egmond, *Underworlds: Organized Crime in the Netherlands, 1650-1800* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993).

[36] Hell was replete with 'drunkards and epicures' but also with reputable characters such as courtiers, soldiers, scholars, citizens, and farmers. See Thomas Dekker, 'Lantern and Candle-light' (1608) in Arthur F Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars: A New Gallery of Tudor and Early Stuart Rogue Literature* (2nd edn.;Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), pp. 207-60: 222.

there was constant traffic between the city and its 'liberties'[37] or 'bastard sanctuaries' (the two terms were not necessarily interchangeable): demonised contact zones such as Shoreditch and Paris Garden in Southwark on London's South Bank organised around bear pits, brothels, and theatres or areas surrounding Westminster Abbey[38] and St. Martin-le-Grand (having the largest concentration of Dutch and French craftsmen immigrants despite London's strict restrictions on alien labour) which stood on the northern border of the city of London in the suburbs of Middlesex.

Originating as church liberties (such as St. Mary Spital, St. Helen Bishopsgate, St. John of Jerusalem among others) in pre-Tudor times (whence churches were considered immune from civil and royal law and could protect criminals or those who sheltered there from being extradited against their will), these new neighbourhoods were enclaves of jurisdiction where the king's writ did not hold authority and by the time of Elizabeth had acquired the squalid reputation as hideaways for the criminal riff-raff. With the dissolution of monasteries, real estate in the liberties was opened up for new individuals and social practices. Enclosure victims, masterless men, foreign tradesmen without guild credentials, criminals, prostitutes, radical Puritans, and players turned over the liberties to their own private enterprises.

One strikingly new and audacious appropriation of the post-monastic liberties was made by the growth of the theatre (in 1576 James Burbage erected 'The Theatre' in the liberty of Shoreditch followed by the 'Curtain' in 1577, the 'Rose' built by Philip Henslowe in 1587, the 'Swan' around 1595, the first 'Globe' in 1599, and the 'Hope' in 1614) as a viable and highly visible institution that transformed the traditional freedom

[37] The 'liberties' or suburbs were parts of the city that extended up to three miles from the ancient Roman wall. Their marginal geopolitical status accorded it freedom from manorial rule, monarchical obligation or allegiance to lord mayor, sheriffs, and the Common Council. They existed inside as well as outside the city walls where the private playhouses were situated. They formed an equivocal territory that was neither outside nor inside the community, under civic authority yet not fully under their control. They were places where forms of moral excess were allowed license to exist. They could be both within the City proper (such as Blackfriars within the walls and Whitefriars within the bars) and beyond it (such as Holywell in Shoreditch).

[38] The Westminster Abbey was the most powerful chartered sanctuary in England. Its unique geography and unrestricted rights (its charter covered all crimes) made it a formidable opponent to those who sought to challenge the authority of the church. It was finally abolished by James I in 1623. Closely linked with this was the ecclesiastical foundation of St. Martin-le-Grand (abolished by Henry VIII in 1548) which was a source of constant trouble for the City authorities. Alsatia (after the ancient name for the debatable region between France and Germany, Alsace as a place literally without the law) in Whitefriars, an area north of the River Thames was also a refuge for debtors, perpetrators of crimes, debauchery, and offence against the laws. Throughout the first part of the seventeenth-century Blackfriars became a sanctuary for French Huguenot refugees seeking a new life in London. Originally the precinct of the Benedictine Order till the Reformation, the district was a 'liberty' up to 1608 when James I allowed it to come under the city's government in return of a huge loan. The district's main troubles came from the playhouse that was situated there.

afforded by the liberties into moral, ideological, and topological license.[39] However the vehement opposition by the wealthy middle- and upper-middle class residents to the setting up of a theatre in the precincts of Blackfriars rebuts New Historicist claims about the marginalisation of liberties. Among the residents who signed the petition were Lord Ellesmere, the newly appointed Chancellor and Lord Hunsdon, the patron of Shakespeare's company.

Crucially then the congested metropolis was a nexus of circulations, fabrications, and interactions of goods, capital, and people where watertight demarcations between city/liberties, licit/illicit were difficult to sustain. In addition the city's democratised open spaces and new commercial institutions such as the Royal Exchange (as a centre of uninterrupted transit), the theatre or the Grocers' Hall were a conduit for money and economic growth where corporate groups could no longer be kept spatially and socially separate. London was a filthy maze of labyrinthine lanes and narrow alleys difficult to access and even more difficult to 'see' where a wrong turn could prove fatal; destruction was inevitable if the rules of the game were misplaced. In this hybrid sociogeography identity was more a question of perpetual transgression or translation of one world to another, as social and spatial structures of urban environments challenged and corroded familiar practices of cultural interaction based on once sacred (often blood or kinship) ties of charity, trust, obligation or reciprocity. This is the social context from which Jonson drew the plots of his citizen comedies.

The new urbanite had to engage in a wide spectrum of civic negotiations: anonymous interactions, casual attachments or intimate relationships. Moreover during times of peak alien immigration, language and dialect problems would have been common enough. The subject's inability to endow the past with a superior meaning and authority and assimilate himself into the wider community resulted in a degree of alienation, instability, and anonymity. Given such a disorienting environment it is not surprising that self-display and self-withholding should have become calculated tactics in the practical art of self-deployment. Plagued by the perceived (hypocritical) gap between an authentic 'unexpressed interior' and a socially visible yet falsifiable 'theatricalised exterior', city life demanded the constant practice of induction or 'artificial conjecture'.[40] The compulsion to perform and dissimulate was a necessity of social existence which may have prompted

---

[39] See Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995).
[40] John Cotta, *The Trial of Witch-craft, shewing the True Method of the Discovery* (1616), p. 4.Quoted in Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, p. 5.

playwrights such as Jonson and Middleton to create a satiric world of disguisers and role-players, of men who create an illusion of themselves by a change in appearance or by verbal disguise.

As the crisis of economics and demographics forced communities to look for new ways of survival, such anxieties frequently surfaced in an obsession with the figure of the cultural outsider (often identified with the social, religious, sexual, political or racial other)[41] who exploited and outraged rustic modes of identity formation based on kinship relations, neighbourly reputation, and reciprocal acts of hospitality to dupe naïve and unsuspecting people. Perhaps it was inevitable that the concerns associated with radically new social energies and self-management strategies should have been transferred onto marginalised others. Sub-cultural groups were believed to have been besieging and appropriating psychological and geographical space through their subversive mimicking of normative visions of protected domesticity or political allegiance. The control of urban space became a metonym for control, domination, and power as early modern governments sought to monitor all literal and metaphorical dark corners of the country, rendering them knowable, organised, and ruled.[42] The sudden urgent need to penetrate personal, mental, and communal living spaces was an attempt to create a transparent culture where knowledge and social practice were (still) harmoniously aligned.

For many contemporaries the visibility of strangers (both exotic and home-grown) in places such as Blackfriars and St. Martin's was cause enough for suspicion. For native Londoners, the new skills, technical expertise, and cheap labour brought by these 'foreigners' could hardly outweigh the risks posed by them, whether politically, economically or in terms of faith. Xenophobic feelings or violent outbursts against outsiders were rare although not uncommon, with the 1517 'Evil May Day' riots being the most brutal in recent memory. Within this emerging discriminatory urban mentality the class of poor, materially dispossessed, and socially dislocated figures – rogues, vagrants, masterless men, whores, and sturdy beggars – became a disturbing symptom of the changing times, onto whom the socio-economic anxieties of a chancy world were

---

[41] As Derrida reminds us (in his famous 1968 essay 'Plato's Pharmacy') the scapegoat or the *pharmakos* was always chosen from within the *polis*, not from the ranks of the enemy. The *pharmakos* was the origin of difference and division, representing both an introjection and projection of evil. Jacques Derrida, 'Plato's Pharmacy', in *Disseminations*, trans. Barbara Johnson (London: The Athlone Press, 1981), pp. 61-172.

[42] In his study of critical attitudes to cultural space Steve Pile notes that 'the construction, maintenance and policing of spatial boundaries is not just a question of political economy, it relates to the ways in which people develop boundaries between self and other.' See Steve Pile, *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 89.

displaced. Estateless, jobless, living outside parish structures of authority, free from church discipline, and barred from receiving sacraments, their marginalisation made it difficult to control them.

Increasingly visible due to their mobility, rootlessness, placelessness, idleness, and proclivity for petty crime early modern vagabondage[43] was defined as 'a social and political danger', a serious public menace, with what was essentially a socio-economic problem gradually acquiring the hue of a covert nationwide conspiracy to disrupt social order and the circumscribed polities, ideologies, and structures of an emergent nation-state. Even the Queen seems not to have been immune from their influence as this letter from William Fleetwood, Recorder of London to Lord Burghley proves:

> Early in January 1582, towards the end of Christmastide, the Queen was riding through Islington when her carriage was surrounded by a great crowd of beggars. The incident must have alarmed her, because William Fleetwood, recorder of London, was ordered to begin a sweep of masterless men the same day. The campaign lasted about ten days and netted several hundred vagrants -100 being taken in a single day. The beggars in Islington were easily located because they were wont to huddle together for warmth among the brick kilns in the village.[44]

On hindsight R.H. Tawney's celebrated comment about sixteenth-century Europe living in terror of the tramp[45] may have seemed credible to contemporaries given the fact that travelling between towns or on city roads could be a hazardous proposition due to the constant presence of rogues, robbers, bandits, thieves, pickpockets, who posed a threat to life and property. Poor laws, along with enclosure laws, and laws requiring proof of residence worked to exclude itinerant or displaced people from citizenship and treat them as enemies of the community.

Thus for instance early modern city walls, municipal gates, parish boundaries or country borders (no longer a medieval symbol of territorial liberties) became sites where the category of the unwanted were created, institutionalised, and monitored. Exclusionary civic policies fostered the notion of trustworthy resident versus the untrustworthy outsider or dubious foreigner.[46] Such physical and mental insularities insinuated itself into

---

[43] The word 'vagabond' was given legal definition during Elizabeth I's reign.

[44] Roger B. Manning, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 169.

[45] R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth-Century* (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1912), p. 268.

[46] Maria R. Boes, 'Unwanted Travellers: The Tightening of City Borders', in *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Thomas Betteridge (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), pp. 87-112: 100.

evolving concepts of civic and national identity based on class and ethnocentricity. The selective closing of city borders to unwanted travellers and preventing those who had been expelled from returning encompassed a wide spectrum of early modern undesirables such as Jews, Gypsies, unaccompanied women, or beggars. Hence in 1462 the local Jewish population in Frankfurt were forced to move into segregated quarters called the *Judengasse* or the 'Jewish street'.[47] Strasbourg allowed Jews to come to town during the day, but they had to leave when the horn for departure was blown at 6 p.m.[48] A 1522 decree stipulated strict punishment in the form of incarceration for all Romani and Sinti who transgressed border controls.[49] Similarly in 1483 all towns and district courts in the Bernese territories were instructed to expel 'foreign French-speaking beggars' on the spot.[50] The same principle of simultaneous social and geographical surveillance applied to women as well, especially to those who were poor and travelling, or single. In Lyon guards at the city gates were installed to keep out old women or widows with children.[51] Municipal poor relief cordoned off the 'undeserving' mobile poor from the 'deserving' settled poor.[52]

Penal policies were influenced by segregative measures with banishment being the preferred mode of punishment especially for those who were considered suspect but not found guilty, due to lack of evidence. For the rest there was whipping, branding, mutilation, the stocks, or Bridewell: hospital, workhouse, and prison rolled into one. Through such moves state and ecclesiastical authorities in England and the rest of Europe reengineered poverty from a state of holiness and reverence[53] to one of disease and disorder. In the effort to achieve stability Tudor and Stuart governments repeatedly

---

[47] Boes, *Unwanted Travellers*, p. 94.

[48] Ibid., p. 93.

[49] Valentin Groebner, *Who are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*, trans. Mark Kyburz and John Peck (New York: Zone Books, 2007), p. 179.

[50] Ibid., p. 178.

[51] Boes, 'Unwanted Travellers', inBetteridge, p. 101.

[52] Relief was dispensed under the Poor Laws mainly to the settled poor, the unsettled were perceived to be nonhuman. In his harangue against idle vagrants, the preacher John Downame in *The Plea of the Poor; or, A Treatise of Beneficence and Alms-Deeds* (London: E. Griffin, 1616), p. 38 portrays them as the 'blemish of our government, who have nothing in propriety but their licentious life and lawless condition; no known father or mother, wife or children, but a promiscuous generation, who are all kin, and yet know no kindred, no house or home, no law but their sensual lust...' Quoted in Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, p. 14. It is interesting to see how Downame constructs vagrancy as a negative condition opposed to the private redemptive sphere of the home and the relations fostered by it.

[53] In medieval Europe as in the late Roman Empire, poverty had been closely associated with Christian theology. It was believed that the poor were a necessary part of social life because they enabled the wealthy to perform good works and earn salvation. Post-Reformation Europe rejected poverty's traditional spiritual value, severing itself from the longstanding organicist view that regarded the poor as one of the three estates, whose welfare was the responsibility of those in the highest estate. The new valorisation of wealth and property may have insinuated a new belief that poverty was akin to crime.

attempted to fix in time and place a hierarchical structure of authority, epistemology, and power. If the sumptuary laws[54] attempted to solidify the signs that marked status and social identity, the Statute of Artificers (1563)[55] was an attempt to establish wages and professions in an eternal present, as also to prevent mobility within the kingdom. The continuing pressure towards stasis finally culminated in the Act of Settlement of 1662 (14 Charles II, c. 12).[56]

A nation-state is not only a geopolitical realm but also an ideologically bounded imagined community which represents itself as the site of uniformity, equilibrium, and integration. Within such a territory differences are elided, assimilated, destroyed, excluded, or assigned to heterotopic enclaves in order to emphasise the privileged homogeneity of the rest of the community. Criminality often owes its origins to the loss of shared legibility. Thus the process of state criminalisation of the alien[57] and the dispossessed was also tied up to the belief that itinerant beggars and vagabonds formed shadowy fraternities, clandestine societies, and inhabited meticulously organized criminal underworlds. The growing wave of early modern fears and fascinations surrounding such unlawful heterotopias surface in popular pamphleteering, such as in Richard West's *The Court of Conscience, or Dick Whippers Sessions* (1607) where cheats and cutpurses walk,

<div align="center">in shape,</div>

> Of a good gentleman with glorious tongue:
>
> Though for a prey you altogether gape,
>
> Trauersing the Citty all the streets along.
>
> Besiedging euery crowd in euery place,
>
> And will vndoe a man before his face.[58]

In *The Terrors of the Night, or A Discourse of Apparitions* (1594) Thomas Nashe observed that,

---

[54] English sumptuary laws restricted the wearing of certain types, qualities, and colours of apparel to certain social classes. These laws attempted to maintain class distinctions in an increasingly fluid social era.

[55] It mandated that a seven year apprenticeship was required of all existing trades throughout England and Wales. The law also stated that urban masters could take as apprentices only those who were not employed in husbandry and were not the sons of labourers.

[56] This act permitted the removal of any poor person to his/her supposed place of 'origin', if it appeared that he/she might become a 'charge' on the community. It also provided for the transportation to the English plantations for confirmed vagrants and offered a reward of two shillings to those who captured them. See William C. Carroll, *Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996), pp. 5-6.

[57] The anti-alien riots that shook the streets of London in the 1590s were a direct fallout of popular anxieties surrounding economic exploitation by foreign merchants.

[58] Quoted in Hiscock, *Uses of This World*, p. 176.

[noted augurers and soothsayers] may very well pick men's purses, like the unskilfuller cozening kind of alchemists, with their artificial and ceremonial magic, but no effect shall they achieve thereby, though they would hang themselves. The reason is, the devil of late is grown a puritan and cannot away with any ceremonies.[59]

These 'caterpillars of the commonwealth', as William Harrison described them in his *Description of England* (1577) occupied the dark folds and recesses of London's chequered topography: a signifier of the awkward even forceful alliance of tradition and modernity. Yet lacking the modern specificity of place such ambivalent spaces (or imaginary geographies) were at once within the purview of the city's authority yet simultaneously outside of civic rule or municipal control: offering a 'steel glass' to the Tudor commonwealth, real yet distorted.[60] This politically seditious sub-culture was attributed a distinct ideology and lifestyle, with a penchant for impersonating identities and infiltrating decent society, using an alien language in the form of cant or pedlar's French, bound by obligations of service, with elaborate status hierarchies, criminal specialisations,[61] security systems, and intelligence networks. Later migrancy studies have confirmed that these were essentially myths and the dominant statistical profile was made up of the lone-travelling, young, male adult servant-labourer, within fifty miles from the parish of his origin.

Thus amidst fears of insecurity and anxiety fantastic stories of politically motivated itinerant vagrant-arsonist gangs who allegedly planned the destruction of entire territories such as the Southwest German duchy of Württemberg fed the popular imagination.[62] In fourteenth-century France there were rumours about vagrants using poison to spread leprosy or the plague.[63] Such 'bio-terrorist' attacks were supposed to have been financed

---

[59] Hiscock, Ibid., p. 176.

[60] Kinney, 'Introduction', in *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars,* pp. 11-57: 54.

[61] These 'findings' have been discredited by most modern historians. Ian Archer sees the anxiety about thieving gangs to have had little relation to the reality of small groups of migrants engaged in casual theft to eke out a living. Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly similarly think the 'sub-culture' of beggars and vagabonds to have been an imaginative creation. See Ian Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 206 and Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*, trans. James Coonan (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1979).

[62] Johannes Dillinger, 'Organized Arson as a Political Crime: The Construction of a "Terrorist" Menace in the Early Modern Period', *Crime, History and Societies*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2006, pp. 101-21: 101.

[63] This accusation also hints at the close links between disease and vagrancy in this period. Humanist treatises such as those by Juan Luis Vives and Thomas Starkey concerning the poor often portrayed them in terms of filth, stench, and contagion. Municipal by-laws against beggars and vagabonds were issued at the same time as the orders for cleaning the streets. See Juan Luis Vives, *Concerning the Relief of the Poor*, trans. Richard Hyrde (London: John Dantner, 1592) and Thomas Starkey, *A Dialogue Between Pole and Lupset*, ed. T. F. Mayer (London: Office of the Royal Historical Society, 1989).

by Jews and Muslims in the hope of destroying Christianity. After the devastating fire of London, measures were taken against vagrants who were said to be the henchmen of the Quakers, or of the Catholics/religious minorities eager to spread terror and insecurity in the Anglican kingdom.[64] A Privy Council letter addressed to the Shrewsbury Corporation in 1571 made firm links between vagrancy and sedition:[65] 'There is no greater disorder nor no greater root of thefts, murders, picking, stealing, debate, and sedition than is these vagabonds.'[66] A Polish secret organisation was said to offer the services of tramps as arsonists. Yet popular disturbances such as food riots (1595) or peasant uprisings (Kent, 1528; Kett's Rebellion, Norfolk, 1549; Midland Rising, 1607) were largely community affairs, and not the work of roving strangers as they were advertised to be.

Even so throughout sixteenth-century Europe the spectre of *Mordbrenner* gangs of itinerant arsonists and murderers created a major concern for governing authorities. Composed of itinerant street beggars or vagrants and apparently financed by foreign enemies, they were supposed to travel under secret codenames and have their own distinctive and arcane signs (such as girdles made from straw or white staffs) and marks to aid in mutual identification and indicate the place and date of the next crime. These underground communes were reported to use a form of veiled language variously called 'cant' or 'Pedler's French': an argot of strange and outlandish terms that was meant to enable secret communication without arousing suspicion. Social historians such as Beier reject any notion of cant as 'antilanguage' preferring to see it as a semantic jargon.

Yet William Carroll conjectures that cant contained within it, if not an 'alternative ideology', then at least a marker of a counter-discourse and an alternative mode of politics that was generated from below.[67] The use of cant helped to make firm the latent connection between the opacity of private esoteric languages and their resistance to state authority.[68] Independent evidence about real-life canting is slim just as later historical research has proved conclusively that the *Mordbrenner* were an imaginary menace which was grossly exaggerated. Although the veracity of individual confessions made in trial

---

[64] Dillinger, 'Organized Arson as a Political Crime', p. 102.

[65] In the sixteenth century 'sedition' amounted to a concerted movement by an organised body of dissidents to overthrow an established government and invited grave retribution.

[66] Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 157.

[67] See Carroll, *Fat King, Lean Beggar*, p. 37, n. 25. Beier's comments can be found in 'The Canting Lexicon in Early Modern England: Antilanguage or Jargon?' in *The Social History of Language: Language and Jargon*, vol. 3, ed. Peter Burke and Roy S. Porter (London: Polity Press, 1995), pp. 64-101 and in *Masterless Men*, p. 126.

[68] For an interesting linking of notions of cant to questions of nationhood and citizenship see Janet Sorensen, 'Vulgar Tongues: Canting Dictionaries and the Language of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 37, 2004, pp. 435-54. See also Paula Blank, *Broken English: Dialectics and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings* (London: Routledge, 1996).

records of the *Mordbrenner* are highly disputable yet in its own time arrests and interrogations increased public panic. Growing alarms about the threat posed by such invented anti-societies increased and intensified the government search for methods aimed at uncovering their hidden realities and for firmly identifying those whose primary allegiances were to some such subversive commune.

While it is highly arguable whether planned crimes against the community ever really existed, such misconceptions did make vagrants the scapegoats of a calculated government paranoia to punish people for imagined crimes that had no basis in actual behaviour. It is also plausible that the fear of imaginary crime imparted a distinct flavour to Renaissance othering in the process of modern nation-building (recalling 'nation's' etymological derivation from *natio* signifying 'breed', 'stock', or 'race') and simultaneous global exploration, inspiring solidarity, and feeling of cultural homogeneity in the face of common terror against a collective 'national' enemy, increasingly identified with the geographical (e.g. migrant foreign workers) and class outsider (e.g. beggars or vagabonds). England turned towards a culture war at home trying to find an adversary even as it sought to define 'Englishness' by spatially, linguistically, and mentally othering those who did not agree with or participate in traditional English values.

Significantly early modern heterotopias as spaces of the other and othered spaces serve to recall a special variant of the 'container' schema (already touched upon in Chapter II) that has been an integral element in the Western political discourse of security since the sixteenth century for conceptualising the state or country and by implication the self as a closed container that could be sealed or penetrated. Paul Chilton shows how this metaphor is used for demarcating the borders of in-groups and out-groups based on the analogy: 'what is inside is close to the self, and what is outside is also outside the law'.[69] The container metaphor is often invoked to rationalise acts of ethnic cleansing or clarify security *breaches*, *infiltrations*, *leaks* or *threats* helping to draw the mental and ideological borders of Europe and Europeanness. Heterotopias turn the container metaphor inside out by confining the deviant and the unwanted to separate privatised enclaves in order to sanitise what is outside, thereby providing a useful locus for working out the anxieties associated with early modern privacy.

As a cognitive metaphor they also provide a convenient discursive framework where such marginalised groups/individuals acquire a distinctive voice less as empathetic

---

[69] Paul Chilton, *Analyzing Political Discourse*: Theory and Practice (London and New York: Routledge, 2004).

subjects and agents (in an ironic contrast to their real life objective status) than as violent transgressors whose inner selves are disruptive and destructive. Thus the heterotopic paradigm also offers the prospect of an alternative spatial politics through which concepts of personal/collective identity, belonging and agency could be debated. The relation of all this to a discussion of early modern privacy and the rogue may not ultimately be as tenuous as it seems. The Reformist idealisation of domesticity and traditional claims for the family was emerging as a viable model for national identification and policy-making when Jonson was writing his plays. The political analogy of the household and the state drew its sustenance from the underlying metaphor that characterised England (and later Europe) as a naturalised family unit bound by in-group solidarity and blood/kinship ties. Hence anxieties about the divisiveness of individualism, privacy, and solitude inflected both state and home.

Jonson's uniqueness lay in the way in which he was able to use the 'rogue-artist' to mediate both negative and positive consequences of what happens when the home ceased to function as a microcosmic state under the onslaught of privacy. *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* show how the safety, security, moral probity, normal domestic routine, and intimacy of the household and its familial relationships become compromised when it is no longer visible to the scrutiny and judgement of an active external community. The enclosed interior of the invaded house becomes a dark, disorderly heterotopic space controlled by the rogue that forms the backdrop of the anti-social, anti-familial plots of these two plays. The movement of the plays is thus from secrecy to disclosure, from the concealment of private crime and intrigue to its public detection and subjection to (mock) punishment at the hands of authority figures. On the other hand *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* as well as *Bartholomew Fair* also show how the privacy of newly ruptured selves or families attested to the tenuous possibility of individual freedom and self-autonomy (as symbolised in Mosca in *Volpone* and Face in *The Alchemist*) or of alternative forms of affection, belonging, group emancipation and solidarity (as in the fairground community in *Bartholomew Fair*) at a time of intensive moral disciplining and public surveillance.

III

Vagrancy and the Breaching of Borders

One of the many cultural responses to the phobia of supposed secret subcultures (that centred on the myth of an Elizabethan underworld) was the popularisation of a genre of

pamphlet-writing (devoted to the chronicling of criminal types and criminal activities in and around the city of London) that developed in England between the 1550s and the 1620s.[70] Paola Pugliatti in her review of the relations between play-acting and vagrancy makes a distinction between two separate narrative sub-genres that centred on the world of petty crime: rogue pamphlets and cony-catching pamphlets. She argues that the former drew inspiration from a long-standing European tradition of beggar books[71] with John Awdeley's *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1561) and Thomas Harman's *A Caveat for Common Cursitors Vulgarly called Vagabonds* (1566) being the two main English instances. On the other hand she considers cony-catching pamphlets to be a home-grown genre that focussed on the burgeoning capital city in contrast to the earlier tradition which directed its attention onto a rural setting with its barns, markets, country fairs, and highways.

Exemplars of the cony-catching tradition would include prose narratives by Robert Greene, Dekker, and Samuel Rid.[72] In the rogue pamphlet tradition exemplified by Awdeley, miserably dressed vagrants (organised in a hierarchy of upright men, rufflers, patricoes, autem morts or counterfeit cranks) preyed upon their social betters; in the latter kind typified by writers such as Greene, immaculately attired, socially and linguistically dexterous cony-catchers extorted the naïve 'cony' (meaning rabbit to suggest the helplessness of unsuspecting victims) who had just arrived fresh from the countryside.[73] Notwithstanding the neat usefulness of such a distinction it is possible to see both sub-genres as like-minded in their demonisation of vagrancy as a state of unrepentant criminality. More importantly both types are also inflected by the anxieties of

---

[70] Priced cheaply at four or six pence they had the power to appeal to a wide range of audience. Incidentally the sudden interest in marginal and exotic types was not restricted to narrative alone, for visual art from 1500-1800 was marked by an exceptionally prominent role given to socially obscure types. See in this regard, *Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Tom Nichols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

[71] Pugliatti names the German *Liber Vagatorum* (*ca.* 1509), *Narrenschiff* by Sebastian Brant (1494) known in England through the translation of Alexander Barclay, Teseo Pini's *Speculum Cerretanorum* (speculated to have been written between 1484 and 1486), and Tomaso Garzoni's *La piazza universale* (1585) among others. In general she draws a qualitative distinction in terms of moral strictness between texts produced in Protestant and Catholic countries. See *Liber Vagatorum*, ed. D. B. Thomas, trans. J. C. Hotten (London: Penguin, 1932), Teseo Pini, *Speculum Cerretanorum* in *Il libro dei vagabondi*, ed. Piero Camporesi (Torino: Einaudi, 1973), pp. 7-77, and Tomaso Garzoni, *La piazza universale di tutte le professionidel mondo*, 2 vols. (Venezia, 1585), ed. P. Cherchi and B. Collina (Torino: Einaudi, 1996).

[72] They include Robert Greene's *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage* (1591), *The Black Book's Messenger* (1592), *A Disputation Between a He Cony-Catcher and a She Cony-Catcher* (1592), Thomas Dekker's *The Bellman of London* (1608), *Lantern and Candle-light* (1608), and Samuel Rid's *The Art of Juggling* (1612). With the exception of the third and fourth of the above-mentioned pamphlets, see Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, pp. 155-86, 207-60, and 261-91 respectively. For the rest see Greene, 'A Disputation Between a He Cony-Catcher and a She Cony-Catcher', in *The Elizabethan Underworld*, ed. Arthur Valentine Judges (2nd edn.; London: Routledge, 1965), pp. 206-47 and Thomas Dekker, 'The Bellman of London', in *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, vol. 3, ed. A. B. Grosart (1885, New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), pp. 61-169.

[73] Paola Pugliatti, *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 125-7.

identity in a changing world (which grew more acute in the latter series of pamphlets) united in their artistic ambition to provide an orderly domain of fantasised control. Thus whereas rustic rogues still remain a sociologically homogeneous and identifiable group it is difficult to determine the identity of the street-smart cony-catchers. Rogue literature's tortured negotiations with the loss of cultural legibility in a once familiar milieu, makes them analogous to what Lawrence Manley calls 'techniques of settlement'.[74] These essentially imaginative narratives about a variety of discrete, underground criminal networks can be seen as a performative ground (almost a literary heterotopia) where anxieties about identity and display could be resolved and comprehended.

The sixteenth-century rogue has been at the crux of scholarly studies right from early works such as Edward Viles and Fredrick J. Furnivall's *The Rogues and Vagabonds of Shakespeare's Youth* (1880), Charles J. Ribton-Turner's classic historical survey entitled *A History of Vagrants and Vagrancy and Beggars and Begging* (1887), F. W. Chandler's two-volume *Literature of Roguery* (1907), and Frank Aydelotte's *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (1913).[75] An especially influential anthology was compiled by Arthur Valentine Judges in 1930 to overcome, as he complained, the tendency 'to overlook the historical value of these descriptive writings.'[76] Written during the dark years of the Depression in war-ravaged England, Judge's tome of economic and historical scholarship was a Whig defence of the early modern vagabond, portraying him as a hapless victim of punitive Elizabethan social laws.

Gamini Salgado's *Cony-Catchers and Bawdy Baskets* (1972) renewed academic interest in rogue pamphlets; however Salgado's emphasis was unmistakably social, interpreting a tightly organised criminal underclass as a parallel image of an orderly and hierarchical society. Salgado followed this with *The Elizabethan Underworld* (1977) to evoke a sense of

---

[74] Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). Jean-Christophe Agnew writes in a similar vein: 'In the face of the accumulating pressures of enclosure, disestablishment, and demobilization, new forms of social, political, and imaginative order were improvised to keep people and things in their place. Like the estates literature that preceded it, rogue literature served as a figurative act of settlement: exposing, dissecting, and classifying all that threatened to confuse the social relations of Elizabethan England, tying the loose ends of commerce and crime back to the frayed fabric of society...The effect of these fictions was to assimilate an otherwise erratic pattern of itinerancy and trespass into a more familiar notion of deliberate, if dubious, guild activity: a freemasonry of crime whose arts and mysteries the pamphlets purported to lay bare.' See Jean-Christophe Agnew, *Worlds Apart: The Market and Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 65.

[75] Edward Viles and Fredrick J. Furnivall, *The Rogues and Vagabonds of Shakespere's Youth* (London: Trübner, 1880), C. J. Ribton-Turner, *A History of Vagrants and Vagrancy and Beggars and Begging* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1887), F. W. Chandler, *Literature of Roguery*, 2 vols. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1907), Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913).

[76] Judges, *Elizabethan Underworld*, p. xiii.

sixteenth-century London overrun by underworld figures inhabiting their own social spaces and yet also freely flowing through the city. A similar approach was taken by John McMullan in *The Canting Crew: London's Criminal Underworld, 1550-1700* (1984) mapping London as a geography of diverse social universes, with the prohibited areas possessing their own 'criminal vocabulary, criminal technology, division of labour, apprenticeship system, criminal haunts, and style of collective life.'[77]

Since the late 1990s a sub-discipline of early modern historical research called 'Rogue Studies' has emerged. These revisionist-historicist and poststructuralist accounts of underworld literature as a site of discursive and ideological contest, where culturally inscribed social differences such as class, race, gender, and nation were written in through an experimental hybrid form of faux journalism,[78] have been extremely diverse in nature. Taking off from Arthur F. Kinney's *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars: A New Gallery of Tudor and Early Stuart Rogue Literature* (1990) they include recent studies such as Hal Gladfelder's *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth-Century England: Beyond the Law* (2001), Linda Woodbridge's *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature* (2001), and Bryan Reynolds' *Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England* (2002).[79]

More lately Craig Dionne and Steve Mentz have appealed for a 'middle position', that combines both fact and fiction: reading the rogue as a historical figure who 'reveals' something about the real social conditions of early modern England and one who 'represents' an imagined response to cultural stimuli. My work is an extension of such thinking, using the Jonsonian rogue as an aid to construct the anxieties of the early

---

[77] John McMullan, *The Canting Crew: London's Criminal Underworld, 1550-1700* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1984), p. 157.

[78] See *Rogues and Early Modern English Culture*, ed. Craig Dionne and Steve Mentz (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), p. 15.

[79] Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, 1990.Gladfelder employs a Foucauldian theoretical model to read the complex representational strategies of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century 'crime reporting' as a precursor to the novels by Daniel Defoe and Henry Fielding. Reynolds engages in a post-Deleuzian reading of the criminal underworld as a medium through which early modern subjects experienced a divergent mode of cognitive freedom (associated with sociopaths, schizoids, criminals, philosophers, artists, and nonconformists in general) which he labels as 'transversal identity', 'where someone goes conceptually and emotionally when they venture...beyond the boundaries of their own subjective territory and experiences alternate sensations.' Placing less emphasis on the actual homeless and itinerant populations, both Reynolds and Gladfelder consider the image of the rogue as a powerful constitutive force in the construction of early modern bourgeois subjectivity. Woodbridge challenges any reading of rogue pamphlets as reflecting a genuinely organised criminal underworld, preferring to see them as an outgrowth of the comical jest book tradition. See Bryan Reynolds, *Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England* (Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 18, Hal Gladfelder, *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth-Century England: Beyond the Law* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2001), and Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, 2001.

modern social imaginary, especially in relation to the changing dialectic between public and private that I have traced in the preceding chapters. In doing so this chapter also aims to connect with the line of thought pursued in section 1 of Chapter I and in section 1 of this chapter, showing how similar ways of thinking have persisted till today that use the figure of the illegal migrant or asylum-seeker as a figure for grounding displaced anxieties about unbridled privacy and 'risky' individuality.

Vagrancy was objectionable primarily because it was opposed to governing morals concerning economic thrift, settled domesticity, and labour. Vagrants were abhorred because they were perceived as anti-work who just wanted to live off the hard-earned material wealth of others. Comparable to parasites they adopted a life in which mobility was the end not the means to a more productive life. Without a steady source of income to fall back on they were considered suspicious and nefarious on account of their 'present-oriented' ethos: obtaining food and money through trickery and disguise with no care for the future. The vagrant's devious opportunism, penchant for illicit disguise, simulation, mendacity, and impersonation incarnated in a compelling and risky way not only the problematic connections between external show and interior authenticity but also the hazards of the mobility of identity enshrined in the Renaissance ideology of self-fashioning. Divinely sanctioned order was based on birth which defined individual trajectory and determined the degree of one's entitlement to goods, power, and privilege. Humanists ranging from Giovanni Pico della Mirandola[80] to Erasmus and Juan Luis Vives accepted human beings as amorphous, morally neutral, adaptable creatures at birth, who were capable of playing an incredible array of roles under the influence of proper training and education.

Like Proteus and Faustus, Renaissance individuals were perceived as creating themselves, free from any *a priori* definitions of the self and utterly detached from the traditions, crafts, and places by which medieval people acquired their identities. Vagrancy literature contorts such optimistic assessments of self-transforming creativity and freedom (Proteus, we recall, was also a master of deception and Faustus sold his soul to

---

[80] Pico's 'Oration' can be seen as a classic humanist statement on the freedom and potential of the individual human being: 'Neither a fixed abode nor a form that is thine alone nor any function peculiar to thyself have we given thee, Adam, to the end that according to thy longing and according to thy judgement thou mayest have and possess what abode, what form, and what functions thou thyself shalt desire.' See Pico della Mirandola, 'Oration on the Dignity of Man', in *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, ed. E. Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, and J. H. Randall (1948; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 213-54: 224-5.

the Devil) through the spectre of the role-playing[81] vagabond who conceives of life in histrionic terms, as parasitic acts of exploitation. If identity and social life was founded on the temporary and changeable roles one chose to play, then the authenticity and substantiality of the self beneath the roles could become debatable. Ironically enough, in no other figure of Renaissance literature was the heady freedom and mobility involved in self-fashioning so closely bound up with a sadistic preying upon and deceiving others. This simultaneous fear and fascination enabled Jonson to use the rogue to both mediate the perils of private subjectivity and to structure aesthetic experience and cognition.

As denizens of early modern underworld heterotopias, vagrants presented new social possibilities: they were figures of and for new spaces, fissures, and energies of an emergent London of nascent accumulation, consumption, and social competition caught in the residual warp of a traditional hierarchical system. The heterotopia also exists as a fluid and liminal space between the civic and the personal, the visible and the invisible: subliminal spaces separate from and yet connected to all other spaces. This inherent paradox enables heterotopias to rehearse the ambiguities of public-private boundaries. Likewise the principal accusations against vagrants were centred both on their visible mobility and their inveterate secretiveness. At once homely (*heimlich*) insider and unhomely (*unheimlich*) outsider,[82] monster and canny rogue, their threat lay in their ability to breach both physical and psychological borders and transgress categories.[83]

Vagrants wandered at a time that placed a premium on settled life; shifting roles, and performing identities in an age still committed to rigid occupational categories and fixity of identity.[84] There was no clear destination to wandering, and aimless itinerancy called to

---

[81] Fumerton interprets vagrant 'role-playing' from the perspective of multiple role speculations necessitated by shifting jobs and places undertaken by the dispossessed. See Chapter II, n. 12.

[82] In an essay published in 1919 Sigmund Freud went on to explain how the German word for 'homely' (*heimlich*) with its connotations of 'private', 'hidden', 'secret', inevitably conceals its opposite- the 'unhomely' or *unheimlich*. See Sigmund Freud, 'The "Uncanny,"' in *Pelican Freud Library*, vol. 14, trans. James Strachey (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985).

[83] A 1580 royal proclamation troped London as the queen's private chamber within her home (i.e. England) and expressed a nightmarish vision of the poor invading it by the hordes: 'The Queen's majesty, perceiving the state of the city of London (being anciently termed her chamber) and the suburbs and confines thereof to increase daily by excess of people, [and acknowledging that] where there are such great multitudes of people brought to inhabit in small rooms...it must needs follow that if any plague or popular sickness should...enter amongst those multitudes that the same would...spread itself and invade the whole city...' *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols. ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1964-69), vol. 2, pp. 466-7. Quoted in Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, p. 178.

[84] Very often vagrants' tricks relied on their mobility and loose connections with places: 'A Wild Rogue is he that hath no abiding place but his color of going abroad to beg is commonly to seek some kinsman of his, and all that be of his corporation be properly called Rogues.' See John Awdeley, 'The Fraternity of Vagabonds', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 93. Although long-distance travel was

mind how God had forced Cain to abandon (home and) farming and embark on a life of perpetual vagrancy. In Christian thinking the cardinal sin of idleness or sloth (*acedia*) was inextricably connected to restlessness (*pervagatio*). Originating with the Egyptian desert monks (especially Evagrius Ponticus) near Alexandria in the fourth century, *acedia* or the 'noonday demon' was one of the most pernicious temptations faced in ascetic life. Not only did it induce weariness with the rigours of monastic life but it also provoked him 'to step out of his cell', and make him 'long for different places'. Mobility created distance, change, anonymity, placelessness, instability, and unstable moral subjects in a theoretically static society. Glossing on the implications of 'place' in Renaissance England, Linda Woodbridge takes it to signify both social rank and geographical location, such that those who wandered and had no fixed place to live often represented anti-hierarchical socio-cultural dislocations occasioned by the cultural breaks induced by the Reformation, humanism or the rise of bureaucracy.

Anxieties about social climbing or aimless travelling without a fixed itinerary were often projected and displaced onto the placeless. Vagrancy serves to remind of Tudor state attempts to reterritorialise England from a zone of extraterritorial depravity and licentiousness into one of thrift and productive labour; from an unregulated exterior space to a regulated interior space (that identified England as a 'home nation'): legalising certain flows (international business travel) while trying to block others. Given the difficulties of travel (underscored by travel's etymological link with 'travail' or hard work) in the period due to the material conditions of roads, lodging, and inclement weather, these itinerant groups may have represented a sort of 'geography of appropriation'[85] that threatened to undermine official channels of control: demarcating a sharp difference between a geography more amenable to state control (state space) and a geography resistant to such control (non-state space).Vagrancy also represented an alternative (illicit)

---

slowly becoming a fact of life with the reality of international trade, yet most still continued to work where they lived. The only socially condoned form of purposeful travel for lay people in the medieval era was the pilgrimage. This attitude may have been influenced by the Pauline metaphor which implied that all men were mere earthly visitors (Hebrews 11:13-16), which coupled with the idea of a geo-spiritual centre toward which all mankind gravitates gave special significance to the act of journeying inwards, symbolically equivalent to the Christian traveller's progress toward his spiritual homeland. In post-Reformation England such a spiritual centre was displaced by the notion of the domestic hearth. All such factors combined to approve of the ideational over phenomenological aspects of travel and visualise journeys more as an interiorised experience than as a means of acquiring experiential data.

[85] Phrase taken from G. Dematteis, *Le metafore della terra* (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1985), p. 25 quoted in Pugliatti,*Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England*, p. 2, n. 3.

economy of travel,[86] unregulated and unsanctioned mobility being associated with criminality.[87]

In representing London as under assault by travelling vagrant hordes, rogue literature rehearsed cultural fears about an imminent bio-security threat that as stated in Chapter I, would seem all too familiar to a twenty first-century audience barraged with news about refugees infiltrating the European Union. Most of these early pamphlets are products of a siege mentality, but more significantly their explicit purgative zeal about thwarting rogues was energised by broader anxieties regarding British integrity and the stirrings of national identity. It is interesting to note in this regard how the state (as already pointed out in Chapter II) was trying to redefine and expand the idea of home as one including the whole of England but sans the unwanted presence of vagrants who were either sent back to their rightful penal or parish 'homes' or confined to heterotopic spaces at the edge of the cultural imaginary.

These erstwhile servants, farmers or out-of-job apprentices turned vagrants (who people the morally polluted and criminal world of Jonsonian comedies) had left behind a solid social structure involving families, kinship networks, class hierarchy, and patriarchal order. Cut off from a stable community, apprentice-mentor relations, parental family or its affective ties, they were also technically masterless: they were not protected by a (father-like) master nor were they attached to a socialising and disciplining guild system. The heady liberty that stemmed from the lack of binding terms and regulations easily translated into a condition inseparable from a status of outlawry in the early modern imagination.[88] Rogues on their part lived in temporary locations such as alehouses, prisons, cellars, brick-kilns, haystacks or under hedges that parodied the normative home. They undermined ordinary domestic practices and rituals by apparently indulging in sexual orgies in secluded barns, sleeping atop dunghills, hiding their healthy bodies under

---

[86] The word vagabond derives from the Latin *vagari*, meaning to wander or err and is closely linked to French *errance* (from Latin *errare*) meaning to deviate and go in the wrong way.

[87] In keeping with medieval Christian thought which imparted to 'good' travel a definite teleological sense, Renaissance thinkers approved of 'controlled structured movement along fixed lines of power; of premeditated forays from a centre to a periphery and back again.' See Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, p. 252. The aimless travel of the vagabond would merge into the figure of the strolling (bourgeois) *flâneur* in the nineteenth century. This serves to reveal how the demonisation of vagrant mobility was intrinsically connected to a valorisation of the same liberty in respectable classes.

[88] With the emergence of capitalism the family would experience a sharp disconnection of work from the home, thus undermining the role of men as care-givers within the family, although they were to retain their position as family disciplinarians for a long time to come.

dirty bandages and fabricated sores[89] to beg for alms, and conveying secret personalised messages in thieves' cant. In a particularly telling example Harman narrates how vagrants transform marginal locations such as barns and backhouses into a sense of lived space and living place, mimicking (and parodying) the conjugal duties and obligations between husband and wife:

> The men never trouble themselves with the thing, but [take] the same to be the duty of the wife. And she shuffles up a quantity of straw or hay into some pretty corner of the barn where she may conveniently lie...Then she layeth her wallet, or some other little pack of rags or scrip under her head in the straw to bear up the same, and layeth her petticoat or cloak upon and over the straw so made like a bed, and that serveth for the blanket...If the upright man come[s] in where they lie, he hath his choice, and creepeth in close by his Doxy; the Rogue hath his leavings.[90]

The development of a newly private sexuality (marked by new trends in architectural design as outlined in Chapter II of this work) was often accompanied by a prurient tendency to pry into the sexual practices of rogues and vagabonds.[91] They were demonised as bestial due to their sheer (bodily) display and lack of privacy as also for their secretiveness: ill-clad vagrant women were envisaged as public sexual utility items for men on the road, engaging in 'public' sex within the 'hideous intimacy' of barns and cottages (the portrayal of Dol 'Common' and her relationship with Subtle in *The Alchemist* plays upon such associated ideas). Hence the rogue established an effective association between social identity and sexual behaviour: their delinquent sexuality often being represented through beast imagery, more often that of rabbits and vipers.[92] Imagining a world of brute sensuality sans marriage may also have been an oblique comment on the slow decline of marriage as an economic necessity for the upper classes as it may also

---

[89] The British anthropologist Mary Douglas argues that dirt signifies 'matter out of place', then the filth, excrement, and lack of hygiene that was associated with the poor was often related to an anxiety about boundaries and distinctions. See Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), p. 5. Woodbridge interprets the fear of feigned illness as a complacent evasion: 'onlookers revolted by beggars' open sores could reassure themselves that salves and cunning bandages accounted for everything.' See Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, p. 181.

[90] Thomas Harman, 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors, Vulgarly Called Vagabonds', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, pp. 109-53: 144-5.

[91] Privacy was a class (and gendered) privilege belonging to the aristocratic and upper classes and was most often a by-product of money. The urban poor and nameless masses had no means of obtaining this luxury.

[92] Rabbits and rogues were both believed to be exceptionally fertile and their unchecked reproduction was felt to be threatening. Vipers were known to give birth to scores of young at a time and believed to eat their way out of their mother's womb. Depictions of rabbits acting like criminals (picking locks, playing cards) symbolises the blurring of the distinction between animal and human.

have been a critique of the growing abstraction or de-eroticisation of the marital bond. Rogue literature also dwelt on the anxiety of unchecked breeding and illicit bodily activities engendered in obscure private spaces.

Cony-catching narratives underlined their admonitory function by advertising themselves as an exposé of clandestine underworld practices: the lantern shedding light on covert rituals was a controlling image of rogue literature as in Dekker's *Lantern and Candle-light*. Similarly Greene's attempts to decode a piece of thieves' cant in *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage* is accompanied by the claim that, 'Many things lie hidden which are not exposed' (*Multa latent quae non patent*).[93] He warns that,

> If I should spend many sheets in deciphering their shifts, it were frivolous, in that
> they be many and are full of variety. For every day they invent new tricks and
> such quaint devices as are secret and yet passing dangerous, that if a man had
> *Argus'* eyes, he could scarcely pry into the bottom of their practices.[94]

Rogue literature warns that the purpose of early modern inwardness was not always contemplative. It became a medium for showing how the new concept of privacy as the space in which one's innermost beliefs were lodged could be used to manipulate and abuse the relation between inside and outside for worldly gain. This self-interestedness was bound up with a restricted notion of the self as atomised and alienated, concerned with other people only so far as they could be intimidated, manipulated, and rudely astonished. In order to track the line of interpretation this dissertation is pursuing, I would like to place rogue literature within an epistemic crux, reading it as a conceptual and discursive (heterotopic) space that rehearsed anxieties of early modern identity, especially through its negotiation between the dynamics of partial concealment (private self) and partial disclosure (public space).[95] Jonson embraced this sub-genre to highlight shifts in the texture of early modern subjectivity caught in the cleft between conceptions of self as location and self as enclosure. He used the figure of the 'rogue-artist' to project and relocate fears about the calculated deployment of fake social behaviours and the uneasy awareness of their inner insincerity. Further, Jonson made a creative appropriation of rogue literature's spatial mapping of the dispossessed world of England's itinerant

---

[93] The play of light and darkness was essentially a characteristic of baroque paintings, yet it can be safely asserted that such an interplay penetrated into the entire intellectual life of the time, into religion, physical science, and philosophy.

[94] Robert Greene, 'A Notable Discovery of Cozenage', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 175.

[95] Foucault's definition of heterotopia is also implicated in a tension between a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and renders them accessible.

poor to chart and perform his own tentative travels into the world of print enterprise in a bid to self-promote his socially mobile status as autonomous master-playwright.

Although vagabonds may have been few in number, yet they had high public visibility because they were constantly on the move.[96] Their disturbing conspicuousness and physical proximity was conceptualised as radically disruptive of the social order that upset the collective social imaginary and growing self-perception of a unified civic identity. Vagabondage symbolised spatial transgression and a thoroughly provocative form of transformative action that conceived of identity as practice, as agency in motion. The rogue's peripatetic mapping of space charted a radically haptic topography: a sense of inhabited and traversed space based on site(s) rather than sight.[97] The mobile vagrant body was not a fixed contemplator or a disembodied eye/I but a physical entity that constructed a subjectivity based on the erotic materiality of tactile interactions and corporeal traversals.[98] Nonetheless if the conspicuousness of vagrants bothered society, paradoxically their apparent invisibility created deeper anxieties. Thus vagrancy laws[99] which were the penalising component of the Poor Laws tried to curtail vagrant mobility (ecological range) by reducing their public prominence through incarceration or by sending them off to their native parishes.

---

[96] It is difficult to determine the exact number of vagrants on the move, since contemporary estimates varied greatly. John Manningham put it at 30,000 in 1602, William Harrison to over 10,000 in 1577, Edward Hext, the Somerset Justice of the Peace at three or four thousand in a shire in 1596. Recent historians such as Beier have put the numbers of the wandering homeless at 15,000 in 1572 and 25,000 in the 1630s. See Beier, *Masterless Men*, p. 16.

[97] The reinvention of class-based experience of space was one of the hallmarks of modernity; in particular the network of interconnected (domestic) architectural forms (for lodging and living) introduced in the early modern era produced a new spatio-visuality: mobility was the essence of these architectures for they encouraged movement from outer to inner and back again. Middle-class homes seem to have been most affected by this dialectic, where the boundary between public and private space seems to have been more fluid. An eclectic mix of windows, balconies, bedrooms, and closets served to bridge the thin line between display and introspection, community and individual. They changed the relation between spatial perception and bodily motion. Vagrancy may have represented in a more bizarre form the anxieties associated with this new geography of modernity.

[98] The creation of a proto-bourgeois identity was associated, I believe, with a redefinition of body and its senses. Class belonging and exclusion were often decided along sensory lines, with smell, touch, and taste being relegated to the lower sections of the society. Such tendencies tended to deepen the division between public and private, with space being seen as a source of anxiety and a terrain of control.

[99] The historical origins of the vagrancy laws can be traced to fourteenth-century England where the ravages of the Black Death had decimated half of the labour supply and increased the demand for wages. As the landed elite refused to or were unable to meet these demands farmers moved to other places in search of work. Early vagrancy laws were meant to halt the mobility of the poor and force them to accept lower wages. See William Chambliss, 'A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy', *Social Problems*, vol. 12, no. 1, Summer 1964, pp. 67-77. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/798699 According to Beier as the labour markets shifted to one of surplus after 1500, the primary functions of vagrancy laws became social control and labour discipline. See A. L. Beier, '"A New Serfdom": Labor Laws, Vagrancy Statutes, and Labor Discipline in England, 1350-1800', in *Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. A. L. Beier and Paul R. Ocobock (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2008), pp. 35-63.

Interestingly such punitive measures that necessitated a surveillant (and deprived) life of restricted mobility, lack of civic voice, and embargoes on public gatherings or interactions rehearsed the privative nature of privacy in its most acute form. Simultaneously punishment also took the form of rendering the vagrant more visibly public: inscribing his crime on his 'able' body by branding a V-shaped mark on the breast[100] and exhibiting him as state property. Hence every move to flush out vagrants to their resident parishes was accompanied by fears about their underground activities. By locating the early modern vagrant within this widening chasm between private being and public role, he becomes a grotesque prototype for the emerging 'modern' subject and its attendant anxieties. Indeed the sense in which he could conceal, alter, or transcend his consigned category constituted a source of the fascination surrounding the rogue in particular and the marginalised in general.

Punitive measures thus often focussed on outward corporeal markers only in order to disclose the rogue's internal (im)moral qualities. Vagrancy legislation was unique because while most crimes were defined by actions (*actus reus*), laws relating to vagabondage made no specific action or inaction illegal. Instead the laws were based on personal condition, state of being, and socio-economic status.[101] The vagrant status was not simply a physical condition, dependent on mobility or homelessness but a state of the mind as well. To identify vagrants authorities often resorted to physical punishment, using bodily (haptic) compulsions as a way to discover and chastise the dark truths of the mind (*mens rea*). The conceptual crisis that marks this sceptical effort to unravel unspoken intentions and unacted desires through the body reveals rather acutely the corporeal imagining of the inner self and the problem of making connections between overt and covert, visible effect and invisible cause that plagued the early modern imagination.

Although graphically anomalous in the context of normative culture and grossly aberrant in terms of their antisocial values, yet strangely enough vagrants were perceived to have had the dexterity to permeate through social spaces without detection. This underhanded ability enabled them to overcome all social control and containment

---

[100] The vagrancy law of 1547 decreed that 'able-bodied persons not working should be adjudged vagabonds; they might be seized by their former masters, branded with a V on the breast, and made slaves for two years.' Branding was revived in the Act of 1604 (1 James I, c. 7) whereby incorrigible rogues were to be branded in the left shoulder with a hot burning iron in the shape of a Roman 'R'. Henry VIII's proclamation against vagabonds in the year 1531 ordered guilty beggars and vagabonds to be bound and whipped after being stripped naked. In addition the offender was burnt through the gristle of his right ear, with the semiotic mutilation of the vagrant's body becoming a 'manifestation of' and 'due punishment received for' for his wicked life. See Carroll, *Fat King, Lean Beggar*, pp. 43-4.
[101] *Cast Out*, ed. Beier and Ocobock, p. 1.

strategies that were based on visual evidence and physical distance. It was precisely this paradoxical doubleness that fomented cultural panic attacks: they were overtly deviant yet exasperatingly invisible, everywhere and yet nowhere, anyone and yet no one. In such a disquieting world identificatory schemas broke down as everyone seemed suspect, morphing into groundless fantasies of the shape-shifting doppelgänger. The rogues' invisibility was made visible only when it was represented as disguise. The notion of the double undermines the logic of identity, representing the psychic fear of the mirror image, the evil twin gone astray. Explicating on the nature of the literary uncanny Sigmund Freud[102] went on to emphasise the sense of repetition that informs the strange. The uncanny is not simply a matter of the mysterious or the secret but involves a kind of duplicity (doubling and deception) within the familiar.

During the sixteenth century proxy persons and impersonators bearing invented and ever-changing names, fictitious backgrounds, and forged documents became a powerful trope in debates over social roles and their representation and over truthfulness and dissimulation. Undoubtedly the most spectacular case of forged identity was that of the peasant impostor Arnaud du Tilh alias Pansette who arrived at the provincial south-western French village of Artigat at the foothill of the Pyrenees and assumed the identity, property, and family of the absentee soldier-adventurer Martin Guerre. He charmed his way into the affections of Guerre's attractive wife Bertrande de Rols, and even fathered a child with her. Arnaud was finally beheaded at Toulouse in 1560 when the impotent and acerbic Guerre returned after spending many years abroad.[103] Rumours of a scandalous book entitled *On the Three Impostors* (that purported to reveal Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed as the three greatest frauds ever) caused much furore in scholarly circles with different authors such as Boccaccio, Frederick II, Aretino, Rabelais, Giordano Bruno, and Tommaso Campanella suspected of having authored it. The real book, *Liber De Tribus Impostoribus* incidentally was not written till after 1680.[104]

The sixteenth century was preoccupied with imposture and infiltration and the phenomenon of 'passing'.[105] Passing or impersonation challenged the ontology of unitary

---

[102] Freud, 'The "Uncanny"', in *Pelican Freud Library*, vol. 14.
[103] See Davis, *Return of Martin Guerre.*
[104] See Groebner, *Who are You?*, p. 217. The advent of Christianity and the mass of apocryphal texts that grew around it augmented earlier practices, although the moralistic strictures against truth and falsehood became much stricter. The Donation of Constantine and the Forged Decretals of Isadore come to mind. In classical fifth-century Greece Herodotus recorded a pre-documentary forgery of interpolations made in the text of the Oracles of Musaeus and by Onomacritus in the Homeric epics.
[105] The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines 'pass (for)' as 'to be taken for, to be accepted, received, or held in repute as, often with the implication of being something else.' For a discussion on the politics of 'passing'

identity founded on an 'essential self' based on the enclosures of class, ethnicity or gender engaging instead in multiple and contingent (deceptive) selves composed of and created by a series of guises and masks, performances and roles. As a means of accessing socio-economic opportunities to which one was not rightfully entitled, passing addressed the anxieties produced by a border-patrolling society. Moreover it forced a reconsideration of the essentialist cultural logic that the physical body was the site of identic intelligibility, interrogating the visible as an epistemological guarantor of truth.

Cony-catching literature was an intensely corporeal genre and accounts of duplicitous opportunism and their revelations were often centred on the vagrant's body. It posited the rogue to be in possession of hidden information that the author or reader had to strive to uncover. In early modern England thoughts were akin to subjects,[106] and access to hitherto unconcealed knowledge often referred to something that was metaphoric and inward. The search for knowledge was figured as penetrative and in case of resistant subjects a violative act, an extraction of secrets by force.[107] Procedures of discovery brought socially acknowledged externals into alignment with internal truths. Often practices of stripping beggars may have stemmed from the fear of hidden monstrosity that was not simply corporeal but psychological.[108]

(although not in relation to the early modern period) see Elaine K. Ginsberg, 'Introduction: The Politics of Passing', in *Passing and the Fictions of Identity*, ed. Elaine K. Ginsberg (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996), pp. 1-18.

[106] See Mullaney, *Place of the Stage*, p. 106.

[107] Francis Bacon had famously praised Elizabeth for 'not liking to make windows into mens hearts and secret thoughts', yet James I remained ambiguous on whether a ruler should be a passive observer of his subjects' external actions and speech, or if judging their intentions necessitated making windows into their hearts and secret thoughts. See Francis Bacon, 'Certain Observations Upon a Libel Published this Present Year, 1592', in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, vol. 3 (London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1819), pp. 40-105: 73. On a wittier note it may help to keep in mind that Widow Edith's pretence to gentility, despite her roots in yeomanry is punished by being 'purged' of her pretensions with a violent laxative. Edith was a jest book heroine (immortalised in *The Twelve Merry Jests of the Widow Edith*, 1526 written by Thomas More's servant Walter Smith) who was noted for her petty thievery and trickery. Edith may not have been a widow, more likely a husband deserter, yet she continually threatens society through her cunning inventiveness and criminality. See Walter Smith, *The Twelve Merry Jests of the Widow Edith* in *Shakespeare's Jest-Books*, vol. 3, ed. William Hazlitt (London: Willis and Sotheran, 1864), pp. 27-108. Anne McClintock's comment seems apt in this regard, although they pertain to the eighteenth century: 'All too often, Enlightenment metaphysics presented knowledge as a relation of power between two gendered spaces, articulated by a journey and technology of conversion: the male penetration and exposure of a veiled, female interior; and the aggressive conversion of its "secrets" into a visible, male science of the surface.' See Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 23.

[108] The Renaissance fear of the physiologically hideous could well have been an anxiety about the psychologically monstrous. Medieval European folktales about Animal Brides such as Melusine the snake-bride or the shape-shifting monster bridegroom expresses a fear about snakelike appendages but also the (sexual) anxiety that lay beneath the ordinarily familiar. Interestingly these legends such as Jean d' Arras' *Mélusine* (1390) also demonstrate very early on the fragility of public identity and the need to legitimize the existence of a hidden interior persona. In Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* Book I (1590) the heroine of holiness is named Una who possesses a unitary nature but the forces of sin represented by Duessa are

The teleological progression from unknowing to truth allied rogue literature with other knowledge-producing practices of the period, such as the anatomy lesson, jest books, martyrology, inquisition or exploration narratives: these located truth in the material world but beyond the limits of sense perception.[109] Their rhetoric of exposure and discovery ends up ultimately in an endlessly regressive hermeneutic dilemma (that also plagues the conclusion of both *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*) calling into question the capacity of the visible body to act as an objective vehicle of a truth that was increasingly defined as interior, private, and subjective. As yet another cultural response to the anxieties surrounding the emergence of the interiorised and epistemically problematic subject, rogue literature (notwithstanding its comic tenor) too constituted a mode of cognition that made the impersonating body a cache for hidden motives or loyalties, where the intense subjectivity of truth made it inaccessible to all except the vagrant-trickster (which must have rendered it an useful medium for Jonson to express his own epistemological concerns regarding identity and cognition).

IV

Thomas Harman's Secret Alter-Ego

The heterotopia as elaborated by Foucault is a concept in human geography, which describes non-hegemonic places and spaces of otherness. He also likened such heterotopic counter-sites to an epistemological mirror where:

> I see myself there where I am not, in an unreal, virtual space that opens up behind the surface; I am over there, there where I am not, a sort of shadow that gives my own visibility to myself, that enables me to see myself there where I am absent...From the standpoint of the mirror I discover my absence from the place where I am since I see myself over there. Starting from this gaze that is, as it were, directed toward me, from the ground of this virtual space that is on the other side of the glass, I come back toward myself; I begin again to direct my eyes toward myself and to reconstitute myself there where I am. The mirror functions

---

double and hybrid. Error is half woman, half snake, Archimago can shape-shift. The stripping of Duessa reveals the 'filthy scald' on her head, an abominable sour breath, scabby skin, and a dung-encrusted rump. See Spenser's *The Faerie Queen*, ed. J. C. Smith (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909).

[109] Although belonging to different genres, such works nearly always advertised themselves as 'brief discoveries', 'anatomies', 'displayings', and 'detections'. They endorsed the claim that 'there is more peril in close fistulas, than outward sores, in secret ambush, than main battles.' Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (London, 1582) quoted in Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, pp. 44-5.

as a heterotopia in this respect: It makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there.[110]

The mirror represents a unique space of mutable multiplicity caught in the traffic between the familiar and the secret, the utopian and the dystopian or a subjectivity of social relationships and that of inwardness. The mirror is an illusory utopia in the sense that it projects a virtual space behind its surface, a space in which the observer is misperceived as being present. Conversely the mirror is also perplexingly heterotopic due to the oblique manner in which it affirms the observer's position in real space. The mirror critiques fixed and centred identities, expressing a psychological state of personal alienation and moral incoherence.[111] The mirrored image is absolutely real yet unreal for in order to perceive it one has to pass the image through the virtual point of the mirror.

The fictitious underworlds of Renaissance rogue narratives are similarly the cognitive mirror that reflects and refracts an emerging 'modern' identity that is implicated in a series of perplexing middles and intermediate states. Early modern culture was able to reach an understanding of identity and agency only by passing through a process of reflexive duplication. The literary underworld is the mirrored diegetic space of the intimate and hidden double; a rhizome space which 'has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things; interbeing, intermezzo.'[112] Rogue literature was not written by rogues[113] and it is possible to see that he became a demonised other against whom the dominant culture (represented by the author) fashioned its emergent bourgeois identity grounded on mobility, social dexterity, linguistic prowess, and privacy. The marginalised rogue then appears to be an imaginary construct, an ensemble of cultural practices with a discursive body that helped to explain many of the changes affecting life in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Both the author and reader become vital imaginary presences in this process of othering and are constructed through the act of representation: playing 'centre' to the

---

[110] Foucault, 'Of Other Spaces', *Diacritics*, p. 25.

[111] The mirror as a visual conceit calls to mind conduct books for princes that were written with the explicit purpose of edifying the royalty, informing them of model behaviour, character, and thought. They thus attest to the longstanding correlation between mirrors and the construction of the self.

[112] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), p. 25.

[113] Lowlier forms of 'street' literature such as ballads and broadsides in this sense may give a truer representation of the vagrant, laboring poor. See Fumerton, 'Making Vagrancy (In)visible: The Economics of Disguise in Early Modern Rogue Pamphlets', in Dionne and Mentz, pp. 193-210: 204.

subject's 'margin'. Rogue literature also defined the boundaries of the normative reading community, serving to confirm the contrast (and paradoxical closeness) between a social centre and its dependent periphery, respectable insider and marginal heterotopic outsider. Many early writers and publishers were interested in capturing something of the underworld's fascination in order to produce a saleable work of art: inviting the reader to take an illicit carnivalesque delight in the antics and apparent liberties of the marginalised subject. The success of such works was dependent upon a proliferating print culture and emergent market conditions that were ironically enough also a source of the socio-economic deprivations they depicted in literature. The dispossessed and economically useless vagrant subject was thus transformed into a commodity for sale in the proto-capitalist economy. I hope to show in the remainder of this chapter that the rogue often emerged as the writer's shadowy self in what was to be a significant phase in the development of the 'author-function'.[114] My focus here will be on the multiple subject positions or role-playing provoked by a burgeoning print market but also on how vagrancy (with its connotations of solitude, idleness, and mental disorderliness) as a state implying psychological freedom and creativity emerges as a powerful trope for the founding of the author as a private epistemological subject.

Harman was a member of the landed gentry at Crayford and had been a Justice of the Peace in Kent during the reign of Mary Tudor and was thus socially and economically distanced from the subject matter of his rogue classic entitled *A Caveat for Common Cursitors Vulgarly called Vagabonds* (1566). Dedicated to Bess of Hardwick, one of England's richest women, this anti-poverty pamphlet served an ideological function purporting to provide a means of social control and supervision, through which the meaning of the rogue could be defined and contained: to reveal their 'drowsy demeanor and unlawful language, pilfering picking, wily wandering, and liking lechery of all these rabblement of rascals...so that their indecent, doleful dealing and execrable exercises may appear to all, as it were, in a glass...'[115] The pamphlet espouses a now lost ethic of neighbourly solidarity, friendly intercourse, hospitality, and transparent social relationships in the image of a rural England framed by activities such as going to the market, gossiping in the street or over fences, and drinking in taverns.

---

[114] Early modern authorities demonised any sort of agency or possessive creative individualism that had the ability to alter traditional social fact, doctrinal custom or established authority. The tendency to be suspicious of subjective structures of knowledge is one that has stayed with us till today.

[115] Thomas Harman, 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 110.

Such nostalgic visions of rural collectivism are undercut by unsettling forces that threaten it both overtly (vagrancy) and covertly (printing). Harman believes that the elimination of theft will 'encourage a great number of gentlemen and others, seeing this security, to set up houses and keep hospitality in the country, to the comfort of their neighbours, relief of the poor, and to the amendment of the commonwealth; then shall not sin and wickedness so much abound among us.'[116] The pamphlet also reveals the epistemic and ideological disruptiveness that marks the emergent (authorial) subject. Thus Harman's public performance as a respectable and charitable gentleman and erstwhile Justice of the Peace seems starkly at odds with his secretly unacknowledged design – the self-construction of an authorial identity within a burgeoning print market.

Hence Harman's taxonomic pretence is undermined by the fact that he receives information from the rogue, just as the pamphlet's purported 'moral' value shades into titillating entertainment.[117] Ostensibly *The Caveat* was engendered in a private act of (literary) seizure and betrayal: Harman gains the trust of the 'loitering lusks and lazy lorels' with flattering words, money, and good cheer and induces them to uncover their 'deep dissimulation and detestable dealing', confess their 'scelerous secrets', promising 'never to discover their names or anything they shewed me.' Yet his own admission of deep dissembling with the vagrants raises suspicions about his moral credibility just as his ethnographic appropriation of their strange practices and discourses reminds of similar appropriations by vagrants of other people's material and social markers.

The relationship that Harman shares with the vagrants signals the loss of social legibility and trust, the restitution of which is also ironically the theme of the work.[118] Similarly his alleged discovery of the secrets of a 'crafty' and deceiving, non-labouring class ultimately transforms uneasily into an account of his own 'creative' charlatanism tainted in the deceptions of marketplace economics. The rogue's successful performance of learned languages, erudite professions,[119] and literary market strategies mirrors those of Harman and thus undermines any claims towards authorial legitimacy. The text thus becomes a site for constant slippage between older forms of authority and social

---

[116] Harman, *Caveat*, p. 110.

[117] Both author and reader participate in a shared project of fiction-making, whereby one creates and the other consumes. It is also possible to see a larger shift in the way in which oral information obtained from resistant informants becomes the subject matter of the written work.

[118] Thomas Harman hopes that his work will restore a rural culture in which gentlemen 'keep hospitality in the country, to the comfort of their neighbours, relief of the poor and amendment of the commonwealth.' See 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 110.

[119] This is evident in the spectre of the 'Latinate' rogue as progenitors of disorder, although their language contains traces of a classical past.

enterprise and the actual mode of its production through writerly imitation, invention, and plagiarism. Harman's uneasy negotiation between these two modes of social relations (just as Jonson's half a century later) sheds light on the early modern professional writer's ambivalent status between commercial shrewdness and scholarly purity; writerly collaboration and authorial individuality.[120]

In his essay 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', J. W. Saunders pointed out how with the advent of print in the Tudor period, the commercialisation of writing was regarded as a vulgar and defamatory practice by many.[121] In contrast to texts which existed in exclusive manuscript copies, printed texts made for autonomy and textual integrity and were more numerous and more widely disseminated.[122] Not only were they amenable to corrections and standardisations, they also facilitated a rationalised organisation of data through devices such as exactly repeated page numbers, table of contents, alphabetised indices, dictionaries, and atlases. Print facilitated the preservation of knowledge, both old and new because it freed scribal texts from the corruptions that were attendant upon repeated recopying and annotating.[123]

Notwithstanding its disadvantages however, the circulation of manuscripts in small coterie circles comprised of close friends, clients, and family members was however considered a cultured activity, choosing to disseminate to a wider audience for fame and prestige was supposed to devalue the entire basis of writing. The indifference or deep reluctance of Elizabethan and Jacobean 'gentlemanly/courtly' writers to print their work ensured that many works died after circulating within a manuscript audience. The courtier regarded poetry writing as one of the arts of refinement, not a means of economic gain. Thus early Tudor writers such as Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, Sir Philip Sidney,[124] his friends Fulke Greville and Sir Edward Dyer,

---

[120] In Dekker's 'Lantern and Candle-light', the devils are seen to thrive off print culture; the business of hell is described as 'Black Acts' punning on the blackness of sin and that of ink. See Laurie Ellinghausen, 'Black Acts: Textual Labour and Commercial Deceit in Dekker's *Lantern and Candlelight*', in Dionne and Mentz, pp. 204-311.

[121] J. W. Saunders, 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism*, vol. 1, 1951, pp. 139-64.

[122] The early modern literary system comprised of various subsystems. Thus writers may have written for private oral presentations without any thought of publication. 'Publishing' on the other hand might have proceeded through three avenues: public modes of theatrical performance and print publication and the semi-public one of manuscript circulation. Manuscripts were circulated either in coteries or more widely disseminated through professional scribes.

[123] Daniel Traister, 'Reluctant Virgins: The Stigma of Print Revisited', *Colby Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1990, pp. 75-86: 76.

[124] Very often the anxieties regarding print were articulated in terms of class. Apart from catalysing traditional fears about writing in general such as -embarrassment at appearing in public, fear of criticism, worries about the control of meaning- publication also seemed dangerous precisely because it threatened to

later writers such as John Donne, Thomas Carew, John Suckling, Andrew Marvell were strikingly hesitant in getting their works printed.[125]

There were exceptions however; Edmund Spenser had no hesitation of seeing *The Fairie Queene* (1590) go into print. Publication of his work may have seemed the most expedient way of insinuating into court circles and subsequently into positions of civil authority. Yet Spenser's printing forays may have been accompanied by many misgivings proved by the fact that he left out his name as author on the title page. Although Shakespeare remained indifferent to the prospect of print, his contemporary Jonson clearly saw the potential of the new medium in making claims about the 'literary' merits of his work. His apathy to issues of social status was most overtly exemplified in the care with which he oversaw the publication of the prestigious folio edition of his *Workes* in 1616 at a time when drama was not considered as serious literature.

It was a different story for the 'professionals', generally poor writers for whom print provided the best opportunity to capitalise on their poetic genius and for whom the stigma of social scandal attached to publication would not have mattered much.

> Though the pecuniary rewards were in themselves meagre and hazardous, and though few writers could expect any regular income from publications, nevertheless the printed page provided a ready introduction to the fruits of patronage, and thereby, in times which were literally desperate for many authors, a gateway to social advancement and security. So, whereas for the amateur poets of the Court an avoidance of print was socially desirable, for the professional poets outside or only on the edge of Court circles the achievement of print becomes an economic necessity.[126]

'Grub street' writers such as Greene, Nashe, and Dekker were unapologetic about putting their work into print for it provided them a source of sustenance to back their meagre incomes. Yet pamphleteering was an occupation that was generally associated with low status and a bad reputation.[127] This is what makes Harman's position unique, not only

---

destroy manuscript exchange and patronage networks. It made 'public' what had hitherto been guarded in 'private' circles. See Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, New York, and London: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 173. Chapter VI of the present dissertation will delve into this in greater detail.

[125] See Richard Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

[126] Saunders, 'Stigma of Print', p. 141.

[127] Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640* (Rutherford, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1983), p. 27. Poverty-ridden hack writers probably would not have

was he a gentleman of some means who ideally should have eschewed print, on the contrary his canny capitalising of the new medium made him a prototype for the later master-poets such as Jonson who too was aware of the potentialities of the new form and made the most definitive attempt to create something of a pre-copyright to define intellectual property. Harman thus symbolises the classic discrepancy between professional identity and personal character that caused widespread confusion during this period.[128] On one hand he expresses discreet anxieties about print (especially its cheaper versions), whose multiplicity and promiscuous availability to readers of varying social classes and apparent immunity to any control made it seem corrosive of the social hierarchy.[129]

Yet on the other Harman was a social renegade (which justifies his similarity to Jonson) whose undisputed involvement in the open and boundless world of print was indicated by his assiduous travelling from Kent to London to oversee the printing of his book. Printed texts multiplied alarmingly and spread across the land: the close link between vagrancy and print as new forms of circulation in the early modern social imaginary was demonstrated by pedlars (routinely stigmatised as vagrants) who purveyed printed ballads and books among other things.[130] As will be evident from my discussion of Jonson's printed texts in Chapter VI, print's connection with authorial 'ambition' (its Latin root *ambire* means to go around or literally circulate oneself)[131] is more than conspicuous. Like vagrants on the move Harman (and later Jonson) juggles between different subject positions whether as charitable gentleman parishioner, benevolent landlord, Justice of the Peace, crafty detective, or author in the making that grants him a residual economic freedom comparable to that of the rogues. Yet as Woodbridge notes,

---

been so worried about their social status, having conceded to the reality of their present situation, a far cry from the great futures that had awaited them as university graduates.

[128] See Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 47.

[129] Such apprehensions about the threat that scurrilous and unworthy cheaply printed material would pose for the survival of scholarly works would only intensify with time. It coincided with a series of a popular anti-establishment pamphlets signed 'Martin Marprelate' that launched a vituperative attack (in the 1580s) on the episcopacy and Church establishment. Racy and vigorous they served to open up and engage a new popular audience in a critique of state and church. In the 1590s the pamphlet war among Greene, Nashe, and Gabriel Harvey was to expose again the instability and discord associated with the press.

[130] Dekker in 'Lantern and Candle-light' describes a cony-catching scam whereby itinerant printers (falconers) sought potential patrons on the basis of dedication pages hastily printed up and attached to old, discarded books. They travelled throughout the shires of England, eking their living by such hawking. The falconer culled advantages from both the old (based on patronage) and new (based on print) authorial modes, using the former to make his profit and the latter to cover his tracks. I will be referring to this in greater detail in the fifth chapter.

[131] The Latin word was used to suggest the notion of the self in circulation. Not only does Harman physically circulate between home and workplace, he also metaphorically circulated through his texts.

printing also promoted an agile movement of the mind which was both exciting and fearsome. As with all cultural innovations which were perceived to be perilous, their anxieties were often projected onto the figure of the vagrant as the most visibly mobile.[132] The claim to disseminate the secrets of vagrant life for the moral edification of readers, even as Harman reveals a snide awareness of the commercial aspects of the project is symbolic of the juxtaposition of the aesthetic and the economic that drove Jonson as well.

Writers often created distancing or rationalising strategies to clarify their venture into the world of print. These ranged from withholding of names, specious claims about the text as a piece of youthful exercise, or most commonly that the published text did not have the author's full consent. Textual discourse was envisaged as a private and secretive matter that was unveiled through the public medium of print in a vulnerable moment of transgression.[133] Reading was constructed as a voyeuristic performance, an act of prurient indulgence in clandestine worlds/words. In the case of Harman vindication for printing his pamphlet[134] is couched in the language of social welfare and moral service to the nation. Stephen Greenblatt reads rogue texts as attempts to police or control deviance by demonising the rogue.[135] Harman is thus shown to enlist the help of the printer of *A Caveat* in his campaign to expose and arrest phony epileptics. He posits printers as agents of law and order, even agents of the Crown in combating criminal vagrancy.

I suggest however that placed against the contemporary rationalisations regarding printing; Harman's nationalistic rhetoric is nothing but an elaborately constructed pose. What it makes apparent is how Harman's conventional anxieties about print (veering between ethical didacticism and amusing titillation) also stresses on the dialectic between concealed design and its public exposure. The act of discovery of illicit heterotopic worlds (through print) could help to create a sense of a privileged proto-bourgeois inner

---

[132] See Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, p. 251.

[133] William Percy's *Sonnets to the Fairest Coelia* (1594) opens with an assurance that the published text is a mistake, an act of betrayal: 'Whereas I was fullie determined to have concealed my Sonnets, as things privie to my Selfe'...'yet of courtesie having lent them to some, they were secretlie committed to the Presse, and almost finished, before it came to my knowledge,' STC 19819, quoted in Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, p. 174.

[134] Harman's forays into the print-world would usher in a renaissance of the cony-catching pamphlet (unbound and costing a few pence each, typically consisting of one to twelve sheets), especially in the hands of Greene and Dekker in the aftermath of the Martin Marprelate controversy.

[135] Stephen Greenblatt notes that in much of the cony-catching literature of the period 'printing is represented in the text itself as a force for social order and the detection of criminal fraud.' See his book *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 50-1.

space often identified with the home.[136] The text offers to empower the reader with secret knowledge about the criminal life, language, and mores of England's vagabond underbelly. Furthermore Harman constructs both text and the vagrant underworld as an enclosed and secret sphere, into which he guides the innocent citizen-reader. The act of reading rehearses a haptic journey into the depths of a secluded interiority (much like Montaigne's discussed in Chapter II), through a process of gradual unmasking that moves between the visual and the corporeal. By promising a thrilling opportunity to gaze into a clandestine world, Harman is able to construct a 'private' erotic moment of shared intimacy and freedom between himself and his reader. Such a relationship recreates the socially enclosed and exclusive relationship of coterie manuscript culture. Yet this inward centripetalised movement is simultaneously offset by the printed text's centrifugal progress into the public sphere. It is this 'both-and' dialectic that also best describes the private-public dimensions of Jonson's authorial persona.

The salacious nature of public display in print often drew upon a sexualised corporeal analogy.[137] In his preface to the inaugural publication of Philip Sidney's sonnet sequence *Astrophel and Stella* in 1591, Nashe expressed his protest against coterie circulation that concealed literary works from public view. Commenting on this lengthy prefatorial diatribe, Wendy Wall is struck by the nature of the bizarre and contradictory sexual metaphors used to imagine poetry as a force locked within women's treasure chests and commonplace books which has to be extracted through the use of (male) force.[138] For Nashe, though poetry is 'oftentimes imprisoned in Ladyes casks, & the president

---

[136] There are a wealth of 'homely' details in the pamphlet which serve to bolster the sense of a protected inner space under beleaguered threat by vagrants. They range from accounts of Harman's illness that forced him to stay at home facilitating his conversation with the vagrants, or that thieves stole his copper cauldron but left the pewter dishes soaking in it because they were engraved with his coat of arms. He links himself to dates, places, and the business of daily life including the making of his book to guarantee it's a degree of familiarity and authenticity. Harman allows intrusions into the domestic space of his comfortable manor house only in order to control and punish such spatial transgressions. Woodbridge interprets the 'house-threatening vagrant' as a successor to similar other figures such as the 'home-invading friar'. Friars who preached from town to town were frequently portrayed as seducers of housewives. The marginalised have often been conceived as a grotesque parody of domesticity. For instance cats, the witch's familiar, traditionally symbolise home and hearth, and the witch's supposed suckling of familiars travestied maternal domesticity. See Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, pp. 173-5.

[137] Thus in *The Golden Age* (1611) Thomas Heywood imagines his books to have been thrust naked into the world. Texts were often compared to frail, naked, and immodest human flesh. Similarly the act of textual production was often imagined in terms of sexual reproduction, with the site of writing being comparable to the female genitalia, and the reader as a nurse to the birthing process. See Heywood's *The Golden Age* (London: John Pearson, 1874). Thus Ben Jonson projected as the most 'masculine' of English writers depicted his creativity as a maternal function. In a like vein the stationer compared the corrupt printed version of Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton's *Gorboduc* (1570) to a ravished virgin. See Sackville and Norton's *Gorboduc / Ferrex and Porrex* (London: T. C. and R. C. Jack, 1908).

[138] The words 'casket' and 'case' were often used as codenames for the female genitalia. See Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, pp. 170-2.

bookes...yet at length it breaks foorth in spight of his keepers, and useth some private penne (instead of a picklock) to procure his violent enlargement.'[139] Books were often presented as physical objects that circulated within a market of lustful buyers and sellers. Printed texts played upon a sense of (sexual) prohibition to encourage its commodity value in the literary marketplace.

My interest in Harman is not only due to his prefiguring of Jonson's later entrepreneurial career (that will form the subject-matter of Chapter VI) but also for what is arguably one of the most celebrated episodes in the pamphlet, the discovery and apprehension of Nicholas Jennings, alias Nicholas Blunt the counterfeit crank or beggar who simulated epilepsy. This is relevant because it helps to bring out a historically specific version of early modern intersubjectivity that helps to throw oblique light on the nature of the master-retainer association and the emergence of 'rogue' consciousness in the latter that drives at least two of the plays being studied in this dissertation. Elizabeth Hanson finds a peculiar affinity between Harman and Jennings: the latter clothed in 'ugly, irksome attire', and spattered blood and dirt, who works the streets of London by day, and returns at night to 'a pretty house, well stuffed, with a fair joint-table, and a fair cupboard garnished with pewter, having an old ancient woman to his wife.'[140] By using the guise of a vagrant to hide his respectable identity Jennings mirrors Harman's own attempts to hide his multiple role speculations under the facade of a 'poor' country gentleman.[141] Introduced in chapter 11 of the second edition of *A Caveat* this episode is striking for the way in which attempts to 'smoke out' deceits intersects with and tries to interrupt the history of the book's printing process.

> Upon Allhallowsday in the morning last, Anno Domini 1566, ere my book was
> half printed, I mean the first impression, there came early in the morning a
> Counterfeit Crank under my lodging at the Whitefriars, within the cloister in a

---

[139] Thomas Nashe, Introduction to Philip Sidney, *Syr P.S. His Astrophel and Stella*, STC 225369 (1591) quoted in Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, p. 170.
[140] Hanson, *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England*, p. 104. She points out that the resemblance between Harman and Jennings is underscored by a woodcut accompanying the fourth edition where there were two versions of Jennings standing side by side: one in rags and the other in the attire of a poor gentleman.
[141] Despite being a wealthy landowner Harman advertised himself as 'a poor gentleman, have kept a house these twenty years whereupon poverty daily hath and doth repair, not without some relief, as my poor calling and ability may and doth extend...' See Thomas Harman, 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors', in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 109.

little yard or court, whereabouts lay two or three great Ladies being without the liberties of London, whereby he hoped for the better gain.[142]

Harman sends for his printer, informs him of the crank's deception, and asks him to borrow two servants who may follow Jennings and afterwards relate about his precise location. Later the printer is able to apprehend the dissembling beggar and he is carried to the constable's victualling house. There Jennings is undressed, washed, and his naked unblemished body is greatly admired by the crowding men and women. He is charitably treated with food, fire, and ale but Jennings ultimately escapes when the excitement of the hunt betrays his guardians who after a few drinks, decide 'to search a barn for some rogues and upright men a quarter of a mile from the house, that stood alone in the fields, and went out about their business, leaving this crank alone with the wife and maidens.'[143] Crime has triumphed so it would seem,[144] however I am more interested in the specifics of the epistemological encounter, especially how the hostile discovery of another's secret innermost being, verges on a grotesque (physical) intimacy between Harman and Jennings.

In its association with tropes of mobility and hermetic secrecy vagrancy embodied a sense of both semiotic polysemy and corporeal elusiveness. The Jennings episode, as does the encounter with the walking-mort or the dummerer,[145] incarnates in persuasive ways the problem of reading the body or identity in an age that had lost traditional means of interpretation. If character was an effect of inscriptions and textual surfaces then the body of the dissimulative other was constructed as frustratingly resistant to reading. It thwarted attempts to arrest and insert their multivalency into an overarching system of ordered unitary signification (these issues have already been touched upon in the modern

---

[142] Harman, 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors', in Rogues, in Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, p. 129.

[143] Harman, 'A Caveat for Common Cursitors', p. 131.

[144] The story did not end here, for in the 1567 edition the printer again encountered Jennings, this time in the guise of a mariner and an out-of-work hat maker. The printer once more apprehends Jennings and has him pilloried twice and sets him free on the condition that he toil hard for a living. However I agree with Elizabeth Hanson's suggestion that the text's credibility and future circulation in the print market defies any definitive closure. The logic of the crank's career is ultimately the logic of print, requiring repeated exposures to ensure its continuing circulation. Pamphlet writers comforted their readers by telling them how to handle the frightening underworld, but also continued to stir up anxiety by showing this underworld to be pervasive and subject to constant change. In this connection see also Martine Van Elk, '"She would tell none other tale": Narrative Strategies in the Bridewell Court Books and the Rogue Literature of the Early Modern Period', *Early Modern Culture,* vol. 7, 2008, pp. 1-20. It is possible that Harman may not have invented the character of Jennings although he did invent parts of the narrative attributed to him.

[145] The 'dummerer' was a fraudulent deaf-mute who kept up his pretence until he was subjected to extreme punishment. When all efforts fail Harman has him tied and hoisted onto a beam and left to hang until he cried to be let down.

context in Chapter I). Owing to the early modern corporeal habit of thinking, bodily interiority seems to have been practically inseparable from the interiority of the mind: the body was regarded as a physiological sign for a radically covert agency. Graphic accounts of vagrant torture were believed to rehearse modes of gaining access to a hidden evil. Yet corporeal proof yielded by the vagrant ultimately became a drama of false signification, a counterfeiting of bodily exteriors and interiors such that the body became a manipulable sign-system. In the quest to wrest essence and manipulate meaning out of Jennings' opaque body, I suggest that Harman may have tried to use print as a metaphorical mode of converting problematic flesh into intelligible semiotics. Yet the lack of closure inherent within the narrative tends to rehearse the inscrutable vagrant body as a series of textual aporia. The interpretive moment is infinitely displaced into the future as continual interpretive labour. As the site where substance and sign collide and reproduce, the rogue remains a sealed and veiled subject, thwarting hermeneutic totalisation, perpetually sought yet forever inaccessible.

Fantastic tales of deceitful vagrants such as the one involving Jennings emerged in a world in which the issue of reproducing the authentic was presenting itself in a new way. It was perhaps inevitable that the first age of mechanical reproduction would be closely linked with questions of identity as well. Print was the first means of mass communication in early modern Europe, but as Snyder points out it was scarcely a neutral medium for the transmission of thought.[146] The paper bodies it (re)produced profoundly affected those who came into contact with them, the word was as much a part of material space as a product of the author's consciousness. In short, reproductive techniques (the manufacture of identical objects in large numbers) and authenticity were closely associated. Printed literary works acted as authorial doubles but at the same time opened up the possibility of a troubling hiatus between the real person and his representation on paper *in absentia*. Objectified thoughts had the disturbing potential of multiplying *ad infinitum* and leave the orbit of the author far behind, disquietingly vulnerable to appropriation and abuse by others through pirated copies and plagiarism.[147]

Understood as the public(is)ation of the private, print was thus closely connected to questions of public self-display and authorial agency.[148] Publication was an act of

---

[146] Snyder, *Dissimulation and Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*, p. 24.
[147] In later years Harman's work would be repeatedly appropriated by later writers to supply materials for newer pamphlets. Recursiveness was a feature of the cony-catching genre in general.
[148] In a culture still dominated by patron-client relationships, manuscript publications were 'private' only in the sense that the author, and not the bookseller, had control over the manuscript.

deprivatisation that abstracted both author and reader from the concrete presence of face-to-face exchange reminiscent of the secrecy of strictly private and elitist consumption of coterie culture. Moreover, the co-existence of aristocratic or state patronage and the literary marketplace made it imperative for writers to satisfy simultaneously the demands of a traditional and emergent literary economy. Such ambivalences also help to frame the career of Jonson whose printed literary output was produced under the anxiety of an authorship under the control of capitalist entrepreneurs: a nightmare world of indifferent patrons, quantity triumphing over quality, booksellers advising writers or publishers slandering authors with impunity. Thus Jonson's self-characterisation vacillated between the pose of the thriving public professional 'master playwright' and the private amateur marked by authorial disdain and diffident integrity, between the deserving dependency of patronage and the self-reliant independence of commercial success.

Keeping this tangled relation in mind and Jonson's unique straddling of the theatrical and print world; the next three chapters of this dissertation will look at three of his 'middle' plays from the twin perspectives of dramaturgy and textuality. The fourth and fifth chapters will historicise the Jonsonian underclass rogue and evaluate his potentiality to act as a brazen surrogate for authorial freedom and self-independence even as he serves to underscore Jonson's ambivalent relationship to the changing social dialectics of public performance and private design. The sixth chapter will concentrate on textual (after)effects and on the materiality of the printed page through which Jonson created a sense of lived intimacy (comparable to the socially differentiated private coterie audience that marked scribal culture) in an abstract world of radical intersubjective divides.

CHAPTER FOUR

HALF LIGHTS AND FULL SHADOWS: DISCOVERY AND CONCEALMENT OF THE EARLY MODERN SELF

To know our enemies' minds, we rip their hearts;

Their papers is more lawful.[1]

If there were no dark places, no shadows, no half-lights, would men's dim comprehension be illumined in the full radiance that would reveal all?[2]

I

The Problem of Representing Inwardness

Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio's baroque exploration of the mysteries of Christian incarnation and resurrection in the devotional painting entitled *The Incredulity of St. Thomas* (1603) is striking for its caressing play on folds, textures, lights, and shadows to reveal an intensely (homo)erotic almost tantalising tactility. It invites the viewer to both feel and see that parallels Christ's voluntary piloting of the hesitant Thomas' fingers into the creviced folds of the bloodless post-Crucifixion wound beneath his nipple. The overpowering emotional resonance of the moment necessitates a suspension of the distancing sense of ocular vision to embrace the unconsciousness of peripheral vision and tactile immediacy. Thomas' astonishment thematises the startling reality effect of the image as his elbow protrudes towards the viewer's space, dissolving the picture plane.

Yet his quest for evidentiary proof about the salvation which leads him to penetrate Christ's corporeal surface remains incomplete, doomed to constant deferral;[3] failing to grasp the divine and secret essence of the Redeemer's dark interior (psychic) cavity. Absolute knowledge (like Platonic essence) is always unreachable, its core is unknowable, and thus the quest for truth is always interminable and endless. There always exists

---

[1] William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, IV.vi. 255-6.

[2] Ruth M. Stauffer, *Joseph Conrad: His Romantic Realism* (New York: Haskell House Publishers Limited, 1922), p. 74.

[3] According to St. John's Gospel (20:25) the apostle Thomas was unwilling to accept the truth of the Resurrection until he had thrust his hand into Christ's wounds: 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails and put my finger into the place of the nails and put my hand into his side, I will not believe.' The drama of disbelief that Caravaggio enacts in his painting is radically different from the Biblical version where Thomas' incredulity ends in a childlike affirmation of belief and faith: 'My Lord and my God'.

something more beyond what is already known, something always to be discovered. Hence the gaping hole in Christ's body acts as both the lure and unbreachable threshold that separates yet connects self with the other, signifier with referent. Despite its intense naturalism verging on *trompe l'oeil* (French for 'deceives the eye': use of perspective to create an illusion of three-dimensionality) the painting destabilises convictions about direct access to things-in-themselves by insisting that the internal workings of other minds is remote and inaccessible. The theistic context of the post-Tridentine (i.e. after 1563) painting questions the nature of certainty and of disenchanted faith as well, for what is most true is often least verifiable.

Significantly Thomas or Te'oma' means 'twin' in Aramaic and extra-canonical texts such as the Nag Hammadi scrolls often identified him as the brother of Jesus. From this perspective the painting hints at the teasing possibility of man's encounter with the profundity of his own subconscious deep self. Renaissance religious culture conceived human inwardness to be a privileged and (often dangerously) elusive truth: an absent presence interpreted to observers by ambiguous inklings and tokens. Despite its baroque lineage Caravaggio's painting participates in an anti-ocularcentric discourse to create a cognitive model that structures itself around the dichotomy between a fallible human vision and an inscrutable divine mystery. Caravaggio's religious scepticism links the imperviousness of the perceived other, whose mysterious interior can never be fully displayed, with a troubling corollary about the limitations of the perceiving subject as well. Certainly Caravaggio's insights were not new for the connection between social comprehension and spiritual hermeneutics was made a long time back by Augustine. The Church Father questioned man's denial of the veiled truths of Christianity even though lack of transparency was a feature that marked even the most intimate of social intercourses.

> Tell me, I ask you, with what eyes do you see your friend's will toward you? For, no will can be seen with bodily eyes. Or, indeed, do you also see in your mind that which is taking place in the mind of another?...Perhaps you will say that you see the will of another through his deeds? Then you will see acts and hear words, but of your friend's will you will believe that which cannot be seen or heard. The will is not color or figure that may be impressed upon the eyes; nor is it a sound or formula that may strike upon the ears; nor, indeed, is it yours to be felt by the affection of your heart. It follows, therefore, that, although it is not seen or heard or grasped inwardly by you, it is believed. Otherwise your life would be left

barren of any friendship, or love bestowed upon you would not be paid back by you in turn.[4]

What is also remarkable is the dramatic potential of the painted moment as Christ pulls back his mantle like a theatrical curtain, baring his breast and wound for visual and tactile inspection (almost akin to a peepshow). The dark space within which the four figures are positioned makes no reference to time or to a clearly defined external or even internal landscape, having instead the contours of a stage setting where they are actors. The transubstantiated Christ resists definitive interpretation functioning as a problematic signifier standing uneasily on the threshold of the critical *topoi* between word and flesh, substance and accidence, the spectacle of corporeal violence and the silence of textual mediation. Christ's body performs a double dislocation as a cultural symbol because it moves the ordinary human body into the sacred sphere, conversely it also transfers the concept of divinity to the banal domain of the human body. Thomas' hermeneutic quest for evidential proof is thus unable to arrest the wound's proliferating meaning or breach the conceptual gap between the mimetic and the representational. Christ's 'unruly' body symbolises a robust plenitude of meaning that tantalises the rational mind as the interpretive moment is infinitely displaced into the future. His body remains a sealed and veiled mystery 'always sought but completely inaccessible, an enigma which functions at once as pure symbol and pure presence, as vacant and as utterly productive place.'[5]

Likewise the vexed nature of the divine event under interrogation works out in miniature similar problems and paradoxes between 'real and represented presence',[6] which are also encountered within the theatre.[7] The stage too provides a cultural and

[4] Augustine, *On Faith in Things Unseen,* in *Writings of Saint Augustine,* ed. Roy Joseph Deferrari and Mary Francis McDonald (New York: Cima Publishing, 1947). Quoted in Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, p. 9.

[5] Paul Strohm, 'The Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*: Commemoration and Repetition in Late Medieval England', in *Performances of the Sacred in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Susanne Rupp and Tobias Döring (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), pp. 33-44: 36. Strohm's idea of 'hermeneutic surplus' is similar to what Stephen Greenblatt has regarded (in the context of the Eucharistic bread) as 'the problem of the leftover', or 'the status of the material remainder'. See Stephen Greenblatt, 'Remnants of the Sacred in Early Modern England', in *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 337-45. Jay Zysk's discussion of the dialectics between symbol and presence in connection with the Eucharist has influenced my understanding of Caravaggio. See Jay Zysk, 'Reforming Corporeality: Eucharistic Semiotics in Early Modern Drama', Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Brown University, 2011.

[6] See Anthony B. Dawson and Paul Yachnin, *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 27.

[7] Liturgy and theatre have shared a complex relationship from the time of the medieval mystery plays down to the post-Reformation anti-papist critiques of the Mass as *Hocus pocus* (troping on the Latin *Hoc est corpus meum* or 'This is my body'). Liturgy is an act of performance that takes as its central theme the relationship of Christ's body to humanity and the meeting of the earthly and the heavenly. See O. B. Hardison, *Christian*

aesthetic space where the relation between real and virtual, bodily presence and its rhetorical figuration, corporeal ambiguity and semiotic polysemy are uneasily worked out.[8] Early modern theatre (the word traces its etymological roots to the Greek *theastai* 'to see, to behold') was also implicated in anxieties about authenticity in its deliberate estrangement of fictional surface from truth, with plebeian actors concealing or refashioning their real identities to feign the status or gender of another.[9] Theatre was basically an act of cozening spectatorial faith that frustrated and falsified rhetorical claims through the manoeuvring of a system of signs: a counterfeiting of the terms of corporeal exteriors and interiors such that the body became a manipulable sign system.

The gap between the poverty of early modern theatrical resources and the dramatised situations further aggravated the relationship between spectacle and a truth imagined to be inward and invisible. Such chronic doubts about the adequacy of what could be seen tended to make the theatre an art of incompletion, absence, contingent knowledge, and ontological groundlessness: a form of visual display that flaunted the limits of its display[10] where 'Nothing is but what is not' and 'I am not what I am' and which 'requir'd' (that) 'You do awake your faith'.[11] English Renaissance theatrical method was thus essentially synecdochic, referring to events, objects, situations, and landscapes that could not be shown onstage and symbolised a classic crisis in social or ontological discernment (serving as an appropriate medium for displaying the problems of representing character interiority and audience cognition). Spectators had to employ partial and limited presentations as a basis for conjecture about what was undisclosed or technically undiscoverable. This latent interpretive perspicacity to decipher differences between the

---

Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1963) and Sarah Beckwith, *Signifying God: Social Relation and Symbolic Act in the York Corpus Christi Plays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). Early modern theatre often made use of the language and ritual actions of Catholicism and Protestantism with special emphasis on Eucharistic theology. See Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002). A useful account can also be found Timothy Rosendale, *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

[8] The Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre developed in circumstances that imparted an edge to its sceptical potential. As one of the dominant literary forms of the era theatre was inextricably implicated in a semiotic crisis produced by the topsy-turvy slippage between a reformed Protestantism and a waning Catholicism. Steven Mullaney comments on the Janus-like position of early modern theatre on the thresholds of physical and discursive spaces. It occupied buildings in the Liberties, both inside and outside London and the grasp of civic authority; professional theatre played subversively on work-leisure, appearance-being, and provided a home and royal livery for a bunch of strolling rogues. See Mullaney, *Place of the Stage.*

[9] Clothes acted as a trope for rhetorical dissimulation. See Madhavi Menon, *Wanton Words: Rhetoric and Sexuality in the English Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004).

[10] Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, p. 210.

[11] William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, I.iii.140-1; *Othello*, I.i.65; and *The Winter's Tale*, V.iii.94-5 respectively.

knowable and the unknowable also helped to create epistemological distinctions (in the theatre) between those who knew and those who did not.

The actions seen in Caravaggio's painting too are just a part of the story, the rest remains hidden: beyond vision except for the illuminating shaft of light (cellar lighting) from an invisible source that falls on the deeply engrossed characters, creating a dramatic tableau of scintillating lights and shadows. Implicit too is the appeal to suspend disbelief enjoined in Christ's words to his doubting disciple and the two other bedraggled apostles who look on with raised questioning brows: 'Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing' (John 20:27). Further, the underlying question of the nature of Christ's resurrection and his change from spiritual to corporeal (the Son of God made man) and back to spiritual[12] rehearses the economy of transformation and masquerading substitution[13] that drives the representational and illusory economy of Western theatre.

The dramatic interrogation of faith and love also unfolds between the feminised body of Christ[14] and the masculine body of Thomas as the inquisitor (which justifies its potential to act as a template for the interaction between the inscrutable Jonsonian rogue and his onstage and offstage specatators). The visual montage rehearses the persistent (patriarchal) anti-theatrical prejudice that has haunted Renaissance theatre especially its latent effeminacy and femininity and its potential to contaminate and infect viewers minds who could imitate what they saw on stage.[15] The complexities of intersubjective

---

[12] Theological arguments about the Incarnation have centered on the character of Christ's body especially its susceptibility to touch and his propensity to bleed. Such qualities helped to problematise doctrines of the incorruptible and thus bloodless body of the resurrected Christ.

[13] Theatrical substitution recalls Derrida's notion of the 'dangerous' supplement as an addition that 'intervenes or insinuates itself in-the-place-of.' 'Compensatory and vicarious, the supplement is an adjunct' that 'is not simply added to the positivity of a presence, it produces no relief, its place is assigned in the structure by the mark of an emptiness. Somewhere, something can be filled up *of itself*, can accomplish itself, only by allowing itself to be filled through sign and proxy. The sign is always the supplement of the thing itself.' See Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, p. 145.

[14] Christ was traditionally considered the most feminine of all men because he had no mortal father. In the painting Caravaggio foregrounds Christ's femininity through the carefully rendered diaphanous folds of his robe which reminded of the clothes worn by the Virgin in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century visual depictions. Further such a conception helps to ground the sensuous and unprudish exchange between *amor eroticus* (erotic love) and *amor divinus* (divine love) in baroque representations of Christ.

[15] Theatre's investment in touch whether real or metaphorical may have been one of the principal reasons behind the Puritan complaint about theatre's carnal sensuality. Puritan critics saw boy players in masks, gowns, and fans as positively wicked but also dangerously seductive. The Anglican cleric Stephen Gosson in *The School of Abuse* (1579; London: Reprinted for the Shakespeare Society, 1841) complained that theatre was likely to effeminise the mind and soften the responses of the audience, describing it as 'the very markets of bawdry', in *Plays Confuted in Five Actions* (1582; London: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1972). Four years later Philip Stubbes in *Anatomy of Abuses,* ed. Frederick J. Furnivall (1583; London: The New Shakespeare Society, 1877) feared that transvestite theatre could structurally transform men into women and topped it with the charge of sodomy. William Prynne in *Histriomastix* (1633) made a similar objection

comprehension tend to be more intricate in the oral medium of theatre since it is dictated by the conditions of performance, than other (written) literary forms which are composed with specific patrons in mind or can be enjoyed without any direct encounter between purveyor and consumer. Thomas' intersubjective encounter with Christ takes place through emphatic bodily actions and gestures that results in a structured dialectic between self and other in which difference and affinity, distance and proximity is negotiated in a sensuous move from sight to touch.

Caravaggio's painting also hints at the Counter-Reformation effort to re-establish the old *kath'holon* feeling of a *communio ecclesiatica et eucharista* that had been destroyed by the onslaught of Calvinistic Protestantism. Such efforts were doomed to fail in the long run and the painting thus partakes in the acute anxiety and distress that accompanied the solitary spiritual journey into the intricate and dreadful terrain of the body's interior conscience. It intersects with what Jonathan Miller and Jonathan Sawday[16] see as a seismic shift in seventeenth-century (body) science marked by a crisis of faith that turned thinking people into Doubting Thomases, determined to penetrate others' insides to find evidence for their beliefs. The probing g(r)aze of Thomas' finger rehearses the embodied materiality of the theatrical moment[17] which is both visual and tactile: it functions as the point where self and other tries to become one. Commenting on the new chiaroscurist (contrast of light and dark) and tenebrist (use of shadows) regime that marked the baroque where 'clarity endlessly plunges into obscurity', Gilles Deleuze adds:

> (I)n place of the white chalk or plaster that primes the canvas, Tintoretto and
> Caravaggio use a dark, red-brown background on which they place the thickest
> shadows, and paint directly by shading towards the shadows...Things jump out of

---

about the emasculating power of texts, lamenting that acted passion made men 'mimicall, histrionicall, [...] apish, amorous, and unmanly, both in their habites, gestures, speeches, complements, and their whole deportment: enervating and resolving the virility and vigour of their minds.' Quoted by Kristine Steenbergh, 'Emotion, Performance, and Gender in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*', in *Sexed Sentiments: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Gender and Emotion*, ed. Willemijn Ruberg, Kristine Steenbergh (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), pp. 92-116: 102. Resting on the biblical injunction (Deuteronomy 22:5) against cross-dressing religious anti-theatricalists were concerned at the possibility of costume altering the gender of the male body beneath it. See Laura Levine, *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[16] Jonathan Miller, 'The Pump: Harvey and the Circulation of Blood', in *Blood: Art, Power, Politics and Pathology*, ed. James M. Bradburne (Munich: Prestel, 2002), pp. 100-7, Sawday, *Body Emblazoned*.

[17] The Latin word for touch '*contingere*' lies at the root of modern words such as 'contact' and 'contiguity' and helps to shed light on the haptic nature of the theatre. In a different context Giuliana Bruno comments on the reversibility that characterises the shared contact of haptic experience: 'The haptic...allows us to come into contact with people and the surface of things. Thus, while the basis of touch is a reaching out...it also implies the reverse: that is, being touched in return. This reciprocal condition can be extended to a representational object as well...' See Giuliana Bruno, *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film* (London: Verso, 2002), p. 9.

the background, colors spring from the common base that attests to their obscure nature, figures are defined by their covering more than their contour.[18]

Combining Mannerist perspective with baroque dramatic alternation of solid lights and deep darks enabled the creation of an illusion of indeterminate space and solid forms that remained partially concealed and partially revealed.[19] The shadow always implies the presence of light; the transparency of dark areas and the opacity of light areas created three-dimensional contrasts between the void of interior psychic experience and exterior material life. In another of Caravaggio's paintings entitled *St. John the Baptist in the Wilderness* (c. 1604) the figure of the brightly illuminated Baptist has dark shadows traversing and invading its opaque solidity, thus imparting a sense of mystery and ambiguity to the figure. The darkness of the eye sockets or the layered fabric folds[20] hint at the darkness of an internal drama of the soul, a stirring reminder of the dynamic subjective space that lurks within (darkness and shadow interpreted in the sense of 'privation' or 'diminution'). Similarly the circular interplay of intensifying contrasts and shadows in *Narcissus* (1599) helps to present the inner subjectivity of the self-absorbed figure gazing at the pool. Such techniques helped to sustain the ontological illusion of 'divided selves' that remain not 'fully and clearly represented, but partially hidden',[21] torn between interior conscience and public conformity.[22]

---

[18] Gilles Deleuze, *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*, trans. Tom Conley (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), pp. 31-2. Caravaggio's paintings usually had warm, brownish backgrounds that would have been composed of pigments such as red earth, yellow ochre, umber, and white lead. When this pigment mixture was glazed with a dark transparent layer it created an illusion of deep spaces or dark receding passages.

[19] The light within baroque visual art comes from an undefined source outside of the space of the painting, not from the space occupied by the viewer which produces a sense of both enigmatic absence and intimate presence. Further the 'discovery of darkness' was an essential innovation in painting around 1600. Whereas late medieval Christian theology had assigned a negative meaning to darkness in its association with 'evil, negation, non-being and sin', by the end of the sixteenth century darkness in the visual arts took on a positive value artistically and psychologically, reinforcing the intense light that was distinctive of the paintings of the period. See M. Rzepinska and K. Malcharek, 'Tenebrism in Baroque Painting and Its Ideological Background', *Artibuas et Historiae*, vol. 7, no. 13, 1986, pp. 91-112: 92, 97. Source: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1483250

[20] Drapery forms and folds conceal but also suggests that which is hidden, it constitutes the point where distinctions between inside and outside blur. See Anne Hollander, *Fabric of Vision: Dress and Drapery in Painting* (London: National Gallery Company Limited, 2002) and Gen Doy, *Drapery: Classicism and Barbarism in Visual Culture* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2002).

[21] See Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance and Baroque*, trans. Kathrin Simon, introd. Peter Murray (1888, London: Collins, 1964). Wölfflin was one of the earliest writers on the subject of the baroque. He characterised baroque style as 'painterly' by which he meant that which was animated, giving an illusion of movement, of light and shade as different objects seem to project or recede in space. See also Erwin Panofsky, 'What is Baroque?' in *Three Essays on Style*, ed. Irving Lavin (1934; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 17-88.

[22] No other age was as profoundly affected by the 'axiology of darkness and shadows' as this particular era. The Jesuit and the Reformed Carmelite Orders (compare the 'dark ecstasy' of St. Teresa and the 'night of dark faith' of St. John of the Cross, the latter of whom was influenced by the writings of Dionysus the Areopagite) recommended darkness as conducive to contemplation and thus a positive value in spiritual

Given theatre's cognitive investment in the afflictions and satisfactions that attend upon the difference between an unexpressed (genuine) interior and a theatricalised (fabricated) exterior, I suggest that it made significant contributions to the representation and construction of the early modern 'inward' subject. It also presented an experimental forum for expressing new modes of social relations and identity formations. Theatrical impersonation flowed into real life as people performed their official roles or capacities and presented themselves for scrutiny by others. Performance and role playing were a normal part of early modern social experience and exchange (*orbis theatrum mundi*). Inward truth may have been an intrinsically religious concept but not all of the cultural settings in which it was articulated were theological. Theatre was a cultural institution that clarified and complicated Renaissance paradigms for a treacherous but invisible reality, driven by chronic doubts about the adequacy of what could be seen and what remained hidden ('wee shall marre all, if once we ope the mysteries/O' the Tyring-house, and tell what's done within').[23] It was predicated upon the discovery of inward truth through disclosure, yet unspoken intentions and unacted desires lost their currency once they were revealed, so Renaissance playwrights were compelled to maintain a very fine balance between depth and surface to sustain theatrical vraisemblance.

The theatrical self emerged at the locus of a vanishing point where visible markers faded into interior essence. Lacking a well-defined rubric for expressing 'modern' complexities of psychological realism, early modern cultural discourses (such as the anatomy lesson or the voyage of discovery) often appealed to the difference between appearance andreality through the use of techniques of deception, evasion, indirection, paradox, linguistic obfuscation or the withholding of vital information to convey an illusory sense of inward depth that could not be overtly manifested.[24] As one of the many knowledge-producing practices of the era, theatre too made use of parallel discursive

---

life. This tendency was exacerbated through an acquaintance with Judaic mysticism where God was supposed to dwell in darkness and where both darkness and light were his attributes. Baroque painting was marked by its artistic appreciation for the positive values of darkness. The new astronomy laid importance on phenomena such as the solar eclipse and lunar phases. Such positive appraisals of darkness also seem indicative of a profound intellectual revolution. See Rzepinska and Malcharek, 'Tenebrism in Baroque Painting and Its Ideological Background', p. 112.

[23] Jonson, *The Magnetic Lady*, IV.vii.42-3. It is possible that the 'Tyring-house' or the attiring-room usually referred to an alcove covered by a curtain that could be pulled back to reveal a particular scene, giving an impression of a concealed interior space.

[24] A number of works written in the first few years of the seventeenth century revolved around the use of deceptive strategies. These were Jonson's *The Silent Woman*, Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and George Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*. See Victor Oscar Freeburg, *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama: A Study in Stage Tradition* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965) and Bertrand Evans, *Shakespeare's Comedies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).

techniques (eavesdropping, deliberate misstatements, incongruities or inconsistencies of motivation, asides, and monologues) for indicating psychological agency and inner thought. These perplexing fluctuations between flatness and depth or transparency and obscurity engaged the spectator in an affectively intimate relationship of erotic exchange with the stage. Such mechanisms enabled the audience to treat dramatic characters as 'real' people who possessed a modicum of interiority rather than as mere ciphers.

<div align="center">

II

Negotiating Privacy in Jonson

</div>

Jonson's (1572-1637) oeuvre especially his middle plays are imbued with an explicit Caravaggesque realism[25] and a baroque-inspired *Weltanschauung*: a penchant for change and movement, an emphasis on creative ingenuity, and radical doubt, a world of spectacular illusionistic interior spaces and protean deceit where one dissimulates what is and simulates what is not. At the same time both the creators' penchant for intellective cognition and abstract reasoning, devaluation of sensual seduction or primitive illusionism in favour of literate understanding implicates them in an ascendant scientific or rationalistic worldview. The dubious distinction of having killed men in duels/brawls was perhaps not the only common thread that bound these two alcoholic geniuses. Their work was also implicated in a major paradigm shift that witnessed the vacillation of traditional guiding principles such as the transparent revelation of the scriptures or the validity of reason, gradual dissolution of the classic idealist trust in vision, a crumbling of the certainties and beliefs associated with the unified humanist subject and a shift towards relativistic and sceptical versions of truth and reality.

Caravaggio's visual tableau partakes in the effort to separate the sacred from the profane and achieve a proper participation in the divine through the senses. Interestingly enough, sensory discourses and affective practices are gradually becoming the subject of a burgeoning field in the humanities today. From the late Middle Ages, religious reform

---

[25] The influence can be stretched in the other direction as well, for some of Caravaggio's characters seem almost like caricatures out of Jonsonian plays. Consider for example the grimacing weather-beaten bearded figure in *The Cardsharps* (c. 1595). The situation itself is reminiscent of the gulling episodes that were the hallmark of Jonson's workmanship. Caravaggio received his training in Milan and was deeply influenced by the painters of Lombardy and the Venuto who were well known for their 'lighting' experiments. Translations of Italian studies on perspective, lights, shadows, and mirrors circulated in Jonsonian England too, as for instance Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo's *Trattato dell'arte de Pittura, Scultura, et Architectura* (Milan: per Paolo Gottardo Pontio, 1585) and Salomon de Caus's *La perspective, avec la raison des ombres et miroirs* published at Oxford in 1611.

movements led to a reappraisal of the senses (with its gradual valorisation of 'higher' vision and hearing and denigration of 'lower' touch, smell, and taste) as portals for experiencing and communicating with the divine, registering the beginnings of a shift towards more 'interior' or abstract forms of religiosity. Sensation played a crucial role in the doctrinal disputes of the Reformation and in the shaping of new devotional practices and theologies. The senses permitted knowledge of the material and spiritual universe, linking inner and outer, visible and invisible worlds.

It may not be out of place to tender the suggestion that the disordered state of the sensory apparatus during this era and Christianity's problematic engagement with the material world at this time help to place in perspective Jonson's famed religious apostasy (see footnote 82): idolatry and heresy involved both body and mind. Equally significantly it also raises the problem of literary representation in Jonson, especially the act of viewing and its connections with the higher contemplative faculties of the soul. Post-Tridentine art laid primary importance on eliciting emotional responses from the viewer (strengthening affective ties in specific communal or corporate settings) in contrast to its 'cerebral' potential to instruct. Jonsonian ethics and aesthetics are inextricably linked, I feel to the discourse of sensory discipline common to both traditionalists and reformists. They manifest the problem of the relic in an age of emergent print capitalism: between the corporeality of 'real presence' and the abstraction of 'represented absence'.

The larger concerns about identity, empirically verifiable experiences, authenticity, dissidence, intellectual doubt or freedom of thought addressed in *The Incredulity of St. Thomas* were the general concerns of the age and Jonson was not immune to them. In effect I have used Caravaggio's painting to introduce many of the concerns which were vital for the age and which I suggest help to position Jonson as playwright and thinker of his times. By eliding its theological trappings the theatricality of the painting might well recall the comical scenes of make-believe trickery between urban doppelgängers and their naive or distrustful victims that abound in Jonson's plays. Further, the painting serves to foreground the viewer's position, stimulating his curiosity by drawing him into the scene and questioning his critical distance from the tableau, even as it offers him metatheatrical cues to understand the gravity of the scene and negotiate the density of the interactions being portrayed. Similarly Jonson's intense investment in audience-engaging strategies that stress the fictional nature of the play was novel in its own day, almost an anticipation of Bertolt Brecht's *Verfremsdungeffekt* or Alienation Effect.

Alienation Effect is a typically modern invention that Brecht used primarily in its performative context to define a set of innovative formal techniques designed to distance or estrange the audience from passive empathetic involvement with characters or their ideologies through jolting reminders of the constructed artificiality of the acted play. Thus he used explanatory captions or illustrations projected on a screen, actors stepping out of character to sing songs or lecturing the audience that there is no fourth wall to aggressively draw attention to the play-making process itself and ensure that the audience did not lose itself emotionally in the drama. Yet this is to discount how something very similar is also to be found in seventeenth-century drama, nonetheless what distinguishes it from its Brechtian counterpart is its ideational context rather than its formal effect. Early modern theatre was not the realistic 'drawing room' drama of the nineteenth century; its materially bare stage devoid of realistic props and contrivances; jostling crowds, cross-dressed actors, and daylight performances would have at any rate stood as inevitable reminders of the non-illusionistic artificiality of the play.

Rather what is significant is the intellectual rather than the structural resonance of introducing a sudden change in the dramatic conventions through which the action of the play was presented. Seventeenth-century metatheatre emerged as the ideological response to a long history of anti-theatricality. Playwrights used it to ruminate on the changing nature of the theatrical medium and its representational techniques in what was undoubtedly one of the most decisive junctures in dramatic art. Critical distancing involved a shattering of the delusion that the play was a self-contained spectacular show that bore no relation to life either through overt techniques such as direct addresses to the audience by the actor or covertly through the introduction of metadramatic references and metaphors related to the play-within-the-play. While such methods did help to deflate credulity and convince the audience of the deceptive nature of the visual display, more significantly such detachment enacted an interrogation of the visual reality of lived experience to comment on the illusoriness of life itself. The metaphor of the world as stage was a typical baroque theme which like the allied motifs of the mirror or *trompe l'oeil* ceilings and paintings played upon the hybridity of space and the fluidity of borders to examine the ambiguous perceptual distinction between 'real-seeming pretence and reality'.

In her book *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*, Anne Righter (Barton) has demonstrated how of all the playwrights writing during this time, Shakespeare displayed the most conscious and also grim awareness of the play metaphor. She concentrates on the figure

of the 'Player-Kings of the flawed rule' such as Macbeth, Henry IV, and Richard III to illustrate the contrast between their real selves and assumed parts.[26] Shakespeare used dramaturgical reflexivity to suspend dramatic illusion and set up a conceptual mirror to illuminate the theatrical nature of the workaday world. Yet in Shakespeare, metadrama is also a characteristic facet of psychological self-consciousness (as in *Hamlet*), the microcosm of the theatrical moment compelling attention to the existential reality by which it is circumscribed. Metatheatre undermined the simple mimetic logic of verisimilitude to reveal the discrepancy between the pretence of the enacted self and the authenticity of inner character – a subject that had charged relevance in an era concerned with the anxious circumspection of performed socio-political and religious identities. Thus Shakespeare used moments of theatrical self-consciousness to point metaphysically towards a more general sense of epistemological unease arising from a growing feeling about the contradictions inherent in the abyss of human nature. At the structural level he also used metatheatre to challenge the spectator to maintain a precarious balance between emotional and intellectual responses: to judge without sentimentality and empathise with those being judged.

Middleton deployed the same device to problematise spectatorial response to onstage characters. He used estrangement as a compelling theatrical tool to throw into relief the ambiguity of the audience's emotional reaction to amoral characters such as Tangle in *The Phoenix* (1603) and Harry Dampit in *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1605). Despite the misdeeds of the unqualified pseudo-lawyer in the earlier play and the prevailing anti-law sentiment it is impossible not to sympathise with his hardship or to be comically entertained by his knavish onstage dealings. Middleton fleshes out his character by including reasons for the lawyer's vexatious impulses that reveals an insecure life caught up in life's vicissitudes. The metadramatic merger of theatrical fiction with lived reality is registered by the notorious usurer Dampit in the latter play. Swapan Chakravorty points out how his presence within the comedy is dictated by the circumstances of 'social fact'[27] if not by plot exigencies. Middleton dilutes the nature of the audience's delight in his trickery by using Dampit to set off the social anxieties associated with an unscrupulous man who makes his fortune by exploiting on others naivety and greed: 'That such a man is a usurer like Lucre and Hoard, and that he lives by cunning like Witgood and the Courtesan, sour our enjoyment of their tricks rather than save them from moral

---

[26] Anne Righter (Barton), *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961).

[27] Chakravorty, *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton*, p. 60.

scrutiny.'[28] His structural unwieldiness is probably signalled by the fact that he 'remains outside the web of trick and counter-trick, the only guest who does not make it to Hoard's wedding'.[29]

If Shakespeare used metatheatricality to aid the playgoers' interpretation of the play, the same cannot be said about Jonson who used it to manipulate and disrupt the spectators' knowledge and expectation of accepted staging practices with the intent of deceiving them. Moreover the moral relativism and ironic detachment that characterised Middletonian comedy would have been alien to Jonson's caustically didactic temperament. Concerned with the social nature and function of theatrical art, he used the poetics of lying implicit in metadrama to affirm the veracity of real life and individual identity against the conventional metatheatrical argument that equated living with role-playing. Jonsonian self-reflexive dramaturgy was primarily oriented towards teaching a specific kind of spectatorial stance; geared towards engaging and transforming their social conscience.

He used metatheatre to create ruptures in the unity of the spectatorial position, encouraging them to explore the layered levels of reality and interpretation that resulted from the skill of the rogue characters in breaking the dramatic frame and performing roles both as actor and playwright. Like Middleton Jonson used the trickster's verbal *trompe l'oeil* as a lesson in metatheatrical hermeneutics, tutoring his spectators about the dangers of affective engagement at the cost of intellectual alienation. The extensive prologues, epilogues, inductions that frame Jonsonian drama rehearse those liminal metatheatrical moments when drama moved beyond its margins to hand over authority to the audience in the effort to legitimise it. The urgency with which Jonson appealed to audience judgment to harvest aesthetic authority and artistic recognition for as a yet undefined profession and art was unparalleled in this era.

Yet if Caravaggio's conflict between faith and scepticism tries to make a haptic appeal towards private conscience and interior consciousness (embracing the dark light of faith) – which reaches its Biblical culmination in Thomas' childlike exclamation (John 20:28): 'My Lord and my God' – Jonson's stance is strikingly more progressive (proto-empiricist perhaps) in its endorsement of reason, rather than untested belief to distinguish between

---

[28] Chakravorty, *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton*, p. 60.
[29] Ibid., p. 61.

appearance and truth. In Jonson's case the theatrical lens[30] dazzles and distorts rather than presenting a clear and tranquil perspective on the truth of the world: subverting and decentring the unified subject of (monocular) vision constructed by the dominant ocular regime. Simultaneously they also aim at a truthful but exaggeratedly inverted representation of reality that opened the 'critical' eye to innumerable visual deceptions informing life and the possibility of a multiplicity of perceptions and a plurality of spatial planes: combining two ocular orders in a single planar space. Their physical paths may not have crossed yet Caravaggio and Jonson were roughly contemporaries (though the former's life was cut short by an untimely death in 1610 at the age of 39 while the latter rose to prominence, lost popularity, suffered a stroke, and died in relative obscurity) who were implicated in a series of epistemic shifts that were eventually to culminate in the dominant scopic system identified with the Enlightenment.[31] The larger process of denarrativisation of the world from the textual towards the figural[32] intersected with a wide variety of other changes afflicting early modern life such as steady urbanisation, rise of modern socio-moral mores, gradual commoditisation of art,[33] ascent of print culture, proto-capitalism, and the emergence of modern science.[34]

---

[30] The typical mirror of the baroque was not the flat reflecting mirror which was often seen to be vital in the development of the rationalised perspective but rather the anamorphic mirror -'strange glasses' as Giambattista della Porta was to call them in his 1589 treatise *Magiae Naturalis* (Aubrii & Schleichius, 1619)- whether concave mirrors or convex lenses, that distorted the visual image. Anamorphosis derives from the Greek *ana* (again) and *morphe* (form). It was developed by Leonardo da Vinci in 1485 and along with the *camera obscura* continued to be popular well into the eighteenth century, with Hans Holbein's *The Ambassadors* (1533) being one of its best known exemplars. See Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), p. 48.

[31] The impending rationalisation of sight was triggered by a number of socio-political, technical and aesthetic innovations. One of its sources was apparently the elaborate courtly rituals of display for marking social hierarchy that devalued the more intimate senses of touch and smell in favour of the remoteness of vision. See Elias, *Civilizing Process*. Although the court with the king at its centre was assumed to be at the centre of a vast network of visual channels through which subjects were perpetually on view yet in course of time the power and autonomisation of the visual to control behaviour could become increasingly depersonalised. This was most pertinently seen in the growing relevance of the idea of the king's two bodies. See Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*.

[32] Within art, this process was marked by the Renaissance invention of the illusion of perspective (derives from Latin *perspicere* 'to see through'), a technique for rendering three-dimensional space onto the two dimensional surface of the flat canvas. Filippo Brunelleschi's breakthrough invention rendered space as an ordered, uniform system of abstract linear coordinates. Multiple vantage points were replaced by the disembodied, impassive monocular gazing eye of the beholder as the static centre of the visible world.

[33] The use of perspective coincided with a view of visual arts as a detached commodity available for capitalist circulation, to be sold and possessed for its exchange value.

[34] The new science (which displaced natural magic, astrology, and alchemy) emerged with Nicholas Copernicus, Johannes Kepler, Galileo, and culminated in Descartes and Isaac Newton. Their cosmology broke the ties between science and sensory perception. By placing the sun, not the earth at the centre of the universe, it contradicted the veracity of any claims that were based on sensory perception. Developments in optical physics and anatomy changed the concept of visual reality forever.

Many of these changes have already been outlined in the previous chapters; my particular interest lies in Jonson's use of the rogue to engage in a dialogue with emerging subjective impulses and codes of privacy (in the sense of inner contemplative life and domestic intimacy) as a function of the baroque mentality within a growing discourse of scientific objectivity and philosophical scepticism.[35] Such negotiations shifted uneasily between the twin poles of grotesque perversions of the private disengaged subject (reminiscent of the classical *idioteis*) in the figure of the secretive rogue-artist ('I haue no wife, no parent, child, allie' or 'I feare, I shalle begin to grow in loue/With my deare selfe')[36] or a critique of emerging codes of monogamous sexual intimacy or idealised closeness centred on the nuclear family on one hand and his growing appreciation for the solitary intellectual pleasures and friendly camaraderie of private life on the other, especially apparent in his Roman plays and non-dramatic works: 'Nor for my peace will I go farre,/As wandrers doe, that still doe rome,/But make my strengths, such as they are,/Here in my bosome, and at home.'[37] By interrogating the viability of the growing insularity between private and public and his subsequent use of such demarcations for his own artistic purposes, Jonson's work feeds into the contemporary dilemma regarding the cultural ambivalence of privacy and psychological interiority in the Renaissance.[38]

Jonson confirmed the early modern anxious suspicion of and hostility to privacy (interpreted as a marker of low social status and implying loss of full human personhood)[39] by showing the secret dangers that lurked in household 'dark corners' and

---

[35] Renaissance scepticism was part of the general movement to seek scientific explanations for natural phenomena. The most influential form of scepticism in the sixteenth century was Pyrrhonian associated with the Greek sceptic Sextus Empiricus whose Latin translations were published as early as 1520. Stanley Cavell notes the close links between the rise of scepticism and the growth of privacy: 'This privacy is expressed in philosophy as a catastrophe of knowledge. It may be thought of as the skeptical isolation of the mind from the body, simultaneously a sense that everything is closed to, occluded in, human knowledge...and at the same time that everything is open to human knowledge.' See Stanley Cavell, *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 224.

[36] Jonson, *Volpone*, I.i.73; III.i.1-2. Jonson's devious protagonists are marked by courtly liberal sexual mores: a reactive stance to the gradual bourgeois puritan tightening up of sexual morals in the seventeenth century. The dissolute and disbanded households of Jonson's comedies are however in contrast to the country house poems and masques where the home is a valued locus of security and comfort.

[37] Jonson, 'To the World: A Farewell for a Gentle-woman, virtuous and noble', *The Forest* IV, ll. 65-8.

[38] Jonson's plays intersect with the shift in the prototypical meaning of home from extended household with its kinship bonds, village, or town of a person's origin to the smaller and larger units of individual domestic household and nation. See Crane, *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory*, p. 45. The family's ties to a larger community of kinship, clientage, and neighbourhood weakened at the expense of growing intimacy within the home.

[39] Compare Antony's petition to Octavius Caesar to 'let him breathe between the heavens and earth,/A private man in Athens.' (*Antony and Cleopatra*, III.xii.14-15) Apart from its association with a sense of lack signified in its etymological association with Latin *privatus*, seventeenth-century privacy was suspected of complicity with all sorts of vice such as adultery, political intrigue, and flattery (See Chapter II). Thus Jonson's dramatised interior spaces are mediated by corruption of both mind and body.

'inner closets' as also in the person of devious household servants or close friends who turn out to be less than loyal. The early modern state remained wary of the internal activities of private households insofar as they could become sites for government resistance. The private space of the chamber ('seat of false-hood, and this caue of cos'nage')[40] was both a locus of economic (as an expensive sign of wealth and status) and sexual (associated with unruly desire and immorality) anxiety. The notion of a concealed life contrasts with the various modes of intellectual autonomy celebrated by Jonson.[41]

All three plays examined in this dissertation critique and interrogate the value accorded to the home as a site of freedom, affection, and choice in contrast to the public domain of politics, necessity, and order. Jonsonian ethics remained sceptical of the uses of secrecy and deception for conspiratorial purposes with the late sixteenth century being infamously associated with secret intrigues such as the Ridolfi Plot (1571), the Guise Plan (1583), and the Babington Conspiracy (1586).[42] Affirming the early modern distortion of privacy to devious secrecy and political inexplicitness (privacy and hence secret knowledge was considered a threat to the law, government, and general order of things)[43] Jonson commented satirically on those hidden forms of social intercourse invented and perpetuated by people for self-serving ends. The sanctity of patron-client service ties or domestic bonds between father-son, husband-wife are destroyed as conflicting interests are pursued under a show of mutual concern. Jonsonian perversions of introspective and domestic privacy are a function of his moral and ethical agenda against disguising in general and of the radical, unprincipled estrangement of internal truth from external manifestation in particular.

His vision of urban decay set against a backdrop of greedy speculation, unreliable investment, and profiteering[44] turned upon the larger anxiety of morally deviant

---

[40] Jonson, *Alchemist*, V.v.115.

[41] Shakespeare uses a similar idea in Sonnet no. 62: 'Sin of self-love possesseth all mine eye,/And all my soul and all my every part;/And for this sin there is no remedy,/It is so grounded inward in my heart.'

[42] *Volpone* was composed in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot when the hunt for Jesuit sympathisers had created treacherous undercurrents in society. A particular Catholic priest was wanted for questioning in connection with the so-called papist controversy of the plot and Jonson had agreed to contact the priest on behalf of the Privy Council. On 8 November, 1605 he wrote to the Earl of Salisbury that he was unable to communicate with the priest in question and expressed outrage that any person of Catholic faith could contemplate such a heinous attack on the established authority of England. In *Volpone* he poked fun at the anti-conspiratorial mindset that had emerged in the wake of the Plot. Throughout his life he remained sufficiently distanced from such state-sponsored paranoia.

[43] Secrecy threatened order and therefore was considered a punishable offence against the government. Confession was considered a civic obligation under penalty of law. The suppression or concealment of information became a capital offense. In a practical sense however privacy was only a criminal offence for the poorer and lower classes.

[44] See L. C. Knights, *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1937).

(marginalised) others infiltrating and colonising public space (see Chapter III), creating monstrous parodies of protected domesticity (the rich tactility of Jonson's suspect and unstable interiors often engender vice or aberration evinced for instance in the abnormality of Volpone's freakish family comprised of his 'sons' Nano, Androgyno, and Castrone), conviviality (the unholy alliance of Face, Subtle, and Dol Common in *The Alchemist*), and conjugal bliss (Corvino's pandering of Celia in *Volpone*, the marriage of convenience between Quarlous and Dame Purecraft in *Bartholomew Fair*).[45] It is plausible that Jonson's scheming tricksters' stage a scathing parody of the Protestant reconfiguration of the new private realm through the revamping of moral values and privatisation of the family at the same time as they exploit it for their nefarious purposes. Lawrence Stone has documented the shift that took place during this time from a medieval model of the family which privileged property-based marriage alliances amongst the aristocracy to the modern nuclear family and the conjugal couple.[46] Sexuality was gradually channelled into the consolidated and normative (abstract) institution of 'holy matrimony' (see Chapter II) as all irregular (and corporeal) sexual forms (concubinage, chastity, incest, and homosexuality) were steadily eliminated or forced underground.

At the other end of the spectrum the most frequent targets of Jonsonian satire are ludicrously uncontrolled 'public' men on display (such as Sir Amorous La Foole, Sir John Daw in *The Silent Woman* or Bartholomew Cokes in *Bartholomew Fair*) who are unable to distinguish between the blindness and futility of theatrical role-playing and reality. Jonson himself admitted in an almost Neostoic vein that,

> I have considered, our whole life is like a Play: wherein every man, forgetfull of himselfe, is in travaile with expression of another. Nay, wee so insist in imitating others, as wee cannot (when it is necessary) returne to our selves: like Children, that imitate the vices of *Stammerers* so long, till at last they become such; and make the habit to another nature, as it is neuer forgotten.
>
> (*Timber, or Discoveries*, ll. 1093-9)

The man who was unable to choose and cultivate one single role was like the mimicking child or ape, since he lacked reason and the knack to take the right course of action. Acting involved an irresponsible surrender of identity and was used by those who

---

[45] According to Christopher Hill, early modern British subjects sought refuge in their homes in response to the disruptive force of capitalism. Home life was developed by the middle classes in town and country 'whose houses began to replace churches as the centres of social life.' See Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London: Panther Books, 1969), pp. 487-8.
[46] Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage in England.*

were unsatisfied with their lot. The role-player who tried to live in 'parts' (both literally and metaphorically) other than his own was a vicious and immoral individual; he ultimately mistook the public mask for the real authentic self.[47] Deception rose from several factors – pride, ambition, insincerity or villainy – but in all cases they were associated with lack of self-knowledge, failure of identity, and the inability to comprehend the world. Jonson's drama reflected 'the horror of a self too often shifted, a self which risks the loss of an inner poise. It reflects this horror even as it portrays...the whirlwind virtuosos of such multiplication.'[48] Those who are too involved with exteriors were always implicated in the folly depicted onstage:

> Beware to bring such appetites to the stage,
>
> They doe confesse a weake, sick, queasie age,
>
> And a shrew'd grudging too of ignorance,
>
> When clothes and faces 'boue the men aduance.

<div align="right">(Prologue to The New Inn, ll. 17-20)</div>

In his commonplace book *Timber, or Discoveries* (published posthumously in 1640-1) too he expressed disdain for those who valued externals – 'Some love any Strumpet (be shee never so shop-like, or meritorious) in good clothes' (*Discoveries,* ll. 317-18) – blinding themselves to real, inner values through an unthinking embrace of lower impulses. Jonson considered opinion (since it mistakes the false image of reality for the truth)[49] to be hostile to fact and given his brush with authority on a number of occasions, he developed a deep distrust of those 'politique Picklocke[s] of the Scene'/'narrow-ey'd decipherers' who in the name of surveillance would search his public utterances for private subversive meanings.

In contrast to sinister interiority or the speciousness of external theatrics Jonson's idealistically wise and virtuous characters (on the lines of satirist-figures such as Asper/Macilente, Crites, and Horace)[50] are constant, honest, and self-sufficient:

---

[47] Jonson's suspicion of proliferating identities is unmistakably Platonic. In Book III of *The Republic* Plato condemned poetic stories dealing with gods disguising themselves on the logic that God was least liable to change into other forms since divinity implied perfection.

[48] Thomas M. Greene, 'Ben Jonson and the Centred Self', *SEL*, vol. 10, 1970, pp. 325-48: 344.

[49] '*Opinion* is a light, vaine, crude, and imperfect thing,/settled in the Imagination; but never arriving at the under/standing, there to obtaine the tincture of *Reason*. Wee/labour with it more then Truth' (*Discoveries*, ll. 43-6). The second part of the masque entitled *Hymenaei* presents a conflict between the stoic virtuosity of Truth and the vicious concealment of Opinion.

[50] Even the satirist's implication in the culture that he exposes lends a dark side to his personality: 'There is always, however, a darker side to his nature, a private personality which the author may or may not allow his satirist to discuss openly, and this personality is, like the public personality, consequent upon the satirist's functions in satire. As a result of his violent attacks on vice, he acquires a number of unpleasant

committed to follow truth and nature ('Truth is man's proper good; and the onely immortall thing, was given to our mortality to use') (*Discoveries*, l. 531-2) in a perfect correspondence between motive and behaviour. Such a classic stoic and humanist ideal often emerges in his encomiastic verse: 'Thou rather striv'st the matter to possesse,/And elements of honour, then the dresse' ('To Sir Henry Nevil', *Epigram* CI, ll. 9-10). His advice to a friend is, 'That whatsoever face thy fate puts on,/Thou shrinke or start not; but be alwayes one' ('An Epistle to a Friend to Persuade Him to the Wars', *The Underwood XV*, ll. 185-6). Lacking histrionic powers these subjectively 'transparent' characters often reject the play-acting world to embrace a responsible life centred in the home, for the self is not to be found in exteriorities.[51]

Jonson's presentation of both positive and negative aspects of private life can be contextualised within the changing valorisation of privacy as a function of inspired contemplation. This may have gradually led him to adapt it to his own purposes; likening imaginative creativity, especially in his poems, to an anatomical retreat into the recesses of the closed female (maternal) body (for instance in imploring his muse to 'Sleep in a Virgins bosome without feare').[52] Jonson's growing awareness of the value of the private as a more authentic and authoritative domain, possessed by every person (unlike his membership of public space) irrespective of class, rank or confessional identity, and set apart from the social engagements of the public sphere may have brought about a more pluralist approach to personhood and spatiality.

---

characteristics which make suspect his pose of a simple lover of plain truth.' See Alvin B. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*, Yale Studies in English, 142 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), p. 22. Quoted by Cory Grewell, *Subversive Merit: The Revision of the Classical Clever Slave as Witty Servant and Social Satirist in the Comedies of Ben Jonson*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, 2008, *Proquest* (UMI Number: 3315423), p. 206, n. 2.

[51] The Renaissance need to understand and be constant to the self was ultimately inspired by the quest for self-knowledge which was basic to Greek moral philosophy. Prominent Elizabethan thinkers who stressed on inner understanding and its relevance for understanding the external (the Socratic *nosce te ipsum* or know thyself), included amongst others Sir Thomas Elyot (*The Book Named the Governor*, 1531) and Sir Philip Sidney (*Apology for Poetry*, 1595).

[52] 'Epistle to My Lady Covell', in *The Underwood* LXXV, l. 15. For an interesting discussion on the seventeenth-century male poets' rhetorical appropriation of women's bodies see Elizabeth D. Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (New York: Routledge, 1992), especially pp. 76-115. Maus also deals with the analogies between mental creativity and bodily fecundity in the chapter entitled 'A Womb of his Own: Male Renaissance Poets in the Female Body', pp. 182-209 in her book *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Jonson laconically unveils his inmost self, comparing his body to a fragile (Lucretian) jar that bears its invisible cargo across the hazardous seas of life: 'Well, with mine owne fraile Pitcher, what to doe/I have decreed; keepe it from waves, and presse;/Lest it be justled, crack'd, made nought, or lesse:/Live to that point I will, for which I am man,/And dwell as in my Center, as I can' ('An Epistle Answering to One That Asked to Be Sealed of the Tribe of Ben', in *The Underwood* XLVII, ll. 56-60). The gender violence implicit in such a scenario is a comment on who ultimately has the right to produce and possess knowledge, a process evident in the government's right (then and today) to intrude into the privacy of the less privileged lot to expose their 'indiscretions' and bring into public view private acts through indictment, trial, prosecution, and execution.

Privacy's new found status as a privileged space of intimate security set apart from social surveillance or political and religious turmoil may have led him to posit the home (domestic concern being also a legacy bequeathed by Roman New Comedy) as a locus of rooted stability, continuity, repose, and harmony.[53] Ian Donaldson asserts that no dramatist before Jonson has been able to fully explore the psychology of urban indoor living[54] yet Jonsonian houses remained troubled heterotopic spaces (especially in their intersections with the public domain) marked by the fear of betrayal and suffering. Very often the cost of domestic secession came at the expense of social death: 'Wise child, did'st hastily returne,/And mad'st thy Mother's wombe thine urne.'[55] One recalls how Renaissance *otium* or the celebration of the contemplative life lived away from the stress of politics and business could also refer to a life of inactivity, idleness, and lust.[56]

A similar impasse emerges in his critique of women who defied the ethical ideal of the private housewife and prevented men from achieving their public calling. Conversely his status as a 'patronage poet', often entailed a more than intimate relationship with wives of patrons or royal ladies, granting him the privilege to 'handle Silke, as free, and neere,/As any Mercer'.[57] With the notion of the family becoming more constrictively private in the course of the sixteenth century that endangered the place of the noble retainer-poet (as member of household, guest or servant who got his compensation in the form of boarding, subsidy, livery, protection, and social prestige in return of corporeal labour, loyalty or textual performance), Jonson's intimate (aristocratic) ideal became strongly suspicious of bourgeois sexual mores (evinced for instance through the public libertarian values of the Collegiate Ladies in *Epicoene*) and the so-called romanticism associated with matrimony.[58] Interestingly however, Jonson envisaged the professional author's changing

---

[53] See two very influential essays on this particular idea: Greene, 'Ben Jonson and the Centred Self' and Don E. Wayne, 'Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson: An Alternative View', *RenD*, vol. 13, 1982, pp. 103-29. Jonson's later plays demonstrate an acceptance of the new regime of intimacy centred on the institution of marriage.

[54] Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

[55] 'Cary-Morison Ode', in *The Underwood* LXX, ll. 7-8. In this connection Jonson's relation of an anecdote about his mother to Drummond is suggestive. Apparently his mother had intended to poison Jonson in the event of his implication for the part he played in the satirical *Eastward Ho*, thus creating a prototype for murderous rather than procreative maternity.

[56] Brian Vickers in 'Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: The Ambivalence of *Otium*', in *Renaissance Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1990, pp. 1-37, points out that Ovid in *Remedia Amoris* drew a direct connection between Venus, the goddess of love and love-making with *otium* and advised lovers to work and keep busy to counteract the adverse effects of leisure. While ancient Romans considered *otium* to be a moral vice, early Church Fathers associated it with *acedia* or sloth.

[57] 'An Elegie', in *The Underwood*, XLII, ll. 30-1.

[58] See Lawrence Venuti, 'Why Jonson Wrote Not of Love', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 12, 1982, pp. 195-220. Unlike other contemporary poets Jonson steered clear of the idealising Petrarchan tradition, though he did write a sonnet to Lady Mary Wroth who was famed for her flouting of marriage

relationship to poetry in terms of social and occupational servitude to a cruel mistress that borders on the erotic:

> Poetry, in this latter Age, hath prov'd but a meane/*Mistresse*, to such as have wholly addicted themselves to/her, or given their names up to her family. They who have/saluted her on the by, and now and then tendred their/visits, shee hath done much for, and advanced in the way/of their owne professions...beyond all they could have hoped, or done for themselves,/without her favour. Wherein she doth emulate the judi/cious, but preposterous bounty of the times *Grandes*: who/accumulate all they can upon the *Parasite*, or *Fresh-man* in/their friendship; but thinke an old Client, or honest servant,/bound by his place to write, and starve.

<div align="right">(Discoveries, ll. 622-30)</div>

The passage also confirms the breakdown of the patriarchal institution of service (as will be evident in the service relationships portrayed in the three plays) with its attendant insecurities, where the 'old Client, or honest seruant' as representative remnants of an outmoded order based on intimate reciprocity lose out against unscrupulous time-servers and sycophants.

At about the same time Counter-Reformation societies were slowly exploring the possibilities of a new moral ideal centred on sincerity; though the artists and intellectuals who endorsed this principle as a secular version of the confessional were often not intimately connected to the patronage networks of the state, court or church and were generally excluded from the power centres of the Old Regime. For those who imagined a life free of surveillance and image-management the sincere and moral expression of the self among one's own innermost circle of friends, or lovers (as in Donne's love poems) provided a way out. But for those who were ambitious enough, success was synonymous with the ability to wear a mask and exercise self-dominion in the public sphere. To them secrecy represented a vital aspect of human affairs and the concomitant realisation of the tensions between interior and exterior self. Jonson's troubled and unsure response to the changing dialectics of inner-outer can be felt in his cynical realisation of the inevitability of role-playing and the mobility of identity at turn-of-the-seventeenth-century England.

---

conventions. Within the plays Jonson presented a critique of bourgeois conjugal values in the Collegiate Ladies and the marriage of the Otters in *Epicoene* or the frustration of a romantic liaison between Celia and Bonario in *The Alchemist*. Although he described his wife, Anne Lewis, to Drummond of Hawthornden as 'a shrew, yet honest', yet during periods of voluntarily imposed long separation from his wife he was twice caught *in flagrante delicto* by other husbands. However this view has to be qualified by the realisation that many of his poems also present an idealisation of the private sphere.

However the dichotomy between the conduct of a virtuous private life and the instrumental rationality of public life (that presupposed a pragmatic accommodation to religious, political, and social hierarchies) became increasingly difficult to balance in the late Seicento.[59] Jonson's life and literary career was spent in search of this ideal equilibrium.

> But nobody can be one person except the wise man; the rest of us often shift our masks...we continually change our characters and play a part contrary to that which we have discarded. You should therefore force yourself to maintain to the very end of life's drama the character which you assumed at the beginning. See to it that men be able to praise you; if not, let them at least identify you.[60]

Poetic honour and ambition can be achieved only when a virtuous appearance coincides with a virtuous reality: 'If divers men seeke Fame, or Honour, by divers ways; so both bee honest, neither is to be blam'd: But they that seeke Immortality, are not onely worthy of leave, but of praise' (*Discoveries*, ll. 175-8). In reality given the unfeasibility of a complete 'aesthetics of detachment'[61] (physically exemplified in the eccentricities of Morose's 'double walls and treble ceilings') and his anxiety about the public performance of socially constructed identities; Jonson's self-consciously 'centred' authorial identity and its relation to ethically urbane 'good society' was fashioned in the anxious and uncertain spectrum between transparency and concealment, public fellowship and private reticence, the prudence of capitalist calling and the sincerity of domestic seclusion. Like Montaigne (see Chapter II) he flirts with the possibility of a solitary existence but also finds it impossible to turn away from the external world.

III

Between Private Conviction and Public Role-Playing

Jonsonian theatrical art remained bound up with the values of public exposure and group experience. The exigencies of his age forced Jonson to embrace both public and courtly audience and unlike Donne (whose verse was not printed until 1633) or Michael Drayton (whose two dozen plays were never published except for one that was printed anonymously) refused to stay confined within the manuscript tradition. The lack of

---

[59] See Snyder, *Dissimulation and Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*, p. 162.
[60] Seneca, *Epigram* CXX, l. 22. Quoted in Peter Hyland's *Disguise and Role-Playing in Ben Jonson's Drama*, (Salzburg: Inst. f. Engl. Sprache u. Literatur, Univ. Salzburg, 1977), p. 23.
[61] See Fumerton, *Cultural Aesthetics*.

opportunities contingent on the breakdown of the late feudal ideology of service and obligation forced Jonson to delve into the world of proto-capitalist socio-economic exchange, selling his labour as a commodity in the market. The exterior, interpersonal domain remained indispensable despite its inadequacies just as the interiorised domain persisted as a realm of both threat and promise. His literary life swung between his opposing desires for personal autonomy and social respectability, for the contemplative life and for public fame, for authorial freedom and for audience acceptance. His distinctiveness lay in his ability to underplay (and may be to a certain extent transcend) the network of dependencies and obligations that in reality directed and regulated his professional behaviour.[62]

Negotiating with the era's dominant protocols of socialisation and deference, Jonson redefined the 'public' through scholarly labour, using privacy and sincerity to fashion a unique portrait of a reclusive writer that emerges even as he withdraws from his audience; fostering a new kind of 'public-private' space that advanced the socio-political agency of 'private' people like him. Equating authorship with the epistemological control over a changing urban space he assumed the private ownership and responsibility of his play-texts as intellectual property (a formidable task given the bleak status of the playwright and in a medium that was plagued by socio-legal pressures) reducing the audience into private individuals who could appreciate a play without interpreting it. His decision to publish his literary ephemera in the prestigious folio[63] format (a form reserved for classics such as the plays of Plautus and Terence, sermons, geographies, royal books such as *The Works of King James*) entitled *Workes* (a translation of the Latin word *Opera* used for published collections by Horace and Virgil) in 1616 can be read as his ultimate (almost hubristic) effort to transform contemplative privacy into a virtue, of reconciling the private and the public through reading, writing, and publication.

Against such contemporary restructurings of interior-exterior space and identity he championed his dramatic self-projections and fashioned his intellectual endeavours (both onstage and in the higher ground of the printed book). Likewise he reinterpreted the emergent notion of familial privacy into his ideal vision of an 'interpretive' community composed of an intimate homosocial fraternity (based on personal interests or

---

[62] See Stanley Fish, 'Authors-Readers: Jonson's Community of the Same', *Representations*, vol. 7, 1984, pp. 26-58.
[63] A folio was made from sheets of paper folded once resulting in a large and grand book in contrast to smaller and less prestigious formats such as the quarto which was folded twice or an octavo that was folded thrice.

communication shared between playwright and the astute few comprising auditors, patrons, and acquaintances)[64] of like-minded cognoscenti, trained in the classical humanist tradition, and based on an economy of private exchange of friendly confidence, trust, principles of intellectual capital or discerning wit (in the sense of 'seat of consciousness or thought'), what Walter J. Ong describing the vibrancy of manuscript culture calls 'participatory poetics'.[65] It creates a sense of a shared freedom of familiarity within a public context or privileged confidentiality with other like-minded individuals (designated in the old use of 'private' to denote the person with whom it is shared).[66] Jonson described his own poetic 'school' in the terms of being 'Sealed in the Tribe of Ben',[67] a new form of voluntary grouping (see Chapter V for the idea of the 'intimate public') based on shared interests, tastes, commitments, and desires that was not rooted in family or social rank: a private heterotopia in a public world.

Far from articulating a sense of social consensus the elites who monopolised the public space of discourse in early modern Europe did not share a reciprocal relationship with the rest of the society, using complex linguistic and cultural codes for communicating among themselves. Reminiscent of the Greek *symposium* or *convivium* (drinking group) or the Roman *hetaireia* (club of men with shared political, religious or occupational interests) were various early modern youth 'orders' such as the Order of the Bugle or Order of the Blue comprised of young men called 'Tityre-tus', the 'Roaring

---

[64] Fish describes the way in which Jonson's poems create an implied audience of like-minded readers and recipients who constituted an elite but egalitarian discipleship, 'a community of the same', who recognized the value of the ideals of friendship, loyalty, and steadfastness. Fish's reading is perceptive enough but does not explain why Jonson was also driven by the desire to place his poems in the public domain. Despite Jonson's involvement in the non-narrative mode of theatre, it is likely that his ideal medium was one that was based on 'telling' rather than 'showing', revealing a partiality towards the printed work.

[65] Walter J. Ong, *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 274-9.

[66] In fact the plural form 'privacies' once designated intimate spaces in implied contrast to a realm of public exposure. They offered opportunities for intimacy however tenuous in a surveillant society used to communal living and hierarchical organisation,

[67] Rather than accept the dominant aristocratic ideology of his society that passed on privileges through birth, Josnon developed the discourse of 'true nobility' (*vera nobilitas* deriving from Greek *arête*, Roman *virtus*, and medieval *gentillesse*) based on the aristocracy of humanist virtue and the merits of intellectual labour: 'Nor, stand so much on your gentilitie,/Which is an aërie, and meere borrow'd thing,/From dead mens dust, and bones: and none of yours/Except you make, or hold it' (*Every Man in His Humour*, 1598, I.i.86-9). See Michael McCanles, *Jonsonian Discriminations: The Humanist Poet and the Praise of True Nobility* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992). Jonson also repeatedly used the theological idea of merit to refer to his misunderstood literary genius in the four plays – *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599), *Cynthia's Revels* (1600), *Poetaster* (1601), and *Sejanus* (1603) – that were written after his conversion to Catholicism. His lifelong emphasis on ethical self-determination and praxis was consonant with the Tridentine belief that God makes the good works of humans meritorious. His ideal social gathering was one in which enjoyment of good food was enhanced by shared scholarly values: 'How so ere, my man/Shall reade a piece of VIRGIL, TACITVS,/LIVIE, or of some better booke to vs,/Of which wee'll speake our minds, amidst our meate;/And Ile profess no verses to repeate.' 'Inviting a Friend to Supper', *Epigram* CI, ll. 20-4.

Boys' or clubs including professional men of standing.[68] Outside social intercourse the hermetic and Kabbalistic tradition represented by Neoplatonists such as Ficino, Mirandola, Cornelius Agrippa, and Giordano Bruno (constituting a hypothetical 'school of night') made prolific use of exoteric or esoteric modes of structuring knowledge.[69] Jonson had roots in the 'middling sort' (his stepfather Robert Brett was a bricklayer, a lineage that caused him much slur and embarrassment)[70] but his classical education brought him into contact and close friendship with the literarily privileged and socially influential such as William Camden, Sir John Roe, the Sidneys, Lucy Countess of Bedford, Edward Alleyn, and Lady Mary Wroth.

Theatre incidentally coincided with a major educational revolution[71] that led to the development of a sophisticated group of literate spectators marked by intellectual and social mobility. Starting off his theatrical career by writing plays for Philip Henslowe who was the leading impresario for the public theatre, Jonson was able to take advantage of this new 'open' climate (he completed grammar school but never matriculated at the university, though he was to receive an honorary Master of Arts degree from Oxford University in 1619) to fashion a distinct identity for himself.[72] Drama gave unprecedented access to ideas and ideologies and altered the structure of knowledge by redefining and expanding its boundaries. However early modern public theatre was marked by audience heterogeneity with a fair number of people belonging to varied socio-economic groups attending both public open air theatres and private halls.[73] It provided a model of the

---

[68] The Mermaid (frequented by Jonson) along with other clubs such as the Mitre, the Apollo room of the Devil Tavern, the Triple Tun, and St. Dunstan were playgrounds for the socially well-connected such as courtiers, Members of Parliament, lawyers, and diplomats. They had formalised behavioural conventions dictated by oaths of loyalty and wearing of identifying marks. They were frequently perceived to be covert sites of papist conspiracy and organised misrule. See Timothy Raylor, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy* (Cranbury, N. J.: Associated University Presses, 1994).

[69] See Frances Amelia Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1999), Hilary Gatti, *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge: Giordano Bruno in England* (London: Routledge, 1989), and Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986).

[70] By the time he took his first steps as a child he lived with his mother and step-father in Hartshorn Lane near Charing Cross which was a slum area in the liberties of Westminster Abbey. Attending school in St. Martins Lane, hardly one of the respectable areas of London, would bring him into close awareness dark underbelly of the city. Undoubtedly Jonson's sights aimed higher and strained father-son relationships run through his plays. Very early he dropped the 'h' from his surname (he claimed descent from the Johnstones of Dumfries, just across the Scottish border) as the 't' had been discarded long time back, allowing Jonson to 'fashion' his own identity at a time when birth was the key social category.

[71] See Lawrence Stone, 'The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640', in *Past and Present*, vol. 28, 1964, pp. 41-80 and David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

[72] Jonson's self-making parallels the rise of 'new men' (or *novi homines*) in the spheres of trade (businessmen whose wealth was dictated by capital) and administration (educated but less-well-born public officials).

[73] For a discussion on audience composition see Alfred Harbage, *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), Ann Jennalie Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642*

privatisation of public space where people of varied social, religious, sexual identities, and personal histories could take part in debates and judgments regarding matters of common concern. Thus contrary to modern expectations Renaissance theatrical venues were fluid pluralist spaces intersected by multiple sight lines and featuring different responses (both individual reactions based on personal experiences and public responses as a collective sensory entity) to the staged action as well as viewing practices that were influenced by particular experiences of the world or kinds and degrees of knowledge.[74]

Contemporary democratic perceptions may make it difficult to understand that early modern texts (whether theatrical, scribal or printed) were implicated in a double register that served to preserve the status quo by restricting knowledge of its full significance to the exclusive few.[75] This is especially pertinent in the case of Jonson whose 'cunning palates'/'understanding Gentlemen' are an elitist counter-reaction to the reformation of social space that introduced new forms of association, language, identity, and space.[76] Theatre had just moved from the protection of private aristocratic households[77] into the public world of London and dramatists such as Jonson (though he was not the only one) remained deeply anxious about the changing nature of the theatre and of pandering to debased audience tastes. Spectators could be rowdy, physically and verbally abusive, further popular drama performed by professional acting companies was perceived to be too vulgar to classify as high art. The City and the pulpit regularly singled out the playhouses and petitioned the court for permission to shut them down. These veritable houses of Proteus/Satan were perceived as a festering sore on the city's symbolic

(Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1981), Andrew Gurr's *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (2nd edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), and 'The General and the Caviar: Learned Audiences in the Early Theatre', *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, vol. 26, 1993, pp. 7-20.

[74] See Paul Yachnin's essay on 'The Reformation of Space in Shakespeare's Playhouse', in *Making Space in Public in Early Modern Europe: Geography, Performance, Privacy*, ed. Angela Vanhaelen and Joseph P. Ward (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 262-80.

[75] For a critique of such views see Richard Levin, 'The Two-Audience Theory of English Renaissance Drama', *Shakespeare Studies*, vol. 18, 1986, pp. 251-75.

[76] Prologue to *Epicoene, or The Silent Woman*, l. 10 and Induction to *Bartholomew Fair*, l .49. It is not advisable to read early modern texts as appealing to a uniformly homogeneous group. Gary Alan Fine in *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) refers to audience segregation, hidden messages, and role distancing as three possible ways of dealing with the problem of reaching diverse audiences with the same words. The inscrutability of Hamlet's deep self may not have been scrutable to all; he was possibly viewed as a revenge tragedy hero in the Kydian mould. Yet for the perceptive enough there were interpretive clues ('I have that within which passes show' or 'this bait of falsehood takes the carp of truth') which hinted at the radical interiority offered in the play.

[77] In a 1572 statute (14 Eliz. c. 5) players were defined as vagabonds, subject to being arrested, whipped or branded unless they were 'liveried' servants of an aristocratic household. Yet the animus of civic and religious authorities was rarely directed towards other popular pastimes such as bearbaiting or sword-fighting which were held in open air amphitheatres that were similar in construction to The Theatre and the Globe. Playwrights attacked such hypocrisy by insisting that theatre was one source of immortality, though not the only one.

economy, capable of polluting the morals of the apprentices, confound roles and categories, and incite riots or sedition. Theatrical representation, it was felt, could invade and influence not only socio-political and erotic life, but also the life of the mind.

If the city fathers worried over the accessibility of the performative potential of theatre by a wide spectrum of society, on the other hand the monarch was enthusiastic about seeing well-written and well-rehearsed plays at the court as part of Christmas festivities. Although it understood the power of theatrical display (with their elaborate costumes and entourage being a part of the theatricalisation of power) yet it was averse to paying for the development and maintenance of the repertory companies. Repeatedly claiming a moral and pedagogical purpose for his 'art', Jonson's worries about the reception of his work by the aesthetically untrained though 'literate' multitude was also a symptom of how the theatre had become a pawn in the power play between court and city. In her study of the Jacobean politics of leisure, Leah Marcus sees playwrights such as Jonson caught in the chasm of a bastard feudal culture.[78] Professional popular playwrights tried to salvage the sunken reputation of drama at the same time as they exerted to dissociate themselves from theatre's implication in the contagion of the 'low'.

More often than not in real life Jonson stayed biased against his spectators for practically many of those differences – such as social class and education – which he had struggled to surmount in his own life. The received impression of his unappreciative (mis)readers or spectators ('Pied ignorance') in prologues or dedications remained prejudiced by charges of misplaced interpretations, criticism, scepticism, boredom, and practical illiteracy: evidence of an expansive and expanding spectatorship that included courtiers, tradesmen, and apprentices. He disparaged those without the benefit of a classical humanist education, claiming that mere literacy was not enough to guarantee literary judgment and moral discrimination. In his address to the reader in *The Alchemist*, he makes distinctions between reading and understanding: 'IF thou beest more, thou art an Vnderstander, and then/I trust thee' (ll. 1-2). Actively engaged in the creation of multiple theatrical competencies he never addressed his audience as a community of equals, but as a society differentiated by classes, and the experience of the play and their reactions to it validated and reinforced that distinction rather than breaking it down.[79]

> The wise and many-headed Bench, that sits

---

[78] See Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
[79] Jonathan Haynes, 'Festivity and Dramatic Economy of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*', *ELH*, vol. 51, no. 4, Winter 1984, pp. 645-668: 660.

Vpon the Life and Death of Playes, and Wits

(Compos'd of Gamester, Captaine, Knight, Knight's man...

With the shop's Foreman, or some such brave sparke

That may judge for his six-pence) had before

They saw it halfe, damnd thy whole play and more.[80]

('To Mr. John Fletcher, Upon His Faithful Shepherdess',

The Underwood XIV)

Such reasons led him to present his works (such as *Cynthia's Revels* and *Poetaster* in 1600 and 1601 respectively) in private hall theatres where high ticket prices (almost six times more than that of public amphitheatres) assured him of a select and elegant audience. In a world where money determined the right to censure (for ticket prices could be as low as a penny), Jonson looked towards the monarch as the ultimate source of artistic legitimation and defended his own and the monarch's privilege not to be open to interrogation by social or intellectual inferiors.

How best of kings, dost thou a sceptre bear!

How, best of poets, dost thou laurel wear!...

Whom should my muse then fly to, but the best

Of kings for grace; of poets for my test?

('To King James', *Epigram* IV, ll. 1-2, 9-10)

Despite his strong opinions on many contemporary issues Jonson was also a pragmatist and well versed in strategies of survival. Thus he managed to work with uncongenial patrons such as Robert Cecil,[81] remained close friends with radical members of the Mermaid Club, and even became the unofficial Poet Laureate (since John Skelton) of Protestant England with a royal pension in 1616. His prudence failed however, when he was jailed after staging one of his (now lost) plays, *The Isle of Dogs* (1597), and was interrogated by England's foremost torturer, Richard Topcliffe. Although he had to act as a propagandist for Stuart royal policies in his masques (sometimes against his wishes) yet he was summoned more than once by the Privy Council to answer charges of slander,

---

[80] Jonson's 1608 poem was written in response to the hostile public reception of John Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* which was the first attempt at tragicomedy on the English stage.

[81] Laudatory poems addressed to a patron proved to be a formidable task for a poet who valued his own honesty and independence. In 'To Robert Earl of Salisbury', Jonson tried to celebrate the man's virtues without lapsing into flattery. His naive compliments to his patron: 'you are so great that nothing I say can make any difference', are tempered by critiques of the complimentary mode: 'you are what you are and nothing I say can make any difference.' Such statements challenge the patron to enhance the poet's self-esteem by matching up to the terms of the naive complimentary mode. See David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 130.

libel, and sedition. He got into trouble with James' Scottish councillors after making reckless jokes (along with George Chapman and John Marston) about Scots in *Eastward Ho!* (1605) and nearly risked having his ears and nose cut off as a punitive measure. Jonson's loyalties were multiple and extremely flexible, dictated by the pragmatic expediencies of the moment: a skilled maneuverer in an age of growing baroque complexity where one confirmed to conceal or suppressed in order to reveal.[82]

Jonson's emergence as a playwright came at a time when early modern Europe was in the chaotic throes of the burgeoning spirit of mercantilism with its concerted attempt to promote state economic interests over and above questions of privilege, tradition or religion. Technological progress, expansion of educational opportunities, dramatic increase in social mobility, international trade, and capitalism combined with a politics based on reason of state to lead to what has been called the first great 'modernist'[83] European emancipation from the binds imposed by faith and morality. Jonson's real and fictional worlds were those of constant social flux and blurrings between gentry and non-gentry, breakdown of civic roles and identities, and increasing ideological uncertainty. Euphoria about self-shaping identities 'rising and changing solely through the efforts of his will, intelligence and art',[84] were offset by disorienting fears that those who lacked fixed social roles may not have any authentic, underlying identities.

On the other hand the uneasiness with increasingly individualised or mobile personalities gave rise to a new tendency to construe other people in terms of resistant secrets awaiting discovery that seems to have grown particularly acute during this era. Much speculation was invested in the nature and discovery of hypocritical hidden selves which were supposed to reside under the socially deceptive masks worn by people.

---

[82] The question of Jonson's religious affiliation was a vexed one. *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1598) which features the religious awakening of a miserly farmer named Sordido may have been modeled on his own life-threatening experience in the aftermath of having killed a fellow actor, Gabriel Spencer in a duel on 22 September, 1598. Jailed at Tyburn he narrowly escaped death by pleading the benefit of clergy -the ability to read a verse from the Latin Bible (attesting as I would like to see it as a dependence on Protestant vocal aesthetics) at a time of widespread illiteracy. However Jonson continued to take communion in the Church of England till the end of Elizabeth's reign. He was what Protestants would call a church papist and Catholics a schismatic: a Catholic by conviction who nonetheless conformed to the state religion. Jonson may not have been necessarily clandestine as far as his religion was concerned for theatrical rivals (Marston and Dekker) often commented publicly about Jonson's popery in their plays. Between 1603 and 1606 he attended church but abstained from communion. He appeared before the Consistory Court in 1606 on charges of recusancy though in 1610 he publicly returned to the Church of England. Yet this is to deny the candid affirmations of religious sincerity found in a lyric such as 'To Heaven'. See Julie Maxwell, 'Religion', in *Ben Jonson in Context*, ed. Julie Sanders (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 229-36.
[83] Jonson was one of the first writers in the seventeenth century to use the word 'moderne' in its earlier sense of the 'present time' which indicated his acute awareness of the social transformations taking place.
[84] Wayne A. Rebhorn, *Foxes and Lions: Machiavelli's Confidence Men* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 27.

Jonson's plays thus allow for a heterogeneous and contingent world composed of interactions between both pre-modern (transparent 'humour' characters or gulls) and modern subject positions (the elusive trickster, reclusive scholar, and master-poet): indulging in two mutually constitutive and apparently contradictory Renaissance fantasies that suggest that selves can be both obscure, hidden, ineffable or capable of being fully manifest (which will be dealt in detail in Chapter V). Together this dialectic of vision and concealment constituted an important aspect of early modern self-conception. More importantly they may have been a strategic mode of ontological accommodation with the changing socio-political worlds of the Renaissance.

In the following pages I will suggest that the use of the (baroque) discrepancy between inside and outside as a rhetorical and textual trope centred on the figure of the trickster might yield a finer-grained re-understanding of this playwright for whom a shrewd negotiation with the anxieties generated by the fracture between public deference and private conviction, authorial *sprezzatura* and socio-economic exigencies, strident impulsiveness and silent restraint may have granted a limited and provisional form of agency (notwithstanding postmodernist interrogations of authorial intention)[85] in a time of flux. As a classic interface between baroque dichotomy and scientific scepticism the Jonsonian trickster offered a valuable analogue for a playwright trying to define his place and craft. Performing different roles with different audiences[86] enabled him to produce and occupy alternate physical heterotopias and mental topographies that in turn shaped his authorial identity in the uneasy malleable role-playing between the creative knave and the coterie intellectual.[87] His rich psychological investment in classical scholarship may have gradually sanctioned a more flexible approach to 'truth', in its allowance for justifiable deception and infidelity.

Jonson steered a path similar to the Horatian 'golden mean' between eloquence and silence, which was also an essential marker of the Jonsonian wit or true intelligence. More pertinently, his simultaneous valorisation and interrogation of new collective formations

---

[85] W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, 'The Intentional Fallacy', in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*, ed. W. K. Wimsatt (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954), pp. 3-18, Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?', in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), pp. 101-20, and Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader*, ed. Sean Burke (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), pp. 125-30.
[86] See Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959) where the Canadian sociologist introduces the idea of 'audience segregation' as the everyday practice of compartmentalising our social lives and our role performances with each audience we engage with.
[87] For Jonson's perennial problems with the audience see 'Ben Jonson and the Loathèd Stage', in Jonas Barish, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981), pp. 132-54.

and individuals represented an uneasy negotiation with his own public privation and its defiance of preconceived notions (of birth and status) that determined entry into the early modern politics of courtly privilege. For the deeply conservative Jonson, socially mobile upstarts or servile hypocrites were common satiric targets, yet also a means of vicariously performing his public ambitions as a poet. The wandering rogue or mercenary servant represented not just aimless loitering but also a specific mobility of the mind and its radical openness to new and unsettling ideas in a deeply conformist era. The received notion of a stoic and moralistic humanist author therefore has to accommodate the reality that Jonson often lived life outside the bounds of societal conventions. Yet at the very least, the difficulty of 'embedding' Jonson the playwright or his cunning strategists' is also ultimately related, I feel, to their entrenchment in the peculiar epistemological drawbacks and anxieties of the theatre as a cultural institution that was marked by elusiveness and reversibility.

IV
Cultural Representations of the Rogue-Trickster

The revelation of Christ's divine mystery to an unconvinced Thomas evokes another scene of recognition from classical literature: the particular scene I have in mind is the meeting between the disguised Ulysses and his old nursemaid Eurycleia in the nineteenth book of Homer's *Odyssey*. At Penelope's command she begins to wash the feet of her unrecognised master and although Athena has transformed Ulysses' (the name itself means 'Wounded Thigh') outward appearance, she has not disguised the scar on his leg, an irrevocable trace of a hunting injury sustained at Parnassus when he was much younger, which subsequently gives him away (*kredemnon luesthai* or tearing of the veil). Both scenes (classical and Biblical) stress upon recognition based on physical contact and critique all forms of communication, perception, and knowledge that are based merely on sight. As heroes who thematically triumph over death Christ and Ulysses share several traditional motifs[88] such as the return of the disguised king to his kingdom (Jerusalem and Ithaca respectively) who remains unrecognised by his people, his mocking humiliation and willingness to undergo suffering (at the hands of the Jewish religious elite and

---

[88] Parallels between Greek myth and the New Testament should not be surprising given the very broad reach and influence of Hellenistic culture, and that the authors of the gospels knew the Old Testament only in the Greek Septuagint.

Penelope's suitors), prophetic warnings of an impending apocalypse (destruction of the Temple, wars, earthquakes, Second Coming and disaster awaiting the Phaeacian suitors), betrayal (by Peter, Judas and Eurylocus, Euryalus, Eurymachus, Melanthius), 'crucifixion' (nailed to a Cross and tied to a mast in the Sirens episode) and ultimate effulgent transfiguration (visible only to the disciples and to Telemachus).[89]

For early modern readers Ulysses was associated with the calculative ability to act and dissimulate as circumstances demanded: an exemplar of constancy and vigilant premeditation that won over change. The physically versatile and mentally flexible Ulysses marked a breakthrough into the modern nomadic consciousness,[90] representing the polytropic[91] verve to assume many duplicitous forms, take on strategic disguises to slip out of traps. His practical and cunning (*dolos* or *metis* as a means of achieving the desired through a manipulation of hostile forces that are too powerful to be controlled) encounter with a chancy and uncertain world would have appealed to the Renaissance mind. In his self-serving equation of praxis with *phronesis*, Ulysses was well-skilled in seizing *kairos* (opportunity) and finding a way out of situational impasses. The forethought and cunning intelligence attributed to him recalls the Greek *metis* valued by the Pre-Socratics that combined quick-wittedness, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, and opportunism. Individuals possessing *metis* were never at a loss in trying situations: they were *polumetis* (multi-skilled), *polutropos* (much travelled or of many turns), and *polumekhanos* (of many devices). Marcel Detienne and Paul Vernant's[92]

---

[89] Theologians such as Origen of Alexandria and Hippolytus of Rome made such connections explicit in the second and third centuries. For detailed description of these parallels see Bruce Louden, *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 258-82.

[90] Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer see Ulysses as a prototype of the modern bourgeois individual who is forced to wander. See *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972). See also Charles Taylor, 'The Obstacles to Odysseus' Return: Identity and Consciousness in the *Odyssey*', *Yale Review*, vol. 50, 1961, pp. 569-80 and Charles P. Segal, 'The Phaeacians and the Symbolism of Odysseus' Return', *Arion*, vol. 1, no. 4, 1962, pp. 17-64. Erich Auerbach's seminal essay 'Odysseus' Scar', in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), pp. 3-23.

[91] *Polutropos* (of many twists and turns) could suggest not only the physical world of action and travel but also a mental dimension. The adjective appears in the first line of the Oddyssey and once thereafter in Book X, line 330. Apart from this the word appears nowhere else in the Homeric corpus except in the 'Hymn to Hermes' where it designated the crafty god of thieves, who marked the day of his birth by inventing the lyre and filching Apollo's cattle, thus presupposing an implicit link between deceit and versatility.

[92] Marcel Detienne and Jean Paul Vernant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978). Metis, the Titaness of Wisdom, was swallowed by her husband Zeus (standing for speculative reason and androcentric ideology) for fear that if she gave birth to his child, that child would depose of him just as he had dislodged his father Chronos from the throne. A fully grown and armed Athene was thus born from Zeus' head. It is tempting to reduce *metis* to *phroneis* (prudence) though there are subtle distinctions between the two. Aristotle used *phronesis* for the practical aspects of metic intelligence but not its indirect and devious aspects.

celebration of the idea of 'metis' as a form of universal intelligence (in contrast to brute force) drew inspiration from the classical myth of Metis (Thought), daughter of the shape-shifting sea god Proteus, also famed for her metamorphic transformations. The physical internalisation of the pregnant Metis by her husband Zeus (symbolic of *episteme* or the Platonic disinterested contemplation of eternal forms) can plausibly be seen as the symbolic association of practical cunning with invisible interior space and concealment. Like her daughter Athena (and in turn her protégée Ulysses) Metis is thus all surface as well as depthless interiority representing perpetual becoming and unmediated knowledge.

Ulysses' final return (*nostos*) to Ithaca from Troy after nineteen years also makes him a precursor of the introspective self-conscious mind (in fact Ulysses espouses a very different ethic compared to his 'heroic' counterparts in *The Iliad*). The homecoming is both objective (return to domestic hearth and marriage bed) as well as subjective and ontological (journey into the interior world of the soul): a foregrounding of inwardness and self-awareness. Ulysses' character is unique in the classical world for it underscored very early the tension between a socially defined centrifugal individuality (evinced in the Cyclops' cave where Ulysses denies his own identity to become *outis*, 'nobody', and in his constant need to explore new worlds) and a latent sense of interiority (he represented the ideal of the opaque liar). This was reason enough for Ulysses to be perceived as a prototypical 'early modern' figure for a culture trying to find its true place and identity in a time of instability.[93] Yet what was disturbing was how Ulysses' survival and identification was contingent on the creation of a false identity and his innate ability to invent and deceive.[94] From this perspective his narrative represents the dark dissimulative converse to the spiritual candour of Christian resurrection, notwithstanding the belief that in Greek and Latin patristic theology Christ was viewed as a trickster who used guile

---

[93] One of the most well-known literary examples of a superimposition of trickster archetype on the cultural hero was that of Hamlet. The oldest source of *Hamlet* – the Danish Saxo Grammaticus' tale of Amleth – portrays Hamlet as a trickster in the same tradition as the Norse half-god and shape-shifter Loki. See Hilda Ellis Davidson, 'Loki and Saxo's Hamlet', in *The Fool and the Trickster: Studies in Honour of Enid Welsford*, ed. Paul Williams (Totowa: D. S. Brewer Limited, 1979), pp. 3-17. Hamlet also represents the most overt link between the trickster and notions of interiority as questions of conscious awareness, suffering, and deliberation blend with those of dissimulation and social manipulation. See also Mark Thornton Burnett, "'For They are Actions that a Man Might Play": Hamlet as Trickster', in *Hamlet*, ed. Peter J. Smith and Nigel Wood (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996), pp. 24-54.

[94] In *The Divine Comedy*, Dante placed Ulysses in Inferno for being a dissembler, dishonest both with himself and with those he loved. Moreover he also made a caricature of Ulysses in Canto 26 of the *Inferno* by revealing him to be a victim of the *discendi cupiditas*: one who persuades his crew to continue beyond the limits of the known world in search of even more wisdom and experience. Erasmus also painted a negative image in the adage *commentum Ulysseum* (II, 8, 79) though there are key passages in his writings where Ulysses is presented as the normative model for a ruler. *Collected Works of Erasmus*, trans. Margaret Mann Phillips and R. A. B. Mynors (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), p. 81.

to defeat Satan.[95] Odysseus' story (especially the motif of the returning hero) coincided with the diffusion of Egyptian and Oriental cultures through the eastern and western Mediterranean, Greek emigration, trading, overseas colonisation, cultural encounters with 'barbarous' non-Greeks, and the flux of empires. Literary fiction became a medium to explore the psychological correlates of the breaking down of long established certitudes in the classical world.

Jonson's appropriation of the trickster archetype[96] implicit in Ulysses may have worked on similar lines during a time when radical changes in English economy, intellectual and religious practices were placing immense pressures on long held ideological structures. However Jonson's use of the disguise motif drew on several other existing traditions: the native morality tradition and the Italian comedy of 'travesty-doubles, or quick change artists and of clever cheating.'[97] The English tradition in particular presupposed a close connection between disguise and vice, reflecting the traditional idea that the Devil could take any counterfeit shape he wished in order to deceive mankind. Again being the classical-minded playwright that he was, Jonson inevitably drew upon Roman comic conventions, especially those centring on the clever slave who tricks others in order to benefit his master.[98] Deceptive trickery was also a common feature of the continental *novella* tradition, Italian *commedia dell'arte*, continental romances, and native ballads. Notwithstanding the Elizabethan theatrical audience's familiarity with such disguise conventions (appearing in the form of devices such as the female page, the boy bride, the multi-disguised rogue, machiavel or the guardian, lover or spy in disguise),[99] I suggest that the Jonsonian use of the concealment motif in relation to

---

[95] See Kathleen Ashley, 'The Guiler Beguiled: Christ and Satan as Theological Tricksters in Medieval Religious Literature', *Criticism*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1982, pp. 126-37. Although Christian history interprets shape-shifting as diabolical, yet there are exceptions. Thus despite the 'oneness' of God, He is multiplied in the Trinity, and God reveals himself as a burning bush to Moses. Christ disguised himself as a gardener to Mary Magdalene and some theological commentaries understood the Incarnation as a kind of disguise that Satan tried to decipher.

[96] In an undated epigram that was published posthumously in *The Underwood* section of his 1641 *Works* and beginning with the line 'The Wisdome Madam of your Private Life', Jonson addressed a lady whose identity remains a mystery, though some conjecture it to have been Elizabeth, Countess of Rutland. Howsoever it be, the text informs that her husband (a certain 'Ulisses') 'hath ta'ne leave to goe' and is currently travelling abroad 'Countries, and Climes manners, and men to know', and that the lady ('Penelope') meanwhile 'live[s] a widowed wife'. See Boris Borukhov, 'Ben Jonson's "Widowed Wife": A New Candidate', in *Notes and Queries*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2009, pp. 86-91.

[97] See Muriel C. Bradbrook, *The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 95 and Allardyce Nicoll, *British Drama* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963).

[98] The major Plautine plays which make use of such motifs are *Asinaria*, *Persa*, *Pseudolus*, *Captivi*, *Casina*, and *Amphitruo*.

[99] Freeburg, *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama*, p. 4.

the rogue was reinterpreted and given a sharper relevance in the context of the contemporary epistemological breakages associated with the baroque.

This work will dwell at greater length in Chapter V how Jonson's rogues drew inspiration from a continuum of literary or folk types such as the tricky slave (*servus callidus* or *dolosus servus*) of Plautine New Comedy, medieval folk pranksters (Reynard the Fox of medieval animal *fabliaus*, Till Eulenspiegel, Diccon of Bedlam, Robin Goodfellow, the Vice of morality plays), and the English servant type that was to reach its culmination in the consummate malcontents of the Renaissance stage (Edmund, Jachimo, Flaminio, De Flores, and Bosola). Yet it is the illusion of deliberative agency, the skill to control or direct contingencies, and use of strategic deception that lends a degree of qualitative difference to the early modern array of flamboyant and cynical tricksters: particularly the Machiavellian domestics of Jonson's middle city comedies (which forms the basis of the logic, as I explain in Chapter V section 1, to incorporate only these characters and not others from the Jonsonian oeuvre).[100] The influence of native cony-catching pamphlets (discussed in Chapter III) as a contributing factor towards such qualitative differences can also be hardly underestimated.

These unsettled and volatile characters are publicly affable and engaging conversationalists yet quick to discern private advantage and inventive opportunism. They are complex, morally ambivalent individuals, and their inner designs are so carefully concealed from the rest of the characters that they seem to be entirely credible and authentic. As implicit Jonsonian surrogates they portray their author's deep scepticism about the power of visual perception, the ability to interpret experience, and the stability of reality in a world where pragmatism wound up into self-interest. Imposture for Jonson may have been an intellectual and moral failure, caused by wilful misuse of reason and the freedom of choice: 'Many men beleeve not themselves, what they would/perswade others; and lesse doe the things, which they/would impose on others...' (*Discoveries*, ll. 50-2). Yet his literary appropriation of the rogue and his deceptions also confirmed how the practice of dissimulation had become personally and politically indispensable to many.

Jonsonian tricksters trace the jagged contours of the destitution and rootlessness of early modern life personified in the class of the Tudor dispossessed. Like other writers of

---

[100] City comedy was a compact and stylised subgenre that flourished between 1605 and 1630 with Jonson, Marston, and Thomas Middleton being its most accomplished writers. Unlike earlier romantic treatments of the city – such as in Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* – these urban comedies celebrated intrigue and deception. Two important works dealing with this subgenre are Knight's *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson* and Brian Gibbon's *Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968).

the time Jonson had an explicit relationship to the popular material of the rogue narratives referred to in Chapter III, having drawn on it in *Every Man in his Humour* (1598), *The Alchemist* (1610), *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), *The Devil is an Ass* (1616), and the masque entitled *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* (1621). His work thus marked a converging ground between the canonical centre and the popular margins of Renaissance literary activity. Previous depictions of underworld characters on the stage or in the rogue pamphlets had depicted them as a kind of sub-culture that mimicked the roles and professions of legitimate society, and organised themselves into intricate thieving and swindling guilds, with its own distinctive argot and hierarchy. Jonathan Haynes maintains that, 'Jonson's specific and decisive step was to imagine an underworld no longer structured on the guild model, but on a capitalist one.'[101] Writing during a time when intense class insecurity and rapid social mobility was making it difficult to judge birth and gentility by appearance alone, the rogue provided Jonson with a means of working out his own authorial anxieties. More significantly the servant-tricksters enabled him to redefine the material conditions of service into that of aesthetic or artistic labour. Moreover, as a classic instance of the marginalised individual acquiring a temporary yet distinct subjectivity, the rogue-artist would have appealed to Jonson's desire to claim a distinct aesthetic voice for a lowly profession in a world of changing literary sensibilities.

The trickster offered a legitimating cultural paradigm for the contemporary necessity to master outward appearances while hiding the private space of conscience from public view. As Detienne and Vernant[102] have shown with respect to classical mythology, shape-shifting and the use of clever guile are typically ploys suited to the socially disadvantaged. To Jonson the rogue may have afforded a simultaneous recognition and condemnation of the contingent ways in which reputation was to be achieved in those times: by flattering powerful patrons or clients, ingratiating to the tastes of undiscerning spectators or by stealing other people's ideas. Moreover the ambiguity of his position within a commercialised patronage system[103] – his social inferiority and intellectual superiority

---

[101] Jonathan Haynes, *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 109.

[102] Detienne and Vernant, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*.

[103] See Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (New York: Routledge, 2003). The proliferation of offices and honours under James' administration led to personal wealth becoming an important factor in attaining high social rank in Jacobean England, especially when titles could be openly purchased. Such a system often led to corruption in the dispensing of titles and offices which often went to the highest bidder. This corrupt process was compounded by the latent medieval custom of gift giving as a way of expressing loyalty to patrons or bestowing reward to clients among the feudal aristocracy. The corruption inherent in attaining and maintaining social rank is critiqued in *Volpone*.

(borne out by the inappropriate melding of 'mix(ing) his/head with other mens heeles') (Induction to *Bartholomew Fair*, ll. 130-1) – bore a strange similarity to these self-determining fictional types – both embodying new social (and aesthetic) possibilities and fissiparous energies in an age of radical mobility, change, and social adjustment.

These outcasts and their economic malpractices of dubious trade and dishonest investment is again an oblique comment on Jonson's own implication in a distinctly mercantile cultural ideal. Their attempts at mobility and social adaptability by hoarding wealth and rising up the hierarchical ladder bore uncomfortable resemblance to Jonson's ambitious and often shameless staking of new claims as a commercially successful author.[104] Similarly their artistic illusions which act as sources of self-enrichment are also an implicit observation on the playhouse's own accumulation of box-office profit. However, the rogue's marginality and imposture also reflects on the early modern playwright's peripheral socio-economic position whose striving for authorial subjectivity remained perpetually out of reach.[105] Apparently Jonson seems to suggest that even disenfranchised service might be aesthetically 'productive', and material property might be reinterpreted as intellectual property.[106]

The cony-catcher also provided Jonson with a fuller acceptance of the deceptive and manipulative nature of artistic design since '*Poets* neuer credit gain'd/By writing truths, but things (like truths) well fain'd.' (Second Prologue to *The Silent Woman*, ll. 9-10) Their activities however dubious become a powerful trope to express the liberty of creative imagination. The plays help to clarify the dangerous proximity between the true artificer (fluent in social graces yet devoid of pretensions) and the false one: 'If all you boast of your great art be true;/Sure, willing pouerty liues most in you' ('To Alchymists', *Epigram*

---

[104] Commenting on the establishment of the 'author' as an identifiable, reputable citizen practising a useful and respectable occupation during the Renaissance, Kinney sees Jonson as having established his plays as England's first identifiable canon by publishing *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson* in 1616. He cites Stephen Orgel's emphasis that playwrighting during this time was considered to be a collaborative effort, but in the case of *Sejanus*: '(I)n preparing the play for publication, Jonson took control of the text: he replaced his collaborator's scenes with ones of his own, and added a good deal of new material, largely historical documentation...Jonson here has succeeded in suppressing the theatrical production, and has replaced it with an independent, printed text, which he consistently refers to, moreover, not as a play but as a poem.' See Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*, pp. 6-7.

[105] For a fuller treatment on the ambivalent status of the author 'as an individual yet unindividuated presence, as a catholic disposition without specific position' in the 'heteronomous cultural space' of early modern England see Swapan Chakravorty's essay 'Author as *Auctor*: The Shakesperean Instance', in *Renaissance Texts and Contexts*, ed. Amlan Dasgupta (Kolkata: Macmillan India Limited, 2003), pp. 8-31: 10.

[106] I am indebted for this reading to Elizabeth Rivlin's '"Iterate the Work": *The Alchemist* and Ben Jonson's Labors of Service', in *The Aesthetics of Service in Early Modern England* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2012), pp. 107-34: 109.

VI, l. 29).[107] Jonson railed against the cultural practices of an age that drew its sustenance from outward appearances. In the 'Epistle: To Katherine, Lady Aubigny', (her husband was his courtly patron) he defined his art as being diametrically opposed to cosmetic signification.

> I, therefore, who professe my self in loue
>
> With euery virtue, wheresoere it moue,
>
> And howsoeuer; as I am at fewd
>
> With sinne and vice, though with a throne endew'd...
>
> I, that haue suffer'd this; and, though forsooke
>
> Of *Fortune*, haue not alter'd yet my looke,
>
> Or so my self abandon'd, as because
>
> Men are not iust, or keepe no holy lawes
>
> Of nature, and societie, I should faint;
>
> Or feare to draw true lines, 'cause others paint...
>
> (Epistle: To Katharine, Lady Aubigny', in *The Forest* XIII, ll. 7-10, 15-20)

Recurrent imagery relating to cosmetics (common Renaissance motif symbolic of pride, and concealment of corruption), masks, and visors in the plays comment on the ubiquity of disguising and hypocrisy. Jonson's dislike of prosthetic devices that aided self-fashioning translates for instance into a damning Juvenalian satire of women who use ornamental tricks to enhance beauty and conceal imperfections: a flawless exterior hiding a rotten core ('Which lady sleepes with her owne face, a nights?', *Sejanus*, I.i.307-9). Yet just as the intricate feminine assemblage of clothing and cosmetic arts retained its dangerous charm for Jonson (as in Truewit's justification of womanly artifice in *Epicoene*), so the creative artistry and ethical flexibility of his roguish schemers retained a strong pull

---

[107] Despite Jonson's blatant anti-theatrical tendency and his intolerant approach to moral vices especially in the earlier plays, there is a conscious celebration of the illusory artifices of women, actors, and the emancipator agency of tricksters in the later ones. His self-image in the early plays is marked by strong ethical characteristics: Lorenzo Junior in *Every Man In His Humour*, Asper/Macilente in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Crites in *Cynthia's Revels*, and Horace in *Poetaster*. The experience of the war of the theatres (Poetomachia) may have taught him to believe less in these rigid and static self-projections. *Sejanus* the tragedy that followed the comical satires adopted a more indirect and ironic mode by which he could escape 'wolues black iaw and the dull asses hoofe' ('Apologeticall Dialogue' appended to *Poetaster*). In the following four comedies Jonson was to discover his artistic affinity with the cony-catcher as he produced four consummate meditations on the nature of identity and dissimulation. Cosmetic or visual ornament was traditionally associated with rhetorical ornament which came to include all figures of speech and tropes and was linked to the artist's creation of images of order. While this helps to appreciate the relation of the cunning artistry of his craft with that of the 'cosmetic' arts, it also aids in modifying the stoic and misogynist strain in Jonson.

on him despite his stoic fortitude and absolute disavowal of performance.[108] Hence his criticism of the contemporary tendency to disguise intentions proceeded simultaneously with,

> [A] less acknowledged but nonetheless potent theatricalism. The fact that Volpone, Morose, and Sir Epicure all think of the garbing of their paramours as 'art' serves to underscore the resemblance between the costumer's trade and the poet's, the craft of the cosmetician and that of the playwright. By placing the sacred term 'art' in the unhallowed mouths of these characters, Jonson acknowledges the bond between himself and them even as he repudiates it.[109]

In his essay 'On Negation', Freud commented how denial and devaluation of the work of others is often an indispensàble element of authorial self-constitution.[110] Peter Stallybrass and Allon White make a similar point with reference to Jonson.

> Disgust bears the imprint of desire, and Jonson found in the huckster, the cony-catcher (that is, con-man) and the pick-pocket an image of his own precarious and importuning craft. Proclaiming so loudly how all the other plays were mere cozening, did not Jonson pursue the perennial strategy of the mountebank who decried the deceptions and the false wares of others the more easily to practise his own deceptions and pass off his own productions as the 'real thing'?
>
> As a 'master poet', then Jonson constituted his identity in opposition to the theatre and the fair. Through the imaginary separation of the scholar's study and library from the theatrical marketplace, Jonson simultaneously mapped out the divisions...between the 'author' and the hack...in the fair he could stigmatize the voices which competed against his own and reveal just how 'dirty' were the hands which sullied his 'pure' wares.[111]

---

[108] Even the artist and scholar figures in the later plays are urbane and shrewd artificers. Jonson observed that imitation was an asset to a younger writer in developing his own voice: 'The third requisite in our *Poet*, or Maker, is *Imitation*, to bee able to convert the substance, or Riches of an other Poet, to his owne use. To make choise of one excellent man above the rest, and so to follow him, till he grow very *Hee*: or so like him, as the Copie may be mistaken for the Principall. Not, as a Creature, that swallowes, what it takes in, crude, raw, or indigested; but, that feedes with an Appetite, and hath a Stomacke to concoct, divide, and turne all into nourishment' (*Discoveries,* ll. 2466-75).

[109] Jonas Barish, 'Jonson and the Loathèd Stage', in *A Celebration of Ben Jonson*, ed. William Blissett, Julian Patrick, and R. W. Van Fossen (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), pp. 30-46: 51.

[110] Sigmund Freud, 'On Negation', in *On Freud's 'Negation'*, ed. Mary Kay O'Neill and Salman Akhtar (London: Karnac Books, 2011).

[111] Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London: Methuen, 1986), p. 77.

Jonson had a knack for working 'through hints and glances, what lies beneath the surface, behind a public face.'[112] The prolific use of disguise whether verbal or otherwise indicated an acknowledgement of an inward identity hidden beneath an obscuring exterior. His elaborate authorial self-presentations in the dramatic prologues and inductions (see Chapter VI for Jonson's role-playing in the paratextual spaces of the printed editions of his plays) are also as playfully elusive as those of his self-consciously tricky rogues. Jonsonian 'humorous' drama has been conventionally critiqued for its lack of profundity, character development, and engagement in superficies in contrast to the psychological strength of Shakespearean drama.[113] T. S. Eliot may have described Jonson's poetry as 'being of the surface', on the contrary by rehearsing the discrepancy between external seeming and interior being and promising their comic erasure or in the constant transgressions between private and public space and persona, Jonson ruminated upon the changing modes of cognition and the nature of his aesthetic project in the increasingly uncertain environment of Jacobean London.

Further, Jonson's plays allude to a conventional association between glass and anatomy in their moralistic aim to mirror and excoriate (in the sense of both reprimanding and dissecting) the vices and follies of the age, in his search for the ideal unchanging transparent form in a world of false appearances and hectic corruption.

> Well I will scourge those apes;
>
> And to these courteous eyes oppose a mirror,
>
> As large as is the stage, whereon we act:
>
> Where they shall see the times deformities
>
> Anatomiz'd in euery nerve, and sinnew,
>
> With constant courage, and contempt of feare.
>
> (Induction to *Every Man Out of His Humour*, ll. 117-22)

The verbal exposures performed by his plays are visually framed within a corporeal context (like 'glasses,/Cut in more subtill angles, to disperse,/And multiply the figures as I walke', *Alchemist*, II.ii.45-7): linguistic disclosures become an alternative to ripping open

---

[112] See Ian Donaldson, 'Jonson's Poetry', in Harp and Stewart, pp. 119-139: 126.

[113] The ideological process of canon formation has reduced Jonson to Shakespeare's other who was unable to tap into the universal life-force that shapes humanity. As David Riggs rightly comments: 'It is an irony of literary history that future readers not only accepted Jonson's claim about Shakespeare's 'natural' genius, but also turned it into an indictment of Jonson, the plodding and laborious exponent of "art". In the eyes of posterity Jonson's "principle function", as Harry Levin says, "has been to serve as a stalking horse for Shakespeare. Others abide our question, Shakespeare transcends it; and if you would understand, point for point, the limitations he transcends, go read Jonson".' See Riggs, *Ben Jonson*, p. 278.

bodies to reflect the secret corruptions of the heart. Jonson favoured the conventional image of the satirist as one who uses the discovery mode to produce authority, finding out the hidden truth by peeling off layers of obscurity and deceit, offering the uncovered body as a model of truth: 'I'll strip the ragged follies of the time/Naked as their birth' (Induction to *Every Man Out of His Humour*, ll. 16-18).[114] Truth may be difficult to access not only because of the limitations of the perceiving mind but also because of the labyrinthian and dissembling surface of nature. Jonson's surveillant 'play' mirrors are both didactic and epistemological touchstones, serving to externalise and make visible guilty inwardness. Visual appearances might deceive yet these verbally refracting and flaying mirrors claim to tell the truth in a world of shifting and changing outer forms (cryptically paralleling the courtly mirror-for-princes tradition).

Renaissance thinkers such as Francis Bacon and Descartes often used the idea of the mind as a Platonic mirror that reflected the natural world.[115] Jonson's moralistic theory too seems to be influenced by the concept of the mirror as man's inward soul (*synderesis*). Some recent commentators such as Deborah Shuger have argued that the use of mirrors in early modern artistic practices (writings, paintings or woodcuts) did not refer to the individuated, interiorised self but were rather employed as instruments of correction, cruel reminders of *vanitas*, mortality, and reflections of virtue.[116] Others such as Sabine Melchior-Bonnet[117] situate the Renaissance mirror as a private instrument of self-examination and interior dialogue. I suggest that Jonson's appropriation of the (baroque) mirror as an artistic trope positions his plays both as emblems of self-recognition as well as of metaphysical anxiety, situating the spectator both as viewing subject and as the object viewed. It tries to affect an unstable convergence of the physical and the

---

[114] Similar parallels can be found in Truth's exhortation in *Hymenaei*, ll. 719-21: 'whosoe're thou be in this disguise,/Cleare Truth, anon, shall strip thee to the heart;/And shew how mere phantasticall thou art.'

[115] According to Francis Bacon (in Book I of the *Novum Organum*, Aphorisms 39-68) the human mind is not a *tabula rasa*, but a crooked mirror on account of implicit distortions. He does not sketch a basic epistemology but asserts that the images of the mind are not an objective representation of true objects. Consequently the mind needs to be freed from idols (products of the human imagination) before any knowledge acquisition.

[116] See Deborah Shuger, 'The "I" of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind', in *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday*, ed. Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), pp. 19-36. Early modern (convex) mirrors produced distorted images and were a trope for representing the social persona and a means of self-scrutiny and self-correction, of self-abasement in the eyes of God, or a picture of folly and *vanitas*. Leonardo da Vinci used the mirror as a figurative tool, instructing the painter to 'keep his mind as clear as the surface of a mirror, which assumes colours as various as those of the different objects.' See Leonardo da Vinci, 'On the artist's temperament and good working habits', in Alessandro Vezzosi, *Leonardo da Vinci: The Mind of the Renaissance* (New York: Discoveries, 1997), p. 136. Parmigianino offered a visual emblem of the mirrored self as a contortion of art and nature in *Self-Portrait in a Convex Mirror* (1524).

[117] Sabine Melchior-Bonnet, *The Mirror: A History*, trans. Katharine H. Jewett (London: Routledge, 2001).

psychological, facilitating an understanding of the self reflected therein, both in terms of pre-modern non-reflexive multiplicity even as it gestures sceptically towards hidden spaces and secret depths within the soul. By doing so Jonson anticipates the imminent Cartesian mind-body separation, encouraging the spectators to read their own bodily or verbal affectations in the humours mirrored onstage and gaze inwards in order to attempt self-reform and self-manipulation. Ever alert to the moral and pedagogical purpose of his work, Jonson in the prologue to *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*, invoked the neoclassical Horatian maxim of *utile et dulce* (profit and delight) in defense of the corrective and satirical nature of his comedy.

> ...Though this pen
>> Did neuer aime to grieve, but better men;
> How e'er the age, he liues in, doth endure
>> The vices that shee breeds, aboue their cure.
> But, when wholesome remedies are sweet,
>> And, in their working, gaine, and profit meet,
> He hopes to find no spirit so much diseas'd,
>> But will, with such correctiues, be pleas'd.
>
> (Prologue to *The Alchemist*, ll. 11-18)

Jonson promotes a healthy interaction of mind and bodily demeanour, even as he seems to look askance at the widespread Renaissance correlation between the function of vision and the process of conceptual thought. His plays overtly uphold a didactic (pre-Reformation) counter-aesthetic that tries to conflate exterior mask (socially obvious features) and interior essence through a hermeneutics whose focus lay on the now-lost nexus between polysemous, unreliable, dissimulative body signifiers and immaterial language: 'Language most shewes a man: Speake, that I may see thee. It springs out of the most retired and inmost parts of us, and is the Image of the Parent of it, the mind. No glasse renders a mans forme, or likeness, so true as his speech' (*Discoveries*, ll. 2031-5). Art promotes ethical improvement and judgment, elevating visual experience to moral rationality, yet Jonson seems all too aware of the frustrations of knowing oneself or others. In reality his 'middle' comedies remain witness to a post-Reformation semiotic crisis where any claim to definitive interpretation is problematised by the irremediable rupture between signifier and referent (what Jean-Christophe Agnew calls the 'crisis of

representation').[118] The figure of the rogue in his plays operates as a metaphorical trope that enables Jonson to address the contemporary fracture of epistemological coherence. As discursive exercises in self-imaging and artistic empowerment, they also help to put in unique perspective the creation and recreation of authorial identity.

---

[118] Jean-Christophe Agnew, *Worlds Apart: The Market and Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 2-3. Traditional social signs and symbols had metamorphosed into detached and manipulable commodities. Augustine in his early commentaries on the Book of Genesis and the *Confessions* had visualised language to be an after-effect of the Fall and had associated it with opacity, fragmentation, and dissimulation in contrast to the transparent totality of prelapsarian communication. Despite the Western humanist valorisation of speech as the field of human agency and social meaning, a strong anti-rhetorical counter-tradition drawing on Neostoicism pointedly undercut the value of speech. This line of thinking was registered by Puritan polemicists such as William Perkins and George Webb and the philosopher Peter Ramus (1515-1572), a fiercely outspoken critic of Cicero who considered speech to have been mere cosmetic ornamentation.

CHAPTER FIVE

CREATIVE LABOUR AND IMAGINATIVE DECEIT: THE ROGUE-ARTISTS OF JONSONIAN COMEDY

> *Imposture* is a specious thing; yet never worse, Then when
> it faines to be best, and to none discover'd sooner, then the
> simplest. For *Truth* and *Goodnesse* are plaine, and open:
> but *Imposture* is ever asham'd of the light.[1]

I
Rogues and Master-Playwrights

The choice of the three plays *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholomew Fair* considered as the most consummate expression of Jonson's middle phase career, for discussion in this dissertation, is dictated less by the convenience of their chronological contiguity. On the contrary such a preference is primarily governed by their suitability for examining early modern privacy's association with a sense of privation or lack: an othered state representing the dark and unseen converse of the public realm or self. The sense of privacy as a condition affording pleasurable freedom from external scrutiny was complemented by its analogous meaning as shared freedom of familiarity. This latter meaning of privacy as the awareness of a sense of privileged confidentiality with another person or group drew on the classical ideal of passionate friendship (*amicitia*) based on a mutual recognition of virtue providing a powerful counterpoint to the kinship networks and social hierarchies determining one's position in life. These three plays mull on the continuum of diverse subtexts of early modern privacy that ranged from the closeness nurtured by the family or property ownership in an emergent liberal economy to further encompass ideas of friendship, personal servitude, patronage, clientage or forms of intimacy within public realms.

Jonson's personal engagement with the paradoxes of the privacy discourse is two-fold. Firstly, he uses the lower-order servant-trickster as a negative prototype to bring out the menacing aspects of privacy, especially in the way in which they exploit trust and feign familiarity to further their own self-oriented materialistic ends. Yet each of these

---

[1] *Discoveries*, ll. 236-9.

characters also possesses an innately corrupt human imagination that evades external control and frees them from the demands of their social functions, thus perverting demarcations between systemic and personal. Their changeability and mobility makes rogue an ideal exemplar to express Jonson's own ambiguous role-playing and the exhilarating though perverse autonomy of his spontaneous authorial creativity. Secondly, Jonson plays on the affirmative possibility of creating a private world peopled by apolitical individuals united through mutual self-interest and like-mindedness.

This dissertation defends its selection of the plays *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholomew Fair* on account of the mutual lower-order solidarity shared by the parasite Mosca, Face the servant, and the sub-cultural fraternity of Smithfield. Their shared social marginality makes them particularly significant for grounding privacy in relations of authority and subversion. Such considerations leave out perforce scheming characters who belong to the privileged stratum such as Volpone, the Venetian magnifico; the aspiring gallant Francis Quicksilver in *Eastward Ho!* (1605; written jointly with George Chapman and John Marston); the conman-projector Merecraft in *The Devil Is an Ass* (1616); and Pennyboy Canter, the legal scion of the Pennyboy family in *The Staple of News* (1626) (the latter's disguise as a canting beggar is merely a ruse that he discards after reassuming his fortune; in addition Canter's moral virtuosity in the service of his 'master' Pennyboy Jr. makes him doubly irrelevant *vis-à-vis* the main argument of this dissertation).

In addition none of the characters in the Jonsonian comic oeuvre possess the psychological complexity and covert subversivemess that is comparable to the insincerity, deceit, self-indulgence, and sheer selfishness of Mosca and Face. By contrast the loyalty and meticulousness of classical servant-charlatans in early humours comedies such as Brainworm in *Every Man in His Humour* (1598); Carlo Buffone and Macilente in *Everyman Out of His Humour* (1599); or of retainers such as Prudence and Compass in the late Caroline plays *The New Inn* (1629) and *The Magnetic Lady* (1632) (although the final four in the list are not technically 'rogues') sets them apart. These individuals cannot really be said to have a private motive for self-advancement apart from aiding their master's interests or deriding and exposing the gulls. Brainworm's witty scheming in securing future employment is ultimately directed towards the 'greater good' of the clandestine marriage between Edward Knowell and Mistress Bridget. Moreover, his dependence on spontaneous physical disguise whether as a

mendicant soldier, as Justice Clement's servant or as a sergeant of the law in order to carry out his intrigue makes it less consummate than the superior verbal masquerade adopted by Mosca and Face.

Buffone, the scurrilous jester and violent tavern railer and Macilente, the discontented scholar are more of satiric expositors than cunning tricksters. Even the latter's wily scheming aiming at others downfall is not ostensibly directed towards personal profit; neither does it threaten the social order but only serves to restore it to health: 'strip the ragged follies of the time,/Naked as at their birth'. While their unsettled and mobile entities locate them on the lower ranks of the social hierarchy, yet strictly speaking they are not in anyone's service. Moreover, their one-track habit of social commentary (justifiable on the grounds of the behaviourally static form of humours comedy in which they appear) that involves the ridiculing of follies and deflating of affectations reduces the particularity of their inner selves.

Prudence, the chambermaid of *The New Inn* and Compass in *The Magnetic Lady* are virtuous archetypes who bear no resemblance to the conning characters of earlier plays. In keeping with the mellow, nostalgic spirit of the late comedies, their manoeuvring of the fluid borders between public and private selves are seemingly directed towards redemptive and didactic goals. Through the 'machinations' of her inner virtues such as wit, discretion, and intellect Pru furthers the love between Lovel and her mistress Lady Frampul. Compass' (in being Lady Loadstone's steward he has authority though he lacks social rank or wealth) learning and wisdom leads to the usurer Sir Moath Interest's reform and brings about the reconciliation between various characters. Their just rewards (Prudence enters a prosperous marriage with Lord Latimer; Compass marries the heiress, Placentia Steele) in terms of social advancement and inheritance of wealth in lieu of their merit implies that they are moral antitypes of the earlier servant-tricksters.

The concept of social meritocracy imagined in these late plays parallels the fanciful working out of Jonson's idealistic imagined community of like-minded individuals joined in friendship, intimacy, and cultivation of inner virtues. In this thesis the choice of the third play *Bartholomew Fair* is guided by its unique theatrical template that Jonson uses to work out his celebration of the intimate public – where a marginalised though egalitarian community of unscrupulous fair dwellers and pickpockets mimic a familiar association of friends and companions joined in privileged confidentiality to present a revisionary (subaltern) alternative to older networks based on kith and kin. The play imagines a fanciful world where the economic self-interest of the characters mixes with the pleasures

of freedom and affective ties. Although *Bartholomew Fair* does not contain isolable specimens of the rogue-artist, it is plausible to read the play as an example of a voluntary community of 'private' persons bound by common humanity rather than a status-based hierarchy in opposition to the dominant regime. In turn this helps to initiate discussion of Jonson's foray into the world of print commerce, interpreted as his appropriation of the rogue-artist as authorial persona on the mise en scène of the material page. Here for once, he tries to alleviate the anxieties of nurturing private mercenary interest by locating the 1616 folio within a selective and idealised community of concurring readers bound by sociability and affective ties.

Jonson's fascination with the ontology of the self became especially acute in the centrifugally fractured 'middle' comedies – *Volpone* (1606), *The Alchemist* (1610), and *Bartholomew Fair* (1614). These plays are marked by experimental freedom and psychological insights; they are possibly his most significant contribution to the early modern discourse on dissimulation and secrecy. They present worlds that inaugurate a regime of indeterminate social relations marked by substitution in which the consecrated centre of power has either been temporarily usurped or superseded by a structure of delegated authority or has absented itself from the action. Their contingent worlds are inhabited by men and women who have learnt to profit from the fissure between truth and what is thought to be true.

Jonson concentrates on those moments when both body and the space enclosing it are at risk. Venice in the throes of acquisitive capitalism, London in the grip of plague or the carnivalesque inversions of the fairground mirrors the ontological rupture at the beginning of the seventeenth century; revealing anxieties about real or symbolic identities and boundaries or the fixity of power and property. All the plays deal with the problem of authority and knowledge that haunt relations between hierarchically related men in an era of expanding state authority; they also articulate aspects of the epistemically resistant subject. They end in the attempt to mend the rupture either through the resuscitation of *de jure* power by staging the rightful ruler's return to 'correct' the wrongs that have been committed in his absence or with a festive inversion of moral authority in the fairgrounds of Smithfield.[2]

---

[2] The period right after the accession of James I (chosen by Elizabeth's Privy Councillors) was marked by the performance of a number of plays (such as Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* and Middleton's *The Phoenix*) that exploited the disguised ruler motif to imagine a state mechanism that was run by deputies or substitutes. See Leonard Tennenhouse, 'Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time', in *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), pp.

As the play's comic hierarchy is restored the rogue is either expunged from or socialised into the folds of the community. In his own life too Jonson ultimately desired to situate the author and his creation beyond the huckstering of an increasingly commodified literary and theatrical marketplace. His scepticism about the sources of his authority led him to alienate himself from the nostalgia of popular theatrical traditions, practices ('a servant-monster', 'a nest of anticks', and 'tales, tempests, and such-like drolleries') and sites of festivity ('the sword-and-buckler age of Smithfield') that seems radically opposed to Harman's intimate (oral) relationship with vagrant culture. Thus Jonson framed his break from traditional social and representational practices in terms of a series of substitutions and exclusions as enumerated by the Bookholder and Scrivener in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair*:

> Instead of a little Davy to take the toll o' the bawds, the author doth promise a strutting horse courser, with a leer drunkard, two or three to attend him, in as good equipage as you would wish. And then for Kindheart, the tooth-drawer, a fine oily pig woman, with her tapster to bid you welcome, and a consort of roarers for music. A wise Justice of Peace *meditant*, instead of a juggler with an ape. A civil cutpurse *searchant*. A sweet singer of new ballads *allurant*; and as fresh an hypocrite as ever was breached *rampant*.[3]

(ll. 113-22)

Despite such acts of creative disaffiliation Jonson's authorial project remained circumscribed by the cleft between a decaying patronage system (with its consequent shift of power away from great households towards the royal court) and unreliable dependence on the vagaries of the commercial market: outside feudal concepts of meritorious nobility or bourgeois gentility. He may have recovered textual authority from the players' but he was still a nominal servant of the Stuart court and a paying public.

The interest of characters such as Face and Mosca lies in their offering a representational ground through which the early modern other or author may be seen and deciphered. As dark upshots of a transitional era both creator and created were thrust into cruel and aggressive proto-capitalist worlds where they had to use their creative intellects and linguistic dexterity to live or fall prey to superior intriguers. Survival

---

139-56. Anne Barton points out that by 1614, the disguised magistrate as an authorial figure and agent of order was a comic cliché. See Anne Barton, *Ben Jonson: Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 204.

[3] Throughout the years from 1607 to 1614 when Shakespeare was writing his last plays, Jonson criticised them, famously calling *Pericles* a 'mouldy tale'.

through wits on urban streets could be strikingly akin to managing one's career by exploiting the politics of courtly privilege or manipulating a set of competitive relationships with potential clients or fellow playwrights. Similarly exposure of gulls as unmeritorious fools who are swiftly divested of their money (as the new marker of social status) seems similar to the theatre's siphoning off money from its credulous spectators.

The trickster's arrogation of the role of trusted aide and advisor to his master reflects on Jonson's own aspirations to become a royal counsellor and cultural spokesman for his age. The rogue's ability to take advantage of his close familiarity with his master plays on an earlier sense of 'domestic' which indicated a privileged level of access to knowledge or intimacy with another. It implied the dependent's favour in his master's eyes or that of a client in his patron's. The rogue's success at feigning allegiance to an older (feudal) paradigm of master-servant[4] relationship even as he tries to exploit the position of his benefactor suggests uneven faith in an ethical core and the sturdy belief in performativity as the essence of social status. His manipulation of masks and social roles towards an advantageous manoeuvring of public space in a world of cut-throat competition helped in the discursive construction of a distinctly urban culture.

An expanding urban economy marked by circulation of liquid capital and consumption of commodities resulted in new forms of employment at all social levels which would have been unthinkable in earlier eras: lawyers, apothecaries, bookbinders, booksellers, physicians, purveyors of imported cloth, pawnbrokers, entrepreneurial courtiers, players, or playwrights who performed service to make profit and advance their social position.[5] The stable identification between master and servant diminished in a capitalistic economy, determined instead by contractual relationship between customer and seller. Jonson's aspirations as an author involved both an implication in and transcendence of the proliferating early modern 'service sector'. He used the performance of service to articulate a relationship of fluid exchange between playwright and audience even as he made overtures towards an individualist position free of external control and thus outside of normative structures.

The figure of the autonomous and creative proprietary 'masterless' author was however still a notion incompatible with the ideology of the patriarchal absolutist state where all individuals were supposed to be governed by their social superiors. Thus

---

[4] In his own life Jonson was the only early modern author whose uncomfortable relationship with his former servant-turned-minor-Caroline-playwright Richard Brome was expressed through print.

[5] I am indebted to Grewell's thesis (that has now been published as a book) for an understanding of the intricacies of master-servant relationships. See Grewell, *Subversive Merit*.

Jonson's staking of new claims for authorial 'place', though initially based on the freedom of roguish chicanery[6] ultimately looked nostalgically towards a 'consociation of offices' between the monarch and scholar in which power was exchanged for learning and learning for power.[7] Such claims came at a time when the personal frontal relation between sovereign and counsellor was being steadily displaced by lateral and abstract impersonality of bureaucratic relationships. Jonson's shrewdly self-patronising intimacy with the monarch nonetheless implied the intellectual and ethical right to be arbiter forcing the audience to treat him as their moral superior.

Like other Renaissance intellectuals Jonson had a clear idea of the power of knowledge in the construction of social and political ideals. Machiavelli and Bacon had conceived of knowledge as an empowering force of agency and means of control; however Jonson was only too aware of knowledge sundered from political power in everyday affairs. The fantasy of the autonomous, self-contained, 'knowing self' was a class, gendered, and ultimately racial construct, determined by the logic of private property and possessive individualism. Perhaps Ervin Beck's suggestive remarks on the adoption of the Christianised and 'morally improved' Terentian 'Prodigal Son' paradigm in Renaissance plays hint at just such recognition in Jonson.

Tudor humanism in its concern to make the biblical parable morally instructive steered clear of any sympathy for the dissolute brother by splitting up trickery and deceit into the twin figures of the prodigal son (comic hero) and the Vice (rogue). The almost forced Jonsonian denouements show the playwright's closing identification with the comic hero in his ultimate reconciliation with the *senex* (father figure) and negation of the

---

[6] In the epistle prefacing the 1612 quarto edition of *The Alchemist* (ll. 2-8), Jonson suggests that the playwright himself is a practitioner of the trickster's game: 'If thou art one that tak'st vp, and but a Pretender, beware at what hands thou receiu'st thy commoditie; for thou wert neuer more fair in the way to be cos'ned (then in this Age) in Poetry, especially in Plays: wherein, now, the Concupiscence of Daunces and Antickes so raigneth, as to runne away from Nature, and be afraid of her, is the onely point of art that tickles the Spectators.' See William R. Dynes, 'The Trickster-figure in Jacobean City Comedy', *SEL* 1500-1900, vol. 33, 1993, pp. 365-83.

[7] Stallybrass and White, *Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, p. 73. Jonathan Goldberg in *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and Their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983), p. 59 has noted that Jonson's decision to include the masques in his 1616 folio provided a meeting ground between monarch and poet: 'Printed, the masque gains an everlastingness, a royal imprimatur. In Jonson's masques to celebrate the king means to reveal their shared status as writing.' Goldberg sees both kingship and authorship as participants in the process of the production and reception of meanings through which relations of power are established. Especially James' inclination to rule through public visibility along with an asserted remoteness from the eyes of his subjects is close to the dialectics of discovery and concealment in Jonson as well. Further in courtly books of conduct writing was also presented as one of the essential arts of courtiership.

trickster principle.[8] Yet, as Anne Barton remarks, the New Testament cautionary allegory about the wandering, rioting, whoring, and ultimately repentant prodigal brother had always been potentially subversive. In fact, the charming and clever rascally younger son seems (comically) more engaging than his stay-at-home elder brother. She points to its literary use by city-comedy writers such as Middleton, Fletcher, and Rowley who were able to break the moral stereotype associated with the story by 'showing how the wicked course of the prodigal might lead him, not to repentance or despair, but merely into the arms of a desirable, rich (and often sexually highly alert) woman.'[9]

In the same way the comic energies of Jonson's tricksters seem to undermine the author's purported moral underpinnings as the discoverer of iniquities seems perilously close to switching places with the iniquitous discovered. The plays force an interrogation of the marginalised other's access to power and appropriation of self-creative agency in their disturbing ability to merge knowledge, possession, and will. Even if the rogue's energy has been compromised to the strict demands of hierarchy, the motivations behind his actions remain a secret, so he continues to be a potential threat. Jonson's move to enunciate a new form of 'authorial' labour veered dangerously close to the mental acuity, spontaneous creativity, rhetorical versatility, and resourcefulness of the rogues 'craft' despite his attempt to distinguish his 'higher' art by stressing its didactic valence and moral industry.[10] Jonson's surreptitious overwriting of a subversive private script by a publicly conservative one can be deciphered only through an adjustment in interpretive perspective.

More significantly, then, Jonson's literary appropriation of the servant-trickster (as the origin of authorial, performative, and artistic functions within the play) in this regard enabled him to envisage authorship as a mimetic practice that made possible new identity formations in a still deeply traditional era. Such artistic representations rewrite the metamorphic or imitative faculty of the trickster as a form of representational power that produces an alternate and unsanctioned image of authority, thereby granting the rogue a measure of agency that veers towards the transgressive. The linking of generic[11]

---

[8] Ervin Beck, 'Terence Improved: The Paradigm of the Prodigal Son in English Renaissance Comedy', *RenD*, vol. 6, 1973, pp. 107-22. The figure of the male householder was presented as guarantor of social order: an agent of tradition who was resistant to the unsettling change represented by servants or dependents.

[9] Barton, *Ben Jonson*, p. 243.

[10] See Karen Helfand Bix's essay '"Masters of Their Occupation": Labor and Fellowship in the Cony-Catching Pamphlets', in Dionne and Mentz, pp. 171-92.

[11] Comedy's association with the 'low' goes back to Aristotle who in the *Poetics* said that the subject of comedy was mean or paltry (*phaulos*) in contrast to tragedy which concerned itself with the serious, solemn,

inferiority with aesthetic potency in the figure of the trickster might have been a compelling self-image for Jonson who was concerned with positing a unique position for the author and exhibiting the pedagogical value of his fictions at a time when play writing was considered a socially degraded activity.[12] In effect, I see the rogue's mediation of contraries such as private and public, fact and fiction as folding tenuously into an account of the emergence of authorial subjectivity.

As 'playmakers' and covert expeditors of their own little theatrical plots and stratagems the rogues bear uncanny resemblance to Jonson, serving to underscore their common liminality. Ian Donaldson corroborates such a view when he points out analogues between the unpredictability of the rogues' plots and those of Jonson. Jonson's dramatic technique always traded in complexity, secrecy, and surprise even though he never admitted to thrusting the wrong end of the narrative skein on to his spectators. Like his rogues, Jonson's dramatic aims and motives remained concealed, with their moral designs moving unpredictably towards unknown ends.[13] The trickster's dramaturgical construction and exploitation of false epistemologies take place inside the closed and confined (but ultimately breached) private spaces of Volpone's bedchamber, Subtle's alchemical laboratory, or Ursula's roast pig-booth (which are further located within the physical space of the theatre[14] and the commercial exchange economy of the larger society): ludic and macabre spaces for deviant and carnivalesque behaviour.

Apart from a few doors early modern stages had few props with the theatre being a communal space which had minimal opportunities for expressing privacy. Jonson's theatrical houses are publicly constructed domestic spaces where actions such as peeking through windows, movement downstage, speaking through keyholes or in lowered tones, keeping the gulls waiting at the door,[15] timing character arrivals and departures or

---

and the good (*spoudaios*). Western critical tradition thus had the Stagirite's weighty authority for treating the comic as second rate if it was treated at all.

[12] Playwrights wrote for and were economically dependent on theatrical companies that in turn were reliant on patronage and sponsorship of noblemen. Placed low on the social and aesthetic hierarchy (in contrast to writers in courtly genres) their occasional writings for the court were not enough to accord them prestige. Such concerns became more acute in the context of the playwright's interaction with his audience.

[13] Ian Donaldson, 'Unknown Ends: *Volpone*', in *Ben Jonson*, ed. Richard Dutton (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2000), pp. 118-22.

[14] The playhouse may be considered a memorial reconstruction of the domestic houses and business establishments of Southwark or London. Jonson prominently underscored the link between domestic houses and playhouses just as he often presented the playwright as a house builder.

[15] In Jonsonian drama the door constitutes an important locus in its own right. They also constitute the main tool in the control and manipulation of private space. See Ann C. Christensen, '"The doors are made against you": Domestic Thresholds in Ben Jonson's Plays', *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, vol. 18, 1997, pp. 153-78: 176 and James D. Mardock, *Our Scene is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008), p. 87.

unexplained noises and smells from offstage areas helped to create the illusion of and mastery over a closed interior space that was vulnerable to intrusions from the external world. The technical production of the rogue's stratagems is hidden from outside eyes, success in this case depending on the privacy and inviolability of hermetic spaces. The illusory devices run so smoothly that their inner workings remain concealed to most onstage characters (barring the audience who are given sneak previews into the trickster's motives and machinations) until they are forcibly revealed in the comic catastrophe. Likewise Jonson would ideally conceive all his works as coterie texts, meant for the admiration of a select and exclusive literary or socially elite circle, reaching its logical (though extreme) culmination in the private self-directed author holding his distance from both the plebeians and the aristocrats.[16]

Although the ultimate disclosure of secret stratagems vindicates authority yet the plays also rehearse the ultimate nightmare of a system temporarily overturned by the treacherous subordinate. Such disclosures remain precariously unstable for they are ultimately dictated either by chance (*Volpone*) or by authorial or spectatorial willingness to participate in the theatrical illusion (*The Alchemist, Bartholomew Fair*). Face's 'triumph' is an ironic one since it is based on the astuteness of his performance. The spectator's position is rendered less than innocent, underscoring a fictionalised complicity with the rogue that threatens to dampen his moral condemnations. Jonson's own attitude remained at best ambivalent, morally supple and ethically eclectic: veering between dispensing the strictest punishment to the artful deceivers of *Volpone* on the grounds of silencing those 'that crie out, we neuer punish vice in our enterludes,' (Dedicatory Epistle, l. 116)[17] to his acceptance of and delight in deception that emerges in the notoriously amoral ending of Lovewit's unscrupulously indulgent, 'I loue a teeming wit, as I loue my nourishment', in *The Alchemist* (V.i.16). His tolerance of ingenious subterfuges is carried to its logical finale in the 'festive' *Bartholomew Fair*, revealing sympathy for errant humanity that includes the playwright as well. Epistemological uncertainty remains a fundamental condition of human life depicted in these plays.

Possibly part of the attraction and cultural valence of such figures derived from their ability to comprehend, articulate or legitimise the norms of dissimulatory practice. As

---

[16] On this latter point see Stallybrass and White's chapter, 'The Fair, the Pig, Authorship', *Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, pp. 27-124.

[17] By the time he wrote *Bartholomew Fair* four years later, Jonson had implicitly identified with the fairground charlatans. Rather than punishing the artificer he used the puppet show to refute the Puritan Zeal-of-the-Land Busy's fulminations against the theatre.

markers of Jonson's implicit frustration with a 'world that conducts its business under a veil of secrecy',[18] they are as well a reminder of the highly disciplined practices of daily self-management and self-presentation that Jonson had learnt to take advantage of. Jonson's indeterminacy participates in the discourse of 'honest dissimulation' that was slowly gaining credence by the end of the sixteenth century.[19] One of the foremost early exponents of this theory was the Neapolitan humanist Giovanni Pontano (1426-1503) whose *De Prudentia* (On prudence) which first appeared posthumously in 1505, contended that 'nonetheless at times the power of fortune and the variety and inconstancy of human events are such that, in the right time and place, it is necessary not only to simulate or dissimulate, but also to make use of fictions: and this is considered extremely honest and worthy of highest praise.'[20] Pontano was followed by others in the early years of the Cinquecento such as the Ferrarese humanist and diplomat Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541) and the Dutch humanist Erasmus who in his collection of *Adagia* (Adages) formulated an image of the reserved Christian individual who possesses beneath a mask of irony and indifference to worldly values, a precious inner centre that is only revealed to a few. In his adage entitled 'Sileni Alcibiadis' (The sileni of Alcibiades, III.iii.i), he drew on the classical *sileni* – small statuettes made of wood and containing another, different figure hidden within them- to argue how their innate excellence is buried in their inmost parts, though their outward shell may seem contemptible at first glance. Like the ancient Greek *sileni* the honest dissimulator had to hide his thoughts behind an opaque and impenetrable screen, and reveal himself only to the initiated few who could be entrusted with the precious knowledge within. Erasmus found nothing wrong with a radical and wilful

---

[18] William E. Slights, *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 60.

[19] Besides Cicero and Horace, the other major Roman writer especially valued by Jonson was the historian Tacitus (evinced in *Epigram* CI). Tacitus's laconic account of the deeds and misdeeds of Rome's imperial rulers such as Tiberius and Domitian may have fascinated Jonson's republican tendencies. Tacitus was frequently associated with Machiavelli in Jonson's time. Although he was visibly attracted to the Italian's belief in mixed government and classical republicanism, yet he also consciously rejected Machiavellian amorality and atheism. In his examination of Jonson's relation to contemporary political thought, Joseph Kelly arrives at the conclusion that Jonson was a constitutional monarchist -a position that was at once conservative and potentially revolutionary in being opposed to the view of the Stuart monarchs. He surmises that Jonson's politics may have been closer to the Parliamentary opposition than to the Court's. See Joseph Jon Kelly, 'Ben Jonson's Politics', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* n.s. vol. 7, 1983, pp. 192-215. Jonson shared the ambivalence of most of his fellows in the seventeenth century who a few years after his death went to fight in the Civil War.

[20] Giovanni Pontano, *De Prudentia*, fol. 202r (Naples: Sigismondo Mayr, 1505). Quoted in Snyder, *Dissimulation and Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*, p. 50.

disjunction between inside (core of affect and intellect) and the outside (comportment, appearance) so long as there was an ethical justification for doing so.[21]

The distinction between honest dissimulation (leading to complete self-consciousness and self-transparency) and dishonest simulation was to acquire a special urgency by the time of the Counter-Reformation. In 1570 the northern Italian physician and philosopher Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576) wrote a work called *Proxeneta* where he used ancient moral philosophy to deliberate on the attractiveness of dissimulation as a practice that involved a detached attitude as well as the ability to equivocate by 'doing and saying' something other than what one wanted to do or say. Cardano considered Socrates to be its most important representative justifying dissimulation by virtue of its being a less dangerous practice to be used while speaking to the powerful. Though arguably the distinction between simulation (lying) and dissimulation (secrecy)[22] remains unconvincing for many critics, yet Jonson, I feel, is constantly at pains to negotiate the tensions between them in his writing.

One other writer who similarly negotiated such tensions was Montaigne (discussed in Chapter II), though Jonson's subordinate social position would have made such tensions even more acute. The French essayist acknowledges that it would be a serious mistake to underestimate or deny the importance of indirection and deceit in human affairs[23] since complete frankness might amount to foolish indiscretion, at the same time as he distances himself from it. In both cases, however, the practice of honest dissimulation as a means of defensive and accommodative negotiation with the absolutist regime played a formative role in the appropriation of a secularised and psychologised interiority.

Jonson distinguishes between the simulatory theatrics and illegitimate forms of writing represented by his rogue-artists and the morally credible dissimulative poetics of the master-playwright though at times the distinction does seem rather tenuous. *Imitatio* (mimesis) was a central tenet of the humanist programme for education but early modern authors were well aware of its dangers, prescribing its use only by elite and discriminating subjects possessing enough interpretive skill and prior experience in a wide range of literary models.[24] As an exemplar of 'good' *imitatio* Jonson's artistic representations leave

---

[21] Snyder, *Dissimulation and Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*, p. 52.
[22] Jean Baudrillard notes that dissimulation 'is to feign not to have what one has. To simulate is to feign to have what one hasn't. One implies a presence, the other an absence.' See Jean Baudrillard, *Simulations* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983), p. 5.
[23] Montaigne, 'On Presumption' (Book II, Chapter XVII).
[24] Roger Ascham in *The Schoolmaster* (1570) associates servants with wrongful use of imitation, who become the objects of their young master's imitations: 'This child, using much the company of servingmen and

the 'reality principle intact: the difference is always clear, it is only masked': they bar access to something that truly exists, plausibly the interior life of the author in his defence against the world. They conjoin the aesthetic imperative of providing pleasurable entertainment with the social obligation of moral improvement which is the rightful aim of mimesis. On the other hand the 'artful' deceptions of his roguish personas threaten 'the difference between "true" and "false", between "real" and "imaginary"',[25] calling into focus the arbitrariness of the sign itself. The contagious touch of their indecorous and improper aesthetics ruptures the link between poetic and social 'making', spreading to infect vulnerable spectators or readers who imitate such 'bad' poetic examples. Anti-platonic in its disparagement of lucid clarity and essential form, the visual seductions of rogue 'art' celebrated a confusing interplay of form and chaos, transparency and obscurity.

In his desire to reconcile the promotion of common good with the satisfaction of self-interest Jonson shared the concerns of the English courtesy writers who sought to develop a native version of Roman 'civil conversation' that would resolve the Ciceronian *honestas* (which licensed dissembling rhetoric to facilitate negotiation and resolution) with the English sense of 'honesty' as plain-speaking and truth-telling.[26] In his preface 'To the Reader' in *The Alchemist*, Jonson suggests that his plays are a warning to his gullible readers who should be prepared to defend themselves against the cunning traps set for them by others in real life, quietly eliding the nature of the moral deceptions that await them within the theatre itself. Even in a play like *Bartholomew Fair* which has been generally applauded for its apparent amoral indulgence, Jonson seeks to create a distance between himself and his fictional charlatans. The Epilogue addressed to James I (spoken only at the Court presentation of the play) demands judgment for the profane characters' displayed onstage:

> you can tell
> If we have us'd that *leave* you gave us, well:
> Or whether wee to *rage*, or *license* breake,
> Or be *prophane*, or make *prophane* men speake?

---

giving good ear to their talk, did easily learn which he shall hardly forget all days of his life hereafter.' Quoted in Rivlin's *Aesthetics of Service in Early Modern England*, p. 7. Policing the effects of social mimesis ensured the maintenance of status hierarchies between servant and master.

[25] Baudrillard, *Simulations*, p. 5.

[26] See Jennifer Richards, *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

> This is your power to judge (great Sir).[27]

> (ll. 5-9)

Theatre's power to restructure civic identity within an emerging bourgeois culture would be contingent on the spectator's shrewd ability to detect the subtle differences between the moral and the mimetic. It helped to initiate the 'good citizen' into the new languages of urban civic culture making the city seem more manageable, while helping to shield them from its moral stigma.

II
Performing Privacy: Mosca and Face

While contemporary scholarship has explored how the Jonsonian rogue drew literary inspiration from the subversive and witty attributes of the clever slave of Roman New Comedy, what has been less commonly acknowledged is the way in which the nature of this stimulation might also have been both ideological and metatheatrical. To begin with, Roman Comedy's literary engagement with civic self-definition based on a collective commitment to the *res publica* and it's transient though tendentious expression of individualism within authoritarian structures would have more than appealed to Jonson's latent republican sympathies. Furthermore, Plautus' use of the slave as an agent of dramaturgical self-consciousness may have influenced Jonson's own creative appropriation of the rogue to express the nascence of early modern authorial subjectivity. New Comedy can be read as an exercise in cultural and political self-understanding, a unique platform for staging, albeit tongue-in-cheek, the subtle and complex destabilisation of elite Roman identity under the increasing onslaught of Hellenistic culture in the third and second centuries BCE.[28] Plautus and Terence were able to draw upon the power differential inherent in the ubiquitous social institution of slavery to reflect on Rome's troubled and paradoxical encounter with the Greek East.

Thus the tense intersubjective contest mediating the master-slave dynamic at the crux of these plays rehearsed the textured history of altering paradigms of power between Greece and Rome, indicated most remarkably perhaps in the changing social and behavioural features of the trickster: from the energetic and creatively resourceful

---

[27] This play is unique for its presentation on consecutive days, to a public audience at the Hope Theatre and to a Court audience that included the monarch.

[28] As the Romans conquered mainland Greece and Italy they were brought into contact with the immense literary and artistic achievements of the Greeks.

free citizen of Aristophanes' democratic *polis* (such as Dicaeopolis in *The Acharnians* or Pisthetaerus and Euelpides in *The Birds*) to the shrewd and cunning (Greek) slave in the the new (Roman) political centre of a culturally diverse Mediterranean world. Republican Republican Rome's ambivalent perception of the Hellenes (ranging between the threat of of intimidation and the charm of its allurements)[29] can be gauged from the way in which the Plautine slave's relative cultural sophistication and intellectual superiority over his old and boorish upper-class master within the carnivalesque play world was complemented by his real socio-political powerlessness. Such a reading is strengthened by the fact that the prospect of a 'clever slave' did have a distinct basis in Plautus' time. Quite a few of the Greek prisoners of war who were brought to Rome as slaves were highly educated and later became teachers in rich patrician households (Terence being one such figure). Such slaves who were philosophical thinkers and intellectuals in their own right were often manumitted prompting Horace's famous apothegm: *Graecia captaferum victorem cepit.*[30]

Elite Roman Republican identity was predicated on a strong sense of communal cohesion and political participation in a state of collective autonomy that gave free citizens a voice in the articulation and administration of the laws of the oligarchical polity. Written during a time of rapid cultural pluralisation and emerging group if not national consciousness, Plautine Comedy stages an exploration of identity as a process of working out the conflicting impulses between a public (Roman) self founded in traditional authority or *pietas* and a private (Hellenic) self based on secret unsanctioned fantasies. The figure of the non-Roman slave – the ultimate outsider who becomes an intimate insider – in this sense may have allowed for both a vicarious performance and negation of individualist impulses within the strict traditional norms and egalitarian values of the *communitas*; representing an element of play in a rigid system of authority and prohibition.

Plautine plays dramatise a surreal situation where wily slave-tricksters such as Tranio (*Mostellaria*), Chrysalus (*Bacchides*), Pseudolus (*Pseudolus*) or the Terentian Syrus (*Adelphoe*) use vitriolic invective and outrageously hilarious stratagems to outwit their cruelly selfish and cynical masters. Although the Plautine slave is not a psychologised character in the modern sense of the term, yet what is striking in this clash of social and mental tensions that pits the slave's ironic, amoral individualism against the norms of the Roman *civitas* is

---

[29] The Elder Cato who was a contemporary of Plautus was opposed to the spread of Hellenic culture to the extent that he refused to speak Greek even though he was proficient in the language. This dichotomous attitude characterised most Romans of the time, thus while Greek education was seen to be a necessity yet their notorious indulgence and lack of *gravitas* made them seem a corrupting influence.

[30] Translated as 'Greece, the captive, made her savage victor captive', *Epistle*, II, 1, 156.

that it offers a narrow window into an early cultural representation of a specific kind of marginalised subjectivity. If chattel slavery implied a total negation of personhood,[31] then the trickster's short-lived agency (marked by the plurality of the social roles he adopts and his divided selfhood) *vis-a-vis* his master within the play world conferred on the former an identity that was paradoxically defined by his private bo(u)nded condition.[32] The subordinated subject conveyed the problem of acting from personal volition (albeit in furthering his young master's erotic pursuits) and the ability to survive in a ruthless world by maintaining a masked sense of self. These tricksters are at times motivated enough to be able to see through their *agelastic* masters' specious rhetoric and the attendant patriarchalised structures of meaning.

The cunning Plautine slaves are able to reverse the normal civic and domestic hierarchies and the status identities of those in power through their daring and duplicitous schemes. The slave's machinations howsoever farcical they maybe, reveal the claims of hegemony to be constructed and always in need of ideological maintenance.[33] In their fictional disturbance of social hierarchies, the plays offer fantasies of personal freedom without the associated dangers that would apply in real life. On the contrary those loyal and conscientious slaves (*servus frugi*) who are happy to moralise and deliver didactic expositions on the duties proper to a serving-man such as Grumio in *Mostellaria*, Messenio in the *Menaechmi*, Sceledrus in *Miles Gloriosus* or Lydus in *Bacchides* are dramatically worthless for this very reason. It is this paradox of unresolved intent and the problem of competing subjectivities that makes the clever Roman slave and his relationship with his master both theatrically and culturally significant. Moreover over and above their comic potential the emphasis on disguise and impersonation inherent in such relationships represent one of the earliest literary engagements with problems related to the precariousness and instability of identity, status, and worth.

Elite investment in such popular forms of literature lay in the pleasures that were specific to New Comedy; especially in the way in which the identity of the slave served as a locus both for sameness and difference. While their real-life role as an instrument of servitude may have set the slaves apart from the free citizen-spectators, yet their

---

[31] Full personhood was a status that could only be achieved through the activities of friendship, political participation, intellectual debate, military service, and performance of public roles.

[32] Classical Greek and Roman thought consigned women, children, and slaves to the private realm which meant that they were believed to have no existence beyond material desire and necessity.

[33] See Kathleen McCarthy, *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

comic rebellion against authority would have served as a site of reel-life sympathetic identification and emancipatory release for those in the audience who might have been actually or nominally subordinated to others in reality: sons to fathers, wives to husbands husbands or workers to employers. It is this potential to act both as object as well as subject that makes the classical comic slave an interesting study in terms of subjectivity. subjectivity. This ability to incorporate the antinomies of agency and determinism, freedom and alienation, autonomy and oppression would later become the driving force behind the humanistic assertion of an authentic self. Within theatre the dramatic potential of the clever role-playing slave lies in the way in which he can both act and be acted upon. Thus the intriguing creator-slaves (*servuus callidi*) of Plautine comedy derive their theatrical power from the impression they are able to give of being an objective extension of their masters' personae and yet surreptitiously and rather ingenuously also possess enough of judgmental skills to acquire a unique individualised identity.

However given the publicly financed religio-civic nature of the Roman entertainment industry, these comedies were never an uncomplicated representation of self-expression by individuals who traditionally had no say in society. Whatever agency the slave may have possessed was mediated through structures of state or civic power and the plays remained firmly grounded in a dynamically complex hierarchical and authoritarian culture that explicitly ranked people on the basis of gender, geography, wealth or juridical status. The radically open and unapologetic manner of defining Roman identity by asserting rank and the cluster of privileges and obligations consequent upon all relationships would have precluded any simplistic articulation of egalitarian and individualistic principles by the subordinate slave against his dominant master. Thus the appealing though unscrupulous intelligence represented by the trickster is never allowed to reach its logical culmination but displaced by the return of socially conservative values in the triumph of young love and the reweaving of broken familial bonds.

One of the ways in which the slave's latent subversiveness in disrupting civic relationships is dramatically buffered is to gear the plot towards making the slave use his cunning to bring his young master's erotic pursuits to fruition irrespective of whether it leads to his ultimate freedom or not. The slave's undermining of family relationships especially between father and son is offset by the service he renders to his younger master in setting up a new family with the girl he loves. Sometimes the slave's machinations lead to an accidental revelation of the true identity of the slave or courtesan 'heroine' whose status as a member of a respectable patrician family makes possible her

206

induction into the domestic unit. It is the slave's disinterested agency or lack of self-ego that makes his self-aggrandisement acceptable and thus safely ineffective. They may achieve temporary comic victories but such triumphs are ultimately time-bound. Although he does win some sort of moral battle over his old master, he does so only by returning to his marginalised state as the master also regains his former position of control. It is a mistake to assume that the slave can work for his own benefit and those Roman plays where the slave does show some self-interest such as *Persa* and *Aulularia* may have failed onstage for that very reason.

On retrospect it is not difficult to see why Jonson may have found Plautus ideologically and creatively engaging. At the very least, the machinations of the marginalised slave's creative genius against a dour rule-making, power-containing authority would have appealed to the private non-conformist side of his character. Like Plautus Jonson too drew on the trickster as a metaphor for change (even if short-lived), a spirit of disorder that challenges and interrogates a morally conservative and status-conscious society: a progressive force of consciousness that is both a-structural and anti-structural in its nature. In his neo-classical adaptation of the Roman comic plot where mischievous slaves temporarily undermine the power of their guardians, Jonson introduced a thoroughly 'modernist' design focusing on what happens when avaricious, egoistic servants try to permanently undermine the authority of equally fraudulent and covetous patrons, clients or employers.[34] He also rehistoricised the figure of the impudent Roman slave to endow him with greater contemporary relevance, using the trickster-servant as trope to reflect upon the changing parameters of early modern proto-bourgeois identity and the crisis of private individualism in a tightly controlled and well-preserved social order.

The pre-existent characteristics of the classical slave were socio-historically reinforced by imposing on them the prevailing stereotypes and anxieties regarding English vagrants, servants or apprentices within a shifting cultural, economic, and political context. Jonson drew on the physical and occupational mobility and the unscrupulous rapaciousness of these marginalised character types to mirror

---

[34] This is an interesting modification of the conventional master-servant relationship as envisaged by social commentators like William Harrison. 'These men are profitable to none, for if their condition be well perused, they are enemies to their masters, to their friends, and to themselves.' They are liable to 'insinuate themselves with young gentlemen and noblemen newly come to their lands...whereby the good nature of the parties are not only a little impaired but also their livelihoods and revenues so wasted and consumed that if at all, yet not in many years, they shall be able to recover themselves.' Harrison, *Description of England*, p. 119.

respectively the fears of the porosity of class boundaries and the spectre of rampant acquisitiveness plaguing England. His innovations in this regard are striking, for early modern representations of the classical trickster were initially mediated through Latin humanist comedy and the so-called *commedia erudita* (learned comedy) which developed partly as a response to the discovery of twelve new Plautine comedies by Nicolaus Cusanus in 1429. If the characteristic 'subversive' features of the slave were preserved in in early practitioners of the form such as Ludovico Ariosto and Bibbiena they underwent consistent dilution in later authors. Hence in writers such as Annibal Caro, Giorgetto of Cecchi and Della Porta the scheming servant gradually became subsidiary to the action, his role supplanted by the didactic philosophising servant who was felt to be less threatening than the former. As a pale and useless reflection of the former *servus callidus* the Renaissance servant was divested of qualities that had endowed him with vestiges of agency such as leadership in action, mental astuteness, linguistic dexterity, self-confident boasting, and his signature carnivalesque humour. The didactic impulse underlying humanist art made Terence's politically milder comedies with their tamer slaves much more theatrically and socially appealing.

Even in the popular oral tradition of the *commedia dell'arte* that was usually marked by the improvisatory ebullience of servants known as the *zani*, these characters too lost out on their status as prime movers of the plot to acquire a new role as the comic buffoon. The decline in the serving-man's social, if not moral status in early modern society precluded the attribution of the finer qualities of wit and intelligence on the low-born, vulgar servant. Instead of intellectual superiority and linguistic dexterity the servant of *commedia dell'arte* was marked by gross sexual innuendoes, slapstick humour, ridiculous bragging, rough dialectal speech, and an extraordinary appetite.[35] The evolution of the Roman *dolosus servus* into the Italian *zani* thus presupposed a privileging of physical over intellectual qualities.

This gradual loss of identity was paralleled by the different though related tradition of the medieval clown with his undisciplined physicality and coarse theatricality. This loss may have been related to the Counter-Reformation appraisal of a conservative society that was uncomfortable with the subversive idea of a character from the subordinate classes using his intelligence to rule the story and by extension his master. In such a

---

[35] Unlike Roman times when servants or slaves were usually educated individuals, in Renaissance Europe servants were not prisoners of war brought from other countries. There were no expectations from them in terms of their mental capabilities, no anticipation of the way in which could defy their social class and become 'free' citizens.

highly hierarchical and authoritarian society, it was crucial that depiction of a poor person taking control of rich men's lives and playing with multiple personas be not presented as role models to the lower classes. It was ideologically safer thus to portray a 'predictable' automatous character with no intellect and one who was able to entertain the audience solely through his foul language, comic gags, and offensive behaviour.

It is to Jonson's credit (and also to the other city-comedy writers of his time) that he was able to revive the social and intellectual characteristics of the classical slave along with his native theatrical tour de force. Yet writing under changing conditions of identity formation and under the influence of a very different set of material and physical conditions, Jonson was able to amplify on how personal self-interest could easily take precedence over community allegiance, something that had only been obliquely suggested in Plautus. More importantly the Roman intriguer responds to situations which are not of his own making; his actions are mostly geared towards retrieving his young master from some difficulty, whether erotic or monetary. In contrast the Jonsonian rogue initiates events and uses his wits to take advantage of others reflecting greater volition and by implication the possession of rationality and an inward (a)moral agency. Moreover the actions of the Plautine slave hardly have the same social consequences that his early modern successors would have, registered most overtly in their conventional conclusions where moral extremes are converted to their opposites as private interests are superseded by the outward (re)turn to collective public harmony. Conversely, the morally and aesthetically questionable endings of Jonson's plays show that the overarching didactic framework of Roman Comedy was insufficient to contain and control the complexities and paradoxes of early modern society. Finally, the greater risk posed by these latter set of characters can be seen as a symptom of the changing epistemological contours of early modern society, especially the new shift in social psyche away from community interdependence to individual initiative.

This is not to say, however, that Plautine slaves were pure automatons. But Roman civil law lacked a concept of agency in the modern sense of the term. In theory Roman slavery implied a form of control that transferred volition, freedom of movement, access to the body, and labour from slave to economically privileged slaveholder. Whatever agency the slave could be said to possess was understood to lie if not in his submissive obedience then in a deferential acceptance that presupposed a

thorough internalisation of the master's will such that the slave could anticipate the former's wishes and take due action. This in turn was legally complemented by the *auctoritas principis* (connected to the Roman *paterfamilias*) possessed by the slave-master that implied a prudent mediation of his authority through personalised influence rather than through abstract institutions such as the bureaucracy, wage labour or public office.

It denoted a moral quality of power that was dependent on a number of allied factors such as the master's general character and demeanour, pietistic service to the Republic, and his family background. The idealistic concept of *auctoritas* helped to ease if not rationalise the slave-holders absolute often violent control over the slave (*dominica potestas*), shielding power relations in a rhetoric of mutuality and father-like sovereign authority that was exercised by the master in lieu of willing compliance to and recognition of that power by his subordinates. This personalised form of power which conferred legal validity on the actions of the subject who lacked similar authority was meant to harmonise all social relationships into a paternalistic scheme of things.

But in practical workaday life masters would have employed slaves as *de facto* agents who often worked independently, in different role-capacities, and in locations outside the master's hometown such that it was often not possible to supervise every decision that the slave-agent made on the former's behalf. Thus the theoretical effectiveness of the master's authority was always interpellated by the practical recognition of the slave's subjectivity, the fact that he could take action against and not on behalf of his master (in fact slave rebellions were not uncommon in Rome). In the *Politics*, Aristotle states that the slave is an extension of the master's body: conjoint yet separate. He might have extended this idea further to point out that the slave was a part of the master's psyche as well.

For those classical slaves who performed crucial tasks as secretary and amanuensis (too often modern conceptions remain blinkered in their association of slavery with mere physical drudgery) it was impossible not to have been privy to the workings of the master's mind. Proper service in these senses would have entailed the possession of knowledge and abilities that contradicted the slave's socially subordinate position. The most enterprising of the lot may have falsified record books, embezzled money or even secretly arranged for their manumission. The relationship between master and slave was often a contest fought in the arena of the mind. What this points to is an interesting though paradoxical symbiosis of values as master and slave interpenetrated, extended each other's selves or exchanged identities. This synergy of proximate minds that lends

itself to complementarities, reversals, and appropriations is what is especially appealing about the master-slave dialectic.

<div align="center">

III

Tricksters and Early Modern Subjectivity

</div>

The dramatic relevance of *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* for theorising the early modern self and studying the vexed nature of inter-subjective relationships can hardly be underestimated. They help to thicken and make manifest the latent tension of Plautine plays by representing a crisis of *auctoritas* with its bonds of trust and mutual affiliation showing the chaos that sets in when masters lack requisite moral authority to rule and their subordinates are able to manipulate the discrepancy between private interiorised self and public constructions of the self for unethical ends. Jonson appropriated the master-slave dynamics represented in Roman ideologies of authority and power to articulate problems of early modern self-definition and community formation. He explored the anxieties regarding contemporary cultural understandings and practices of identity by mediating such issues through 'comic' plots where the clever and wicked servant, as the master's 'other(ed)' self, uses his representational license to undermine authority or tries to impose his personal viewpoint on the owner (or on the gulls as surrogate masters) even as he protects his own subjectivity from similar imposition.

These fictional relationships would have helped to ground and naturalise the new and varied social interactions in early modern England. They provide a rich medium for unpacking the various strands that made up the indeterminate and provisional nature of identity in the early modern period. Jonson used these interactions to complicate a morally and ideologically black and white picture by pitting the amoral genius of the fiendishly intelligent rogue-servant against an ethically maligned worldview of authority represented by his real and notional masters. It is ultimately the blurriness of these social relations and affective identities that gives Jonsonian comedy its peculiar power. The height of such indistinctness is probably reached in those brief moments when the lowly trickster's cunning is able to undermine the control of his superiors, representing the illusory and paradoxical tethering of public (masterly) authoritativeness with private (roguish) insubordination: a point of autonomous subjectivity where master and servant become one. These moments testify to the

cultural fantasy of appropriating the rogue's subversive energy in the service of reinforcing power and moral authority.[36]

Jonsonian comedies are the creative artefacts of a transitional culture when the assault on traditional social structures necessitated the formation of an identity that was not dependent upon one's place in tradition or nature. They engage in questions about the relationship between the individual and the community but equally significantly on how the self negotiates the social disruptions and uncertainties accompanying modernisation and the rise of commoditised cultures. The chaotic diversity and change that marked the onset of modernity made the concept of a coherent unified self gradually redundant. Instead the new subject was marked by his ability to get round the contingencies of time and place through his own wilful and self-interested actions.

The modern subject's emergence was implicated in the development of two new mechanisms of self-identity: first, the gradual weakening of group ties that saw the locus of identity formation shifting to the inner private life of the individual; and second, the explosion of socio-economic roles and lifestyle choices in a new world of opportunities informed a notion of self that was infinitely malleable and socially determined. The former encouraged the development of introspection and more intense psychological lives that turned inwards in the quest for self-sufficiency and improvement. The latter demanded the presentation of diverse faces to different people even if they were radically at odds with one another. As two vital facets of self-agency, interiority and reflexivity throws light on the ways in which identity and modernity mutually informed each other.

IV

Jonsonian Gulls

The first group of characters that testify to the problematic relationship that modernity created between community and individual identity are the gulls. The multiplication of social roles and relationships within an expanding and secularising market-based society led to the development of sociologically divided selves. New jobs and professions consequent upon the boom in pre-capitalist speculative market economies, growth of a

---

[36] The ending of *The Alchemist* and of *Volpone* to a lesser extent plays out the fantasy of the master both notionally identifying himself with his servant and also usurping the comic energies traditionally associated with the rogue for his own private ends. This fusion can be traced back to Plautus' conflation of the comic types of *servus callidus* and *adulescens amans* as a means of reinforcing civic and domestic values. However in the interests of the argument being pursued in this dissertation I have deliberately left out this strand of enquiry from further analysis.

large-scale bureaucracy, knowledge networking, and capitalist entrepreneurial projects led to changing conceptions of the self that were no longer tied to traditional parameters such as land, birth or occupation. The increasing socio-cultural capital of this new and motley 'middle class' drew from the lower gentry and mercantile ranks comprising government officials, lawyers, would-be or actual courtiers, scholars, money-lenders, merchant adventurers, manufacturers, soldiers or financiers. Moreover, the growth of urban conglomerations and emergence of civic offices created a dynamically new urban hierarchy comprised of mayors, aldermen, and sheriffs that had no medieval precedent.

These individuals lacked pre-histories of 'noble' association showing that identity was determined by personal responsibility and was not an inheritance of lineage and kinship relationships – a function of what one did rather than of what one was. Yet as in all such periods of cultural confusion and change the appraisal of new forms of identity and social mobility went hand in hand with the conservative defence of an imagined traditional order. Thus the progressive ideological distinction between extrinsic signifiers of identity (such as dignity of blood, rank or honour) and intrinsic values (such as virtue, judgement, mental acumen or industry) was often ruptured by fears about ruthless opportunism and deceptive and masked appearances. All too often these 'new men' were believed to have forsaken religious and moral values in their quest for a socio-economic model of nobility.

Such anxieties did, however, become a threatening reality in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart regime. Whereas noble titles were traditionally earned by the oldest and most distinguished families in England as a reward for their military service to the country, changing times led to titles being conferred as a result of shrewd political lobbying or personal friendship with the monarch. Burdened with the escalating costs of being at perpetual war with Catholic Spain, an economically impoverished Elizabeth was forced to hand over patents of monopoly or knighthoods in lieu of monetary gifts or other honours to sustain an already bleeding Royal Exchequer, in effect destabilising the delicate bases of a long-existing feudal-aristocratic hierarchy. This led in the long-run to an unethical and intensely competitive patronage system where perquisites were literally sold for cash to the highest bidder, leading to fraudulent dealings between those who distributed honours and those who bought them reaching a climax in the first few decades of the seventeenth century.

Literary historians such as Malcolm Smuts and Linda Peck[37] have pointed out how the commercialisation of patronage during this time led to a situation where privileges of rank were sold in lieu of capital and not in cognizance of noble birth, civic merit or martial service. The competition for favour was severe and marked by insecurity with disgruntled clients being quick at changing patrons. This naturally led to a lot of resentment towards 'favourites' or 'upstarts'. It was generally assumed that class membership had become all but a question about money and that social status and recognition were not innate but acquirable. This latter concern was more than exacerbated by the materialist culture that came to dominate England in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries that bound all sections of society in similar market relations and common patterns of taste.

Radical changes in the distribution of income and the consequent stimulation of consumer demand among the middle classes fuelled new consumption styles and demand for movable and non-movable property.[38] The increasing wealth elasticity among the lower gentry fed the rapid rate of change in fashions and the willingness to acquire the latest leisure products. Jonson's gulls are products of this so-called commodity fetish, symbolic representatives of the reckless newly wealthy who were addicted to the contagion of luxury living and spending.[39] Understandably all these characters are portrayed as outlandish caricatures, lacking depth and inner normative controls that effectively elides the commercial agency of the 'new men' they were supposed to represent. Hence despite the fact that many 'noble' families like the Mores, Wolseys, Cromwells, Cecils and Walsinghams traced their origins to commerce, the authority of many ambitious 'new men' and their system of (consumerist) values remained suspect. Possibly Jonson has such scenario in mind when he berates himself for writing commendatory poems in praise of noble personages who had afterwards proved themselves unworthy of such praise by their lack of *noblesse oblige*.

Though I confesse (as euery*Muse* hath err'd)

---

[37] Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* and Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England.*
[38] London became the centre of a consumer society that boasted the availability of luxury goods such as coaches, watches, Venetian glasses, stockings, and lace collars that would have been unimaginable even a few decades back. As the gentlemanly class came to be more closely identified with extravagant spending and luxury, would-be courtiers wishing to affect a genteel pose imitated the excessive spending and consuming of their social superiors. See Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition,* p. 58.
[39] The passage and the eventual inefficacy of the sumptuary laws from the mid to the late sixteenth century testified to the anxieties of class fluidity but also to the increasing financial well-being of the 'middling sort' who could afford to buy expensive and exotic furs and silks that till now had only been confined to the nobility.

And mine not least) I haue too oft preferr'd

Men past their termes; and prais'd some names too much:

But 'twas, with purpose, to haue made them such.

Since, being deceiu'd, I turne a sharper eye

Vpon my selfe; and aske, to whome, and why,

And what I write: and vex it' manie days,

Before men get a verse, much lesse a prayse.

<div align="right">(Prefatory poem to John Selden's Titles of Honour, ll. 19-26)</div>

Jonson's unsavoury depiction of this new corporate class (Macilente's 'popenjayes')[40] is typical, for contemporary literature often deflected anxieties about the incipient acquisitiveness of society by focusing on the personal dishonesty and social irresponsibility of this generation of self-made men. They are shown to lack self-discipline, inner virtues, and rationality in their obsession with appearance and their lack of concern for the moral stature that should ideally have characterised a gentleman. Their vanity, materialistic addiction, desire for short-cuts to success, power, and status would have been an implicit critique of those literary patrons or theatrical spectators whose claim to noble status was not based on hereditary factors.

Most of their actions fail to surprise for they lack epistemic layering and ulterior motives: the false glitter of their materialistic surfaces indicating their inner vacuity. As bizarre manifestations of self-displaying reflexive selves, the question of a discrepancy between inner and outer self hardly matters to them; their lives are lived exclusively on the surface. Not only do they not experience thought and lack interiority, the pragmatics of characterisation as far as the gulls are concerned is less about their psychological selves than about social legibility and replicability. As generic types rather than specific individuals, their automotive selves are conceived as an array of carefully chosen masks and exterior shells which are designed to gratify and influence others but which conceal an ultimately extraneous or missing interior.

The gulls also help to unpack contemporary communal patterns and practices of identity. Early modern identification was more often a question of external display of the imagined affiliation to class, profession, kinship or religion; it assigned individuals to groups and communities such as serfs, knights or nobility along purely visual lines.

---

[40] 'A number of these popenjayes there are,/Whom, if a man conferre, and but examine/Their inward merit, with such men as want;/Lord, lord, what things they are!' (*Every Man Out of His Humour*, II.v.45-8) They showed how external signs such as dress, manners, and outward characteristics were not necessarily a correct indicator of gender, education, economic status, social rank or occupation.

Identity was determined by the logic of sameness; implying not only the resemblance or recognisability of the individual over time, but also a consciousness of communal duties and obligations. The self was implicated in a network of collectively used signs (determined by hierarchy, patronage, contract, birth, marriage, kinship, friendship, local local customs or geography among others) whose precise combination enabled classification; the authenticity of a visual marker drew on its similarity to other comparable insignia.

Individuals existed only so far as they participated in universals; early modern identity in this sense had more to do with commonality than individual distinctiveness. Group experience and collective decision-making mediated through associational forms such as the guild or the parish continued to be central to the experience of reality well into the seventeenth century.[41] The Jonsonian gulls thus transgress the rules of collective subjectivity and group belonging that required a sense of moral and social subordination to the interests of the commune. Yet their credulity reflects their lack of individual agency to make or influence personal choices and their predictable dependence on (unreliable) others (the tricksters) to put their plans to realisation. They represent a simplistic version of the crisis of corporate identity triggered by the rise of proto-capitalism.

In *The Alchemist* the naive tobacconist Abel Drugger hopes to get astrological advice that will enable him to acquire the outward signs to attract customers to his new apothecary shop. He lacks the personal acumen that will enable him to become a successful businessman through his own skills and falls prey to the trap laid by Face and Subtle. Encouraged by dreams of a better life, he is convinced by Subtle that he is a 'fortunate fellow' ... 'in right way to'ward riches' (I.iii.33, 35) who would soon be made a livery-man of his company and a sheriff ('call'd to the scarlet', I.iii.37) by next spring. The cozening duo help each of the gulls to transcend the limitations of their identities by formulating new (though uncertain and fraudulent) roles for them. Face's instruction to Drugger to hire the costume of Heironimo (of Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*) is perhaps the most overt expression of social identity as a function of mere external signifiers.

> FAC.   Thou must borrow,
> A Spanish suite. Hast thou no credit with the players?
> DRV. Yes, sir, did you neuer see me play the foole?

---

[41] Joshua Phillips, *English Fictions of Communal Identity, 1485-1603* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010).

FAC. I know not, Nab: thou shalt, if I can helpe it.

Hieronymo's old cloake, ruffe, and hat will serue,

Ile tell thee more, when thou brings 'hem.

<div align="center">(IV.vii.67-2)</div>

Dapper, the lawyer's clerk hopes to obtain a 'familiar' spirit that can advise him on his gambling ventures. But he is led on to entertain the greater advantages of being the nephew of the Fairy Queen who 'may chance/To leaue three or foure hundred chests of treasure,/And some twelue thousand acres of *Faerie* land' (V.iv.53-5) to him. He is made to believe that his lack of noble ancestry and social position may be erased through Subtle's art and replaced with the promise of a new, lucrative, and expedited inheritance in Fairyland. Both Drugger and Dapper though not evil, are united in their dreams of social advancement and lack the autonomy to create an internal life of their own. Yet their desire for assimilation into higher social ranks and eventual exclusion reveals the anxieties of permeability between different social classes and how closely such borders were policed. Their comically bumbling endeavours showed the impossibility of negotiating the demands of social practices and class signs that did not naturally belong to one. Thoroughly puppet-like they aspire to occupy a place of affluence, authority or stature that they are unworthy of holding within the social hierarchy.

Even the hypocritical and sophistic 'brothers' Anabaptists Tribulation Wholesome and Ananias who belong to the reformed Protestant Church in Amsterdam have no qualms about using property belonging to the orphans in their determination to find 'wealth' for their brethren elect. All of them are revealed to be trapped in the empty space of their own vain fantasies of consumerist greed, dreaming of an idle, rich life; these characters are hollow one-dimensional entities seen only from the outside. Sir Epicure Mammon symbolises the disparity between outwardly expressed social rank and actual merit, giving a tacit lie to the early modern belief that identity was a function of social position and the obligations and duties attached with it. Sir Epicure Mammon's hedonist dreams involving sexual and social metamorphosis is engineered through money:

<div align="center">For I doe</div>

meane

To haue a list of wiues, and concubines,

Equall with SALOMON; who had the *stone*

Alike with me: and I will make me, a back

With the *elixir* that shall be as tough

As HERCVLES, to encounter fiftie a night.

<div align="center">(II.ii.35-8)</div>

This would-be sophisticate's private sybaritic paradise is the subject of spectacular public display, revealing the ironic gap between lustful ambition and the charity ('Founding of colledges, and *grammar* schooles,/Marrying yong virgins, building hospitalls,/And now, and then, a church', II.iii.50-3) towards and defence of the established order proper to a knight:

And they shall fan me with ten estrich tailes...

My meat, shall all come in, in *Indian* shells,

Dishes of agate, set in gold, and studded,

With emeralds, saphyres, hiacynths, and rubies.

The tongues of carpes, dormise, and camels heeles,

Boil'd i' the spirit of SOL, and dissolu'd pearle...

<div align="center">(II.ii.69, 72-6)</div>

These debauched and voluptuous fantasies diminish the role of procreative marriage and biological parentage in the propagation of generations. Mammon visualises how the power of gold can supersede familial relationships, using money to buy sex with the 'sublim'd pure wife' of a 'wealthy citizen, or rich lawyer' (II.ii.54-5) or employing fathers and mothers as 'bawds'. Equally he undermines the new valorisation of the sanctified interior world of the Protestant bourgeois home and the intimate bonds and relations it stood for through his perverted imagination. His bedroom is a distorted version of the 'recessed' withdrawing room that was increasingly becoming an important private space for sharing confidence and intimacy in early modern houses. In his courtship of Dol he envisions a new nation and an alternative pedigree 'begotten in an orgiastic fornication with gold itself':

Thinke therefore, thy first wish, now; let me heare it:

And it shall raine into thy lap, no shower,

But flouds of gold, whole cataracts, a deluge,

To get a nation on thee!

<div align="center">(IV.i.125-8)</div>

Mammon lacks the skill to convert economic capital into worthy socio-cultural capital. In his pursuit of pleasure he remains unappreciative of the traditional markers of

aristocratic identity such as landownership, ancestry, hospitality, and noble character, displaying lack of knowledge regarding the mutually definitive relationship between person and place. He is paralleled though on a smaller scale, by the young country house gentleman Kastril whose disregard for such conventional associations brings him to London in the hope of learning the art of quarrelling as a behavioural accoutrement to his genteel status. He is tempted by Face's promises of more lucrative sources of income such as gambling: 'What, three thousand/a yeere!...Are there such?' (III.iv.53-4). Yet their failure to understand the subtler mechanisms of maintaining social membership through the performance of rituals and values of class fidelity that transcend the mere possession of money, affects all sections of London society depicted in *The Alchemist* in one way or the other.

Despite its exotic setting and the classical *captatio* framework, *Volpone* explores similar pre-capitalist anxieties of social climbing and dependence upon the nobility of blood and rank to determine 'worth'. However, the consumerist exchange economy that scaffolds the play also imparts a more sinister quality to the gulls in comparison to those in *The Alchemist*. I use this discussion of the 'victims' of *Volpone* to initiate my argument about the rogue-trickster, since the line dividing gull and rogue in this play is admittedly more fluid. Like the rogues, they misrepresent the truth of their real vicious selves and construct advantageous identity positions for themselves, bringing rich merchandise as gifts to Volpone to secure his inheritance. They use theatricality to misrepresent and conceal the greedy avarice and covetousness of their inner selves, hiding self-interest behind a show of benevolent concern for the 'sick' magnifico. Yet the stability of their identities is finally assaulted by being subjected to the more consummate delusory theatrical scenarios of Volpone and Mosca. If the gulls in *The Alchemist* were unidimensionally foolish, then the trio of dupes in *Volpone* – Corvino, Corbaccio, and Voltore – are single-mindedly debased and degenerate. In addition all these characters also inhabit a cultural space where traditional domestic relationships are constantly confounded and destabilised: strangers are privileged over family members, husbands pimp their wives, and virtue is a product sold for profit.

The legacy-hunters are respectable property-owning middle-class subjects in their own right, attesting to the growing association between 'respectable' social identity

and the possession of material goods.[42] They have separate public identities as merchants, attorneys, or respectable gentlemen in Venice yet they are afflicted by an obsession for worldly acquisition. The gulls in *Volpone* undermine bourgeois social values such as self-denial, prudence, honest performance of duties, family inheritance or marriage which were precisely the kind of values that set the proto-bourgeois family apart from aristocratic patterns of overindulgence and corruption. As in the earlier play Mosca and Volpone lure the dupes by offering them alternate lifestyles and identities, in this case the possibility of becoming the sole heir to a rich and dying nobleman. They do so by playing on and denigrating the principles of a traditional exchange economy where a gift was envisaged as a kind of a credit because it was hoped that it would be repaid in due time with another gift of due value. Jonson is careful to add a few layers to these icons of unmeritorious gentility for they serve to point out the irremediable evil of their private lives and the moral disconnect between status and character, public role and private worth.

Thus Corvino's public 'mercantile' persona is more than complemented by his savage treatment and domestic abuse of his beautiful and virtuous wife Celia whom he considers to be an extension of his property. In a disturbed, sexually envious relationship that vaguely recalls *Othello* – the other great Renaissance play marked by tragic domestic discord performed in 1604 – he fears that his wife's disloyalty will adversely affect his public relationships with other men, for he will lose honour and place in a male society predicated upon the 'domination of women and the generation of male heirs'.[43] Having spied her watching the mountebank's show from the window and throwing down her handkerchief, he harangues her:

> Death of mine honour, with the cities foole?...
>
>   --- and you smile,
>
> Most graciously! And fan your fauours forth,
>
> To giue your hot spectators satisfaction!...
>
>   well, you shall haue him, yes.
>
> He shall come home, and minister vnto you
>
> The fricace, for the moother.
>
>   (II.v.1, 7-9, 15-7)

---

[42] *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[43] Howard Marchitell, 'Desire and Domination in *Volpone*', *SEL 1500-1900*, vol 31, 1993, pp. 287-308: 297.

and her entire family:

> You would be damn'd, ere you did this, you whore:
>
> Thou'ldst tremble, to imagine, that the murder
>
> Of father, mother, brother, all thy race,
>
> Should follow as the subiect of my iustice!

<div align="center">(II.v.26-9)</div>

His outward politeness and decency hides not only a rapacious impulse but more significantly a tormented familial life wracked by feelings of insecurity and inferiority (he even threatens her with a chastity belt). Constantly suspicious about the legitimacy of her fidelity towards him, he is quick to discard his jealous rage however to cajole ('pious worke, mere charity, for physick', III.vii.65) convince,

> 'Pray thee, sweet;
>
> (Good'faith) thou shalt haue iewells, gownes, attires,
>
> What thou wilt thinke, and aske. Do, but, go kisse him.
>
> Or touch him, but. For my sake.

<div align="center">(III.vii.110-13)</div>

and by degrees threaten a bewildered Celia to shed her wifely devotion and pander to Volpone's depraved sexuality in order to fulfil his corrupt desires.

> Be damn'd.
>
> (Heart) I will drag thee hence, home, by the haire;
>
> Cry thee a strumpet, through the streets; rip vp
>
> Thy mouth,vnto thine eares; and slit thy nose,
>
> Like a raw rotchet.

<div align="center">(III.vii.96-100)</div>

Their abusive if not sadistic relationship criticises any idealistic notion of marital harmony contained within the four walls of the house.

Corbaccio's social identity as an old and venerable gentleman is supplemented by his horrendous performance as a father given the unnatural treatment he metes out to his upright son Bonario. He undermines the sacred position that fathers held in early modern culture, representing the absoluteness of patriarchal power that is also sadly enough morally flawed.[44] The domestically skewed family that he shares with Bonario, his biological son (the mother figure is noticeably absent) destabilises the Reformatory

---

[44] See in this connection Tom MacFaul's *Problem Fathers in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). However MacFaul's book makes no mention of *Volpone*.

valorisation of the nuclear family as the primary, normative social unit in Renaissance England. Surprisingly enough the play's only indirect reference to Bonario's mother occurs through Corbaccio's bastardising of his son, implicitly equating the mother with a with a whore.

Desperate in his attempts to recapture his lost youth[45] and reverse the ravages of time, he is quick to discern his own selfish interest and has no qualms about disrupting the natural bonds of kinship and disinheriting ('an vtter stranger, to my loines', IV.v.109) his only son.[46] The upright Bonario is accused of being guilty of attempted murder and adultery and called names such as a 'Monster of men, swine, goate, wolfe, parricide...viper' (IV.v.111-2). To Corvino as to Corbaccio familial bonds are not inviolable and are merely to be traded for material gain or social advancement. All such understated touches hint at a sense of individual complexity in their characters and disclose lesser-known facets of their predatory subjectivities. Equally significantly, these characters help to reveal the anxieties associated with the increasing sexualisation of the family unit through the eroticisation of the conjugal couple and the new affectionate bonds being developed between parents and children.

V

Jonsonian Rogues

The second group of characters who symbolise an acute abuse of class identities and interpersonal relationships are the rogues. Whatever their skills the gulls are outperformed by the greater theatrical and unethical virtuosity of the tricksters who sell them dreams of becoming what they are not. The unceremonious treatment meted out to the gulls and their unworthy social aspirations in *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* would compel belief that Jonson was an orthodox anti-modernist who believed in a social structure based on hierarchy and divine mandate where every member had an unalterable essence and function. Such a well-ordered, stratified cosmic order would have imagined little contradiction between individual and society, reducing interiority and self-reflexivity to values consistent with collectively endorsed religious or political goals. Yet the complex

---

[45] See Stella Achilleos, 'New Directions: Age and Ageing', in Matthew Steggle (ed.), *Volpone: A Critical Guide* (London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011), pp. 144-67: 149-50.
[46] Property transmission was crucial to the social functioning of the early modern patriarchal household. In disowning Bonario, Corbaccio undermines the notion of fatherhood and its attendant responsibilities towards dependents.

ambivalence of Jonson's authorial position within these two plays is also revealed in the way in which their representation of the social relations between rogues and their dupes helps to mediate between two competing moral ideologies: an older traditional/neo-feudal discourse centred on condemnation of the fluidity of class margins and a newer progressive proto-capitalist discourse dwelling on praise of the protean flexibility of status categories. Jonson is able to use this dialectical interplay as a means of interrogating the competing claims of pedigree and blood *vis-a-vis* the virtues of vocational talent and industry as markers of 'gentle' identity.

In the process, he is able to use the figure of the rogue to define and naturalise a notion of self (albeit exaggerated) as an earned rather than innate condition that thrives on industry, wit, and intelligence. Howsoever Jonson may rail at the materialistic values of a market-oriented culture through his ungracious representation of the gulls, his growing sympathetic engagement with the disenfranchised trickster as an authorial doppelganger shows that he was also aware that the unpredictability of the times promised unprecedented creative (and commercial) avenues to those who could take advantage of the moment. Moreover, the framework of disguise and chicanery that enfolds the social give and take between gulls and rogues is also a timely reminder of the way in which hierarchical relationships and their associated emotional investments were slowly being undermined in this era.

Early modern political thought frequently invoked the classical analogy between the civic (*polis*) and the domestic (*oikos*) to examine the relationship between the state (*res publica*) and its free citizens. By grounding the action of *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* in the master and servant-trickster subjective dyad, Jonson used the relationship to explore two different though ultimately interrelated anxieties. Thus he drew on both the private and public aspects of the relation; first, by mediating its affective intimacies through the changing trajectories of marital and familial bonds in newly emerging 'middling' domesticity: the master-servant's reciprocal closeness mirroring conjugal intimacy and its underlying patriarchal ethos of dependency, deference, and reciprocal obligation emulating the filial piety of the father-son relationship. Second, he placed the relationship within a larger socio-economic context to explore the shifting nature of early modern service interactions, especially the fraught negotiation between authority and subjection in the transition from late feudal to proto-capitalist forms of exchange.

Most household manuals and conduct books envisaged the private home with its domestic economy as the primary social unit producing obedient citizens and church-goers and the foundation of virtuous, disciplined civic behaviour. Jonson however appropriates tropes from conventional domestic settings and then fractures them under the weight of trickery and deception revealing the household to be a materially and ideologically unstable space. Cut off from legitimate sources of authority that would have given it moral mooring, he shows how the mounting privatisation of families could lead to subversion of state or public authority. He presents the discrepancy between ideological precept and domestic practice by revealing how the rogue's subterfuges redefine the 'tranquil' space of the normative 'bourgeois' home and rewrite its relationships of kinship and familial bonds of loyalty or fealty modelled on the heteronormative patriarchal household. As prototypes of 'idle persons' and 'masterless men' who are themselves cut off from familial and social positions, they break down family ties in order to further their own self-interested ends:

> but that I haue done
>
> Base offices, in rending friends asunder,
>
> Diuiding families, betraying counsells,
>
> Whispering false lyes, or mining men with praises,
>
> Train'd their credulitie with periuries,
>
> Corrupted chastitie...

> (III.ii.25-30)

Both plays demonstrate the home and nuclear family centred on it as dysfunctional sites of permanent and unchanging conflict, in *Volpone* this is mediated through the perversions of matrimony present in the latent homoeroticism (conveyed through epithets such as 'louing', 'sweet', 'beloued', 'exquisite', 'diuine', 'precious') used by master to address his servant) between Volpone and Mosca and the abnormal parental relationship between Volpone and his three 'misbegotten' children – Nano the dwarf, Androgyno the fool, and Castrone the eunuch.

> CORV. Has he children? MOS. Bas-
>
> tards,
>
> Some dozen, or more, that he begot on beggers,
>
> *Gipseys*, and *Iewes*, and black-*moores*, when he was drunke...
>
> H' is the true father of his family,
>
> In all, saue me—

The intimate dalliances shared by Volpone and Mosca in the private space of the bedroom mask the purely commercial if not parasitic nature of their relationship (at least from the latter's perspective which may have ironically reflected on how most marriages were essentially property alliances), critiquing the Reformist idea of marriage as an idealised heterosexual relationship of virtuous companionate love, conducted within a secure domestic space where both partners could find sexual fulfilment. Given the frequent urge that Volpone has to touch ('good rascall, let me kisse thee', I.iv.137) and embrace his servant and the sexualised language he uses to describe the latter, the play reveals the latent homoerotic dynamics of their relationship. Exhilarated at Mosca's skill in executing his plans he exclaims:

> *My wittie mischief,*
> Let me embrace thee. O that I could now
> Transforme thee to a Venus –

<div align="right">(V.iii.102-4)</div>

Notwithstanding such sexual transgressions, this unnatural household is also marked by a reversal of the gender division of labour (which gradually hardened with the Reformation emphasis on women as representatives of the hearth and men of the public realm) as in assuming the role of a husband the 'sick' Volpone stays confined within the narrower domestic sphere and has to depend on Mosca to take charge of managing his public affairs.

Even *The Alchemist* starts out with the house at Blackfriars being deserted by Lovewit, the controlling 'father' figure rendering it vulnerable to the incursions of the 'indenture tripartite' of Face, Subtle, and Dol who set up shop in the house, undermining the intimate values it stands for by implicating it in seedy commercial transactions.[47] The new worth placed on private spaces (both literal and metaphorical) into which one withdrew for spiritual prayer, meditation, and self-examination is critiqued in the unholy use to which the rogues put the house. Yet as a matter of fact, Lovewit's bachelor pad offers only a pale semblance of the conventional family, a disorienting and unstable space that he inhabits with his servant-butler Jeremy. Their lopsided household is comically paralleled by the complaints of the sixth neighbour

---

[47] It may not be amiss to point out how both masters, i.e. Volpone and Lovewit are incipient capitalists though they try to appropriate the role of the traditional patriarch as well. Their greed and 'commodity-fetish', locates them firmly within a new exchange economy. It is no surprise then that the rogue-servants take advantage of both the old and new market systems as they deal with the gulls and their masters.

who happened to overhear nocturnal noises coming from Lovewit's house as he sat patiently fixing his wife's undergarments: 'Some three weekes since, I heard a dolefull cry,/As I sate vp, a mending my wiues stockings' (V.i.33-4). The 'happy' family established at the end when Dame Pliant the beautiful and brainless nineteen-year old widow steps into the dead mistress' (I.i.58) shoes is left in doubt, given the usual fate of cuckoldry that awaited early modern marriages between old men and young women.[48] Balancing Face's lack of commitment to his master is the faux kinship he seems to share with the two other rascals of the conning trio. Yet this apparent homosocial fellowship (reminiscent of a 'republic' or 'commonwealth') and camaraderie is only a mask that Face uses to deceive his cohorts in crime. Face preys upon and exploits changing familial relationships to move beyond the role allocated to him in the traditional household economy and valorise other possible self-determining subjectivities.

His exclusive prerogative over Lovewit's household space (and by implication over the circulation of information within it) and its domestic economy in the sense of managing the home, its goods and services, and socio-economic relationship among its members allows him complete control over the conspiracy. Like Mosca, Face rewrites the seemingly reciprocal and nurturing relationships of the paternalistic paradigm such that within the fictional space of the play-world it is the subordinate who bestows (or rather seems to bestow) promises of almost fatherly protection, material well-being, and emotional coherence to the gulls. By promising monetary returns to the unsuspecting gulls the tricksters are able to manipulate the older system of rewards and punishments to their own benefit.

Thus Subtle the pseudo-alchemist adopts the role of a father to his 'son' Mammon the knight:

> SVB.   What, my sonne!
>
> O, I haue liu'd too long. MAM. Nay good, deare father,
>
> There was no'vnchast purpose.

<div align="right">(IV.v.35-7)</div>

Similarly in *Volpone*, as James Hirsch points out, the word 'father' is rendered semantically null since all utterances involving it are made to sound hollow. Such moral exhaustion is evident in Corbaccio's desire to be a 'father' to Mosca at the cost of disinheriting Bonario and in Voltore's and Mosca's address to the Avocatori as 'Graue fathers'/'father

---

[48] Equally significantly Face's plan earlier in the play to prostitute Dame Pliant when he finds himself burdened with too many clients is also an ominous signal of what may become of Lovewit's conjugal life.

hoods'/'sires'/'most reuerend fathers' and the latter's failure to live up to their roles as civic guardians.[49] The tricksters simulate closeness, trust, and familiarity to disarm the gulls' resistance, pretending to represent the latter's desires by suppressing their own under the guise of servile objectification. In their ability to command respect from the gulls, the tricksters not only undermine the fake idealism associated with paternalism, but seize its altruistic rhetoric as a cover for social control and class manipulation, this time from the other end of the social spectrum.

In spite of the risks associated with the trickster's private subterfuges, his brief performance of counter-identity through an autonomous unfettered kind of subjectivity would have appealed to Jonson's strong individualist frame of mind. Both rogues offer a cognitive model for registering the fluid possibilities for self-definition under the new conditions associated with modernity. The perversions of domestic service and private identity performed by Face and Mosca in their respective households reflect on the exigencies of an emergent market economy that radically changed the socio-economic relations of service. In contrast to the old-world retainer who embodied the golden standard of servitude in the intimate, patriarchal (often rural) world of the extended family and feudal household, the 'new' urban servant was able to fashion himself as an independent and equal party in a depersonalised wage contract with his employer where his assent could no longer be accepted at face-value. Mosca's pretence of being Volpone's heir to provoke the legacy-hunters only reveals his true colours:

> So, now I haue the keies, and am possest.
> Since he will, needs, be dead, afore his time,
> I'le burie him, or gaine by him. I'am his heire:
> And so will keepe me, till he share at least.
> To cosen him of all, were but a cheat
> Well plac'd; no man would construe it a sinne:
> Let his sport pay for't, this is call'd the FOXE-trap.

> (V.v.12-8)

By setting a price on his services, the servant was able to exercise economic agency thereby commanding the terms of his labour. Moreover the commercial and relatively impermanent nature of the exchange enabled the servant to overlook his true position

---

[49] James E. Hirsch (ed.), *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1997), p. 111-12.

as a mere dependant in a patriarchal, aristocratic hierarchy. These roguish antagonists (who are almost akin to Machiavellian meritocrats) then actively bridge the public-private private divide for they introduce social relations of power and control into the household, household, mirroring these relations within the domestic unit occupied by master and servant. At the same time the power dynamics of the household are extended outward into the larger public sphere of polity and economy reflected in the relations the rogue shares with his gulled victims. The rogue-servant thus helps to both negotiate and reconcile the conflicting demands and distinctions between authority and individuality or between patriarchal and market relations. In *Volpone*, this can be seen in the moment when Mosca is enjoined by Volpone to 'Get on thy gowne' and pretend to be his heir, surrendering all power and in effect handing over his identity, wealth, and status:

> Hold, here's my
>
> will.
> Get thee a cap, a count-booke, pen and inke,
> Papers afore thee; sit, as thou wert taking
> An inuentory of parcels: I'le get vp,
> Behind the cortine, on a stoole, and harken;
>
> (V.ii.80-4)

Mosca's act of representation becomes an act of displacement whereby Volpone only nominally remains the master, with the servant controlling the action. It also reveals how Mosca's old-world obligation to his patron is erased by its eventual implication in commercial exchange, marked by the elaborate stock-taking of the next scene: nine Turkey carpets, two suits of bedding, eight velvets, two cloths of gold, eight chests of linen, four chests of damask, ten suits of hangings among others. Even in *The Alchemist*, the handing over of the keys to the chest by Subtle to Face represents a divestment of authority from the pseudo-alchemist master to the servant just as the turning over of the ill-gotten gains from Face to Lovewit signifies the reestablishment of the status quo.

> FAC. What boxe is that? SVB. The fish-wiues rings,
> I thinke:
> And th' ale-wiues single money...
> FAC.   ...and our siluer-beakers,
> And tauern cups. Where be the *French* petti-coats,
> And girdles, and hangers? SVB.Here, i' the trunke,
> And the bolts of lawne. FAC. Is DRVGGERS damaske,

there?

And the *tabacco*? SVB. Yes. FAC. Giue me the keyes.

(V.iv.113-21)

A proto-capitalist market ethic always remained susceptible to the fear that the subject's obligations and obsequiousness to authority were owed only in exchange of capital. Neo-feudal economic transactions were based on mutually binding obligations and reciprocity. The inherent inequality involved in business dealings between people having vastly different social influences was masked through a benign rhetoric of moral economy based on feelings of trust, fairness, and justice. The social networks and relations that had fostered and informally garrisoned pre-capitalist commerce from crumbling were rendered useless in a free and anonymous market. The possibility of wilfully manoeuvring and exploiting the psychological disconnect between inner and outer selves to serve private and thus deceitful ends contributed to the uncertainties and tensions of the provisional nature of all civic relationships.

The lack of an effective system of checks and balances to safeguard transactions between strangers was more than exacerbated by England's transition into a centralised monolithic power structure. With self-determining private agency constituting a major problematic of all service and power relations from monarch to labourer, the early modern surveillance regime sought to enforce moral alerting by portraying and overcoming the visual and informational discrepancy between outward appearance and inward self. The state did away with all forms of individuality as a threat to institutionalised autonomy: a source of alienation or cause of social, political or economic unrest. It attempted to curb personal desire and expression and coerce people into committing themselves to socially approved communal ideals.

The Jonsonian rogue thus served as the uncertain epistemological context for mirroring men's false exteriors and secret depths, a means of rearranging power relations as knowledge though he is ultimately excluded from the processes of subjection that conceded agency and interiority to those in command (Volpone, the Avocatori, Lovewit, Quarlous, and James I who appropriate the 'labour' and 'imagination' of the cozener for their own profitable ends) through a process of timely physical or verbal revelation. They use their protean flexibility at harnessing different roles and exploiting the fluid liminality between inner and outer self to define a behavioural model of identity created through an exercise of will and personal intention. They manipulate unequal power relations and reverse socially expected

229

outcomes to further individual desire. Just like their clever Roman predecessors, the comic qualities of Mosca and Face are primarily defined by their ability to arbitrate between their conventional instrumentality and their acquired subjectivity.

The rogues are able to take on a gamut of positions between the idealistic stereotype of the silent, obedient retainer and his grotesque antitype in the outspoken and assertive servant: maintaining the autonomy of their selves through a performance of overt submission and covert resistance. They are able to succeed by keeping their private subjective selves untouched and undefined even as they pander to the wishes of their superiors. Like Ulysses these characters are granted an epistemic vantage point through their ability to be insider and outsider, familiar and unfathomable, existing on the narrow cusp between mediated representations and interiorised psyches. Their theatrical gifts are rooted in self-display as well as in a passion for deception: oscillating fluidly between ontologies of self-replication and hidden identity. They stand on the threshold, both inside and outside the house or family unit, and on the dangerous frontiers between classes, genders, languages, and moral codes.

Mosca starts out by being Volpone's 'parasite,/His knaue, his pandar' (IV.v.15-6), a much shadowy and elusive character in comparison to Volpone's gregariousness. He is dependent on his master for food and a living and is over enthusiastic about expressing this reliance publicly through shows of servility and pathos, which on certain occasions tends to be a source of awkwardness even for Volpone. But gradually he grows increasingly aware of his power and independence from Volpone: consciously playing the Fool to deceive his master even as the latter goes on to play 'sick' to con the legacy-hunters.[50] As the character bearing the closest resemblance to Jonson, he most nearly controls the destinies of others because he possesses the deepest understanding of society. His constant shifting of roles is dictated by the wants of his master or the gulls, appearing as a cipher upon which they can impose their desires. Mosca's clarity of thought enables him to manipulate them as he pleases, since they are 'so possest, and stuft with his owne hopes...'(V.ii.24). His own disguising is limited to verbal imposture in

---

[50] The parasite (translated from the Greek as 'one who takes food beside') were originally designated officiants at Greek temples who were selected to eat the offerings after official sacrifices as an act of worship. Later it became the name of a popular character type in classical comedy, standing for impoverished profiteers whose garrulous impudence, buffoonish wit, and servile flattery enabled him to win an invitation to dinner. In this play parasitism is a universal condition ('All the wise world is little else, in nature,/But Parasites, or Sub-parasites' III.i.12-13) afflicting all individuals who try to live off the wealth or livelihood of others without doing any honest work. But it is not so much a form of physical abhorrence for labour than a quality of intellectual superiority, dependent upon wit and dexterous manipulation of others' naiveté and benevolence.

the Machiavellian tradition; he presents different versions of himself to everyone. He affects sincerity by his sweet assurances and his ingenuous ability to make others believe that he is telling the truth to each of them. Professing undying loyalty he assures Corvino that:

> ...I would not doe that thing might crosse
>
> Your ends, on whom I haue my whole dependence, sir:..
>
> (II.vi.40-1)

To Voltore he promises that:

> My onely ayme was to dig you a fortune
>
> Out of these two, old rotten sepulchres—
>
> (III.ix.38-9)

Directing his private play he urges to Lady Would-be that:

> My purpose is, to vrge
>
> My patron to reforme his will;...
>
> ...you shall be now
>
> Put in the first...
>
> (IV.vi.96-7, 99-100)

Mosca has the capacity to blend secret motives with an innate capacity of making intimate appeals to other people's emotions. He disguises an insubordinate will behind a duplicitous, convincing performance of service. The Pauline advice to servants[51] enjoined singleness of devotion and purity of intention towards the master as Christ's representative: 'Servants, be obedient unto them that are your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling in singleness of your hearts as unto Christ,/Not with service to the eye, as men pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of god from the heart (Ephesians 6:5).' 'Eye-service' implied a split between internal and external, such dichotomies often concealing the wickedness of internal disposition under

---

[51] In his account of the Elizabethan Underworld, Arthur Kinney identifies former servants (retainers, stewards, monastery servants) to have been a substantial part of the underclass. They included for instance the 'Rufflers' ('outcasts of serving-men'), 'Upright Men' ('serving-men, artificers, and laboring men') and 'Dells' (who fled service to escape from 'some sharp mistress that they serve'). See Kinney (ed.), *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars*. A. L. Beier similarly notes that the majority of vagrants were either still in employment or engaged in the service professions. See Beier, *Masterless Men*, p. 44. Jonson inverts the servant-turned-rogue paradigm into that of the rogue-turned-servant. Several contemporary texts focus on the slippage between the two categories of servants and rogues, for instance Gervase Markham's *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men* (rpt. 1598; Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1997).

a façade of dedicated service.[52] Similarly in *Discoveries*, Jonson cautions against the servant who 'remove themselves upon craft, and designe...with a premeditated thought to their owne, rather their *Princes* profit. Such let the *Prince* take heed of, and not doubt to reckon in the List of his open enemies' (ll. 1134-8).

Mosca's resourcefulness in abetting his master's confidence games brings him to the realisation that like the legacy-hunters he might as well sponge off the wealth of others instead of honestly labouring in Volpone's service. As the master of impersonation, he cleverly executes Volpone's ideas and is ready to devise a lie to extricate themselves from tricky situations. As the character closest to Jonson, he 'deuis(es) formall tale(s)' (IV.iv.7) and most nearly controls the metatheatrical destinies of others. Thus he is able to rescue Volpone from the allegations of Bonario by staging a false 'play' full of 'ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy' (Epistle, l.37) and proving to the judges the 'framed' Volpone's innocence and the 'horride strange offence' that Bonario '(did) commit 'gainst nature, in his youth' (IV.vi.89-90). He weaves rhetorical ornamentation, verbal poetics, vivid images, (as in the court appearance of the 'feeble' Volpone) and shocking revelations (made by Lady Would-be about Celia's moral virtuosity) to dramatise a sensational story that compels audience belief, revealing the slim dividing line between mendacity and theatrical illusion; in effect nudging towards a cautious discernment of theatrical forms that are sensationalistic, morally unconstructive, and erroneous in their portrayal of reality.

Conscience is a 'beggers/vertue' (III.vii.211) in Venice, and Mosca absolutely has no scruples about practising deceit as when he sneakily manages to convince Corvino that Volpone's physical welfare being contingent upon 'some yong woman'... 'Lustie, and full of iuice, to sleepe by him' (II.vi.34-5) it is best to hand over Celia to Volpone:

> CORV. Best to hire
> Some common curtezan?...
> MOS. No, no: it must be one, that ha's no trickes, sir,
> Some simple thing, a creature, made vnto it;
> Some wench you may command. Ha' you no kinswoman?
> God's so ------- Thinke, thinke, thinke, thinke, thinke, thinke,
>   thinke, sir.

---

[52] Compare in this regard Thomas Fosset's injunction in *The Servant's Dutie* (1613) that the servant should have 'no wille of his owne, nor power over him selfe, but wholly to resign himself to the will of his Master, and this is to obey.' Quoted in Rivlin, *Aesthetics of Service in Early Modern England*, p. 15.

One o' the Doctors offer'd, there his daughter...

Yes, signior LVPO, the phy-

sician...

CORV. I pray thee giue me leaue. If any man

But I had had this lucke------- The thing, in'tselfe,

I know, is nothing------ Wherefore should not I

As well command my bloud, and my affections,

As this dull Doctor? In the point of honour,

The cases are all one, of wife, and daughter.

MOS.I heare him comming. CORV.Shee shall doo't:

'Tis done.

Slight, if this Doctor, who is not engag'd…

Offer his daughter, what should I, that am

So deeply in? I will preuent him: wretch!...

The

Party, you wot of,

Shall be mine owne wife, MOSCA.

(II.vi.50-81)

He feigns weakness to hide his true cunning strength as in his dealings with a visibly
sarcastic Bonario:

MOS. Heauen, be good to me.

These imputations are too common, sir,

And eas'ly stuck on vertue when shees poore;

You are vnequall to me, and how ere

Your sentence may be righteous, yet you are not,

That ere you know me, thus, proceed in censure:

St.MARKE beare witnesse 'gainst you, 'tis inhumane.

BON. What? do's he weepe? the signe is soft, and

good!

I doe repent me, that I was so harsh.

(III.ii.11-19)

It is ironical that Volpone accidentally touches on the hidden sinister qualities of his
parasite without even realising it as he praises his lackey for his unceremonious tricking
of the dupes: 'O, my fine diuell' (V.iii.46), 'Rare, MOSCA! How his villany becomes him!'

233

(V.iii.61), even appreciatively calling him a '*Basiliske*' (V.viii.28) that denoted a mythological creature hatched by a serpent from a rooster's egg, whose look or breath was apparently fatal. In keeping with his character, Mosca's most important deception is the one that he pulls on Volpone and on the audience, hiding his private nature and intentions from both.

Mosca's accomplishment as an artist has a sinister edge than that of Volpone, because his dizzying role-multiplications serve as a veneer for ulterior commercial motives (thus providing a more faithful portrayal of the authorial condition) unlike his master who is not really concerned with material profits. He has a firmer control over his performances than Volpone though like him he too takes great delight in the technical perfection of an impersonation. Mosca subverts the role of the ideal servant in protecting his own interests under the guise of safeguarding Volpone's secret: constructing a hierarchy of self-constituted interiorities. His rationalistic worldview is one wholly made up of 'parasites and sub-parasites', where impersonation is the condition of success and where people succeed or fail by their dissembling skill: 'Hood an asse, with reverend purple,/So you can hide his two ambitious eares,/And, he shall passe for a cathedrall Doctor.' (I.ii.111-13) He vindicates his advice against showing any sympathetic feeling for the apparently dying Volpone by suggesting that, 'The weeping of an heire should still be laughter,/Under a visor.' (I.v.22-3)

Gulling is a form of power play that is based on a hierarchy of sophisticated cleverness. It is the primary technique used by all the characters to assert superiority over others, and Mosca's deception too is an enactment of secret desires for social advancement and authority. The rogues' hidden hostility is either expressed directly through intimate confidences to the audience (in asides) or indirectly through servile flattery and duplicity as they seek to manipulate their masters' trust in them. Contrary to their subjugated low class status as 'clot-poules' (III.i.9) in real life, the fictional space of the play-within-the-play offers them freedom from being subjected to another's perspective, presenting a powerful testimony to the emerging autonomy and malleability of the mind, just the kind of monologic and volitional agency that was both desired and feared in this era. Jonson thus exploits the rogue's epistemological volatility and theatrical ambivalence to represent the powerful dichotomy of the early modern discourse on privacy.

In *Volpone*, the initial stirrings of Mosca's private self-assertive identity occur in the middle of the play (the first time he appears onstage without Volpone) when he begins to

grow convinced about his skilled proficiency at executing (dubious) plans; but this confidence is left unexpressed as he seems to go back to the conventional role expected of him, acting as Volpone's faithful servant and helping him to get out of his trouble with Bonario and Celia. Yet as it turns out later, Mosca's help may have been motivated as much by private interest as by a charitable desire to help his master. Thus when the opportunity to appropriate Volpone's wealth comes, his sound business sense prevails and he is quick to seize it. Within the beast-tale framework, his covetous motivations impel him to move out of his role as a harmless fly which circles around greater beasts to 'transform' into the beast itself. The second half of the play thus marks the rising metatheatrical dominance of Mosca as a substitute protagonist when Volpone (in fact he simply becomes a spectator) seems to lose situational control and audience sympathy after his 'seduction' of Celia.

This shift (which is also a function of the tilting of the knowledge and property bias towards the servant) signals Mosca's single-handed ability to drive the play forward and act as its (im)moral voice instead of collaborating with Volpone.[53] Just as Mosca is about to cross the boundary that divides the staged private play within Volpone's bedchamber to the public world of the law court, Volpone regains theatrical control through his final revelation. Although it puts an end to Mosca's spiralling career, the latter's failure begs the question whether his punishment is just desert for his deceit and greed or for his attempt at usurping the powers and privileges of the nobility and move beyond his allotted social class. Mosca is penalised for playing the game of feeding off the wealth and livelihood of others better than the rest. His shrewd ingenuity and the correctness of his evaluation regarding society make him in the end a much more empathetic character than the gulls.

The Alchemist seems to bridge *Volpone* and *Bartholomew Fair* for it engages in an exploration of both alternative as well as institutionalised forms of social grouping and association as sources of identity and meaning making: the normative master-servant relationship of the earlier play is thus complemented by other modes of participatory social organisation as in the latter play. *The Alchemist* begins with a fortuitous act of substitution in which the rightful practitioner of power, Lovewit departs from his Blackfriars house to his country estate fearing infection from the plague, leaving

---

[53] This is also signified by the roles they assume at the end of the play – Volpone that of a *commendatori* or sergeant and Mosca that of a *clarissimo* or nobleman. It is interesting however to note that Mosca is worse off as an exemplar of the bad master because in addition to their shared greed and deceit, he turns out the three 'freaks' from the house as soon as he gains control.

behind his butler Jeremy in charge of the household. The latter invites two other con-artists, Subtle a cheater with no permanent abode and Dol Common, a Southwark punk punk to share and transform the domestic space and its associated relations into a locus locus of opportunism: performing new identities and gulling unsuspecting dupes of their their money. The play examines the possibility of sustaining different forms of community or sociality that are at odds with established public culture (i.e. outside the rubric of service) through a presentation of the pseudo-republic (a kind of subaltern 'counter-public' that functions as a space for withdrawal and regroupment and a site for agitative activities directed towards the greater society) comprised of rogues only to find it inadequate and thereby reinstating institutionalised and hierarchic forms of social relations at the conclusion.

In *Bartholomew Fair* Jonson's latent republican sympathies tilt the balance the other way, in favour of an idealised notion of community defined as a private fellowship or intimacy of like-minded people delineated through the fairground denizens at Smithfield that work towards the common good. In fact all conventional forms of 'service' relationships are shown to fail in the latter play whether that of husband-wife (John and Win Littlewit; the Overdos), master-servant (Bartholomew Cokes and Humphrey Wasp) or guardian-ward (Adam Overdo and Grace Wellborn) to endorse a form of atavistic collective commune through its cony-catching 'fraternity'.

This dialectic between individual and community would also determine the nature of Jonson's implication in the world of print, especially to the way (as I have traced in Chapter VI) in which he would use the new medium to chart the formation of a textual coterie comprised of author as the head of the 'household' who experiences freedom and intimacy within a family circle ('Sons of Ben') dedicated to literature, ethical reflection, and self-improvement. The coterie (prefiguring an early prototype of the modern civil society) acts as a public space located within the private realm: an example of a utopian voluntary community not based on status hierarchy that allowed for the expression of a more authentic selfhood. By thus adopting a nominally private position as an elite and reclusive author (a subject position that had no validity in dominant culture) Jonson was not only able to mark himself off the public sphere of authority, but was also able to assert the authenticity and exclusivity of his marginalised experience as playwright.

In *The Alchemist*, Jeremy the butler's temporary deliverance from real world service relationships is followed by the establishment of the 'venter *tripartite*' (I.i.135); an alchemical scam impersonating as a joint stock company. It simulates a pretended master-

servant relation between the two male rogues (Subtle appears to the world as the apparent master though it is the 'servant' who really manages the plot) or between tricksters and their victims[54] as an external façade to hide within a purely commercial coalition based on overtly sympathetic (that shares 'All things in common?/Without prioritie?', I.i.135-6) yet ultimately divergent interests. The coalition tries to supplant traditional service relations in favour of a collaborative project that is 'undertaken on the initiative and for the benefit of shareholders'.[55]

Despite their apparent egalitarianism, the swindlers' 'fraternal' alliance is based from the start on an implicit inequality not so much of wealth as of authority and intellect. Like Mosca who augments his initial role as a subsidiary stage-hand to become the principal 'plotter', Jeremy similarly rises from being collaborator-cum-joint business partner (as Captain Face) and the alchemist's drudge-cum-apprentice (as Lungs) to primary mover of the self-consciously sustained metatheatrical play. Their pact initially resembles the professional contracts of early modern theatrical companies such as the King's Men which allotted specific shares to individual stockholders (significantly the core group of shareholders were known as 'housekeepers'). The performances put on by the scamsters depend on disguise and impersonation, attracting audiences drawn from all sections of the society who part with their money to witness the grandiose illusion, much as Jonson's play would have been seen by real-life 'paying' spectators.

The Alchemist plays on the distinction between public and private through a skilful manipulation of the difference in knowledge hierarchies between various characters. Thus there is the predictable discrepancy between the blinkered idiocy of the dupes and the worldly-wise perspective of the rogues. In most of such scenes the intriguers speak in two voices; the public voice that sustains and indulges the foolish fantasy of the victims and the private voice that reminds of the actual reality. Jonson also interposes scenes of the rogues' internal quarrels and their plotting to which the real audience members are privy, with scenes in which they present a unified front to

---

[54] The rogues soon realize that they do have to 'serve' the gulls in a more conventional sense to cater to their desires. Thus as the pace of the play picks up the rogues have to be alert to respond to the beck and call of their gulls, inventing strategies to keep them placated. See Elizabeth Rivlin, 'The Rogues' Paradox: Redefining Work in *The Alchemist*', in Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (ed.), *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 115-29: 122. The word 'serve' which keeps on recurring through the play, harps on this ambivalence, referring both to labour as well as tricking and duping.

[55] Rivlin in Dowd and Korda, *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama*, p. 121.

deceive their clients. The dual level of interpretation comes through most explicitly in episodes dealing with rogue-dupe encounters as in this hilarious scene where Mammon Mammon meets Dol and mistakes her to be a noble lady of good breeding:

> MAM. There is a strange nobilitie i' your eye,
>
> This lip, that chin! Methinks you doe resemble
>
> One o' the *Austriack* princes.FAC. Very like,
>
> Her father was an *Irish* costar-mongar.
>
> MAM. The house of *Valois*, iust, had such a nose.
>
> And such a fore-head, yet, the *Medici*
>
> Of Florence boast. DOL. Troth, and I haue beene lik'ned
>
> To all these Princes. FAC. I'll be sworn, I hearde it.
>
> MAM. I know not how! it is not any one,
>
> But e'en the very choise of all their features.
>
> FAC. I'll in, and laugh.

<div align="center">(IV.i.55-65)</div>

This difference is also overtly performed in the scene where Face and Subtle pretend to engage in confidential talk about Dapper's impending good fortune even as the latter 'overhears' them:

> FAC. Speake you this from art?
>
> SVB. I, sir, and reason too: the ground of art.
>
> H'is o' the onely best complexion,
>
> The queene of *Fairy* loues. FAC. What! is he! SVB. Peace.
>
> Hee'll ouer-heare you. Sir, should shee but see him—
>
> FAC. What? SVB. Do not you tell him. FAC.Will
>
> he win at cards too?
>
> SVB. The spirits of dead HOLLAND, liuing ISAAC,
>
> You'ld sweare, were in him: such a vigorous luck
>
> As cannot be resisted. 'Slight hee'll put
>
> Sixe o' your gallants, to a cloke, indeed.
>
> FAC. A strange successe, that some man shall be borne
>
> too!
>
> SVB. He heares you, man— DAP. Sir, Ile not be
>
> ingratefull.

> FAC. Faith, I haue a confidence in his good nature:
>
> You heare, he sayes he will not be ingratefull.

(I.ii.104-16)

Similarly in the scene where Face and Subtle exchange pleasantries and gossip after Drugger has left reveals their predatory nature. Yet it also confirms Face's double-edged personality; by criticising Drugger's stupidity just minutes after he has pretended to be the latter's sympathiser shows him to be a victimiser who has no moral scruples whatsoever.

> FAC. (Thou shalt know more anone. Away, be gone.)
>
> A miserable rogue, and liues with cheese,
>
> And has the wormes. That was the cause indeed
>
> Why he came now. He dealt with me, in priuate
>
> To get a med'cine for 'hem. SVB. And shall, sir. This
>
> > workes.

(II.vi.80-4)

Moreover, the closed circle of power is left vulnerable to attacks of self-interest as when Face yearns to get married to Dame Pliant and Subtle does not seem to be too disinterested either. Dol, as the least powerful member of the alliance is conveniently left out of the conspiracy. This should be a sufficient warning to the audience about the ultimate fate of the confraternity.

> FAC. A wife, a wife, for one on'vs, my deare SVBTLE:
>
> Wee'll eene draw lots, and he, that failes, shall haue
>
> The more in goods, the other has in taile…
>
> SVB. Faith, best let's see her first, and then determine.
>
> FAC. Content. But DOL must ha' no breath on't.
>
> SVB. Mum.

(II.vi.91-2)

Each of the first four acts work on a similar pattern, juxtaposing scenes of gulling with scenes where the audience gets to know about the intriguers' real motives. Yet the greatest manipulation of knowledge occurs through Face's ability to unceremoniously terminate the 'contract' and dismiss his cheating partners, probably a foregone conclusion given the acrimonious power struggle of the opening scene, but then totally unexpected when it does come. Knowledge becomes power through an ability to regulate its distribution within social relations – from the most intimate to

the most detached. Secrecy is a function of knowledge that is intentionally withheld from others; as an interior experience it is a powerful tool for both creating and assaulting autonomy. They create spaces that might be segregated or shared socially with others. Such acts of partitioning enable the creation of privacy as a condition in which individuals or groups can free themselves of the demands and expectations of others.

> The power of…secrecy can be immense. Because it bypasses inspection and eludes interference, secrecy is central to the planning of every form of injury to human beings. It cloaks the execution of these plans and wipes out all traces afterward. It enters into all prying and intrusion that cannot be carried out openly. While not all that is secret is meant to deceive…all deceit does rely on keeping something secret.[56]

Modern day privacy refers to those places, spaces, and matters upon or into which others may not intrude without the consent of the person or organisation to whom they are designated as belonging. Such a notion of privacy 'need not hide, and secrecy hides far more than what is private'… 'a private life need not be a secret life.'[57] Such finer distinctions were immaterial to the early modern era, and as privacy hesitantly piggy-backed on secrecy, both came to be construed as matters of grave socio-political threat and insecurity. As instances of marginalised selves, Face (and Mosca before him) represents both the thrills as well as the anxieties of privacy: a momentary lack of accountability that is both self-desirable yet feared in others. In being able to define 'a sense of control over one's identity, over access to oneself, over which aspects of oneself one will present at which time and to whom, along with the ability to press or to waive territorial claims'[58] these plebeian tricksters are able to anticipate and define the conceptual parameters of modern privacy.

Both characters also represent a commodification of information, revealing knowledge to be an asset which plausibly points to their inherent appeal to Jonson. The risk associated with them is that they represent the hazards of knowledge possession and its surveillance, yet knowledge is not a material property that can either be protected or restricted through legal, social or cultural control mechanisms. In their metatheatrical game of protecting their own motives even as they try to assault on others' information, these characters give an early premonition of the tense traffic between autonomous

---

[56] Sissela Bok, *Secrecy: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), p. 26.
[57] Bok, *Secrecy*, p. 11.
[58] Jean L. Cohen, *Regulating Intimacy: A New Legal Paradigm* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002), p. 57.

personhood, privacy, and the public realm that would become the core element of modernity. To think that these early modern concerns are passé is to overlook how issues are deeply afflicting late modern existence, especially the way in which the proliferation and diffusion of bio-communication and mind-invading technologies are increasingly undermining the protection of private knowledge or innermost thoughts (I have already referred to such concerns in the introductory chapter).

Face's creative and comic ingenuity in contrast to the dull gravity of the older Subtle is expressed very early in the play through the implicit rhetorical framework of the *commedia dell 'arte* that determines the mutual give and take of their initial interactions.[59] Face's deprecatory description of Subtle's 'pinched-horn nose' (I.i.28) and his

> feet in mouldie slippers, for your kibes,
>
> A felt of rugg, and a thin thredden cloake,
>
> That scarce would couer your no-buttocks—

<div align="center">(I.i.35-7)</div>

recall early modern iconographic portrayals of the old, hook-nosed Pantalone's slight frame wearing black slippers and poorly covered in a black cloak. By extension Face is 'exposed as a *zanni* figure, the clever servant who advances his own interests by undermining his master.'[60] Moreover in keeping with the *commedia* tradition Face ruthlessly betrays and outmanoeuvres Subtle by appropriating both his 'pelfe' (privately appropriating the wealth that has been mined through collective labour) and his woman (Dame Pliant who he sets aside for his real master Lovewit). The less than equable relationship of the first scene sets the tone for what is to come later since their partnership is based on the gradual monopolisation of power by Face.

As one of the primary metaphors of the play apart from alchemy, the plague initiates a polluted atmosphere of cultural collapse that bears the potential to engender disquietingly new marginal identities and grotesque socio-economic relationships. The link between external character and interiority prove unstable and the practice of subterfuge becomes a communicable disease of the soul that spreads with alarming rapidity. Early modern methods of controlling plague through social exile and civic quarantine also had the power of radically transforming urban space: closed and claustrophobic houses and

---

[59] I am indebted for this useful suggestion to Anthony Ellis' *Old Age, Masculinity, and Early Modern Drama: Comic Elders on the Italian and Shakespearean Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), pp. 143-4.

[60] Ellis' *Old Age, Masculinity, and Early Modern Drama*, p. 144.

neighbourhoods turning into literal and metaphorical enclosures and diffusers of iniquity. Partially drawing on and parodying the model of medieval estates satire[61] the alliance of Subtle (Lords Spiritual), Face (Lords Temporal), and Dol (Commons or Parliament) is purely pragmatic as each tries to achieve mastery by annihilating the other's identity through stripping away surfaces. Both Subtle and Face posit identity as something materially or alchemically manufactured, especially in terms of clothes[62] and language:

> Rais'd thee from broomes, and dust, and watring pots?...
>
> Put thee in words, and fashion? made thee fit
>
> For more than ordinarie fellowships?
>
> Giv'n thee thy othes, thy quarrelling dimensions?
>
> Thy rules, to cheat at horse-race, cock-pit, cardes,
>
> Dice, or what euer gallant tincture, else?
>
> (I.i.67, 72-6)

Or

> When you went pinn'd up, in the seuerall rags,
>
> Yo' had raked, and pick'd from dung-hills, before day.
>
> (I.i.33-4)

Against Jonson's ideal world of constancy and the 'centred self' these rogues keep on changing surfaces until they are unable to recognise the original part intended for them, confusing the mask with the face. Subtle reincarnates the early modern phobia of the able-bodied, unemployed, rootless, and lawless vagrant just as he also associated with the plague-like miasma originating beyond the City walls. Unsatisfied with the habitual paltriness of his life at Pie Corner, his successive roles as alchemist, 'priest of faery', and learned doctor allows him to prey both upon the commonwealth and violate the sanctity of the household. Yet Subtle is psychologically a less complex character than Face; the former's lack of prudence in assessing situations and his inability at maintaining ironic self-detachment ultimately leads to his downfall. His momentary suspicion and sense of caution that he shares with the audience ('we must keepe FACE in awe,/Or he will over-looke vs like a tyranne') (IV.iii.18-19) meets its ultimate match against the superior criminal machinations of Face.

---

[61] Alan C. Dessen, '*The Alchemist*: Jonson's "Estates Play"', *RenD*, vol. 7 (1964), pp. 35-54.

[62] As clothes lost out on their status as stable signifiers of identity, sumptuary statutes from as early as 1362 were issued to rectify the crisis of disruption between attire and social rank. Clothes, portraits, stamps, letters, and seals bore testimony to a material and performative culture of signs that were used to remedy the ontological and semiotic ruptures of the era. Mosca and Face critique the notion of a legible subject and a stable signifying system that maintained itself through the management and circulation of information.

Subtle may have started out as an equal partner yet is very soon reduced to act on the cues provided by Face; busying himself with his 'magesterium' in his non-existent alchemical laboratory behind the scenes. While the assumption of a mask may insinuate at the essential emptiness of the self yet it reveals something deeper in the case of Face. Jonson seems to be complicating materialist views of identity in order to construct selves that are comprised of both interior ineffable qualities as well as external physical characteristics.[63] The term '"face" can be associated with 'command of countenance, especially with reference to freedom from indication of shame; a bold front; impudence, effrontery, "cheek".'[64] It also carries the ambiguous connotations of a 'mask': appearance becomes an empty sign for those who abandon the self. In the preface to *The Alchemist* dedicated to Lady Mary Wroth, Jonson while stressing the sincerity of his letter, says that he does not wish it to 'talke, like one of the ambitious Faces of the time: who the more they paint, are the lesse themselves' (Epistle to Lady Mary Wroth, ll. 16-18).

But there is also a suggestion of a consciously planned effort to deceive in another use of the word made by Jonson in *Epicoene* where Truewit tells the annoyed Dauphine and Clerimont not to 'put on this strange face to pay my courtesie: off with this visor' (II.ii.34-5).[65] Incidentally the Latin word for 'face' *vultus* was derived from *volo* 'I want', affirming how appearance was a product of one's *own* wishing and willing. This may have been one reason why the word did not exist in the Middle Ages. The numerous public faces Face assumes whether as 'suburb-Captain', Lungs, Ulenspiegel, or Jeremy the Butler attest to a life lived on surfaces but it also plays with the tantalising possibility of keeping aspects of the self wholly unknown: 'vnderground, in cellars,/Or an ale-house, darker than deafe *John's*' (I.i.85).

Face confronts dangers with greater fortitude than Subtle who easily gets flustered when plans tend to go awry. He is the one who introduces the first client thus taking an active role in script-writing. Unlike Subtle whose long verbose speeches slow down the action, Face's physical nimbleness is matched only by his mental quickness. As author and stage-manager he sustains and speeds up an elaborate staged play of make-

---

[63] In maintaining this stance I go against such critics as Katharine Eisaman Maus who deny the existence of a separate spiritual realm in Jonson and perceive the inward to be merely an effect of the material. See Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, p. 172. Michael Schoenfeldt posits a similar view in *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

[64] Edward B. Partridge, *The Broken Compass: A Study of the Major Comedies* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1958), p. 11.

[65] I am indebted to Hyland's *Disguise and Role-Playing in Ben Jonson's Drama*, p. 102 for this interpretation.

believe and disguise with finesse and exactitude: 'searching out these veines, then following 'hem,/Then trying 'hem out' (I.iii.106-7). Like the proverbial cony-catcher he is he is quick to sniff out the gulls' weaknesses and confer on them new though fictitious identities of greater importance. Thus he is able to whet Dapper's appetite by enticing him into a costly plot about his 'Aunt', the Queen of Fairies. Where Subtle only introduces the idea, Face's imagination is revealed through his ability to improvise further further by transforming the 'ceremonious, otherworldly queen' into an 'ordinary mortal': mortal': 'a lone woman,/And very rich' (I.ii.155-6) who, might in earthly fashion take a fancy to a young man…when Dapper finally '[provides] for her Grace's servants' (III.iv.141), the money goes straight into Face's pocket, and Subtle is not onstage to observe it. It is Face's ingenuity and daring, in ludicrously secularizing the Queen of Fairy, which creates another way to soak the client, in addition to demanding the usual fee for the Doctor's services.[66]

He boosts Drugger's bourgeois ego by proclaiming him an 'honest fellow' who 'lets me haue good *tabacco*' which he 'do's not/Sophisticate…with sack-lees, or oyle,/…A neate, spruce-honest-fellow' (I.iii.22-4, 32). Face plays on the pharmacist's dreams of success by predicting that, 'This summer/He will be of the clothing of his companie:/And, next spring, call'd to the scarlet' (I.iii.35-7). Face's improvisational skills are however constantly put to the test as his dupes arrive unexpectedly in clusters and he has to play off one against another in order to sustain the charade. Thus he is able to save the day when Subtle is locked in a losing verbal duel with Surly by presumably pushing Dol onstage who in her masquerade as a mad 'lords sister' instantly catches Mammon's roving eye, thereby disrupting the 'action', forcing Surly to exit in exasperation: 'Hart, this is a bawdy-house! I'll be burnt else' (II.iii.226). Face uses the same technique in what is arguably one of his trickiest challenges by overcoming his miscalculation regarding the 'Spanish don's' arrival by overwhelming the disguised Surly through the sheer physical violence and verbal fusillade hurled upon him by the combined might of Kastril, Drugger, and Ananias.

> KAS. It is my humour: you are a Pimpe, and a Trig,
>
> And an AMADIS *de Gaule*, or a *Don* QUIXOTE.
>
> DRV. Or a Knight o'the *curious cox-combe*. Doe you
>
>   see?...

---

[66] Joyce Van Dyke, 'The Game of Wits in *The Alchemist*', *SEL*, vol. 19, 1970, pp. 253-69: 261-2.

KAS. Then you are an *Otter*, and a *Shad*, a *Whit*,

A very *Tim*. SVR. You'll heare me, sir? KAS. I will

  Not.

(ANA. Depart, proud *Spanish*

  Fiend)… Child of perdition!

<div align="right">(IV.vii.39-41, 45-6, 58-9)</div>

As the most resourcefully supple mind in the play, Face's final triumph however lies in saving himself from yet another ill-timed arrival. By playing upon his returned master's desire for material possessions who cynically reaps benefit from the wit of his servant; Face reveals cleverness and the new urban individualism to be valuable forms of capital in a world experiencing socio-economic change ("Fore god, my intelligence/Costs me more money, then my share oft comes to', I.iii.107-8). Subtle's attempt at a similar *coup d'état* stays confined in the realm of thoughts; he remains locked up in a world of illusion that distorts his ability to interpret reality:

<div align="center">Soone at night, my</div>

DOLLY,

When we are shipt, and all our goods aboord,

East-ward for *Ratcliffe*; we will turne our course

To Brainford, westward, if thou saist the word:

And take our leaues of this ore-weaning raskall,

This peremptorie FACE.

<div align="right">(V.iv.74-9)</div>

As the face of an increasingly uncertain and disordered world, Face believes that all things are governed by chance and success or failure is unrelated to integrity of character. Although the gulls and the other two tricksters have been driven out empty-handed yet in the (a)moral order established at the end of the play, it seems Face will probably allot only a minor role to Lovewit – a disturbing hint of their now reversed roles as master and servant.

More than Subtle it is Face who uses secrecy as a means of self-empowerment and inflicting harm on others, his ruthless improvisation is certainly sharper than his classical counterpart Tranio in Plautus' *Mostellaria*. Unlike Subtle's specialised jargon, Face's language is eloquent yet vicious, socially shrewd yet disturbing, tinged with psychological

<div align="center">245</div>

acuity[67] and his audacious mock asides to the 'iudging spectator' manage to keep them deceived along with the other members of the 'venter tripartite', revealing Face to be the master swindler (who shifts alliances with self-serving ease from Subtle his temporary master to Lovewit his primary master; reflecting how urban servants tended to switch masters with quick frequency) in both onstage and offstage worlds. The audience is allowed to congratulate itself for being privy to the secrets of the characters, yet Jonson places limits upon what can really be known, how much can be made visible. Face's surface conceals even as it reveals, constituting one of the most valuable kinds of practical human knowledge in world of endless tricks and betrayals: the knowledge of when and how not to speak one's heart or mind.

His escape 'shows that flexibility is needed to respond to each varying situation on its own merits, and that, since morality implies a certain kind of inflexibility, the immoral can often respond to a crisis more adroitly than the moral.'[68] Secrecy implies the power to discern and enable the sequestration of things and experiences into meaningful social categories. Comprehending and negotiating of information requires wise discernment to sort out the real from the false, reveal what is hidden or know what should be kept hidden. Unfortunately Lovewit's (whose proclivity for 'low' forms of entertainment such as 'bawdy pictures', 'flea performances' or 'dancing dogs' leave much to be desired) wish to be ruled by his servant's wit shows that he lacks such discriminating powers. It acknowledges that a serious breach in the moral and informational order of the household still exists for the master imitates the servant and not the other way round.[69] The play thus reconfigures modes of knowing (both in the exterior sense of knowing or not knowing others and interior self-knowledge) and their intersections with power.

Jonson broached the novelty of the secrets of inner life, invisible to the eye and distinct from the material manifestations of the self through the discourse of creative

---

[67] His quick improvisations lead Jonathan Haynes to compare Face with the 'taker-up' in 'barnard's law' who 'seemeth a skilful man in all things, who hath by long travail learned without book a thousand policies to insinuate himself into a man's acquaintance. Talk of matters in law, he hath plenty of cases at his fingers' ends, and he hath seen, and tried, and ruled in the King's courts. Speak of grazing and husbandry, no man knoweth more shires than he, nor better which way to raise a gainful commodity, and how the abuses and overture of prices might be redressed. Finally, enter into what discourse they list, were it into a broom-man's faculty, he knoweth what gains they have for old boots and shoes.' Robert Greene, *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage*, quoted in Jonathan Haynes, 'Representing the Underworld: *The Alchemist'*, *Studies in Philology*, vol. 86, no. 1, Winter 1989, pp. 18-41: 34-5. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4174324
[68] Ruth Evans Netscher, 'The Moral Vision of "The Alchemist": Tricks, Psychotherapy, and Personality Traits', *Literature and Medicine*, vol. 7, 1988, pp. 177-94: 188.
[69] A similar situation arises in the earlier *Every Man in His Humour* (V.iii.112-4) when Justice Clement, a lover of jests and wit, forgives Brainworm for the ingenuity of his devices: 'Thou hast done, or assisted to nothing, in my judgment, but deserves to bee pardon'd for the wit o' the offence.' He dispenses dramatic justice where wit rather than morality is the objective.

wit.[70] The verbal form 'to wit' (to see and hence to know) is etymologically allied to the Old High German *wizzan* 'to know', Latin *videre* 'to see', and the Greek *eidenai* 'to know' from *idein* 'to see'. Wit denoted not only mental capability but was intrinsically connected to the power of judicious appraisal and the ethical or aesthetic complexities of human agency. It provided the (amoral) knowledge about the reconfigurations of urban space, of how to read other people's appearances, enabling a progression from the exterior to the interior of man: it also offered the instruments for successful and effective self-fashioning. As one of the constitutive factors in the slow but steady disengagement of the self from external matrices, wit was a vital form of cultural capital for negotiating emerging metropolitan needs and demands.

Thus at the metacognitive level Face is able to prudently rehearse a number of potential scenarios for future action before choosing the best one (i.e. telling the 'truth' to his master). The trickster's entire life was composed of *beffa* (tricks) whereby he created his own victims by secretly pandering to their weaknesses and exploiting their inanities. Mosca's skill lay in the imaginative ability to insinuate himself into the minds of other comically imbecile characters and read their misplaced beliefs and goals in order to deceive them. Conversely such characters hint at the dangerous possibility of concealed thoughts and desires influencing reality, radically altering the sceptical divide between self and world and the limits of what can be known. Face and Subtle's professional virtuosity rested in the knack to 'improvise disguise and become whatever their clients yield to most susceptibly':[71] counting on the dexterity to transform immediately in response to the change of their clients' natures. Surly fails to act as moral arbiter because he lacks wit, and is infected by the 'vice of honesty' (V.v.84). Face's final mocking address to the audience appeals to its love for wit that precludes moral judgment and the knack to make distinctions. Although he claims to act as their agent establishing a contract with them, the self he offers to the audience here is yet another role:

> And though I am cleane
>
> Got off, from SVBTLE, SVRLY, MAMMON, DOL,
>
> Hot ANANIAS, DAPPER, DRVGGER, all
>
> With whom I traded; yet I put my selfe

---

[70] For an era that was in the process of consolidating ideas about identity, the Renaissance had different words to describe different shades of subjectivity. 'Wit' represented the shifting ground between the infinity of the scholastic 'soul' and the finite Enlightenment 'mind'. Secular writers conceived wit as disconnected from and yet existing within a body that was increasingly being objectified by contemporary anatomy.

[71] John Enck, *Jonson and the Comic Truth* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), p. 160.

On you, that are my countrey: and this pelfe,

Which I haue got, if you doe quit me, rests

To feast you often, and inuite new ghests.

<div align="right">(V.v.159-65)</div>

Face's last joke ('pelf' as both the illegally amassed money in Lovewit's house and box-office turnovers piled up by the King's Men) is contingent on the paradoxical similarity between the theatrical world and the world of incipient capitalism, for both depended on selling specialised products to mass audiences and depended for their prosperity on low wage costs and fluid capital. As early examples of joint stock companies the theatre was one of the more advanced segments of the early modern commercial economy. It was to Jonson's credit that he understood the close connections between theatre and an upcoming consumer economy, aiding in the gradual internalisation of the ideologies of modern urban life.[72]

Jonson's next major comic composition *Bartholomew Fair* (which incidentally was not a part of the 1616 folio plausibly for its lack of conformity to classical decorum) plays on the nexus between market, theatre, and the restructuring of private identity. Although Jonson gained commercial success in the public theatre he remained sceptical of the source of his monetary profits. His conventional harangue against the compulsions that forced him to pander his pedagogical art to please debased lower and middle class popular tastes was somewhat of a rationalising posture. He sought to purge the 'loathéd stage' of its vulgarity and restore its classical dignity by imitating Roman models. In his attempt to escape from the world of exchange he intermittently turned to aristocratic and royal patronage by writing poetry and composing masques for selected private audiences.

These concerns remind how Plautus' explicit assimilation of the playwright with the figure of the controlling slave-trickster may have more than interested Jonson who famously defined himself as the court's 'servant, but not slave'.[73] He similarly used his fictional, scheming rogues as a metaphorical trope to project the anxieties of his authorial voice. The Roman playwright's choice of the lowly slave (of all other roles available) to appropriate a speaking subject-position is striking given the marginalised if not dubious status of playwrights and actors in Roman society. Yet the playwright's conscious intellectual self-positioning as a member of the lower classes helped him to assimilate his latent authorial self-aggrandisement within a larger rhetoric of self-deprecation. Alison

---

[72] See Martin Butler, 'Jonson's London and its Theatres', in Harp and Stewart, pp. 15-29.
[73] Jonson, *Cynthia's Revels*, 'To the Special Fountain of Manners, The Court'.

Sharrock in her commentary on the figure of the slave-*architectus* points out that Plautus' creative use of the clever trickster enabled the playwright to play with the relationships of power which are crucial to all literature but particularly relevant to comedy which is a genre characterised and defined by its baseness.[74]

The ignobility of the slave's servile position acts as a creative license to show off his intelligence; his metatheatrical control of everyone else in the play is merely a polite reminder of the artful and sophisticated nature of the real play written by Plautus. Moreover, both the slave's and the playwright's marginal social status were paradoxically empowering for they performed in a space where power structures and cultural beliefs could be challenged while they themselves had no status to lose.[75] The slave's relationship with his master offers yet another perspective to explore the stresses and anxieties of the relationship between playwright and spectators. His ultimate dependence upon his master or patron despite the resourcefulness of his 'craft' is paralleled by way in which the playwright's god-like creation and control over the play is complemented by his socio-economic dependence upon the whims of his paying audience: dramatists who according to Jonson,

> haue no house,
>
> No family...and therefore mould
>
> Tales for mens eares...
>
> ...and some stale receipts
>
> To please the belly, and the groine...
>
> That can fawne, and fleere,
>
> Make their reuennue out of legs, and faces,
>
> Eccho my-Lord, and lick away a moath:
>
> (*Volpone*, III.i.15-22)

For both slave and playwright, catering to the pleasures of the master opened up the possibility of being either critically judged or exonerated in the throes of aesthetic gratification. Such concerns would have been equally germane to Jonson who used the persona of the cynically clever and ironically detached rogue-servant as 'internal

---

[74] Alison Sharrock, *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[75] As a space for public interaction and collective engagement the theatre was one of the most crucial means of teaching the art of civic self-presentation and displaying interiorised subjectivity. Illusion, deceit, and disguise form the crux of comic drama, functioning as the signifier of the play-making process itself. It deceives by seeming to be the truth, yet its force as art depends on the ability to see through its deceit.

playwright' to create a contingent and ambivalent space for an independent subject: apparently in control and yet ultimately at the mercy of his master or audience. Thus the masterly success of both Face and Mosca lies in deviating from the socially scripted play and doing things their own way though the nature of that independence is finally questioned through Mosca's metatheatrical punishment and Face's pandering to the real audience members at Blackfriars.

The trickster's grand scheme for deception becomes a metaphor for the activation of the real plot of the play; his supervision over the action is an aesthetic foil to the author's control of mimesis; his anti-naturalistic theatricality the dark obverse of the master-playwright's didactic realism. These consummate rogue-artists who direct the plot and its complexities dazzle not only the fictional dupes but the real life spectators as well, tricking both into believing that it (meaning both Jonson's play and the rogue's design) is a brilliant plan. The clever servant's claims to theatrical speech and metatheatrical plot-management become by implication an analogue for the author's textual production. Writing is a powerful (even subversive) means of exercising agency and in rewriting the plot to construct different meanings to suit his purpose the trickster could establish a counter-discourse to that envisaged in the 'master-plot'. In this sense the triumph of the trickster is also a powerful metaphor for the successful fabrication of the play. These characters are therefore important markers of Jonsonian aesthetics, helping to define a paradigm of authorial subjectivity in new and unexpected ways.

As dishonourable though knowing trickster-playwrights (Jonson's derogatory word for such inferior dramatists is 'poetasters' who blur the line between truth and lies) they offer a more realistic representation of the dramatist as a sharp-witted vendor of a popular theatrical commodity, interpellating Jonson's ambitious and idealised image of the master-playwright as a scholar-courtier who is commissioned to provide royal entertainment. The uneasy blend of subjective agency and objective limitations in these rogues corresponds to how most playwrights would have operated as servants to numerous masters that included not only the ticket-buying audience but several real and potential patrons such as the playing company, rich aristocrats, and the monarch himself. Both would have used their wits and their flair with words to eke a living, presenting an outsider's view on mainstream society and its people. This latent empathy between the rogue and the playwright helps to create a first person subjective voice: an unstable partial identity (that of the 'rogue-artist') where the servant-trickster acts as a vicarious projection of the poet's persona.

> This is the creature, had the art borne with him;
>
> Toilse not to learne it, but doth practise it
>
> Out of most excellent nature: and such sparkes,
>
> Are the true Parasites, others but their *Zani's*.

<div align="right">(Volpone, III.i.30-4)</div>

Such characters also serve to comment on the rigid stratification of class in early modern society and to the possibility of 'making' one's identity. Volpone hints at much when in a fit of praise at Mosca's scheming he says:

> VOLP. 'Fore heau'n, a braue *Clarissimo*, thou becom'st it!
>
> Pitty thou wert not borne one.MOS.If I hold
>
> My made one, 'twill be well.

<div align="right">(V.v.3-5)</div>

Although Mosca's pun on the connotations of 'made' in the sense of fabrication or manufacturing hints at the anxieties of deception regarding the self-made man (pointed out earlier in this section) and the consequent destabilisation of social order, yet it serves to complicate Jonson's attitude towards social constructions of class. Mosca's 'making' is different only in degree rather than in kind from the higher-placed gulls, and while Jonson does not endorse such social transgressions neither does he seem to criticise it. This uncertainty is made clear through the ambiguous if not compromised nature of the endings where the audience's greater emotional investment in the trickster characters compared to the good Celia and Bonario (who act as representatives of old world honour and idealism) or the morally corrupt Surly makes most spectators sceptical of the harsh treatment meted out to the rogues. Thus the rogue-artist's close identification with Jonson serves as a means of deliberating on questions of (authorial) identity and the problem of dependency, self-possession, personal volition or exploitation involved in relationships of power and subjection in a complexly transforming world.

Since the discourse of the private self was not fully latent during this era, Jonson strategically embraced the creative and unethical strategies of the rogue-artist as a supplement to mimetically construct the intellectual and psychological foundations of authorship in the face of hostile material and ideological circumstances. Like the clever Plautine slave who must not act in his own interest but only for the greater good of his master, Jonson's plays are mediated by an overarching moral and intellectual framework that divests (comic) control from the rogue, aiming to 'shew an image of

the times' and teach good values: 'wherein I haue labour'd ... to reduce not onely the ancient formes, but manners of the scene – the easinesse, the propriety, the innocence, and last the doctrine, which is the principall end of poesie: to informe men in the best reason of liuing' (Epistle to *Volpone*, ll. 104-9). But it is the difficulty of drawing a clear line between Jonson the moralist or civic defender and Jonson the opportunist playwright (evinced metatheatrically in Face's triumph at the end of *The Alchemist* or in his self-conscious boasting in the Epistle to *Volpone*) that makes his works remarkable. This ability to explore a notion of identity as a product of pragmatic negotiation between personal choice and its regulation by external forces is what makes Jonson a 'modern' author.

VI
Festive Conviviality in *Bartholomew Fair*

In *Bartholomew Fair* the figure of the individual rogue-artist is superseded by the representation of a subaltern counterpublic: a Smithfield fair place community of petty thieves, charlatans, and street vendors who use profane language and perform corporeal obscenities to engage in new ways of defining identity, agency, and sociability. This egalitarian and democratic community provides an alternative discursive space that emerges in response to the exclusions and marginalisations within the dominant, stratified public sphere.[76] While they offer an alternate means of social withdrawal and regrouping (as for instance the male humanist networks of friendship constructed through the medium of letters) they also function as a site of antisocial activities affirming the dual nature of early modern privacy: a locus both of freedom and risk. Jonson uses the Fair as a ludic and socially marginal space whose inversions of status hierarchies and social barriers help to paradoxically construct a humanist and meritocratic ethic of civility that is founded on spontaneous and charitable behaviour, hospitality, sociability, and conversational license. A similar strain of thinking can be seen in a much later Latin poem entitled 'Leges Convivales' (1619-1624) translated by Alexander Brome in 1636, where Jonson situates an egalitarian community of 'learned, civil, merry men', and 'choise

---

[76] I have drawn on the idea of 'counterpublic' from Nancy Fraser's essay 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', *Social Text*, vol. 9 (1990), pp. 56-80.

Ladies'[77] within a drinking house, whose membership is guaranteed not by ascribed status or gender 'but (by) talking wittily'.

Janus-like *Bartholomew Fair* looks both backwards towards feudal privilege and forwards in time towards a proto-capitalist economy trying to find a happy mean.[78] Thus Jonson uses a cheery yet thieving gang of petty underworld figures[79] set apart from quotidian restrictions and public controls to project an inverted version of his socially reformist ideal (private-public) community: an intimate coterie of learned friends conversing freely and wittily over good food and strong drink within a public space,[80] what Joseph Loewenstein calls 'a private culture of connoisseurship'.[81] Jonson's projected affiliation between criminal society and Bartholomew Fair was not misplaced. In his *Survey of London* (1598) John Stow stated that the Fair had been started in 1133 by Henry II as an annual three-day cloth fair on the open grounds of West Smithfield. By the sixteenth century the Fair had become a complex hub of commerce though during the time of the play's writing (1614) it was more noted for being a site of late summer entertainment and licentious revelry.[82] Moreover its convenient location in the notorious ward of Farringdon Without (which topped all categories of offences in the Bridewell's court books) on the edges of Middlesex's red light district had made it a haven for prostitutes, thieves, and vagrants.

---

[77] 'Ben. Johnsons Sociable rules for the Apollo', in *Alexander Brome: Poems*, vol. 1, ed. Roman Dubinsky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), l. 1, 3-4. The Latin version ('Leges Convivales') as well as the English version 'Over the Door at the Entrance into the Apollo,' of the poem can be found in the *Works*.

[78] The search for the ideal reconciliation between the commercial and celebratory aspects of the marketplace was not special to Jonson. Susan Wells sees this to be a universal phenomenon in the Jacobean comedic genre. See Susan Wells, 'Jacobean City Comedy and the Ideology of the City', *ELH*, vol. 48, no. 1, Spring 1981, pp. 37-60: 37-8. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2873011

[79] Jonson's play participates in the growing belief that England's vagrants assembled into a society of their own using them to represent a distorted reflection of ordinary life and conventional family structures. In her discussion of the literary trope of the 'merry beggar' (as in Richard Brome's *A Jovial Crew* and John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *The Beggar's Bush*) Linda Woodbridge argues that the early modern fascination with vagrancy came from his supposed association with geographical and mental freedom in an era marked by coercive authority and settled respectability. See Woodbridge, *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*, pp. 240-1.

[80] Tudor humanists identified a male domestic sphere of learned exchange 'over dinner, in gardens, in bedchambers, in letters, dialogues, and poetry', that might transform social relations between literate men but which is defined by its exclusion of women and the vulgar mob. See Richards, *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*.

[81] Joseph Loewenstein, 'Martial, Jonson, and the Assertion of Plagiarism', *Reading, Society, and Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 275-94: 279.

[82] Leah Marcus points out that Bartholomew Fair divided the cloth fair that took place within the walls of St. Bartholomew's Priory from the pleasure fair that went on outside the City walls. See Leah S. Marcus, 'Pastimes and the Purging of the Theater: *Bartholomew Fair* (1614)', in *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 196-209.

The play counterbalances and critiques dominant constructions of (heteronormative) social ties and kinship bonds based on hierarchy such as relations between parent-child, husband-wife, service relationships between master-servant or relations of mutuality between friends against a sub-culture based on reciprocal associations of affection, connection, and communication that cuts across gender, age, and social status. The cony-catching 'fraternity' challenges and critiques the exclusionary and hegemonic norms of the proto-bourgeois domestic or public world represented by visitors such as Adam Overdo, Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, Humphrey Wasp, Tom Quarlous, and Ned Winwife. Their elaborate alternate styles of behaviour and speech enable the tricksters to exercise agency over their experiences; Smithfield representing an othered space where the 'anxieties and insecurities of life in a rigidly organised hierarchical society could be given relatively free reign'.[83]

Idealised domesticity was central to the Reformation project and the institutionalisation of familial intimacy became a crucial component of national policy. The Protestant nuclear family was also a vital institution for a distinctive middle class culture and the crux around which questions of property, propriety, and political power were worked out. Moreover the home was of charged relevance for professional playwrights like Jonson who were caught in an ambiguous position between a waning aristocracy and a new bourgeoisie. *Bartholomew Fair* is striking for its unsettling of key Renaissance signifiers of domestic stability and patriarchal authority as also for its interrogation of marriage and family as a source of order and stability in the macrocosm, indicated by its less than perfect marriages, awkward or mismatched courtships, sexually and ethically corrupted men and women, or the subversions of morally culpable father-figures. The play marks structural and thematic deviations from the two earlier works, for here Jonson dispersed attention over a group of characters coming from different social backgrounds, beliefs, and genders instead of concentrating on one/two main characters. By focusing not on the grotesque distortions of introspective privacy (as in the previous two plays discussed) but rather on the travesties of domestic privacy, *Bartholomew Fair* anticipates Jonson's normative ideal of a heterotopic 'coterie' community within a changing public world.

Like *Volpone* and *The Alchemist*, *Bartholomew Fair* too begins with a description of a non-aristocratic urban household whose stability and status is subsequently called into

---

[83] Mullaney, *Place of the Stage*, p. 22.

question by the ensuing comic action. However unlike the bleak, squalid male-run 'women-absent' households of the previous two plays, the proctor John Littlewit's seems to conform overtly to the Reformist prototype of a conventional family: a and contented domestic life ('maintain'd…this seuen yeere', I.v.165) comprised of a devoted husband, a petite and beautiful wife Win, an impending baby, and a deeply religious, widowed mother-in-law. Yet as so often in Jonson this superficial veneer only masks the deeper fissures within the family: Dame Purecraft's religiosity conveniently glosses over the hypocrisy which permits her to arrange (along with her 'Banbury' suitor Busy) for mercenary marriages between decayed 'brethren' and rich widows and of poor virgins to wealthy men. Similarly Littlewit's role as the patriarchal head of the family is undercut by his innate idiocy and his uxorious tendency to pander to the excessively gaudy tastes of his equally foolish wife.

> *Win!* Now you looke finely indeed,*Win!* thisCap do's conuince! you'ld not ha' worne it, *Win*, nor ha' had it veluet, but a rough countrey Beauer, with a copper-band, like the Conney-skinne woman of *Budge*-row! Sweete *Win*, let me kisse it! And, her fine high shooes, like the *Spanish Lady!* Good *Win*, goe a little, I would faine see thee pace, pretty *Win!*

> (I.i.19-25)

This naivety surfaces later on when he shirks his husbanding responsibilities and leaves Win unattended at the fair, thus making her easy prey for the bawds. Littlewit's over-fondness for his wife translates into lack of moral authority and agency to exert domestic patriarchalism.

This '(non)conformist' citizen family which has a married couple as its core nucleus is complemented by four other 'alternative' family structures, interpreting 'family' in the broadest terms possible as a non-biological unit inclusive of the bonds and intimacies between extended kin, friends, and servants: the rural landed gentry family represented by the presumably parentless Bartholomew Cokes and his servant-tutor Wasp; Overdo, his wife, and their ward Grace Wellborn; and the 'mock' family comprising Ursula the pig-woman and her man-servant Mooncalf. The family unit comprising the childish wastrel Bartholomew Cokes as the dim-witted 'Esquire of Harrow' and his acerbic servant-tutor is a diluted version of the menacing closeness of master-servant relationships which had propelled earlier plays. But Cokes is a far cry from the previous masters (Volpone and Lovewit), one who dreams of becoming rich

through his impending marriage to Grace and shows no concern for his responsibilities (like Kastril in *The Alchemist*) towards his country estate.

Similarly his 'servant' Wasp is clever, subversive, and witty like his Roman predecessors and takes the initiative in bringing his young master's erotic pursuits to fruition; however he lacks the sharper psychological edge of his Jonsonian brethren Mosca and Face. Throughout the play he unleashes his verbal furore against his numskull master haranguing him for his prodigality, recklessness, and inattentiveness. Yet his relative lack of involvement and his ultimate failure (he is even punished in the stocks) in securing the marriage license shows the extent to which Jonson's creative energies were focused elsewhere in this play. Barring Quarlous, the prototypical role of the trickster-servant is appropriated by the fair world denizens who take advantage of Cokes' attraction for flashy trinkets and worthless goods to divest him of his possessions.

Old Ursula's private 'booth' (brothel) with its seething ovens, beds, restrooms, and its constant stream of sweaty/hungry visitors parodies the normative idealisation of patriarchal family space centred on the domestic hearth(which is called a 'mansion', even a 'bower', II.v.40) and its attendant hospitality and economy. Jonson's representation of the foul-mouthed and fleshy Ursula as the matriarchal 'head' of her family ('mother o' the Bawds', 'mother o' the Pigs', 'Mother o' the *Furies*', II.v.74, 75, 76 respectively)[84] of prostitutes, thieves, and faux children like Mooncalf (who is variously referred to as 'boy', 'stripling' or 'child')[85] ridicules the lack of similar (private) authority in the male characters of the play. As a figure embodying prodigious yet barren sexuality, Ursula's promiscuity poses a threat to the sexual legitimacy that underlined patriarchal domestic hegemony. On the other hand her ability to conduct her nefarious trade (under the innocuous façade of a pig and ale-stall) with considerable acumen shows how she is adept at negotiating the demands of the public world of as well. Like Face and Mosca she is able to successfully balance both private and public life registered most overtly in how the (feminine) booth which is an enclosed 'womb-like' space is located within and remains open to the larger (masculine) world of noise, chaos, and transaction symbolised by the fair.

---

[84] Thayer identifies Ursula with Demeter, the Greek goddess of harvest, fertility, and agriculture. See his *Ben Jonson: Studies in the Plays* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963).

[85] In his research into the history of the European family Philippe Ariès argued for a changed attitude towards children and a new conceptualisation of childhood as a distinct and formative stage in the life-cycle. Unlike medieval times when children were considered to be small and imperfect adults who had to be subjected to strict upbringing, the early modern era recognised their special status and need for parental love and care. See Phillipe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*, trans. R. Baldick (New York: Vintage, 1962).

Adam Overdo and his wife Alice are presumably childless, yet by buying Grace Wellborn's wardship[86] for the purpose of marrying her off to his idiotic brother-in-law Cokes, this unit too (like the Littlewits) mimics and distorts the norms of the conventional nuclear family in establishing familial relationships through law if not Instead of the emotional bonds that nurtured the married couple and their this family is marked by monetary transactions. For the notorious system of wardship would have left Overdo in control of the wealth attached to his 'theoretical' daughter Grace and also ensure that she would be unable to escape marriage without paying the value of that wealth to her guardian. This crisis if not abuse of 'parent-child' relationship is complemented by the latent conjugal anxieties of an inter-class marriage. Although Overdo rises from humble origins as scrivener: 'I knew *Adam*, the Clerke, your husband, when he was *Adam* Scriuener, and writ for two pence a sheet, as high as he beares his head now' (IV.iv.162-4) and becomes rich enough to buy Grace's wardship, his wife belongs to the landed gentry. The discrepancy between outward traditional morality and inward sexual frustration is possibly signalled in the way in which a drunk and nauseous Mistress Overdo is led to the very brink of prostitution in Knockem's stable, falling prey to the same vices that her husband seeks to discover. In the process Jonson reveals the thin line dividing marriage and whoredom, both institutions strikingly similar in their assault on female autonomy and chastity and in their treatment of women as sexualised and commercialised commodities.

The closest that Jonson comes to defining the parameters of a monogamous 'companionate' marriage within the play is in the personalised 'love-match' that Grace enters into with Winwife. Here for once, the contractual undertaking established in the public domain will hopefully be complemented by private bonds of affection and individualised emotional attachment. Yet this model of the family based on heterosexual emotional attraction results from the unsettling of yet another (new) family archetype established through the close friendship ties between men of similar social standing as in the case of Winwife, a London gentleman and his friend Quarlous, an erstwhile law student turned 'gamester'. The bond shared by the two comes through in the very first scene in which they both appear onstage when Quarlous playfully chides Winwife for having left without informing him after a 'hot night' together as a violation of the terms of their shared male intimacy (I.iii.14):

---

[86] The origins of wardship go back to feudal times and it gave power to the Crown to exercise powers and duties over orphaned children whose fathers had owned land.

What an vnmercifull companion art thou, to quit thy lodging, at such

vngentlemanly houres? … I pray thee what aylest thou, thou canst not sleepe?

Hast thou Thornes i' thy eye-lids, or Thistles i' thy bed?

<div align="right">(I.iii.2-3, 7-9)</div>

Quarlous' cynical account of Winwife's philandering ways reveals his less than optimistic view of families and the (heterosexual) relationships that sustain it:

Hoy-day! how respectiue you are become o' the sudden! I feare this family will

turne you reformed too, pray you come about againe. Because she is in possibility

to be your daughter in-law, and may aske you blessing here-after, when she courts

it to Totnam to eat creame. Well, I will forbeare, Sir, but I'faith, would thou

wouldst leaue they exercise of widow-hunting once!...A sweet course for a man to

waste the brand of life for, to be still raking himself a fortune in an old woman's

embers; we shall ha' thee, after thou hast beene but a moneth marryed to one of

'hem, looke like *the quartane ague*, and the black *Iaundise* met in a face, and walke as

if thou had'st borrow'd legges of a *Spinner*, and voice of a *Cricket*.

<div align="right">(I.iii.57-63, 77-83)</div>

However their common pursuit of 'excellent creeping sport' (I.v.141) at the expense of their visit to the fair is soon disrupted as they become rivals for the hand of the rich and beautiful Grace. Tom ultimately steps aside in the interests of 'friendship' and marries the rich Dame Purecraft – a commercially expedient manoeuvre that he is quick to take advantage of.

In contrast the Smithfield denizens represent a complex network of affinity and associative intimacy that transcends traditional family ties, reviving a vision of neighbourliness that had become fragmented and marginalised in the century after 1550. These people are governed by an older vital regime of open sexual mores, trust, friendship, and libidinal energy. In her commentary on *Bartholomew Fair* Barton notes that the rogues in the Fair display a remarkable and touching loyalty to one another.[87]Thus when Ursula is scalded everyone leaps to her aid; Joan Trash and Lantern Leatherhead address each other as 'brother' and 'sister' when they are not quarrelling denoting a common sense of identity. Ursula and Knockem continually insult and deride each other but there is no real offense meant.

VRS. Well, I shall be meet with your mumbling mouth

---

[87] Barton, *Ben Jonson*, p. 205.

one day.

KNO. What? thou'lt poyson mee with a neuft in a

bottle of Ale, will't thou? Or a spider in a tobacco-pipe,

Vrs? Come, there's no malice in these fat folks, I neuer

feare thee, and I can scape thy leane *Mooncalfe* here. Let's

drinke it out, good *Vrs*, and no vapours!

<div align="center">(II.iii.19-24)</div>

Jonson glamorises the freedom associated with vagrant life in contrast to the dullness of bourgeois respectability centred on the home ('de leef of a/Bondwoman!', IV.v.32-3) so much so that Whit the bawd is able to persuade the pregnant Win into prostitution, justifying that it would liven up her 'scurvy dull life' and make her 'a free-woman, and a Lady' (IV.v.34). Further Knockem chides 'honesht' Win for being too loyal to her husband: 'Husband? An idle vapour; he must not know/you, nor you him; there's the true vapour' (V.iv.47-8). Their witty Cavalier charm, agency, and self-sufficiency parody settled domesticity even as their rootlessness, sexual promiscuity, and exploitation of kinship loyalties signal this play's deep ambivalence towards domestic values.[88] Finally the house of Overdo hosts the remaining bit of the puppet play and final feast of forgiveness (harkening to an older world where gentlemen 'keepe hospitality'[89] instead of searching for private enormities) but only after male proprietary control is subverted through Mistress Overdo's wanton drunkenness: a case of the market invading the walled and constricted space of the bourgeois home.

The Fair coincided with the annual feast day of St. Bartholomew (24 August) who as recounted in Jacobus de Voragine's *Golden Legend* (*ca*.1260), was captured by King Astyages of Armenia and punished by being flayed alive (hence patron benefactor of skinners and leatherworkers) for having converted the latter's brother to the Christian faith.[90] Despite the gradual commercialisation (and simultaneous criminalisation) of the Fair it would be reasonable to say that the Saint's symbolic presence continued to linger

---

[88] Beier wrote that, 'Vagrants were a menace to the social order because they broke the accepted norms of family life…If the normal household of the period contained a married couple, children and servants, then vagrants were a radical departure from it.' See Beier, *Masterless Men*, p. 51.

[89] James I's 1616 speech before the Star Chamber enjoined the landed classes towards a proper celebration of festivals such as Christmas and Easter. Hospitality was a vital social virtue, a Christian and moral duty and a foundation of the moral economy. Yet the decades between the late 1590s to the Civil War were witness to a gradual transmutation of the values attached to hospitability. See in this regard Felicity Heal's *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[90] Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* fresco in the Sistine Chapel (1534-41) represents one of the best known depictions of Bartholomew, bearing a knife in one hand and his hide in the other as evidence of his martyrdom.

on it; the domineering edifices of the church and hospital of Saint Bartholomew the Great[91] in its vicinity possibly being the least of such reasons. Londoners had good cause to value Bartholomew, for the priory was renowned for miracles in pre-Reformation England. For medieval believers' the saint's presence was believed to be particularly potent on the day of his yearly festival.[92] Composed in the aftermath of Jonson's reconversion from Catholicism (in 1610) the play has been read as a hagiographic parody evinced most explicitly in the play's vacuous Bartholomew Cokes, being named after the Apostle.[93]

Jonson's use of petty criminal characters to invoke (however satirically) the Saint's presence (through expressions such as 'Bartholmew-bird', 'Bartholmew-wit', 'Bartholmew-terms', and 'Bartholmew pig', among others) as also in the implied punning on the dual senses of 'flay' as stripping of skin and stripping of belongings makes an unstated link between the criminal underworld and older medieval forms (even pagan classical structures reminiscent of fertility rites and rituals invoked through references to 'Orpheus among the beasts', 'Ceres selling her daughter's picture in ginger-work' or to Neptune and Mercury) of intimate associations based on kinship, guild or religious structures. When Nightingale the ballad seller advertises his wares, he sings of the fairgoers as '*Birds o' the Booths here billing/Yeerely with old Saint Barthle!*' (II.ii.36-7). Peter Brown hinges onto Nightingale's use of the word 'billing' (meaning a nuzzling sort of caress) to point out the strong affectional bonds between the denizens of the Fair and London's patron Saint.[94] Similarly Lantern Leatherhead the hobby-horse seller calls upon 'Luck and Saint Bartholomew' to assist his puppet play. The original dates of the play's performance on 31October (All Hallows' Eve) followed by its court performance on the night of 1 November (All Saints' Day) were traditionally linked with communal commemorations of the dead and the start of the medieval ritual of carnival. Likewise its subliminal association with the Catholic massacre of the French Huguenots at Paris on 24 August 1572 gave it basis in vicarious communal suffering and fellow-feeling for Protestant brethren abroad.

---

[91] These structures were built by Rahere, Henry I's jester who had a miraculous vision of Saint Bartholomew asking him build a church in the suburbs of London at Smithfield while promising to perpetually defend and protect the place.

[92] See Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*.

[93] See for instance Alison A. Chapman's 'Flaying Bartholomew: Jonson's Hagiographic Parody', *Modern Philology*, vol. 101, no. 4, May 2004, pp. 511-41.

[94] Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

The Smithfield cony-catching community is committed to a strong sense of group loyalty. All their crimes are committed as a team: Ezekiel Edgworth cooperates with Nightingale, a ballad singer in filching and conveying purses, and Ursula acts as a fence. In an insightful reading Jonathan Haynes interprets the criminal underworld of the Fair as preserving memories of a primitive, plebeian communism and the freedom of exchange among equals.[95] The knaves create a 'green world' in which the Fair visitors are barred entry recreating the small insulated social units prevalent in earlier eras through their greater identification with the social group, delicate sense of personal property, and decreased muting of drives. Together these lawless participants symbolise a kind of civil harmony that is based on the satisfaction of fundamental economic needs and natural human desires.

However, Jonson predictably complicates any simplistic assertions of shared conviviality and solidarity in this 'brotherhood' of street merchants, tavern owners, and criminals by implicating it in a pragmatic process of commercial exchange and through the sense of pungent scepticism that underlies its carnivalesque travesties. Thus their alliances are purely commercial and limited by the time of the Fair. Trash and Leatherhead work in unison only when there is a prospect of mutual profit. Moreover these characters are well aware of the discrepancy between self-presentation and interior truth; prudently using that knowledge with sophistication to fleece the Fair's visitors. The tricksters are much shrewder than the propertied 'sippers o' the city' who 'looke as they would not drinke off two penn'orth of/bottle-ale amongst 'hem' (III.ii.112-13). The Fair gives the hustlers space to manipulate appearance and improvise behaviour; assume alternative social identities and create new scripts to suit their private demands.

Thus Leatherhead the hobby-horse seller turns puppeteer, Nightingale is a ballad-singer cum thief, the 'ciuill younge Gentleman' (II.iv.24) Edgworth turns out actually to be a cutpurse, Captain Whit the 'military' man and Knockem the horse-dealer are also thieves and bawds. However they are all aware of the true identities and devious business secrets and shady dealings of their fellow hucksters. There are few individual secrets in this group; they all work according to pre-determined scripts and their anonymity provides them a distinct advantage over the Fair visitors. Yet Jonson balances the agency of the sub-cultural community against that of the 'new' age

---

[95] Haynes, 'Festivity and the Dramatic Economy of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*', pp. 645-68.

individual, represented here by the urbane and educated Quarlous, showing that the aggressive opportunism and practical improvisation of the latter grants him the final victory over the simpler minded tricksters.

In retrospect the inclusivist and charitable communion of *Bartholomew Fair* is the closest that Jonson comes to defining his idea of a proto-civil society as a founding locus of ethical life that competes with the newly expanding political state and the emerging household. However given that the idea of a distinct early modern private sphere was ridden with deep ambivalence, this idea is filtered through the representation of a criminal underworld as the 'dark' counterpart to the public realm. Thus depictions of the fair world as a zone of freedom for individuals and groups to associate with others, articulate a common purpose, and determine internal structures of group authority and identity are complemented by the dormant anarchy, amorality, and venality that lie just beneath it. While anonymity and use of encrypted language enable the tricksters to protect the secrecy of their trade and identity, they also reveal the risk posed by such private activities to public welfare and security. Thus Joan's gingerbread is made out of 'stale bread, rotten eggs, musty ginger and dead honey' (II.ii.6-9). Ursula reveals the unceremonious aspect of unregulated commerce when she instructs Mooncalf on the tricks of the trade:

> (B)ut looke too't, sirrah, you were best, three pence a pipe full, I will ha' made, of all my whole halfe pound of tabacco, and a quarter of a pound of *Coltsfoot*, mixt with it too, to itch it out. . . . Then 6. and 20. shillings a barrell I will aduance o' my Beere; and fifty shillings a hundred o' my bottle-ale, I ha' told you the waies how to raise it. Froth your cannes well i' the filling, at length, Rogue, and iogge your bottles o' the buttocke, Sirrah, then skinke out the first glasse, euer, and drinke with all companies, though you be sure to be drunke; you'll mis-reckon the better, and be lesse asham'd on't. But your true tricke, Rascall, must be, to be euer busie, and mis-take away the bottles and cannes, in hast, before they be halfe drunke off, and neuer hear any body call, (if they should chance to marke you) till you ha' brought fresh, and be able to forsweare 'hem.
>
> (II.ii.89-92, 96-105)

On the contrary, Cokes as a representative of the older world order is oblivious of the advantages that privacy provides in shielding his personal interests. In the scene where Nightingale offers to sell Cokes a ballad at the price of a penny, the latter foolishly reveals that he would have been charged more if Nightingale only knew who he was:

NIG. But 'twill cost a penny alone,

if you buy it..

COK. No matter for the price, thou dost not know me,

I see, I am an odd *Bartholmew.*

(III.v.45-7)

The play is also refreshingly modern in the concerns it raises regarding censorship, surveillance, and privacy. It offers an example of a miniature self-regulating society or nascent free market economy that is under assault from the regulations imposed by external 'state' authority. The three self-styled 'censor' figures Overdo, Busy, and Wasp (whose pretentious diatribes would seem all too familiar to a 21st century audience) thus try to undermine this community's freedom of speech and opinion in the interests of eliminating political (treason, disorder, sedition against state) religious (heresy, profanity), and moral (impiety, obscenity) threats. Thus the freedom and spontaneity that marks the Fair and its inhabitants and their struggle against law and order is also symbolic of the tussle of the theatrical arts against censorship and of the civil society against surveillance.[96]

As with earlier plays, Jonson's latent sympathies are with the marginalised group of thieves and charlatans for in them he saw reflected an image of the status of the professional dramatist and actor. He also probably understood that a controlled market would invariably lead to theatre companies being ruled by government directives. Secondly the human interactions, social transactions, and complex relationships symbolised by the rogues' community would have appealed to Jonson's desire for an apolitical pluralised sphere that would accommodate a diversity of social voices and creative interests. While these concerns make Jonson a writer who addresses typically modern anxieties, yet it also links up with his efforts to use print as a platform to engage in an idea of a virtual, voluntary private network of like-minded people centred on shared interests, purposes, values, and commitment to public good.

As members of small scale forms of association, these individuals would use informed reading, writing, and deliberation to generate its own authority and defend rights of (intellectual) property and a personhood defined by literary production. As a

---

[96] The need to access and safeguard private information that is played out between the law-enforcing agencies and the rogues rehearses a struggle that is all too familiar in today's world. While the guardians' efforts to track, monitor, and identify deviance may not quite match up to the proliferation of sophisticated surveillance software and (bio)technologies, yet the underlying principle remains similar. The sub-cultural brotherhood in *Bartholmew Fair* seems a striking archetype of the modern Virtual Public Network (VPN) that is used for getting around vigorous online censorship.

newly emerging medium that was still nominally outside state control, Jonson may have been quick to understand its potential as a media space encouraging public critique, self-reflection, and collective and self-fashioning. This coterie of author-reader(s) offers a pale image of a public sphere comprised of participants who are private people (not associated with the state in any official capacity and without rank or social distinction) and whose access to public discourse occurs through private acts of reading in the confined space of the study, the bedroom or the closet.

<div align="center">

VII

Jonson's Multimedial Art

</div>

I had commenced the fourth chapter by conjecturing on the possibility of reading proto-baroque features in Jonson's plays especially in their sceptical handling of subjective uncertainties in the forming and performing of identity, illusoriness of perception, complexities of appearance and reality, and their emphasis on audience understanding: they are also, I feel early markers of the imminent Cartesian dissociationism between thinking being (*res cogitans*) and extended substance (*res extensa*). Baroque themes had been developing on the Continent for nearly twenty years before the turn of the seventeenth century and it is plausible that writing at the very cusp of modernity, Jonson anticipated these tastes and preoccupations. Moreover the baroque division of performance space into that of spectator and that of represented reality, registered for instance in the technique of the 'play-within-the-play'[97] seems to have been especially relevant for a playwright like Jonson who was concerned with the cognitive and moral nature of the spectator's theatrical experience. His use of prologues, epilogues, inductions, or the embedded play with its multilayered perspectives on reality, where players take on many roles, including that of the spectator and the self-aware playwright, problematised the hierarchised difference between the real and the fictive, outside and inside, disrupting the conventional presumption of fictional distance that preserves the illusoriness of theatrical spectacle.

Theatrical self-reflexivity places a premium on judgment rather than mere sensory perception, trapping the audience into a realisation of the extent to which role-playing

---

[97] For a discussion on metatheatre as a symptom of a changing world-order, see William Eggington, *How the World Became a Stage: Presence, Theatricality, and the Question of Modernity* (Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press, 2003).

and performance permeate all aspects of human exchange: ''tis all *deceptio visus*' (*The Alchemist*, V.iii.62). It also conjures the disorienting epistemic condition that lived reality is subject to the gaze of others. The 'modernity' of Jonsonian art, I feel, is implicated in the larger drifts towards the de-corporealisation and de-eroticisation of the human relation to reality. Theatrical spectacle as transient and deceptive illusion tends to hide its referents, rendering them less real. But in offering the audience extraordinary visual stimuli and a direct experience of physically present bodies and objects, spectacle was theatrically much more powerful (Lodovico Castelvetro felt that the pleasure of spectacle could only provoke the 'ignorant multitude'[98]).

The issue of visual spectacle (aesthetic form) versus verbal text (epistemological content) is always a problematic one in Jonson's plays. Richard Cave comments how Jonson increasingly came to identify 'spectacle' with scenic theatre and the mechanics required to accomplish marvels in the elaborate court masques. As his relation with Inigo Jones became less than cordial, his pronouncements against visual effects and spectators[99] whose concept of theatre extended no further than delighting the eye and fancy became even stronger.[100] His increasing emphasis on the relevance of the poetic text also initiated a marked preference for auditors (with hearing considered more reliable than sight and much less likely to be deceived)[101] as the ideal receivers of his drama (Jonson's projected elitist audience would be likely to occupy the boxes and hence their theatrical experience would be more aural than visual).[102]

---

[98] See Lodovico Castelvetro's 'A Commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle' (1570) in *Literary Criticism: From Plato to Dryden*, ed. Allan H. Gilbert (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1967), pp. 304-57.

[99] Andrew Gurr comments how Jonson's use of the term 'spectators' to refer to his audience was infused with sneering contempt for the 'debased preference for stage spectacle rather than the "poetic soul of the play, which he claimed they could only find by listening to his words".' See Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, p. 86.

[100] Richard Cave, 'Visualising Jonson's Text', in *Ben Jonson and Theatre: Performance, Practice and Theory*, ed. Richard Cave, Elizabeth Schafer, and Brian Woolland (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 31-42.

[101] In his commentary on Plato's *Symposium*, Marsilio Ficino described sight and hearing as 'spiritual senses' linked to the higher human capacity for ethical thought and higher reasoning.

[102] Jonson's crediting of text over performance followed the time-honoured Aristotelian privileging of plot over spectacle. Such differences emerge at their clearest in his early masques where Jonson drew a distinction between the soul (inherent in words) and earthly body (comprised of visible spectacle). See Barish, *Antitheatrical Prejudice*, pp. 140-3. Jonson's uncomfortable relation with the set-designer Inigo Jones, his partner in the production of the royal masques, testifies to such a crisis for aristocratic spectators and performers valued the dancing and music as integral parts of the masque rather than the poetry. Likewise his habitual skepticism about the visual arts derived from his (Plutarchian) understanding of the complementary kinship between poetry and painting: '*Poetry*, and *Picture*, are Arts of a like nature; and both are busie about imitation. It was excellently said of *Plutarch*, Poetry was a speaking Picture, and *Picture* a mute Poesie. For they both invent, faine, and devise many things, and accommodate all they invent to the use, and service of nature. Yet of the two, the Pen is more noble, then the Pencill. For that can speake to the Understanding; the other, but to the Sense.' (*Discoveries*, ll. 1509-16)

The immediate appeal and eventual threat of Jonsonian tricksters lies in their dangerous overindulgence in and abuse of the visual, aural as well as tactile senses that produce physical and moral corruption. Their spectacular rhetoric and bedazzling role-performances defy clarity of thought and perspectival perception on the part of the audience, deflecting attention from the textual representations. Their *trompe l'oeil* representations manipulate narratives so that other characters draw false inferences persuading them that they have actually witnessed what in reality does not exist.[103] The rogues' theatrical attractiveness also extends into the tactile for they exploit physical contiguity or bodily proximity between master-servant, amongst fair-denizens or actor and spectator[104] to create a provisional sense of social familiarity and privacy within the public realm. The powerful physical and psychic agility of these rogues defy easy visualisation inviting the possibility of a tactile apprehension. Their embodied identities can only be mapped (if at all) through a cluster of tactile sensations and bodily positions with respect to other people (master, gull), objects (such as gold, Philosopher's Stone) or architectural features (bedchamber, closet, laboratory, showground, pig-booth) within closed spaces where their tricks are carried out. Such spaces help to reconfirm and maintain (trickster) identity as both materially and historically located.

These rogues cannot be separated from the material structure of such spaces, and once the structure dismantles their chicanery comes to an end. The plays continue a long tradition of moralising texts and images that presented touch (both literal and metaphorical), which if left unchecked by reason and the discipline of labour, as leading man to pursue sensual pleasures and vices (lust, greed, wantonness, and seduction) that endangered his ethical and spiritual well-being. Lacking restraint touch could also jeopardise man's private role within the family and his civic role within the community: 'The slothful hideth his hand in his bosom' (Proverbs 26:15). As visual, aural, and tactile interfaces Jonsonian rogues present and exploit a multi-layered and multi-sensory theatre of kinaesthetic imagination and visceral engagement where the differently classed and gendered other exists in illicit intimacy with his socio-economic betters (whether onstage nominal master or offstage paying public) creating a faux sense of family.

To Renaissance thinkers as to the ancients the senses provided potentially dangerous conduits to sin and temptation, but they were also equally modes of access to knowledge

---

[103] Lorna Hutson, 'Law, Crime and Punishment', in Sanders, pp. 221-28: 224.
[104] The unlocalised space in front of and at the sides of the two pillars was usually not a part of the acting area. It was a liminal space that belonged to both real and play world, usually used by comic actors to interact with the audience. It was possible for those standing in the pit to touch the actor's feet.

or virtue and mediators between body and mind. Thus the tactile sense was also perceived to be the sense most necessary for discrimination and judgment, Thomas Aquinas considered it be closest to common sense.[105] Touch and hearing were also perceived as the senses most conducive towards evoking inward contemplation. Thus Jonson constructs a critical and experiential framework that negates external sight (binocular vision produced by the body) to structure itself upon reason (in the fifteenth century Marsilio Ficino argued for reason as the sixth sense which along with hearing and sight were allocated to the soul) and the positive attributes of touch and hearing: 'Pray thee, take care, that taks't my booke in *hand*,/To reade it well: that is, to *understand.*' ('To the Reader', *Epigram* I, ll.1-2) (Italics mine.).[106]

Michael O'Connell's suggestion that Jonson's ideal theatrical audience would be a blind one[107] is apt enough, yet to experience a play without seeing it is also an implicit comment on the emerging position of the reader. The reader's imaginative and rational leap of faith is one that recalls Christ's words to a finally convinced Thomas: 'Blessed are they who did not see, and yet believed' (John 20:29). Communicative (read intellectual) impediment is plausibly one of the prime reasons why Jonson's plays and printed texts remained confined within academic circles; forbidding scholarship being one of the ways in which Jonson created a private world of his own. Not that this would have made any difference to a playwright who would have his book 'lye vpon the stall, till it be sought', ('To my Bookseller', *Epigram* III, l. 5)[108] and for whom drama should be:

offered, as a Rite,

To Schollers, that can iudge, and faire report

The sense they heare, aboue the vulgar sort

---

[105] Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History* considered touch to be the sense in which man ranked above all other species followed by taste. In the remaining senses he was surpassed by other creatures: eagle (eyesight), vulture (smell), and mole (hearing). *Pliny's Natural History: A Selection from Philemon Holland's Translation*, ed. J. Newsome (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964).

[106] Jonson's equation of the hand with perception goes back to Aristotle's *De Anima* which describes the human hand as being in the service of man's reason and wisdom and part of the divine plan distinguishing man from animals. *Aristotle De Anima*, trans. and introd. R. D. Hicks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907). The reference to Lactantius has been taken from Sharon Assaf's 'The Ambivalence of the Sense of Touch in Early Modern Prints', in *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2005, pp. 75-98: 83.

[107] See Michael O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 21. Jonson's posited relationship between text and recipient would recall the Spanish baroque artist Jusepe de Ribera's portrait entitled *Allegory of Touch* (c. 1615) where a blind man (possibly the blind sculptor Giovanni Gonnelli) examines a marble object.

[108] It recalls Horace's (*Satires*, I. iv) appeal to a few discriminating readers: 'I want no stall or pillar to have my little works, so that the hands of the crowd…may sweat over them. Nor do I recite them to any save my friends, and then only when pressed -not anywhere or before any hearers.' Quoted in *Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, p. 120.

Of Nut-crackers, that onely come for sight.

<div align="right">(The Staple of News, Prologue for the Court, ll. 5-8)</div>

Moreover, his authorial insistence on speculation[109] and the inner harmony of the soul governed by (in)sight (the kind of vision that is not dependent on physical proximity) and the intellectual virtues of prudence, reason or wisdom entails the exploration of a new notion of identity that privileges mind over body, participating in the growth of a dominant scientific scepticism and intellectual inquiry. However his simultaneous devaluation of the certainties provided by sight and his dependence on the pleasurable corporeal sensations of 'rogue-theatre' to convey the complex conceptual didacticism of the 'master-poet's theatre' points to the kind of Caravaggesque ambivalences mentioned earlier.[110] Such intermediations between sensory affect and intellectual effect (itself a response to the early modern epistemological overhauling of the senses) help to situate Jonson at an epistemic chiasm when the rupture between imagination-reason, body-mind, touch-sight, signifier-signified were just beginning to congeal. The appeal to sensory intimacy is thus an astute intellectual strategy that paradoxically signals a distancing rejection of the powerful seduction of sensuous pleasure and empathy in favour of spiritual introspection. The plays speak to the intellect (wit) and to its conceptualising capacities by way of addressing the senses and undifferentiated embodied responses.

> (I)f wee will looke with/our understanding, and not our senses, wee may/behold vertue, and beauty, (though cover'd with rags) in their/brightnesse; and vice, and deformity so much the fowler,/in having all the splendor of riches to guild them, or the/false light of honour and power to helpe them. Yet this is/that, wherewith the world is taken, and runs mad to gaze/on: Clothes and Titles, the Birdlime of *Fools*.

<div align="right">(Discoveries, ll.1429-36)</div>

Registering the shift from a perceptual to a rational experience of the world, Jonson associates true, essential theatre (of the mind) with logical reasoning that goes beyond the visual and false theatre with sensory empathy and dangerous delusiveness. In demanding a demarcation between emotion and reasoning in his ideal audience he already anticipates the Neoclassical 'dissociation of sensibility' made famous by T. S. Eliot. Yet such a mode

---

[109] Incidentally both spectacle (from Latin *spectaculum* meaning 'to watch' or 'look at') and speculation (from Latin *speculati* meaning 'to watch', 'to examine' or 'to observe') share the same etymological origins.

[110] Matthew Martin in 'Play and Plague in Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist*', *English Studies in Canada*, vol. 26, 2000, pp. 393-408, interprets Jonsonian drama in terms of competing theatrical practices, between the dangerous delusiveness of the trickster's delightful amoral theatre and his own detached, true, essential theatre rooted in place.

of spectating can be an extremely risky dramaturgical manoeuvre for it implies that the audience's experience of the play is ultimately one that is dictated by the playwright's version. This can have potentially destabilising effects as I will go on to show later in this section. However the ultimate strength of his work lies in the brusque conflict between visual representation and verbal interpretation.

Jonson's theatricality and classicism may not have been as mutually exclusive categories as believed to be; very often the intimate fellowship of public performance was the logical inverse of the silent privacy of reading. His ideal community of 'understanders' (auditors rather than spectators) bound by rational judgment and aesthetic acuity shades into the solitary reader's personal communion with the text. In its privileging of affective bonds established through shared rationality, virtue, and action over the consumptive passivity of sight Jonson's reformatory theatre partakes in the kind of sceptical cognitive hermeneutics outlined in the Caravaggesque paintings at the beginning of this chapter. Pursuing this line of thinking the remaining section of this chapter will look at how Jonson uses baroque techniques of characterisation and dramaturgy to produce an effect of psychic depth on surfaces showing their larger relevance in educating the audience regarding the nature of truth as a subjective construct and its manipulation for covert purposes. They also represent the mental aesthetic of a world order that saw life as play and expressed itself in terms of a redoubling of reality. The next and final chapter will look at Jonson's performance of privacy within the printed text.

Jonson's engagement in the epistemic and ideological crisis surrounding the growing alienation of the individual from his world intersected with two oppositional modes of knowing: the newer discourse posited that the self knows and takes the world as the object of his thinking (self-constituted interiority rooted in the immaterial world of inner life); the older discourse conceived that the subject could only know self-reflexively, recognising his place in the hierarchical order (exterior display of identity fixed in the material world of the body). Thus the theatrical interactions between his characters whether rogue or gull offer exemplary interfaces between older and newer subject positions. Moreover in his ability to assume and project the division between theatre and the real world and negotiate the layered complexities of performative action, Jonson's model auditor or reader bears striking resemblance to the Cartesian subject; split into the interior world of the thinking subject or *cogito* and the sensory grossness of the material viewing body.

Lawrence Danson sees Jonsonian humour theory as an early variant of social psychology.[111] Originating in classical and medieval medicine, humoural theory (used to refer to the combination of four bodily humours) instigated a dynamic and integrated relationship between a fluid role-playing individual and his world.[112] The structural system of humours aided in the social construction of selfhood as an easily decipherable semiotic system. 'Humour' characters tended to reveal themselves in their bodily demeanour (through manifest quirks of behaviour, gestures, tones of voice, unconscious habits) and lacked self-knowledge, testifying reliably to its shameful secrets: there was no discrepancy between surface and depth. Jonson used such physiological materialism ('Look upon an effeminate person: his very gait confesseth him') (*Discoveries*, ll. 950-3) not literally but metaphorically especially in his early 'comicall satyres' emerging in the passions and eccentric affectations of particularised characters, using it as a scathing critique of social mobility. The Induction to *Every Man Out of His Humour* encompasses both 'real' humours who are obsessed by a single passion (Kitely in *Every Man in His Humour*; Morose in *Silent Woman*) and 'sham' humours (Matthew, Bobadil, and Stephen in *Every Man in His Humour*; Fastidious Briske and Fungoso in *Every Man Out of His Humour*; Dapper and Drugger in *The Alchemist*):

> As when some one peculiar quality
>
> Doth so possesse a man, that it doth draw
>
> All his affects, his spirits, and his powers,
>
> In their confluctions, all to runne one way,
>
> This may be truly said to be a Humour.
>
> But that a rooke, in wearing a pyed feather,
>
> The cable hat-band, or the three-pild ruffe,

---

[111] Lawrence Danson, 'Jonsonian Comedy and the Discovery of the Social Self', *PMLA*, vol. 99, 1984, pp. 179-93. For a different perspective see James D. Redwine Jr., 'Beyond Psychology: The Moral Basis of Jonson's Theory of Humour Characterization', *ELH*, vol. 28, 1961, pp. 316-34: 320-21. Redwine asserts that humour theory is an ethical rather than a psychological analysis of behaviour: 'Jonson's humour characters are conceived as responsible free agents, not somapsychotic automatons...To call Jonson's theory of humours a "psychology" is to risk serious misunderstanding...'

[112] Important humoural-pathological treatises written during this period include among others, Levinus Lemnius' *The Touchstone of Complexions,* trans. Thomas Newton (London: Marshe, 1581), Timothy Bright's *A Treatise of Melancholie* (rpt. 1586; New York: The Facsimile Text Society by Columbia University Press, 1940), and Robert Burton's *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. J. B. Bamborough and Martin Dodsworth (1621; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). They refer to physiognomic features as markers of the distribution and proportion of the four humours, blood, phlegm, black bile, and yellow bile which determined character as sanguine, phlegmatic, melancholic, or choleric respectively. Humoural theory relied on stereotyping for constructing social relations and deciphering the world. Jonson's use of correlations between animal and human characteristics in *Volpone* was possibly influenced by Giambattista della Porta's use of zoomorphic typology in *De Humana Physiognomonia* (1586; Frankfurt: Rosa, 1601).

> A yard of shooetye, or the *Switzers* knot
>
> On his *French* garters, should affect a Humour.
>
> O, 'tis more then most ridiculous.
>
> (Induction to *Every Man Out of His Humour*, ll.105-14)

These latter self-deceiving characters voluntarily fabricate the image they wish to project; they have no stable self beneath the trappings: they are only 'meere outside(s)'.[113] As a product of generic and rigid roles self became a play of endless differentiation in a world of commodified appearances, a protean chain of linguistic and sartorial signifiers that are endlessly reproduced and mutated without ever reaching a moment of full presence. Once the disguise is removed there is nothing more for them to say or to be: 'the splendidness of their wardrobes is matched by their inner aridity.'[114] On the other hand, Jonson's explorations of psychological inwardness in the creative ingenuity of his roguish protagonists provided an analogue to the emergent models of a private (Cartesian) inscrutable interiority.

Interestingly the term 'person' derives from the Greek word for mask *prosopon* 'before the eyes' (Medieval Latin *masca* 'spectre, nightmare' or Arabic *mashkarah* related to mockery, deception or trickery) that was worn during theatrical performances. The mask can reveal and define not only the roles in which the actor is cast but also conceal many other features about the wearer. Similarly the paradox of the mask pervades Jonson's theatrical representation of the rogue. Fully self-aware they disguise their true intentions and desires in their attempts to control others ('O sir, it holds for good politie euer, to have that outwardly in vilest estimation, that inwardly is most deare to us', *Every Man in His Humour*, II.iv.5-7). It is ultimately their ontological rootlessness and instinctive self-control that makes their subterfuges successful. Like actors they replicate themselves in front of the gull-spectators, create a facsimile but detach themselves from its emotional resonance. They seem to recall how the practice of dissimulation was linked to the Old Regime culture of display and observation, permitting thoughts to arise and persist undetected by others even as one participated in daily civil conversation.

The Jonsonian rogue is situated, I suggest, at the heuristic crux between these two discourses: both socio-culturally self-conditioned yet possessing the agency or intent (unlike the real life vagrant) to operate secretly beyond the constraints of constituted

---

[113] Quoted by Herford and Simpson from Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), vol. IX, p. 414.
[114] Jonas A. Barish, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1960), p. 107.

authority. As representations of the nascent early modern 'deep self', Jonson's rogues lack the advantages of a good birth, yet display a keen sense of resourceful intelligence and linguistic verve (including silence[115] implying not only wisdom but also obscurity and the capacity to create illusions) which in the seventeenth century was closely associated with rational perception leading to knowledge. Like Stephen Greenblatt's self-fashioned identities they are both eminently aware of the matrices of authority[116] that surround them and against or through which they have to construct their identities.

Yet it is also possible to say that their ultimate aim is not submission to but the undermining of authority. Uniting thoughts with outward acts, their energies are directed towards a calculation of the manner in which a situation might be manipulated to their advantage. Thus they 'fashion' themselves as friends to the gulls and fools in their respective plays, feigning deference through self-conscious performance whose only purpose is to deceive. Social roles turn out to be detachable or relational and personal ties a product of self-interest. Such characters attest to the epistemological anxiety of distinguishing between sincerity and dissimulation at a time when (class, religious, and gender) conformity and performance of identity ('passing') were alike necessary prerequisites for participation in various forms of social life. Read as proxy authorial figures they serve to comment on Jonson's ambiguous position within a discursive field defined by the twin poles of 'authority' and 'transgression'.

When epistemic categories of the human are imposed upon theatrical constructions, playwrights have to depend upon embodied display to convey disembodied essence: using carefully selected and contrived words to give an impression of states of mind and conform to a certain range of human behavioural probabilities. This cognitive impasse is more acute in the case of a playwright like Jonson where figurative and mimetic impulses are constantly at loggerheads. One of the fundamental ways in which Jonson created a sense of superficial psychological depth was through a system of nomenclature: assigning characters names that denoted their inner essence, employing metaphorical names as clues to their hidden nature. Jonson's names may be prototypical but they are always precise: Dol Common ('Dol' is a shortened form of Dorothy recalling 'Dol Tearsheet' and 'Kate Common' of the *Henry IV* plays) in *The Alchemist* spells out the name's generic

---

[115] Jonson drew upon a rich classical and Renaissance tradition which insisted that silence, properly used, is a means to wisdom and power.

[116] Greenblatt postulated that self-fashioned identities involved 'submission to an absolute power or authority situated at least partially outside the self -God, a sacred book, an institution such as church, court, colonial or military administration.' See Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, p. 9.

associations with prostitution. She brilliantly plays whatever role is needed to keep up the illusion of the 'venture tripartite': appearing convincing either as a mad Lord's daughter or the Queen of Fairies.

Sometimes deceptions constitute attempts to hide the dramatic relevance of names not only from other characters but also from the audience.[117] Hence the name 'Epicoene' (which in Greek and Latin grammar was an adjective describing nouns denoting members of either sex without changing their grammatical gender) obstructed any prior comprehension of the 'Silent Woman's' identity through semantic puzzling. Jonson also uses speech in the form of monologues or private conversations to reflect the underlying ethos of a character, the twists and turns of the protagonist's train of thoughts and emotions:

> I Feare, I shall begin to grow in loue
>
> With my deare selfe, and my most prosp'rous parts,
>
> That doe spring, and burgeon; I can feele
>
> A whimsy i' my bloud: (I know not how)
>
> Successe hath made me wanton. I could skip
>
> Out of my skin, now, like a subtill snake,
>
> I am so limber...

> (*Volpone*, III.i.1-7)

Often complexities of character grow out of the character's allusions to selves that lie outside dialogue and action. The most obvious instance of a character alluding cryptically to a secret self involved the stage convention of comic disguising. Disguising addressed the potential fluidity (one character sustaining two or more roles) of early modern identity and of the possibility of achieving freedom from authoritarian constraints. Jonson uses chiaroscurist patterns of external performance and conspiratorial secrecy to deepen and darken the characterisation of his tricksters. Another source of interpretative obfuscation in Jonsonian plays was achieved through the hectic movement between onstage action and offstage discovery spaces.

---

[117] The significance of character naming can be attested from Jonson's own life, particularly his desire to fashion his surname by dropping the 'h' from Johnson (referred to earlier in Chapter IV, n. 70) which was a fairly common surname in Elizabethan times. Although he believed in the Aristotelian position (in *De Interpretatione*) that words have no intrinsic relation with what they signified, yet in artistic practice he adopted a Cratylic position endorsed by Plato which stated that the essential properties of things are expressed through their names. Socrates also argued that since true poets are divinely inspired they can give names correctly and can discern the veiled significances that linger behind linguistic signifiers.

Theatre's implication in the alienation of surface from depth, of appearance from truth, meant that a character's thoughts and passions imagined as properties of his hidden interior are not immediately accessible to other people. Theatrical experience plays on the promise of what can be imagined offstage, beyond surface appearances thus demanding the constant practice of deduction, or 'artificial conjecture',[118] reasoning from superficial to deep, effect to cause or seeming to being. The denial of the desire to go offstage heightens the mystery of the theatrical process though in reality they may contain nothing more than,

> The emptie walls, worse then I left 'hem, smok'd,
>
> A few crack'd pots, and glasses, and a fornace,
>
> The seeling fill'd with *poesies* of the candle:
>
> And MADAME, with a Dildo, writ o' the walls.
>
> <div align="right">(The Alchemist, V.v.39-42)</div>

On the other hand, theatre's investment in intersubjective relations makes it impossible for a character to achieve complete autonomy of privacy, for that would defeat the very purpose of theatre. Thus dramatic characters have to negotiate the dividing line between absolute concealment and complete revelation, revealing their thoughts to some and concealing them to others.[119] This helped to create the illusion of a hermeneutics of intentionality, allowing the character to maintain the fantasy of a single coherent identity across a range of conflicting behaviours. Thus though the rogue's motives are indiscernible to other impercipient onstage characters they are wholly visible to offstage spectators as they are given omniscient access to his fictional hiddenness. Through asides and soliloquies or simply through their indomitable zest, they build up a strong degree of complicity with the audience encouraging the real world spectators to endorse their reading of the play.

Jonson, however, frequently offset such epistemic psychologising in two ways: first, the inherent slipperiness and transitoriness of verbal and physical signs entails a continual movement and displacement of truth, so that which is within repeatedly eludes display ('uncasing' scenes are reduced to metonymic removals of jackets, perukes, beards, hoisting of garments that reveal 'nothing' of the rogue's internal motivations); second,

---

[118] John Cotta, *The Trial of Witch-craft, Shewing the True Method of the Discovery* (London, 1616), p. 4. Quoted in Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*, p. 5.

[119] The truly ridiculous Jonsonian characters are those who display all, characters such as Overdo and Bobadil who cannot sustain their chosen role for the mask invariably slips and reveals the sorry truth beneath.

conclusions based on ethical virtue or fantasies of complacent omniscience are often overturned respectively by mimetic sympathies or gaps in the knowledge conveyed to the audience.[120] Jonson's inherent scepticism about human motives always harboured the possibility that the rogue's friendly posture and overtures with the audience might just be another role that parallels his relation with the gulls.

Roguish personas exploit the gap between 'transparency' and 'opacity' of representation, so that even as he seems to reveal himself, he reflexively interposes his own agency turning representation into yet another form of self-presentation. Such discrepancies are also evident in the morally lax or stringent endings of *The Alchemist* and *Volpone* respectively or in the surprise identity of Epicoene. Jonson uses polyphonic characterisation as a mechanism of testing knowledge, highlighting the problematic nature of the boundary between the real and the transgressive, the material and the intellectual. His plays self-consciously flaunt their status as theatrical artefacts, whether in occasional references by the playwright, characters using theatrical terminology or presenting actors in their real life personas as at the end of the play.[121] Jonsonian theatre offers both a guarantee and a falsifying of a materially knowable world and the objects or activities present in it.

Theatrical performance is delineated from other forms of experience on account of the fundamental visual breach between actors and spectators; marked by the actors' spectacular costumes, stage lighting, or audience seating arrangements. The metatheatrical elements however help to locate the audience at this very breach, collapsing any easy sense of spatial demarcation or innocent visualisation of experience. Incapability of interpreting the poetic text translates into an inept control over theatrical and by implication urban spaces. James Mardock claims that Jonson presented the inability to judge in terms of spatial practice. He uses the example of Bartholomew Cokes to show how as an exemplar of the poorly judging audience, he is unable to rise above the

---

[120] The first decade of the seventeenth century was marked by a number of works that exploited the epistemological lack in the audience by intentionally withholding vital information from them. Such plays include Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*, Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*, *All's Well That Ends Well*, and Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*. Such a technique can also be discerned within Jonson's contribution to the royal pageant that was devised by the civic authorities in honour of James' accession. Averse to explaining the meaning of his triumphal arches, he presented them such that 'as vpon the view they might without cloude, or obscurity declare themselves to the sharpe and learned. And for the multitude, no doubt but their grounded iudgments gazed, said it was fine, and were satisfied.' Quoted in Mardock, *Our Scene is London*, p. 35. The ideal receiver of such a pageant would be the educated reader, not the 'multitude.
[121] The double meaning of the house at Blackfriars in *The Alchemist* is possibly Jonson's most explicit comment on the metatheatrical nature of the play.

foolishness and greedy excess of the Fair's sensory novelties.[122] Yet his mentor Wasp is equally unable to adjudicate because of his refusal to look at or even physically interact with the Fair for fear of corruption.

For Jonson judicious organisation and disinterested manipulation of stage space translated into a control over urban space. Jonson's theatre extends a sensual (visual, tactile, aural) invitation to the audience's inward eye (and ear) to travel with detached neutrality through illusory stage space and distinguish between truth and delusion. In doing so Jonson envisages a new poetics that allows the 'eye of the soul' (akin to Hamlet's 'mind's eye', I.ii.185) to intuit a new kind of (Platonic) knowledge based upon the 'light of reason'.[123] He makes an explicit equation between haptic travel and a particular spectatorial practice that privileges thinking and refrains from indulging in the ostentatious display of the transformative power of stage space: free movement in this case paralleling the exercise of wit and judgment. Hence Jonson draws on the baroque device of the 'play-within-the-play' to comment on the act of viewing (as an intellective act) and the artifice of the work that at the same time tries to convince of its reality. It is a graphic reminder of the *topos* of *theatrum mundi* even as it allows the audience to encounter a multifaceted vision of ontology and cognitive processes. Of particular interest also are the contradictory viewer positions that are generated: identification with tricksters and absorption in their fictional delusions and a dispassionate, judicious viewer who maintains his distance from the action. The plays thus teach the various practical skills needed to negotiate the changing social relations of seventeenth-century pre-capitalist England.

However the series of nested plays-within-the-play in *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, and *Bartholomew Fair* also help to diffuse focus to give rise to an empathetic and participatory gaze, capitalising on the gullibility of the less clever audience by fabricating dramas of deception and manipulation. Mosca's perverse interlude in the First Act featuring the three freaks – Nano, Androgyno, and Castrone – is a play that he writes and directs himself, with Volpone's favourable responses as audience being an indication of the latter's debased tastes. The device misleads other characters and forces them to alter their thoughts and actions in order to adapt to the newly created reality. Metatheatre provided a setting where interpretive issues and responses that challenge the onstage spectators act as means of making the offstage audience conscious of their responses at that given

---

[122] Mardock, *Our Scene is London*, p. 99.
[123] Plato, *Republic*, Book VII.

moment. While offering the audience multiple foci of engagement it initiates a lesson in the subjective nature of perception and the conflicts between real-seeming artifice and true reality.

The overlap between life and play as two planes of existence creates a liminal space where acting and being, public performance and private interpretation, illusion and knowledge merge. What is strikingly 'modern' in such audience-distancing strategies is the structure and meaning of knowing that it envisages; especially 'the new scope for individual action within an expanding royal administration, religious schism, new technologies, and economic arrangements'[124] through an exercise of rational deduction. The knowledge-making system that Jonson envisages undermines the structural system of power, conferring individuating agency on the ethical responsiveness of the thinking, working, and enunciating subject. At the same time such scenarios of theatrical discovery reveal the tensions that structure the early modern disciplinary regime, for the spectator is also defined by his liminal position between the subjective and the objective.

Douglas Duncan sees Jonson's dramatic practice as informed by the practice of oblique teaching developed by Erasmus and Thomas More through their admiration for the Greek author Lucian.[125] Duncan locates Jonson within a long line of Christian humanists (up to John Milton and Jonathan Swift) who used fiction to educate their public through devious processes of intellectual and moral testing: 'sharpening the advanced intelligence'.[126] Such 'cerebral' techniques within Jonson's plays may justifiably be seen as encouraging the transformation of the astute playgoer from a passive recipient to an active participant in the creation of meaning. Within theatrical precincts it also aids in the creation of a fellowship of like-minded individuals based on kindred talents and interests, marked by their sharpness of insight from the ignorant rabble surrounding them. Yet for all its didactic intentions Jonsonian metatheatre veers dangerously close to the transgressive, not simply in its ability to interrogate the cognitive distinction between true-feigned or moral-mimetic but also in its knack of offering alternative interpretations and the experimental withholding of knowledge from the audience, except the most observant of them (given the era's general embargo on showing personal meaning to all and sundry). Such techniques ostensibly recall how the practice of hermeneutics was derived from Hermes, the Greek god of trickery.

---

124 Mardock, *Our Scene is London*, p. 2.
125 Douglas Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition* (New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
126 Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, p. 40.

Jonson forces the audience's guilty identification with the trickster's witty deceptions and feel betrayed when the rogue meets his due. It takes the sting of the moralistic ending to bring back the spectators to their better 'moral' selves and turn them shamefaced against the theatrical delusion they have been tricked into conniving with.[127] The laughter which Jonson elicits from his audience is nearly always 'tinged with some form of culpable delight',[128] whether in sanctioning blasphemy or cruelty and in a 'wilful perversion of the moral sense or in a simple escape from it.'[129] The concluding lines of *Volpone* had forced the spectators to acknowledge that their approval of the play depended on their refusal to see that the play had been ostensibly directed against them. At the end of *The Alchemist* Face's promise and the audience's applause which follows it will imply that it has been duped into passing a wrong verdict: a confession of the part it has played in the conspiracy. Similarly the warm indulgence of *Bartholomew Fair* should not obscure its deceiving intent, for Jonson had promised in the Induction that 'his *Ware* was still the/same'. (Induction, l. 161) The ending that entails a drowning of the rational faculty in wine, should be interpreted in the light of his earlier sarcastic reference to '*Tales, Tempests,* and such like *Drolleries*', and '*Iigges*/and Dances' (l.19, ll.131-2) implicating the audience for its love of vulgar popular tastes and low pastimes.[130]

However much leeway he may seem to give to his intelligent, curious, and disciplined 'understander', Jonson emerges as the principal controller of spatial meaning and agency, identifying himself as a detached, disinterested observer and monocular static point of knowledge. Such techniques affirm Jonson's growing assertion of the notion of autonomous literary proprietorship; constructing a distinctive authorial identity on the sophisticated ability to obfuscate information and produce partial representations. His literary oeuvre is marked by the gradual (moral) deterioration and disappearance of authorial surrogates, finally culminating in the construction of authorship as a 'condition

---

[127] Barish, *Antitheatrical Prejudice*, p. 153.

[128] Aristotle spoke of the moderately ugly, flawed, and deficient as the causes of laughter. In expressing such a view Aristotle might have been influenced by his master Plato who too worries over the disruptive power of laughter and hence banished it from his ideal republic along with most fiction. Centuries later Sir Philip Sidney voiced the same distrust about the anarchic, disturbing power of laughter in the *Apology for Poetry* (1595).

[129] Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, p. 191.

[130] Enemies of the stage charged that plays rested on lies and hypocrisy, with religious and moral authorities equating it with 'lewd' pastimes such as bear-baiting, morris dancing, mumming, gambling, and dicing. The only way left to professional playwrights to dissociate themselves from the scurrilities and obscenities of such 'low' pastimes was to insist on the moral gravity of drama in general. Jonson's elaborate defense of dramatic didacticism was thus an effort to divorce theatre from the contagion of the 'low'. See Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth* (Chicago, 1986).

of abstraction'[131] from the ephemeral vagaries of the theatre (several of his published scripts announced their distance from the theatre as for instance the 1600 quarto of *Every Man Out of His Humour*). The meaning of the play became something that Jonson possessed privately; any understanding of it entailed a discovery of the author's intention. For all its seeming support for pluralist interpretations and invitation to see the truth from a multiplicity of perspectives, in reality the plays critique any interpretation made by imperceptive audiences, encouraging (blind) identification with the ultimate judgment of the author. Similarly the play-text was the playwright's property,[132] outside the control of the theatrical repertory, impassive of the web of meanings that the audience tried to impose on it. Jonson enforced a shift from corporate regulation of meaning to individual and authorial control over textual signification.

Like his fictitious analogues Jonson starts out by playing servant to his audience only to posit himself as their lawful master, not in terms of money or status but intellectual merit.[133] Authorial retreat is marked by a progressive increase in textual effects that recreate the author's subjective presence within the play. By 1614, if not earlier Jonson had come to realise that his expectations of aesthetic appreciation from his paying public may have been too high. In *Bartholomew Fair* he adopts the role of the artist as detached observer, maintaining a self-preserving distance from his experiences.[134] The role allowed him to accept all aspects of life – its pleasurable excesses as well as its disappointing humiliations. It also forced him into contractual compromise with a debased public that guaranteed audience attention and limited authorial obligation. Such conditions were already ripe for his movement into the abstract commodity world of print: a silent textual

---

[131] Hanson, *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England*, p. 119.

[132] Scripts were usually considered the property of the theatre company that performed them. It was seldom allowed to slip out of its control for fear that public familiarity with the text, or rival productions by other troupes would reduce its popularity. Jonson envisaged his texts and creative artefacts as a form of scholarly property; such literary possessiveness was encouraged and influenced by capitalistic notions of selfhood. More significantly the afterlives (despite being rejected by the public) of many of Jonson's plays were a result of the growth of the printing industry.

[133] Early modern service in the sense of servitude was often conceived as a temporary state, with the performance of service being a necessary preparation to become successful masters. Popular legends about servants-turned-masters are those of Simon Eyre, John Winchcombe, and Dick Whittington.

[134] Jonson's 'Ode to Himself' attached to *The New Inn* (1629) expressed his frustration with popular taste. He tries to convince himself to abandon the theatre once and for all, though he was never able to desert 'My old Arts'. At the time of his death he was still working on two plays -*The Sad Shepherd* and *Mortimer His Fall.*

world that he both shares with the intellectually detached disembodied (elite) reader and the unrefined common reader.[135]

> If gracious silence, sweet attention,
>
> Quicke sight, and quicker apprehension,
>
> (The lights of iudgements throne) shine any where;
>
> Our doubtfull authour hopes this is their sphere,
>
> And therefore opens he himselfe to those;
>
> To other weaker beames, his labours close:
>
> As loth to prostitute their virgin straine,
>
> To eu'rie vulgar, and adult'rate braine.
>
> In this alone, his MVSE her sweetnesse hath,
>
> She shunnes the print of any beaten path;
>
> And proues new wayes to come to learned eares:
>
> (Prologue to *Cynthia's Revels*, ll. 1-11)

---

[135] However, early modern reading experiences could be both communal (aural) and isolated (visual). In addition the medieval practice of vocalised and communal reading continued into the Renaissance. The last chapter of this dissertation will look upon this aspect in greater detail.

CHAPTER SIX

MARGINAL RETREATS: STAGING PRIVACY ON THE PRINTED PAGE

--neque, me ut miretur turba, laboro: Contentus paucis lectoribus[1]

Est Virgo Hec Penna : Meretrix Est Stampificata[2]

When we doe give, ALPHONSO, to the light,

A worke of ours, we part with our owne right;

For, then, all mouthes will judge, and their owne way.[3]

I

Cuffe's Private Study

In 1601 Henry Cuffe, personal secretary and chief adviser to Robert Devereux, the second Earl of Essex, was hanged and quartered at Tyburn for no less a crime than reading quietly at his desk! Despite his protestations, Attorney-General and prosecuting counsel Sir Edward Coke indicted Cuffe for 'imagining and compassing'[4] the Queen's destruction, proclaiming him a 'cunning coiner of all plots'[5]: physical absence on the day of the ill-fated rebellion being unacceptable as evidence for his purported innocence. Even printed accounts of the aborted insurrection vilified Cuffe as the arch-manipulator of the Essex clique, a 'notable traitor by the book', whose culpability resided in his 'wicked' disinclination to prevent a conspiracy he apparently had full knowledge of. Further, Cuffe's secretarial relation with his aristocratic patron exposed the dark

---

[1] Horace's *Satires*, I.x.73-4 on the frontispiece of Jonson's 1616 Folio – 'and I do not work so that the crowd may admire me: I am content with a few readers', in *Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*, p. 153.

[2] 'The pen is a virgin, the printing press a whore', a comment made by Filippo di Strata, a late fifteenth-century Dominican friar, on Johannes Gutenberg's movable type (that produced the forty-two line Bible as the first major book printed in the West), quoted in Wall's *Imprint of Gender*, p. 169.

[3] 'To Alphonso Ferrabosco, on his Book', *Epigram* CXXXI, ll. 1-3.

[4] The legal statute of 1351 (25 Edw. 3, st. 5 c. 2) promulgated under Edward III (and later incorporated into Edward Cokes' *Institutes* in 1644) made it treason to 'compass or imagine' the death of the king, his queen or the royal heir. These verbs were literal translations of original Law French (*compasser* and *imaginer*) and occurred in no other English legal statute. Treason law was distinctive in its emphasis upon crime as an effect of the imagination for which guilt could be inferred without being realised in action. The period between 1485 and 1602 alone saw the enactment of sixty-eight treason statutes. Essex's aborted coup was arguably the most famous of treasonous acts of the imagination to take place in Elizabeth's reign.

[5] See Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia* (London: Pimlico, 2006), p. 252.

undercurrents of the humanist privileging of intellectual intimacies (suggestive of the homoerotic potential of the classical *amicitia*) between men of shared literary tastes, not least because Essex was believed to have been instigated by the seductive persuasions of his secretary's prodigious learning and scholarship.[6]

Cuffe was indeed a classical scholar of distinction (despite his Somerset yeomanry birth and humble grammar school origins), fellow of Merton College, and a prolific reader, and while the exact nature of the book(s) being read by him on that fateful Sunday in February may well stay unknown, what remains remarkable is the intriguing engendering of crime in the ostensibly innocuous act of private reading, especially the nature of the implicit links established between silent comprehension and treasonous intent, transgression and materially located textuality, passive contemplation and active deceit, (pre)meditation and literary agency, withdrawal and creative autonomy (precisely those qualities that have been shared by Jonson and his rogue-artists). More significantly his culpability serves to shed light on the introspective reading (and writing) mind as a potentially malicious site where projected evils could be conceived and initiated.[7] It is ironic that the untimely demise of Cuffe's scholarly aspirations should have transpired through the act of reading and (mis)representing the written word.

At a primary level the episode underscores the quiet hazards of (silent) unmediated reading, especially the risks posed by unsupervised private readers recalling Thomas Wilson's evocative warning in the *Arte of Rhetorique* (1585) of the moral dangers and physiological corruptions informing the reading process: 'Who that toucheth Pitch shall be filed with it, and he that goeth in the Sunne shall be sun burnt, although he thinke not of it. So they that will read this or such like bookes, shall in the ende be as the bookes are.'[8] Reading in general could produce a humoural imbalance and modify the physical complexions, whetting the appetites and passions, provoking these internal agents of insurrection to exert pressure on the fragile and unstable edifice of the self, epitomised most memorably in the fifth Canto of Dante's *Inferno* (strikingly reminiscent of other eroticised scenes of adulterous reading such as that between Augustine and Dido and

---

[6] Essex's assembling of intellectual talent was equalled only by Queen Elizabeth I. By 1595 he had a secretariat that was comprised of scholars and academics such as Edward Reynoldes, Henry Wotton, Cuffe, and William Temple. His long sojourn at Cambridge honed his intellectual interests enabling him to see scholars as natural companions for soldiers.

[7] 'The slow shift to silent solitary reading may have whetted anxieties about the private, and potentially unregulated, nature of the act.' See Swapan Chakravorty's essay 'Hypocrite Lecteur: Reading on the Early Modern Stage', in *Renaissance Themes: Essays Presented to Arun Kumar Das Gupta*, ed. Sukanta Chaudhuri (London: Anthem Press, 2009), pp. 33-61: 36.

[8] Thomas Wilson, *Arte of Rhetorique* (London, 1585), quoted in Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England*, p. 78.

Héloïse and Abelard) where Francesca reminiscences about that transgressive moment when she and Paolo read how,

> love constrained [Lancelot]...one point alone it was that mastered us; when we read that the longed-for smile was kissed by so great a love, he who never shall be parted from me all trembling, kissed my mouth. A Galeotto [pander] was the book and he that wrote it; that day we read in it no further?[9]

Erotic reading could aggravate the body and arouse the mind's eye, foregrounding the tactile and visual pleasure of surfaces and their sensual *frisson*. Books were dangerous because they 'with a silent persuasion insinuate their matter unto the chiefe affection and highest part of the Soule':[10] reading was akin to a lived experience in the mind. They could undermine long-held notions about the relation of the individual to religious, political, and social structures: removing men from their proper place in the society of like-minded men. For an age prone to widespread religious and political censorship, reading was perceived to have serious practical repercussions: reading the wrong sorts of texts could lead to wrong kinds of action.[11] Thus Roger Ascham (tutor to Queen Elizabeth) worried about the pernicious effects of romances and Italianate literature on the imagination:

> In our forefathers tyme, when Papistrie, as a standing poole, covered and overflowed all England, fewe bookes were read in our tong, savyng certaine bookes of Chevalrie, as they sayd, for pastime and pleasure, which, as some say, were made in Monasteries, by idle Monkes, or wanton Chanons: as one for example, *Morte Arthure*: the whole pleasure of which books standeth in two speciall poyntes, in open man's slaughter, and bold bawdrye...What toyes, the dayly readyng of such a booke, may worke in the will of a yong gentleman, or a

---

[9] Dante, *Inferno*, Canto 5, ll. 127ff, quoted in Michael Schoenfeldt's 'Reading Bodies', in Sharpe and Zwicker, pp. 215-43: 217. Reading's implicit link with eroticism is underscored by book titles such as *The Wandring-Whores Complaint for Want of Trading Wherein the Cabinet of Her Iniquity is Unlockt and All Her Secrets Laid Open* (1663), Richard Head's *The Canting Academy, or, The Devil's Cabinet Opened* (1673); *Holborn-Drollery, or, The Beautiful Chloret Surprized in the Sheets...to Which is Annexed, Flora's Cabinet Unlocked* (1673) or *The Cabinet Open'd, or, The Secret History of the Amours of Madame de Maintenon* (1690). Cited in Cecile Jagodzinsky, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville, VA and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999), p. 17.

[10] Thomas Wright, *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (London, 1604), ed. Thomas. O. Sloan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), quoted in Schoenfeldt's 'Reading Bodies', p. 217.

[11] Most European governments and churches attempted to control and regulate printing throughout the sixteenth century because it allowed for the rapid dissemination of ideas and information. The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* was a list of publications that were deemed unorthodox, lascivious, and anticlerical and were therefore banned by the Catholic Church.

yong mayde, that liveth welthelie and idlelie, wise men can judge, and honest men do pitie.[12]

Reading figured as an act of trespass and was conceived to be a powerfully dangerous activity precisely because of its transformative power: producing new forms of identity that traversed the intellectual, the emotional, and the corporeal. It was an embodied act involving not just mind and soul, but closely tied up with bodily processes.

Apart from the hazards underlying the reading process, the circumstances in which it took place would have provoked anxiety as well. Given that early modern lay reading was commonly carried out in public and domestic spaces, not simply in the isolation of the cloistered study or the monastic cell, Cuffe's silent and private individualised reading on the day of Essex's rebellion was an exception and not the norm.[13] Few could afford the luxury of private spaces such as prayer closets and studies for books and reading (though some did, prominent being Montaigne whose definition of a study as 'solarium' was a perfect exemplar of study as privacy) and in general devotional and secular readings were slow, repetitive, collective, and intensive oral, aural, and tactile exercises that helped to maintain the cohesiveness of the social unit. Reading aloud was even known to be a form of revitalising pneumatic therapy that stimulated the soul and cured the desiccated brain and complexion of melancholics.[14] For the literate[15] minority (or the non-literate majority) listening remained a vital method of acquiring knowledge whether through the sermon or the Lessons in church or listening to the reading of the Bible, Psalms or devotional books at home.

Reflecting the traditional royalist suspicion of solitude, the Act for the Advancement of True Religion promulgated by Henry VIII in 1543 allowed 'everye noble man and gentleman being a householder to reade or cause to be red by any of his famylie or

---

[12] Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster* (1570), ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1967), pp. 230-1. In particular reading was supposed to have a more pernicious effect on certain categories of readers than others. Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540) warned of the vulnerability that women had towards the romance. See his 1524 *Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*, ed. and trans. Charles Fantazzi (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). From 1506 to at least 1597 Spanish authorities likewise attempted to prevent their native subjects in the New World from reading romances. Similarly the younger generation were also thought to be more likely to be affected by the polluting effects of reading. Closer home even Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* expresses acute anxiety over women reading romances in private closeted spaces.

[13] That the scene of Cuffe's subversive reading was at the well-stocked library of Essex cannot have been more than striking. Private collections, parish or public libraries (eased out by the salons and coffee-houses of a later age), were places synonymous with working collections of books where decisions of policy and piety were often taken.

[14] See Spiller, *Reading and the History of Race in the Renaissance*, p. 32.

[15] The early modern notion of literacy usually presupposed a demarcation between reading and writing literacies or between 'phonetic' and 'comprehension' literacy. See in this regard Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Methuen, 1981).

servants in his house orchard or gardeyne, and to his owne famylie, any texte of the Byble or New Testament, so the same be done quietlie and without disturbaunce of good order.'[16] Perceived to be alien and even demonic, silent reading was a rare phenomenon (even individual reading such as that of the Book of Hours was usually done in a muffled voice) and practiced if at all for professional or religious purposes only by habitual readers.[17] Private reading made possible as Alvin Kernan points out, the reception of knowledge 'not through the ear but through the eye alone, not from the exchange of views with others viva voce but by scanning and interpreting fixed rows of silent signs, not in a noisy community of other persons but in the silence of the library and isolated consciousness.'[18] This reflective turn inward made the cultivation of private life possible and freed the individual from the established norms, constraints, and expectations of the group.

The anxiety about new-fangled notions of privacy (with its attendant fears of carnality, deceit, and secrecy) would have further helped to position the learned man engrossed in his books as a deeply ambivalent (even devious) figure. Private spaces naturally afforded a freedom that could not be interrupted or distracted: far removed from moral and religious censors who acted as barriers towards the accession of apparently lewd, sinful, and seditious matter. Not surprisingly then, intellectual deliberation and retribution seemed perilously similar to the early modern imagination. Thus Andrea Alciato's brooding scholar-philosopher (emblem XI entitled 'In Silentium'/'On Silence' from the *Emblematum liber* of 1591) bore striking resemblance to the menacing figure of Vengeance in G. P. Valeriano Bolzani's woodcut 'Meditatio vel Ultio'/'Meditation or Revenge' from the *Hieroglyphica* (1610). From one perspective the pensive rumination of Alciato's reader sitting at his desk with a finger on his lips and the other hand resting on an open book seems the dark complement of Bolzani's finger-biting figure of Revenge, suggesting that silent reading was often construed as a marker of malevolent intention and agency rather than absence and stasis.[19]

---

[16] Quoted in Heidi Brayman Hackel's '"Boasting of Silence": Women Readers in a Patriarchal State', in Sharpe and Zwicker, pp. 101-21: 103.

[17] Rapid and silent reading was a relatively new (though not unusual) trend which became prominent with the Irish scribes who copied manuscripts in separated text from the seventh and eighth centuries. It increased in frequency only in the late tenth century when learned scholars attempted to master the huge corpus of technical, scientific, and philosophical classical texts.

[18] Alvin Kernan, *Samuel Johnson and the Impact of Print* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), pp. 220-1.

[19] For a culture deeply committed to the ideals of rhetoric with its logic of participatory spiritual and civic politics, silence was often seen as a form of disaffection and withdrawal, even of disobedience and threat. Thus in addition to expectable glosses such as 'quietness', 'stilness', 'no noyse making', English Renaissance dictionaries and lexicons often linked silence with terms such as *obscuro* ('To cloak, to hide, to keep in

Paul Saenger very persuasively shows how silent reading (and concomitant writing) could be viewed as a breeding ground for insurrection,[20] textual consumption being a site of religious and politically charged activity. Such unwitnessed solitary communication freed intellectual curiosity and speculative thoughts from the corrective and restrictive sanctions imposed by group reading. It encouraged individual critical thinking providing a fertile medium for the development of scepticism and intellectual heterodoxy. Private reading 'invited each reader to go beyond the text; in so doing, it further propelled the intellectual development of the individual reader and the culture.'[21] The Cuffe-Essex episode has justifiably received scholarly attention for its importance towards understanding the discourse of high treason at the turn of the sixteenth century.

Nonetheless it is tempting to map Cuffe's (and as I am trying to hypothesise Jonson's as well) ultimate fate onto a growing culture of books, the emergence of private individualised reading, the rise of urban middle class readership, especially the larger shifts between a declining orality and an incipient literacy, as new trends were emerging in the ways of transmitting knowledge and modes of perceiving the world. The deluge of books and printed materials necessitated a method of instruction that was no longer predominantly oral and conversational but visual and silent. The sudden increase in textual production (and the subsequent informational overload) and its exacerbation by the advent of movable type also led to a dissociation of speech from the human subject and the engendering of 'presence' in the written rather than spoken word. That Cuffe should have envisaged reading (typically considered a part of rhetoric or oral delivery) as the cerebral construction of meaning based on written external cues adds to his modernity. In contrast to public and social readings, the act of private reading dispensed a secret depth to Cuffe's character and conferred a private (authorial) subjectivity that was not articulate, objectified, or part of a visible economy of representation.

Early modern understandings of social and intellectual identity were to a large extent shaped and informed by the changes in reading practices. Cuffe's narcissistic involutions and his consequent chastisement by the state seem to draw upon a specific discourse of

---

silence, or from the knowledge of men') and *reticentia* ('Silence, when one holdeth his peace, and uttereth not the thing that he should tell: a counselling or keeping of counsel'). These meanings appear in Thomas Thomas' *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (1587) and have been cited by Christina Luckyj in *"A Moving Rhetoricke": Gender and Silence in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 2.

[20] Paul Saenger, *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 264-76.

[21] Maryanne Wolf, *Proust and the Squid: The Story and Science of the Reading Brain* (New York: Harper, 2007), p. 217. Quoted in Adriaan van der Weel, *Changing Our Textual Minds: Towards a Digital Order of Knowledge* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 77.

agency that was dependent upon the connections established between textuality and identity: the body was as much the material site of reading as the text itself. Understanding the self as document was the visible corollary to the expansion and increasing viability of the written word. Incidentally the manuscript in this regard offered a provocative parallel to the closed secretive body: Cuffe's performance of inscrutability centres on the image of the book. The parchment and vellum used for (especially legal) documents was made from the dried, treated skin of animals (usually sheep, goats or calves) and was arranged in such a way that the inside of the sealed document was the 'flesh' or the interior of the skin.[22] The text thus acted as a simulacrum for the human body, concealing its written contents within a sheath of skin whose exterior bore the markings of its status, place of origin, and destination.

The source of anxiety surrounding Cuffe's seemingly innocuous reading at Essex House resides in the dialectic it establishes between bodily presence and bodily absence, physical involvement and disembodied participation. Silent reading paradoxically marks presence in absence transforming Cuffe's physical absence on the day of the revolt into a kind of brooding presence. His incrimination and eventual punishment treads an epistemologically uncertain ground in trying to establish conceptual links between thought and voice, internal operations of the mind and its external workings. The inaudible reading body then functions as a problematic signifier that stands uneasily on the critical threshold between corporeal substance and its textual representation. Cuffe's legal conviction would have proceeded on the assumption that intellectual agency provided circumstantial evidence of a carefully planned and purposeful activity. His fate coincides with contemporary shifts in media technology and emergence of alternative communication systems, dramatising a transitional moment in the early modern trajectory between textual and creative authority. His incrimination helps to trace the adverse cultural effects arising out of the uneven movement away from the self's shared, publicly acknowledged or mediated experience towards individual self-scrutiny as the primary locus of authentic perception, thought, and feeling.

Reading was very much a preserve of the wealthy and the clergy, religious houses, and academicians who treated books as precious objects (they were a luxury purchase) that were often inventoried individually in wills. Quite a few Elizabethan noble families employed poor yet talented scholars to act as textual facilitators or discoursers who read books and pondered over manuscripts, either alone or in company, with their patrons'

---

[22] See L. C. Hector, *The Handwriting of English Documents* (2nd edn.; London: Edward Arnold, 1966).

purpose in mind. It is quite plausible that in his functions as professional reader and confidential amanuensis, Cuffe may have habitually collated and interpreted legal, political, military or historical texts that Essex had no time to peruse on his own, adding textual marginalia, emending errors, citing variant readings, supplementing or footnoting, paraphrasing, manipulating interpretations to be rapidly grasped and used by his master for influencing practical action or public arguments whether in politics or civil affairs. Such rhetorical acts of elucidative writing would have further helped him to showcase his abilities as a scholar while simultaneously flattering his patron. Although physically immobile the erudite scholar-reader acted as the vicarious agent of his benefactor's action for according to contemporary hearsay Cuffe's compellingly politicised interpretation of the Roman writer Lucan ('He who as a private individual had not found friends, would find many more of them when he took up arms') had finally managed to convince Essex to rebel against the monarch.

Cuffe's prosecutors would have envisaged his textual glosses and commentaries as an elaborate performance and self-presentation, which granted the book a rhetorically interactive energy that purported to literally/'literarily' transform its aristocratic reader(s). Such circumstantial documentary 'evidence' would have rendered insignificant Cuffe's defence regarding his physical absence on the day of the rebellion. Inevitably such academic counsel and instruction was bound up with the vain desire for attention, greater personal worth, shored up credit, and fortune willing, entry into the services of some noble benefactor. Yet such pragmatic knowledge transactions whether accomplished through accompanied readings or private circulations amongst an elite court coterie (establishing a community held together by the word as it were); oral advice or written arguments between scholarly advisor and political advisee breached professional and emotional boundaries, connecting the private with the public, written and spoken through the language of friendship and exchange, mutual obligation and indebtedness, credit and profit in a very convincing way. The lateral bonds fostered by such new forms of intellectual employment tended to defuse the hierarchical structures of dependence and service between noblemen and educated men in their employ within the feudal household.

Cuffe's liaison with Essex may have been ill-starred but it hints at the emerging trend of the intellectually invigorating political climate of the 1590s when scholarly readers were providing highly specific forms of private (learned) service for politically influential figures including the monarch. While these exchanges shed light on the liminal and

shifting position of such professional 'readers' (who often had to act at the discretion of their betters) they also stress on the growing practice of secretarial production and mediation of humanist learning for military affairs or for courtly display and advancement: registering the moment when aristocratic masculine social agency rooted in codes of honour, frivolous display, and violence was becoming passive and inward in its respect for learning, hard work, and serious devotion to duty. Used as a form of social, political or martial strategy, scholarly reading violated the conventional early modern binary between the classical categories of 'leisure' *otium* (*vita contemplativa*) and 'duty' *negotium* (or *vita activa*). Scholarship was supposed to initiate a preparation for participation in the commonweal (and Jonson would have had a thorough understanding of this), though Cuffe's notorious example was a case of the more subversive effects of academic reading put into the service of corruption and deceit. Professionals like Cuffe (or Jonson) who eked out a living by providing their services for noble patrons blurred and problematised the boundary between scholarly purity and courtly dissimulation. To the early modern imagination Cuffe was a classic exemplar of the 'rogue-artist' – the scholar who turned rogue.

Incidentally Calvinist clergy and laity in the English Church did have a distinctive style of reading that made diligent use of marginal (textual) spaces to express their private opinions. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century religious polemics often centred on textual margins to build up debates, decentering texts to undermine notions of essential and inessential. Apart from Cuffe's highly nonconformist mode of reading on the day of the London riots, I am inclined to conjecture a link (however tenuous) between his final conviction and his radical use of extensive supplementary material at the margins of the books he read (and reread) on behalf of Essex.

Marginalia (the Latin word for 'things in the margin' referring to handwritten and later printed writings or decorations in the margins of a manuscript or book) and interlinear commentary constituted discursive spaces within the textual topography that imparted a remarkable degree of fluidity and multivocality to an early modern publication at a time when the source of textual authority was still uncertain. While Cuffe's hermeneutic endeavour would have enabled him to produce a new text at the margins, the use of such textual supplementarity would have also enabled him to rehearse and break down the conflict between a single centralised authority (represented by the main text, author, editor or sponsor) and plural external authorities at the margins (represented by the paratext or general public): a play made possible by the space of the page. The absence of

a dominant autonomous (textual) authority would have enabled Cuffe to shift authorial responsibility to some other source – to Essex or to his courtly coterie of readers as equally liable collaborators in the textual (conspiratorial) process.[23]

Cuffe, I also think, provides a brilliant example of the perplexing mediation of a guilty conscience and criminal inwardness through academic learning, more specifically the performance of treachery in the intimacy of textual spaces and scholarly practices. He seems to provide a very Certeauian model of the wily cultural consumer who combines textual fragments to create something different and unknown;[24] reshaping texts to complement his subjectivity. These marginal recesses on the page were dynamic sites of creative becoming where authorial agency and readerly interpretation were exercised: indeterminate spaces of rethinking where the fixity of the textual framework was simultaneously complemented and transgressed.

They were also hermeneutic sites where a new kind of privatised subjectivity developed extending outwards to include the reader, creating in the process a dynamic tension between exclusiveness and accessibility, reserve and volubility.[25] As products of the artist's or reader's imagination (rather than that of his sponsoring patron) marginalia represented both textual and visual commentary on the adjacent primary text inviting simultaneous mental and visceral engagement. Fragmentary remnants that recalled the speaker's spontaneous gestures and oral intrusions at the point of reading to his audience; in later periods of literacy such embedded polyphonic rudiments of a live vocal performance were committed to the parchment's margins for the silent reader's perusal.

While the manipulation and re-vision of texts promoted the notion of identity as performance, such polysemous textual encounters also provided a representational space for the expression and formation of early modern self-constituted subjectivity. In addition it underscored the importance of scholarly 'labour' in the conceptualisation of an interiorised sense of self and agency. Instead of acting as a mere cipher upon whom his master could impose his needs and desires, Cuffe's literary and hermeneutic performance at the margins was able to renegotiate and undermine the complex relation between identity and authority. It is this potential for interpretive independence and autonomy

---

[23] Typically compilations and collaborations were quite common in the early modern era rather than the single-author publications that are common today. Authorship as it was understood then was dependent upon mediations, gatherings, and borrowings of materials and collaborative building up on the work of others.

[24] Michel de Certeau, 'Reading as Poaching', in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven F. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 165-76.

[25] The margins of a book were not uniquely private spaces, for palimpsests of multiple ownership marks are often an indicator of the number of hands that the book may have circulated through.

that leads Roger Chartier to see reading as 'rebellious and vagabond. Readers use infinite numbers of subterfuges...to read between the lines, and to subvert the lessons imposed upon them.'[26]

Thus, Cuffe's aesthetic engagement and affective experience with the book provides a prelude to exercising rational judgement, critical appraisal, and even artistic license; his wide textual scholarship a deceptive cover for nursing secret ambition (he had apparently been promised the speakership in the next parliament if Essex's plan succeeded). Cuffe's interpretive acts bring to the fore the changing equations between writer-text-reader, helping in understanding better emergent notions of authorial autonomy and reader empowerment in early modern England. By combining both the roles of annotator-as-writer and reader the Cuffe-Essex incident mediates similar tensions between the writer and his collaborative community, authorial implication and readerly presumption that were to drive Jonson's relation to his readerly coterie.

In an oblique way then Cuffe serves to introduce the concerns of the final chapter of my dissertation which focuses on the cunning editorial self-presentation of an author whose robust scholarship and remarkable reading habits had led him to reprove Shakespeare for his 'smalle *Latine*, and lesse *Greeke*'[27] and whose ability to vocally 'read' Psalm 50 from the Latin Vulgate saved him from impending death (by pleading benefit of clergy). Unlike Cuffe four years back, Jonson narrowly escaped from being punished for involvement in the Gunpowder conspiracy. Both Cuffe's and Jonson's career were profoundly imbricated in the technological changes through which imagination was mediated. Cuffe's relationship with Essex provides a literal prototype for the tense intersubjective negotiations between author and reader (and also for the fictional masters and servants that populate his plays), conspiratorially partnered in a private experience with the text at hand. The freedom to reveal or conceal all or part of one's inner self is a basic condition of privacy. Any transfer of information places the discloser in a vulnerable position and changes the dynamics of personal relationships. The discloser may gain in trust and emotional support by voluntarily risking a vulnerable part of the self; the other person has the option of developing closer ties with the discloser or rejecting and exploiting him.

This interactive nature of self-disclosing relationships, the game of moving margins back and forth, is an apt paradigm for the volatile and mutually transformative if not

---

26 Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), p. viii.
27 Ben Jonson, 'To the Memory of My Beloved, The Author, Mr. William Shakespeare, and what he hath left us', *Ungathered Verse*, vol. VIII.

dissimulative negotiations between Jonson and his readers, who are engaged in the process of disclosure and 'reading' the other. Early modern texts often used spatial metaphors to imagine the relationship between book and reader. Reading is comparable to an invasion or voyeuristic spying into an enclosed or secret sphere, maybe the aristocratic home, the private gentleman's club or the court: an act that seems to move inward through 'public casings towards a secluded interiority.'[28] Similarly publication figured as a volatile but liberating incursion into public spheres. As originators of texts, authors played a vital role in the formation of the private self, authoring and authorising the real and fictional readers represented within his works. As the first negotiator of the distance between public and private life , the author has to find his proper audience and decide how distant or how familiar he needs to be in order to capture the reader's fancy or engage his intelligence.[29]

Such issues would have been pertinent to Jonson, whose authorial self-definition was realised through the canny adjustments between community and individual, civic facade and internal self, public politics and private ethics. Jonson made use of paratextual and typographical devices on the page (such as dedicatory epistles, prefaces, commendatory verses, Latin mottoes, arguments, addresses to the reader) to alleviate (or aggravate as the case may be) the rupture between authorial intention and readerly understanding that often created an effect of rhetorical discontinuity in his writings. Very much like Cuffe may have done, Jonson used 'peritextual'[30] material and space (both at the centre and the margins) as the locus where the author's creative intelligence and private obsessions were able to influence collective modes of negotiation and exchange. He would also have used such paraphernalia to both destabilise the authority of the performed play (which belonged not to the writer but to the theatrical company) and recoup his own right over the written and read play-text. Moreover as luxury products books would have exactly the kind of prestige that Jonson wanted to accrue to his 'works'. The hide-and-seek of affective engagements, rare intimacies, as well as of a kind of studied disengagement as he

---

[28] Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, p. 178.
[29] Jagodzinsky, *Privacy and Print*, p. 5.
[30] I am subscribing to Gerard's division of 'paratexte' into two distinct subspecies: epitext that refers to all the material outside the traditional borders of the book such as secondary criticism or author interviews; and peritext that denotes physical features of the books such as the material of the page (whether parchment or paper), the size of the page (quarto, folio, octavo, duodecimo etc.), the condition of the pages which may suggest something about ownership and use (e.g. a text for oral performance, a book in the chain library or a book in the *pecia* system which divided the source text into a number of sections so that they could be simultaneously copied), script, page layout, and linguistic and visual extra-textual signifiers in the book which include marginalia, corrections, miniatures, gesturing signs, and scribal marks. See Gérard Genette, *Paratext: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 1.

alternately indulges and ignores his readers (with the greater aim of commercial gain and harvesting authorial ambition) turns the author (writing 'I') – reader (reading 'I') interaction into a fascinating study of early modern intersubjective relations (already traced in the Harman-Jennings relationship in Chapter III) just as it also turns Jonson into the archetypal figure of the 'rogue-artist'.

II
From Oral to Print Culture

The late modern interface between print and electronic or post-typographic culture represents a resuscitation of the characteristics of oral cultures, creating what Walter Ong has classified as 'secondary orality'[31] or Marshall McLuhan as the 'retribalisation' of experience within a budding digital age. To the cynical minded keeping abreast of Twitter updates or Facebook postings, uploading/viewing Youtube videos, even typographically inaccurate texting may be proof invincible of an intellectual decline, yet such activities are increasingly considered a vital aspect of 'social grooming'. Electronic culture has revived the fluid, shifting, open-ended, socially flexible, and spontaneous evanescence of oral communication: its commitment to group mentality (and consequent apathy of the private self), personal intimacy, presence, and expressive spontaneity is a reversion to the ancient experience of networked social and referential structures. The digital medium's associative, non-linear, and non-hierarchical organisation of visual and multimedial information approximates to the re-emergence of oral psychodynamics in the public sphere. Predictably enough this revolutionary paradigm shift from print towards a digital (hyper)textual 'docuverse'[32] has also radically transformed the nature of writing, authorship, and the liaison between writer and reader.

The contemporary overlap of print and digital cultures and the convergence of modalities in a single digital medial space offers almost a structural parallel to the early modern complex of medial interactions and tense negotiations between competing

---

[31] Walter Ong proposes the term 'secondary orality' (in contrast to 'primary orality') to describe the skills needed to cope with the changes taking place as a result of massive extensions in the use of modern communications media. 'Secondary orality' is a new social condition which involves specialised understanding of the adapted 'oral' systems used in radio, telephones, audio recording, TV, and film. See Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, 1982), pp. 135-7.

[32] 'Docuverse' (meaning document universe) is a term coined in the late 1960s by Ted Nelson, (the founder of the Xanadu project, an ambitious hypertext system that is the forerunner of the Web) who conceived of it as a huge electronic network to connect all the information in the world by means of cross-referenced documents.

modalities of composition: oral/aural, visual, and textual. With only a marginal percentage of the population having access to written sources of information, public and private affairs were primarily conducted through oral communication. The oral milieu was supported by interpersonal connections and survived on memory: a communally shared world of sound and reminiscence where church bells tolled the time, the bellman's ring marked the passage of night into morning, street vendors ferried their wares, and music poured out of alehouses and from tavern doors.

Sound was privileged not only as a mnemonic aid but also for enabling the performer to establish a phatic communion with the audience by the power of his own voice. As a potent early modern social networking tool the privileging of the ritual formality of the spoken word continued well into the seventeenth century with writing regarded as a poor replacement of speech. The primacy accorded to linguistic codes and gestural protocols (when, where, and how to speak) in conduct manuals and epistolary handbooks that enabled social negotiation and political intervention can hardly be overestimated. Speech was both a marker and maker of social status; it was also an indispensable constituent of the civilising process. Textual representation was viewed as inferior to the directness of vision and the immediacy of human social presence established in oral conversation.

The shift from an oral-based textual culture where written English principally served the functions of transcription, to a literacy-based one is extremely complex. The oral aspect of writing remained pertinent long after the primarily encoding function of the written word had worn off especially in forms of cultural communication such as broadsides, scripts for the stage, sermons, orations, familiar letters or commonplace books. Written conversation thus served as an extension of or model for oral exchange in early modern Europe. Ideas about speech and talking were central to conceptions of civil society with political theorists such as Machiavelli, Leonardo Bruni, Lorenzo Valla, and Francesco Guicciardini stressing the importance of active life, spent in an engagement with the community. In his influential treatise *De conscribendis epistolis* (1522) Erasmus (drawing upon the Roman comic poet Turpilius) defined letter writing as a continuation of oral communication, 'a mutual conversation between absent friends.'

Courtesy books such as Castiglione's *Il libro del cortegiano*, Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo*, and Guazzo's *La civil conversazione* structured their accounts of courtly and civil behaviour in dialogue form to model conversational decorum and stress its value in maintaining reputation, achieving social position, and helping aspiring courtiers or young men in general for public state roles. In her study of the influence of written conversational

models, Virginia Cox posits courtesy books as a 'codification' of the art of conversation; letters, an 'enactment' of conversation, and dialogue, an 'illustration' and celebration of conversation.[33] As a consummate model of 'textual conversation', the dialogue was able to reconcile the humanist insistence on the close relationship between reading, conversation, and political counsel, representing 'a miniature drama of communication' in which personae play out 'act[s] of persuasion' in relation to 'the reality of [an] addressee'.[34] While it is important not to treat literary textual instances of conversational exchanges (such as Jonson's parley with his readers through textual additions such as prologues or epilogues) as reliable markers of everyday oral interaction, they do serve to hint at the close links between orality and textuality in the period.

The adoption of writing as a social practice was most often accompanied by the realisation that it was not a self-sufficient practice in and of itself. The mistrust of purely written evidence led to the necessity of documents being read aloud to be accepted as socially legitimate forms of knowledge. The erratic nature of the transition from oral to textual or scribal society can also be witnessed in the early charters which tended to be rhetorical in tone, with their stress on older forms of authenticating documents (paralinguistic features such as physical presence of the issuer, living witnesses, and symbolic gestures) and the lack of elementary (written) guarantees of their authenticity such as date or place of issue and the name of the scribe. Royal letters of introduction or conduct bore the doubled bodily presence of their regal issuer in the shape of a certification stamp and an authentication seal.

The suspicion of writing as a form of death and oblivion (as against 'living memory') guaranteed the continuing reliance on oral communication, barter, rituals, ceremonies, and symbols for many centuries to come. The early modern scepticism and distrust regarding the written word goes back to classical times. The ancient Greeks fostered an intellectual culture of dialogue with the *symposium* being a key Hellenic social institution where men came together to drink, debate, and converse. Plato's complaints against the artificiality of writing as a new form of technological innovation in the *Phaedrus* were directed at its ability to cause a decline in the powers of memory.[35] As an 'inert' non-

---

[33] Virginia Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglione to Galileo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 25.
[34] Ibid., pp. 5-7.
[35] Socrates narrates the story of the Egyptian god Thoth/Theuth who after having invented the alphabet presented it to Thamus, the chief of the gods as an aid to improving the memory of the Egyptians and making them wiser. Thamus however thinks that writing aids not memory but reminiscence: 'this discovery of yours will create forgetfulness in the learners' souls, because they will not use their memories; they will

interactive one-way communication system it lacked gesturing, intonation, facial expression, and various other non-speech communicative linguistic devices. Further Socrates considered writing to be ambiguous if not utterly deceitful, warning Phaedrus that written words do not mean what they say: 'Then it shows great folly...to suppose that one can transmit or acquire clear and certain knowledge of an art through the medium of writing, or that written words can do more than remind the reader of what he already knows on any given subject.'[36]

Writing eschewed the need for an author and exposed the written word to the potentially fanciful interpretation of the unreliable reader.[37] Plato feared that the detachment of the connection between the originator of knowledge and its intended audience could lead to danger and uncertainty. Such innate distrust was also echoed by later Roman writers such as Juvenal and Horace who relied on 'living memory' for the continued survival of their works. Generally early modern Europe valued speech as a more authentic communicative medium, in the belief that bodily presence in oral discourse guaranteed a greater epistemological certainty. In her observations on the valorisation of oral modes of discourse over written ones, Leah Marcus states:

> It is certainly the case...that sixteenth-century speakers often viewed the production of written versions of their oral discourse as a fall into uncertainty...[S]imilarly, sixteenth-century audiences frequently lamented that manuscript and printed versions of a speech offered only a pale, obscure reflection, an imperfect copy, of the utterance as communicated orally by its author-speaker. Sixteenth-century English culture – even learned culture – had not quite adjusted to the idea that writing could constitute a primary mode of communication. In their introductions to collections of printed sermon literature or university lectures, for example, preachers and scholars frequently felt compelled to assure their invisible public that despite the lessened immediacy of

---

trust to the external written characters and not remember of themselves.' Plato, *Phaedrus*, quoted in Adriaan van der Weel, p. 72.

[36] Plato, *Phaedrus and the Seventh and Eighth Letters*, trans. and ed. Walter Hamilton (London: Penguin Books Limited, 1975), p. 97.

[37] Reading requires a greater heuristic effort than does listening. A speaker can modify his oral text in accordance to the cues provided by the hearer. David Olson has suggested that in primarily oral societies interpretation of spoken words is virtually absent; any meaning assigned to them is regarded as being given by the speaker. See his 'Interpreting Texts and Interpreting Nature: The Effects of Literacy', in *Visible Language*, vol. 20, no. 3, July 1986, pp. 302-17: 305-6. The author of the written work can only imagine the hermeneutic difficulties that his/her readers might face and decide whether to incorporate them or not.

the medium of communication, their readers should still imagine them as physically present.[38]

Habits of orality were thus slow in passing away and the primary means of introduction to textual culture was through their performance. Hence despite their written form, literary manuscripts were heavily reliant on oral/aural transmission, for not only were they frequently copied from dictation but scholarly 'publication' was often tantamount to being read aloud amongst a network of friends or associates. Orally performed and aurally received by a select semi-private coterie of connoisseurs or distributed extensively by scribal publishers[39] they would have relied on human memory for preservation and circulation. Early modern scribal culture furthered the formation of orally/aurally intimate communities (much like contemporary online communities that connect over shared interests) that were dependent on geographical, occupational, family or kinship bonds (as for instance between county neighbours, courtiers or officials, family or immediate relatives respectively) fostering a shared set of values and personal allegiances.

The persistence of the oral substrate in manuscript culture and its inherent links to an older pre-literate oral/aural world plausibly nurtured and strengthened its survival for at least another century. In particular, the study of spoken Latin and the art of discourse (*ars disserendi*) with its stress on *copia* (which Erasmus would define as the ability to express meaning in different ways), rhetorical invention, verbal delivery (*actio*), memory, and the dialectical jousts or extempore disputations that formed the basis of grammar school pedagogy sustained the early modern or(atoric)al frame of mind. The oral environment was so pervasive that no writing would have occurred that was not vocalised, which was not geared to meet the expectations of the listening audience. The close conflation between orality and textuality argues against any clear-cut transition from oral to manuscript or literate culture in favour of an intermediary rhetorical communicative culture. Rhetoric as the art governing oral delivery paradoxically emerged only with the appearance of writing.

---

[38] Leah S. Marcus, 'From Oral Delivery to Print in the Speeches of Elizabeth I', in *Print, Manuscript, & Performance*, ed. Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000), pp. 33-48: 34.

[39] Although scribal publication operated at relatively low volumes, in small increments, and under restrictive conditions yet it was able to bring them to the notice of a considerable number of readers. Scribal publishing involved the relinquishing of control and responsibility (though not necessarily by the author) to a literary executor (maybe friend or patron) over the future social use of a text and making it available for the public realm. Thus individual control was replaced by the control of a community, marking a status midway between private and public. A piece of private writing was thought unfit to be exposed to public view until it had reached a state of finish in terms of style, finesse, or discourse.

> Rhetorical culture is basically oral culture shrouded in writing. It is an oral culture whose institutions (in the sociological sense of this term, ways of doing things, patterns of behaviour) have been codified, put into manuals, made the object of reflection and of reflective training, and thus both artificially sustained and reinforced by writing – the very instrument which was ultimately to make these institutions obsolete.[40]

This culture was implicated in the strain between two competing systems of thought, the older, pre-literate, oral world that viewed language as a dialectical instrument of persuasion and vocal exchange; and the emerging visual yet silent (print) world preoccupied with space that would gradually come to treat language (especially its written form) as an unspoken and visual occurrence, a medium of individual contemplation and isolated intellectual activity relatively uninvolved with communication.

> Printing made the location of words on a page the same in every copy of a particular edition, giving a text a fixed home in space impossible to imagine effectively in a pretypographical culture. Printing thus heightened the value of the visual imagination and the visual memory over the auditory imagination and the auditory memory...[41]

The profound revolutions in thought and language in the first few decades of the seventeenth century would ultimately lead towards the Cartesian logic of personal inquiry and silent cerebration with its emphasis on the art of thinking. The decline and obliteration of an oral or voice-based rhetorical culture into one visually and cognitively centred on print was not really a smooth one. Oral presentations derived authority from the presence of the speaking voice and the intimate relationships sustained between writer and his semiprivate gathering of listeners (recreating a sense of the extended 'kinship' family). Print on the other hand was much more depersonalised with texts being disseminated to a readership that extended beyond the writer's immediate ken and control. In his landmark 1936 essay 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility', Walter Benjamin spoke on similar lines by stating that the manuscript codex possessed an intimacy, presence, and 'aura' that was lacking in the depersonalised form of the printed book.[42]

The abundant personal care and meticulous labour that went into the making of a handwritten copy generally made early modern literary cognoscenti more inclined to use

---

[40] Walter J. Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), p. 261.

[41] Ong, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology*, p. 167.

[42] Benjamin, 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility'.

the socially 'prestigious' manuscript mode to distribute and publish works of scholarly interest (which included not only lyric poetry and music, but scientific, antiquarian, and philosophical writings as well) despite their wariness of the written word.[43] Many may also have shirked from the implicit associations between printed literature and the growing middle class clientele it catered to. Consequently scribal transmission maintained its own integrity and exclusivity even under the onslaught of the first modern system of mass (re)production and communication ushered in by the introduction of moveable metal type: invariably the two mediums were used concurrently in a complementary manner. For instance early printed books could hardly be distinguished from the manuscripts[44] that they were intended to replace and dedicated bibliophiles often hired scribes to turn printed texts into beautifully decorated manuscripts before adding it to their personal collections. Printing paradoxically provided a radical stimulation to write, instead of signalling the demise of handwritten texts. In the almost nostalgic effort to ease the transition from chirographical to mechanical production of books, individual owners of printed books often annotated them by hand thereby preserving collaborative features of the earlier oral, scribal culture. Despite the claims of authority and reach provided by print, many writers continued to supplement their verse and prose narratives with framing narratorial conventions that augmented its links to a passing (upper-class) ideal of aurality and performativity.

---

[43] The three main modes of scribal publication, according to Harold Love, were author publication (when production and distribution took place under the author's directions), entrepreneurial publication (copying of manuscripts for sale by agents other than the author), and user publication (non-commercial replication for personal use). The first method (which was to be appropriated by Jonson) was generally used by writers from the gentry or aristocracy when only a few copies were involved. The presence of signed dedications and epistles addressed to particular persons or passages and corrections in the author's hand were some of the important features for distinguishing it from the two other modes. Communication of manuscripts became a widespread practice in the early seventeenth century (and continued at least throughout the reign of Charles II), not only for gentlemen poets but also for the lowly born poetic aspirants for whom the printing press was an equally viable mode of self-advertisement. See Love, *Culture and Commerce of Texts,* pp. 46-53.

[44] Early printers sought to imitate the form of the manuscript by printing on vellum or parchment, they copied the layout of marginated manuscripts, and used typefaces (such as black letter type) that imitated local scribal handwriting. Hence early printing houses cut their letters in *textus quadratus*, employing a style of lettering already in use in pre-print England for both ecclesiastical and commercial postings. Printing shops still required the services of a skilled penman or 'printer's scribe' who made manuscript corrections on printed sheets in addition to book-binders or calligraphers. In their turn scribes were often connected with a small circle of booksellers who published engraved copy-books, maps, and prints to wealthy collectors. In the endeavour to make early printed books resemble high quality manuscripts they were often sent to the illuminator or rubricator to achieve a finished professional look. Thus early printers left a space where the illuminator could insert elaborate initial letters and illustrations to printed books. Sometimes they printed a small guide letter (also known as director) in the blank space, telling the illuminator which letter to insert. Early printed books began with the first page of text and finished in the same way as manuscripts, with a colophon (a brief description at the end of a manuscript that contained the name of the printer, the date and other additional information).

The intricate convergences of communication technologies were displayed in their most acute form in the newly popular forms of commercial theatrical performance, which as an institutionalised form of spectacle marked the conjunction of spoken (dialogic) and the written (textual) word as actors declaimed lines or dialogues that the playwright had written, before an audience comprising both the literate and the non-literate. Likewise printed play-texts circulated at the fluid margins of oral, manuscript, and print cultures,[45] holding within its covers words surrounded by the strange apparatus of act and scene directions, stage instructions, dramatis personae, speech prefixes, frontispieces, title pages, and artificially disciplined by the rule of type that belied the pace and movement of the acted play. Such additions that accompanied the textual narrative tried to play on the oral, aural or even visual possibilities of the composition, inviting the reader to see and hear the text. In addition typographical markers opened up a new kind of textual or performative space where the grain of the actor's voice, the shape of his posture, the suddenness of his movements, and the bite of his articulation were transferred onto the silence of print, a site where drama was silently vocalised.

In 1591 Thomas Nashe ruminated on the relation between stage and page in the preface to Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*, comparing the poem to a 'paper stage' that invites the reader to cast his/her 'curious eyes, while the tragicommody of loue is performed by starlight':[46] literally a drama staged in ink. For many the transition may have been less than happy. Thus John Marston for instance rued in his address to the reader of *The Malcontent* (1604) that it was his 'custome to speake as I thinke, and to write as I speake', complaining that 'Scaenes invented, merely to be spoken, should be inforcively published to be read', and asks 'that the vnhansome shape which this trifle in reading presents may be pardoned, for the pleasure it once afforded you, when it was presented with the soule of lively action.'[47]

The dominant mode of textual reception still called for a listening ear and the radical divorce between writer (speaker) and reader was yet to be fully formalised. Consequently literary productions such as those of Jonson for instance played simultaneously on the oral and written nature of the text: exhorting and rhetorically addressing the 'listener'

---

[45] 'In the theater, play texts regularly passed from authorial manuscript (by way of revisions and censorship) to oral performance, to further revisions (often by writers other than the original authors), to (authorized or unauthorized) print version(s), or, in a case like Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess*, to manuscript circulation.' See Marotti and Bristol, *Print, Manuscript, & Performance*, p. 6.

[46] As quoted by Rachel Willie, 'Viewing the Paper Stage: Civil War, Print, Theater and the Public Sphere', in Vanhaelen and Ward, pp. 54-75: 59.

[47] As quoted by Donald Francis McKenzie, 'Speech-Manuscript-Print', in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays/D. F. McKenzie*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), p. 240.

evoking an intimate and shared performative world and at the same time encouraging the 'reader' to separate himself/herself from the voice of the text to judge individually, thereby deemphasising its singular and abstract nature. The circulation and commoditisation of the printed page within a nascent market also made it an important medium of disseminating ideas and public making, ensuring its survival in audience memory. Printed texts such as those of Jonson's quartos or his *Workes* were thus implicated in the ambiguous and liminal transgression of the chequered worlds of the private yet communally experienced oral/aural world of the aristocratic coterie and the public yet individually experienced, visually oriented middle class print marketplace. The intersection of these printed editions with changing publication modalities (that has formed the subject-matter of this section) rehearses many of the same questions regarding the anxiety and optimism centring on early modern privacy and identity.

<div align="center">

III

From 'Play' to 'Work'

</div>

The concerns traced in the previous section may seem at first sight unconnected to Jonson's negotiation of public and private boundaries in life and art, yet are essential to ground any discussion on the playwright's later entrepreneurial career. My decision to write this chapter was based on the rationale that any narrative about Jonson's fictional rogue-artists can only expand in scope (and not detract from its aim) by looking at Jonson's own career not as dramatist *per se* but as shrewd author-editor where his possibility for exercising creative agency was maximum. This sub-section advances the ideas of the preceding two sections (which has drawn upon the emergent area of book history) to show Jonson's engagement with both the positive and negative dimensions of privacy in his printed output.

On one hand he shows his esteem for the private life of creative contemplation in the creation of a complex sub-cultural 'intimate-public' autonomous space of shared interests (through the use of paratextual devices) that is complemented by the detached creative virtuosity of Jonson. This fraternal (under)world as it were mediates between the nostalgic 'presence' reminiscent of scribal coterie communities and the radically new isolated and depersonalised world of commercial print. Yet any such celebration of the 'good' private life is circumscribed by the fear that all this is nothing more than prudent role-playing used to serve the personal self-interest of a playwright

anxious for material gain and theatrical fame (like his fictional personas). It is reasonable to believe that these textually marginal elements are what ultimately enabled him to create the aura of the so-called Jonsonian literary brand.

Jonson's later career as author-editor is eminently interesting because it foreshadows (and complicates) a trend that was to become increasingly prevalent: a movement away from patronage-driven non-profit economy towards a market-driven revenue-yielding business model (that was afflicting most service relations during this era; Mosca, Face, and the Smithfield community of petty cozeners are all vulnerable to such shifts). If his plays reveal a fascination with the power of commodities over social relations, Jonson was also canny enough to realise that literary artefacts might also use the physical economy of goods and services to disseminate their aesthetic content. It is no coincidence that his rogues are both shrewd businessmen and fine aestheticians. Equating intellectual labour with private property and ownership, Jonson incidentally was not the first English dramatist to call his plays 'works' or to publish them under that rubric.[48]

Still if his play quartos and folio have been acclaimed as breaking new ground and changing the nature of dramatic authorship, printed drama or book culture in seventeenth-century England, then the credit undoubtedly goes to Jonson's superior marketing expertise. His success at publicising himself as an author of repute (by attaching his personality and ideology to his printed works) and commercial viability (by combatively differentiating his 'wares' from that of others in the marketplace)[49] was dependent upon the ability to harness the artistic and new commercial possibilities offered by the printed text. Like the trio of charlatans in *The Alchemist* Jonson's success at promoting an art that was considered inconsequential, dubious, and ultimately short-lived (alchemical) was dependent on clever advertising skills and pragmatic business models.

One effective practice of self-presentation used by Jonson was to impose the burden of the poor response his plays received on the lack of understanding in the audience or

---

[48] Before Jonson, several closet dramas were called works on their title page or by their author: *An Interlude of Minds* (1574) was advertised as 'A worke in Ryme', while *1 and 2 Promos and Cassandra* (1578) was marketed as 'the worke of George Whetstones Gent.' Similarly before the 1616 folio these following 'works' had already been published: George Gascoigne's *The Whole Works or the Pleasantest Works* (1587) which was a collection of four plays and Samuel Daniel's *The Works* (1601) containing the closet drama *Cleopatra* and the two-play collection, *1 and 2 A Satire of the Three Estates*, was reissued in 1604 as *The Workes of the Famous and Worthy Knight, Sir David Linsaie*. See Alan B. Farmer, 'Print Culture and Reading Practices', in Sanders, pp. 192-200:193-4.

[49] Despite the decline in literary patronage, the rise of literacy and the spurt in printing allowed for a choice among multitudes of new texts. The primary purpose of promoting books in such a context was to signal its existence and distinguish it from a field of similar objects. Jonson attacks less erudite popular authors and defines himself as more elite than them, but also implicitly tries, I feel, to make himself accessible to heterogeneous audiences despite his claims to the contrary. Devising a systematic way to appeal to his audience was one of the major tasks of his career.

on the poor quality of the performing players. Jonson overturned a play's adverse theatrical reception by promoting it to a reading audience. Marketers often sell goods appealing to a consumer's desire for material possession and affiliation with one set of peers and distinction from others, implying that their ownership of such products is a sign of social status. Thus in his 'Dedication to the Reader' in *The New Inn* (1631) proclaimed that 'if thou canst but spell, and ioyne my sense; there is more hope of then of a hundred fastidious impertinents, who were there on the first day…To dislike but marke nothing' (ll. 2-4). He was able to segment and shape his ill-defined market seemingly directing his plays to a niche readership recalling the tactic of his rogues temper their schemes in response to the kind of gull they cater to; appealing to and flattering their non-existent qualities in a bid to convince them of their need to own the object of their desires. It is this ability to assert (probably hypothetical) differences in terms of taste and interpretation between dim-witted theatregoers and the discerning reader (failure of knowledge implying a corresponding failure of manners) is what enabled Jonson to sell his products to a socially diverse public and makes one wonder at the qualitative likeness that binds the questionable though commercially shrewd strategies of both author and his fictional characters.

The stunning success of the three printed quarto editions of *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1600) in this regard was exemplary. They are a premature reminder of an emergent sense of subjective awareness in Jonson (that would culminate in the folio) especially the sense of agency that he must have felt in initiating, executing, and controlling the reception and interpretation of his works that was obviously impossible in the contemporary theatrical world. Jonson's act of literary 'making' may seem unexceptional were it not that for the Elizabethans, plays (often considered 'riffe raffes' or 'baggage bookes') were not considered literature in the sense that poetry was. So when Sir Thomas Bodley established the great library in 1612 he regarded plays as unworthy of serious attention or preservation. Playwrights had no legal right over what they had written (they were seldom named on quarto title-pages) and textual ownership was accorded to whoever paid the stationers' guild a sum of money for the work at hand.

In his first brush with the world of print, Jonson sold his copy of *Every Man Out* to a bookseller soon after it was performed to assert his continuing authority over the text even after the players had purchased a copy of it. He was able to garner public attention

by incorporating a number of bibliographic features that were novel in its own day. His typographically striking address to the reader on the title page:[50]

> *The Comicall Satyre of*
>
> Every Man
>
> Out of His
>
> Humor.
>
> *As It Was First Composed*
>
> by the Author B. I.
>
> *Containing more than hath been Publickely Spo-*
>
> *ken or Acted.*
>
> With the severall Character of every Person.

self-reflexively drew attention to the writer's role in composing the text (that set it apart from the authorial anonymity associated with the oral tradition),[51] granting the written text greater prestige and legitimacy over the one performed in 1599 by the Lord Chamberlain's Men (the rightful 'owners' of the play by existing standards) which goes predictably unmentioned. Most printed plays of the time tried to assert closeness to their stage counterparts in an attempt to garner credibility but several of Jonson's published scripts by contrast announced their distance from the theatre.

By taking his scripts directly to the print shop, he not only found a way of circumventing the actors and theatrical spectators, thereby reaching out to an expanded audience (appealing to 'readers over the heads of playhouse audiences')[52] yet cleverly promoted this move in terms of an author speaking in trust to his select coterie of 'understanding' readers. Authorship thus became a function of personal intentionality: a private and exclusive bond shared between author, text, and reader in the vast, undefined and impersonal space of the public marketplace. Incidentally the only other dramatist who had ever been called an author on the title page was the canonical Latin playwright Seneca who was famed for his closet dramas, implying not only Jonson's self-conscious placement of himself within the venerable classical tradition but also his preference for

---

[50] Title pages were an effective means of advertising books by displaying them in bookshops or hanging them out on posts, walls or pillars of St. Paul's: 'hau[ing] my title-lease on posts, or walls,/Or in cleft-stick' (*Epigram* III). Jonson's title page for *Every Man Out of His Humour* prioritised the printed 'composed' text over the performative one (played by the Lord Chamberlain's Men) by attaching his authorial mark on the former. He also ascribed more prestige to the written version by claiming that the play was printed 'AS IT WAS FIRST COMPOSED' and printed two endings to the play to reinforce his claim that it contained 'more than hath been Publickely Spoken or Acted.'

[51] Given the early modern aristocratic disdain for print, printed texts often tried to dissociate themselves from the author. Jonson's self-advertisement is thus strikingly different.

[52] Barish, *Antitheatrical Prejudice*, p. 136.

the privately read rather than the publicly acted play.[53] Further his highly unusual addition of Latin mottoes (Non aliena meo pressi pedi, 'I walked not where others trod', from Horace's *Epistle* 19*,* Book I) and names of the actors and elaborate descriptions of every character in the play,[54] were intended as narrative aids to the readers of the play, not its spectators.

Every Man Out also participates in an emergent typographical convention that was rapidly becoming a marker of plays aimed at the learned or scholarly reader: *sententiae* or vernacular commonplaces, signalled by inverted single or double commas at the beginning of each line or by a change in font, indicating that a passage was worth copying down.[55] In practice commonplace markers (as sophisticated information processing techniques) were products of a privatised reading culture. They could be added or removed and retained by authors, publishers, printers, translators or even readers who used jotting crosses, flowers, trefoils, astrological symbols, manicules (deriving from Latin *maniculum* meaning 'little hand', ☞pointing fists or fingers sometimes embellished with ornate sleeves and cuffs, underscoring the gestural role of the hand in finding and noting passages), straight lines or curly brackets to insert handwritten material into the text.

Such extra-textual markers and the pithy and apothegmatic phrases or longer speeches contained within them 'signalled communal ground',[56] invited noting down, memorisation, and sharing ('commonplaced' owing its etymological roots to Latin 'communis') by a community bound by shared reading practices. When inserted by Jonson they could project authorial subjectivity, reflecting his personal involvement or presence in the text. By introducing such bibliographic markers as a means of symbolising corporeal presence, Jonson complicates any simplistic demarcation between the written and spoken word that has been considered in the previous two sections. Thus Jonson's printed title page for *Every Man Out* comprises a set of verbal traces and echoes that still hint at its original status as an oral work ('*more than hath been Publickely*

---

[53] Such an impression was furthered by the use he made of a Latin motto adapted from Horace's *Epistles* and *Ars Poetica*: 'I did not follow in the footsteps of others/if you examine it up close,/it will strike you the more/and will continue to please after ten repeated viewings.'

[54] The main character Asper for instance was described as 'an ingenious and free spirit, eager and constant in reproof, without feare controuling the worlds abuses.'

[55] In their article, 'The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 59, 2008, pp. 371-420, Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass suggest that commonplace markers were used to place vernacular works in a distinguished literary tradition alongside their classical predecessors. *Sejanus* includes the highest number of (mid line) commonplace markers in the Jonsonian oeuvre.

[56] Margreta de Grazia, 'Shakespeare in Quotation Marks', in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare: Post-Renaissance Reconstructions of the Works and the Myth*, ed. Jean I. Marsden (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), pp. 57-71: 77, cited by Laura Estill, 'Commonplace Markers and Quotation Marks', *ArchBook*, March 2014. Stable URL: http://drc.usak.ca/projects/archbook/commonplace.php

Spoken or Acted'), even though it is the invisible writing pen ('*As It Was First Composed*') that inscribes and gives potency to the author's voice. The printed page served as a written manifesto of a conversational guarantee that Jonson used to construct an authoritative speaking position for himself. Moreover such paratextual elements would have helped in asserting his power over a new and slippery medium addressed to an anonymous faceless audience.

In his analysis of the Jonsonian folio as 'the first important English book systematically to exploit the symbolic potential of typography and the technicalities of print', Martin Butler says that,

> The plays are presented less as scripts for performance than as reading texts that bear comparison with classic Latin literature. Stage directions are removed; speeches are digested into columns, and entrances and exits into massed headings; accidentals are scrupulously treated, with the punctuation being systematic rather than idiomatic, capitalization being regularized, and spelling preserving some evidence of etymology.[57]

Such an impression is inevitably strengthened by a number of features that indicate that the folio play-texts were directed primarily towards a reading audience. They include the use of standardised typography, italicised, and occasionally black-lettered[58] technical terms or foreign words (e.g. 'Ulen Spiegel' in *The Alchemist* and 'landtschap' in *The Masque of Blackness*), foregrounding of rare Latinate words, consolidation of blank verse into single columns, minimum stage directions, marking of new scenes with the entry of new characters, and massed headers listing all the significant characters present onstage or about to appear. The lack of any precedent, past or present, by way of publishing history might have induced Jonson to follow the principles of classical Greek and Roman authors, whose plays were closely read and performed as part of school and university pedagogy, in order to work out scene divisions. Despite Butler's observation which is primarily based on the folio, echoes of an evident and self-conscious theatricality in the Jonsonian printed text can still be found in the manner in which performance markers were added, elaborated, and shifted to a more prominent marginal position: either as

---

[57] Martin Butler, 'Jonson's Folio and the Politics of Patronage', *Criticism*, vol. 35, no. 3, 1993, pp. 377-90: 378.

[58] The persistence of black letter type in cultural productions well into the seventeenth century has been interpreted by modern scholars as either a kind of social discriminant that underscored its validity as a cheap form of entertainment for the lower orders or as a nostalgic reference to a traditional English past. See in this regard Charles C. Mish, 'Black Letter as a Social Discriminant', *PMLA*, vol. 68, 1953, pp. 627-30: 630 and Zachary Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia: Playreading, Popularity and the Meanings of Black Letter', in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), pp. 99-126: 107.

'bracketed insertions between lines of text and printed in an italic typeface to distinguish them from the rest of the surrounding dialogue'; or, printed as marginal annotations which, 'without distracting attention from the main columns of text, add necessary glosses about characters' movements, stage business and, occasionally appearance.'[59]

The visual and the gestural may be sectored but it is not entirely eliminated, 'the page is made both more articulate and self-sufficient; the theater, on the other hand, returns as a referent.'[60] Hence unlike its quarto edition the folio text of *Every Man Out of His Humour* re-established its relation to the theatrical context by stating that it was 'Acted in the yeere 1599. By the then Lord Chamberlaine *his Seruants.*' Nor was this peculiar to *Every Man Out*, for all the individual title pages of the folio similarly acknowledge when and by which company the dramas were originally staged, and after each play Jonson listed the specific actors who performed in it. The note that accompanies the characters' entrance in the folio version of *The Alchemist* (III.v.) reads, '*Subtle disguised like a Priestof Fairy*'; or later in the scene at l. 24 the comment beside Face's instruction, 'If you have a ring about you, cast it off', reads, '*He* [Dapper] *throwes away as they bid him.*'[61] Theatre's peculiar mediation of both oral and literate media would have had special relevance for a playwright who was concerned to raise the status of contemporary drama from popular entertainment to respectable literature. Jonson's accommodation of oral performative art into the new medium of print shows how predominantly oral works materialising in written form cannot escape their dialogical implication within a (speech) community.

Thus inventive typography mimics symbolic dramatic effects as in the use of double-columns to indicate characters speaking simultaneously in *The Alchemist*; blank spaces signalling the drawing of straws in the Induction to *Cynthia's Revels* or the use of typographical emphasis to distinguish set-pieces as in Volpone's mountebank speech or Tiberius's letter to Sejanus. Parentheses are used to signal asides or whole passages of dialogue spoken in hushed tones and marks of elision are frequent. Asterisks within the dialogue in *The Sad Shepherd* give precise indications as to where Robin is to kiss Marian, just as in smoking sequences in *Every Man in His Humour* and the Induction to *Cynthia's Revels*, dashes in the text of the dialogue show where the actors are to puff on their pipes. The rhythmic tempo of scenes that involve rapid, cross-fire talking is preserved in both the folio and the quartos through intact verse lines (instead of breaking them to aid the

[59] Cave, 'Script and Performance', p. 23.
[60] Joseph Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 182-3.
[61] Cave, 'Script and Performance', p. 23. For all subsequent 'textual-performative' instances I remain indebted to Cave's article.

reader) and by distinguishing the speakers' names within a given line by the use of a different typeface (Roman capitals).[62]

Jonson's understanding of pointing practices was derived from Ramus, whose work also provided the model for his *English Grammar* (published in 1640). Humanist techniques of punctuation (which also introduced new marks such as the semi-colon, the question mark, parentheses, and the exclamation point) were used not only for logically marking textual propositions but also in aiding rhetorical delivery and for hermeneutic analysis. The satirical epigram entitled 'To Groome Ideot' shows the correspondence Jonson established between good reading, listening, and comprehension of punctuation:

> Ideot, last night, I prayd thee but forbeare
>
> To read my verses; now I must to heare:
>
> For offring, with thy smiles, my wit to grace,
>
> Thy ignorance still laughs in the wrong place.
>
> And so my sharpnesse thou no lesse dis-ioynts,
>
> Then thou didst late my sense, loosing my points.
>
> So haue I seene at CHRIST-masse sports one lost,
>
> And, hoodwinkd, for a man, embrace a post.
>
> ('To Groome-Ideot', *Epigram* LVIII)

Apart from creating verbal or theatrical effects on the printed page, they also aid in dramatising the authorial speaking voice. Inventive typography helps to assert the perpetuity of the writer's presence even in the obvious fact of his/her absence, introducing as Sara van den Berg asserts, the illusion of 'the time of speech' and 'the time of thought' into written language, 'marking the author's personal idea – its nuances, emphases, and motion.'[63]

A series of intricate visual effects are also borne out by the marginal annotations in *The Sad Shepherd* (III.iv.43-9) where the stage direction states what would not have been apparent through the dialogue alone: 'Enter *Maudl[in]*: like *Marian*. *Maudl*: espying *Robin-Hood* would run out, but he staies her by the Girdle, and runs in with her. He returns with the Girdle broken, and shee in her own shape.'[64] These glosses help to recreate an impression of the performed actions within the silent world of the printed page. The marginal commentaries do not necessarily detract from the textual process, but situated at just the periphery of the reading eye illuminates the main text and assists in its appraisal.

---

[62] Cave, 'Script and Performance', p. 24.

[63] Sara van den Berg, 'Marking his Place: Ben Jonson's Punctuation', *EMLS*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1995, pp. 1-25: 24. Stable URL: http://purl.oclc.org/emls/01-3/bergjons.html

[64] Cave, 'Script and Performance', p. 23.

Likewise Jonson's marginal notes prevent the reader's eye from running horizontally with the flow of dialogue; thus the *Sejanus* quarto (1605, which makes the most sustained use of marginal commentary) creates an impression of double-column printing which aims to restore the experience of the playing-performance.[65]

The quarto pamphlet editions of *Every Man Out* were widely available and the preferred low-cost medium for a new generation of writers-for-pay. Too small and thin to warrant being bound on their own (sometimes they were crudely stapled or 'stab-stitched'), the popularity of these small, cheap, and 'semianonymous, rarely respected by-products of the Elizabethan entertainment industry',[66] depended on their vulgar and short-lived status in the market; distributed in alehouses, hung on bushes, or hawked at street corners along with almanacs, calendars, jest books, news periodicals, and cony-catching pamphlets. They catered to a vast popular (and apparently frivolous) readership for leisure comprising both of emerging middle classes such as tradesmen, artisans, apprentices, yeomen, clergymen, and craftsmen (many of whose experience with the text may have been predominantly aural) as well as elite aristocrats though demarcations were still indistinct.[67] Moreover once printed the quarto text became part of an anonymous proto-capitalist exchange system where they assumed an agency of their own, independent of their authors. Unwilling to be linked with a lowly form such as the quarto and in a bid to more convincingly controlling and authorising his plays' theatrical afterlives Jonson turned to the folio format that was generally reserved for more serious literary pursuits. His didactic purpose in writing plays was also likelier to conform to the practical, utilitarian reading practices (the so-called humanist 'notebook method' which treated texts as bundles of fragments which could be collected and catalogued by readers or writers) associated with the folio.

The 1616 folio (F1) was a calf-bound typographically opulent volume (with more than 1000 pages) that methodically gathered, arranged, and displayed all his diverse literary writings (9 plays from the professional stage, 18 court masques and entertainments, and 148 poems) under the intentionally evocative classical title (recalling the *opera* of classical authors such as Virgil, Cicero, and Ovid) of *THE WORKES of Beniamin Jonson*:[68] an

---

[65] See William W. E. Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001), p. 32, n. 22.

[66] Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates*, p. 151.

[67] See Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 91.

[68] The engraved title-page with its title 'Workes' written in large-size capital letters and surrounded by dramatic amount of white space gives it a prominence that sets it apart from comparable volumes published in the same period. The central cartouche is flanked by the figures of 'TRAGOEDIA' and

instance of subjectivity constituted through and represented by a collection of textual ephemera. Printed in two issues (one on luxury large-paper stock and the other on regular paper stock)[69] by William Stansby (working in close partnership with the bookseller Richard Meighen whose shop was on the Strand), the 1616 folio was a lavish edition and the longest English book ever to have included professional stage plays. Jonson is apparently supposed to have taken meticulous even over-fastidious care to ensure that his book was properly produced; proofreading and carefully correcting typographical and textual errors 'at the printing-office/where he would present himself for this purpose every morning.'[70]

Bound and preserved for posterity the folio format ensured both permanence as well as authority. As a large, unwieldy, and expensive medium requiring ample space (presupposing its placing in libraries or on reading lecterns) within which it could be laid out flat to be read, it was destined to cater to the exclusive private scholarly reading of rich aristocrats and the upper class clientele. The novelty of the folio lay in Jonson's redefinition of the form as a kind of cloistered refuge for personal fame in a bid to protect his work against readerly whimsicality, the scrum of commercial theatre, and the deformation of ephemeral quarto copies that got lost, mangled, or fragmented in circulation.[71] However an over-zealous emphasis on Jonson's editorial commitments and the resultant (antitheatrical) folio fixation in traditional Jonsonian scholarship sometimes tends to obscure the fact that the textual history of Jonson's quartos and folio also evinces a persistent adherence to the oral/aural culture of scribal performance.

'COMOEDIA' as the genres sanctioned by Aristotle, and is surrounded by representations of ancient theatres including amphitheatres and a Roman coliseum. The frontispiece also situates them within a time-honoured classical tradition: 'The presence of the obelisks, which are monuments, and the laurels, the traditional crown of the poet, is surely to signify the author's desire that the folio may bring him a poet's immortality. The pictures of the ancient theatre and the sentences from Horace proclaim the allegiance to the revered models and precepts of the classical drama and classical poetry by which his works, too learned for the vulgar, have deserved eternal fame.' See Margery Corbett and Ronald Lightbown, *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-Page in England 1550-1660* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), p. 150.

[69] Paper was a relatively expensive commodity; hence the generous layout of the pages, with their wide margins and ample space is indicative of the quality and cost of the folio. The Puritan pamphleteer William Prynne had complained in 1633 of the lack of decorum involved in having the Shakespearean Second Folio printed on fine paper of the highest quality. Jonson's use of superior grade paper thus sheds light on the kind of cultural status that he perceived the folio to have. More recently D. F. McKenzie and Jerome McGann have harped upon the material form of texts arguing that, 'the material form of books, the non-verbal elements of the typographic notations within them, the very disposition of space itself, have an expressive function in conveying meaning' and 'such matters as ink, typeface, paper, and various other phenomena which are crucial to the understanding of textuality.' See D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 17; and Jerome J. McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 13 respectively.

[70] See *Works*, vol. IX, p. 72.

[71] The quarto was not intended to last forever. After reading, the top and bottom leaf got dirty and torn and the string broke, subsequently it disintegrated and was soon disposed.

Unmindful of the porous boundaries between them, modern scholarship has often imagined scribal and print cultures to be firmly pitted against each other, with the former's non-commercial purity constantly under threat from the 'colonising' and mercantile activities of the latter. Jonson's success at handling his speculative publishing agenda relied on his shrewd ability to mediate between the scholarly disposition of the traditional learned elite and the pragmatic social aspirations and mercantile interests of an evolving middle class readership. The movement between quarto and folio is a display of skill at building a novel system of reputation that was based both upon the ability to move between and transcend old and new modes of literary dissemination systems. Jonson exploited the ability of print to both publicise and privatise at the same time. He thus moderated the anxiety (if not the sheer disgrace) of the author's public exposure in a mass medium by capitalising on print's potential to foster a sense of an intimate public community (reminiscent of the scribal coterie groups) formed between author and reader(s) through the act of solitary reflective reading.

Print, theatre, and scribal publication represented three distinct strategies for aspiring authors and constituted three intertwined literary sub-cultures. The uncertain and fragile nature of bibliophilic patronage[72] which sustained manuscript culture, perpetually subject to the political fortunes and misfortunes of aristocratic benefactors and the ephemerality of public reputations, necessitated a movement towards the vulgar entrepreneurial world of print culture. The Renaissance squeamishness about print stemmed from its promiscuous availability to readers at many social levels that made it seem corrosive of the social hierarchy. As a medium prone to alarmingly quick reproduction and unbridled dissemination, print promoted mobility, not just physical but intellectual that induced anxieties in a deeply traditional society.[73] Given the theatre and the print medium's association with the cheap and the commercial, Jonson used supplementary material taken over from manuscript culture to grant his printed play-texts the additional resonance, status, credit, and authority that they otherwise would have lacked.

Jonson's overarching authorial identity can be said to owe as much to the handwritten worlds of early modern England as it did to the printing press. Two of Jonson's poems *Epigram* XXIII ('To John Donne') and *Epigram* XCIV ('To Lucy, Countess of Bedford,

---

[72] Aristocratic patronage remained a viable necessity for writers including dramatists (despite their growing economic independence) well up to the 1630s.

[73] However the publication of James I's *Works* in 1616 legitimised to some extent the use of print as a medium of self-expression and began to remove the stigma of professionalism associated with book publication. Sara van den Berg, 'Ben Jonson and the Ideology of Authorship', in *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*, ed. Jennifer Brady and W. H. Herendeen (Newark, N. J.: University of Delaware Press, 1991, pp. 111-37: 116-17.

with Mr Donne's Satires') present themselves as coterie texts, intended for perusal amongst an exclusive literary and social circle. Both poems are marked by a sense of shared intimacy and a levelling of social distinctions, imagining them as objects to be read and circulated in a private network of exchange. Often the presence of extant holograph copies of poems sent out to friends and patrons or textual variations, adaptations, and extensions in numerous copies of the same poem (such as the 'Cock Lorell' ballad that exists in 29 different manuscripts) prove that they were transmitted in manuscript before being revised for publication.[74] Although Jonson's plays seem to have been exclusively disseminated through print, the most extensive evidence for scribal publication of a dramatic work is *The Gypsies Metamorphosed* (1621) which existed in not less than five completely different manuscript copies (which rivals Middleton's *A Game at Chess*, 1624, that too exists in five extant manuscript versions). Jonson's gift of a personally inscribed, gilt-stamped copy of *Cynthia's Revels* (1601) to Lucy, Countess of Bedford requesting her favour suggests again his understanding of the delicately balanced relationship between poet and patron.[75]

Although no match to Donne, the most extensive scribal poet in seventeenth-century England, Jonson's work continued to circulate privately in manuscript form and he drew upon the social and literary conditions of a still vibrant scribal culture even as he made forays in the new forum of print publication.[76] Thus the security and shared friendships of the old coterie audience are replaced by a new coterie of publishers, printers, and paying readers. Long after 1616 Jonson would seem to revert to older constructions of authorial identity legitimated by patrons and scribal communities, constructing himself as a self-styled neoconservative patriarch to his adoring literary sons[77] until his death. Only twelve masques were printed as quartos, the rest were read in manuscript and copied for spectators who wished to explore the words and the design at greater leisure than the

---

[74] Peter Beal's monumental census of English manuscripts has discovered approximately 700 scribal and holograph copies of texts by Jonson written till 1700. See *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, vol. 1: 1450-1625 and vol. 2: 1625-1700, ed. Peter Beal (London, 1988-93). Some poems that circulated in manuscript were never printed in his lifetime. Jonson's attack on Inigo Jones, the principal stage-designer of Jacobean court masques, which forms the subject-matter of three poems never went into print though they were scribally published.

[75] The Newcastle, Rawlinson, and Harley MSS provide evidence that copies of small batches of poems were dispatched from time to time as gifts to influential patrons and friends.

[76] One of the earliest examples of Jonson's alertness to the possibilities of scribal publication was the circulation of the manuscript text for the entertainment called *An Entertainment at Theobalds* (1607). Performed before King James I, it was written to mark the occasion of the transfer of 'Theobalds', a magnificent house in Hertfordshire belonging to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury to the monarch.

[77] The Tribe of Ben, an all-male literary coterie comprised of Jonson and his younger admirers which included Richard Brome, Thomas Carew, Lucius Cary, William Cartwright, William Cavendish, Kenelm Digby, Thomas Killigrew, Richard Lovelace, John Suckling, and Edmund Waller among others.

actual performance may have allowed. His use of italic scripts in the manuscript of *Hymenaei* (1606) evoked classical and humanist forms, just as its miniscule size embodied the intense labour that went into the making of the project: very often such 'creative' acts were intended to grant authority to the performance and its print publication.

These different print and manuscript versions of the same Jonsonian text compel an understanding of a writer who was smart enough to exploit the strengths offered by each medium as circumstance and audience demanded. These opportunist tactics seem inherently similar to that of the 'falconer', a criminal-cum-scholar type who took advantage of both patronage and market-based literary systems. This rogue gets an old book printed at his own cost and affixes an epistle dedicatory to the book before presenting it to some prospective gentlemanly patron and is handsomely paid (usually forty shillings by the standards of the era) for it. By the time the gentleman suspects that he has been cozened neither the book nor the falconer can any longer be traced in the myriad printing houses in London. The falconer's cleverness lay in his ability to harvest the greatest possible profit from two concurrently existing authorial modes in the market.[78] Despite the transfers in mediums and modalities Jonson is able to circumvent the limitations of the printed book, creating a plurality of texts within one hand-held text, a unique cohabitation of both printed and performance text on the same sheet of paper.

As the above discussion substantiates, Jonson's play-texts whether quarto or folio are framed by elaborate paratextual materials, often in Latin and Greek, sometimes spilling into the main text compartment. My interest in Jonsonian marginalia[79] lies in its potential to stage the convergences and disruptions of both old and new technological mediums and subjectivities in one single space. As a material and aesthetic feature of manuscript production that can be traced to the twelfth century, marginalia (prefatory material, epistles, rubrication, graphic illustrations including doodles, author's signature, title page or headings) were visual reference points that played a vital part in performing meaning and determining the nature of the reading experience: supplying translations, rhetorical

---

[78] Laurie Ellinghausen, 'Black Acts: Textual Labor and Commercial Deceit in Dekker's Lantern and Candlelight', in Dionne and Mentz, pp. 294-311: 294. See also Chapter III, n. 142 of this dissertation. As a narrative of literary and social advancement the 1616 folio likewise crisscrosses the diverse worlds of commercial theatre and of courtly and aristocratic patronage.

[79] With literary history increasingly becoming a part of book history, so the study of authorship and aesthetics has been dominated by a study of the social and material experience of print. Judged from this viewpoint the visual experience of the printed page is as much a bearer of literary meaning as the text itself and the volume as an object carries as much social weight as the reputation of the writer. See Seth Lerer, 'Books and Readers in the Long Fifteenth Century', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 70, 2007, pp. 453-60.

glosses, preemptions,[80] parodies, explications or simplifications on the centred text. Marginalia signified oral disquisition upon the material contained on the page: a site where the physical act of writing was bound up with the cognitive act of memorisation. In earlier eras such textual paraphernalia may have served both to reinforce textual authority (e.g. citations and annotations from church fathers in canonical religious texts) as well as to undermine it (e.g. scatological obscenities and scurrilous illustrations in the margins). Similarly the main text and sub-text arranged on two different axes represent two facets of Jonson's authorial identity: public playwright and reclusive private author respectively. The less than happy compromises he made on the Jacobean stage are more than complemented by the contingent freedom he may have experienced on the *mise en scène* of printed page. In the manuscript codex (that replaced the book as 'roll' around 400 A. D.) the vertical and hierarchical display of textual information was undercut by marginalia (sometimes written in a different hand, crowded into a corner) which encouraged a tangential democratic reading experience. Yet in Jonson such democratised reading that recalls a world of shared interests and collective memory is perpetually undercut by the realisation that textual meaning can only be a private function of authorial intentionality. Thus the essence of Jonson's self can only be grasped in this constant dialectic between public performance and private meaning.

The margins of a Jonsonian quarto or folio then provided for the confluence of the oral, manuscript, and print cultures, markers of what Harold Love would call a chirographic space: 'an intermediate stage between oral and typographical transmission in which the values of orality – and the fact of presence – are still strongly felt.'[81] Notwithstanding their literary disregard in modern scholarship, early modern paratexts existed as textual events in their own right (constituting a series of texts between title page and dramatic text which are extraneous to the theatrical experience): the first site of encounter between author, text, and audience (though stationers and translators also used such prefatory mediums). Drama is essentially marked by the concealment of the author from public view, where fictional characters confront the audience directly, acting as theatrical intermediaries. Paratexts thus created a public forum where the author's private

---

[80] This referred to the practice of filling up marginal blank spaces so as to prevent the insertion of unauthorised, handwritten text. See Slights, *Managing Readers*, p. 26. Renaissance readers were encouraged to use blank spaces in printed books for their manuscript notes. It also stimulated a phenomenal spurt in the sale of blank books and almanacs with interleaved blank pages which provided space for the reader's activities as a writer.

[81] See Love, *Culture and Commerce of Texts,* p. 142.

voice was able to confront his intended audience directly, establishing his credibility outside the theatre.

Marginalia also rehearse Jonson's problematic negotiation between a private realm of creative contemplation and a public realm of consumption and performativity. On one hand they are a means of public self-fashioning and aggressive advertisement that recall the material insignias (heraldic signs, stamps, watermarks etc.) of an earlier period used for denoting physical ownership, authorship, or origin. Alternatively they are also sites of a private camaraderie designed to give manuscript-like proximity of access to the author. When Genette refers to marginalia as 'thresholds of textuality',[82] he draws upon the widely prevalent metaphorical understanding of extra-textual elements as doors and windows that permit entry into the interior spaces of the text. In such a reading the text is imagined as a solid and otherwise impenetrable vault, whose edifying and ethically enlightening content can only be accessed via the marginal (extra-textual) 'keys' offered by the author.

Marginalia are thus secluded interactive spaces and comfort zones (analogous to a kind of textual heterotopia) at the cloistered margins of the main text where hierarchies are dismantled as the author uses rhetorical, oratorical, and epistolary strategies to commune freely with his selected coterie of (real or imagined) intelligent and attentive listeners: providing helpful distinctions, translations, interpretations or engaging the reader in a lively debate with the centred text.[83] Such material could summarise the action of the play, help the readers to keep track of the characters, answer or anticipate criticisms from readers, and explain controversial aspects of the play or its performance history.[84] The controlled use of such sophisticated literary perspectival shifts conducted the readers through a series of perceptions and standpoints (evocative of changing viewer-image relationships that characterised the Baroque in general), producing a re-

---

[82] Genette, *Paratext: Threshold of Textuality.*

[83] Although the marginalia can develop in situations where the discrepancy in levels of knowledge between reader and author is not marked (as in the informally amiable information sharing among antiquarians or men of law), yet there are also situations where the discrepancy in the levels of knowledge is especially conspicuous. Such a condition obtains in didactic texts that were meant for moral instruction, teaching in this case implying a flow of information or opinion from a person of superior skill or knowledge to an inferior. Such a model of hortatory or admonitory, even chastising or hectoring marginal commentary is of special relevance to understand Jonson's relation with his reader, given that he considered moral instruction to be the 'best reason of liuing'. See Epistle to *Volpone*, l. 109. Given the depths of the humanist scholia that inundate Jonsonian texts such as *Sejanus*, they would have been beyond the reach of any abecedarian reader. Jonson's negotiations with his audience moved between the calmly clarifying (addressed to impress the discerning listener) to the harshly disapproving (directed towards disarming the vulgar 'fooles' and 'apes' who find dangerous meanings in every textual conceit) as he tried to manage recalcitrant or inept readers. In any case such voices help to destroy the fiction of the silent and detached reader.

[84] Farmer, 'Print Culture and Reading Practices', in Sanders, p. 197.

conceptualisation of the difference between private and public experience. Yet they could also be frustratingly labyrinthian serving to lead the injudicious reader out of the text rather than into it. Thus even as Jonson reaches out to an ideal audience (who in reality would be his social superiors) in a spirit of bonhomie he is careful to screen himself from the uncouth public reader. He used the same framing devices though to slight the ignorant reader for his paucity of taste and judgement, implicitly serving to foreground the understanding skills of the cognisant reader as against the vulgar, the ill-informed, and the credulous. Marginalia are thus proprietary marks or copyright safeguards that established Jonson's authorial possession over the text;[85] embedded instructions for controlling textual reception by a hyper-critical audience.

Like his own dramatic career and that of his fictional rogue-artists' the narrative of Jonson's publishing vocation is constituted by the uneasy dialectic between self-presentation and self-concealment: flanked by quarto and folio, anonymous crowds and private circles or in the movements between theatre and print shop, dining hall or study. The marginalia's unique mediation of both the oral, rhetorical world and the world of silent reflection and friendly camaraderie emerges in the way it shifts between conversational engagement and silent reticence, active participation and detached observation. The effort to establish a community of like-minded individuals (that was evidently directed towards the more learned of his readers) is balanced by the steady detachment of the author from vulgar public view. However such efforts are always undermined by the realisation that like his rogue-artists Jonson is ultimately no more than a cozening hawker who uses deceptive sales practices to dupe his customers and sell useless trifles such as play-books as commodities to be cherished and possessed.

The meaning of the play became in effect something that the author possessed privately and in order to understand the play the audience had to discover the author's intentions. This could take place either through the invitation that Jonson extended to selected judicious readers to join an ideal homosocial (readerly) community or in the hermeneutical signals that allowed his common readers to grasp (or miss) Jonson's dramatic purpose. His acknowledgement (however grudging) of the plays' ultimate theatrical entrenchment, his private rapport and intimacy with his implied readers, deference towards wealthy patrons or disdain for the ordinary reader provided the capital (cultural and economic) that would aid in selling his books, in effect they are nothing

---

[85] Every edition of Jonson's professional plays advertised his name or initials on its title page-occasionally calling him an 'Author'-and almost every one contained a Latin motto. His copious marginal notes, where he displayed his classical scholarship and defended his text against detractors, were also intended to buttress authorial presence.

short of effective role-playing strategies to woo his customers and promote his distinctive brand. Marginalia stood on a cultural fault line between past and future: they help to chart the narrative of Jonson's socio-literary ascent from/between aristocratic patronage to/and emerging consumer relationships within an unruly market society. More importantly by drawing on earlier scribal traditions of textual transmission or production and emphasising their continuity into the present, Jonson took the first important step towards shaping the reading experience and training the early modern reader to receive, access, and accept a novel medium.

<div align="center">

IV

Paratextual Detours in Jonsonian Plays

</div>

The quarto edition of *Volpone* (1607), STC 14783; printed by George Eld for publisher Thomas Thorpe was modelled on early humanist editions of Plautus and Terence, and one of the first four professional plays (along with *Sejanus*, *Catiline*, and John Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess*) to be bulwarked by as many as eleven commendatory verses in English and Latin by fellow-poets such as John Donne, George Chapman, Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher, praising the play and its author, that tries to invite a privileged audience and gives off a strong impression of coterie condescension towards the vulgar tastes of theatrical spectators and forms a complex of intellectual and social intimacies. Although commendations often appeared to be private, personal exchanges between friends, these verses were intended to publicise the ability of the recommended author to appeal to a larger literary audience, specific coteries or patrons. The quarto edition from this perspective may be considered as somewhat of a trendsetting innovation, for professional plays[86] (and least of all quartos) in the 1580s or 1590s were not usually printed with paratextual material, barring stage directions.[87]

---

[86] Early modern publications which were less likely (or even unlikely) to carry marginalia would include broadsides, prayer books, slim pamphlets reporting on monstrous births, sensational events or proclamations. Such 'popular' forms of literature were written in simple styles and printed in large Roman type on pages with wide uncluttered margins. There were exceptions to this rule however as attested by John Bunyan's allegorical *Pilgrim's Progress* (1678) which was extremely popular yet heavily annotated.

[87] The inclusion of prefaces, dedications or epistles became much more common in the Jacobean era than in the Elizabethan. Nearly fifty percent of the ninety-four extant first edition plays printed between 1603 and 1616 contained front matter of some type in comparison to the meager less than ten percent in the previous decade. They were used for elevating the status of printed drama. See Paul J. Voss, 'Printing Conventions and the Early Modern Play', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, vol. 15, 2002, pp. 98-115: 107. However the affixing of commendatory verses was even rarer than other kinds of supplementary matter and only seven professional plays published till 1620 had them.

In general, the presence or absence of paratextual elements, played a crucial role in determining the standards of literary respectability in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England. Commendatory verses (very akin to the modern use of blurbs from established authors that endorse and impart prestige to new publications) conveyed the suggestion that printed drama too deserved to be praised and recommended like literary forms situated at the higher rungs of the generic hierarchy. Despite their private appearance these verses were ostentatious public offerings that showcased the author's friendships and associations, both professional and personal and played a crucial role in the visual vocabulary of early modern advertising.

A further obvious paratextual feature that endowed *Volpone* with scholarly cachet and palpable literary ambition was Jonson's lengthy epistle dedication[88] to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge where the play was performed before its London debut ('TO/THE MOST/NOBLE AND/MOST EQVALL/SISTERS,/THE TWO/FAMOVS VNIVERSITIES,/FOR THEIR LOVE/AND/ACCEPTANCE/SHEWN TO HIS POEME IN THE/PRESENTATION'), which established the play's learned credentials, defended his art, and the particular choices the writer had to make in the comedy.[89] Incidentally the Chancellor of Cambridge at that time was his patron Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury (thought to be the 'chiefest minister' (V.xii.108) of the anti-Catholic paranoia that had gripped London in the winter of 1605-6) and the Chancellor of Oxford was Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset, who was also the Lord Treasurer and Jonson's benefactor.[90] While the practice of dedicating plays was not common and may have been imitated from

---

[88] No sixteenth-century playbook was ever dedicated and only thirty playbook editions appearing between 1600 and 1622 contained dedications, whereas two hundred and twelve playbooks did not. Similarly authorial addresses only became more common in the early years of James' reign though the trend was definitely slow in catching. A few examples apart from those by Jonson would include John Marston's *The Malcontent* (1604), Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1607), and Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608).

[89] Jonson argues that it is 'the office of a comic poet to imitate justice and instruct to life, as well as purity of language, or stir up gentle affections.' The insertion of dedications and commendatory verses played upon two traditional commonplaces of Renaissance literature: the desire for immortal fame and the contempt for the *profanum vulgus*.

[90] Sackville served as the Chancellor of Oxford from 1592 until his death in 1608. He may have requested his friend Cecil to allow Jonson's play to be performed at Cambridge. University performances were a rare sign of honour and favour, since universities rarely allowed plays written for public theatres to be performed on their grounds. Apart from this Jonson had received Sackville's support during the controversy surrounding the authorship of *Eastward Ho!*, and Sackville is reputed to have gifted Jonson with wine bottles to celebrate his release from prison in late 1605.

Italian practice, Jonson's choice of dedicatees, in this case two educational institutes of repute, was as striking as those of John Marston.[91]

Despite its printed form, Jonson locates the play within a complicated network of patronage relationships not only to give it a powerful prominence, but also to declare the new form's continuity with traditional scribal modes of textual production and transmission. Jonson is thus able to transgress the class structures of seventeenth-century English society to target an emergent middle class readership through his use of the quarto form, while his use of the textual furniture of earlier scribal cultures enables him to reach out to the elite classes as well. Such a construction creates the perception that the social capital that belonged to the nobility could be had through the shared experience of reading the play. His appreciation for the academic elite of Oxbridge for their fairness and good judgement in accepting *Volpone* acts as a means of educating his anonymous readers in the finer aspects of literary appreciation.

Such reinforcements seem necessary in the wake of the epistle's peeved allusion to those 'that professe to haue a key for the decyphering of euerything', which is plainly a topical and anxious reference to the previous year's events centring on the Gunpowder Plot. They also self-consciously set the published play apart from a culture of performance, even seeming to imply that the printed text is the real play. In spite of *Volpone*'s theatrical success at the Globe, Jonson is anxious to register the distance of the published (proof) text from the performed play: 'My workes are read, allow'd, (I/speake of those that are intirely mine) looke into them...' (Epistle to *Volpone*, ll. 54-5) The counter-theatrical bent of mind seems apparent in remarks such as:

> (N)ow, especially in dramatick, or (as they terme it) stage-/poetrie, nothing but ribaldry, profanation, blasphemy, all/license of offence to god, and man, is practis'd...
>
> (ll. 36-8)

> For my particular,/I can (and from a most cleare conscience) affirme, that I haue/euer trembled to thinke toward the least prophanenesse; haue/lothed the vse of such foule, and vn-wash'd baud'ry, as is now/made the foode of the scene...
>
> (ll. 43-7)

---

[91] In 1602 John Marston dedicated *Antonio and Mellida* to 'Nobody', and in 1604 he dedicated *The Malcontent* to Jonson himself. George Chapman however initiated the crucial practice of dedicating plays to actual or potential patrons; and in 1608 he dedicated *Byron's Tragedy* to Thomas Walsingham. See Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship,* p. 164, n. 65.

> This it is, hath not only rap't me to present/indignation, but made me
>
> studious heretofore; and, by all my/actions, to stand off, from them...
>
> <div align="right">(ll. 100-2)</div>

The dedication page visually and typographically centralises the name of the author; further the list of dramatis personae,[92] continental style listing of characters at the start of a scene, uninterrupted printing,[93] and very few indications as to when characters should leave the stage[94] makes it a distinctly readerly text that reflects nothing of play house practice. In effect the presence of such intervening material deliberately ruptures the mimetic relationship between the theatrical experience and the experience of opening a playbook.

What is also striking is the use of a wide range of rhetorical strategies and textual role-playing that operates on multiple levels to grant leverage to his text and address different sections of the audience. Jonson is thus:

i) a humble servant to his dedicatees ('*most learned* ARBITRESSES'/'most reuerenced/SISTERS') (Epistle to *Volpone*, l. 103, ll. 124-5) whose conventional gesture of authorial humility critiques the idea of self-sufficiency or uncompromised agency: 'Neuer, (most equall SISTERS) had any man a wit so/presently excellent as that it could raise it selfe; but there /must come both matter, occasion, commenders, and fauourers/to it.' (Ibid., ll. 1-4)

ii) a classically trained scholar addressing scholarly inclined like-minded people and covertly signalling his preference for a life of study over that of a writer for the metropolitan London theatre. Later in his career Jonson would be honoured by both Oxford and Cambridge, and welcomed into the academic precincts of Christ Church, Oxford and Gresham College, London.

iii) a professional dramatist-cum-instructor who has to rely on the support of an approving audience and thus justifies his dereliction of duty in respect to his comedy by stating: '(A)nd though my catastrophe may, in/the strict rigour of

---

[92] Character lists were intended to address specific needs of the readers and not the spectators. This was usually a precedent established in editions of classical drama and its translations. The 1581 collection of *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies* prints a character list before each play, and Richard Bernard's *Terence in English* (1598) similarly includes a list of 'The speakers in this Comedy'. See Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare and the Book Trade* (2nd edn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), no page numbers specified.

[93] Prior to Jonson's enthusiastic endorsement of continuous printing (starting with the 1605 quarto of *Sejanus*), only academic plays, translations or closet drama made use of the device. As a marker of literary pretensions, continuous printing gave more weight to content than to the theatrical imperative of clearly distinguishing the speaker of the lines or identifying a new speaker on a new line.

[94] Division of a play into five acts followed neoclassical precedent; theatrical manuscripts were not interrupted by act breaks because the performances of plays by adult companies were continuous (in contrast to performances by boys' companies at elite venues). The absence of act and scene breaks thus actually conformed to theatrical logic.

comick law, meet with censure, as turning/back to my promise; I desire the learned, and charitable critick to haue so much faith in me, to thinke it was done off industrie:/For, with what ease I could haue varied it, neerer his scale/(but that I feare to boast mine owne faculty) I could here insert./But my speciall ayme being to put the snaffle in their mouths,/that crie out, we neuer punish vice in our *enterludes*, etc./I took the more liberty; though not without some lines of/example, drawne euen in the ancients themselues, the goings/out of whose comoedies are not alwaies ioyfull, but oft-times the bawdes, the seruants, the riuals, yea, and the masters are/mulcted: and fitly, it being the office of *comick-Poet*, to imi-/tate iustice, and to instruct to life, as well as puritie of language, or stirre vp gentle affections...' (Ibid., ll. 109-23)

iv) a moralist whose aim is to 'raise the despis'd head of/*poetrie* again, and stripping her out of those rotten and base/rags, wherwith the Times haue adulterated her form, restore/her to her primitiue habit, feature and maiesty, and render her/worthy to be imbraced, and kist, of all the great and master-/*spirits* of our world' (Epistle to *Volpone*, ll. 129-34).[95] The role of the comic poet is 'to imitate justice, and instruct to life', and such an adjudicative role mirrors and yet exceeds that of civic administrators. Sometimes his critical comments may verge on the conceited: as when he claims how the play mixes 'profit with your pleasure' (Prologue to *Volpone*, l. 8) or was written in the short space of five weeks, and that it came from the poet's 'owne hande, without a coadjutor,/Nouice, journeyman, or tutor' (Ibid., ll. 17-18), yet undeniably such defiant assertions have helped to ensure that Jonson's works for the stage were read as single-mindedly ethical and reformist by nature.

The display of rhetorical competence and personation aims at establishing a level of intimacy at the same time as they both overwhelm the reader and deflect attention from Jonson's authoritarian attitude. While Jonson's self-possessed authorial self (in the quartos) is really an eclectic mix of such personae, they also serve to underscore how any fantasy of private self-sufficiency or unambiguous centrality is ultimately structured by context (fit subject matter, favourable opportunity) and is dependent upon others (patrons, spectators, and readers). The dialectic between public and private or inescapable dependency and independence that structures both paratext and main play emerges most

---

[95] The comic text is comparable to a wanton woman's disheveled body and Jonson's poetic authority is based upon the redemptive act of stripping and redressing her. Wendy Wall points out how Jonson like other authors of the time relied on the image of the displayed woman to scandalously authorise his work. See Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, pp. 184-5.

prominently in the plays acrostic style prose 'Argument'[96] where the vertically spelt 'VOLPONE' (in capitals and at the head of each line) is also implicated in the words and sentences in which they appear and the syntax of the argument as a whole. The isolation and unique legibility of Volpone's name is thus embedded in and constituted by its environment.[97]

> *V OLPONE*, childeless, rich, faines sicke, despaires,
>
> O ffers his state to hopes of seuerall heires,
>
> L ies languishing; his Parasite receaues
>
> P resents of all, assures, deludes: Then weaues,
>
> O ther crosse-plots, which ope' themselues, are told.
>
> N ew tricks for safety, are sought; they thriue: When, bold,
>
> E ach tempts th' other againe, and all are sold.

The second edition of *Volpone* in the 1616 folio (STC 14751/14752) printed by William Stansby was clearly based on a marked-up copy of the quarto, and generally shows fewer substantial alterations, probably because Jonson's enthusiasm for revision may have waned by this stage in the folio. Although the folio's reduction of the quarto's lavish use of italic type and capital letters, its substitution of small capitals for proper names in place of the earlier edition's more usual use of upper- and lower-case italic or the omissions of the quarto's diareses, circumflex accents, stresses on foreign words may have been nothing more than routine print shop changes, yet on the whole there were far fewer press-corrections in the folio than the quarto presumably because the copy being used by the printers was in a very good condition. Similarly the addition of certain matters of stage-business such as the twenty-nine side-noted stage directions; use of heavy punctuation such as the applying of commas after vocatives; exclamation marks; dashes at the end of interrupted incomplete sentences; greater use of parentheses to set off adverbial or other adjunct phrases (indicating quotations or identifying asides) may possibly have been due to compositorial choice than authorial intervention. But they serve to reconstitute the play's performative context just as the quarto version is marked by the desire to erase its theatrical vocabulary.

---

[96] The 'Argument', also called 'Fabule argumentum', was a plot summary printed before the dramatic text with the aim of facilitating readerly understanding. In the fifty year period between 1580 and 1630, only five plays appeared with an 'Argument': Jonson's *Sejanus* (1605, 1616), *Volpone* (1607, 1616), and *The Alchemist* (1612, 1616); and Marston's *The Dutch Courtesan* (1605), and *Sophonisba* (1606).

[97] I am indebted to Fredric V. Bogel for the vertical and horizontal 'readings' of the Argument, though he uses it in a different context. See his book, *The Difference Satire Makes: Rhetoric and Reading from Jonson to Byron* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), pp. 85-6.

Given the generally vexed question of responsibility regarding changes made from quarto to folio, the few alterations in which Jonson definitely did have a hand were in the cropping of several commendatory verses (may be for lack of space) and placing the ones retained (such as those by Edmund Bolton, Donne, and Beaumont)[98] in the first quire or at the start of the folio; the loss of the laconically provocative introduction of the quarto ('There followes an *Epistle*, if you dare venture on the length'), its signature flourish (with its prosperous Blackfriars address), and the learned though redundant gloss on the word 'Cestus' (V.ii.102).[99] Notwithstanding the mixed nature of the textual emendations and typographical practices that attend the transition from the quarto to the folio, it is also possible to see how Jonson adapted his craft to changing socio-political exigencies. Naturally the decreased urgency to defend *Volpone* after the space of nine years confers the folio text a certain degree of mellowness and less piquancy or edginess in contrast to the quarto. The break from play house practices seem more certain because the punctuation is so dense that it could hardly act as a reliable guide for oral delivery. Rhetorical markers in the text are not equivalent to embedded stage directions but were probably intended as information for the reader. Still the use of question marks in Mosca's famous line, 'Am not I here? whom you haue made? your creature?' (I.v.78) or the use of dashes, as many as eight in six lines to increase the vehemence and impulsiveness of Celia's speech as she resists Volpone's seductive overtures,[100] does preserve the oral emphasis of speech and the semiotics of stage delivery but any attempt to interpret them as actual performance cues for actors might be futile.

On the whole the folio paratexts demonstrates a greater self-assurance and individualised authorial agency that nominally evokes yet consciously separates Jonson from other theatrical partners or patronage networks (even nobles are imagined less as patrons and more as friends) that formed the basis of early modern writing, becoming an inaccessible self-authorising figure who would want his book to be sought out by the right kind of learned customer rather than be hawked by a bookseller looking to make a sale to anyone with the money to pay for it. If the book did not sell on his terms he

---

[98] In the long-continuing scholarly debate about the extent of Jonson's involvement in the folio revisions there have been primarily two schools of thought: while the Oxford editors (C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson) have granted authority to the folio text as a visible expression of Jonson's workmanship, Henry de Vocht has led a consistent campaign to champion the quarto texts, dislodging the authority accorded to the folio, by claiming that Jonson had no hand in the textual emendations.

[99] Richard Dutton, '*Volpone*: Textual Essay', in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Volpone_textual_essay/5/

[100] *Volpone* (New Mermaids Series), ed. Philip Brockbank (California: The University of California Press, 1968), p. 170 quoted by Dutton, *Volpone*, in *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Volpone_textual_essay/5/

would rather have it sent to 'Bucklersbury', a precinct in London that was populated by grocers and apothecaries. Jonson would rather prefer to have his book torn apart there and used as food wrappers or toilet paper than to have it fall into pretentious and undeserving hands: an extreme response to the awareness that book acquisition no longer depended on a network of intimate social associations linking author with purchaser. ('To My Bookseller', *Epigram* III) Scholarly detachment or textual abstraction is a recurring trope in his writing and remains an integral component of the inherited legacy of the exclusivity of the Jonsonian brand.

It is a strategy that helps to liberate Jonson from the collaborative nature of early modern playwrighting and enables the author to define himself without the buttressing influence of other discourses and practices: establishing a kind of private princedom. Horace in *Ars Poetica* had enjoined the aspiring poet to withhold a manuscript from public circulation for nine years. The Latin cognates of the word 'edition' refer to that moment of release (recalling Martial's comparison of a published work to a manumitted slave) that marks the end of a writer's control over a work and the beginning of its autonomous social phase.[101] Jonson seems to imagine a reversion to a pre-editorial phase when the poem stood free from vulgar misappropriation and plagiarism.

In the passage from the authorial public personas of the quarto to the folio's expression of the purportedly authentic self through the individuated (bibliographic) ego one witnesses then the mediation between the 'public, social, communal, and oral experience of the text during the manuscript era and the private and individualized reception of the written word'[102] of the print era. Thus if his printed quarto play-texts are marked by a social and ceremonial imperative to recreate the verbal effect of the author's 'speaking presence', inviting active oral/aural participation from his listener; then the folio is marked by the diminishing of the authorial voice as readers become silent observers of the ordered structure of ideas in the writer's mind within the closed spatial world of the text. From the latter perspective writing was not an accurate rendition of speech but a portrayal of private thoughts.

Like the quarto *Volpone*, the first (1612) edition (STC 14755) of *The Alchemist* (printed by Thomas Snodham) self-consciously removed all signs of staging: the text itself contains next to nothing by way of stage directions and there is no reference to a

---

[101] For the reference to Horace and the classical etymology of edition see Loewenstein, 'Martial, Jonson, and the Assertion of Plagiarism', in Sharpe and Zwicker, pp. 275-94: 287.
[102] Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print*, p. 11.

company or its performance on the title page;[103] its place being taken by a Latin epigram from Horace's *Satires*. It was followed by Jonson's dedicatory epistle, a preface to the reader, George Lucy's poem in praise of Jonson ('To my friend, Mr. Ben: Ionson. Vpon his Alchemist'), and a plot summary in acrostic verse. It was Jonson's first printed play to seek aristocratic patronage and the only one of his plays to be addressed to a woman. It was tenderly dedicated to Mary, Lady Wroth,[104] the eldest daughter of Robert Sidney and widow of Sir Robert Wroth (to whom Jonson had dedicated the third poem in *The Forrest* some years earlier). She was part of the Sidney-Pembroke-Herbert circle, the most important aristocratic (Protestant) circle of literary patrons in England at that time: privileged men and women who circulated their works in manuscript, professionals who depended on public sales and private patronage, and scholars who published books (both their own and translations of others) in order to disseminate humanist learning.[105] She was also a prolific writer in her own right and the first Englishwoman to have penned a voluminous prose romance *Urania*, a sonnet sequence *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus* and a pastoral drama entitled *Love's Victory*. As an astute patron-hunter it is easy to see why she would have attracted Jonson's eye.[106]

Jonson imagines her as a guardian of the literary reputation of her illustrious uncle Sir Philip Sidney: 'TO THE LADY, MOST DESERVING HER NAME, AND BLOVD: Mary, LA. WROTH.'[107] He flatters her as one whose 'judgement (which/is a SIDNEYS)' rendered her the leading member of a class of sympathisers and an ideal patron; his praise of her aristocratic taste and discernment a public marker of the poet's close brush with social privilege. The devotional and idealising rhetoric in which the dedication is couched

---

[103] THE ALCHEMIST./VVritten/by/BEN. IONSON./--*Neque, me, vt miretur turba, laboro :/Contentus paucis lectoribus.*/LONDON,/Printed by *Thomas Snodham*, for *Walter Burre*, and are to be sold by *Walter Burre*, and are to be sold by *Iohn Stepneth*, at the West-end of Paules./1612.

[104] Jonson had addressed *Epigrams* 103 and 105 to her and was especially 'devoted to Lady Mary, and the encounter would have been warm. She had danced in his masques such as *Blackness* (1605) and *Beauty* (1608) and had been flatteringly addressed by him both in verse and in prose'... 'Jonson had been altogether less taken with her late husband, who had evidently resented his intimacy with Lady Mary; Jonson darkly reported to William Drummond that she had been 'unworthily married on a jealous husband.' See Ian Donaldson, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 36.

[105] See Sara van den Berg, 'True Relation: The Life and Career of Ben Jonson', in Harp and Stewart, pp. 1-14: 3.

[106] Jonson's dedication to Wroth mediates Genette's distinction between private and public dedicatees. His private dedicatee was 'a person, known to the public or not, to whom a work is dedicated in the name of a personal relationship: friendship, kinship, or other.' His public dedicatee 'is a person who is more or less well known but with whom the author, by his dedication, indicates a relationship that is public in nature—intellectual, artistic, political, or other.' See Genette, *Paratext*, p. 131.

[107] Jonson's dedication escapes some of the traditional attributes that accompanied commendatory work addressed to women, such as the mention of chastity. There is no mention of this which was so ubiquitous in Jonson's praise of women, which was not really surprising given that Wroth had borne two children out of wedlock to her cousin William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke (to whom Jonson dedicated the 1611 quarto edition of *Catiline*). See Barbara Smith, T*he Women of Ben Jonson's Poetry: Female Representations in the Non-Dramatic Verse* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995), p. 62.

elides the text's implication in the vulgar print trade (the 'vile arts' of the market) or the constraints of public theatricality, imagining the book as a gift or sacrifice:

> In the age of sacrifices, the truth of religion was not in the greatnesse, & fat of the offrings, but in the devotion, and zeale of the sacrificers: Else, what could a handful of gummes have done in the sight of a hetacombe? or, how might I appeare at this altar, except with those affections, that no lesse love the light and witnesse, then they have the conscience of your vertue.
>
> (Epistle to Lady Mary Wroth, ll. 1-6)

Similarly the preface to the reader cryptically pursues a distinction developed by Martial in his *Epigrams* (XII: 37, 2) between the *polyposum* and the *nasutum*:[108]

> IF thou beest more, thou art an Vnderstander, and then/I trust thee. If thou art one that tak'st vp, and but a Pre-/tender, beware at what hands thou receiu'st thy commoditie;/for thou wert neuer more fair in the way to be cos'ned (then/in this Age) in *Poetry*, especially in Playes: wherein, now,/the Concupiscence of Iigges, and Daunces so raigneth, as/to runne away from Nature, and be afraid of her, is the onely/point of art that tickles the *Spectators*.
>
> (Preface to the Reader, ll. 1-8)

The conventional rhetoric of such addresses 'sought to capture goodwill and create an intimate atmosphere by differentiating the author from an increasingly crowded marketplace, or by flattering the reader that while the general crowd may be foolish, credulous, and vulgar, he...was all the more distinguished for rising above the commonality in the exercise of judgement and discrimination.'[109] Printing discriminates within a reading public, to denigrate those who are not 'understanders', making a suggestion that echoes Jonson's address to two groups of readers (and by implication two kinds of readings) in the quarto edition of *Catiline* (1611): 'the Reader in Ordinarie' and 'the Reader extraordinarie'.[110] It is in such moments of rhetorical distrust for readers who are rude, obstinate or unskilful that Jonson helps to shape and define his ideal readership, thereby simultaneously imprinting his brand with the values and qualities that he imparts

---

[108] '*Nasutum volo, nolo polyposum*', which translates as 'I approve of a man with a nose: I object to one with polypus.' The phrase 'with a nose' meant to be an excellent critic; hence Nasutus is a worthy critic, while the judgements of Polyposus are ill-informed and malevolent.

[109] Joad Raymond, 'Irrational, impractical and unprofitable: reading the news in seventeenth-century Britain', in Sharpe and Zwicker, pp. 185-212:188.

[110] Jonson locates bad reading as represented by 'the Reader in Ordinarie' in the alienations of purchase that divide producer and consumer. The extraordinary reader by contrast is the better man to whom Jonson submits both himself and his work, establishing a relationship of intimate clientage between reader and writer. See Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship*, p. 161.

to the model reader. In reality Jonson's intended audience may have been far more multi-layered in scope than the exclusive audience suggested in his paratexts.

The folio text surprisingly added many references to its original theatrical performance:

> THE ALCHEMIST./*A Comoedie*./Acted in the yeere 1610. By the/Kings
> MAIESTIES/Seruants./The author B. I./LVCRET./--*petere inde*
> *coronam,/Vnde prius nulli velarint tempora Musae*./LONDON,/Printed by
> WILLIAM STANSBY/M. DC. XVI.[111]

Although theatrical directions appear in the margins of the text they are intended more like notes to the reader than as instructional cues for actors. However along with accompanying marginal glosses (such as the comment '*Surly like a Spaniard*' that supplements Surly's appearance in disguise to spy on the roguish trio implying that the audience see through the disguise immediately, thereby robbing the character of any expertise in masking) and overall layout of the printed page, help to preserve the vocal orchestration that must have formed a part of the original performance, inviting oral/aural participation from the reader.[112] Such a technique can be seen in the closing lines of the opening scene of *The Alchemist* where the quarrel between the triumvirate has scarcely been resolved when a knock comes from '*within*' (creating a sense of stage geography).

Dol is sent out to spy on who has arrived and she reports that it is a young man with the appearance of a clerk; Face identifies the man as Dapper and informs his accomplices of the man's desire to have a *familiar*. The next six uninterrupted lines are a visual representation of the sheer verve and rapidity with which the scam is set up with the names of the speakers being distinguished by a different typeface. In his comment upon this particular scene, Richard Cave rues how modern conventions of typographic display (with each new speaker having a new line in the text that slows down the pace and visually reduces it to a series of questions and answers) convey nothing of the spontaneous improvisation required to deal with a new gull, especially

---

[111] The extra page added after the play's conclusion also alluded to its performed context: This comoedie vvas first/acted, in the yeere 1610./*By the Kings Maiesties*/SERVANTS./the principall Comoedians were,/RIC. BVRBADGE [and so on]./*With the allowance of the* Master of REVELLS.

[112] Similarly Dol's comment in the first scene, 'You'll bring your head within a cocks-combe, will you? Is buttressed (in the folio) by the marginal note, 'Shee catcheth out Face his sword: and breaks Subtle's glass', whereas the same scene in the quarto does not contain such comments. See Elizabeth Schafer and Emma Cox, '*The Alchemist* on the Stage: Performance, Collaboration and Deviation', in *The Alchemist: A Critical Reader*, ed. Erin Julian and Helen Ostovich (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 43-74: 46.

the trio's brilliant demonic intelligences and their ability to respond to the situation as a unified team after the divisive quarrel.

> The exhilarating audacity of the moment, the breathtaking expertise with which cues and roles are decided on, and the relish with which Face and Subtle plunge straight into *performance* are all exactly contained within the chosen layout. This is not just dramatic verse; it is *theatrical* verse, meticulously showing what is meant in terms of performance by spontaneous improvisation.[113]

William Sherman in his essay on *The Alchemist* also admits how careful typographical strategies that try to recreate syntactic or rhetorical effects are often lost in modern editions. Commenting on the *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, he confesses that the paucity of resources may often rob a modern edition of its verbal resonances:

> We have...sacrificed one of the most interesting pieces of printing in the entire Jonsonian canon, the scene at the beginning of Act 4 Scene 5 where Dol goes into her 'fit of talking': as Face and Mammon desperately try to get a word in edgewise, the concurrent passages are printed alongside each other in two columns joined--or is it separated?--by a bracket, an effect we have tried to convey with the more limited resources of the dash.[114]

Dol's fit of talking takes place simultaneously with Face and Mammon's discussion of it, indicated in the folio by their parallel arrangement within curly brackets, holding two inherently disjointed performances together rather than bracketing them off. Early modern pointing techniques were used to mediate between the oral and the written worlds, by putting voice on paper. Typographical directions function in relation to the text as the actors function in relation to the author's script. Jonson used long dashes in a manner similar to stage directions, using them to mark the places where speeches are interrupted. Jonson's editorial practices are implicated in the high point of tension between the oral and visual worlds. The careful placement of commas, colons, hyphens, apostrophes, and full stops seeks to erase the boundary between the spoken and written word, but also points towards their impending and irremediable rupture: an early

---

[113] Cave, 'Script and Performance', p. 25. A similar point is made by Jonas Barish in his Yale edition of *Sejanus* arguing that modernisation while helping to make texts more easily accessible involves its penalties as well, especially in the realm of punctuation, because light punctuation blurs, if not erases, many caesural effects. See Ben Jonson, *Sejanus*, ed. Jonas Barish (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965), p. 205.

[114] William H. Sherman, '*The Alchemist*: Textual Essay', in *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Alchemist_textual_essay/5/ See also 'Choice of copy-texts' in *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/about/general_intro/copy_texts/

prognostication of the growing rationalist conviction that language was a silent, spatial phenomenon concerned with thought and not with speech.[115]

There were other changes as well such as the excision of the preface addressed to the reader, the prefatory verse by George Lucy was removed and replaced with a cluster of poetic attributes at the beginning of the collection, and a new epigraph was added from Lucretius's *De Rerum Natura* in place of the original epigraph from Horace (since it was being used on the title page for the entire volume). The letter to Lady Wroth appeared in slightly edited form and was followed by the unchanged list of dramatis personae and the acrostic[116] 'Argument'.

> **T** he sicknesse hot, a master quit, for feare,
>
> H is house in towne: and left one seruant there.
>
> E ase him corrupted, and gaue means to know
>
> **A** cheater, and his punque; who, now brought low,
>
> L eauing their narrow practise, were become
>
> C os'ners at large: and onely wanting some
>
> H ouse to set vp, with him they here contract,
>
> E ach for a share, and all begin to act.
>
> M uch company they draw, and much abuse,
>
> I n casting figures, telling fortunes, newes,
>
> S elling of flyes, flat bawdry, with the *stone*:
>
> T ill it, and they, and all in *fume* are gone.

The folio also included a list of the players such as Richard Burbage, Robert Armin, William Ostler, John Heminges, Henry Condell, and Alexander Cook among others. Such textual changes serve to stage once more the nervous poise between a public commercial and material market of printed books and the private intimacies of a culture of connoisseurship, even of intellectual reclusiveness. The cultural change that is witnessed in the shift from quarto to folio marks on a small scale the process through which drama was to gain in terms of social and literary respectability through privatised reading and isolation from the public sphere: possibly a sign of drama's diminishing significance as a form of public opinion making in the ages to come.

---

[115] It is true that significant vestiges of oral culture retained its hold even as late as the eighteenth century expressed most prominently in the theories of Locke and his followers. While rationalists viewed language as an inherent property of the mind, the empiricists treated language as communication, as a form of external behaviour governed largely by habit and social convention.

[116] The acrostic was an early mnemonic device used to aid oral transmission. The earliest known instance of such mnemonic aids is in the Old Testament which belong to the alphabetical or abecedarian type.

Bartholomew Fair (STC 14753.5) was not published or entered in the Stationers Register in Jonson's lifetime (appearing neither in quarto nor in folio) appearing in print only in the folio of 1631 (F2(2)). Reasons for Jonson's exclusion of this significant work from the 1616 collection has worried scholars with explanations ranging from the difficulty of making room for a lengthy play at a time when the folio had already gone to the press[117] to its radical innovativeness which precluded its entry into a work marked by classical homogeneity and generic trajectory (from comedy to tragedy)[118] or even Jonson's realisation that it was not worthy of literary preservation.[119] There is a vast discrepancy between the circumstances of the play's performed version in 1614 at the Hope and its eventual printed edition seventeen years later. The authorial obtrusions and aggrandisements in the former seemed justified keeping in mind the eminence that Jonson had achieved then. However by 1631 his position was much less secure, he was sick (he had suffered two strokes in 1626 and 1628), with failing eyesight, and living in relative penury; his quarrel with Inigo Jones had intensified (over the masque *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*); worse, he had also lost favour with the contemporary theatrical audience and there was no mutual respect with Charles I.

Given such circumstances, Jonson's decision to print a substantial second folio volume of his *Workes* that would open with *Bartholomew Fair* (containing its dedication to the previous monarch James I) and contain his less popular contemporary works (*The Staple of News* and *The Devil is an Ass*) as well, represented not just a pecuniary but plausibly a sentimental attempt to retrieve his earlier prestige. Rather than *Bartholomew Fair*, it is the title page of *The New Inn* that hints at the real purpose for publishing his plays: m*e lectori credere mallem:/Quam spectatoris fastidia ferre superbi* (Horace's *Epistle* 1, Book II, 'I prefer to entrust myself to a reader rather than to bear the disdain of a scornful spectator'). (*New Inn*) The general spirit of the 1631 collection seems at times to be very different from the previous quartos and folio. The plays were intended as presentation copies to an intimate elite circle of benefactors and admirers, reflecting Jonson's nostalgia for an earlier patronage system of manuscript exchange. However given his fall out with the printer John Beale, the project was aborted, even though all three works were

---

[117] See *Works*, vol. I, pp. 331-5 and vol. IX, pp. 14-15. Dutton too cites lack of space and suggests that Jonson deliberately saved *Bartholomew Fair* for the opening position of volume two. Richard Dutton, *Ben Jonson: To the First Folio* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

[118] Suzanne Gossett (ed.), 'Introduction' to *Bartholomew Fair* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).

[119] Kathleen Lynch, 'The Dramatic Festivity of *Bartholomew Fair*', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews*, vol. 8, 1996, pp. 128-45: 135.

eventually printed, each with its own title page, in a slim folio volume (containing 63 folio sheets), bearing the imprint 'Printed by *I. B.* [John Beale] for ROBERT ALLOT...1631.'

The only copy (of *The Devil is an Ass*) from this collection that was definitely gifted was to his Catholic patron William Cavendish, the Earl of Newcastle to whom Jonson wrote an animated yet poignant letter (Letter 15 dated 20 December) describing Beale as 'lewd' and an 'Absolute Knave', whose slipshod printing and sloppy inefficiency (occasionally attributed by modern scholars to the imperfectly finished authorial foul papers that probably acted as a copy for *Bartholomew Fair*) had hindered Jonson from supplying his patron with a single folio containing all the three comedies. Ultimately *Bartholomew Fair* only appeared in the second folio (F2) of 1640-1[120] (by which time Jonson had been dead for three years), published by Richard Meighen, incorporating in its first section both title (spelt as 'Bartholmew Fayre') and text of the play as it had been prepared in 1631.

Notwithstanding Jonson's dissatisfaction with the quality of Beale's printing and the numerous undiscounted errors, the play displays a similar dramaturgical sensitivity found in the earlier (folio) plays. The ninety-six marginal (some seemingly supererogatory) directions are not simply directives on stage business but more in the nature of descriptive and explanatory instructions ('This they whisper, that Overdoo heares it not', or 'Mistresse Overdoo is sicke: and her husband is silenc'd').[121] One very complex instance occurs where Cokes has his purse stolen by Edgworth while listening to Nightingale's ballad. Edgworth's movements around Cokes and the latter's constant removal of his purse from his pocket to see whether it has been stolen or not are initially indicated by the use of marginal glosses. At the climactic moment, the song lyrics, an account of the thief's trick with the straw that enables him to filch Cokes's purse, and Winwife and Quarlous's observations on the scene they are watching from within the crowd are laid out in three distinct columns side-by-side on the page to indicate their simultaneous performance onstage.

The remarks of the two gallants draw the audience's interest to Edgworth's action as the song continues to delight the simpleton Cokes, offering a moment of pure visual theatre. However Jonson is able to manipulate the focus of the audience's gaze through

---

[120] However it is likely that a few bound copies of the three plays were made up and released without a general title page.

[121] Some directions enhance the text with indications of performance: 'Ursla comes in againe dropping'. Others give information that cannot be deduced from the spoken text. Cokes's loss of purse emerges primarily from the stage direction: 'Edgworth gets up to him, and tickles him in the eare with a straw twice to draw his hand out of his pocket.' See John Creaser, '*Bartholomew Fair*: Textual Essay', in *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Bartholomew_Fair_textual_essay/6/

his typographical arrangements, so that they can follow not only the theft but also the cunning handing over of the purse to Nightingale. Further Winwife's final comment ''Fore/God, he is an brave fellow; pity he should be detected', spills over from the columns (where the text of his dialogue with Quarlous and Grace is printed in smaller typeface to allow it to fit the available space alongside the song and stage directions) leaving the last phrase isolated in the same-sized typeface as is generally deployed for the dialogue. The segregation and consequent privileging of the remark 'pity he should be detected', is intended as a direct challenge to the audience's ethical mores.[122]

Jonson exploits the spatial logic of print to give an impression of Winwife, Quarlous, and Grace acting as theatrical spectators of the action involving Cokes and Edgworth. Similarly the scene of the second theft, which involves the gulling of Cokes's tutor Wasp under Quarlous's instigation, textually conveys the boisterousness of the crowd. Although the margin is strongly marked off as separate from the space of the dialogue, yet the textual margin is literally the scene of action and the printed dregs of the theatricalised action. It is possible to replicate the theatrical experience merely by looking at the marginal directions, yet they inhabit a shared signifying structure. The reader's encounter with the printed play is as much an act of seeing as it is an act of linguistic interpretation. The visual as well as the oral/aural experience work as subtending and supplementary semiotic systems that share the same space as the words in the play. This mutual interdependence is strikingly different from the authorial assertiveness found in the earlier editions of Jonson's print oeuvre. Barton comments how these last plays are marked by a desire to reconstruct the original theatrical dimension; and that far from providing proof of the playwright's failing powers, 'the margins of Beale's edition show the dramatist vividly imagining the stage action of his plays from his sick-bed and prepared, as an editor, to experiment, to alter previous patterns and practices in these last years of his life.'[123]

In its day *Bartholomew Fair* was quite an eccentricity in its own right, somewhat comparable to what *Tristram Shandy* or *Waiting for Godot* might have been to an eighteenth- or twentieth-century audience respectively. Apart from its narrative oddity and the apparently anarchic method, the play was also radical in envisioning a considerable laxation of authorial prerogative in directing the meaning of the play, placing agency in the hands of an unreliable and fickle audience instead, but on the condition that each person 'exercise his owne/Iudgement', (Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* l. 98) thereby

---

[122] See Cave, 'Script and Performance', pp. 25-6.
[123] Barton, *Ben Jonson*, p. 257.

intellectualising the theatrical experience. In my earlier discussions I have consciously steered away from including prologues and epilogues under the assumption that they formed a part of the performed play, my intention being to look only at those paratextual features that were exclusively a part of the printed text.

However keeping in mind the choppily textured printing history of *Bartholomew Fair* and the general absence of Jonson's exemplary (editorial) guardianship behind it (with the exception of forme B2v:3 which were intended as gifts for friends and patrons),[124] I will have to focus perforce mainly upon the writer's extensive musings on the role of the theatre and theatre-goers in the lengthy 'Induction to the Stage' (presented before the commercial theatrical audience at the Hope) and the brief ritualistic celebration of the King's judgement in the 'Prologue to the King's Majesty' and Epilogue (included for a performance at Whitehall) to understand Jonson's relation to the proposed printed play. In turn they help to throw into perspective the altered textual and authorial status of the 1631 printed version.

The Induction is constructed as a conversation between the Stage-keeper and two authorial surrogates associated with manuscript production: the Bookholder (prompter responsible for ensuring the players' adherence to the script of the play and responsible for keeping track of the company's play books), and a Scrivener (professional copyist or scribe who supervises the writing out of theatrical books) which sets up a tension between two kinds of theatrical experience: visual and aural, implying that the best hearers are also the best spectators. The Stage-keeper's traditional and lowbrow aesthetic complaints about the poet not paying heed to his suggestions for including 'a fine Pumpe vpon the Stage'... 'a *Punque*/set vnder vpon her head, with her Sterne vpward', (ll. 32-4) is answered by a mock-legal contract from the author, framed as a set of 'ARTICLES of Agreement, indented, between the/*Spectators* or *Hearers*, at the *Hope* on the Bankeside, in the/County of *Surrey* on the one party; And the *Author*.' (ll. 64-6)

> INPRIMIS, It is couenanted and agreed, by and betweene/the parties abouesaid, and the said *Spectators*, and *Hearers*,/aswell the curious and enuious, as the fauouring and iudici-/ous, as also the grounded Iudgements and vnderstandings,/doe for themselues seuerally Couenant, and agree to remaine/in the places, their money or friends haue put them in, with/patience, for the space of two hours and an halfe, and some-/what more. In which time the *Author*

---

[124] Even though the exact location of Beale's workshop is not known, it would have been difficult for Jonson to physically supervise the editing by negotiating the rough and crowded streets from his new home near the Abbey at Westminster. However the large-paper presentation copies do contain stop-press corrections that were clearly authorial in origin.

promiseth to present/them by vs, with a new sufficient Play called

BARTHOLMEW/FAYRE, merry, and as full of noise, as sport.

(ll. 73-82)

It calls for an individual exercise of wit that forbids the audience to 'censure by *Contagion*, or vpon *trust*,/from another's voice, or face, that sits by him' (ll. 98-9). Jonson may have relinquished his authority over the text ('departed with his right', l. 87) but he retains the ultimate right to control the audience's judgement and the playhouse that they inhabit. Nevertheless his ambivalent stance towards the commercial theatre audience, at once cajoling and coercive, registers the extent to which the audience did threaten the author's ability to control reception. Apart from the legal articulation of authority, the author ('the maker') displays visible agency by claiming to present the play through a subsidiary acting company – the Lady Elizabeth's Servants. A similar self-aggrandisement is visible in his dedication of the court performance to James I, thereby affixing a royal seal of approval on his drama (the epilogue on the printed page appears at just the point where James' servant the Master of the Revels would customarily affix his seal, permitting the play to be acted). Yet despite his claim of sole authorship, Jonson displays a deep anxiety about collective and patronage networks in which the play is implicated: 'You know the scope of *Writers*, and what store/*of* leaue *is giuen them*, if they take not more/*And turne it into* license.' (Epilogue, ll. 3-5) Jonson is eager to place interpretive agency in the hands of the King rather than the author, but there is also a fear regarding the extent of authorial freedom and the limitations that are placed on what writers can control in their writing.

The two different introductions contextualise the play for two distinct kinds of audiences (vulgar mob of curious, envious, favouring, and judicious spectators and a royal audience), showing Jonson's ability to mediate between different kinds of spectatorial hierarchies. He is able to repackage the same material to present it before the aristocracy with its anti-commercial feudal privileges of honour and nobility and the rising bourgeoisie with its money and commerce. The printed text of 1631 alerts the cautious reader to the specific historical moment of its double première in 1614, inviting him to make a complex set of chronological reconstructions. The title page of the printed version states that *Bartholomew Fair* was 'A COMEDIE, ACTED IN THE YEARE, 1614...And then dedicated To KING JAMES, of *most Blessed Memorie*; By The Author, BENJAMIN JOHNSON.' Yet historical perspective had altered by then and the

affirmation of royal authority over plays and pastimes must have seemed shaky indeed given Charles I's insecure position.

Antitheatrical sentiment (as represented by the Puritan Busy in the play) was raging and it is ironical that within two years of the publication of the 1640 folio, the theatres would be closed. Juxtaposed against the altered circumstances of 1631 the paratexts of Jonson's performed play chart a different trajectory. Authorial individuality (he was the only person to be buried in an upright position at Westminster Abbey in the northern aisle of the Nave) blends with, even succumbs to the wistful desire to retreat into an intimate collaborative network of like-minded friends and patrons as a protection against censure and slander. *Bartholomew Fair*'s transition from performance to print traces yet again Jonson's uneasy dialectic between autonomy and dependence entrenched most vividly in the only portrait (recorded by David Piper, now known to be derived from a miniature of Isaac Oliver, painted by his father Peter Oliver) that depicts Jonson late in life before he had suffered a stroke. In this 'begging portrait', the poet holds the manuscript of some Skeltonic verses asking the clerk of the Exchequer to forward his overdue pension. In the lower-left-hand corner is an inkstand, decorated with the figure of Fortune, which underlines the diminished condition of the poet and the humiliation that attended it.[125] By a strange twist of fate the less than happy endings to the otherwise dissimilar lives of Jonson and Cuffe (both exemplars of the over-educated parvenu) seem to have been bound by their commitment to the book and the written word.

---

[125] van den Berg, 'True Relation', in Harp and Stewart, p. 12.

POSTSCRIPT: PERIPHERIES

> There seems little, in these accounts, that such beggars cannot do: they can forge
> official documents, feign disease and mutilation, obliterate distinctions between
> true and false, and, if the occasion demands, even 'playe' the role of middle-class
> citizen...Rarely has any culture fashioned so wily and powerful an enemy out of
> such degraded and pathetic materials.[1]

Paradoxically enough former American President George W. Bush's declaration of the global 'War against Terror' in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks was complemented by the perceived domestic threat posed by same-sex civil unions to long-existing sanctities of heterosexual marriage structures and conventional gender roles. By placing the extremist at par with the sexually non-normative, Bush was making an interesting though hardly novel connection between the stability of family life and matters of national security but also establishing implicit correspondences connecting the illicit sexualities of illegal immigrants at home and the violence of self-styled *jihadis* on foreign shores (recalling the joint attack on communists and homosexuals during the Cold War era).

Within this skewed paradigm both the innocent immigrant and the unscrupulous terrorist are deemed to have abnormal sexualities, deviant gendered relationships, and failed domestic lives. This logic depends on a racial and sexual economy that maps the ideological values associated with migration onto the War on Terror. Thus both types are understood to stand either outside the context of family and its relationships or in terms of fictive intimacies and social kinship lineages between husband-wife, brother-brother, father-son.[2] The commingling of such domestic and foreign threats has made the boundaries demarcating public and private life fluid and breachable, changing the nature of the late modern public sphere in unprecedented ways.

The Bush-inspired binary framework between 'us' and 'them' that has led to the displacement and projection of specific anxieties and uncertainties generated in the post-

---

[1] Carroll, *Fat King, Lean Beggar*, p. 47.
[2] Prospective immigrants often enter into sham marriages or civil partnerships to obtain partner visas. The UK Home Office estimates that on an average four thousand to ten thousand applications per year (by non-EEA nationals) are made on the basis of such false relationships. The US Congress has enacted extensive legislation that gives immigration authorities the power to investigate and discover instances of marriage fraud. Diasporic cultures have also been known to exploit extended kinship relationships concerning brothers, sisters, uncles, and aunts to settle down in the West. On a more sinister note children might be trafficked by individuals claiming to be their fathers or uncles. Terrorist networks are frequently known to use the ideology of brotherhoods and patrilineal relationships or play upon a spirit of intimate community and kinship related emotions to sustain its nefarious motives.

9/11 collective American consciousness onto socially marginalised bodies and spaces reflects and corroborates the early modern cultural moment traced in this thesis. The danger of perceived risks to the national imaginary has resulted in the grouping together (under the abusive cultural catch-all of 'Pakis' for instance) of apparently unrelated individuals under the rubric of generalised and objectless suspicion: same-sex couples, Latin American labour migrants, South Asian asylum-seekers or Middle East contract workers. Their bodies are initially rendered threatening through their constructed association with homosexuality or the September attacks and then these same bodies are offered as threats in need of containment.

Much later running for Presidential candidature in a recession-hit America (the 'Great Recession' is arguably the most significant event for Americans after 9/11) Barack Obama was able to mobilise a similar framework of threat and containment to differentiate between the 'greed and irresponsibility' of the non-/anti-American (coloured, Muslim, and sexually unconventional) 'welfare thug' who drains off the money produced by the 'hard work and sacrifice' of the resident (white, Christian, and 'straight') American. Further both events (to be further aggravated by the recent Presidential election result) have inevitably led to the idea of a 'gated' America (and by implication 'Fortress' Europe) revealing a reluctance to engage in a new world of uncontainable threat and contingent risk by retreating inside homes, locking doors, displaying national flags at entry points, forming the Department of Homeland Security or Home Office, securing borders with increasingly stringent measures such as the US Patriot Act or avant-garde surveillance technologies.[3]

More so positing of the safe retreat and immobilised domesticity offered by the 'home' against the undefined terrors of the paradigmatic enemy other, is accompanied by the voyeuristic and discriminatory desire to violate or spy into the personal and liminal spaces (such as domestic dwellings, places of worship as in the Oak Creek gurudwara shootout or miscreant activities targeting mosques in Chicago or Oklahoma City, minority run educational institutions, pubs, Facebook accounts, behavioural traits or sartorial preferences) belonging to or frequented by certain classes or individuals as sites of transgression and indeterminacy: reflecting ambivalence between a cultural desire for privacy and an unwarranted desire for the visual surveillance and tactile invasion of other's privacy and agency. In fact civil libertarians' and privacy advocates warn that the

---

[3] It was not until Edward Snowden's (former National Security Agency contractor) disclosure of secret documents about the NSA's inner workings to the media that the full extent of government surveillance has come to the fore.

337

government's scrutiny of innocent groups and individuals (non-terrorist Muslims, students, workers with valid permits) will lead to the unnecessary harassment and investigation without any valid basis. A 6 March 2003 report in the *Economist* stated that:

> In the months after the September 11th attacks, some 1,200 immigrants, mostly Muslims, were rounded up by the police and immigration officials across the country. Some of these were held for months before seeing a lawyer or being brought before an immigration judge. Most have since been released, some were deported, and only a few were charged with a crime. This practice seems to have continued, though the government has stopped reporting arrests.[4]

Forcibly stripped of their autonomy and divested of any control over the self, the rhetoric of urgency and danger also precludes such sub-nationals from occupying civic space (such as airports, railway carriages, parks or malls) without being observed and assessed as potentially suspicious interlopers by others who are not members of such a group. Such individuals and groups lose their freedom in trying to avoid the discriminatory gaze, for most of them personal life is lived perforce on the outside, occupying a morbid space marked by the suspensive hiatus of the private and the public. One has reached full circle to that moment nearly three hundred years ago when the growing utopian cult of the patriarchal home and its valorisation of intimate freedoms were also inextricably linked to the anxiety about interior (feminised) spaces and identities as sites of sexual deviance, political treason, and untrammelled self-interest centred on the early modern bogeyman.

This thesis has proceeded on the assumption that Europe past and present represent not just a geo-political locus but a universal attribute of the human mind. Thus at the risk of seeming de-focused it does at the very least justify the spatio-temporal digressive liberties this work has taken in ranging between the not too dissimilar minds of Eric Schmidt, CEO of Google from 2001 to 2011 and Edward Hext, Somerset M.P. and Justice of Peace from 1594 to 1624. The trappings of cultural datedness adhering to the notion of the early modern have often led scholarly discussions on this era to be caught in a time warp. Instead, an effective way of re-engaging and re-imagining this era is to look at its afterlife in the late modern cultural, ideological, and epistemological imaginary. The moment of baroque uncertainty traced in this work is thus also the dark double of a contemporary globalised world under duress from credit risks (hawala), unregulated migration, religious radicalism, and terrorism. Once more private actors and covert

---

[4] Stable URL: http://www.economist.com/node/1622177

knowledge practices and networks are threatening to disturb social order and public discourse, initiating information, currency, and people flows through unauthorised channels and across borders. Yet again the trickster seems to be everywhere; protean, disruptive, multilingual, multiracial, and border-transgressing figures who help redefine a seemingly jeopardised European national identity and character. The spate of public counter-control measures devised for managing these hazards appear to recreate a situation similar to what was experienced four hundred years back. The emergence of new state-of-the-art knowledge management strategies that tries to rewrite and comprehend a changing world permits an epistemic reimagining of the baroque moment four centuries ago. In no two eras has the conceptual understanding of knowledge as the cognitive crisis between appearance and reality, public performance and private design acquired such a sense of urgency.

By the early years of the seventeenth century a widespread skepticism about humanism's decline was playing itself out in erudite circles. Humanism's value as an intellectually respectable component of contemporary thought was increasingly being undermined by the global flow of 'risky' knowledge systems (that ranged from new scientific theories and non-Western philosophies to non-Christian theologies). It was also impossible to disengage the positive elements of humanism from the negative: individualism from egotism and self-centeredness, self-determination from arrogance, volition and agency from power and domination. Existent knowledge practices and their ability to shape moral and civic life were beginning to seem progressively less credible. The crisis of evidence that followed this collapse and the proliferation of new ideas and epistemological positions meant that it was possible to construct a private idiosyncratic version of events and their causation and claim it to be true.

The baroque era moreover multiplied opportunities for all social groups to articulate a relation to state power instead of restricting agency to the elite few. State efforts to consolidate, censor, and restrict new informational networks was marred by the fact that it could not offer a credible syncretic system that could fill up the existent vacuum and universal doubt was the order of the day. Its efforts to subject the private self to a field of visibility were problematised by the inevitable opacity and endless deferral of knowledge. The baroque ideal of the transparent self was nothing more than a complex of shards of personality where it was impossible to define where the public ended and the private commenced. While any notion of a coherent autonomous (proto-Enlightenment) self would have seemed a distant reality the

transitory, improvised, and performative nature of baroque subjectivity could only be found in the sense of traffic between different 'selves' or in a dramatic conflict with the dehumanised social, political or racial 'other'.

Considering that Jonson was writing during the late Renaissance when the preoccupation with knowledge and its perception was transforming the European intellectual and literary landscape, it is possible to read the three plays discussed in this thesis as a fragment of a greater deliberation on the project of modernity especially the negotiation between alternate forms of self and knowing and its assimilation into a proto-Enlightenment hegemonic universalism. The trickster's plots present complex perceptual strategies that exploit contemporary epistemic problems and teach the individual to act responsibly in the moral, political and social sphere, in the process legitimising 'good' art or fiction as a form of valid pedagogical practice and morally transforming knowledge. The rogue's urbane suavity and premeditative calculation, his private self-seeking and mercenary manipulation of others makes him both a symbolic figure embodying the sceptical crisis of modernity as well as of cultural survival and creative expression in the face of impending globalisation.

More so the Jonsonian trickster aesthetic helps to reinvent narrative form; its disruptions, multiple viewpoints, and polyvalent voices dismantling controlling ideologies that seems to recall Mikhail Bakhtin's conception of the novel as 'dialogized heteroglossia'.[5] Yet the upsetting of language and power hierarchies is limited by the conservative requirements of the comic genre and by the epistemic demands of an all-controlling omniscient master-author. As a figure of narrative control gone awry the rogue as a criminal and thus ineffectual playwright also stands for the dangers associated with false epistemologies. The trickster author's seductive spectacles, deceptive disguises, false syllogism, and misinterpretation of facts for boosting his private motive is posited as a vital means of interrogating the reliability of different forms of knowledge-making, thereby enabling the spectator or reader to make sense of the contemporary epistemological indirection.

The euphoric celebration of the Shakespearean quatercentenary has probably quietly eclipsed the fact that this year also happens to mark the 400th year of Jonson's first printed folio. Yet this is hardly unexpected. Despite the prodigious amount of scholarship and literary interest that Jonson has nurtured in these intervening centuries, his reputation has nonetheless always been obscured by his senior and more illustrious

---

[5] Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981).

compatriot. Notwithstanding the overt transparency of Jonson's formidable public reputation, he has also remained a curiously private if not marginalised figure both in and death. This is not simply the kind of obscurity that shrouds Shakespeare's personal life and authorial veracity, but the paradox of the 'private-public': a sense of a gregarious public identity that is also shaped and complemented by the performance of a private retreat from social life to indulge in creative contemplation. This dissertation hopes ultimately to have facilitated an understanding of how this paradox of the 'private-public' that is endemic to modernity also shaped the flux of Jonson's authorial subjectivity – formed in the dialectic between a radical if not utopian withdrawal into privacy and an active involvement in a public sphere shaped by the exigencies of power.

———————————————

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY WORKS:

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. 2 vols. trans. Laurence Shapcote and Daniel J. Sullivan. 2nd edn. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990.

The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham. M. L. Wine (ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973.

Ariosto, Lodovico. *Orlando Furioso*. 8 vols. trans. W. S. Rose. London: John Murray Albemarle Street, 1884.

Aristotle. *The Politics of Aristotle*. trans. B. Jowett. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885.

-----*The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. trans. F. H. Peters. London: Kegan Paul, 1891.

-----*Aristotle's De Anima*. trans. and introd. D. W. Hamlyn. 1968; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

-----*Poetics*. trans. Ingram Bywater. 1977; rpt. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster*. Lawrence V. Ryan (ed.). Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Augustine. *The Confessions of St. Augustine, Books I-X*. trans. F. J. Sheed. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942.

-----*Treatises of Various Subjects*. vol. 16. Roy J. Deferrari (ed.). New York: Catholic University of America Press, 1952.

Bacon, Francis. *The Works of Francis Bacon*. vol. 3. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1819.

-----*The Works of Francis Bacon*. vol. 5. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1826.

-----*The Advancement of Learning and New Atlantis*. London: Oxford University Press, 1906.

-----*Essays by Francis Bacon*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Beal, Peter (ed.). *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, vol. 1: 1450-1625 and vol. 2: 1625-1700. London, 1988-93.

Beaumont, Francis, and Fletcher, John. *Philaster*. vol. 1. J. St. Loe Strachey (ed.). London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1949.

Bright, Timothy. *A Treatise of Melancholie*. 1586; rpt. New York: The Facsimile Text Society by Columbia University Press, 1940.

Brome, Richard. *A Jovial Crew*. Ann Haaker (ed.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. J. B. Bamborough, Martin Dodsworth (ed.). 1621; rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. introd. Charles Davies and Constance Davies (ed.). London: Ginn, 1949.

Calvin, John. *The Excuse of John Calvin Against The Complaints of Messieurs The Nicodemites of His Too Great Severity*. Johann Baum, Eduard Cunitz, and Eduard Reuss (ed.). Brunswick, 1863-1896.

Canonieri, Pietro Andrea. *Il Perfetto Cortegiano et dell'Ufizio del Prencipe verso 'L Cortegiano*. Rome : Zannetti, 1609.

Casa, Giovanni Della. *Galateo: Or, A Treatise on Politeness and Delicacy of Manners*. J. Dodsley, 1774.

Castelvetro, Lodovico. 'A Commentary on the *Poetics* of Aristotle'. In Allan H. Gilbert (ed.). *Literary Criticism: From Plato to Dryden*. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, pp. 304-57.

Castiglione, Baldassarre. *The Book of the Courtier: From the Italian of Count Baldassare Castiglione*. trans. Thomas Hoby. introd. Walter Raleigh. London : David Nutt, 1900.

Caus, Salomon de. *La perspective, avec la raison des ombres et miroirs*.London, 1611.

Cavendish, Margaret. *Select Poems of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle*. Sir Egerton Brydges (ed.). Kent: Johnson and Warwick, 1813.

Chapman, George. *The Revenge of Bussy d' Ambois.* Nicholas Brooke (ed.). London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1964.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales.* trans. Nevill Coghill. 1951; rpt. London: Penguin Books, 1958.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Inventione,De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica.* trans. H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Cleveland, John. *The Poems of John Cleveland.* John M. Berdan (ed.). New York: Grafton Press, 1993.

Cokes, Edward. *Institutes of the Laws of England.* E. and R. Brooke, 1797.

A Collection of Ordinances and Regulations for the Government of the Royal Household, Made in Divers Reigns, Etc. London: John Nichols, 1790.

Cotgrave, Randle. *A Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues.* London, 1611.

Crooke, Helkiah. *Microcosmographia: A Description of the Body of Man.* London: W. Laggard, 1615.

Dante, Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy: Inferno.* trans. Charles S. Singleton. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Dekker, Thomas. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker.* 4 vols. London: John Pearson, 1873.

-----*The Shoemaker's Holiday.* Wilfrid J. Halliday (ed.). London: Macmillan, 1927.

-----*The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker.* 5 vols. Alexander B. Grosart (ed.). 1885; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Descartes, Rene. *Discourse on the Method and the Meditations.* trans. John Veitch. New York: Cosimo, Inc., 2008.

Drayton, Michael. *The Works of Michael Drayton.* 5 vols. J. William Hebel (ed.). Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1961.

Dubinsky, Roman (ed.). *Alexander Brome: Poems.* vol. 1. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Empiricus, Sextus. *Sextus Empiricus.* vol. 1. trans. R. G. Bury. London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Collected Works of Erasmus.* trans. Margaret Mann Phillips and R. A. B. Mynors. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

-----*A Handbook on Good Manners for Children: De Civilitate Morum Puerilium Libellus.* trans. Eleanor Merchant. London: Preface Publishing, 2008.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium.* trans. Sears Jayne. Dallas, Texas: Spring Publications, 2000.

Fish, Simon. *A Supplication for the Beggars.* Edward Arber (ed.). London, 1878.

Fletcher, John, and Massinger, Philip. *The Beggar's Bush.* John H. Dorenkamp (ed.). The Hague: Mouton, 1967.

Foley, Henry. *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus.* vol. 4. London: Burns and Oates, 1878.

Garnet, Henry. *A Treatise of Equivocation.* David Jardine (ed.). London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851.

Garzoni, Tomaso. *La piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo.*2 vols. P. Cherchi and B. Collina (ed.). Torino: Einaudi, 1996.

Gerard, John. *John Gerard: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan.* John Morris (ed.). London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1871.

Gosson, Stephen. *The School of Abuse.* 1579; rpt. London: Reprinted for the Shakespeare Society, 1841.

-----*Plays Confuted in Five Actions.* 1582; rpt. London: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1972.

Guazzo, Stephano. *La civil conversazione.* Stoer, 1609.

Guicciardini, Francesco. *Dialogo e Discorsi del Reggimento di Firenze.* R. Palmarocchi (ed.). G. Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1932.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England*. Georges Edelen (ed.). Ithaca, N. Y.: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell University Press, 1968.

Hesiod. *Works and Days*. trans. Richard Lattimore. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1959.

The Holy Bible, King James Study Bible. Thomas Nelson Inc., 1999.

Horace. *Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (ed.). 1926; rpt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Golden Age*. London: John Pearson, 1874.

-----*Thomas Heywood*. introd. J. Addington Symonds. A. Wilson Verity (ed.). London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.

James I. *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*. Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards, and Joseph Marshall (ed.). Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Johnson, Samuel.*Dr.Johnson's English Dictionary as Improved by Todd and Abridged by Chalmers*. Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1830.

Jonson, Ben. *Works*. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson (ed.). 11 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925-52.

-----*Sejanus*. Jonas Barish (ed.). New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965.

-----*Bartholomew Fair*. Suzanne Gossett (ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

-----*The Alchemist: A Critical Reader*. Erin Julian and Helen Ostovich (ed.). London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Judges, Arthur Valentine (ed.). *The Elizabethan Underworld*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge, 1965.

The Koran. trans. J. M. Rodwell. introd. Alan Jones. London: Hachette, 2011.

Lemnius, Levinas. *The Touchstone of Complexions*. trans. Thomas Newton. London: Marshe, 1581.

Liber Vagatorum. D. B. Thomas (ed.). trans. J. C. Hotten. London: Penguin, 1932.

Lomazzo, Giovanni Paolo. *Trattato dell'arte de Pittura.*Milan: per Paolo Gottardo Pontio, 1585.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince.* trans. Robert M. Adams (ed.). 2nd edn. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992.

Markham, Gervase. *A Health to the Gentlemanly Profession of Serving-Men.* 1598; rpt. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Dr. Faustus.* John D. Jump (ed.). New Delhi: B. I. Publications, 1975.

Marston, John. *The Dutch Courtesan.* M. L. Wine (ed.). London: Edward Arnold, 1965.

-----*The Malcontent.* M. L. Wine (ed.). London: Edward Arnold, 1965.

Marvell, Andrew. *Selected Poetry and Prose.* London and New York: Methuen, 1986.

Middleton, Thomas,and Rowley, William. *The Spanish Gipsie and All's Lost by Lust.* Edgar C. Morris (ed.). Boston and London: D. C. Heath & Company, 1908.

Mirandola, Pico della. 'Oration on the Dignity of Man'. In E. Cassirer, P. O. Kristeller, and J. H. Randall (ed.). *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man.* 1948; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 213-54.

Montaigne, Michel. *Essays of Michel de Montaigne.* trans. Charles Cotton. William Carew Hazlitt (ed.). London: Reeves and Turner, 1877. Stable URL: http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/3600

Mulcaster, Richard. *Positions: Wherein Those Primitive Circumstances be Examined, which are Necessarie for the Training Up of Children.* 1581; rpt. London: Longman Greens, 1888.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works.* J. B. Steane (ed.). London: Penguin, 1972.

Parsons, Robert. *A Brief Discours Contayning Certayne Reasons Why Catholiques Refuse To Goe To Church.* London, 1580.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Petrarch's 'Secretum': With Introduction, Notes and Critical Anthology.* Davy A. Carozza and H. James Shey (ed.). New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Pini, Teseo. *Speculum Cerretanorum* in *Il libro dei vagabondi*. Piero Camporesi (ed.). Torino: Einaudi, 1973.

Plato. *Phaedrus and the Seventh and Eighth Letters*. trans. and introd. Walter Hamilton. London: Penguin Books Limited, 1975.

-----*Republic*. trans. Benjamin Jowett. New York: Modern Library, 1982.

-----*Cratylus*. trans. Benjamin Jowett. Middlesex: The Echo Library, 2006.

Plautus, Titus Maccius. *Comedies of T. Maccius Plautus*. trans. Edward H. Sugden. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1893.

-----*The Pseudolus of Plautus*. H. W. Auden (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.

-----*The Comedies of Plautus*. Henry Thomas Riley (ed.). London: G. Bell and Sons, 1912.

-----*Plautus, the Darker Comedies: Bacchides, Casina and Truculentus*. trans. James Tatum. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University, 1983.

Pliny (The Elder). *Pliny's Natural History: A Selection from Philemon Holland's Translation*. J. Newsome (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Porta, Giambattista Della. *De Humana Physiognomonia*. 1586; Frankfurt : Rosa, 1601.

-----*Magiae Naturalis*. 1589; Aubrii & Schleichius, 1619.

Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. trans. H. E. Butler. London and New York: William Heinemann and G. P. Putnam, 1921-22.

Raleigh, Walter. *Skeptic, or Speculation*. London, 1651.

Sackville, Thomas, and Norton, Thomas. *Gorboduc*. London: T. C. and R. C. Jack, 1908.

Shakespeare, William. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (ed.). New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1997.

Sidney, Philip. *Apologie for Poetrie*. introd. J. Churton Collins (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon
    Press, 1950.

Smith, Walter. *The Twelve Merry Jests of the Widow Edith*. In *Shakespeare's Jest-Books*. 3
    vols. William Hazlitt (ed.). London: Willis and Sotheran, 1864, pp. 27-108.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queen*. J. C. Smith (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Starkey, Thomas. *A Dialogue Between Pole and Lupset*. T. F. Mayer (ed.). London:
    Office of the Royal Historical Society, 1989.

Stow, John. *The Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*. 6th edn. London: J.
    Richardson, 1754-55.

Stubbes, Philip. *Anatomy of Abuses*. Frederick J. Furnivall (ed.). 1583; rpt. London: the
    New Shakespeare Society, 1877.

Tanner, Joseph R (ed.). *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I, A.D. 1603-1625*.
    1930; rpt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Taylor, John. *The Pennyles Pilgrimage or The Money-lesse Perambulation of John Taylor*.
    London, 1618.

-----*A New Discouery by Sea, with a Vvherry from London to Salisbury*. 1623; rpt.
    Proquest, Eebo Editions, 2010.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *The Old Regime and the Revolution*. New York: Harper &
    Brothers, 1856.

Vives, Juan Luis. *Concerning the Relief of the Poor*. trans. Richard Hyrde. London: John
    Dantner, 1592.

-----*The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. trans. Charles
    Fantazzi (ed.). London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

SECONDARY WORKS:

Achilleos, Stella. 'New Directions: Age and Aging'. In Matthew Steggle (ed.). *Volpone: A Critical Guide*. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011, pp. 144-67.

Adorno, Theodor, and Horkheimer, Max. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. trans. John Cumming. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.

Aers, David. 'A Whisper in the Ear of Early Modernists'. In David Aers (ed.). *Culture and History 1350-1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing*. Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1992, pp. 177-202.

Agnew, Jean-Christophe. *Worlds Apart: The Market and Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Albrow, Martin. 'Travelling beyond Local Cultures: Socioscapes in a Global City'. In *Living the Global City: Globalization as Local Process*. London: Routledge, 1997, pp. 35-69.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. rev. edn. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Anzieu, Didier. *The Skin Ego*. trans. Chris Turner. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Archer, Ian. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

-----'The Nostalgia of John Stow'. In David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (ed.). *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 17-34.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. trans. R. Baldick. New York: Vintage, 1962.

Ashley, Kathleen. 'The Guiler Beguiled: Christ and Satan as Theological Tricksters in Medieval Religious Literature'. *Criticism*, 24, 1982, pp. 126-37.

Assaf, Sharon. 'The Ambivalence of the Sense of Touch in Early Modern Prints'. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*,29, 2005, pp. 75-98.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthroplogy of Supermodernity.* London: Verso, 1995.

Aydelotte, Frank. *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space.* New York: Orion, 1964.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Michael Holquist (ed.). trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barish, Jonas. *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

-----'Jonson and the Loathèd Stage'. In William Blissett, Julian Patrick, and R. W. Van Fossen (ed.). *A Celebration of Ben Jonson.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973, pp. 30-46.

-----*The Antitheatrical Prejudice.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Barker, Francis. *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays in Subjection.* New York: Methuen, 1984.

Barthes, Roland. 'The Death of the Author'. In Sean Burke (ed.). *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern: A Reader.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995, pp. 125-30.

Barton, Anne. *Ben Jonson: Dramatist.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations.* New York: Semiotext(e), 1983.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals.* Oxford: Polity Press, 1987.

Beck, Ervin. 'Terence Improved: The Paradigm of the Prodigal Son in English Renaissance Comedy'. *RenD*, 6, 1973, pp. 107-22.

Beck, Ulrich. *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

-----*Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage, 1992.

Beckwith, Sarah. *Signifying God: Social Relation and Symbolic Act in the York Corpus Christi Plays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Beier, A. L. *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England 1560-1640*. London: Methuen, 1985.

-----"The Canting Lexicon in Early Modern England: Antilanguage or Jargon?' In Peter Burke and Roy S. Porter (ed.) *The Social History of Language: Language and Jargon*, vol. 3. London: Polity Press, 1995, pp. 64-101.

-----"'A New Serfdom": Labor Laws, Vagrancy Statutes, and Labor Discipline in England, 1350-1800'. In A. L. Beier and Paul R. Ocobock (ed.). *Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective*. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2008, pp. 35-63.

Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama.* London: Methuen, 1985.

Benjamin, Walter. 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility'. In Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings (ed.). *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume4: 1938-40*. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002, pp. 251-83.

Berg, Sara van den. 'Ben Jonson and the Ideology of Authorship'. In Jennifer Brady and W. H. Herendeen (ed.). *Ben Jonson's 1616 Folio*. Newark, N. J.: University of Delaware Press, 1991, pp. 111-37.

----- 'Marking his Place: Ben Jonson's Punctuation'. *EMLS*, 1, 1995, pp. 1-25. Stable URL: http://purl.oclc.org/emls/01-3/bergjons.html

Blank, Paula. *Broken English: Dialectics and the Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Blissett, William, Patrick, Julian, and Fossen, R. W. Van (ed.). *A Celebration of Ben Jonson.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Boes, Maria R. 'Unwanted Travellers: The Tightening of City Borders'. In Thomas Betteridge (ed.). *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007, pp. 87-112.

Bogel, Fredric V. *The Difference Satire Makes: Rhetoric and Reading from Jonson to Byron*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Bok, Sissela. *Secrecy:On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Bold, John. 'Privacy and the Plan'. In John Bold and Edward Chaney(ed.). *English Architecture Public and Private*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1993, pp. 107-19.

Borukhov, Boris. 'Ben Jonson's "Widowed Wife": A New Candidate'. *Notes and Queries*, 56, 2009, pp. 86-91.

Bradbrook, Muriel C. *TheGrowth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.

Braddick, Michael J. *State Formation in Early Modern England c. 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Bruno, Giuliana. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. London: Verso, 2002.

Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*. trans. S. G. C. Middlemore. New York: Harper and Rowe, 1958.

Burke, Peter. *The Art of Conversation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. '"For They are Actions that a Man Might Play": Hamlet as Trickster'. In Peter J. Smith and Nigel Wood (ed.). *Hamlet*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996, pp. 24-54.

Butler, Judith, and Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Who Sings the Nation-State?: Language, Politics, Belonging.* London, New York, Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2007.

Butler, Martin. 'Jonson's Folio and the Politics of Patronage'. *Criticism*, 35, 1993, pp. 377-90.

Bynum, William F., and Porter, Roy (ed.). *Medicine and the Five Senses.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Carlson, David. *English Humanist Books: Writers and Patrons, Manuscript and Print, 1475-1525.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Carroll, William C. *Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Carruthers, Mary J. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture.* 1990; rpt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Cascardi, Anthony. *The Subject of Modernity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Cassell, Philip (ed.). *The Giddens Reader.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Cavaillé, Jean-Pierre. *Dis/simulations.* Paris: Champion, 2002.

Cavallo, Sandra, and Evangelisti, Silvia. 'Introduction'. In Sandra Cavallo and Silvia Evangelisti (ed.). *Domestic Institutional Interiors in Early Modern Europe.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, pp. 1-23.

Cave, Richard. 'Visualising Jonson's Text'. In Richard Cave, Elizabeth Schafer, and Brian Woolland(ed.).*Ben Jonson and Theatre: Performance, Practice and Theory.* London: Routledge, 1999, pp. 31-42.

Cave, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Cavell, Stanley. *Disowning Knowledge in Seven Plays of Shakespeare.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Certeau, Michel de. 'Reading as Poaching'. trans. Steven F. Rendall. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, pp. 165-76.

Chakravorty, Swapan. *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

-----'Author as Auctor: The Shakespearean Instance'. In Amlan Dasgupta (ed.). *Renaissance Texts and Contexts*. Kolkata : Macmillan India Limited, 2003, pp. 8-31.

-----'Hypocrite Lecteur: Reading on the Early Modern Stage'. In Sukanta Chaudhuri (ed.). *Renaissance Themes:Essays Presented to Arun Kumar Das Gupta*. London: Anthem Press, 2009, pp. 33-61.

Chambliss, William. 'A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy'. *Social Problems*, 12, 1964, pp. 67-77. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/798699

Chandler, F. W. *Literature of Roguery*. 2 vols. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1907.

Chapman, Alison A. 'Flaying Bartholomew: Jonson's Hagiographic Parody'. *Modern Philology*, 101, 2004, pp. 511-41.

Chartier, Roger. 'Leisure and Sociability: Reading Aloud in Early Modern Europe'. trans. Carol Mossman. *Urban Life in the Renaissance*. Susan Zimmerman and Ronald F. E. Weissman (ed.). Newark, N. J: University of Delaware Press, 1989, pp. 103-20.

Chilton, Paul. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Christensen, Ann C. '"The doors are made against you": Domestic Thresholds in Ben Jonson's Plays'. *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association*, 18, 1997, pp. 153-78.

Christopher, Brandon Whiting. '"Officious Men of State": Early Modern Drama and Early English Bureaucratic Identity'. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University, 2007.

Clark, Sandra. *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640*. Rutherford, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1983.

Cohen, Jean L. *Regulating Intimacy: A New Legal Paradigm*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Cook, Ann Jenalie. *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Corbett, Margery, and Lightbown, Ronald. *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-Page in England 1550-1660*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Crane, Mary Thomas. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

-----*Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Creaser, John. '*Bartholomew Fair*: Textual Essay'. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/esssays/Bartholomew_Fair_textual_essay/

Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

-----'Response: Private Lives, Public Performance, and Rites of Passage'. In Betty S. Travitsky and Adele F. Seeff (ed.). Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994, pp. 187-97.

Cuddy, Neil. 'The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603-1625'. In David Starkey, D. A. L. Morgan, John Murphy, Pam Wright, Neil Cuddy, and Kevin Sharpe (ed.). *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*. London and New York: Longmans, 1987, pp. 173-225.

Danson, Lawrence. 'Jonsonian Comedy and the Discovery of the Social Self'. *PMLA*, 99, 1984, pp. 179-93.

Darnton, Robert. *The Kiss of Lamourette: Reflections in Cultural History*. London and New York: W. W. Norton, 1990.

Davidson, Hilda Ellis. 'Loki and Saxo's Hamlet'. In Paul Williams (ed.). *The Fool and the Trickster: Studies in Honour of Enid Welsford*. Totowa: D. S. Brewer, 1979, pp. 3-17.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975.

-----*The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Dawson, Anthony, and Yachnin, Paul. *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Daybell, James. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635*.Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Dehaene, Michael, and Cauter, Lieven De (ed.). *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Deleuze, Gilles. 'The Fold'. *Yale French Studies*, 80, 1991, pp. 227-47.

-----*The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Derrida, Jacques. *Disseminations*. trans. Barbara Johnson. London: The Athlone Press, 1981.

-----*The Post Card: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

-----*Of Grammatology*. trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997.

De Sousa, Geraldo U. *At Home in Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010.

Dessen, Alan C. 'The *Alchemist*: Jonson's "Estates Play"'.*RenD*, 7, 1964, pp. 35-54.

Detienne, Marcel, and Vernant, Jean Paul. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1978.

Dillinger, Johannes. 'Terrorists and Witches: Popular Ideas of Evil in the Early Modern Period'. *History of European Ideas*, 30, 2004, pp. 167-82.

-----'Organized Arson as a Political Crime: The Construction of a "Terrorist" Menace in the Early Modern Period'. *Crime, History and Societies*, 10, 2006, pp. 101-21.

Dionne, Craig, and Mentz, Steve (ed.). *Rogues and Early Modern English Culture*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Sussex: Harvester, 1984.

Donaldson, Ian. *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

-----'Unknown Ends: *Volpone*'. Richard Dutton (ed.). *Ben Jonson*. Harlow: Pearson Education, pp. 118-22.

-----*Ben Jonson: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Doy, Gen. *Drapery: Classicism and Barbarism in Visual Culture*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2002.

Duncan, Douglas. *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Dutton, Richard. *Ben Jonson: To the First Folio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

-----'*Volpone*: Textual Essay'. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Volpone_textual_essay

Dyke, Joyce Van. 'The Game of Wits in *The Alchemist*'. *SEL*, 19, 1970, pp. 253-69.

Dynes, William R. 'The Trickster-figure in Jacobean City Comedy'. *SEL*, 33, 1993, pp. 365-83.

Eck, Marcel. *Lies and Truth*. trans. Bernard Murchland. London: Macmillan, 1970.

Eggington, William. *How the World Became a Stage: Presence, Theatricality, and the Question of Modernity*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press, 2003.

Egmond, Florike. *Underworlds: Organized Crime in the Netherlands, 1650-1800*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. vol. 1. trans. Edmund Jephcott. rev. edn. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

Ellis, Anthony. *Old Age, Masculinity, and Early Modern Drama: Comic Elders on the Italian and Shakespearean Stage*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.

Elk, Martine Van. '"She would tell none other tale": Narrative Strategies in the Bridewell Court Books and the Rogue Literature of the Early Modern Period'. *Early Modern Culture*, 7, 2008, pp. 1-20.

Elton, G. R. *Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Enck, John. *Jonson and the Comic Truth*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Engels, Frederich. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Introd. Pat Brewer. Chippendale, NSW, Australia: Resistance Books, 2004.

Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare and the Book Trade*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Evans, Bertrand. *Shakespeare's Comedies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Ferry, Anne. *The 'Inward' Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Fine, Gary Alan. *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Finlay, Roger. *Population and Metropolis: The Demography of London 1580-1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Finnegan, Ruth. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.

Fish, Stanley. 'Authors-Readers: Jonson's Community of the Same'. *Representations*, 7, 1984, pp. 26-58.

Focillon, Henry. *The Life of Forms in Art*. trans. Charles B. Hogan and George Kubler. New York: Zone Books, Inc., 1989.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*.trans. Alan Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

-----*The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*. trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978.

-----'The Eye of Power'. In Colin Gordon (ed.). *Power / Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon, 1980, pp. 146-65.

----- 'What is an Author?'. In Paul Rabinow (ed.). *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984, pp. 101-20.

-----'Of Other Spaces'. trans. Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics*, 16, 1986, pp. 22-7.

-----*Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. L. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. H. Hutton (ed.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Fraser, Nancy. 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy'.*Social Text*, 9, 1990, pp. 56-80.

Freeburg, Victor Oscar. *Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama: A Study in Stage Tradition*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

Freud, Sigmund. 'The "Uncanny"'. Pelican Freud Library. trans. James Strachey. vol. 14. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985.

-----'On Negation'. *On Freud's 'Negation'*. Mary Kay O'Neill and Salman Akhtar (ed.). London: Karnac Books, 2011.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

-----'"Secret" Arts: Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets'. *Representations*, 15, 1996, pp. 57-97.

-----*Unsettled: The Culture of Mobility and the Working Poor in Early Modern England.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Gallagher, Lowell. *Medusa's Gaze: Casuistry and Conscience in the Renaissance.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Garber, Marjorie. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Green, Felicity. *Montaigne and the Life of Freedom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Gatti, Hilary. *The Renaissance Drama of Knowledge: Giordano Bruno in England.*London: Routledge, 1989.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

-----'"From the Native's Point of View": On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding'. In Richard A. Shweder and Robert A. Levine (ed.). *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, andEmotion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp. 126-36.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratext: Thresholds of Interpretation.* trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gibbons, Brian. *Jacobean City Comedy*: *A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Gillman, Sander L. *Inscribing the Other.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.

-----'Touch, Sexuality and Disease'. In William F. Bynum and Roy Porter (ed.). *Medicine and the Five Senses.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 198-224.

Ginsberg, Elaine K. 'Introduction: The Politics of Passing'. In Elaine K. Ginsberg (ed.). *Passing and the Fictions of Identity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996, pp. 1-18.

Gladfelder, Hal. *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth-Century England: Beyond the Law.* Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and Their Contemporaries.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Goody, Jack. *The Interface between the Written and the Oral.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Gowing, Laura. *Domestic Dangers:Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

-----'Ordering the Body: Illegitimacy and Female Authority in Seventeenth-Century England'. In Michael J. Braddick and John Walter (ed.). *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy, and Subordination in Britain and Ireland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 49-51.

Grafton, Anthony. *The Footnote: A Curious History.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Grazia, Margreta De, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass (ed.). *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

-----*Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

-----*Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture.* 1990; rpt. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Greene, Thomas M. 'Ben Jonson and the Centred Self'. *SEL*, 10, 1970, pp. 325-48.

Gregory, Derek, and Pred, Allan (ed.). *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror and Political Violence.* New York, London: Routledge, 2007, pp. 1-6.

Grewell, Cory. *Subversive Merit: The Revision of the Classical Clever Slave as Witty Servant and Social Satirist in the Comedies of Ben Jonson.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, 2008. *Proquest* (UMI Number: 3315423).

Groebner, Valentin. *Who Are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe.* trans. Mark Kyburz and John Peck. New York: Zone Books, 2007.

Gurr, Andrew. 'The General and the Caviar: Learned Audiences in the Early Theatre'. *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 26, 1993, pp. 7-20.

-----*Playgoing in Shakespeare's London.* 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

Hackel, Heidi Brayman. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hanson, Elizabeth. *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Harbage, Alfred. *Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions.* New York: Macmillan, 1952.

Hardison, O. B. *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1963.

Harris, Jonathan Gil, and Korda, Natasha (ed.). *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Harp, Richard, and Stewart, Stanley (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

-----*Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture.* Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Havelock, Eric. *Origins of Western Literacy.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1976.

Haynes, Jonathan. 'Festivity and the Dramatic Economy of Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*'. *ELH*, 51, 1984, pp. 645-68.

-----'Representing the Underworld: *The Alchemist*'. *Studies in Philology*, 86, Winter 1989, pp. 18-41.

-----*The Social Relations of Jonson's Theatre.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hector, L. C. *The Handwriting of English Documents.* 2nd edn. London: Edward Arnold, 1966.

Helgerson, Richard. *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton and the Literary System.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Hetherington, Kevin. *The Badlands of Modernity: Heterotopia and Social Ordering.* London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Higgs, Edward. *The Information State in England: The Central Collection of Information on Citizens since 1500.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Hill, Christopher. So*ciety and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England.* London: Panther Books, 1969.

Hirsch, James (ed.). *New Perspectives on Ben Jonson.* Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1997.

Hollander, Anne. *Fabric of Vision: Dress and Drapery in Painting.* London: National Gallery Company Limited, 2002.

Hollander, John. 'The Language of Privacy'. *Social Research*, 68, 2001, pp. 5-28. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40971434

Hollander, Martha. *AnEntrance for the Eyes: Space and Meaning in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Art.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2002.

Hoskins, G. W. 'The Rebuilding of Rural England, 1570-1640'. *Past and Present*, 4, 1953, pp. 44-59.

Huebert, Ronald. 'Privacy: The Early History of a Word'. *The Sewanee Review*, 105, 1997, pp. 21-38. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27548290

Hunt, Lynn. *The Family Romance of the French Revolution.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.

Hyland, Peter. *Disguise and Role-Playing in Ben Jonson's Drama.* Salzburg: Inst. f. Engl. Sprache u. Literatur, Univ. Salzburg, 1977.

Jagodzinsky, Cecile. *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England.* Charlottesville VA and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999.

Jardine, Lisa, and Grafton, Anthony. '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy'. *Past and Present*, 0, 1990, pp. 30-78.

Jay, Martin. *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.

Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Stallybrass, Peter. 'The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*'. *SEL*, 24, 1984, pp. 53-68.

Jung, Carl. *Psychology and Alchemy.* trans. R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Kahn, David. *The Codebreakers: The Comprehensive History of Secret Communication from Ancient Times to the Internet.* 2nd edn. New York: Scribner, 1996.

Kahn, Victoria. *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Kamboureli, Smaro. *Scandalous Bodies: Diasporic Literatures in English Canada.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kelly, Joseph Jon. 'Ben Jonson's Politics'. *Renaissanceand Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, n.s. 7, 1983, pp. 192-215.

Kernan, Alvin B. *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the English Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

-----*Samuel Johnson and the Impact of Print*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Kinney, Arthur F (ed.). *Rogues, Vagabonds, and Sturdy Beggars: A New Gallery of Tudor and Early Stuart Rogue Literature*. 2nd edn. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.

Knapp, Jeffrey. *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theater in Renaissance England*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Knights, L. C. *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937.

Larson, Katharine. *Early Modern Women in Conversation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991.

Lerer, Seth. 'Books and Readers in the Long Fifteenth Century'. *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 70, 2007, pp. 453-60.

Lesser, Zachary. 'Typographic Nostalgia: Playreading, Popularity and the Meanings of Black Letter.' In Marta Straznicky (ed.). *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006, pp. 99-126.

Lesser, Zachary, and Stallybrass, Peter. 'The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays'. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 59, 2008, pp. 371-420.

Levin, Richard. 'The Two-Audience Theory of English Renaissance Drama'. *Shakespeare Studies*, 18, 1986, pp. 251-75.

Levine, Laura. *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Lis, Catharina, and Soly, Hugo. *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*. trans. James Coonan. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1979.

Loades, David. *The Tudor Court*. Totowa: Barnes & Noble Books, 1987.

Loewenstein, Joseph. *Ben Jonson and Possessive Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Louden, Bruce. *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Love, Harold. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth Century England*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

Luckyj, Christina. *"A Moving Rhetoricke": Gender and Silence in Early Modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Lynch, Kathleen. 'The Dramatic Festivity of *Bartholomew Fair*'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews*, 8, 1996, pp. 128-45.

Lynch, Kevin. *Good City Form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.

MacFaul, Tom. *Problem Fathers in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *After Virtue*. 1981; rpt. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Mack, Peter. 'Renaissance Habits of Reading'. In Sukanta Chaudhuri (ed.). *Renaissance Essays for Kitty Scoular Datta*. Calcutta: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 1-25.

MacRae, Andrew. 'The Peripatetic Muse: Internal Travel and the Cultural Production of Space in Pre-Revolutionary England'. In Gerald Maclean, Donna Landry, and Joseph P. Ward (ed.). *The Country and the City Revisited: England and the Politics of Culture, 1550-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 41-57.

Manguel, Alberto. *A History of Reading*. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.

Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Manning, Roger. *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Marchitell, Howard. 'Desire and Domination in *Volpone*'. *SEL 1500-1900*, 31, 1993, pp. 287-308.

Marcus, Leah S. *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

-----'Pastimes and the Purging of the Theater: *Bartholomew Fair* (1614)'. In David Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (ed.). *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama.* New York: Routledge, 1991, pp. 196-209.

-----'From Oral Delivery to Print in the Speeches of Elizabeth I'. In Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol (ed.). *Print, Manuscript, & Performance.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000, pp. 33-48.

Mardock, James D. *Our Scene is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author.* New York: Routledge, 2008.

Marks, Laura U. *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.

-----*Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Marotti, Arthur F. *John Donne, Coterie Poet.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.

-----*Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Martin, John Jeffries. 'Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe'. *The American Historical Review*, 102, 1997, pp. 1309-42.

-----*Myths of Renaissance Individualism.* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Martin, Matthew. 'Play and Plague in Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist*'. *English Studies in Canada*, 26, 2000, pp. 393-408.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Mazzola, Elizabeth, and Abate, Corinne S. 'Introduction: Indistinguished Space'. In Elizabeth Mazzola and Corinne S. Abate (ed.). *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003, pp. 1-17.

McCanles, Michael. *Jonsonian Discriminations: The Humanist Poet and the Praise of True Nobility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

McCarthy, Kathleen. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

McGann, Jerome J. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, N. J: Princeton University Press, 1991.

McKenzie, D. F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2005.

McKitterick, David. *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

McLuhan, Marshall. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

-----*Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.

McMullan, John. *The Canting Crew: London's Criminal Underworld, 1550-1700*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1984.

Melchior-Bonnet, Sabine. *The Mirror: A History*. trans. Katharine H. Jewett. London: Routledge, 2001.

Mentz, Steve. *Romance for Sale in Early Modern England: The Rise of Prose Fiction.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Menon, Madhavi. *Wanton Words: Rhetoric and Sexuality in the English Renaissance.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Miller, Jonathan. "The Pump: Harvey and the Circulation of Blood'. In James M. Bradburne (ed.). *Blood: Art, Power, Politics and Pathology.* Munich: Prestel, 2002, pp. 100-7.

Mingay, G. E. *A Social History of the English Countryside.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Mish, Charles C. 'Black Letter as a Social Discriminant'. *PMLA*, 68, 1953, pp. 627-30.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Myers, Anne M. *Literature and Architecture in Early Modern England.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2012.

Netscher, Ruth Evans. 'The Moral Vision of "*The Alchemist*": Tricks, Psychotherapy, and Personality Traits. *Literature and Medicine*, 7, 1988, pp. 177-94.

Nichols, Tom (ed.). *Others and Outcasts in Early Modern Europe.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *British Drama.* New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963.

Nock, Steven L. *The Costs of Privacy: Surveillance and Reputation in America.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1998.

O'Beirne, Emer. 'Mapping the Non-lieu in Marc Augé's writings'. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 42, 2006, pp. 38-50.

O'Connell, Michael. *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early Modern England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

O'Hara, Dian. *Courtship and Constraint: Rethinking the Making of Marriage in Tudor England.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

O'Hara, Kieron, and Shadbolt, Nigel. *The Spy in the Coffee Machine: The End of Privacy as We Know it.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008.

Olson, David. 'Interpreting Texts and Interpreting Nature: The Effects of Literacy'. *Visible Language*, 20, 1986, pp. 302-17.

Ong, Walter J. *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971.

-----*Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

-----*Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* London and New York: Methuen, 1982.

Orlin, Lena Cowen. *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

-----*Locating Privacy in Tudor London.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Paige, Nicholas D. *Being Interior: Autobiography and the Contradictions of Modernity in Seventeenth-Century France.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Panofsky, Dora, and Panofsky, Erwin. *Pandora's Box: The Changing Aspects of a Mythical Symbol.* New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Panofsky, Erwin. 'What is Baroque?'. In Irving Lavin (ed.). *Three Essays on Style.* 1934; rpt. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995, pp. 17-88.

Pardue, Brad C. *Printing, Power, and Piety: Appeals to the Public during the Early Years of the English Reformation.* Leiden, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2012.

Partridge, Edward B. *The Broken Compass: A Study of the Major Comedies.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1958.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Phillips, Joshua. *English Fictions of Communal Identity, 1485-1603*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2010.

Pike, Burton. *The Image of the City in Modern Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Pile, Steve. *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Pincock, Stephen. *Codebreaker: The History of Codes and Ciphers, from the Ancient Pharaohs to Quantum Cryptography.* New York: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Ponty, Maurice-Merleau. *Phenomenology of Perception.* trans. Colin Smith. New York: Routledge, 1962.

-----*The Visible and the Invisible.* trans. Alphonso Lingis. Claude Lefort (ed.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988.

Popkin, Richard. *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes.* rev. edn. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964.

Prendergast, Maria Teresa Micaela. 'Philoclea Parsed: Prose, Verse, and Femininity in Sidney's Old Arcadia'. In Constance Caroline Relihan (ed.). *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose.* Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1996, pp. 99-116.

Pugliatti, Paola. *Beggary and Theatre in Early Modern England.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Pugliese, Joseph. 'Biotypologies of Terrorism'. *Cultural Studies Review*, 14, 2008, pp. 49-66.

Rambuss, Richard. 'The Secretary's Study: The Secret Design of *The Shepheardes Calendar*'. *ELH*, 59, 1992, pp. 313-35.

Ranum, Ornest. 'The Refuges of Intimacy'. In Roger Chartier (ed.). *A History of Private Life: Passions of the Renaissance*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1989, pp. 207-63.

-----*Spenser's Secret Career*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Rappaport, Steve. *Worlds within Worlds: Structures of Life in Sixteenth Century London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Raylor, Timothy. *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy*. Cranbury, N. J.: Associated University Presses, 1994.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. *Foxes and Lions: Machiavelli's Confidence Men*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Redwine Jr, James D. 'Beyond Psychology: The Moral Basis of Jonson's Theory of Humour Characterization'. *ELH*, vol. 28, 1961, pp. 316-34.

Regosin, Richard L. *The Matter of My Book: Montaigne's 'Essais' as the Book of the Self*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Reigl, Aloïs. 'Late Roman or Oriental?' In Gert Schiff (ed.). trans. Peter Wortsman. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 1988, pp. 173-91.

Reiss, Timothy J. 'Montaigne and the Subject of Polity'. In Patricia Parker and David Quint (ed.). *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986, pp. 115-49.

-----*Mirages of the Selfe: Patterns of Personhood in Ancient and Early Modern Europe*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Reynolds, Bryan. *Becoming Criminal: Transversal Performance and Cultural Dissidence in Early Modern England*. Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Ribton-Turner, C. J. *A History of Vagrants and Vagrancy and Beggars and Begging*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1887.

Richards, Jennifer. *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Richardson, Catherine. *Domestic Life and Domestic Tragedy in Post-Reformation England.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: A Life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Rivlin, Elizabeth. 'The Rogues' Paradox: Redefining Work in *The Alchemist*'. In Michelle M. Dowd and Natasha Korda (ed.). *Working Subjects in Early Modern English Drama.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2011, pp. 115-29.

-----*The Aesthetics of Service in Early Modern England.* Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2012.

Rosendale, Timothy. *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Rouse, Roger. 'Mexican Migration and the Social Space of Postmodernism'. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, 1, 1991, pp. 8-23.

Russell, Rebecca Ross. *Gender and Jewelry: A Feminist Analysis.* Medford, MA: Tufts University Press, 2010.

Rzepsinska, M., and Malcharek, K. 'Tenebrism in Baroque Painting and Its Ideological Background'. *Artibuas et Historiae*, 7, 1986, pp. 91-112. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1483250

Saenger, Paul. *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York: Vintage, 1994.

Sanders, Julie (ed.). *Ben Jonson in Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Saunders, J. W. 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry'. *Essays in Criticism*, 1, 1951, pp. 139-64.

Sawday, Jonathan. *The Body Emblazoned: Dissection and the Human Body in Renaissance Culture.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Schneider, Gary. *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular Letters and Letter Writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700.* Cranbury, N. J.: Associated University Presses, 2005.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England: Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Scoglio, Stefano. *Transforming Privacy: ATranspersonal Philosophy of Rights.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998.

Segal, Charles P. 'The Phaeacians and the Symbolism of Odysseus' Return'. *Arion*, 1, 1962, pp. 17-64.

Sennett, Richard. *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization.* London: Faber and Faber, 1994.

Shane, David Grahame. *Recombinant Urbanism: Conceptual Modeling in Architecture, Urban Design, and City Theory.* London: John Wiley, 2005.

Sharpe, Kevin, and Zwicker, Steven N (ed.). *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Sharrock, Alison. *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence.* Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2009.

Sherman, William H. *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.

-----'*The Alchemist*: Textual Essay'. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/k/essays/Alchemist_textual_essay/

-----'Choice of copy-texts'. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online*. Stable URL: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/benjonson/about/general_intro/copy_texts/

Shuger, Deborah. 'The "I" of the Beholder: Renaissance Mirrors and the Reflexive Mind'. In Patricia Fumerton and Simon Hunt (ed.). *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999, pp. 19-36.

Silk, Michael, Gildenhard, Ingo, and Barrow, Rosemary. *The Classical Tradition: Art, Literature, Thought.* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Limited, 2014.

Slights, Camille W. *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert and Milton.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Slights, William W. E. *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy.* Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

-----*Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Smith, Barbara. T*he Women of Ben Jonson's Poetry: Female Representations in the Non-Dramatic Verse.* Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995.

Smith, Bruce. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

-----*Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1999.

Smith, Donald K. *The Cartographic Imagination in Early Modern England: Re-Writing the World in Marlowe, Spenser, Raleigh and Marvell.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia.* London: Pimlico, 2006.

Smuts, Malcolm R. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.

Soja, Edward W. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Sommerville, Johann P (ed.). *James VI and I:Political Writings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Sorensen, Janet. 'Vulgar Tongues: Canting Dictionaries and the Language of the People in Eighteenth-Century Britain'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, 2004, pp. 435-54.

Strohm, Paul. 'The Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*: Commemoration and Repetition in Late Medieval England'. In Susanne Rupp and Tobias Döring (ed.). *Performances of the Sacred in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005, pp. 33-44.

Snyder, Jon R. *Dissimulation and Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Spiller, Elizabeth. *Reading and the History of Race in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Spufford, Margaret. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Methuen, 1981.

Stallybrass, Peter, and White, Allon. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Stauffer, Ruth M. *Joseph Conrad: His Romantic Realism*. New York: Haskell House Publishers Limited, 1972.

Stewart, Alan. *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Stone, Lawrence. 'The Educational Revolution in England, 1560-1640'. *Past and Present*, 28, 1964, pp. 41-80.

-----*The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

-----*The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Swanson, Judith. *The Public and the Private in Aristotle's Political Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Tawney, R. H. *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth-Century*. London: Longman's Green and Co., 1912.

Taylor, Charles. 'The Obstacles to Odysseus' Return: Identity and Consciousness in the *Odyssey*'. *Yale Review*, 50, 1961, pp. 569-80.

-----*Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. 'Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time'. In Stephen Greenblatt (ed.). *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982, pp. 139-56.

Thayer, C. J. *Ben Jonson: Studies in the Plays*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1963.

Traister, Daniel. 'Reluctant Virgins: The Stigma of Print Revisited'. *Colby Quarterly*, 26, 1990, pp. 75-86.

Tribble, Evelyn Byrd. "'Like a Looking-Glas in the Frame': From the Marginal Note to the Footnote". In D. C. Greetham (ed.). *The Margins of the Text*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997, pp. 229-44.

Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Venuti, Lawrence. 'Why Jonson Wrote not of Love'. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 12, 1982, pp. 195-220.

Vezzosi, Alessandro. *Leonardo da Vinci: The Mind of the Renaissance*. New York: Discoveries, 1997.

Vickers, Brian. 'Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: The Ambivalence of *Otium*'. *Renaissance Studies*, 4, 1990, pp. 1-37.

Viles, Edward, and Furnivall, Fredrick J. *The Rogues and Vagabonds of Shakespeare's Youth*. London: Trübner, 1880.

Voekel, Swen. "'Upon the Suddaine View': State, Civil Society and Surveillance in Early Modern England'. *EMLS*, 4, 1998, pp. 1-27. Stable URL: http://purl.oclc.org/emls/04-2/voekupon.htm

Voss, Paul. 'Printing Conventions and the Early Modern Play'. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 15, 2002, pp. 98-115.

Wall, Wendy. 'Disclosures in Print: The "Violent Enlargement" of the Renaissance Voyeuristic Text'. *SEL*, 29, 1989, pp. 35-59.

-----*The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Ward, Joseph P. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Wayne, Don E. 'Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson: An Alternative View'. *RenD*, 13, 1982, pp. 103-29.

Wells, Susan. 'Jacobean City Comedy and the Ideology of the City'. *ELH*, 48, 1981, pp. 37-60. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2873011

West, William N. 'Reading Rooms: Architecture and Agency in the Houses of Michel de Montaigne and Nicholas Bacon'. *Comparative Literature*, 56, 2004, pp. 111-29.

Westin, Alan F. *Privacy and Freedom.* New York: Athenaeum, 1967.

Whigham, Frank. *Ambition and Privilege: The Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Wilkins, Harold T. *Secret Cities of Old South America.*1952; rpt. New York: Cosimo Inc., 2008.

Williams, Penry. *The Tudor Regime.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Wilson, Peter.*Absolutism in Central Europe*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Wilson, Richard. *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Wimsatt, W. K., and Beardseley, Monroe C. 'The Intentional Fallacy'. In W. K. Wimsatt (ed.). *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954, pp. 3-18.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Renaissance and Baroque*. trans. Kathrin Simon. introd. Peter Murray. 1888, London: Collins, 1964.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

-----'Renaissance Bogeymen: The Necessary Monsters of the Age'. In Guido Ruggiero (ed.). *A Companion to the Worlds of the Renaissance*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002, pp. 444-59.

Yachnin, Paul. 'The Reformation of Space in Shakespeare's Playhouse'. InAngela Vanhaelen and Joseph P. Ward (ed.). *Making Space in Public in Early Modern Europe: Geography, Performance, Privacy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013, pp. 262-80.

Yates, Frances Amelia. *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Yates, Julian. *Misuse, Failure: Object Lessons from the English Renaissance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Zagorin, Perez. 'The Historical Significance of Lying and Dissimulation'. *Social Research*, 63, 1996, pp. 863-912.

Zysk, Jay. 'Reforming Corporeality: Eucharistic Semiotics in Early Modern Drama'. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University, 2011.