

“PRESENT OCCASIONS” AND THE SHAPING OF BEN JONSON’S MASQUES

BY LEAH SINANOGLOU MARCUS

Ben Jonson saw his masques as a fusing of the topical and the timeless: “though their voice be taught to sound to present occasions, their sense or doth or should always lay hold on more removed mysteries.”¹ Recent critics have gone a long way toward comprehending Jonson’s “more removed mysteries”—his exaltation of such ideals as the ordering power of reason and theory of divine right. But we have only begun to deal with the problem of “present occasions,” and our recognition of Jonson’s artistry continues to suffer as a result.² We do know, of course, that in his early masques much of Jonson’s subject matter and at least some structural elements were dictated by members of the royal family; we know also that some of Jonson’s last masques for James I were written in celebration of controversial royal policies.³ But what of the years in between? C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson have claimed that the masques of Jonson’s middle years are most successful largely because they avoid “the disintegrating attractions of comedy, personal satire, and topical allusion.”⁴ I will argue, on the contrary, that Jonson’s middle masques are at least as carefully grounded in “present occasions” as his earlier and later productions, and that a knowledge of those occasions will add to our appreciation of Jonson’s craftsmanship rather than detracting from it.

The present study will center on Jonson’s problematic spectacles for the Christmas season of 1616-17, *Christmas His Masque* and *The Vision of Delight*. No two masques could seem more unlike. In fact *Christmas*, despite its title, has not usually been considered a masque at all. Yet both works were carefully designed to support the same set of royal policies. Although part of my purpose will be to elucidate the political allegory and common rhetorical aim of these two works in particular, I will use the 1616-17 masques to build a much more general argument. The court masque was perhaps the most inherently topical of all seventeenth-century art forms. Masques were shaped by contemporary events and intended, in turn, to give shape to those events. To read Jonson’s

masques in isolation from the environment in which his audience lived is all too often to miss the controlling formal principle behind them. The more we steep ourselves in the immediate political and social milieu of the masques, the more richness and sophistication we will find in Jonson's craftsmanship: the frequently puzzling relationship between masque and antimasque will become clearer, incoherent passages will become recognizable as adroit commentary on events, "lapses" in taste will become justifiable or at least comprehensible in terms of the poet's larger intent. Jonson sought above all to make his viewers understanders. "Else the glory of all these solemnities had perished like a blaze and gone out in the beholders' eyes" (*Hymenaei*, 75). His contemporaries frequently failed to grasp the "more removed mysteries"; we are likely to stray in an opposite direction. Unless we make ourselves understanders of the process of Jonson's masques, how their author arrived at timeless ideals through the transmutation of "present occasions," we modern readers may dismiss the masque, as some of its seventeenth-century beholders did, as the most ephemeral and fragmented of literary forms.

I

The Vision of Delight was performed twice, on Twelfth Night and on January 19, 1617. The masque opens with "a street in perspective of fair building discovered" (245). Delight appears from "afar off" to present the first antimasque, a "she-monster delivered of six burratines that dance with six pantaloons." Then Delight calls upon Night to rise and transform the scene. Night, in turn, invokes Fant'sy, creator of dreams and visions. Fant'sy offers two "dreams": the first is an antimasque of "phantasms" which Fant'sy somewhat apologetically introduces in a long, rambling, topsy-turvy speech which has mystified commentators; the second is a contrasting vision of Peace descending upon the verdant spring bower of Zephyrus. Wonder and the Choir admire this beautiful but apparently ephemeral sight. Then the bower of Zephyrus opens and Fant'sy's vision becomes reality. The masquing courtiers are revealed as "the glories of the spring" and King James is discovered and hailed as the power "Whose presence maketh this perpetual spring" (253). Dances and revelry follow; finally in the epilogue Night redescends, day approaches, and the Choir admonishes, "as night to sport, day doth to action call" (255).

For the Oxford editors, as we have seen, *The Vision of Delight* is

among Jonson's happiest and most unified productions. Other perceptive readers, however, have disagreed, finding the antimasques and Fant'sy's long tirade, which comprises no less than one fourth of the spoken lines of the work, "disintegrating attractions" indeed and difficult to incorporate into the design of the whole. Enid Welsford noted Jonson's unusually strong debt to continental sources in the antimasques and took Jonson's emphasis on burratines, pantaloons, and phantasms as a condescending submission to popular taste for things foreign and grotesque.⁵ More recently, Stephen Orgel has argued persuasively against Welsford's theory and defended the antimasques as "beautifully apt and structurally necessary" (11). But even Orgel notes the masque's unusual eclecticism and its "attenuation of structure" by Jonsonian standards (36). Why Jonson chose such disparate materials for his masque and why he designed it with such apparent diffuseness are questions which have not yet been settled.

To read *The Vision of Delight* with its "present occasion" clearly in mind, however, is to recognize that it is put together with a great deal of care and economy. Jonson shaped the work, even the curious personages of its antimasques and Fant'sy's topsy-turvy harangue, to glorify James I's policies for the year just past and to commemorate even the language in which those policies were set forth. In 1616 *The Workes of the Most High and Mighty Prince, Iames* appeared in folio, a publishing event of such magnitude that it could not possibly go unnoticed by anyone so appreciative of James's learning as Jonson was, particularly since Jonson's own folio appeared the same year. *The Vision of Delight* is one author's commemoration of the triumph of another. At the same time, Jonson cleverly managed to make his masque a celebration of a long-awaited major political act, James I's speech before the Star Chamber on June 20, 1616. James himself and his editors obviously regarded the speech very highly: it was included as the final item in the volume of his works after only four other speeches. Jonson designed his masque to give concrete form to the most important policy sections of James's speech and thereby paid his chief patron a fine double compliment: the king is exalted as author and as center of creative political energy for the kingdom.

James's speech was, appropriately for its occasion, about the proper administration of justice. He charged himself to "imitate GOD and his Christ, in being iust and righteous" and to purge the law of "Incertaintie and Noueltie."⁶ He commanded the judges of

the land to keep justice from overflowing its proper boundaries, particularly in matters concerning “the mysterie of the Kings power” and prerogative (333). Then he called upon the rest of his subjects as well to avoid “new Puritanicall straines, that make all things popular” and to respect the “ancient Limits” of English law and custom (337).

In the last section of his speech, James applied his caveats against innovation and overpresumption to the changing economic and social conditions in London and the countryside. James was no admirer of London: for years he had sought to limit the city’s growth by placing severe restrictions on new building.⁷ In his speech before Star Chamber, he called for even stricter measures: “And for the decrease of new Buildings heere, I would haue the builders restrained, and committed to prison; and if the builders cannot be found, then the workemen to be imprisoned; and not this onely, but likewise the buildings to bee cast downe . . .” (344). In addition, he restated and amplified a 1615 proclamation commanding all gentry and nobility without special business in London to return to their country estates “to maintaine Hospitalitie amongst their neighbours; which was equiuocally taken by some, as that it was meant onely for that Christmas: But my will and meaning was, and here I declare that my meaning was, that it should alwayes continue” (343). The king perceived the population shift to London not as part of a gradual evolution in the composition of British society, but as a disease, a dangerous unbalancing of the ancient, healthy harmony of the whole body politic: “like the Spleene in the body, which in measure as it ouergrowes, the body wastes. For is it possible but the Countrey must diminish, if *London* doe so increase, and all sorts of people doe come to *London*?” (343). The city was swelling in corruption and the countryside withering away. James attributed the onset of this disease to the overweening pride of the upper classes, particularly women, and their craving for suspiciously un-English novelties; he prescribed as its only remedy a return to the old humbler pattern:

One of the greatest causes of all Gentlemens desire, that haue no calling or errand, to dwell in *London*, is apparently the pride of the women: For if they bee wiues, then their husbands; and if they be maydes, then their fathers must bring them vp to *London*; because the new fashion is to bee had no where but in *London*: and here, if they be vnmarried they marre their marriages, and if they be married, they loose their reputations, and rob their husbands purses. It is the fashion of *Italy*, especially of

Naples, (which is one of the richest parts of it) that all the Gentry dwell in the principall Townes, and so the whole countrey is emptie: Euen so now in *England*, all the countrey is gotten into *London*; so as with time, *England* will onely be *London*, and the whole countrey be left waste: For as wee now doe imitate the French fashion, in fashion of Clothes, and Lackeys to follow euery man; So haue wee got vp the Italian fashion, in liuing miserably in our houses, and dwelling all in the Citie: but let vs in Gods Name leaue these idle forreine toyes, and keepe the old fashion of *England*: For it was wont to be the honour and reputation of the English Nobilitie and Gentry, to liue in the countrey, and keepe hospitalitie; for which we were famous aboue all the countreys in the world; which wee may the better doe, hauing a soile abundantly fertile to liue in.

And now out of my owne mouth I declare vnto you, (which being in this place, is equall to a Proclamation, which I intend likewise shortly hereafter to haue publicly proclaimed,) that the Courtiers, Citizens and Lawyers, and those that belong vnto them, and others as haue Pleas in Terme time, are onely necessary persons to remaine about this Citie; others must get them into the Countrey; For beside the hauing of the countrey desolate, when the Gentry dwell thus in *London*, diuers other mischiefes arise vpon it: First, if insurrections should fall out (as was lately seene by the *Leuellers* gathering together) what order can bee taken with it, when the country is vnfurnished of Gentlemen to take order with it? Next, the poore want reliefe for fault of the Gentlemens hospitalitie at home: Thirdly, my seruice is neglected, and the good gouernment of the countrey for lacke of the principall Gentlemens presence, that should performe it: And lastly, the Gentlemen lose their owne thrift, for lacke of their owne presence, in seeing to their owne businesse at home. Therefore as euery fish liues in his owne place, some in the fresh, some in the salt, some in the mud: so let euery one liue in his owne place, some at Court, some in the Citie, some in the Countrey; especially at Festiuall times, as Christmas and Easter, and the rest.

(343-44)

The Vision of Delight follows the king's analysis closely and creates through art the transformation his policies were intended to produce in reality. The masque moves from a corrupt and disordered city environment out to an idealized, revitalized countryside. As Orgel has perceptively noted, *The Vision of Delight* stands at the point of a major shift in the presentation of pastoral in not only Jonson's but all Stuart court masques:

In the early years of James I, when a pastoral scene appears as part of a sequence, contrasted with cities or palaces, it invariably comes at the beginning and embodies the wildness of nature or

the untutored innocence that we pass beyond to clear visions of sophistication and order, usually represented by complex machines and Palladian architecture. But after about a decade, from 1616 onward, this sequence is reversed. When pastoral settings appear they come at the end, and embody the ultimate ideal that the masque asserts. . . . the important point is that the sequences are invariable: in a Stuart court masque with this sort of structure, when a pastoral scene appears before 1616 it always comes at the beginning, after 1616 it always comes at the end.⁸

Orgel links this shift generally to the “developing movement toward autocracy” and a gradual widening of the sphere over which the ruler claimed control. But given the precise coincidence in time between James’s proclamations ordering the landed classes back out into the country and the new exaltation of pastoral over court and city life in the masque, we can be much more specific about why the shift in structure came about. The first masque to display the new “anti-court” pattern is *Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists at Court*, the first court masque produced after the king’s 1615 proclamation. The second, which reworks the major themes of *Mercury*, is *The Vision of Delight*. The next year’s Twelfth Night masque was *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, a work whose “present occasion” is also closely linked with James’s rural policy, specifically his issuing of the *Book of Sports*.⁹ We have no proof that King James supervised either the form or the content of these masques as closely as Queen Anne or Prince Henry had some of Jonson’s earlier productions. But the fact that Jonson continued year after year to base his masques on significant aspects of James’s political life, and the fact that James granted his chief masquewriter a pension in 1616, suggest very strongly that the political rhetoric of Jonson’s masques, if not actually dictated by the king, at least did not go unappreciated.

The Vision of Delight begins in the “here and now” of a daytime city street meant to suggest London. Delight’s invitation to revelry runs contrary to the rejuvenating decentralization James planned for England and follows the prevailing upperclass impulse to focus everything on London and the court. The king complained that “now in *England*, all the countrey is gotten into London”; Delight calls upon Grace, Love Harmony, Revel, Sport and Laughter to do just that: to “turn every sort / O’ the pleasures of the spring / To the graces of a court” (245). Wonder, significantly, remains apart; the pleasures Delight proposes are too commonplace to arouse Wonder to a response. And too inconstant as well: their ruling principle is

the giddy desire for incessant novelty which James's speech castigated in the English upper classes. James compared London to an overgrown spleen; Jonson gives her inhabitants the impulsive changeability associated in the seventeenth century with an over-dominance of spleen:

Let your shows be new, as strange,
Let them oft and sweetly vary;
Let them haste so to their change
As the seers may not tarry.

(245)

The first antimasque of a huge "she-monster" who gives birth to grotesque Italianate offspring—burratines and pantaloons—brings wittily to life the king's disparaging view of London, a city swollen with corrupt humors. The she-monster suggests as well a caricature of English women puffed with pride who have "got vp the Italian fashion" and given up the traditional "old fashion of England." As the Oxford editors point out, the word *burratine* could refer not only to a grotesque character from the Venetian carnival, but also to one of the "new deuised names, of Stuffles and Colours,"¹⁰ a new-fangled fashion to which female pride had recently given birth.

The city grotesques banished, Delight turns from the everyday world of the streets to a new realm of night and fantasy which suggests the royal court and its revelry. The choir calls upon Fant'sy to create for the masque's audience a "waking dream" of harmony to counteract the monsters of the city streets, but Fant'sy protests, in effect, that novelty and change are still in the ascendant:

But it is no one dream that can please these all;
Wherefore I would know what dreams would delight 'em,
For never was Fant'sy more loath to affright 'em.
And Fant'sy, I tell you, has dreams that have wings,
And dreams that have honey, and dreams that have stings;

(247)

Fant'sy's long satiric tirade is a catalogue of fragments and impossibilities designed to reform the unsettled and fantastical tastes of the audience of nobles and gentry; the speech in its pith and earthiness is an imaginative descant upon the king's own depiction of English society in disorder. James ordered, "Therefore as euery fish liues in his owne place, some in the fresh, some in the salt, some in the mud: so let euery one liue in his owne place, some at

Court, some in the Citie, some in the Countrey"; Fant'sy argues, similarly,

The politic pudding hath still his two ends,
Though the bellows and bagpipe were nev'r so good friends;
And who can report what offence it would be
For the squirrel to see a dog climb a tree?

(248)

The irrational, free-associational turns in Fant'sy's speech suggest the irrational and restless tastes of England's upper classes and those aspiring to such exalted position. James decried their lust and pride; Fant'sy reduces them to mere plumes and codpieces. As James lamented their imitation of "the French fashion, in fashion of Clothes, and Lackeys" so Fant'sy ridicules the ludicrous significance they attach to French trifles:

For say the French farthingale and the French hood
Were here to dispute; must it be understood
A feather, for a wisp, were a fit moderator?

(247)

For Fant'sy, as for King James, the feathers and wisps of outlandish taste exemplify in miniature the malaise of the kingdom as a whole. Order and decorum are all of a piece. To abandon them on one level is to create chaos on all:

Open that gap,
And out skip your fleas, four and twenty at a clap,
With a chain and trundle bed following at th'heels,
And will they not cry then, the world runs a-wheels?
As for example, a belly and no face
With the bill of shoveler may here come in place,
The haunches of a drum with the feet of a pot
And the tail of a Kentishman to it—why not?

(250)

The second antimasque of phantasms is not described in Jonson's text, but presumably the phantasms were just such fragmented and partial forms as Fant'sy deploras. The drawing supplied by Orgel and Roy Strong as a possible study for the second antimasque of *The Vision of Delight* shows two inchoate forms, one vaguely Chinese, the other half bird, half man.¹¹ The phantasms are the comical yet lamentable result of human art and ingenuity misapplied.

Fant'sy's topsy-turvy vision of English disorder was obviously

designed not only to echo the king but also to appeal to his well known taste for earthy humor; that is no doubt a major reason why Jonson allowed the “thread” of Fant’sy’s verbal antimasque to be “drawn out” so long. Even Jonson’s difficult reference to the duelling of “the crab and the ropemaker” at the end of Fant’sy’s harangue must have been relished by the monarch because it gives emblematic form to his 1616 diagnosis of what was wrong with England. As Orgel points out, the crab is associated in Alciati’s emblems with gluttons, parasites, toadies (488)—like those flocking to Jacobean London in search of bonanza. The ropemaker, who appears with the crab in Alciati, “is Ocnus, a mythological figure represented as endlessly weaving a rope which is then devoured by an ass standing nearby. Classical commentators explain that the ass is Ocnus’ spendthrift wife, and take the scene as a warning against marrying unfrugal women. But Renaissance writers, observing that the name Ocnus (oknos) means sloth, stressed the vicious aspects of misguided industry. . . . Alciati’s sixteenth-century commentator Claude Mignault (or Claudius Minos) even managed to reconcile Ocnus’ name with his industriousness by explaining that ‘he is slothful, no matter how much he labors, who misplaces his resources and puts them to wholly unnecessary uses’ ” (488). All of these connotations were clearly in Jonson’s mind as he devised the final verses of Fant’sy’s invective. We may presume that Jonson’s scholarly in-joke, however far above the heads of some of the more fantastical courtiers, was appreciated by his fellow scholar James I.

The antimasques give light, form, and motion to James’s description of abuses in contemporary London and the court. Considering the king’s strong objection to English aping of continental fashions, we can recognize how rhetorically appropriate Jonson’s extreme eclecticism in the antimasques is. He borrowed heavily and obviously from foreign masques and spectacles in order to give additional thrust to his satire against things foreign. James scoffed at French and Italian fashions; Jonson’s first antimasque is imported directly from France, the second from Italy. As Welsford has pointed out, the first antimasque is an obvious imitation of the first part of the *Ballet de la Foire St-Germain* “in which the midwife brought various groups of dancers out of the huge wooden female figure representing the Fair.” This ballet-masquerade was well enough known in England to be imitated again shortly after *The Vision of Delight* in a masque at Gray’s Inn.¹² Jonson’s second antimasque and certain elements of the masque proper are heavily

indebted to the Florentine *Notte d'Amore* (1608). In both works "Night is invoked, Phantasms are summoned to perform grotesque dances, an Hour appears, great wonder is expressed at all the glories of the time" and both pieces end with Aurora dismissing the audience to the next day's work. The Florentine phantasms were monstrous unfinished forms closely akin to those described by Fant'sy. They danced "an extravagant dance imitating various actions; but always starting another movement before they had finished the first."¹³

In addition, the opening street scene for *The Vision of Delight* was copied directly out of two drawings by Sebastiano Serlio: its strongly Italianate architecture was a particularly apt reminder of the Jacobean building craze to which both James and Jonson himself (in "To Penshurst") objected. London was literally being transformed from Tudor to Italianate, since many of the offending new winter residences for the nobility and gentry were being built in the newly fashionable Italianate style.¹⁴ The masque's music, too, demonstrates an unusual dependence on continental forms: it was performed by twelve French musicians and *Delight's* initial invitation to city pleasures was sung *in stilo recitativo*—very probably the first use of the Italian recitative in England.¹⁵ We can speculate that that most Italianate Englishman Inigo Jones, assuming with Orgel and Strong that he was the designer for *The Vision of Delight*, may have had some difficulty stomaching the anti-continental bias of the antimasques. But Jonson's intent was not to condemn *all* borrowing. Rather, he sought to impose rationality and order on a situation which had gotten out of hand, to reeducate courtiers and gentry along lines set out by James himself about the proper uses of art. Without the moderating influence of royal wisdom and royal policy, the world of the antimasques could presumably continue indefinitely and the upper classes race on endlessly in their futile search for novelty.

Fant'sy occupies a pivotal position in *The Vision of Delight*, first demonstrating through satire the folly of one sort of dream, then, having weaned the audience from their folly, inspiring them with a vastly superior dream worthy of their emulation. Fant'sy shifts roles in eight beautifully modulated lines which move from the jogging anapests of the frenzied antimasque world to a smooth iambic pentameter appropriate for introducing Peace and the bower of Zephyrus:

Why, this you will say was fantastical now,
 As the cock and the bull, the whale and the cow;
 But vanish away; I have change to present you,
 And such as I hope will more truly content you.
 Behold the gold-haired Hour descending here,
 That keeps the gate of heaven and turns the year,
 Already with her sight how she doth cheer,
 And makes another face of things appear.

(250-51)

In the antimasques, the various attributes are at war: art perverts nature, all is frenzied haste and nothing satisfies. As Peace descends on the bower of Zephyrus, by contrast, permanence and change, art and nature are reconciled. The character of Fant'sy in its dual roles is Jonson's tribute to the creative imagination of James I, able both to diagnose abuses and to propose noble and harmonious correctives. The figure of Peace, the Hour who brings in the New Year's vision of pastoral springtime, was undoubtedly meant as a further tribute to James, who prided himself most of all on his kingly role as peacemaker. The frontispiece of his 1616 *Workes* displays *Pax* and *Religio* in harmony under a crown. *Pax* bears an olive branch in one hand and a cornucopia of fruit and flowers in the other. On the opposite page James is depicted holding an emblem of the world with his motto *beati pacifici* above his head.¹⁶ As the king brings peace to the world on the emblematic frontispiece to his works, so his creative Fant'sy confers Peace in *The Vision of Delight*. In the masque, as on the frontispiece, Peace is closely tied to fertility. Wonder, silent until the revelation of the bower of Zephyrus, is finally aroused to awed response by the bower's harmonization of art and nature and the miraculous appearance of Spring's "fruitful dew" and flowers in the midst of winter (251).

The theme of winter rebirth and reawakening appears frequently in the court masques for Epiphany and has obvious theological overtones. Wonder proposes gods from classical mythology who might have worked such a marvel, but Fant'sy promises even greater marvels: the bower opens out to become a larger pastoral landscape which represents all of Britain. Wonder notes verdant fields and trees, flowing meadows, calm seas and smooth rivers, frisking lambs, grazing sheep, carolling birds and, most important of all, the masquers themselves displayed as the "glories" of this spring paradise. The final vision of *The Vision of Delight* is precisely the

fertile, healthy countryside which the king proposed in his 1616 speech to restore by limiting the size of London and returning the gentry and nobility to their proper rural spheres of action.

This final and most beautiful stage in the masque's progression from perverse artifice to perfected nature goes beyond praise for the king's creative vision to celebrate his godlike power to make that vision reality. When Wonder asks, "What power is this, what god?" Fant'sy reveals the monarch in his own person among the audience:

Behold a king
Whose presence maketh this perpetual spring
The glories of which spring grow in that bower,
And are the marks and beauties of his power.

(253)

King James himself is England's Favonius, father of the spring—the god who, with God's grace, can work this miraculous epiphany upon the nation. In his 1616 speech James admonished his subjects not to "take away the mysticall reuerence, that belongs vnto them that sit in the Throne of God." Jonson's masque reaffirms the mystery of divine right by celebrating James and his wise policies as the channel by which divine blessings are conferred upon the land. The dances of the main masque, in greatest contrast to the overblown and frantic futility of the antimasques, imitate the motion in stasis of nature herself: "In curious knots and mazes so / The spring at first was taught to go," and of Zephyr (Favonius) and Flora whose union first caused and still epitomizes the mildness and beauty of spring. Through the dances, the pattern of the masque is brought full circle. At its opening, Delight proposed to bring spring to the court but managed only to produce monstrous perversions of nature. The king is able to succeed where mere Delight failed by reversing Delight's proposal: nature is not brought to court, but the court is brought back to an idealized, revitalized nature.

By the time the masque has ended, the courtiers, and presumably the auditory as well, have completed their education in the proper uses of art. What remains, as the masque's epilogue admonishes, is for viewers and participants to carry this lesson back into the reemerging here and now of everyday life, to defer to the mystery of royal power and help translate the masquing vision of a night into a perpetual English reality. Such a translation might involve real sacrifice: in the case of all those who held no place at court and could

not justify their presence in London by pleading urgent necessity, it would mean no less than to give up their city ambitions, submit to the king's wise cure for the diseased imbalance of the nation, and "get them into the Countrey."

II

We do not know the precise date during the 1616-17 festivities on which *Christmas His Masque* was performed, very likely Christmas Day itself. Even more than *The Vision of Delight*, *Christmas His Masque* has proved a puzzle to modern readers, partly because there seems so little of it.¹⁷ It is not words that are missing in *Christmas His Masque*: the text is approximately the same length as Jonson's other masques. But *Christmas* seems to be little more than a truncated mummers' play. It lacks Jonson's standard division between masque and antimasque; it lacks the characteristic transforming visions; it lacks, most important of all, the participation of the courtiers and any unifying interaction through dances between masquers and the court audience.

Why, given its radical departures from Jonson's usual form, did its author even call *Christmas His Masque* a masque? Its manuscript title was *Christmas his show* (233). Assuming that Jonson himself was responsible for the changed title, he may have had in mind the connection he had drawn in *The Entertainment at Althrope* between masquing and traditional holiday morris dancing: in that work No-body announces himself as the "Huisher to a Morrise, / (A kind of Masque) whereof good store is / In the countrey hereabout. . . ." ¹⁸ Mumming, then, could be a sort of poor man's masque, a show appropriate to performers incapable of the highest reaches of art. But Jonson's purpose was more complex than merely to draw parallels between court and country entertainment: *Christmas His Masque* fails to become a full-blown masque, or even a complete mummers' play, because of the failure in devotion of its hypothetical producers, the citizens of London.

James' 1616 speech before Star Chamber called, among other things, for the proper celebration of Christmas: the landed classes were to live in the country and "keepe hospitalitie" in the traditional English fashion, "especially at Festiuall times, as Christmas and Easter, and the rest." As *The Vision of Delight* satirizes the overblown humors of the upper classes and educates them as to the wisdom of royal policy, so *Christmas His Masque* castigates the

London citizens for their stubborn ineducability. The upper classes had failed to keep Christmas in the country, but Londoners were not keeping Christmas at all. Christmas, along with all other religious holidays, was under strong attack in London by the very "Puritans and Nouelists" the major portion of the king's 1616 speech was designed to curb.

In great country houses, the proper keeping of Christmas involved collective feasting and merriment under the reign of Misrule, dancing, dicing, and very likely also mumming and St. George plays performed by local villagers. In London, similarly, the citizens had traditionally paid their holiday respects to the king and royal family in residence by offering gifts and elaborate civic pageantry. In 1377, for example, the Commons of London rode "on mumming" to make "sporte and solemnity to ye yong prince" Richard II. Bringing dice cleverly designed so that the courtiers would always win, the citizens initiated a game of chance: "they set before the prince's mother, the D. of Lancaster, and ye other earles euery one a gould ringe and ye mother and ye lordes wonne them. And then ye prince caused to bring ye wine and they dronk with great joye, commanding ye minstrels to play and ye trompets began to sound and other instruments to pipe &c. And ye prince and ye lordes danced on ye one syde, and ye mummers on ye other a great while and then they drank and tooke their leaue and so departed toward London."¹⁹ Similarly, in 1401 the men of London "made a gret mummyng to [the king] of XII Aldermen & here sones" at Christmas time.²⁰ During Tudor times holiday civic pageants became even more elaborate; they were still a very prominent feature of Queen Elizabeth's reign. But the advent of the Stuarts brought a rapid decline. London pageantry came to center more and more on the Lord Mayor's shows, while court entertainments became more and more isolated from the citizenry. Part of the reason for this decline and separation was that King James disliked civic pageantry intensely and played his role in the festivities with poor grace. But another part of the problem was the growing alienation of London citizens from the crown.²¹

Londoners, already burdened with taxes which went in part to finance such costly, unsound business propositions as the Stuart court masques, resented the expenditure of yet more hard earned money on obligatory city shows for the king. They often went to rather elaborate lengths to get out of the responsibility. In 1613, for example, James called upon the Lord Mayor to arrange an enter-

tainment in honor of the wedding of the Earl of Somerset. The Lord Mayor sent back apologies that his house was too small. The king countered that he “might command the biggest hall in the towne.” Trapped, the mayor and city council grudgingly agreed to hold the required entertainment at the City’s expense. Londoners had gotten so far out of hand that when a court masque included the presentation of a lavish gift to the king by his courtiers or the common people as a demonstration to foreign emissaries of the “loving support” of Englishmen for their king, the gift would be paid for in advance out of the royal treasury.²²

Economics, however, was not the only issue. Many Londoners objected to the support demanded by the king on ideological grounds as well. London was a stronghold for seventeenth-century puritans, a group for whom both King James and Ben Jonson felt virulent dislike. The puritans tended to place pageants, masques, Christmas games and other holiday festivities in the same category and to reject them all for the same set of reasons. All were inherently suspect because they wasted time and energies more suitably channelled toward the service of God. But much more damning was the fact that English plays, mummings, and drunken festivities could be traced back to Roman times: they had begun among idolatrous pagans, been fostered by the superstitious Roman Catholic Church, and were therefore anathema to anyone who considered himself a reformed Christian.²³

King James’s habitual response to this historical argument was the *reductio ad absurdum*: he quipped at the Hampton Court Conference that perhaps shoes were also to be abandoned because they had been worn in pagan and popish times; in the 1616 speech before Star Chamber he quoted a pagan sentence, *A Ioue principium*, in a Christian context and then pointed out with elaborate mock deference to puritan sensibilities, that “though it was spoken by a Pagan, yet it is good and holy” (328). For King James, the refusal to keep traditional English customs was not a religious but a political matter. In his *Basilikon Doron*, published in England in 1603 and reprinted in the 1616 *Workes*, James indirectly refuted puritan arguments against the old festivals by drawing a parallel between fasting, which many puritans did not object to on principle, and other old customs to which they did object. He also called his son’s attention to the great usefulness of “good cheere at Christmasse” and “publike spectacles of all honest games, and exercises of armes” in preserving the public quiet. In his 1603

speech before Parliament James had reaffirmed that puritan dissent was not really a question of religious scruples, but of dangerous leanings toward political sedition.²⁴

Given James's stated policies, the obstinate refusal of Londoners to keep Christmas was an open defiance of royal authority. Especially in the 1616-17 Christmas season, when the gentry and nobility were presumably less numerous about town than in previous years, it was particularly important for the citizens to return to their traditional role and fête the king and his court as a proof of love and loyalty. This they were not likely to do. Happily, however, when a king's subjects fail him, a masque writer can be called in to fill the gap. *Christmas His Masque* purports to be a revival of a traditional English mummers' show performed by lowly London apprentices and shopkeepers. After numerous interruptions Christmas manages to explain the purpose of his coming to court:

Now their intent is about the present,
With all the appurtenances,
A right Christmas, as of old it was,
To be gathered out of the dances.

(239)

Christmas and his merry boys and girls are striving to please the king and demonstrate London's obedience by keeping Christmas in the proper traditional fashion. And yet, as several jokes in the masque remind us, these simple, loyal old-fashioned Londoners are themselves actors hired by the king to play their parts. *Christmas His Masque* is built upon a central irony. Whatever the hired players perform serves to point up the failure of their London counterparts. The masque's demonstration of City loyalty and its protestations of love for the king actually highlight the absence of such amiable sentiments in the real citizens of London.

At the beginning of the masque, Christmas swaggers in in traditional garb and expansive mood, incredulous that anyone should attempt to keep him out. He is the incarnation of a traditional London Christmas: "Christmas, old Christmas . . . Christmas of London, and Captain Christmas" (233)—the very type of Christmas which contemporary Londoners with puritan leanings were in fact attempting to keep out. His jests about the proper time of his arrival relate not to the adoption of the Gregorian calendar, as the Oxford editors have implied, but to an important issue in contemporary controversy. Some seventeenth-century puritans argued that rela-

tively sober cheer at Christmas might be acceptable, particularly in great houses, so long as the holiday did not fall on the Sabbath, in which case the celebration would have to be moved to another day.²⁵ Old Captain Christmas ridicules such equivocation: "A good jest, as if I could come more than once a year." His next remarks are also a specific response to puritan objections: "Why, I am no dangerous person, and so I told my friends o' the guard. I am old Gregory Christmas still, and though I come out of Pope's Head Alley, as good a Protestant as any i' my parish" (233). As we have seen, contemporary puritans claimed Christmas celebration was "dangerous" because it descended directly from pagan and popish customs: the very name of Christ-mas included reference to a popish abomination, the mass.²⁶ Old Gregory Christmas defends himself against such charges by pointing out, as King James and his bishops so often had to, that the mere fact of his popish origin does not keep him from being a worthy protestant custom.

Even his mysterious name Gregory, which has stymied recent editors, can, I think, be best explained with reference to contemporary controversy. When puritan pamphleteers and preachers sought to prove the paganism of contemporary English festivals, they turned invariably to the direct testimony of Pope Gregory the Great. His missionaries in England at the time of England's conversion to Christianity wrote that their efforts were being hindered because the English continued to cling to remnants of their old heathen religion. Pope Gregory ordered the missionaries to permit heathen temples and heathen festivals to remain, but reconsecrated to the Christian God.²⁷ As a result of the noxious policies of Pope Gregory, according to puritan controversialists, customs derived from "*Roman Saturnalia, and Bacchanalian festivals*" crept into the church—among them the "*dancing, Masques, Mummeries, Stage-playes, and such other Christmas disorders now in use with Christians.*" The pagan derivation of such disorders "should cause all pious Christians eternally to abominate them."²⁸ For King James, however, such an argument was one of the very "Nouelties" his 1616 speech was designed to curb; Christmas was worth keeping precisely because of its ancient status as a good "old fashion of *England.*" When Jonson's Christmas claims "I am old Gregory Christmas still," he means he is invariable in his essence—the same ancient set of customs which had existed in England at the time of Pope Gregory. The mere fact of his durability throughout the ages is no proof that he should be neglected and despised in the

present, particularly since to “abominate” old Gregory Christmas would be to violate the king’s express commands.

Christmas is rather apologetic about the limitations of the entertainment he is about to present. It was originally meant for a guild-hall and has been touched up quickly with the help of the Groom of the Revels to make it acceptable for court. Even so, his masque is not quite the usual court production: “another manner of device than your New Year’s night” (234). Appropriately, old Christmas’s show begins as a faithful reproduction of a traditional folk drama, amalgamating features from the mummers’ and sword dance plays. Fish and Friday are banished as they usually are in feast day entertainments. Christmas prays for the audience, presents the actors along with their places of origin, and specifies the purpose of the show as the leader does in the introduction to the conventional folk plays. His cry for quiet “Mum! Mum!” as the dancers are brought in, the circling of the dancers, the meter and rhyme of their carols—all are conventional.²⁹ Even the scrambling of actors for last minute props and their occasional bumbblings comically reproduce the flurries of discomfiture simple tradesfolk or villagers must often have displayed in the unaccustomed role of performers.

The names of Christmas’s dancers, however, are not at all characteristic English mumming names, with the exception of Minced Pie.³⁰ Rather, Jonson’s mummers, the sons and daughters of Christmas, are each one of the customs necessary to make a “right Christmas, as of old it was”: Misrule, Carol, Minced Pie (who stands for Christmas feasting), Gambol, Post and Pair (a card game), New Year’s Gift, Mumming, Wassail, Offering, and last of all, Baby Cake, a special cake eaten at Epiphany. Each custom is at the same time a London personage who hails from a street punningly suitable to his or her profession. Minced Pie, for example, is a cook’s wife out of Scalding Alley, where meat purveyors actually lived; the name of her street suggests the scalding required in the preparation of a good mincemeat pie. Offering is a Christmas custom “that in every great house keepeth,” the traditional custom of holiday offerings to the poor in the houses of the nobility and gentry. Appropriately for the one who is to collect the offerings, he is named Little-worth and hails from Penny-rich (Peneritch) Street. Christmas’s introduction of the dancers is full of clever and elaborate jokes, many of which are probably unrecoverable. The important point however, is that the list welds London people, places, and holiday pastimes into an inseparable unity dedicated to

Christmas revelry before the king. Christmas's witty catalogue suggests that the keeping of Christmas is, or ought to be, just as indigenous and intrinsic to London as the pattern of her streets and the occupations of her population.

Christmas does his best to present a proper old-fashioned show for the king. But through no fault of his own, he fails. In the first place, he cannot find enough customs in all of London to make up the twelve requisite dancers, one for each day of Christmas. His apologies that he has only mustered up ten sons and daughters could perhaps be a joke about some shortage of actors in the company which performed the show, but it also suggests a rather severe dearth of holiday spirit in the City of London. A more serious problem is the inadequacy of Cupid, whose task it is to lead and inspire the Christmas dancers. Cupid is hilariously garbed like a City apprentice "in a flat cap and a prentice's coat, with wings at his shoulders" (234)—by no means a standard image for that familiar allegorical figure. His dress, though, is entirely appropriate for his specific function in *Christmas His Masque*. This prentice Cupid stands for "the Love o' the city" (240), that is, the City's love for the king. The masque's performers have been drawn by Cupid to court, "Drawn here by Love," in order to present their entertainment. Christmas is careful to inform the auditory that even when Cupid is not actually leading the dancers he continues to lead them in spirit (240). Their performance will be an actualization of his influence, a proof of their love for King James. If Cupid fails to inspire them, the whole enterprise will fail as a demonstration of London's devotion.

The crucial moment in the entertainment comes when Cupid is called upon to address the royal audience, to begin an interaction between the king and his City subjects:

You worthy wights, king, lords and knights,
O queen and ladies bright,
Cupid invites you to the sights
He shall present tonight.

(242)

The commencement of Cupid's speech suggests that the show has barely begun—there are to be "sights" and perhaps further speeches which will give *Christmas His Masque* a more elaborate form closer to the usual court masque. Even the mummings' and sword dance plays always included the enactment of a combat, death and revival—a folk analogue to the Epiphany theme of reviv-

al in the masque.³¹ But Cupid stumbles, falters, and forgets his lines: the Love of the City is not strong enough to bring the promised entertainment into existence. Christmas complains, "This it is to have speeches" and his show limps lamely toward a conclusion with nothing but the dances.

Even Cupid, though quite small and timid, might have proved equal to his task of guiding and inspiring the evening's entertainment were it not for the alien, meddling presence of his mother Venus, a "deaf tire woman" who intrudes upon the show without the slightest comprehension of its specific purpose or of dramatic art in general. If Cupid represents London's love for the king, timid and faltering in the present yet potentially an inspiration for considerable feats of loyalty, his mother Venus embodies all the perverse London attitudes which work against any strengthening of City love and devotion. Venus is, as critics have noted, a close relative of the meddling wife in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* whose silly ignorance of the nature of dramatic illusion nearly destroys the play.³² Venus, however, is a more disruptive figure, comical yet maddening in her pigheaded incomprehension. She is deaf to the carolling of Christmas's children, pushy and ambitious, and willing to ruin the whole show in order to promote her own son's fortunes. Her occupation of "tire woman" is appropriate for one concerned only with showy externals. When she bursts onto the scene, the sons and daughters of Christmas are quickly infected with her own ambitious acquisitiveness: they break rank and start clamoring about newly discovered inadequacies in their costumes and appurtenances. When the moment arrives for Cupid's big speech, Venus's concern that her son show himself off to best advantage makes the poor lad so self-conscious that he loses his powers of speech entirely. Worst of all, like the typical citizen, this London Venus is extremely preoccupied with money. She is so far from understanding the masque's purpose as a demonstration of love for the king that she can think only of how much his majesty will pay *her*: "How does his majesty like him, I pray? Will he give him eight pence a day, think you?" (243). This crass reversal of the masque's intent proves to be its kiss of death. Christmas gives up on Cupid altogether and motions him and his disruptive mother aside. Venus has not only exposed the central fiction of the masque: the hired actors are revealed as actors; her narrow-minded literalism destroys the masque's functioning even as art, as a symbolic restoration of the love of his majesty's subjects.

The allegory of *Christmas His Masque* is a more pessimistic re-working of several of the themes of Jonson's *Love Restored*, presented at court on Twelfth Night, 1612. That masque, too, is about the intractability of London citizens. In 1611 puritan outcries against the court masque had reached such a pitch that King James was forced greatly to curtail the cost of *Love Restored*: expenses for the production came to only about £280 as opposed to £1087 for *Oberon* the year before.³³ As the masque opens, Masquerado fears there may be no masque at all, and with reason. Plutus, the god of wealth, enters disguised as Cupid, "Love-in-Court," and begins to declaim against the "light, feathered vanity" of the masque (187). Plutus's harangue is a witty caricature of puritan and City invective against the "unprofitable evils" of masquing. Though he claims to represent love and the king's best interests, it becomes increasingly clear in the course of Plutus's tirades that he is a niggardly miser who stands only for money. He is unmasked and silenced by Robin Goodfellow, another character like Christmas in *Christmas His Masque* who speaks against "Nouelty" on behalf of old fashioned English customs. Once the god of money is vanquished, the genuine Cupid Love-in-Court returns from his icy exile to be warmed and revived by the glowing beams of the king's presence. In *Love Restored*, as in *Christmas His Masque*, Cupid leads and inspires the dances; through the harmonious motions of the masquers the restoration of Love-in-Court is made manifest. In *Christmas*, however, love never quite is restored: Venus comes perilously close to defeating the whole endeavor. In *Christmas*, too, perhaps because of Cupid's failure to initiate an interaction between dancers and audience, the presence of the king fails to work the usual miracles of transformation. It would seem that Jonson found Love-in-Court, the love of the courtiers, much more responsive to the revivifying powers of the monarch than the less tractable Love of the City.

Christmas His Masque closes not with the paeans to royal power usual in the Jonsonian masque, but with old Christmas's advice to the king about how to bring that power to bear on the lost devotion of Londoners. The sons of Christmas have displayed their loyalty through dancing but will practice it also through the holiday "exercises of armes" the king's *Basilikon Doron* had called for. Such displays of the martial arts necessary for the kingdom's defense were another traditional custom which had greatly declined among Londoners.³⁴

Nor do you think their legs is all
The commendation of my sons,
For at the artillery-garden they shall
As well (forsooth) use their guns.

(243)

Christmas suggests that the most basic reason for the sorry condition of City loyalty is that Londoners are too wealthy and proud. Too many of them, like Ralph the grocer-knight in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, act and dress beyond their stations in the “silk” and “gold lace” of the nobility. Christmas’s advice to King James is severe beneath its joviality: these aspiring “knights o’ the shop” should be kindly relieved of some of the excess captial which has caused them to outreach their place in the social hierarchy. Rich Londoners are not so overburdened with taxes as they complain, but simply unwilling to spend their “pelf” on the king or indeed on anyone but themselves and their own bellies:

But were I so wise I might seem to advise
So great a potentate as yourself,
They should, sir, I tell ye, spare’t out o’ their belly,
And this way spend some of their pelf;
Aye, and come to the court for to make you some sport
At the least once every year,
As Christmas hath done with his seventh or eighth son
And his couple of daughters dear.

(244)

Christmas’s epilogue is designed not only to counsel the king, but also to warn proud Londoners. Jonas Barish has suggested that Jonson sometimes built the bourgeoisie into the rhetorical scheme of his masques. Some prominent London citizens may well have been in attendance for the performance of *Christmas His Masque*.³⁵ However gratifying Christmas’s advice may have been to the king and courtiers, we may surmise that it would have left any Pudding Lane Venuses or grocer-knights among the audience uncomfortable in their silks and rather more uncomfortable with the masque’s stern call for humility.

Taken together, Jonson’s 1616-17 masques make a significant statement about England, both in its present malaise and in an idealized state of health. In their portrayal of the nation’s imbalances and in their suggestions for a remedy, both works follow closely James’s own pronouncements and policies. London is

brought down and the country revitalized as King James called for them to be in his 1616 speech before Star Chamber. To recognize how closely Jonson worked with James's ideas, how carefully he tuned his masques to the voice of "present occasions," ought not to detract from our ability to make out the sense of their "more removed mysteries." Quite the contrary: it will enrich their meaning and force us to realize what ingenuity and diplomacy were required in the creative process of masque making if a masque was to be well made. The present study is intended not only as a demonstration of the importance of including "present occasions" among the givens of Jonson's craft, but also as a challenge to further work in discovering those occasions. Much work, indeed, remains to be done. We ourselves might profit by Jonson's playful advice to those who ridiculed his own devotion to scholarship in the masque: "And howsoever some may squeamishly cry out that all endeavor of learning and sharpness in these transitory devices, especially where it steps beyond their little or (let me not wrong 'em) no brain at all, is superfluous, I am contented these fastidious stomachs should leave my full tables and enjoy at home their clean empty trenchers, fittest for such airy tastes, where perhaps a few Italian herbs picked up and made into a salad may find sweeter acceptance than all the most nourishing and sound meats of the world" (*Hymenaei*, 76).

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

FOOTNOTES

¹ Ben Jonson, *The Complete Masques*, ed. Stephen Orgel (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969), p. 76. Because of its more accurate notes and dating of the masques, I will use Orgel's as my standard edition. Further quotations will be indicated by page number in the text. I must also record my great indebtedness to *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52).

² The best recent studies of Jonson's "removed mysteries" are Stephen Orgel, *The Jonsonian Masque* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1965); Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1973); Orgel's *The Illusion of Power* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1975); Jonas Barish, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1967), esp. Chap. 6; Ernest William Talbert, "The Interpretation of Jonson's Courtly Spectacles," *PMLA*, 61 (1946), 454-73; Dolora Cunningham, "The Jonsonian Masque as a Literary Form," in *Ben Jonson: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Barish (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963), pp. 160-74; John C. Meagher, *Method and Meaning in Jonson's Masques* (Notre Dame,

Indiana: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1966); W. Todd Furniss, "Ben Jonson's Masques," in *Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton* (1958; rpt. Archon Books: n.p., 1969), pp. 89-180; and Enid Welsford's still useful *The Court Masque: A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1927). Furniss and Orgel, particularly Orgel's *Illusion of Power*, deal at some length with the problem of "present occasions." The present study is strongly indebted to Orgel's seminal work. For a general sense of the importance the Stuart court attached to masques as instruments of state, see Mary Sullivan, *Court Masques of James I* (New York: Putnam, 1913).

³ See Orgel, *The Jonsonian Masque*, p. 69; Furniss, pp. 113-19, 124; and Orgel's ed. of the masques, p. 504, n.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, I, 71.

⁵ *The Court Masque*, p. 203.

⁶ Excerpts from James's speech are quoted from the convenient edition of C. H. McIlwain, *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1918), pp. 326, 331. This edition is also available in 1965 rpt. Further quotations will be indicated by page number in the text.

⁷ See the proclamations for 1605, 1607, 1611, and 1615, in *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), I, 117, 122, 131, 138.

⁸ *The Illusion of Power*, pp. 49-50.

⁹ See my article "The Occasion of Ben Jonson's *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*," to appear in *SEL* during 1979.

¹⁰ Herford and Simpson, X, 571.

¹¹ Orgel and Strong, I, 270.

¹² Welsford, pp. 202-03.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 199-202.

¹⁴ On building and the ostentatious display of wealth see Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965). See also J. Alfred Gotch, *The Growth of the English House* (London: Batsford, 1909), pp. 150-60. The stage design for the masque's first scene is reproduced in Orgel and Strong, I, 273.

¹⁵ See Orgel's edition, notes pp. 245, 489-90; and Meagher, pp. 77-79.

¹⁶ See Allan H. Gilbert's discussion of the king's association with peace in *The Symbolic Persons in the Masques of Ben Jonson* (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1948), pp. 132-42.

¹⁷ For representative opinions, see G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956), IV, 639; Herford and Simpson, VII, 433; and Gilbert, p. 24.

¹⁸ Herford and Simpson, VII, 129 and X, 397 n.

¹⁹ Quoted in Welsford, pp. 38-39, from Harleian Ms. 247.

²⁰ Sullivan, p. 7 n.

²¹ On the decline of civic pageantry and its causes, see David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642* (London: Edward Arnold, 1971), pp. 2-5, 33-105; and for earlier Tudor pageantry, Sidney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969).

²² Sullivan, pp. 92, 153-54.

²³ For representative puritan opinion see Barnabe Googe, tr., *The Popish Kingdome* (1570; rpt. London: Chiswick Press, 1880), ed. Robert Charles Hope, fols. 57-58; John Northbrooke, *A Treatise wherein Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine plaies or Enterludes . . . are reprovved* (London, 1579); Nicholas Bownde's very influential *The True Doctrine of the Sabbath* (London, 1606), pp. 263-68; and William Prynne's mammoth compilation of all earlier arguments in *Histrio-Mastix* (London, 1633), esp. pp. 21-24 and 757-80. For discussion of seventeenth-century puritan opinion see W. B. Whitaker, *Sunday in Tudor and Stuart Times* (London: Houghton, 1933);

and Christopher Hill, *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (New York: Schocken, 1964), pp. 168-94.

²⁴ McIlwain, pp. 27, 274. See also Appendix C which catalogues James I's hatred of puritans, pp. xc-xci.

²⁵ See, for example, Bownde's discussion, pp. 202-72.

²⁶ Prynne, p. 759.

²⁷ *Selected Epistles of Gregory the Great*, tr. James Barmby in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd ser. Vol. 13, pt. 2 (New York: Scribner, 1905), p. 84. The most available 17th cen. source for the letter was Bede the Venerable, *The Historie of the Chvrch of England*, tr. Thomas Stapleton (St. Omers, 1622), Bk. I, Chapt. 30, p. 144. Before that appeared, of course, Gregory could be read in Latin.

²⁸ Prynne, pp. 759-60. See also Bk. V of Polydore Vergil's *De rerum inventoribus*, available in a number of 16th and 17th cen. editions.

²⁹ See C. R. Baskerville, "The Sources of Jonson's *Masque of Christmas* and *Love's Welcome at Welbeck*," *MP*, 6 (1908), 257-69; and R.J.E. Tiddy, *The Mummers' Play* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), pp. 115-31.

³⁰ Baskerville, p. 261.

³¹ Tiddy, pp. 71-72.

³² See T. M. Parrott, "Comedy in the Court Masque: A Study of Jonson's Contribution," *PQ*, 20 (1941), 428-41; and Herford and Simpson, X, 560. *The Vision of Delight* also has several very probable borrowings from Beaumont in Fant'sy's long tirade: "The world it runs on wheels" appears in Act V, scene iii, and a reference to the "pudding" and its two ends in Act I, scene ii. If Jonson was referring deliberately to the Beaumont play in the antimasques of *The Vision of Delight*, he probably did so to point out slyly to his audience that the middle classes too were caught up in the vanities James I had castigated in the upper classes.

³³ Herford and Simpson, X, 522, 533.

³⁴ See John Stow's complaints in *A Survey of London*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), I, 84-95.

³⁵ Barish, p. 245.